

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

COMMITTEE REPORT

For

December 2012

December 11 Present: Benton (Chair), Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Merten, Welsh, Thorsen

December 18 Present: Collins, Costello, Grunow, Hayes (Chair Pro-Tem), Kane, Liera, Merten, Welsh, Thorsen

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT 12/11/12

Costello: 1. The public comment dead line for the Hillel project has been extended until mid January. **2.** The Shaw project was pulled from the LJCPA Consent Agenda because records for any LJ Community Group voting to approve the project could not be located. **3.** The Butterfield project was approved at the LJCPA with an additional 3 ft on the South side yard setback, total 15 ft, and a North side yard setback of 11 ft. No obstacles or vegetation over 3 ft will be allowed in these view easements.

Thorsen: Construction trucks block traffic lanes on Inspiration Way.

Kane: This started when the LJHS was asked whether the Morton Bay Fig at the former Top O' the Cove site was "protected". The City had a tree survey done and a City policy passed SD Tree Protection Policy 900-19 of June 13, 2005. It is cultural resource, an inventory of trees on GIS Does this Group know what we might do with this? **Collins:** Give it to Jim Neri.

Liera: take it to all the Community Groups. **Merten:** have this as an Agenda item next week.

2. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT 12/18/12

None.

3. FINAL REVIEW 12/11/12 (PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED 11/20/12)

Project Name: **BERNATE TICINO RESIDENCE**

1328 Virginia Way	Permits:	CDP
Project #: PO# 293008	DPM:	Laura Black 619-236-6327
Zone: RS-1-7		LBlack@sandiego.gov
	Applicant:	Sarah Horton 619-231-9905

Scope of Work:

Sustainable expedite program process two Coastal Development Permit to construction a 4,918 sq ft, two story, above basement, single family residence with detached garage and guest quarters, on a 6,995 sq ft vacant lot located at 1328 Virginia Way in the RS-1-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Ht Limit, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. Council District 1.

Presenters 12/11/12: Sarah Horton
Ricardo Torres

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 11/20/12:

The previous house was demolished. Need a CDP to build a single family 2-story house with guest house and basement. Project is sustainable expedite process. House is large but preserving as much yard as possible. The house is not stepping in the upper level, but have moved house away from the setbacks.

DISCUSSION 11/20/12:

Collins: Have you talked to the neighbors to the South? Two level guest structure?

Liera: How does this building fit the neighbors on each side? We need a section, for neighborhood context, to see how this fits in, with spacing, height ,etc, to the existing condition.

Collins: Is the garage two car? *Yes, two car with guest parking too.*

Welsh: Did the demolition have a Coastal Permit?

Leslie Davis, Preservationist: The demolished house was the Irving Gill Historic Craftsman Cottage known as "**Windemere**". The house was demolished under improper circumstances. Davis agreed to email links to newspaper articles to the Committee Chair. Project needs a full environmental review (CEQA), historic review too. There may be historic artifacts on the property. The project is eligible for California Register designation at the State level of significance, according to OHP Staff. La Jolla Historical Society was in process.

Liera: An expedited review has certain requirements, can you go over them? How much energy will this be producing, using, saving? *Efficient exterior wall insulation, solar panels 50% energy needs, dual pane low E windows, energy efficient appliances.*

Liera: You are asking for an expedited permit which would not be appropriate because of the demo process. **Collins:** When was the emergency demo?

Davis: 23 Dec 2011, with an “emergency” demo permit.

Welsh: The size of the previous house was 1360 sq ft.

Liera: We need to evaluate what is left on the site, maybe artifacts. Environmental documents will help evaluate loss and potential mitigation.

Collins: How long have you been working on this project? *Six months or something like that*

Costello: what are the side yard setbacks and profile height? *Both sides 4 ft 3 in, front 15 ft. profile is below 24 ft.*

Davis: would like to see environmental documents and no expedited permit.

Kane: The Windemere Cottage was demolished to avoid State Historical Review, and CEQA Review. Application timing is good example of “project splitting”, in violation of CEQA requirements.

Presenters 12/11/12: Sarah Horton
Ricardo Torres
Scott Moomjian
Frank Bottini
Laura Black

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 12/11/12

Moomjian: *asked if DPR Members have a conflict of interest or personal bias and must recuse themselves.*

Chairman Benton: pointed out that our DPR By Laws and the Brown Act indicates a conflict of interest is financial (only).

Liera and Kane: stated they are members of the LJ Historical Society.

Grunow: stated his father is a member and President of the LJ Historical Society.

Provided For FINAL REVIEW 12/11/12:

1. Please provide a clear statement about the CEQA status of the previous project and its relation to this project and note if this came about as a result of project splitting. We would like to know from the Planner if indeed project splitting has occurred. There may be artifacts remaining on this site, please tell us how this will be addressed. Whether there is an Archeological study or as part of a CEQA study, there should be record of architectural drawings of the structure. **Black: no segmenting as per CEQA on this project.**
2. Are other environmental documents needed? **Black: Staff is in the second review of this project. The environmental analysis is on-going.**
3. California State Preservation Office said this is a significant historic property and definitely could be designated; is authorization needed from California State Office of Historic Preservation to proceed with development? **Black: I have not contacted the State office.**
4. Discuss project with neighbors on the south side of street.
5. Please provide a neighborhood context study, 1) a section (massing) showing neighboring houses on both sides with the proposed house, 2) a section going across the street, show relationship to building across the street.
6. Please provide GFA and FAR calculations and their break down.
7. Please provide a clear and detailed statement of how this project meets requirements for sustainable development.
8. Provide more articulation of the rear structures to help the appearance from the alley. The rear structure is rather plain compared to the main structure.
9. Please provide a materials sample board of the exterior.

