

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee – Minutes
4:00 p.m. – Tuesday, December 22, 2009
La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street, La Jolla, CA

Committee members in attendance: Boyden, Furtek, Lucas, Morrison, Schenck

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment -None
2. Chair Comments:
 - Cardenas deck project previously approved pulled at CPA
 - Cell tower expansion at Cliffridge Park and Ragen residence project coming next month
 - Chair requested that all motions be specific due to current LJCPA constraints. A motion to approve findings should state what plans are being approved. Motions to deny should state LJSPDO or LJCPA plan section and quote specific reason from those documents.
3. Project Review (see A to D below)
4. Tim Lucas stated there will be a meeting re LJSPDO revision project in January, likely Wednesday January 20, 2010.

A. FAKHIMI RESIDENCE (returned at City request)

- PROJECT NUMBER: # 179961
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single family residential
- LOCATION: 7790 VIA CAPRI
- PLANNER: Helene Deisher E-mail: hdeisher@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Steve Ragan Ph: 858.756.2526 Email: sragan@johnjensenarchitect.com , jjensen@johnjensenarchitect.com
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION: a 3,134 square foot addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.46 acre site (Source: City)
- Seeking: Variance for two driveway entrances, 58' apart
- Chair Notes: This project was approved by the PRC (5-1-1) and the LJCPA (14-1-1) and I believe with two driveway entrances shown on the plans from the beginning even though no discussion took place. City staff is requiring specific LJCPA approval for a variance (Municipal Code limits driveways to one per 100') from the LJCPA before scheduling this project for a hearing.

Presented by architect John Jensen:

- Code is for one driveway per 100 ft frontage. This site has only 134 ft. of frontage. Variance needed for 2 driveways.
- Each driveway 16 ft. wide. 56 ft. between driveways
- The area in front of the connector between the two driveways will be planted and hidden.
- Due to the traffic circle in front of the house, it is unsafe to back out of the driveway. The westbound traffic on this side is not affected by the traffic circle, and cars speed by all the time. They would like to use this second driveway as a safer way to enter onto the street.
- The residence two properties down has a second driveway. It was an administrative approval by city engineers without any community review.

Comment from Phil Merten: The municipal code requires several findings for a variance. Finding #1 is that there must be Special Circumstances for a variance. Finding #2 is that without the variance, is the property owner deprived of special use of his property?

Response from John Jensen:

- First finding: Special circumstance. Traffic circle in middle of property frontage is unique.
- Second finding: The traffic circle does not slow down the westbound traffic; it only moves it towards their property 1 foot. This makes egress more dangerous as the traffic is coming fast, but with less margin for safety.

Response from Phil: Does not think it meets the second finding, as they could just as easily build a short turn around area that could be used when backing out of the garage. It would be where the proposed link between the driveways would be and would only extend a short distance

Committee discussion: Only one other driveway in neighborhood with this feature. Would this set a precedent such that other residents in the neighborhood would add second driveways? This is not a beach access area, so there is not much demand for parking. Would this be bad? Even though westbound traffic may be fast at times, there is not much of it. Most traffic is Eastbound to enter onto LJ Parkway/52.

Lucas: The residence at 2605 Calle del Oro added a second garage and driveway on less frontage. This had an administrative approval. The city planner/engineer that approved the driveway was concerned with safety, since this was at the approach to a hairpin and this would encourage the owners to park off street.

Motion: Furtek Second: Schenck

The findings can not be made to add second driveway, because it doesn't meet the second finding for depriving reasonable use of the property.

3-1-1

Approve: Furtek, Morrison Schenck

Oppose: Lucas

Abstain: Boyden

B. DESSERT/HANNEKEN RESIDENCE - Second hearing

- PROJECT NUMBER: 192318
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Existing Single family residential
- LOCATION: 8646 Cliffridge Avenue
- PLANNER: Tim Daly Ph: 619-446-5346 Email: tdaly@sandiego.gov
 - Joseph Stanco E-mail jstanco@sandiego.gov (away till 1-4-2010)
 - Terri Bumgardner Email: tbumgardner@sandiego.gov till 1-4-2010
- OWNERS REP: Erika Love Ph: 619-857-7406 Email: pacificpermits@aol.com
 - Katie Powers Ph: 619-286-1633 Email: Katie@charco.com
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 184 s.f. first floor addition and a 1626 s.f. second story addition to an existing 2886 s.f. SFR (Applicant) [Coastal Height Limit, Campus Parking Impact Zones, from NOA.]
- SEEKING: Site Development Permit (SDP)

Boyden (Chair): Read email from city planner Joseph Stanco:

- The project is, after the changes, considered to have only 4-bedrooms
- Proposed residence is sufficiently articulated
- Stepping back of second story left side will not be necessary, since most of the other two story residences have un-articulated sides.

Presented by: Dena Gillespie

- Articulation on left side has been added, even though Mr. Stanco said it wasn't necessary.
- Longest length is 34 ft. unbroken.
- Neighbors were contacted and had no objections.
- 6 ft. side setback is the average for 300' neighborhood.
- Driveway is 32 ft deep. Spaces marked on plans as requested by committee.

Motion: Schenck Second: Lucas

Project meets finding for site development permit based on email from Stanco Dec 10, 2009 and undated plans presented to committee and being submitted to City.

