

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee– Minutes Tuesday January 25, 2011

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment
2. Chair Comments –
 - A. To date we have no information from the Hooshmand, 2414 Calle del Oro, Cto Bello and City Rialto Drain and LJS electric Undergrounding district as to when they want to schedule.
 - B. We are expecting plans for a new project at 8435 Ave. de las Ondas noticed recently. We have plans for the Nooren residence at 8001 Calle de la Plata to be noticed on January 27.
 - C. PRC Terms of service are up for renewal during the month of May and for the Chair. PRC members appointed by the LJCPA should contact the new Chair of the CPA after one is elected in April and LJS Chair for ratification by those boards at their May meetings.
3. Project Review –A-B

Committee members in attendance: Helen Boyden, Tim Lucas, Phil Merten, Betty Morrison, Michael Morton, Dale Naegle, John Schenck. Absent: Ed Furtek

E. Aron Residence

- PROJECT NUMBER: 215861
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
- LOCATION: 8435 La Jolla Scenic Drive North
- Project Manager: Patrick Hooper; 619-557-7992; phooper@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Colin Hernstad; 619-921-0114; colinhernstad@gmail.com

Project description: Demolish existing residence and construct a 2-story 8364 SF residence on a 0.49 acre site in the SF zone of LJSPDO within the LJ Community Plan, Coastal Height Limit, Airport Influence Area, [Campus] Parking Impact [City] To build a new SF residence to accommodate a young, very active family of 6 (expecting to increase) in an environmentally friendly home that will enhance the neighborhood and community. [Applicant]

SEEKING: Site Development Permit (SDP)

Previous Action: November 2010 LJS Permit Review Committee

Motion: Morton Second: Merten

Continue item and return with:

- Parking spaces noted on site plan.
- Setbacks shown on site plan to second story.
- Finished landscape plan and drainage plan.
- Patio structure modifications and how they comply with city codes.
- Show how drainage from roof and hardscape will be handled.
- Distances of hardscape from property lines.
- Completed geology study.
- Updated landscape plan.
- Calculate setback averages.
- Extend site sections to neighboring structures on both side to show mass and bulk of these structures.

Carried: 6-0-1; Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Morrison, Merten, Morton, Schenck; Oppose: 0; Abstain: Boyden (Chair)

Please see November 2010 LJSPRC Minutes for Committee Discussion and Community input.

1/25/2011:

The Chair announced that she had prepared a supplemental neighborhood survey that adds the intervening homes in the 8300, 8200 and 8100 blocks of La Jolla Scenic Drive as well as additional homes in the 8400 and 8500 blocks of La Jolla Scenic Drive and homes omitted in the 300' radius on Cliffridge Lane, plus additional information about

other homes on the west side of La Jolla Scenic Drive. For the homes added only the lot size and home square footage was supplied. She stated that she had distributed the information to committee members without comment prior to the meeting. She then distributed copies of the Supplementary Neighborhood Survey to the Committee, the applicant and others in attendance.

Presented by: Colin Hernstad & Brian Beggs (Tri dimensional engineering) presented on drainage aspects.

Changes and response to previous committee request:

- The proposed project being presented has a reduced footprint on the eastern (rear) side of the house (towards the slope).
- House is now at 7498 sq. ft. with an FAR of about .40
- Plan reflects 6 parking places on the site plan. 6 bedrooms on site plan (5 + Guest).
- Second floor superimposed on the plan.
- Closest first floor setback on the north is 5 foot at the garage. South 9 foot minimum.
- Second story setback minimum: 7.75 on north, 12.5 on the south side. Current: 7' on north, 6' on south.
- Landscape coverage now at: 37%

Civil engineer Beggs: Some of the drainage from the rear yard stays in the back yard in a sump. There is a small north-south swale on east side of property slope which discharges through the yard to the south. A retaining wall is proposed for the east of the lot and the grade below it will be leveled, forming a sump condition that backs into the swale.

Public comment:

Tom Moffette (lives on adjacent property at east below on Sugarman Drive): The property to the north was part of an older city dump. The berm carries water to the south. There is a lot of erosion on the hill several houses to the south. He does not want the quantity of water increased into the swale, which will further the erosion.

Response: the amount of water that will be increased is very small. Runoff from the midpoint of the house goes to the front, the rest to the rear. Water is at a lower slope 1% to the leveled sump area, which should retain most of the water and send very little to the swale.

