

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee– Minutes

Tuesday February 22, 2011

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment-None

2. Chair Comments –

A. To date we have no information on: 2414 Calle del Oro, Cto. Bello and City Rialto Drain and LJS electric undergrounding district as to when they want to schedule. We do have some indication that Hooshmand plans to move forward again.

B. We have received plans and cycle review for 8001 Calle de la Plata: demo and construct a two-story 3700 sq ft SF residence in the MF1 zone, but the applicant states that the project is not ready to be heard.

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 LJSA Chair for ratification by those boards at their May meetings.

3. Project Review –A-C

Board members present: Boyden, Furtek (left after B), Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Morton (left before vote on B), Naegle, Schenck

A. 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] Applicant revisions as of 2-1-2011 reduce size to 7532 sq. ft. plus 966 sq. ft. garage= 8498 sq. ft. total.

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.]

Motion carries: 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.

Previous Action: January 25, 2011

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

Please see January 25, 2011 Minutes for Committee discussion and community input

Boyden: Corrected record on statements last meeting regarding La Jolla Scenic: there are curbs and curb cuts along the east side of LJ Scenic. Owner Mike Aron wanted to skip this PRC meeting and go directly to a full hearing at CPA, but they are presenting this project today. Letters from downslope owners regarding safety issues were mentioned.

Presented by: Colin Hernstad

Changes were made to the plans: To address concerns on the closeness to their neighbor's house on the north property line boundary they have set the north east side of the house back 2 feet at the bedroom area. The façade is quite varied on that side of the property which helps with the feeling of privacy.

They have provided a geology report to Ms. O'Neill to address hill stability issues and drainage for the residents on Sugarman Drive.

All the roof area will now drain to the street (this is not on the plans presented). Two-thirds of the site runoff will go west to the street, and one-third to the east to the swale. In a 100-year storm there is an increase of 0.08 cubic feet per second (CFS) bringing the total to .24 CFS flow total. Overflow will go to the swale, as is the current pattern.

Committee:

Merten: Questions on the relationship of house wall on north side... *Resp: Second floor Overhangs east side, on bedrooms in west. The wall is straight up on west master bedroom.* Questions on paving – could it be made to be grasscrete or other porous surface? *Resp: Yes.*

Lucas: Size of project with this adjusted bedroom setback? *Resp: 7532 + 966 = 8,498 sq ft.*

Boyden: House is 1.5 times the size of the largest 2 houses within a block (around 5,000 for those). FAR = 0.4. Ten houses on similar lots greater than 20k in size have average FAR of 0.17. This house is larger than anything else in the vicinity. The only bigger houses are beyond Pottery Canyon, which is a half mile away. This will take away from the wooded area effect of the area. House next door is in process of being sold; the house on other side the owner has recently passed. Charts of statistics were provided. She has watched the houses get larger over the years, but this is on a larger scale than those.

Resp: From the very first presentation they understand that this house is bigger. (NB Size of the house has been mentioned previously.) This is the narrowest lot of those in the immediately vicinity. They have tried to set it back from LJ Scenic so that the front blends in, and the second story elements are away from the street.. Pictures were shown of several other houses beyond the 300 ft zone have large presence on LJ Scenic. They will make the planting a very important effort in hiding the mass of the building.

Morton: How far is the 2-story set back from the property? *Resp: 75 feet from the west street for the second story element. The section on north that was moved back is 9.6' and bedrooms to south are 8.6' from the side property lines.*

Furtek: Setback of current house from street? *Resp: 65 feet.* Garages set back from the street: 40 – 45 feet. *Resp: They have eliminated one curb cut which which will be filled with planting to improve the look and present a natural affect.*

Public Comment

Ten residents in the area were in attendance.

