

**LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

**COMMITTEE REPORT**  
**FOR**  
**JANUARY 2011**

1/11/2011 Present: Costello, Crisafi (Chairman), DuCharme-Conboy, Gaenzle, Hayes, Liera, Merten, Thorsen

1/18/2011 Present: Collins, Costello, Crisafi (Chairman), Ducharme-Conboy, Kane, Liera, Merten, Thorsen

**FINAL REVIEW**

Project Name: **TREVINO RESIDENCE**

Project #:	5342 Chelsea St.	Permits:	CDP
	PO#221693	DPM:	Jeff Peterson (619) 446-5237 <a href="mailto:JAPeterson@sandiego.gov">JAPeterson@sandiego.gov</a>
Zone:	RS-1-7	Applicant:	Sarah Horton 619-231-9905 shorton@golba.com

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing residence and construct a new sustainable, 3,563 SF, two story over basement, single family residence on a .14 acre site in the RS-1-7 Zone of the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Residential Tandem Parking Zone, Transit Area Zone. Council District 1

**Presenters:** Tim Golba, AIA  
Sarah Horton, AIA

**Please provide for FINAL REVIEW: - *Presenters response in italics***

- a. Profile homes on both the North and South sides for elevations. – *provided. On North, lowered one element, lowered roof, brought another back to match front, trellis added, reduce bulk & scale.*
- b. Consider articulation on North side which relates to adjacent Northern development. Especially consider elevation, relationship of mass of second story to single story next door (ref. LJ Com. Plan, 2<sup>nd</sup> story on sides should be set back). – *(the above answers this)*
- c. Draw footprint of adjacent buildings. – *provided, showing neighboring building four each directions, 1 and 2 story portions, and relationship of all.*

**Neighbor:** We have a high side of street vs low side of street. Views are lost with 2 story development on low side of street.

**Costello:** This part of Chelsea has one level near the street with the more intense second level at the back of the lot. Of course we can't hold the Applicant to a non-existent standard.

**Liera:** Bird Rock area has that stepped back characteristic noted in the Historical Society review.

**Merten:** The modifications to North elevation are really good.

**Liera:** Suggestion, place a trellis over the driveway to soften the look?

**Collins:** Solar panels on project. *Yes, 50 % power to be provided by panels located on back roof.*

**Subcommittee Motion: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit.**

(Merten/Costello 8-0-0)

**In Favor:** Collins, Ducharme-Conboy, Costello, Crisafi, Kane, Liera, Merten, Thorsen

**Oppose:** 0

**Abstain:** 0

**Motion:** Passes

**La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee  
Report – January 2011  
Page 2**

**FINAL REVIEW**

Project Name: **SIMIMI RESIDENCE - *previously reviewed Sept 21, 2010***

946 Muirlands Vista Way	Permits:	CDP
Project #: 211972	DPM:	Glenn Gargas 619-446-5142 <a href="mailto:ggargas@san Diego.gov">ggargas@san Diego.gov</a>
Zone: RS-1-5	Applicant:	Bejan Arfa 619-293-3118 <a href="mailto:bejan@pacbell.net">bejan@pacbell.net</a>

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing residence and construct an approximate 6,421 gross SF two story single family residence on a 17,408 SF lot the RS-1-5 Zone in the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non appealable), Coastal Height Limit.

**Presenter:** Bejan Arfa

**Please provide the following for final review: - *Presenters response in italics***

- 1. Check CC&R's relative to 2<sup>nd</sup> story – *Some 2 story houses exist. Civil matter, but CCRs do allow 2nd story. (Some Committee Members dispute. Chair: in the past we have refused to hear projects until CC&R issues were cleared. Merten: we don't know about the CC&Rs in this subdivision.)***
- 2. Comment on the Cycles Letters statements about development encroachment down hillside. – *not provided***
- 3. Photo of current house and simulation of proposed – *not provided***
- 4. Bring more sections through property and building (through surrounding properties too) – *not provided***
- 5. Comparison to the neighboring properties – *Don't have comparison or sections or aerial survey***
- 6. Comparison to the opposite side of the street – *not provided***
- 7. Show how the building fits into the context of the community (ref LJ Com. Plan) – *not provided***
- 8. How the height relates to the neighbors – *not provided***
- 9. Materials board with colors, garage door materials – *not provided***
- 10. Use large presentation boards for photos and drawings - *not provided***
- 11. Will house block ocean views? – *not provided***
- 12. What is building height, over 40 ft? – *nothing in project is over 40 ft or 30 ft.***
- 13. Provide complete soils report (can email to Michelle, Island Architects) – *provided by email***

**Liera:** Last time we asked for a number of exhibits showing how this site compares to neighbors properties in elevation and footprint. Do you have any exhibits showing exactly this house relates to the houses adjacent to it in plan and in elevation, ie #5 ? We need specific exhibits. Applicants have been successful with this in the past.

