

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee - Minutes

Tuesday August 28, 2012

Committee members in attendance: Helen Boyden (chair) (departed before vote on Vallecitos) Janie Emerson, Myrna Naegle, Laura DuCharme Conboy, Tim Lucas, John Schenck. Absent: Dolores Donovan, Phil Merten

1. No Non-Agenda Public Comment

2. Chair Comments

- Applications have been received for SDPs and CDPs for properties at 2712 Glenwick Place for ESL for previous grading/slope repair and 2382 Via Capri Court for 1st floor and garage adds. They will likely be heard in September.
- Gaxiola at 2414 Calle del Oro is expected to be heard in September
- The Lia and Mazon EOTs were passed on consent at the August LJCPA meeting.
- The Palazzo SCR was pulled from the August LJCPA consent agenda
- The August 21st, LJS AB meeting was cancelled.
- LJS AB agendas have an official posting URL of:
<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/lajolla/pddoab.shtml>

3A. McIlvaine (Landa) Residence

- PROJECT NUMBER: 282104
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 8415 Avenida de las Ondas
- PROJECT MANAGER: Paul Godwin; 619-446-5190; pgodwin@sandiego.gov
- OWNER'S REP: William S. Hayer; 858-792-2800; bhayer@hayerarchitecture.com

Project Description: Demolish existing SFR, garage and pool. Construct new SFR, 2 stories over partial basement incl. garage, new pool with wine grotto & exercise pavilion, new site retaining walls and associated landscape features. [applicant] Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit and Campus Parking Impact Zones.

Seeking: SDP and CDP, Process Three

Disclosure: Committee member and architect Laura DuCharme Conboy will be abstaining because she had done some initial consulting with the property owners very early on in the project. Architect Tony Crisafi, the LJ CPA president, sat in on this project in to provide expertise in the absence of the other architects. Crisafi only asked questions and did not take part in the committee discussion or any votes.

Boyden: The City had comments on the project which were forwarded to the committee. The questions related to easement removal, setbacks, height, lot coverage, FAR, parking, paleontology, and drainage.

Presented by: William Hayer

He provided 300' setback study and photos of those homes.

This project is located on a cul-de-sac at the end of Avenida de las Ondas. The lot size is 25,757 sf. Residence has a tuck under garage and partial basement which totals 3,242 sf. but only 113 sf are added to the GFA (also includes 3986 sf 1st, plus 653 sf pool structure and 3878 2nd floor, totaling 7830 sf). FAR is 30%.

Front setback 20' 6" to north front corner which then jumps to 27' and gets progressively larger to the south. The north side setback at closest point is 11' 4", which is to columns supporting the roof overhang above the front entry. The building corner at that point is actually 21' 6", but the overhang is 10' closer. The south side setback, going to the pool structure is 9' 11" which is buried into the slope, the setback to the residence itself is 69' 9". The rear setback is 16' to the grotto, and 27' to the residence. Based on comparisons, they feel that this is in conformity to the neighborhood.

The height is 29' 7" on the plumb line to the highest point, and 37' 7" from the lowest to the highest point. They submitted this information to the city, but city staff wanted further clarification on several issues, so additional data sheets have been prepared to show that the project is in conformance. There is a landscape area of 52%.

The home has been sited back into the slope (on the east). This softens the impact of the view from the lower properties looking up. This arrangement provides a larger outside space to the west for a pool and large yard.

The building is shingle style using wood shingles, river rock, exposed rafters, and white trim. They tried to offset as many forms as they could to break up the planes and lessen the bulk & scale. A photograph taken from the house below, with the proposed structure drawn in, was shown to the committee to illustrate the minimal impact the new structure will have when seen from below.

Committee Questions:

Emerson: How does the footprint compare to the existing house. **Response:** The outlines of both were shown on a drawing. Basically the house is pulled to the east into the hillside and north closer to the property line.

Boyden: Bedrooms and parking in the neighborhood? **Response:** 5 bedrooms and 5 parking spaces. 3 spaces inside the garage, one is a back and fill. Tandem parking is not allowed in this zone.

