

# La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee – Minutes

## Tuesday September 27, 2011

**Committee in attendance:** Helen Boyden (chair), Dolores Donovan, Janie Emerson, Tim Lucas, Phil Merten, Michael Morton, Dale Naegle, John Schenck. None absent

### 1. Non-Agenda Public Comment - None

### 2. Chair Comments

---To date we have no information on when Gaxiola wants to schedule. Also in this category is a Torrey Pines Road slope repair between Little and Roseland, southeast side of road

---Cto Bello has deferred until they make another submission to the City.

---Palazzo project was withdrawn and therefore there will be no appeal to City Council

---LJCPA voted to appeal 8490 Whale Watch

---LJCPA approved on consent the T-Mobile approval and the Lundberg denial. The City approved the Lundberg SCR the next day and an appeal has been sent and according to recently passed LJCPA appeals procedures the LJCPA will hold a hearing to ratify or not on October 6.

---Nooren-8001 Calle de la Plata was pulled from the LJCPA consent and will have a full hearing at the LJCPA October 6 meeting

---LJCPA President Crisafi elected to hear the Rialto Storm drain as a full hearing at the Sept. 1, CPA meeting and it passed, the president of the HOA having been contacted.

---Hillel Student Center, NOA dated August 11-applicant asked for October 25<sup>th</sup> PRC hearing

---An NOA has been issued to replace and install storm drain, and sewer main and water main. The project area is in the public right-of-way along Avenida De La Playa from Paseo Del Ocaso west to the seawall adjacent to the beach. No other information as of 9/28/2011

---Plans received for a 10,755 sf residence at 8440-8450 Whale Watch Way—appears to have 5201 sf additional applied to GFA- #254765-Notice not received in the mail as of 9/29/2011

---LJCPA adopted a new appeals process – see September 1, 2011 LJCPA minutes

---LJSPRC potential procedure revisions will be deferred until after LJCPA action on recommendations of Ad Hoc Committee—tabled to October 6 LJCPA meeting

---the LJS PDO AB recommended three projects for Process One, stating reasons. One was a resubmittal of 8814 Robinhood Lane, adding ca. 800 sf, most of which went to enclosing portico between home and garage and extending 2<sup>nd</sup> story toward the middle of the house. LJSPDO AB recommendation amounted to not requiring SCR or amendment or new SDP.

---Review of current LJSPRC operating procedures/bylaws and meeting procedures

### 3. Project review

#### A. Chao Residence

- Project No. 242106
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8289 La Jolla Scenic Drive North
- Project Manager: Jeff Peterson; 619-446-5327; [japeterson@sandiego.gov](mailto:japeterson@sandiego.gov)
- Owner's rep: Sasha Varone, Golba Arch.; 619-231-9905; [svarone@golba.com](mailto:svarone@golba.com)

**Project Description:** Demolish existing 1-story single family residence. Construct new 4,655 sf 2-story single family residence with basement. Construct new hardscape and landscape including pool. [applicant] The proposed project will conform to the Council Policy 900-14 criteria by generating 50% or more of the projected total energy consumption on site through renewable energy resources (i.e. photovoltaic). . . . Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, Airport Influence Area-Review Area 2 for MCAS Miramar, and Council District 1. The project site is not located within the Coastal Overlay Zone. [City]

## Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP)

The chair stated that she lived about ¼ mile from the project and walked by frequently.

**Presented by: Tim Golba, Jim Neri**

### Tim Golba gave a general overview of the project:

- House is located on a 10,000 sq ft parcel.
- The neighborhood is predominantly 2-story homes.
- 2-story over a basement plus underground garage (5 spaces)
- FAR is .46, which conforms to zoning requirements anywhere in the city.
- Project sits in zone 52 in city geology survey – stable zone.
- House sets back from the top of the bluff.
- Six bedrooms total.
- Not in campus impact parking zone.
- Project is a sustainable expedite project.
- Cycle issues are clear with the city.

