

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

**COMMITTEE REPORT
FOR
NOVEMBER 2011**

11/8/2011 Present: Benton (Chairman), Collins, DuCharme-Conboy, Costello,
Kane, Hayes, Merten, Thorsen
11/15/2011 Present: Benton (Chairman), Collins, DuCharme-Conboy, Costello,
Gaenzle, Kane, Thorsen

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

11/8/11 Recorder setting 20/20 00 00 00

Thorsen: Provided a copy of the SD City Tree Removal Permit for **Hennessey's** dated 4-25-11. It allows the removal of two Ficus trees (large mature trees) from the parkway in front of Hennessey's on the expressed condition that they be replaced with two Magnolias immediately upon removal. The current state of the parkway is that it has been cemented over, the South tree was replaced with a very small Magnolia (trunk diameter about one inch) the tree from the North-central position was not replaced. The very small Magnolia at the South end of the parkway is placed so close to the concrete that it is unlikely to thrive. The conditions of the permit were not filled.

Kane: UCSD Student Intern project. Is seeking UCSD or SDSU students do an intern project to quantify Community/Neighborhood Character using a strategy from the Form Based Codes. LJ Shores and Barber Track are potential test areas.

11/15/11 None

2. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 11/8/11 + FINAL REVIEW 11/15/11

Project Name: **STEDMAN RESIDENCE**

9030 La Jolla Shores Lane	Permits:	CPD & SDP
Project #: 253561	DPM:	Jeanette Temple 619-557-7908 jtemple@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-1 & RS-1-4	Applicant:	Brandon Ebel 619-398-7518 Guy West 619-293-7640

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands to demolish existing residence and construct a 14,800 SF single family residence and guest quarters on a 1.61 acres site at 9030 La Jolla Shores Lane in the RS-1-1 & RS-1-4 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking. Council District 1

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/8/11: Recorder setting 20/20 00 08 41

Presented a materials board with stone to match sand and bluffs. Presented cardboard model of project. Project house is basically below street level. Roof will be matte finished Titanium. Geological Tech report: did a slope stability analysis, has done coring to 80 ft, will observe the 40 ft bluff setback, there will be a 5 ft safety barrier to prevent people falling down bluff (~ 240 ft down to beach). By driveway, 3 garage doors, stairwell, elevator shaft.

DISCUSSION 11/8/11: *Applicant response in italics.*

DuCharme: Will Titanium roof be raised seams or what type pattern? *Several possibilities.*

Hayes: Will there be roof vents? *Not located yet*

Hayes: Does the roof overhang into the sideyard setback? Provide a section next time.

DuCharme: What are floor to ceiling heights? *About 13.5 ft*

Ann ____: What about landscaping? There are a lot of non-native plants. The driveway is very unattractive, can you replant? Will the Torrey pine be removed? *Existing landscaping will be removed (mostly non-native), will replant the driveway. Replanting with native plants.*

Andrew Thompson: Will the access trail to the North remain open? *Yes*

Jim Fitzgerald: What about storm water drainage? *It will be collected and pumped to the street.*

Cindy Bond: What percentage of the 1.61 acre lot is flat or build able? *< 1/2 or 40%*

Hayes: 14,800 SF includes the guest quarters? *The FAR of .35 was changed by the City to .45*

Kane: Can you explain more about the reflective qualities of the glass? *A high performance laminate double thickness, glass with solar exposure will be recessed way back of the overhangs so there shouldn't be reflections.*

Thorsen: Can this be seen from beach? *Not much because of height, one needs to be way up the beach.*

Merten: Structures need to be separated by > 6 ft. Your South side looks like it is all tied together, if so, you need to correct.

Merten: Property without alley access must have at least one driveway access to the street. **Currently non-conforming, we are making a compliant driveway thru here.**

Recorder setting 20/20 00 54 50

DuCharme: Is the front greenscape >60% *Yes* What is the railing on the South?