Schenck: Since you have to move one car to get to one space isn't that the same as tandem parking? **Response:** The way tandem is currently defined, it is not the same. Tandem implies one car behind the other which is not the case here. Unfortunately they are in a zone where tandem is not allowed. This arrangement has not been presented to the city yet.

Boyden: Describe the wall heights? **Response:** There will be several retaining walls in front of 5' in height with plantings to soften the impact. At the rear is a shoring wall dug into the hillside. A 22' high shoring wall will extend up. In front of that will be a 6' planter area and then a secondary high shoring wall 10' high. The setback from the first shoring wall is 10'.

Lucas: Cubic yards of fill being removed? **Response:** Doesn't have that information here.

Crisafi: What type of environmental document? **Response:** Mitigated Negative Declaration. There will be paleontology monitoring. **Crisafi:** Clarify the area in front of the stairs shown on the drawing – is that a planter between the entrance sidewalk and the driveway? **Response:** Yes. **Crisafi:** Then you can't put a parking space there. There is a trade off when building an underground garage. By using an underground garage you minimize the hardscape in front as the driveway corresponds to the curb cut. On the other hand, underground parking becomes very expensive as you also need turning space in addition to the actual parking spaces, which increases the size of the garage and the costs of doing more construction and a larger excavation. Thinks that this parking arrangement is a creative way to meet the city codes, but we will have to see what the city thinks.

Lucas: The neighborhood is zoned for 2-hour parking, so it is important to have 5 usable spaces onsite. If the city doesn't accept the back-and-fill parking, what will you do? **Response:** We would make a space in front next to the driveway where landscaping is being planned, we can't extend the underground garage any further. The driveway slope is 2% so the space would be usable.

Public comment:

Fred Boynton (neighbor at 2404 Calle del Oro): No issues with this proposal. He would like to see the big concrete cylindrical shaped house above them blocked.

Beverly Boynton: Thinks that this is a good use of the lot. There is a natural drainage area on the Gaxiola property to the south that could be better utilized for drainage if needed.

Committee discussion:

Lucas: Driveway length? **Response:** 27' (20' required). Curb cut is 12'. **Lucas:** Any solar panels? **Response:** None at this time. **Lucas:** Where will the pool equipment be located? **Response:** On the east side next to the shoring wall. **Lucas:** My concern is noise from the pool equipment reflecting off the shoring walls. **Response:** It shouldn't be an issue. There will be a trellis in front of it with plantings which should help mitigate any noise.

Schenck: Is there a drainage plan? **Response:** Most of the site will be collected into area drains and then be routed to the street somewhere in the cul-de-sac of Ave. de las Ondas. Drainage on the southwest portion of lot beyond the proposed retaining wall accounts for approximately 2% of the site. This is the low spot of the lot and they will need to come up with

some sort of an energy dissipating design, such as a trench, where the water can be slowed down so it percolates into the ground, or else install drainage pipes and a sump pump and eject this to the street. This is still to be addressed with the City. The only city comments so far had to do with the type and location of the outflow into the cul-de- sac. Basically looking at through-the-curb or below-the-sidewalk.

Emerson: Objects to routing the drainage to the street. Her house is downstream of this on La Jolla Shores Drive, and there are problems with run-off from Ave. de las Ondas, both from rain and irrigation, that creates a lake of standing water in front of her house that the city has been unable or unwilling to resolve. She is surprised that the city will let them eject the water to the street like this. She will be unable to support the project. **Response:** That is a city issue that needs to be resolved and should not be counted against this project. He will look into it and see if there is anything that can be done. It's possible that most of the runoff could be retained on site, through percolation, but will need to consult with the city on this.

Beverly Boynton (Calle del Oro neighbor): There is a drainage system at the east property line on the Gaxiola property that could be better utilized. **Boyden:** We have received current plans for the Gaxiola project. Apparently there is some retaining wall structure in the vicinity of the Gaxiola drainage system that the city hasn't commented on yet. That project is still under review and we can't address that here.

