

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee Minutes
4:00 p.m. Tuesday, July 22, 2014
La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street, La Jolla, CA

Committee members in attendance: Phil Merten (interim chair), Dolores Donovan, Janie Emerson, Tim Lucas, Myrna Naegle, Bob Steck, John Schenck.

Absent: Laura DuCharme Conboy

1. Welcome and Call to Order:

Interim Chair Phil Merten called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and explained the permit review process to the audience.

2. Adopt the Agenda

Steck moved that we adopt the agenda. Emerson seconded. Motion passed 6-0-1(chair abstains).

3. Non-Agenda Public Comment – 2 minutes each for items not on the agenda

None

4. Committee Member Comments

None

5. Chair Comments

Merten: at its last meeting the La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee (PRC) passed a motion asking the La Jolla Community Planning Association (CPA) to form a committee to investigate the process for amendment of the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance (LJSPDO). The matter was on the most recent CPA meeting but was not reached due to the lateness of the hour. It will be on the agenda for the next CPA meeting. Meanwhile, CPA President Joe LaCava is doing some investigation of his own on procedures to amend the LJSPDO. We will likely hear results of that at next CPA meeting.

6. Project Review

6A. McClelland Residence CDP and SDP

- Project No. 355787
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8352 La Jolla Shores Drive
- Applicant: Richard Gombes 858-456-4070 RGombes@san.rr.com
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas, 619-446-5142 GGargas@sandiego.gov

Project Description: PROCESS 3 - CDP and SDP to demolish an existing structure and to construct a 4,060 sq. ft. two-story single family residence on a 5,500 sq. ft. property. The project site is located at 8352 La Jolla Shores Drive, in the Single Family Residence Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (non-appealable) Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Limit, within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

6A. McClelland Residence CDP and SDP (continued)

Presentation by Richard Gombes

The proposed residence is partially three story and partially two. The three-story portion is 58% and the two-story portion is 42%.of the total project. The site has a minor slope of about 11% from the sidewalk to the back of the lot. The slope allows the house to stay at a height of 28 feet, well within the confines of the 30 foot limit. The ground floor is depressed 2 ½ feet from the sidewalk level.

The FAR is at .74 without the phantom space. When the phantom space is included, the FAR is .89.

When Gombes did a study of the properties within the 300-foot radius, the study showed a large 3-story brown stucco built about 10 years ago with a FAR of .96, on a lot of 5,729 sf. The immediate neighbor to the south at 8344 LJ Shores Drive was built 6 years ago and has a FAR of .64 on a lot of 5500 sf. Behind the present project, at 8314 Paseo del Ocaso, is a house of white stucco with a wood garage door, with a FAR of .76 on a lot of 5,250 sf. At 8368 Paseo del Ocaso is a house built 3 years ago with a FAR of .79, a 4,159 footprint on a lot of 5,250 sf.

The North side yard setback is 6'-2" and 5'-2" at the fireplace. The South setback 5'-1". The Front yard setback is 18'-9". The Rear yard setback is 22'-5".

Height: Chimney comes closest to 30 foot height limit. The proposed house steps back from the street.

Questions from Committee

Lucas: What is the FAR of the immediate neighbor to the north? A. I don't know

Schenck: You need to bring in a matrix of FARs for 300 ft all around.

Lucas: Green space? Landscaped area is 44% of the lot. The residence covers 39 % of the lot, including the covered patio area. Emerson: He is able to have a large amount of green space because the bulk of the square footage goes into the second and third floors.

Steck: Input from neighbors? A: they love it. Happy to see the old house go.

Emerson: Square footage of footprint? A: 2,681.

Lucas: The property line is the back of sidewalk. The Code requires 20 feet from the sidewalk to the front of the garage door.

Merten: He has visibility triangles built in.

Merten: Questions from public?

Q from Sally Miller, tel 858-459-1542: Will the house be air-conditioned and, if so, will the neighbors be able to hear the air-conditioner motors? A: The location of condenser units not yet determined.