Unknown: What is your square footage? *Main house 12,600 SF ,3 bedrooms, original plan had "guest bedrooms" which were mistaken for "quest quarters", but are contiguous with the inside. 1,250 SF guest house.*

Collins: Will the Ti roof be reflective? *We will continue to study, it is metal, but a matte finish.*

Costello: You likely did the steep slope percentage of lot and FAR calc with the City, can you provide to us? *Yes*

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/15/11:

Presented cardboard model of project. Project house is basically below street level. Roof will be matte finished Titanium. By driveway, six openings: 3 garage doors, stairwell, elevator shaft, bathroom light well.

Provided for Final Review 11/15/11: *Applicant response in italics.*

a. Provide detailed calculations; lot SF, steep slope reduction of lot SF, FAR, roof overhangs, phantom floors, etc.

Lot size = 70,357 SF, area not steep hillside = 26,135 + .25 of remaining site area (11,055 SF) = 37,190 SF

GFA = 12,379 SF all area enclosed by exterior walls, balconies, phantom floors.

Proposed FAR = 0.33 = 12,379/37,357. Allowed FAR = 0.45 = 16,735/37,357. Lot coverage 16%

b. Clarify Titanium roof patterns, if not raised seams what, provide eave detail what is vertical surface *low gloss, matte finish Ti, bluest hue color, surface will be flush, panel to panel, little indentations. Gutters*

c. Provide a section(s) along both property lines, closest approach to perpendicular to property line, illustrate relationship of roof overhang, and sideyards setbacks. *Done, eaves well back of setback. Roof eaves below street level.*

d. Provide railing detail at South East corner. *Stainless steel railing mounted to concrete walkway.*

e. Verify that structures, pool house & main house, are separated > 6 ft. *They are separated, clearly demonstrated.*

f. Compare existing to proposed footprints. *Shown superimposed drawing of existing – proposed footprints*

g. Will the side yard Torrey Pines be allowed by City? *Torrey Pine approved by City.*

h. Provide a landscaping plan, include intention for driveway landscaping. *Will relocate palm.*

i. House and Ti roof will be down low, do study or survey of surrounding houses to determine if reflection will be a problem. *May be some flash at certain times of day, but the velveteen matte is intended to be non-glare.*

DISCUSSION 11/15/11: *Applicant response in italics.*

DuCharme: Bedroom opening into the garage is a Code violation. *Yeah, we'll fix that.*

DuCharme: likes house, did a nice job setting house down the slope, out of neighbors view.

Sally Miller: What is the size of the old structure? *I don't know exactly. Replacing about 4,000 SF with 14,000SF house.*

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/15/11: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands to demolish existing residence and construct a 12,379 SF single family residence and guest quarters on a 1.61 acres site at 9030 La Jolla Shores Ln.

(Thorsen/Kane 5-0-0)

In Favor: Benton, DuCharme, Costello, Kane, Thorsen.

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

MOTION PASSES

Recorder setting 21/21 02 41 11

La Jolla Development Permit Review Committee

Committee Report –November 2011

Page 2 of 7

3. PRELIMINARY + FINAL REVIEW 11/8/11

Recorder setting 20/20 01 03 43

Project Name: **WEINTRAUB LL ADJUSTMENT**

321 San Colla St & 334 Ricardo Pl

Project #: 33838

Permits: CPD & Lot Line Adjustment

DPM: Sandra Teasley 619-446-5245

steasley@sandiego.gov

Zone: RS-1-1 & RS-1-4

Applicant: Muareen Pallamary

858-454-4094

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit and Lot Line Adjustment Parcel map at 321 San Colla Street and 334 Ricardo Place in the RS-1-7 Zone in the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (nonappealable), Coastal Height Limit, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. Council District 1.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/8/11:

Fence was placed 2 ft off the property line years ago. Construction was done on this, faulty, basis. Photographs shown of problem. Title company paid one home owner for their property.

Costello asked for proof that both property owners agreed to lot line adjustment, Pallamary provided proof.

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/8/11: to combine Preliminary and Final Reviews.

