

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee Minutes

Tuesday October 25, 2011

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment – 2 minutes - None

2. Chair Report –

- Hillel UCSD Center for Jewish Life originally planned for this meeting has been postponed to the next meeting by request of the applicant
- 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 and Avenida de la Playa/Beach Storm drain project
- Cto. Bello has deferred until they make another submission to the City.
- Status of Item 33 of the 7th Update to the Land Development Code-in effect only for projects with “completion” dates after the effective dates-Airport Authority and Coastal Commission have to approve [late word, Airport Authority approved in October so 7th update is in effect for areas outside the Coastal Overlay Zone-where “completion” date is after effective date]
- LJCPA appeal of 8490 Whale Watch was heard at Planning Commission on October 20. The PC denied the appeal 6-0. PC certified the Negative Declaration.
- The new appeals policy of the LJCPA can be viewed on the website: <http://www.lajollacpa.org/bylaws.html> in a redline/strikeout version-highlights
- LJCPA ratified the appeal of the Lundberg project, on the CPA evaluation of the visibility triangle issues at the driveway and additional free standing wall in the PROW. It has been slated for a Planning Commission appeal hearing on November 3.
- LJCPA approved on consent the 1JWest U/G project
- Hooshmand was pulled from the LJCPA consent calendar by Ed Furtek and is scheduled to have a full hearing at its November 3 meeting.
- Nooren-8001 Calle de la Plata was approved at the LJCPA meeting-interior changes had been made, incorporating a ground level garage in the footprint already evaluated by the PRC
- LJCPA voted to rescind all previous actions on 1912 Spindrift – upon advice of City Attorney. It also voted to approve the project
- LJCPA did not hear the tabled motions about other procedures
- An NOA (10-5or 6) for a 3984 sf addition to a SF home at 2712 Costebelle Dr and plans have been received. No contact as of 10-20. No posting seen on 10-14 and 10-19.[late word, contact made, posting delayed because of misaddressed mail]
- Plans have been received for an SCR for the home at 8335 Camino del Oro-corner of El Paseo Grande. NOA due 10-20. Property is posted.
- LJSPRC meetings for rest of year – different date being sought for December

3. Project review

- A. Chao Residence – 8289 La Jolla Scenic North
- B. 8440/8450 Whale Watch Way

3A. Chao Residence 2nd review

- 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
- Owner's rep: Sasha Varone, Golba Arch.; 619-231-9905; 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]

Project now revised to increase south setback to 5'-2" and change round tower entry to rectilinear with chamfered frame.

Previous Action: September 27 - See minutes at lajollacpa.org for complete minutes

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)

Seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP)

Presented by Tim Golba

Overview of the changes:

The entry for the previous design shown at the last meeting was a larger circular tower element. This front entry has been re-designed and is being presented today. The tower has been removed and the entry is now square and is smaller than the previous design, which better blends in with the rest of the proposed structure. The new design increases the front setback slightly, decreases the GFA slightly, and increases the landscaping by 1%. The setbacks on the side property lines are now 5' 2".

Landscape presentation by Jim Neri:

- Total landscaping = 35%
- They are preserving existing trees on three corners of lot along with an acacia on the slope. They are adding palm trees on the front of the site, with twin palms framing the entry.
- The trash enclosure is hidden in the wall at the lower end of the driveway.
- The north boundary has access to rear yard along the side. There is no access from the south side.

- Rear yard: barbecue area on north side of rear deck
- Pool/Jacuzzi pump enclosure next to the barbeque area right on the property line.
- Pump enclosure is subterranean and has no vents on the neighbor side. Vent will be facing the Jacuzzi and the pool. Since it is subterranean, it does not have to be set back from property line.
- Queen palms on street, Kings on the entrance.
- Right of way greenery: native plants, Manzanita or beach strawberry, thyme.
- No brush management is needed for the slope.

Structure presentation by Tim Golba:

The revised entry design was presented. With the square front, there is an extra 1.5' of setback from the street. The original design had a lot of stone work extending up the front of the house. This had been scaled back in this design, and there is now only a band of stone along the front base of the house. The rest of the walls are stucco.