Tom Moffette: Lives in house on east (downslope). He is concerned with the drainage from the development. Any water that drains to the back is of great concern. In the past there have been many drainage issues, even from moderate rains. *The geology report presented is incorrect and has not been updated to show the current proposed drainage issues.*

Vicky Powell: Sugarman Drive. When they bought their house they were informed that all water would be directed to the storm drains. Percolated water is now present and creates problems. That area in the rear swale is sandstone below 2 feet, so the water does not percolate but will run off downslope. She is requesting that all drainage water go to the front.

Jeff Cohen: Cranbrook Court. He presented street map of homes affected from past runoff issues and presented pictures showing drainage issues such as hillside blowouts and collapse. He is very concerned that this new development will make it worse. Designing to the status quo will not work. An effective drainage plan needs to be developed.

Bill Butler: Sugarman Drive: What is the total water currently being drained?

Resp: Doesn't know. But they didn't want to re-engineer the rear swale and create more issues. They can consider other ways to send more drainage to front... With regards to the geology report presented, it has been updated with small amendment that concern active faults. No updates have been made on the drainage issues.

O'Neill Letter: The highlights from the letter were presented by Boyden. The issues are: excessive size of proposed house, hardscape and drainage issues and overall visual affect. The massive excavation including 2 pools, pergola, large slab may affect the stability of the area. Currently the back yard is undisturbed. Palm trees on front use too much water. Thinks runoff can not be channeled with any certainty and it currently channels in an east-south direction where there have been significant hillside stability issues.

Resp: There currently is excellent vegetation in place.

Jennifer Phelps Sugarman Drive: When their slope failure occurred, geologist engineers recommended against adding any new percolation. This area is typically two feet of loose fill over impermeable sandstone. The water percolates and reaches the sandstone where it channels downslope to create problems along the hillside.

Maria Rothschild: Just spent time with the city street engineer regarding issues in her neighborhood (not this one). The city just completed a curb and gutter upgrade up the street from her house and now the water is directed to their driveway. The city just moved the problem elsewhere. If a street has too little slope, the water will end up standing in the street or will become a problem for another property. She advises to consider all the effects in their drainage design.

Derrick Casady: Could you re-grade the site after tearing down the old house? His understanding is that all water should drain to the street? *Resp: No – the city wants to maintain the status quo.* Followup: Some of the lots have faulty watering systems that leak, causing the properties to become saturated and drain into other properties. Swimming pools also can leak. Illegal draining of pools is an issue.

Mr. Aron: They are concerned with the neighborhood and want to be good neighbors. His wife is a homeopath and is concerned about environmental and health issues. Since moving here they have improved the gardening and appearance of their present house in La Jolla Woods and intend to keep it up. He invites neighbors to visit the house and see the yard.

Committee Discussion

Schenck: Current house – what is the drainage pattern? How much of it goes to the front and back currently? Could all water from lot go to the street? *Resp: A diagram of the area was shown.*

Lucas: Drainage system, gutters/drains are not shown on plans now? *Resp: No.* Lucas agrees with the neighbor concerns. Saying that the city wants to keep the status quo with the parcel drainage does not address the issues and will result in problems down the road. An effective drainage plan needs to be developed.

Naegle: The dangers of the drainage issues could be improved if all the water was sent to the street. They want to build a big house, which will become a precedent for the neighborhood. The front profile of the house should not be completely screened, because the neighbors will be concerned with what development is being hidden. They will want to be able to see the size of the house.

Furtek: They need to address concerns with drainage.

Merten: Since we do not have a set of plans with the suggestions on permeable paving, drains, drainage ... we can not make a motion today unless the plans are marked up. Citywide the maximum FAR for a lot this size (greater than 20,000) is .45. This project is .39 - .40. He appreciates the changes in setback they made to the master bedroom. The second floor element is pushed back more than the present house. The rear bedrooms are pushed back from the property

line. He thinks that the setbacks conform to the neighborhood and likes the articulation on the North wall – thinks it is helpful.

Morton: Consider marking up the plans and adding items to address concerns such as additional landscape, drainage?