**Unknown:** Your boards are very difficult to read and understand.

**Chair:** the last applicant just presented this sort of exhibit. Do you have an aerial survey?

**Ducharme:** What a previous Applicant has done was take a map like yours and with a darker line and outlined the footprint of neighboring houses.

**Costello:** what we are asking is just to make an effort to demonstrate how the buildings relate. I can't read your graphics, they lack contrast and detail.

**Liera:** Did you see how the previous Applicant answered these? *Yes.* We have listed these questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 things like that need to be addressed more carefully.

**Ducharme:** Can't read your figures and dimensions. Can you read them out to us? Walk us through them? Curb setbacks? *15 ft Here inside setback line*

**La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee  
Report – January 2011  
Page 3**

***Simimi Res. – Cont.***

**Thorsen:** House will be unlike any other house in “Bulk and Scale” from street scape. Some of your photos of houses on your board are not in this area.

**Unknown:** Half of our questions (for Final Review) are not addressed

**Chair:** Too many questions are not answered to determine if this matches Community Character, etc.

**Pete Wong:** Photo presented. Will lose view.

**Tiffany LeMarsh:** photo trees with single level, 7,000 sq ft but is single level. Other side single level, second level is down below the slope preserving ocean views. Only one residence is 2 story (built sometime ago), most are built down slope. Against Community Plan; Community Character, Bulk & Scale, “transition to older and new development”. Most houses have been built down slope for the second level.

**Thorsen:** Community Character is single level.

**Ducharme:** from street, front elevation of second level should be stepped back.

**Liera:** Do a split level down slope, it will help stabilize slope too. May cost less. Can deal with light issue.

**Chair:** You have a difficult charge here. All these low profile houses are on your side of the street, one story on the slope side and 2 story below on the downhill side. It is hard to see how this will work or fit into a community without a composite drawing. But I haven’t seen this today and haven’t seen a willingness to come forward with the information to help us make a decision. Should you consider coming back or should the Committee just make a decision?

**Mrs Simimi:** *Would like single story house, lot won’t allow it. Can’t afford to go down the slope.*

**Chair:** Show Prop D height on Section A. Massing of the building from sides to side could be reduced.

**DuCharme:** Could we look at massing, the entry massing is the biggest thing there. Bring that down it would not have the massive look it has now. Lower the entry would make a series of boxes, but less massive. Stair tower doesn’t need that height. Reduce in scale, setback?, float top of roof.

**Chair:** Two directions, go down slope in the back, or begin to set the house back from the sides and reconfigure rooms.

**Chair:** Recommend a simple massing of adjacent homes, Photoshop or similar.

**Merten:** Show buildings on both sides of house.

**Thorsen:** Show buildings across the street too.

**Pete Wong:** Soils Report and undocumented fill. Caissons will need to reach stable soil. Questions stability of slope even with caissons. Just at the threshold to meet earth quake standards.

**Leira:** For return, get letter from City and Soils Engineer that Report is adequate.

**Arfa;** *OK*

**For Return:**

- a. Complete the un-responded above Items 1 thru 13 (10 issues).
- b. Provide letters from City and Soils Engineer that Soils/Geology Report is adequate.
- c. Use Photoshop or similar process to construct a simple massing of adjacent homes:
  1. Show buildings on both sides of house.
  2. Show buildings across the street too.
- d. Reconfigure design
  1. to have two levels with one below the slope as Neighbor to the East, or
  2. step back 2nd level (reduce massing side to side) and reconfigure rooms to soften street view, and for East & West Neighbors.
- e. Show Prop D height on Section A
- f. Please provide clear exhibits

**La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee  
Report – January 2011  
Page 4**

**PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

*Note: Preliminary Reviews can be rendered a Final Review by a unanimous DPR Committee vote.*

Project Name: <b>SHAHBAZ RESIDENCE</b>	Permits: CDP
6412 Avenida Manana	DPM: Tim Daly 619-446-5356
Project #: 216575	<a href="mailto:tdaly@sandiego.gov">tdaly@sandiego.gov</a>
Zone: RS-1-5	Applicant: Bejan Arfa 619-293-3118
	<a href="mailto:bejan@pacbell.net">bejan@pacbell.net</a>

**Scope of Work:**

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing 3,869 SF residence and construct an 7,884 SF two story single family residence and an attached 3 car garage on a .57 acre site in the RS-1-5 Zone in the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area.

**Presenter:** Bejan Arfa *- Presenters response in italics*

**Liera:** It is close to neighbors, which are one story. It would be nice to have a volumetric layout of how they relate to neighbors.