### Landscaping and outside features presented by Jim Neri:

- Palm trees exist at site. Additional palm trees will be planted in front lining the street.
- They will try to retain existing trees on the property.
- The design has 34% greenscape.
- Driveway site lines will be clear – no landscaping will block visibility.
- Hanging plants will be lining the garage driveway
- Underground trash containers will store containers out of sight. They will need to be pulled up the sloping driveway.
- The pool equipment will be located in a subterranean vault on the property line.

### Committee questions:

**Donovan:** Are there any views that will be blocked by the installation of the palm trees or other plantings? *Response: No. The palm trees in front will have no impact on views from the neighbors. The other plantings will not affect views. The houses on either side do not have side windows, so they will not be affected.*

**Emerson:** How wide is the driveway? *Response: driveway is 16' wide.* Q: What is the slope of the bluff in the rear? *Response: the grade is about 1 to 1. According to city geology report the grade varies from 38 to 42%.*

**Naegle:** There are drainage issues and slope stability issues elsewhere in this area. What is the drainage plan? *Response: The drainage plan was shown and explained to the committee. They will capture all runoff from top edge of the slope to the front of lot and sent it to the street in front. Currently falling in the yard and rear of the house runs down the rear slope. This will cut down on the slope stability issues as less water will run into the slope. Pumps will be used at the bottom of the garage driveway to pump the water to the street.*

**Morton:** Can you describe the location and layout of the pool pumps and equipment. *Response: Above ground pool equipment needs to be at least 3' back from the property line to meet code. Pool equipment underground can be located on the property line. The pool equipment will be located in an underground vault along the property line.*

**Lucas:** How will the pool water be drained? *Response: The pool will drain through sewer pipes. The equipment vault will have a connection to the sewer.*

### House presentation: Tim Golba

- Elevations of structure were shown to the committee.
- There is a hidden roof deck not visible from the street.

**Boyden:** Houses in the 8400 block had drainage issues and slope stability issues – does this parcel have issues? *Response: The other lots had cuts into the bluff, but did not protect the cuts. For this project, most of the rear yard will be covered and drains to the street. There will be less drainage going to the bluff than there is now.* Question: The driveway has imposing utility boxes: cable, telephone, power on the south of the driveway restricting the ADA aspects of the sidewalk. The city pointed this out in the cycles? *Response: They discussed this with the City. It was not feasible and very costly to relocate those utility boxes that serve the neighborhood. The City has approved an alternate, keeping sidewalk as is and not disturbing the utility boxes.*

**Merten:** The aerial photographs show side setbacks are closer to neighbors than before and do not mirror the neighbors. How do the proposed setbacks fit in with the neighborhood? *Response: Neighbors have a deck on the north side that is hard to see in the photos. The current garage on this property is only 2' feet away. The new design has the garage farther away. On south side there is a lot of planting and cover that preserves privacy. The second floor is stepped back as well. The neighbors have blank walls on their second stories as well so this should not be an issue. Setbacks at minimum points: North: 5' 2"; South: 4' 2".*

**Morton:** Using the 300' survey, what is average side setback for the neighborhood? *Response: They didn't tabulate that. Boyden, referring to chart that doesn't have averages on it but doing some quick math: approximate average for LJ Scenic homes is about 6', Sugarman Drive is about 5'.* Question: Explain how the pool will be supported? *Response: The pool structure has not been designed yet, but will be supported by at least 4 caissons. The pool dimensions are: 12' x 20' max depth is 5'. The spa to the side is slightly raised above the pool.*

**Boyden:** She has calculated FARs for neighborhood properties. The lots are of similar size. Out of all the 29 houses, five are in the range .30 to .35. The other, this project, is .46 which is substantially larger than the average? *Response: You have to look at this from the standpoint of bulk and scale, not just a FAR number. This house fits in with the other houses in the neighborhood, especially since it is pushed back from the street. Photographs of homes in the neighborhood were shown and compared to the proposed design. The remaining older houses in the neighborhood are smaller and outdated. The more recent houses are much larger.*

**Morton:** Just to remind the committee, FARs do not apply to LJ Shores. A discussion of FARs is irrelevant. Bulk and scale is relevant. Question: What are the relative roof heights in the neighborhood? *Response: Relative heights 26', this project is 26.5', with max height of 28.6' for chimney. Other roof heights were pointed out on the photographs of neighboring properties.* Question: What are the heights of the rotunda? *Response: The rotunda is 21' high to eaves, 26' to the peak.*

**Morton:** Had further questions on front yard hedge and trees. The bulk and scale is reduced because house is back from street. The rotunda is the biggest feature in front.