Merten: The Municipal Code clearly says that this covered space here (indicates on blue print) with living space above it is to be counted into FAR. Counting the covered space makes your FAR .89. Consider that outside of the La Jolla Shores the City wide max FAR is .60. Historically, permit applicants have been asked to submit an assessor's parcel map with the FAR listed on each parcel. One can get the maps from the County Assessor's office. The only problem is that the County Assessor figures do not include garages.

6A. McClelland Residence CDP and SDP (continued)

Merten: Is it fair to say that the Committee members want the 300-ft matrix of FARs? A. [Committee members indicate agreement.]

Gombes: But if you include in the matrix the homes built in the 1950s, which have very small FARs, that throws the average way off. What do I say to my clients when they ask why other people can have large FARs but they cannot?

Merten: I think we should continue the matter to next month to see what the FAR's are for all homes within a 300-foot FAR radius.

Donovan: We would also like a 300-foot radius FAR survey.

Emerson: We would also like a samples board of the materials to be used for this house and a street view of the houses around it.

The McClelland Residence was continued to the August meeting of the PRC.

6B. Verizon Gilman

- Project No. 365466
- Type of Structure: Wireless Communication Facility
- Location: 7650 Gilman Court
- Applicant: Curtis Diehl 760-587-3003 kerrigan.diehl@plancominc.com
- Project Manager: Alexander Hempton 619-446-5349 AHempton@sandiego.gov

Project Description: PROCESS 3 - Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP), and a Site Development Permit (SDP) for a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) consisting of the removal of existing roof-mounted antennas and installation of a new 30 foot tall monopine supporting antennas and an existing equipment enclosure and new emergency generator.

Presentation for Verizon by Kerrigan Diehl

Essentially, we propose to remove the 12 pipe mounts now in place and replace them with a fake pine tree and some landscaping. The current building will remain. We will add a large generator for use in emergencies. The reason for the generator is Hurricane Sandy, which taught that 6 hours of battery back-up is not enough in a disaster when everyone using a cell phone to send texts. Hence the large generator. We are proud of this installation.

Emerson: Are these buildable lots around the towers? A: I don't know.

Lucas: Are you doing co-location with another company? A: No.

Lucas: But your monopole has space for co-location or additional capacity. A. yes, all our poles do.

Schenck: will the generator be visible from the street? A. No, it is behind the building to the north.

Schenck/Lucas: Can the building be better camouflaged? A: Yes, we can do that.

Sally Miller (audience): are there any close neighbors that need to be notified? A. No.

Emerson & Donovan: Not so. There is the La Jolla Serena housing development just down the road and also Colony Hill. A: Well then, they would have been notified when we sent out notices to all addresses within a 300-foot radius of the project.

6B. Verizon Gilman (continued)

Merten: The trees in the area are sycamores and eucalyptus, but not a pine tree in sight. Why not a fake eucalyptus or sycamore? A: We are happy to put in a fake eucalyptus if you guys feel that is more appropriate. Our staff for the past year has decided that pines hold up better over time than eucalyptus. (Further discussion elicits the information that they are going to plant two pine trees behind the monopine to make it less obtrusive.)

Merten: If the committee were to find that recommendations can be made based on the plans presented today, as modified by notations on the plan that the building be painted a darker green to blend with its background and the galvanized iron chain link fence be replaced by a less visible fence, would that be acceptable? A: Yes

Schenck: Move that findings be made for a NUP and a SDP for a Wireless Communication Facility at 3650 Gilman Court based on the plans submitted to the Committee today which include notations on the plans that a) the building be painted dark green b) the chain link fence to be green-coated and in-filled and c) the monopine be backed by two real pines. Second by Emerson. The motion passes 7-0-0.

