

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANING ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE REPORT
FOR
APRIL 2009

LA JOLLA RECREATION CENTER, 615 PROSPECT ST. 4 PM

4/14/09 Present: Crisafi, Hasson, Little, Hayes, Collins, Ashley

4/21/09 Present: Crisafi, Hasson, Little, Sullivan, Ashley, Merten, Gaenzle

Project Name:	VIRGINIA WAY RESIDENCE	Permits:	CDP
	1356 Virginia Way	DPM:	Renee Mezo 619-446-5001
Project #:	JO#43-2056/173165		rmezo@sandiego.gov
Zone:	RS-1-7	Applicant:	Jeff Elden 858-793-4600

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit for a previously demolished residence and construct 4,054 sq. ft. single family residence on a 0.16 acre site in the RS-1-7 Zone within the Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. Notice Cards =1.

Please return for Final Review to address the following items:

- 1. Zoning height at light well. Maximum light well lenght.**
- 2. Zoning height at garage per Chapter 11 and others of the Land Development Code.**
- 3. Zoning height at section A-A on Sheet A-5 at north elevation.**

Project Name:	FORGIONE RESIDENCE	Permits:	CDP
	5511 Calumet Ave.	DPM:	Derrick Johnson 619-446-5238
Project #:	JO#43-2162/175512		dnjohnson@sandiego.gov
Zone:	RS-1-7	Applicant:	Paw Lim 619-890-1688
			<u>Limdesign1688@yahoo.com</u>

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit for a 744 sq. ft. addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.11 acre site in the RS-1-7 Zone within Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. Notice Cards =1.

Please return for Final Review to address the following items:

- 1. New roof over garage in front yard setback to conform Land Development Code and City guidelines for non-conforming or previously existing structures.**

**La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee
Committee Report - April 2009
Page 2**

Project Name: **COUNTRY CLUB DRIVE - review resubmitted plans that consolidates the two lots**
7001 & 6947 Country Club Dr. Permits: CDP
Project #: JO#43-1997/171201 DPM: Michelle Sokolowski 619-446-5278
MSokolowski@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-4 Applicant: Rob Russell 619-465-8948
rob@kappasurveying.com

Subcommittee Motion:

(Little, Ashley 7-0-0) The findings can be made for Lot consolidation of 7001 & 6947 Country Club Dr. and demolition permit for residence on 7001 Country Club Dr.

Project Name: **S.D. FRENCH AMERICAN SCHOOL**
6550 Soledad Mtn. Rd. Permits: CUP
Project #: JO#171564/43-2012 DPM: Patrick Hooper 619-557-7992
phooper@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-2 Applicant: Kathi Riser 619-818-0053
kriser@atlantisgrouponline.com

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Conditional Use Permit to amend CUP 98-0426 for an additional 3 modular classrooms to increase the total on-site student enrollment from 320-650 on a 8.92 acre site in the RS-1-2 zone within the La Jolla Community Plan. Coastal Height Limit. Council District 2. Notice Cards = 3

Please return for Final Review to address the following items:

- 1. City review of results from Traffic Report.**
- 2. Schedule La Jolla Traffic & Transportation Committee Review.**
- 3. Organize new portable classrooms to existing orthogonal grid on site, consolidate access structures, bring photos or visual information on proposed classroom structures and move first building away from slope.**
- 4. Provide additional landscape to screen new classroom buildings.**

PUBLIC DISCUSSION – 4/14/09

**Categorical Exemption - Dan Joyce, City of San Diego
See DRAFT notes.**

La Jolla DPR Committee – Categorical Exclusion
Discussion Points from April 14, 2009

DRAFT

Categorically excluded projects (as qualified in the handout provided by City staff) would receive ministerial review and would be approved by City staff provided the project complied with all the applicable requirements of the Land Development Code. Staff also provided a breakdown that illustrated the reduction in structure size according to base zone. The concerns and discussion revolved around the following issues.

- Categorically excluded projects would not receive community review and input on consistency with the community plan. Related to this concern is that staff has from time to time missed items during the review process and that community review provides an extra set of eyes that can double check and perhaps catch missed items.
 - It was discussed that the purpose of the categorical exclusion is to offer incentives for smaller and shorter structures, and that every additional review adds to time, costs, and uncertainty to the process. A ministerial process is one that requires the project comply with the development regulations. Adding a community review to a ministerial process could prove to be frustrating in that community input that did not directly relate to implementation of the regulations would not need to be incorporated into the project.
 - It was discussed that perhaps something similar to a preliminary review process could be established that would allow the community group or committee to review projects. The timing of the review would need to occur before or during the City review period.
- Projects cannot be categorically excluded if they need a site development permit. Two concerns were raised related to hillsides and drainage.
 - Drainage was raised as a concern. It was felt that the regulations were not properly addressing how drainage patterns were being affected when grading was done. There were no drainage experts available to address the concern. Some thought that the categorical exclusion should address this. However, by the end of the discussion there seemed to be consensus that if in fact there was a problem with the citywide regulations for drainage then those regulations should be amended to address the problem in all of the city and not just the coastal areas.
 - Steep hillsides are considered environmentally sensitive lands and a Site Development Permit is required if there are impacts to steep hillsides. They are defined as a continuous system including off-site with an average gradient of 25 % or more and an overall height of 50 feet. Key is that the hillsides must be natural. Part of the concern relates to manmade hillsides that still function as

visual open space in the community. The concern regarding the steep hillsides seemed to focus on the larger parcels extending up onto the west facing hillsides. There was discussion that perhaps the categorical exclusion could be modified so that projects that impact any "Steep hillside" (including manmade) would be disqualified from the categorical exclusion. Another consideration was that perhaps the categorical exclusion place a limit on lot size since most of the properties of concern were significantly larger than most residential lots. Consideration could be to remove lots of more than 10,000 square feet or 15,000 square feet, or to remove from consideration zones that have a large minimum lot size.

- An overall discussion was that the categorical exclusion should be kept simple and not made overly complex. Creating an overlay complex or onerous process would remove any incentive to building smaller and shorter than otherwise permitted through a CDP.