(Collins/Thorsen 8-0-0)

In Favor: Benton, Collins, DuCharme, Costello, Kane, Hayes, Merten, Thorsen

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

MOTION PASSES

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/8/11: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Lot Line Adjustment Parcel map at 321 San Colla Street and 334 Ricardo Place.

(Collins/Kane 7-0-1)

In Favor: Collins, DuCharme, Costello, Kane, Hayes, Merten, Thorsen

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton (as Chair)

MOTION PASSES

Recorder setting 20/20 01 09 29

4. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 11/8/11 + FINAL REVIEW 11/15/11

Project Name: **ENCORE TRUST RESIDENCE**

9872 La Jolla Farms Road

Project #: PO#237107

Permits: CDP & SDP

DPM: Glenn Gargas 619-446-5142

ggargas@sandiego.gov

Zone: RS-1-2

Applicant: Julia Metcalf

858-945-8486

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to construct a 21,592 SF single family residence and 2,149 SF guest quarters on a vacant 1.52 acre site at 9872 La Jolla Farms Road in the RS-1-2 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking. Council District 1. Notice Cards=1

Chairman Benton: This Project has been returned to us by the LJCPA, so it is a de novo review. By Robert's Rules of Order, we need a motion to rescind in order to hear this again.

Merten: The reason the LJCPA sent this project back to us is that many neighbors attended the LJCPA meeting expressing that they had not been properly notified about this project and/or had not been able to provide input. Urged Committee to vote to rescind.

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/8/11: to rescind the Committee to actions of 13 Sept 2011 on the Encore Trust Residence.

(Thorsen/ Costello 7-0-1)

In Favor: Collins, DuCharme, Costello, Kane, Hayes, Merten, Thorsen

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton (as Chair)

MOTION PASSES

Recorder setting 20/20 01 15 52

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/8/11:

Applicant distributed a 96-page booklet, describing the Project, to all Committee Members and a few to the public. This is a Coastal Development Permit Amendment, which is just the same as a new CDP. The site was previously the Box Canyon Ranch, demo'd in 2005, lot split into Parcels 1 & 2. Parcel 1 (to South) has CDP, is currently under construction. Parcel 2 previously approved for CDP, with FAR .20, 13,456 SF, as "Isakow". There is a 15 ft View Corridor, thru the center of the property, aligned with Black Gold Rd. The beach access, surfer's trail, will be preserved. There is a "Building Restricted Easement". Statement about neighbors: Recorder setting 20/20 01 33 37 "We have spoken to all the neighbors. They do not necessarily agree with the project. There is a meeting tomorrow." (Note: 13 Sept 2011 statements about neighbors is available recorder setting 15/15 01 58 07 to 02 05 53. Written transcript can provided on request.)

DISCUSSION 11/8/11: : *Applicant response in italics.*

Allowed FAR = .45, proposed FAR = .36 23,600 SF GFA, Building Restricted Easement reduced lot

Benton: View from street? *Shown, story poles are there too.*

Costello: Looking at N-1, what % of lot area is the "Building Restricted Easement"? *Close to 1/2 or .72 acre BRE is non-build able.*

Kane: Is this a spec house? *No, a family will live there.*

Tony Crisafi, AIA: representing neighbors. These neighbors have been thru a number of CDPs before, but this time they are concerned about Bulk & Scale. Distributed a seven page handout with six requested action items and provided detail for each request:

1. request DSD to clarify correct process for current proposed design.
2. request applicant to produce public view study from Blackgold and LJ Farms Rd.
3. request applicant to provide public view study from city open space & park.
4. request applicant to comply with visual corridor requirement at south property line and to complement the dedicated view corridor along the property line of 9862 LJ Farms Rd.
5. request applicant to comply with LDC gross floor area calculation requirements.
6. request applicant to comply with building envelope especially at bedrooms along South side yard setback line and entry at front setback line.