Boyden: The city commented about a brow ditch on the property? **Response:** There is an existing brow ditch (culvert) that goes along the east of the property (above the proposed retaining wall) and onto the Gaxiola property to the south where it empties into a catch basin on Calle del Oro. There is no drainage easement or formal document that allows this to happen. It picks up the house above the retaining wall and several other houses to the north. The property above has now added an 8" drainage pipe into this brow ditch without a permit. The previous owner of the project property, in agreement with the previous neighbor above, built this to keep the runoff from above from spilling down and flooding their property. The city is looking into this issue now. The drainage plan was shown to the committee. It was again stated that it may be possible to have much of the water of lighter rainfalls percolate into the ground, but this has not been worked out yet.

Committee: Several committee members had concerns about the unresolved drainage and permitting issues with the brow ditch feeding onto the neighboring property and into a swale area that may or may not be functional.

Motion: Schenck; second: Naegle

Motion to continue this item to a future meeting. The committee would like to see the proposed parking plan after review by the city.

Motion carries: 3-1-2

Approve: Lucas, Naegle, Schenck

Oppose: Emerson

Abstain: Boyden (chair) Conboy (did initial consulting on project)

3B. Vallecitos (Feldman) Residence

- PROJECT NUMBER: 284055
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Single Family Residence
- LOCATION: 2351 Vallecitos
- PROJECT MANAGER: Paul Godwin; 619-446-5190; pgodwin@sandiego.gov
- OWNER'S REP: Haley Bareisa, Island Architects; 858-459-9291; hbareisa@islandarch.com

Project Description: CDP and SDP to demolish an existing residence and construct a 4900 sf SFR on a .444-acre site [applicant] Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Zones.

Seeking: SDP and CDP, Process Three

Full disclosure by Lucas: He lives 3 houses away upslope and attended a recent open house where the proposed design was presented and he then walked around the property. The project does not affect his view and he does not have any direct financial interest in the project. He has not been in contact with the owners or architects regarding the project since the open house. He does not see any conflict of interest and will not be abstaining.

The Chair distributed copies of the 300' survey and several photos of nearby homes provided by the applicant. They had been sent to committee members prior to the meeting along with cycles.

Ms. Bareisa distributed packets with additional information which were discussed in the course of the presentation.

Presented by: Haley Bareisa and Tony Crisafi

They held an open house last month and presented the plans to the neighbors. They had 4 neighbors drop by and review the plans. Signed sheets were presented, two persons had no objections and another signed that she had viewed the plans and made no comments on the signed paper.

The proposed project is a 4900 sf single story house, covering 42% of the lot which is lower in center than present house, giving the neighbor to east a better view. There are two pavilion pop-ups over bedrooms and a larger one over the great room at the northwest corner of the house. Elevations were shown along with the 30' and prop D height diagram. The proposed house was sited to preserve views of the neighbors and to allow the applicant to have a better view over the west neighbor's house. A floor plan was shown. The existing house has an angled orientation and sits in the middle of the lot. The proposed structure has been re-oriented and pulled back to the east property line. They are retaining the same driveway, but the curb cut has been reduced from 19' 10" to 16'. The design is a contemporary ranch and they presented material samples. Site sections were shown.

Conboy: What is the height relationship to the upslope neighbor on the east? **Response:** The neighbor's pad is at 95.5' datum and the flat portions of the proposed project's roof are at 97.5', so the roof is 2' above the neighbor's floor. The great room is at 106.98' and is the highest part of the house. That would put it at just under 12' above the neighbor's floor level. They have tried to orient the great room's ridge line so that it will impact the view less.

There are columns supporting the overhang in front of the dining room which are located 12.5' from the west property line. The setback to the house itself on the west side is 25'. The setback on the east side is 5' to the house.

There are three parking spaces in the garage and 3 outside the garage, plus general driveway parking. They are not in the beach parking impact zone.