**Naegle:** Is concerned about the mass of the house. FAR is an important mathematical method of viewing the size and bulk of a project. The front elevation shows the rotunda, and it is too massive. It can be narrowed somewhat, as most of the enclosed space is not used. He thinks that this could be reduced to be more compatible with the neighborhood.

**Merten:** Agrees with Naegle. The "Romanesque" tower in front looks like it is a different scale from the rest of the building. It is so dominant that you expect that the rest of the house should also be Romanesque, but it isn't.

**Public Comment:** None. No neighbors present.

**Schenck:** Where is the stairway to the roof deck? *Response: It is located in center of the house and is not visible from the street. It was shown on the plans.*

**Lucas:** Had questions on the sustainable expedite and the proposed solar panels. He has concerns that the space allotted for the panels won't have enough area to meet the goals? *Response: The solar array hasn't been designed yet. The sustainable expedite mandates that 50% of the load for the house be generated by alternative sources. There will be enough area for solar panels to meet the requirements. The array will be for photovoltaics only. There will be no solar water heating for the pool.*

**Donovan:** Agrees that the FAR can be a good indicator of bulk and scale. Responds to comments that the older houses in the neighborhood being small is not necessarily bad. Small houses in a neighborhood should not be denigrated.

**Emerson:** Visually this looks massive because of the turret (rotunda).

**Merten:** Not so troubled by the FAR, due to breaking up the facade and stepping back of the second floor. There are still bulk and scale issues. The circular, squatty, Romanesque rotunda needs to be changed a bit to better fit in. He also has concerns on the proposed setbacks and their relation to the neighboring properties. The first floor roof overhang comes within 20" of the property line.

**Morton:** The rotunda feature can probably be changed in some way to mitigate the effect. Approaches such as, materials changes, different eaves, softening the recessed opening, different shapes windows... could all be used to make the rotunda fit in better.

**Motion:** Morton **Second:** Emerson

To continue the project. The committee would like to see next time:

- Calculated summary on setbacks for the neighborhood.
- FAR calculations for the neighborhood.
- Look to mitigating the bulk and scale, in particular the entry tower appearance.
- Materials board or display.

**Motion carries: 7-0-1**

**Approve:** Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; **Oppose:** None; **Abstain:** Boyden (chair)

## **B. Undergrounding Residential Block 1J West**

- Project Number: 216751
- Type of Structure: Undergrounding of overhead utility lines and poles
- Location: See description below and map at hearing
- Project Manager: Helene Deisher; 619-446-5223; [hdeisher@sandiego.gov](mailto:hdeisher@sandiego.gov)
- Applicant: Mario Reyes, PM , City Utilities Undergrounding Program; 619-533-7426; [mreyes@sandiego.gov](mailto:mreyes@sandiego.gov)

**Project Description:** Undergrounding of approximately 13,300 l. f. of overhead utility lines and poles in an area roughly described as north of Avenida de la Playa to SIO, west of La Jolla Shores Drive to the ocean. This description delineates a district and some lots already have undergrounding.