Lucas: Is permeability a good idea given the shallow fill on the lot? Merten: State law is to leave the water that falls on the site, on the site.

Lucas: Thinks the size of the house is out of character with the neighborhood.

Morton: If the screenage and runoff can be annotated to the plan, he can make a motion. The house has been sited in the center of the lot.

Schenck: We are not here to solve the drainage issue.

Morrison: The hearing has been very worthwhile, and many constructive ideas have been given. Not sure we ready to make the decision due to the drainage issues? She is pleased with the public input and problem solving.

Boyden: Read official document from city on another project that cited being between two current homes in size as a reason for supporting that project, implication that, in contrast, this project is outside the parameters of houses in the neighborhood

Motion: Morton Second: Furtek

Based on plans presented and annotated today Feb 22, this plan will be in conformance with the LJS PDO setbacks and the theme “unity with variety.” It is in conformance with other codes. The annotations to the plan include: landscape screening in the front, roof drainage be directed to street, and non-permeable surface runoff, that can be, should be directed to the street. Permeable paving was discussed for the rear and side areas.

Lucas: This is engineering on the fly at best, and is uncomfortable with this plan markup. Will not be supporting this motion.

Schenck: Uncomfortable without a formal drainage plan.

Motion fails 2-5-1

Approve: Furtek, Morton

Oppose: Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Schenck

Abstain: Boyden (chair)

Motion: Morton, Second: Merten

Return to the committee with plans that incorporate changes on landscape screening, hardscape drainage directed to street. Present a workable drainage plan that has been submitted to the City. Present a fully updated set of plans. The drainage plan should be an improvement on the status quo.

Motion carries 7-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Morton, Naegle, Schenck. Abstain: Boyden

B. Diarq-Westway Permit Amendment

- PROJECT NUMBER: 225627
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 8436 Westway Drive
- PROJECT MANAGER: Morris Dye; 619-446-5201; mdye@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Edward Sutton, 858-459-9291; ed.sutton@islandarch.com

Project Description: Demolition of existing 2-story 3,297 sq.ft. house. Construction of new 2-story 7,453 sq. ft. single-family residence, including hardscape, retaining walls, terraces, cantilevered pool and spa and relocation of

driveway. Applicant is requesting an amendment to Site Development Permit (SDP) 416634 and Coastal Development Permit (CDP) 416633.

Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP) and Coastal Development Permit (CDP)

Previous Action: January 27, 2011 Special Meeting

Motion: Lucas; Second: Morton

Continue item to future meeting. The committee requests the following information:

- Driveway engineering in response to concerns expressed by neighbor Wetzler.
- Put up story poles to demonstrate to Dr. Mani and Ms. Evans the heights of the new building in several areas (Crisafi indicated that it may be difficult to get the cooperation of the tenant). Bring photos of story poles enhanced with proposed building outlines if possible.
- Outline, in another color, current house site plan and elevations superimposed over the permitted and proposed designs on existing drawings
- Provide information on proposed drainage system and how it will work.
- Elevations on houses across street and up Calle del Oro (site survey can show this)
- Meet with adjacent neighbors and report on the concerns.
- Provide an outline of the site coverage of the two homes on either side along with the proposed project.

Motion carries 5-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Morton, Schenck; Oppose, 0; Abstain: Boyden (chair)

Morton: Just to clarify the record, the story poles were a recommendation by the committee and were not required.

Presented by: Edward Sutton, Tony Crisafi

The project has not changed. A drainage plan has been made. The design is to collect as much rainwater on site. There is a 2500 gallon cistern onsite to collect a typical rainstorm worth of water. A 100-year storm will not be contained. The City had concerns with retaining walls from Dura-Bloc and the height. One other house on Whale Watch has a 9-foot Dura-Bloc wall without issues. There are many other retaining walls on Whale Watch with averages of 14'- 16' in height.