Boyden: The City had comments about the retaining wall. **Response:** This was concerning the retaining wall near the west property line next to the downslope neighbor. The city was concerned about screening the wall and they also wanted to see other retaining walls in the area. The retaining wall is set back 5' from the property line, so there will be plenty of room for a hedge or other shrubbery to screen the wall. They reduced the wall height from a maximum of 9' on the original plan to 8'. The wall starts at 5' height on the north side (street side) and gets higher towards the back where it reaches 8' in height. The plan is to fill in the lower portions of the yard up to the retaining wall to increase the usable yard space. They feel that with proper screening, this will not change the feel of the downslope neighbor's property. There is currently a hedge that could theoretically remain while the retaining wall is constructed, but it may be necessary to remove it during the construction phase and replace it with newer plantings. Comparison photos of retaining walls were presented to the committee. In particular, pictures of a 16' retaining wall at the Sudbury property (in the area but outside the 300' radius) with plant screening at the top was pointed out as being good for privacy for both homeowners.

Lucas: Can you clarify the retaining wall and what will be filled in? **Response:** They will be filling in the yard up to the retaining wall. At the rear (south) of the lot the ground slopes down, and they will be adding approximately 10' of space to this rear area.

Boyden: The city had a comment about an existing wall in the right of way? **Response:** at the front of the property (north) there is an existing brick wall with pilasters bordering the street that was built in the right of way. They will be doing an EMRI for it.

Conboy: They could break up the retaining wall into two lower walls, with one at the property line and put plantings in. Would the city like that approach better? **Response:** The problem with that approach is that they would not be able to screen the lower retaining wall if it is on the property line. **Conboy:** But then it would only be 4' tall and be of a lesser scale, so would be less imposing.

Schenck: How do the roof heights relate to the upslope property on the east? **Response:** Flat portion 2' above east neighbor floor; the pavilion pop-ups are 6', 8' and 12' above the neighbor's floor. **Schenck:** Can these be lowered a little

bit? **Response:** Anything can be lowered, but it would disrupt the architectural integrity. By siting the house along the east property line, the pop-ups over the bedrooms will be blocking the view less than if they were more in the center of the lot. We have no way of documenting private views.

The Chair stated that the committee cannot consider private views, though parties may try to accommodate them

Boyden: What is the proposed height of the great room versus the current ridgeline? **Response:** The ridgeline over the great room is 8' higher than the existing ridgeline, but it is oriented east-west so it is less detrimental to the views above.

Boyden: What is the interior height of this room? **Response:** Depending on the trusses being used. It will probably be around 14' at the highest point. It is lifted up to bring light in over the large overhangs. It is a truss structure so that it can be insulated.

Emerson: Is it possible to flatten the ridge a little bit? **Response:** It might be. It is a 4 in 12 now.

Public comment:

Littleton Waller (2345 Vallecitos): The retaining wall is 8' high and will look imposing. Will there be plantings? Without the hedge he will have no privacy. **Response:** There will be a replacement hedge. The existing hedge is older and hasn't been maintained properly; the newer hedge will be maintained. Would you prefer a taller hedge? **Waller:** Yes, it will give more privacy. **Conboy:** Will there be a 5' wall or rail at the top of this around the pool area for safety and to prevent an 8' drop at the retaining wall? **Response:** The drawings are currently just showing a lawn. They may have to put up a guardrail or a planter buffer depending on the city review. **Conboy:** I brought this up because a safety buffer would provide more privacy for the neighbors. **Response:** The owners would like a softer transition. It could be that the hedge will be a bit higher than it is now and that there will be a guardrail with planting around it as well. They are showing these as options on the plan now to meet the Coastal Development Permit requirements. Whatever is required will be shown on the building permits.

Naegle: Will the plantings be specified in the building permit? **Response:** They will have to meet the city planting guideline and requirements. There are options as to the types of plants that can be used. The project meets the 30% greenscape requirement by a large amount.