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

**Presented by: Mario Reyes, City of SD**

- The California PUC has mandated undergrounding. The program is for streets that would benefit from the undergrounding of utilities. \$10 million a year grants are provided for some areas.
- A surcharge is being added to the utility bill for undergrounding areas not covered by grants.
- This undergrounding district is being created to prevent further poles from being installed in the district by other providers.
- During the preliminary phase, there were some native artifacts and remains found during sampling, so this project is going through the SDP and community review process.
- For some areas they will have a Native American monitor.
- A community forum will be held to discuss the process

**Merten:** Questions on undergrounding on the public right of way. Response: *Before 2003 the owners were responsible for the hookup from the right of way to the home. After 2003, the surcharge covers it all, and the power company will install to house. They will do the actual connection if the panel accepts feeds from underneath. If panel is recessed into the house, they can not touch a wall, but will install an adapter to link to the box or the homeowner can relocate the panel at their expense. If they have an undersized panel, the homeowner will be required to upgrade before the city can re-connect to the house.*

**Merten:** What if remains are found trenching on a homeowners property? Response: *The project will handle any remains found on a homeowner's property. An archeologist is always present during digging or trenching.*

**Morton:** Timeline for project? *A typical project takes 2 years in design and approval. After approval and additional 1.5 years is typical for construction. This project is projected for construction starting in 2013. Panels on houses will be upgraded first, which is independent of trenching.*

**Naegle:** There are other projects going on in the Shores: Sewer, storm water etc. Will the undergrounding be coordinated to minimize impacts? Response: *they will be coordinating through the city.*

**Public comment:**

**Mark House, local architect:** Cost to replace a pole? *Can't calculate it per pole, more of per house calculation. Usually around \$10,000 a house. What about street lights currently mounted on wooden poles? Streetlights will be replaced. The community will be contacted and trees will be planted.*

**Mario Reyes :** City-wide, there are 1100 miles of undergrounding to be done and it is a big task. Complete undergrounding of the city is scheduled to be completed in 2064. Community forums will be held and issues such as panel requirements, excavation schedules, tree replanting, streetlights, and other issues will be discussed.

**Motion: Naegle; Second: Schenck**

**Findings can be made for a Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands and a Coastal Development Permit for the Undergrounding of Utilities Project 1J West. [properties not yet undergrounded in the district: Avenida de la Playa north to SIO and La Jolla Shores Drive west to the ocean with some outliers]**

**Motion carries: 7-0-1**

**Approve:** Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; **Oppose:** None;

**Abstain:** Boyden (chair)

### **C. Hooshmand Residence –Fifth Review-Approximately 3rd version**

- PROJECT NUMBER: 198459
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
- LOCATION: 2480 Rue Denise
- PLANNER: Glenn Gargas: Ph: 619-446-5142; [ggargas@sandiego.gov](mailto:ggargas@sandiego.gov)
- OWNERS REP: Scott Spencer; 858-8898; [scottspencerarchitect@yahoo.com](mailto:scottspencerarchitect@yahoo.com)

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** An addition and remodel to an existing residence (Applicant)

Note: The NOA dated December 28, 2009 cites a (PROCESS 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for a 4,463 sq. ft. addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.29 acre site at 2480 Rue Denise in the SF Zone of La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone. Current revisions

Revised values for this July 27, 2011 version are listed below, does not add correctly because of some underfloor values.

- Lot Size: 12,660 sf. or 0.29 acres
- Existing Sq/Ft: 2015 sf plus 420 garage
- Proposed Addition: Main level 1504 sf
- Proposed Main Level Total: 3939 SF
- Proposed Addition Lower level: 2158 sf
- Total Sq/Ft 6173 sf includes garage

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

**Previous action March 23, 2010.** See March 23, 2010 PRC minutes for more information  
Continued the item

**Previous Action May 25, 2010** Please see May 2010 PRC minutes for community and committee actions.

**Motion: Furtek; Second: Lucas – amendment by Merten accepted.** Motion to deny. Project does not conform to LJS PDO section 1510.0301(b): Specifically: “Conversely, no structure will be approved that is so different in quality, form, materials, color, and relationship as to disrupt the architectural unity of the area.”

It also does not abide by the three principles on Page 4, three on Page 5, and the first principle on Page 6 of LJ Shores Design Manual. The perceived bulk and relationship of the northward (rear) expansion and extension of the house in relationship to the development on adjacent properties disrupts the architectural unity of the area.