Elevations and renderings were presented of the new design. These drawings incorporated a rough rendering of the neighboring houses on that side of the street to show how this design fits in, in both design and scale with the neighborhood.

The basement plan showed a theater, common room, bedroom, laundry room, and parking for 5 cars.

The driveway slopes from the sidewalk to the lower level garage area. The driveway transitions follow the city code: 10% - 20% - 10%. The slope transition starts 8' from property, which is 8' from the sidewalk. The driveway visibility triangles shown on the plan.

The second story floor plan was presented. Rear elevations and an east-west section was shown.

Building heights: chimney: 28' 6" roof at highest: 26' 6".

Roof-deck: there is a stairwell to the "hidden" roof-deck accessible from 3 bedrooms and the ground level stairs. The roof-deck is sunk 3' 6" from the roof line. If the change was any greater, the roof deck would be considered a room and have to be included in the FAR calculations.

Committee questions/comments:

Emerson, Morton, Naegle all comment that the changes to the front entryway structure, from a large round tower to a smaller square design fits in much better with the neighborhood.

Naegle: Is there an elevator? *Response: Yes.*

Public comment: None

Motion: Schenck **Second:** Emerson

Findings can be made for a Site Development Permit for project as presented with increase to side yard setback and changes to front entry.

Motion carries: 6-0-1

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

3B. 8440/8450 Whale Watch Way

- Project No. 254765
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8440 and 8450 Whale Watch Way
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas; 619-446-5142; ggargas@sandiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Mark House, /House & Dodge; 619-557-0575; markhouse@houseanddodge.com

Project Description: Demolition of single family residences at 8440 and 8450 Whale Watch Way; construction of new two-story SFR with portions of lower level subterranean garage defined as basement; site work to include 2 driveways & curb cuts, site walls, hardscape, landscaping, site grading, fences, pool & spa. [Applicant] (demolish existing residence and construct a 10,755 square foot, two-story, single family residence on a 0.92 acre site. . . . , Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, [Campus]Parking Impact Overlay Zones. [City])

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

Presented by: Mark House

This project will combine two lots, remove the current two houses, and build a single large structure in the middle of the lots.

Project statistics:

- Main level: 8581 sq. ft. (9664 including upper garage)
- Lower level living area: 2174 sq. ft. in FAR calc.
- Lower level total, including lower garage and mechanical room: 6292 sq. ft.
- Project FAR: 39.69
- Habitable space: 10,075
- GFA = 15,957.53 sf
- Total project space: 22,087 sf
- Neighborhood FAR average: 33.10
- Lot coverage: 27%, (allowable 60%)
- Maximum Height: 27' 6 ¾"
- Rear setback: 57.2' neighborhood avg: 40.9
- Green space 44%
- 11 offstreet parking spaces. 10 covered + driveway parking
- Total bedrooms: 5 main + 3 downstairs = 8
- Two driveways 12' wide, existing

With respect to the existing houses, the new project increase the setbacks from the neighboring houses on either side.

Question: The city raised a question of the access tunnel being 10'3 from the property line instead of 15'. *Answer: This is no longer an issue. There was a retaining wall attached to the front access tunnel wall that extends up 3 feet. The city considered it part of the tunnel and therefore a structure. They have changed the design and the retaining wall will be floating and not attached to the access tunnel. By code, the access tunnel being subterranean does not have to be 15 feet from the property line.*

The pool equipment is accessed from a different tunnel.

House materials:

- The roof is a zinc roof with a gray weathered patina. The City does not want reflective material. A material sample was shown.
- Stone veneer will be used and a sample was shown.
- The door and window frames are a nickel colored metal.

The house has 3 pitched roof areas, with flat roof segments in between. The maximum roof heights were shown several ways. A plan was shown with a plumb line. The highest point on the plumb line is 27' 6 3/4". The maximum roof point from existing grade is 26' 5".