**DuCharme:** What is relationship of neighbors roofs from street scene, how does it relate in height?

**Crisafi:** As well as on site plan compose survey on that

**DuCharme:** Neighbor has had a recent remodel and records will be available from City.

**Kane:** Drawings are very hard to read, print too small for presentation. Not consistent elevation, order of photos backward?

**Costello:** Some photos seen before, are from the Simimi neighborhood?

**DuCharme:** Why photos from Muirlands Vista Way, what does the project look like from the bike path?

**Liera:** Notice amount of erosion shown on the photographs.

**Crisafi:** From LJ CP bike path is # 49, photograph site from the bike path below.

**Costello:** I did read the Soils Report.

**DuCharme:** Diveway dimensions? *Set by subdivision Cul-de-sac here.*

**Merten:** If driveway is not 20 ft then two spaces are needed on street.

**Chair:** Clarify issue/wording “ a 24 ft wide driveway where a maximum driveway width of 12 ft is permitted per SDMC” from Cycles Letter pg 2.

**Leon Poensky:** Neighbor that overlooks property. Architectural Jury didn’t want to deal with. Likes conversation about softening impacts. Will be the biggest home in community, “unable to hear” % significantly larger than another home. This Applicant is the first to scrape the lot and rebuild home in the area, others have been remodels. Bulk & Scale is out of character with the Community, 300% larger than any other.

**Collins:** Slope is not stable and there have been failures at near by lots. *All around slopes are unstable. Site has varying 5 to 35 ft of fill.*

**Costello:** Soils Report and Cycles Letters also indicate these failures.

**Thorsen:** Can we ask for Return Item to have footprint and the houses all around it?

**Crisafi:** View from the bike path

Street elevations with homes on both sides of the street. sections

Side yard issues, how they relate to the two homes on either sides

Ocean views through side yards.

**Merten:** 1. Corner that projects forward of neighbors has the same issue as a recent project on Muirlands Dr. *- But Neighbor has no windows there.*

**La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee  
Report – January 2011  
Page 5**

***Shahbaz Res. – cont.***

2. Roof lines are not in the Com. Plan however, this entire area was built out in 1950s Ranch Style, all have low sloping hipped and gabled roofs. This area has a nice sea of singled and tile roofs, house next door has flat roof with parapet and gravel. Instead, use dark gravel or green, and lower parapets.

**Mindy Poensky:** our subdivision is all California Ranch, has 36 houses, average 2500 sq ft

**Chair:** pull tax rolls to provide neighboring F.A.R.s

**Mrs. Van Os:** expressed concerns about views Bulk & Scale. Hot tub lost by erosion. Chair, recommend that neighbors talk to City Geologist, Jim Quinn.

**Thorsen:** Ocean view could be part of this Neighborhood Character.

**Please provide the following for Final Review:**

**a. Clarify issue/wording “a 24 ft wide driveway where a maximum driveway width of 12 ft is permitted per SDMC” from Cycles Letter pg 2.**

**b. photograph the view from the bike path**

**c. project’s footprint and footprint of the houses all around it**

**d. Street scene elevations with homes on both sides of the street, sections. Show relationship to neighbors’ roofs from street scene, and relationship in height.**

**e. show how side yard issues relate to the two homes on either side**

**f. Are there ocean views through side yards from the street?**

**g. pull tax rolls to provide neighboring F.A.R.s**

**PUBLIC DISCUSSION (JAN. 11, 2011)**

Project Name: **BISHOPS SCHOOL LIBRARY VARIANCE – INFORMATION ONLY**

Project Location: 7607 La Jolla Blvd.

Project Summary: Variance to allow a maximum building height at 32’-1” where 30’ is allowed by the PDO in Zones 5 & 6. Planning Commission continued appeal of Hearing Officer’s approval until Jan 20<sup>th</sup>.

Previous DPR action: (July 2010) Findings can be made for Variance 7-0-0

**a. Jan 20 Planning Commission will hear continued Bishops Library Project. (Whitney Project will also be heard. Members asked to attend both, if not to speak, cede time.) Jan 26 Whale Watch Way Project will be before Hearing Officer.**

**b. John Frangos resigned from LJ DPR. LJ, Town Council will need to appoint a replacement representative.**

**c. Review of the Bishops School Library Exhibits**

Architects Crisafi, Ducharme-Conboy, Merten reviewed the Bishops School Library Exhibits submitted Jan 3, 2011. Their conclusions were presented to the LJCPA Jan.6, and contend that several viable alternative designs can be made without compromising building function or the height limit, and that a variance is not justified.

Ducharme-Conboy elaborated on the report, clarified it for non-Architects, finalized it, and added some exhibits.

LJCPA Pres. LaCava wrote a letter, which incorporated the report, to be sent to the Planning Commissioners.

All were thanked for their fine Professional efforts.