Althea Brimm (2411 Vallecitos): At the open house, she requested that the owners trim the hedge bordering the property line as it has been overgrown for years and is way too tall. Today, the gardeners have cut the hedge back to the fence level and it is nothing but stumps and there is no privacy anymore. The proposed house will be 5' from the setback and will be in her face for quite a while as it takes time for the hedge to grow back, if it ever will after cutting it back so drastically. It's a eugenia hedge that is 60 years old and may take years to grow back. This has totally ruined my privacy. **Response:** There was a missed communication with the gardeners as to what you wanted.

Brimm: Her main view is directly out from the house, not oriented to the Cove. The proposed great room structure will affect her view. **Response:** We showed this at the open house last month and didn't hear any objections. **Brimm:** It was hard to tell because the elevations were a smaller scale than the drawings being presented today. With the house being 5' from the property line and privacy issues due to the hedge being cut, are there doors that give onto that side? **Response:** There is a little courtyard in the back that has French doors that open on to it and will have a fountain in it. There are two small windows to the rear (south), one for a bathroom and the other for a closet. To the front (north) there is a door to the garage and a window for the staff bedroom. Since this is close to the property line, you will not see very much of this area. (A discussion concerning the hedge and if it will grow back or need to be replaced occurred at this point between Brimm, the committee, and the architects.) **Crisafi** concluded discussion of Ms. Brimm's concerns by saying that these are private view issues and they will try to work something out.

Schenck: Side yard setback is so different from what is there now. Has an issue with it. **Response:** This is similar to other house in the neighborhood. By pulling the house to one side it opens up the view for the neighbors. They feel that this is very low impact for a new development.

Conboy: Thinks that a site section showing both neighbors' properties, the hedges and retaining walls would be useful for the committee to see if this proposal is in conformance with the neighborhood. **Response:** They can do that.

At this point Boyden left the meeting and Conboy became the acting chair.

Emerson: We haven't heard about the drainage plan. **Response:** The drainage will not change much from the present configuration. The lot slopes to the front (west) and most of the water runs to a swale that runs along the west side property line and discharges to the street. With less slope on the lot more of the water will percolate into the ground. There is some sheet drainage from the driveway which will not change. They are looking into collecting some of the rainwater on-site for irrigation uses. There is an existing gray water tank that they will be using.

Lucas: If you fill in and raise the level of the lot at the rear, is the water going to drain in the same way? Won't you need a French drain or some sort of channel to get the water to the street? **Response:** There is an informal swale here and it is not changing. They will be using BMP (best management practices) and apply gravel at the base of the retaining wall along the hedge that will dissipate energy during a heavy rain.

Brimm (neighbor): What is the time frame for tear-down and building the house? **Response:** The contractor has been pre-selected and when he finishes the project he is currently working on he would start on this project. That would be in a year. It should take 10 months for the complete project including the demolition. They will not be using iron beams in the house and the roof system is a truss, so the roofs will be fabricated offsite and be quick to install. The framing is straight forward as the buildings are not very complicated. They will be doing a green tear-down, and many of the materials will be recycled. It will be a gentle demolition and not a wrecking ball. **Brimm:** Will there be air conditioning units on the roof? **Response:** No. There will only be heating, and this will likely be radiant heating in the floor for allergy reasons.

Crisafi presented the material samples: Santa Barbara stucco, stone paving and some concrete, most of the colors are earth tones with some teak accents. There will be a flat tile roof in earth tones where the roofs are sloped. Where the roofs are flat they may put on a subdued green stone surface. **Conboy:** Green is not an approved color in the La Jolla Shores Design Manual. **Crisafi:** He is surprised that it is not an approved color. What they can do is a brown or warm gray earth tone for the flat areas of the roof. For the driveway they will be using a recycled paving system that looks like decomposed granite but is installed like concrete.

Motion: Naegle; second: Emerson.

Motion to continue the project. The applicant is asked to bring:

- Site cross-section showing the upper and lower neighbor properties in relation to the proposed project.
- Flat roof material sample.

Motion carries: 4-0-1

Approve: Emerson, Lucas, Naegle, Schenck

Oppose:

Abstain: Conboy (acting chair)