4-0-1

Approve: Schenck, Morrison, Furtek, Lucas

Oppose: None

Abstain: Boyden

C. McClelland Residence - First Hearing

- PROJECT NUMBER: 195996
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Type V, NR
- LOCATION: 8360 La Jolla Shores Drive
- PLANNER: Jeannette Temple; Ph. 619-557-7908; E-mail: jtemple@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Richard Gombes) Ph. 858-663-2045; E-mail rgombes@san.rr.com
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 2nd and 3rd story addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.12 acre site in the SF Zone of La Jolla Shores Planned District. Coastal overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, and Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zones within the La Jolla Community Plan area. (City NOA Info) Also Beach Parking Overlay per Cycle review.
- SEEKING: Site Development Permit (SDP) & Coastal Development Permit (CDP)
- OTHER: This property was issued approval #586174 for Project #163792 on 10/31/2008 (per plans) According to architect e-mail: the previous project that was permitted in 2008 was completed through the foundation & framing stage.

Presented by: Architect Richard Gombes

1140 sq feet – orig house. detached garage 438 sq ft

- Original permit for single story development. Demolished existing structures, leaving 50% walls, relocated Garage to front of lot.
- After first reconfiguration: 1043 sq ft first floor living area. Garage 438 sq ft.
- Exterior stairs not included in measurements
- Third floor : 932 sq ft.
- Total sq ft: 4061 sq ft.
- Open patio 741 sq ft. below second floor included in FAR
- Other decks not included in FAR
- Corrected FAR with open patio: .87. Without patio .74 (With Patio is correct)
- Lot coverage 54%
- Greenscape = 37%
- Max height 29' 6"
- House two doors down has FAR of .89

Motion Furtek: Second: Schenck

Review project again after second cycle issues have been released by city. There are too many issues identified in first cycles issue that need to be cleared before any vote can be taken.

4-0-0

Approve: Furtek, Morrison, Schenck, Lucas

Oppose: None

Abstain: Boyden.

D. MARCUS RESIDENCE Final hearing action item

- PROJECT NUMBER: #181889
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single family residential
- LOCATION: 8551 SUGARMAN DRIVE
- PLANNER: Diane Murbach E-mail dmurbach@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Christina Mannion ph. 619-293-7640; Christinam@wallacecunningham.com
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Demolition of existing house and construction of a new 6213 sq. ft. two story single-family house with a basement/garage and a pool (Applicant)

Presented by owners representative Christina Mannion:

- Five air condensing units contribute less than 50 DB total noise.
- They are below grade, covered with grate and moved to street side of home.
- Tabulated summary presented. Including 4 large homes outside the 300' at city request.
- Drainage plan shown.
- Shading study presented: during summer there are limited impacts. Winter at 3:00pm shades house behind on north side where kitchen is located.
- Classification of lot in regards to what street the address should be based on, and what should be considered the front and sides in terms of setbacks is correct according to city.

Boyden (chair): Questions about historical review.

Response Mannion: Nothing historically significant about existing house or former occupants.

Boyden (chair):

- Original house was 1660 sq ft, according to sales brochure:
- Then if garage 450 sq ft., 2100 sq ft. total.
- Original lot coverage: 20%. Proposed 41% lot coverage

3D topographic model of proposed structure, and several adjacent structures on Bremerton and Kilbourn presented by Mannion to illustrate context of proposed building. The public and committee was able to view it.

Photo montage of entire Sugarman Drive area from Richard Talbott was presented.

Highlights of letters for and against read by Boyden (chair).

Public comment for:

Dechants: approve of project.

Butlers: Original homes cheaply built and have problems with settling. Not worth it to remodel existing structure. Should be all new construction.

Dostarts: fill poor, slabs sub par. Fire issues. aging trees. (Committee had copy of letter)

Public comment against:

Kuncz: This is unique neighborhood. Lots of green and landscaping so houses blend in. Designed to look natural. Cutting trees and re-siting house to the higher part of lot will stand out. Looks more like Getty museum than a house.

Lazerow: The large multi-story houses presented by owner's representative are actually in other neighborhoods. Those neighborhoods have larger houses and smaller setbacks. This neighborhood is smaller houses and larger setbacks. The proposed house is out of place in existing neighborhood. Two larger example houses were developed after a deal was cut to approve a synagogue. Even so, those 3 large houses are set back much more on all sides than this proposal. The air conditioning units of the synagogue are loud, and he has doubt that the proposed condensing units will be as quiet as stated. Maximum height of proposed structure is twice average of neighborhood, the set back is half of the average house. House should be set back on all sides and not positioned against the upper corner, next to neighbors with minimal setback. He said that even if the height was reduced, and the setbacks were improved, there are still stylistic issues that make this structure stand out from any other house in the neighborhood. He disagrees with the historical review and thinks that the current house is a historic structure, since each house in the area is slightly different in style and design. Points out that even the chimneys have different brick patterns for variety and style.

Response from Mannion: Setbacks vary in the neighborhood. City says that any new structure must be fire rated for 1 hour due to the wooded character of the area. The proposed structures will be very fire resistant.

Helen: Letters state that two houses have burned in general area and that the whole area has soil compaction and subsidence issues. She said this is not a reason to build such a big/different house in this neighborhood. Committee member Dale Naegle at previous presentation noted that it was too large for neighborhood Morton at that previous meeting thought it looked too commercial.

Phil Merten: Two sections of LJSPDO are designed to allow transitions in the neighborhood. Building what is already there isn't required to meet the code, but building so differently doesn't work either. It is a matter of degree and this is too big a jump. The committee should base findings on these sections of the PDO.

Motion: Furtek Second: Lucas

Motion to deny: The project does not meet the criteria in section 1510.0301 of the La Jolla Shores PDO which states: "No structure will be approved which is so different in quality, form, materials, color, and relationship as to disrupt the architectural unity of the area" and section 1510.0304 which states: "Building and structure setbacks shall be in general conformity with those in the vicinity. The proposed structure is not in compliance with those provisions of the code due to difference in style and size, as well as setbacks next to neighbors and siting of the house.

4-0-1

Approve: Furtek, Morrison, Schenck, Lucas

Oppose: None

Abstain: Boyden (chair)