Views and renderings were presented to show the house with retaining walls and the cantilevered pool in the rear. The walls in the front yard are 6 feet high. Other houses on Westway Drive have similar walls, such as a 5 foot wall 9 feet from the property line, 6-foot tall fences and walls that are 1 foot or less off the property line. This is consistent with other properties in the neighborhood. This design has a 6 foot wall that is 1.5 feet back of property line (plus 6 foot easement).

To address the neighbor concerns with the driveway on the side next to the slope: They will use a deeper foundation (due to surcharge of cars driving) for driveway and put a guardrail 2 to 3 feet in height (enough to be effective with out being offensive).

A neighborhood survey was presented based on the sizes listed in the property tax rolls. It is interesting that many additions have been made to houses in the neighborhoods that aren't reflected in the tax rolls. This tends to make the neighborhood averages lower than they actually are. Regardless, the property tax rolls were used for this survey. A chart of lot size, FARs, and side setbacks was given. This project is an amendment to an approved larger project, so the FAR survey was not detailed.

The outline of the current house, the previously approved (current permit) house, and the proposed house were overlaid and gave a good view of the proposed project. Elevations as well as floor plan views were shown.

Merten: Height of west yard retaining wall maximum? 16'. Does any portion of the site have a natural gradient greater than 25%? No: *this is all disturbed lands anyway.*

Merten: If this was elsewhere in the city the maximum height is 12' for a retaining wall. *Response: They can change the slope of the green retaining wall a bit to allow for larger plants...*

Morton: Side setback? *Resp. There is a 6 foot pinch point on south.*

Public input

Mr. Rudd speaking on Dr. Mani behalf: Their concerns have been addressed.

Mr. Robinson representing Ms. Evans: He believes that the permit previously issued (2007) was not properly noticed and doesn't think that the size of that design should be used when considering this proposed project. The proposed house should be considered on its own design merits and not considered an amendment to a previous design. Ms. Evans has looked at the story poles and the renderings and appears to be able to see over it to the ocean, but still feels walled in. Looking out she only sees the walls. The 300-foot survey chart presented last time had errors due to a spreadsheet issue. These have been corrected with the chart presented today. Looking at FARs: there are 13 houses at .20, 7 houses at .25, 3 houses at .30. Only 2 houses in the area are larger than .35 FAR. The neighborhood average is .25 FAR. This house is .37+ and based on the renderings looks larger than other houses in the neighborhood. Are the CCRs are still in effect? Most of the neighborhood CCR's had height limitations are 22 feet. This house is out of scale and the layout of this house is different from the rest of the neighborhood.

Response: Other houses in the neighborhood are large and larger. We are in conformance. Their understanding is that the CCRs are not in effect.

Peggy Davis: Just sold a house on Ave. de las Ondas and the new owner Mr. Landa did not receive notice. Is there an existing basement? *Yes.* What is the foundation system? Mat footing and no caissons. Soil rating is 2500 lbs. She has big concerns on the drainage from the property.

Ms. Evans: She is concerned with the mass of the buildings. It ruins the neighborhood. Thinks that this is too massive. The tree on side of the house is fine if it doesn't grow too tall, but it does not hide the size of the house.

Response: They will be mitigating the appearance of size by using different materials to blend in. The roof will have green stone in it. The second floor design incorporates greenscape.

Committee:

Lucas: Concerned with the entire second floor at the rear (west) being open and with an elevated pool. Thinks that this will project noise out to the neighborhood and will be an issue later. *Response: This area is glassed in and has sliding glass panels.*

Merten: He is comfortable with project except for the retaining wall which is too high for the La Jolla Shores design guidelines. *Response: We can break the wall into two or three smaller walls with plantings to make it blend into the hillside.*

Lucas: Not to be contrarian, but having a single retaining wall allows for a more unbroken field below and I think blends in better.

Motion: Merten; Second: Schenck

Findings can be made for an SDP and a CDP with the annotations on drawing with 3 five-foot retaining walls instead of one sixteen-foot retaining wall.

Motion carries 6-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden. (Morton left before vote.)