Evelyn Heidelberg, Attorney: FARs out of scale. references the LJ Community Plan, pg 81 Residential. Land Use, Goals, Maintain the character of LJ residential areas by ensuring that redevelopment occurs in a manner that protects natural features, preserves existing streetscape themes and allows a harmonious visual relationship to exist between the bulk & scale of new and older structures. pg 82 maintain character of Bulk & Scale in infill development to existing single dwelling units, pg 84 Community Character, avoid extreme Changes., pg 84 Dev Near Coastal Bluffs, prevent walled off appearance between streets and ocean..

Laura Wheeler: How close is the trail to the guest house? How big the screening? *Trail outlined*

Michael Bruser: Not concerned about the house to be built, per se, but the Bulk & Scale, does not fit into Community. It's a precious piece of property. We will lose the last open vista, house too big.

Susan Mooris: Her house is 7,000 SF home on a 2 acre lot, FAR = .1, she "could" build 80,000 SF house. Doesn't mean one "should". Encore will be out of character, over shadow every thing else in area, block views, out of Bulk & Scale, like a "Home Depot"

Benton: **Recommend the Applicant provide a summery FAR, lot size, Build able lot area. For next time.**

Rob Whittmore: Story poles are up, DPR Members should see them.

Mrs. Bruser: This is the last most magnificent view, and it will be obliterated.

Crisafi: Discussed public views in the area

Hayes: Do you have the Isakow packet? How does this compare in height to Isakow? *It is 6 inches higher* Can you superimpose what was approved and proposed?

Kyla DuPont: What will the relationship be Torrey Pine be to the guest house? *It is next to it, will hang over guest house.*

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/15/11:

Applicant distributed a 96-page description of the Project and its surroundings. Owner wanted to be present, be part of community. The site was previously the Box Canyon Ranch, demolished in 2005, lot split into Parcels 1 & 2. Parcel 1 (to South) has CDP, is currently under construction. Parcel 2 previously approved for CDP in 2009, with FAR .20, 13,456 SF, as "Isakow". A 15 ft View Corridor (VC), thru the center of the property, aligned with Black Gold Rd. The surfer's trail beach access will be preserved. Trail to guest house, 5 ft. Trail gives VC too.

"Building Restricted Easement" of 0.72 acre. Story poles are in place. Sideyard setback issue addressed, ~8 1/2 ft. Setback to respect neighbor; nearest neighbor ~ 65 ft distance provided by lot patterns, geometry. Building Envelope - addressed: a chimney stack and wing wall about 1 ft too far, changed. FAR calculation: some phantom floor area added, some deck area removed, Proposed FAR = .36 Allowed FAR = .45, 23,600 ft² GFA, the pool vessel included = .377. the Building Restricted Easement (BRE) includes steeper part of hillside, plus the 15 ft wide VC = 0.72 acre (not subtracted from lot SF for FAR calc). Lot coverage is 31 % (33%?)

Public View show on graphic of LJ Com. Plan pg 157, fig A, photos shown. Occluding trees on neighbor's property. Did meet with neighbors on Wed. Had separate meeting with Tony Crisafi on Friday. Asks that criticism be specific beyond "too big".

Recorder setting 21/21

00 25 15

DISCUSSION 11/15/11:

Applicant response in italics.

Gaenzle: You have a large footprint, roof area, what energy conservation measures are you using? *Nothing specific yet.* It is really important on a project this size....

Costello: Presented a bell curve showing position of average, one standard deviation = 68% of homes, two st dev = 95% of homes, three st dev = 99.7% of homes. Histogram 1 shows Encore's FAR greater than 95% of area homes. Histogram 2 identifies the problem, Encore's SF greater than 95% of area homes. Histogram 3 shows Encore's lot size is average for area homes (if one is to build a very large home, this might be the neighborhood).

Thorsen: Recorder setting 21/21 00 34 19 For B&S looked at % of lot sizes, lot coverages. 12 homes similar, lot coverages are somewhat comparable. "They are not leading the pack, as far as lot coverage."

Collins: what is your lot coverage *31%, maybe up to 33%*

Jim Mooris: not saying just "too big", useable lot is too small, making FAR too big.