Moffette: Where does the drainage from the pool go? Where do they empty the water from the pool? *Response: There is no storm drain system on LJ Scenic [location of nearest storm drain needs to be clarified at subsequent meeting]. Pool discharge water must go to the sanitary system per code.*

Moffette: The pool is 45' from the east property line. Several years ago, a pool ruptured 6 houses away and created problems for downslope residents. He hopes that this design will be sound.

Susan O'Neill: What is the volume of water coming off the roof and hardscape in a 100 year storm?

Response: They don't measure in total volume but in rates: currently the runoff is 1.10 cubic feet per second (cfs). The proposed project has a slight increase to 1.17 cfs.

O'Neill: What is the mass of the structure? What is the weight – concerns with stability of the soil?

Response: They don't calculate the mass of a house. The geology reports indicate no issues with soil stability.

Board discussion:

Morton: The existing roof plan shows one section is flat. He makes the suggestion that water from this be piped and sent to the front of the house to lower the amount draining to the rear.

Boyden: This house is now smaller at 7498 ft. Average FARs for nearby lots with areas greater than 20,000 sq ft are in the .200 range (current average is .174-calculated after the meeting). This project has a FAR of .4 (reduced from .44) more than twice as much as the houses on similar lots within this section. The largest in neighborhood excluding garage is 5052 sq ft, and this far exceeds that. From a square footage perspective this home is 50% larger than any within two blocks. The larger homes presented for comparison were located south of Pottery Canyon, one half mile distant.

Merten: Has concerns with the way the house is placed on the site. The Design Manual: “Building structure and set backs shall be in general conformity with those in the area...”

Most houses are single story; those with second stories have them placed in center of house away from property line. The second floor level of this design is stepped back slightly, but the profile of the existing vs. proposed really stands out. The proposed stepback doesn't conform to the LJSPDO Design Manual. The proposed mass and bulk is too forward and disrupts the architectural unity of the neighborhood.

Response: Shows poster board of other houses on same side of street. Some Other houses are large in street appearance. Applicant will mitigate the effect of this project through plantings and trees.

Boyden: Points out that the one large house they used as an example for the neighborhood is really large, stands out at the front, and doesn't fit with the neighborhood architectural unity. House on north side of 8435 is ranch style and very low profile. This design will dominate that house. The south house has lots of trees along the side that mitigate the effect of this size and the two story element is in the center of the façade with one story elements to either side. The proposed house is larger than any other in the neighborhood, and the next house would use this as a precedent to propose an even larger home.

Response: Planting will mitigate and the setback from the street mitigates.

Merten: On the south, the setback is adequate and has landscaping to shield the house. On the north side there are concerns with privacy and it crowds the neighboring house. Thinks that the design can be adjusted to better conform with the neighborhood.

Schenck: Concern with the 2-story element on north side and the overall size of the project.

Morrison: The size of house being largest in the neighborhood is a concern.

Naegle: This is a big lot. Since there is no great view, second floor could be reduced and first floor expanded. The design should have an elevator also. He likes the elevations, but thinks the garages with the house behind stand out too much and are not part of the neighborhood.

Response: There is a nice view of the mountains to the east from the second floor. (committee pointed out that there was similar from first floor as there is nothing to block view to the east)

Response from owner: The house to the south is in process of being sold and will be redeveloped/expanded within the next two years.

Boyden: Thinks the applicant's project should match the scale of the neighborhood.

Morton: The original development of this area was in the 1960s, as small modest houses. While there is no established FAR in the La Jolla Shores, he is sensitive to second floor and the neighborhood properties. Recommends looking at the side elevations to see what can be done to shift things a bit, such as, changing windows to high ribbon to protect privacy.

Response: Closet in master bedroom could be reduced. Master bathroom is there and has a planter, so no privacy issue there.

Merten: Our committee is prevented from making conditional approvals. At this time, he can not find that the project conforms, due to the second floor and closeness to the property line issues.

Lucas: Has the same concerns with the scale of the house.

Motion: Merten; Second: Schenck
To continue project to future meeting.