View corridors:

Since the new building will fill the middle views, the side views will be wider

Front wall 3' tall and 3' partially open

Landscape plan presented - much discussion on plantings in relationship to partial public vistas to the ocean:

The La Jolla Community Plan specifies this section of Whale Watch Way as one of partial vistas. There will be two areas at either end of the lot where the driveways are that will offer partial vistas to the ocean. Questions from the committee focused on the plantings, especially the trees and how they would grow, maximum height, fullness, etc.. There were lots of concerns that the tree heights and other plantings would block potential views or vistas.

North driveway:

- Magnolia, St. Mary, 35 ft max height –
- Magnolia tree in the front, its canopy will be above 5 ft
- Camphor trees, 40 feet max

South driveway:

- Magnolia, little gem, 15 ft max height
- Bamboo, 15 ft tall
- Giant birds of paradise, 15 ft tall

· committee suggested change to jacaranda or similar lacy tree

Yard: Paspalum grass, which is low in water use, for rear lawn

Board discussion:

Emerson: Privacy at driveways is not as important. Consider replacing the bamboo border with lower shrubs.

Lucas: What can a pedestrian see in the driveways? *Response: The ocean can be seen, but the view down to the beach could be blocked by plantings on other properties in front, not just from the plantings being proposed.*

Morton: The community plan encourages to preserve and enhance views. He thinks that any trees and plantings should have a lacy canopy. Bamboos can get thick. What is the overall theme? *Response: A South American feel with the plants: cycads and bromeliads. Not Hawaii, but South America. The smaller palms fit in.* Morton: Recommends that the side yard plantings be dwarf varieties.

Donovan: The view is down. Supports Morton comments about dwarf trees. She also has concerns about the landscaping.

Naegle: Wants to see the architecture renderings. Like to say that artists love to have trees in their paintings. The real question is what makes a view? It's ok to have trees in a sight line. If done right the trees and plantings can enhance the view.

Public comment:

Tony Crisafi representing the neighbor, Mr. Wolf at 8430. They appreciate that the house is pulled back from the property line and that there will be some privacy screening provided by the bamboo lining the driveway. The plantings help to break up the length of this large house as you drive down the street.

Sarah Cowan – with builders:

Keep in mind the overall impact of the project. This single house concept improves the vistas over the present 2 house configuration.

The house plan was then presented:

A rendering of house was shown. There are arbors in front, similar to a Japanese influenced house further down the street. Elevations were shown from all sides. The chimneys are at the 30' height and prop D height due to the slope of the lot.

Morton:

Retaining wall design? *Response: Keystone walls or block wall.*

Any site stability issues? *R: No. No historic slides on site. Will meet the 1.5 city requirements. They will use conventional solid footings.*

Retaining walls and fill? *R: They are doing a large amount of fill. Geo grid will be used with the fill. The fill will be compacted. The pool will have its own structure – on piers.*

Drainage? *R: Drainage will go to vegetative swales, used to lessen the drainage by min of 5 – 10%. There are 2 existing cement troughs at the north and south corners of the house. There will be 5 catch basins of about 150 cu ft capacity.*

The sewer design? *R: The sewer will pump up to the street.*

House materials? *R: Limestone block siding, with metal roof.*

Glazing? *R: Starfire glass with low reflectivity*

Historical issues? *R: One house went through a historical review. It is a Henry Hester design house built in 1973. It was determined to not be historically significant.*

Boyden: Is soil really class C or class D? Class C. There are no seismology issues.

Emerson: Would like to see rendering of the entire front of the house.

Naegle: This is a very large house. Several elevations are needed of the area - compared with most single family home projects, this one is a "city." Naegle likes the general architecture. He would like to see several other sections on the public (street) side of the property.

Crisafi suggested that elevations could be better delineated with color added.

Motion: Morton Second: Emerson

Project to be continued to the next committee meeting with the following additional info provided:

- landscape plan that addresses the concerns of the public vistas – allows more views
- More street elevations renderings
- Elevations/renderings from down below including the retaining walls.
- Address the impact of this house from the public right of way.
- Request a complete materials board
- Verify project information and descriptions (height, sq footage, bedrooms)
- Delineate the height limits and datum points in the sections.
- Render in the elevations to make them more visible

Motion carries: 6-0-1

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