6C. Lambert Felice Residence

- Project No. 288444
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 2382 Via Capri Court
- Owner's Rep: Scott Spencer: 858-459-8898 scottspencerarchitect@yahoo.com
- Project Manager: Paul Godwin; 619- 446-5190; pgodwin@sandiego.gov

Project Description: PROCESS 3 – Coastal Development Permit (CDP), and a Site Development Permit (SDP) to add a 702 square foot first-floor addition and a 580 square foot garage addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.30 acre site in the Single Family Residence Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (non-appealable) Overlay Zone , 300 foot Brush Management Buffer Zones, Coastal Height Limit, within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

Lot size: 13,250 sf

Existing Sq/ft: 4204 sf

Proposed Sq/ft 1st story additions: 1840 sf

Total Sq/ft: 6044 sf

Percent of lot covered: 44%

Floor area ratio: 0.456

Height: 29'-3" chimney; 27'3" roof

Front yard setback: 10'

Side yard setback: Street side: 21'; side: 5'

Rear yard setback: 14'6"

Landscape: 36.2%

Off street parking: 4

6C. Lambert Felice Residence (continued)

Presentation by owner Robin Felice, in conjunction with Brian Longmore of Permit Solutions Ltd (brian@permitsolutions.org, 858-603-9478) (sitting in for architect Scott Spencer who is out of town)

Felice: We had your approval about 18 months ago. Then at the very end of the permit process someone realized that the house had to go through the historical review procedure. So we spent over a year proving that the house is not historical. We hired the original architect to evolutionize the home. The Historical Review Committee approved the result. Applying the evolutionary recommendations of the original architect increased the sf by about 500. At that point a new Project Manager was appointed, who who said we had to make sure, since almost two years had passed, that the proposed additional 500 feet was acceptable.

Longmore: The FAR of the original home was .317, the previously approved FAR of the new home was .414, the new proposed FAR is .456.

Committee Questions

Emerson: The loss of the setbacks is troubling. There is inadequate information in this presentation. We need a better representation of what the new proposed house will look like. You are showing us the old plans and asking us to imagine what the new house will look like based solely on a highly abstract pen-and-ink drawing.

Schenck: I think it would be easier for the Committee if, when you come back to us, you treat it as a new project. Show us what is there now and then show us what you will build. That will be easier for us to evaluate than asking us to compare what we approved 18 months ago to what you plan now.

Merten: It would be helpful at least to cast shadows on the drawing to give it some relief.

Longmore: If we are to come back again, exactly what is it you want to know?

Merten: There is an inconsistency between drawings. A 7 foot drop in elevation is shown in the west sideyard, but that elevation change is not depicted on the west or north building elevation drawings. You need to resolve that before you return.

Lucas: We need your new setbacks, and then we need a comparison between them and the neighboring properties.

6C. Lambert Felice Residence (continued)

Merten: Committee, if we are we going to continue the project to the next meeting, let's summarize. The Committee provided the following consensus on the information needed at the next hearing:

- a) The footprints of the two adjacent properties;
- b) Shadows to be cast on the exterior elevations to help us read them;
- c) On the west elevation, indicate the height of the existing property line fence and show how it relates to your building;
- d) Show the grade levels and elevations on the west side of house;
- e) On the east side of the house, show on the site plan the proposed new wall on the east side of the house and also the gate;
- f) A materials/samples board;
- g) More detail on the appearance of the deck;
- h) More detail on the relationship between the garage, driveway and Via Capri;
- i) A perspective sketch, in color, of the most recent version of the proposed remodeled residence;
- j) More detail on the perimeter site wall;
- k) A site drainage plan;
- l) More documentation on how the the 30% greenscape requirement is fulfilled. A: 36.2%.

In sum, it would be simpler if you just treated this most recent incarnation of the project as a new project.

Merten: please ask Scott to review the code section on the number of driveways allowed based on the amount of street frontage.

The Lambert Felice Residence was continued to the August meeting of the PRC.

Meeting adjourned at 6:25