Motion carries: 6-0-0

Approve: Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; Oppose: 0; Abstain: Boyden

D. 1912 Spindrift

- PROJECT NUMBER: 214654
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
- LOCATION: 1912 Spindrift
- Project Manager Glenn Gargas: Ph: 619-446-5142; ggargas@sanidiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Lisa Kriedeman; 858-459-9291; lkriedeman@islandarch.com

Project Description: Demolish existing residence and construct a 4699 sq. ft., two-story single family residence. City Coastal (appealable); Coastal Height Limit, Sensitive Coastal, Flood Plain, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area Overlay Zones [City]Construction of new two level single family residence with loggia, balconies, hardscape, landscape, retaining walls, masonry, fences and pool. [Applicant]

Note: Applicant made another submittal to the City in late November answering questions raised in the first cycle and revising plan. Subsequent City cycle is scheduled to be received prior to this meeting. No revised cycles were provided by the City

Note: Project reduced in size from original submittal to City. [Applicant] See below.

Seeking: Site Development Permit: Environmentally Sensitive Lands and LJSPDO (SDP) and Coastal Development Permit (CDP)

Previous Action: November 2010

Motion: Merten; Second: Morton

Continue item. Request that project come back with neighborhood site plan that shows this building in relationship to neighbors, show the elevation of this house in relationship to neighbors. Provide details on parking spaces and access.

Carried: 6-0-1 Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Morton, Merten, Morrison, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden (Chair)

Please see November 2010 LJSPRC Minutes for Committee Discussion and Community input.

1/25/2011:

Presented by: Matt Peterson & Lisa Kriedeman:

Latest cycle issues: 82 issues identified – all have been resolved except for one.

Concerns with 10 ft setback from the property line. Adjustments have been made to the design to address this.

A poster board was presented with photographs of 16 properties in neighborhood and comparisons to the proposed designs and the existing structure were presented.

Changes include:

- The main level has been reduced 681 sq ft and the upper level has been reduced 463 ft. The total proposed square footage is 3,475, down from 3,753 of the previously presented design and 4,699 from the original concept.
- FAR is now 0.25, down from 0.27.
- Ridge height reduced 2' 7" to 25.25 ft. Chimney lowered 2' 4.5" to 27.25'.
- Pushed building back at north corner, so now 12' setback at closest point to street.

- Front yard setback changed from 10 to 12 ft.
- Side yard setback proposed: South: minimum 2 ft (previously 1.6'). North side remains at 6 ft

Boyden: Due to the hedges in neighborhoods, you can not see houses or any view corridors presently.

Response: The view corridor proposed on the north side of the house will be the first view corridor south of the Marine Room.

Morton: What is the material of the gate and the new fence?

Response: The gate will be open, but there is no view corridor there. The fence will remain as is - they can't disturb the soil due to native American site issues. There will be a view corridor at the wider setback side.

Morton thought the brush and tress along the south property line could be trimmed and thinned which might open up a diagonal view of the ocean.

Public comment:

Sue Weissman: She lives further away and has no view issues. She is concerned about the hedges and brush bordering the sidewalk. The sidewalk is being encroached on by these hedges and they need to be trimmed back.

Response: They will be trimming the hedges back and maintaining things better. They can not do any major changes or plantings due to Native American site restrictions as interpreted by the City.

Board discussion:

Morton: This looks like a modest house. What is the curve of the house for?

Response: A stairway goes up. This also adds articulation to the design and increases the setback to the sidewalk.

Merten: Has concerns about the placement of the building. It doesn't fit with the rest of the houses of the neighborhood, which are all set back more. This house is too near the street and is two stories as well. He does not feel that he can make the findings for this project.

Response: Other houses have 2-story elements and are close to the street (shows neighborhood photos). This is a narrower lot than others in the neighborhood. They can not build on the bluff and there is also a fault line running diagonally, which limits the placement of the house.

Lucas: Is concerned with the massing towards the street, but the circumstances of not being able to develop over the cliff and the Native American site restrictions force a design like this. If they decided against having a pool, they could move the house down slope, and have more parking, but having this shallow pool forces this design.

Morton: This design offers better views and a view corridor than currently exist.

Motion: Lucas; second: Morrison

Findings can be made for the project as shown with the 2' South and 6' North side setbacks. The committee suggests that thinning of the trees be trimmed and that hedges and bluff shrubbery be landscaped and trimmed to improve neighborhood and public views along the property lines.

Motion carries: 4-3-0

Approve: Lucas, Morrison, Morton; Oppose: Merten, Naegle, Schenck; Tiebreak: Boyden (chair) approve