Tony Crisafi, AIA: representing neighbors.

Hired to meet with applicant, help neighbors understand implications of issues. Recorder setting 21/21 00 39 55

Proposed design is much larger than the approved CDP, main and upper level, 9,000 SF to 19,000 SF.

Not about private views, houses are widely separated, lots of setback, wide open views, lots of landscaping in between. House is pushed up against the setbacks on all sides.

Basically two important issues:

1. Scenic overlook from Crisafi handout, based on views from story poles and simulation in Encore booklet.
2. Bulk & Scale. pushes up against all the setbacks. Is encumbered by VC. How landscaping and lighting fits in neighborhood. Provided updated neighborhood lot area, house SF, FAR data.

To use the VC as LaCava said, will need to go thru 2 private properties ... only intended to be seen by people from trail. There will be large trees on Isenberg property.

Benton: Is any one here for Stedman Residence? Seeing none, that eases up the schedule a little bit.

Evelyn Heidelberg, Attorney:

Recorder setting 21/21 00 45 29

Asked Thorsen about data. Is that GFA or FAR? *GFA* Is data from Assessor Office or Zillow, *Zillow* Last time we received criticism for using Zillow, that's why we are now using Assessor's data. How Zoning implements the Community Plan, not correct. Zoning RS-1-2 is throughout the City, no relationship to location or Community Characteristics. The Community Plan is an overlay over the Zoning Ordinance. If all that mattered was the Zoning Ordinance, decision makers would not need to consider the Community Plan, if Zoning implemented the Community Plan. Same with CEQA review. Zoning and FAR are not all that matter, the Community Plan has precedence.

SD Muni Code 132.0403 Coastal Overlay (a) If there is an existing or potential public view and the site is designated in the applicable land use plan as a public view to be protected.

(1) The applicant shall design and site the coastal development in such a manner as to preserve, enhance or restore the designated public view, and

(2) The decision maker shall condition the project to ensure that critical public views to the ocean and shoreline are maintained or enhanced.

In Heidelberg's handout, reference to LJ Community Plan.

pg 39 Goals. Preserve the natural amenities ..., Maintain identified public views..., Enhance existing public access..., Protect the environ sensitive resources....

pg 50 2. Visual Resources a. Public views, identified vantage points b. Public views, first public roadway, preserve & enhance

pg 56 Plan Recommendations. 2. Visual Resources especially, Where existing streets serve as public vantage points, fig 9 & App G, ... view ocean and scenic overlooks and associated view sheds, set back and terrace development away from street in order to preserve and enhance public view

pg 81 Residential Land Use Maintain the character of LJ residential areas by ensuring that redevelopment occurs in a manner that protects natural features, preserves existing streetscape themes and allows a harmonious visual relationship to exist between the bulk & scale of new and older structures

pg 82 Com Character. ... maintain character of Bulk & Scale in infill development to existing single dwelling units.

In Summary...Impact on public views and Bulk & Scale will make this a real game changer in this neighborhood.

DuCharme: where photos taken, it looks you are away from where the arrow is in the Com Plan figure.

Collins: Are setbacks in violation? **Crisafi:** no, didn't see that. Don't look at all Code compliance issues.

Neighbors concerned with Bulk & Scale, view shed, scenic overlook, VC.

Couldn't tell if comply with envelope sloping from plans ... 24 ft then 45 degree angle. Crisafi asked to advise neighbors what they would get and what it would look like.

Kane: Are there height limits on vegetation? *Not aware of any.* Would veg limits help keep views?

Jenny Kruger: Pull guesthouse back to increase "setback", doesn't want to be forced to use large trees for privacy. Concerned with B&S too.

Jim Mooris: this is a smaller usable lot, with the second largest home. Walls off view.

Lynn Bruser: Environment impact includes lighting. Expects excessive lighting. Main thing is losing view.

LaCava: Landscape Plan, Isenberg (Parcel 1) easement restricts plants to 325'. Read Resolutions to Com Plan Nov 4, 2003. 3 of 5, 4 of 5.