C. Casa Belmonte

- PROJECT NUMBER: 226722
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence, two stories with basement
- LOCATION: 8435 Avenida de las Ondas
- PROJECT MANAGER: Glenn Gargas; 619-446-5142; ggargas@sandiego.gov
- OWNER'S REP: David Hawkins, AIA; 619-232-7700; david@H2Asandiego.com

Project Description: Demolition of existing 5,000 s.f. single family residence plus 3-car garage. Construct new two story 5,803 s.f. two-story single family residence with 1,737 s.f. basement garage. Coastal Overlay (non-appealable); Coastal Height Limit; Parking Impact.

Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP) and Coastal Development Permit (CDP)

Presented by: David Hawkins

Existing house was built in 1955. Some improvements were made in the 1990's. The proposed design is tilted on the lot to improve the view and to increase the privacy for the adjacent neighbors. They are keeping the existing retaining walls. The pad area is similar to existing design. The garage has been pushed back further from the street. There is now a front terrace for the view. They will use drought tolerant planting. The rear courtyard has a small lap pool and reflecting pond. There is a viewing platform at the rear area. The garage opening has been changed from a single door and double wide door configuration to only a double wide door now (not reflected on plan yet). This is a modern house design. The edge of the terrace has 2-foot high retaining wall. The existing Italian stone pine tree in front will be retained, but trimmed.

Merten: Overall structure height? *Resp: Fireplace 26 feet. Range: 36.8' from driveway to chimney.*

Merten: Is there a plan view with the existing structure and the proposed structure overlaid? *Response: No.*

Public comment

Phillip Menna 8425 Ave. de las Ondas: Has lived here for 40 years. There was a remodel in 1990 and the concern at that time was the proximity to the bedroom. They worked with the owner at the time to address these concerns. He has concerns that this design will have privacy issues with his bedroom. The style of this proposal is totally different from other houses on the street. This is going to be an eyesore for the neighborhood because it is totally different. It is a shock and out of place.

Response: The angled placement of the house opens up further views and there should not be bedroom privacy issues.

Maria Rothschild 8511 Ave. de Las Ondas: Will they be digging out the basement further? *Resp: Yes, on the same floor level but further back.*

Rothschild: The present house is set back and still has a great view; this design is 10 feet taller and will tower over the neighborhood. There used to be CCRs on west side of Ondas, but believes they are not in effect any longer. This modern style is totally different from the neighborhood. The profile of the house being forward on the lot is totally different from the neighborhood. Even the Cape Cod style house down the street fits in better with the current houses. Nice Montoro style house, but is stark when in the context of this neighborhood.

Committee

Naegle: This is a handsome house but is out of context with the neighborhood. Did you refer to the La Jolla Shores Design Guidelines when designing the house? *Resp: Yes,*

Naegle: This does not conform to those guidelines.

Merten: "Unity with variety" means no cookie cutter homes all the same, there should be differences, but also from the La Jolla Shores PDO "no structure shall be approved which is so different in form.... as to disrupt the architectural unity of the neighborhood." This is really different from the existing neighborhood. It is a handsome house, but doesn't fit and is out of context here. The stonework is dark but is different from other homes and is foreign to the neighborhood. It is the massing and design that is so different from the rest of the neighborhood. Set backs on south are also too close. *Response: There are 3 houses in a row with setbacks of 4 – 6 feet on one side.*

Schenck: Would like to see a profile of this house from the street side in relationship to the existing homes in the neighborhood.

Lucas: Modern office building look. It is too towering for the neighborhood. There is too much glass area, which has poor insulation/energy efficiency properties.

Motion: (Lucas; Second Naegle) Due to the two previous projects taking longer than anticipated we are out of time. Continue the project for responses to committee concerns.

Motion carries 5-0-1

Approve: Lucas, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Schenck; Abstain: Boyden
(Furtek and Morton not present for this item due to scheduling issues)

Adjourned.