**Motion carries: 7-0-1; Approve:** Furtek, Morton, Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Lucas, Schenck; **Oppose:** None; **Abstain:** Boyden (chair)

**Previous action: Please see LJSPRC minutes for June 22, 2010 for additional info on another revision which was out of sync.**

**Previous Action: March 22, 2011** Please see meeting minutes for meeting discussion

**Motion: Merten Second: Naegle.**

The Findings for a SDP cannot be made because the relationship of the proposed development to its site is so different from that of structures on adjacent parcels that the proposed development would disrupt the architectural unity of the area.

(LJSPDO 1510.0301 (b) and LJSPD Design Manual p. 2). The Findings for a CDP cannot be made because the bulk and scale of the proposed structure when viewed from the rear (north) of the property is so different from that of older development on adjacent properties that it does not comply with the community character provisions of the residential element of the LJCP.

**Motion carries:** 4-1-1; approve: Merten, Morrison, Naegle, Schenck; oppose: Lucas; abstain: Boyden. (Morton took part in discussion but had to leave before the vote)

**Presented by: Scott Spencer**

The project was originally presented as a single level, house on stilts. The neighbors and committee were concerned with appearance, bulk and scale, and view blockage issues. The sloping lot is better for split level house than a single story house, so they have redesigned the project.

The design goal was to reduce the top story, and reduce its projection out. For the lower level to look proper, as was pointed out by the city staff, it should extend beyond the upper level. They now have an overall larger house, but if you included the covered area of the original design, the house size is about the same.

They have worked with the neighbors the Luetzows and the Cutler/Shaws on the design. This project is now the same height as present house on Rue Denise. The hedge has been the biggest issue and blocks public views. The hedge on the northeast will be cut down to 3'.

The master bedroom was narrowed by 2' (steps in from first floor). Lower level is still on stilts, but not enclosed, the slope will not be changed, and it will not count in Gross Floor Area. They have worked carefully on the design issues with Mr. Gargas and Mr. Stanko at the city.

**Naegle:** They should consider an elevator? *Response: The cost of an elevator is \$25,000. The elevator may be added later.*  
**Naegle:** They should design a 5' pantry above and below for future expansion of an elevator. **Naegle:** Is very pleased with this design. It better fits the lot, and they have added a lot of value to their house.

**Morton:** Thinks this design is much improved. Wants to see the elevations and the materials. *Response: The lower level has some stonework to better fit in.*

**Merten:** Also thinks that this design is much improved, and appreciates the changes the owner has made. Doesn't think that the stone on lower level adds to the house, and it would probably better blend in to the slope if it was a plain stucco or similar material. *Response: Owner is willing to do that.*

**Public Comment:**

**Bill Luetzow:** Has questions about the ledge on the lower level west side. *Response: without the step-in there is an 18' unbroken high wall. This helps to break that up. The indent should help their view.* Luetzow: They don't think that this design helps their view. The original design was a bit more open on the lower level. Dr. Hooshmand response: The view corridor is improved because the balcony that used to stick out 9' is no longer there.

**Boyden:** The committee only considers public views.

Further committee discussions with architect were made looking at the various revisions of the plans, and how the new design sits. A roof plan was shown. The roof is asphalt composition tile.

**Schenck:** Does this design have 2,000 more space? *Response: the previous design had 4,800 sq. ft. of house and garage. This design is 6,100 ft now, so about 1500 feet larger. Considering the other design with the covered space under the stilts, this design has about the same footprint and mass.*

**Donovan:** Recommends that the landscaping on the slope blend in with the surrounding area and not block views.

**Merten:** Feels that the project has been improved to the point where it complies with the LJSPDO.

**Motion: Merten Second: Naegle**

**Findings can be made for a Site Development Permit and a Coastal Development Permit.**

**Motions Passes: 6-0-2**

**Approve:** Donovan, Lucas, Merten, Morton, Naegle, Schenck; **Oppose:** None; **Abstain:** Emerson, Boyden (chair)