Recorder setting 21/21 01 12 29

Benton: We are free to make decisions on Bulk & Scale, Community Character if we choose to do so.

We have significant Community Character issues because of height, that portion immediately adjacent to the street.

We should see the building envelope on drawings. Asked Members to focus on Community Character, B&S.

Gaenzle: Was VC - trail designated before the lot split? *Yes.* This project will be right up next to the setbacks, where the surrounding houses have generous setbacks. The running trail/ surfers trail will be hugging the two guest houses, that shouldn't be. If the guesthouse was removed, it would enhance the neighborhood by VC, trail, setbacks.

Kane: Difficult to imagine this 21,000 SF single family home, beyond scale of single family. Could become a destination resort. De facto densification of LJ this way. Can't control future use. Need a definition from the City of this kind of home, and single family home.

Benton: Would you consider reducing (Upper level) 7 ft?

Dreier: That 7 ft structure is back into the lot, not close to street.

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 11/15/11: Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to construct a 21,592 SF single-family residence and 2,149 SF guest quarters on a vacant 1.52-acre site at 9872 La Jolla Farms Road.

(DuCharme / Collins 3-4-0)

In Favor: Collins, DuCharme, Thorsen

Oppose: Costello, Gaenzle, Kane

Abstain: Benton (as Chair)

MOTION TIES (FAILS)

Recorder setting 21/21 01 27 53

In Favor: Collins, DuCharme, Thorsen

Oppose: Costello, Gaenzle, Kane, Benton (Chair)

MOTION FAILS

5. FINAL REVIEW 11/15/11

Project name: **Proposed Removal of Trees Obstructing a Designated View Corridor**

Public right of way on north side of Prospect Place at the foot of Park Row

Applicant: Mark Evans 858-454-6527

Scope of Work: Permit to remove trees on public land to restore a currently obstructed public view corridor designated in the Community Plan.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/15/11

At the Oct 11, 2011 meeting the Applicant passed out a handout with photographs, pages from the LJ Community Plan and a City tree removal application. LJ Com. Plan identifies this as a View Corridor. This time, the Applicant passed out a detailed Management Plan to manage several trees, with photos of each tree, plan for each tree and a PhotoShop simulation of the restored View Corridor. Residents will establish a 501(c)(3) to fund a semi-annual maintenance program, and work subject to the oversight of the City Urban Forester. No stump grinding, roots will help prevent erosion. Will leave a 6 – 8 ft hedge. Glenn Gargas, DSD, said Coastal Permit not needed. Dan Daneri, said City Parks & Rec has no supervisory role over tree removal. Went to LJ Parks & Beaches, will return at end of Nov.

DISCUSSION 11/15/11: *Applicant response in italics.*

DuCharme: If you cut a tree down to 5 ft, won't you kill it? *No, it will actually come back, the cambial tissue is still there*

Gaenzle: Why not lace? *Lacing was tried 6 years ago, growth came right back.* Rather you lace.

Collins: There are many trees below on the slope that will protect from erosion.

Brenda ___: Has been working to restore the bluff, helped form Coast Walk, worked on trail.

Unk: We had a homeless camp removed from below.

Sally Miller: (LJP&B Member) This Project has been to LJP&B. How will do maintenance? Do you have signatures of the neighbors? *Yes, all but one who can't be reached, eventually will reach.*

Evans: *Has a packet of signatures, all of Street. 501(c)(3) Coast Walk for semi-annual maintenance, Evans, Passer Co-Managers.*

Benton: Has talked to Patrick Ahern. Will take report from this Committee to LJP&B, will go to LJCPA.

Kane: Is this long term? *Yes, it is to the advantage of the property owners to keep view.*

Benton: Concerned with creation of hedge, hedge may be over-ruled.

Collins: A designated VC doesn't do any good if there is a 6 – 8 ft hedge. Need to address the hedge.

Applicant asked to return with plan without a hedge.

Recorder setting 21/21 02 07 12