Benton: Mr Moomjian, I would guess that members are going to continue asking questions about CEQA, timing, procedures, and correctness of the State's and City's actions. Are you willing to present the Architecture, etc, of the project knowing there is this other set of issues?

Moomjian: *I think we can separate what happened a year ago from today. The State did fail to designate after 3 motions. We have a new project and would like to move forward.*

Liera: Was there sufficient time between the two events (over-the-counter demo permit and the hiring of an Architect/CDP application) to call them separate? What regulation is there about elapsed time?

Black: *We don't have a set time between permitting. Doesn't think there was project splitting, the only thing we considered was demolition.*

Kane: So, if the City has no policy for this (lapsed time required between demolition permit and CDP application to avoid project segmentation), State law would apply? **Black:** *A demolition permit is not subject to CEQA. I'm not talking about a demo permit, I'm talking about project segmentation. I don't believe there was segmentation. There are those that do!*

Benton: I propose that we act on the advice of city staff and proceed. We can reserve comment for a later time. For the present, I recommend that we proceed, unless there are objections.

Merten: Is history of the project off the table?

Benton: Individual Members may reject what was said or further research the history of demolition of the building. We can proceed on, and vote on the project.

recorder setting 17 00 17 49

Thorsen: questions whether proper procedure was followed, especially whether this should be on the sustainable expedite program.

Benton: we can review the project as it stands, holding the historic issues aside if we wish

DISCUSSION 12/11/12:

Courtney Coyle, CEQA Attorney: Laura Black is not an expert on CEQA, not even an expert on the City Municipal Code, and not an attorney. She has no qualifications to comment on project segmentation, CEQA.

Kane: There are many persons from the public who would like to comment, is now OK?

SUBCOMMITTEE POLL 12/11/12:

(Kane / Costello 6-2-1) straw poll on holding Public Comment to discuss whether this project should be reviewed, focused on issues like CEQA conformance, project splitting.

In Favor: Costello, Grunow, Kane, Merten, Thorsen, Welsh

Oppose: Collins, Liera

Abstain: Benton

POLL PASSES

Benton: We will proceed to Public Comment on whether the project can be reviewed, focused on the issues of CEQA conformance, potential historic designation, and possible project splitting.

Coyle: This was demolition by neglect, windows were left open, etc. Then the actual demolition on 23 Dec 2011. Originally the applicant was OK with Historical Society taking the structure. There was no salvage of the old growth redwood. LJHS wanted an EIR if the building was to be demoed, so we could see what alternatives there were, ie re-location. Applicant had options. We were searching for sites to relocate. There was improper segmentation as per CEQA. The California Historical Resources Commission might have found for designation if given the proper information. The applicant's report given to the City's HRB did not mention this was an Irving Gill structure.

That information should have gone to the HRB: it might have made a difference.

recorder setting 17 00 27 39

1. HRB was not given the correct history of the building, Irvin Gill house.
2. A fair argument can be made for historical significance under CEQA
3. There was project splitting under CEQA.
4. There was project personnel continuity between the demo and the design phases.
5. California Historic Preservation Office process should have been allowed to continue.

Looking at the new design, the view of the rear structure is too plain, no character. The story board doesn't have photos showing the other buildings from the alley. This project should rightfully be seen as one with the previous demolition.

Merten: Was a CDP issued for demolition? *No*. Laura Black said demo was by an over the counter permit. But the Muni Code says "any" structure or demo requires a CDP. IE, 113.0103 Definitions, Coastal development includes "demolition"; 126.0702 A Coastal Development Permit issued by the City is required for all coastal development of a premises within the Coastal Overlay Zone; 129.0506 A Demolition/Removal Permit shall not be issued for a development that requires a development permit. DSD really dropped the ball in this case by not requiring a CDP. If this had been done properly, discussion with the Community, the DPR and CPA could have begun.

For example, Mr Moomjian provided a historical analysis on a project at Casa de Manana for Mr Underwood. The project was unique in the neighborhood in terms of construction, technique and details, but it was not historic. Staff considered it different enough to at least require thorough documentation of the building with drawings and photographs before demolition. That was a condition placed on the property before a CDP was issued. So Mr Moomjian is familiar with Historical Resources Board procedure, CDP conditions and demo permit conditions placed on coastal property. I'm concerned this project was treated atypically by Staff from the others.

Thorsen: Scott Moomjian is on the SD County Historical Sites Board, is that a conflict of interest to represent someone here against designation? *No*

Frank Bottini Owner / Lawyer: *House was condemned by the City, exception to CDP. All rules followed. Offered numerous times to donate house to the LJHS. Since it was condemned, no need for a CDP. There was a detailed Engineer's report saying how the house was not habitable and represented a threat to children coming onto the property. As the property owner we would be liable for any injuries. We complied with the law. We agreed to give an engineer's report to DPR.*

Costello: I will need that engineering report for the DPR Members to read and for our files.

(Note: Report not verified. Second request was made for report, no report ever presented)

Benton: We will need that report.

Heath Fox, Executive Dir. LJHS: This project was split in violation of CEQA. In 2010 Windemere Cottage was habitable and safe. Nothing should have been done while the CHPO review was under way. The owner systematically removed structural elements to destabilize the building and remove defining characteristics. Code Compliance should have cited the owner for incremental demolition. The owner knew the Gill history. These actions were on the wrong side of the spirit of the law.

Tom Grunow, President LJHS: was in the house in 2010 when it was on the market. The interior was special. Told the owner it had special significance in La Jolla. Said LJHS would work with the owner, it would not cost him time or money. LJHS had located a site for the Windemere Cottage to be re-located.

Athjna Singer: behalf of Preservation Chair LJHS: If an applicant applies for a demo permit shouldn't the applicant be required to reveal they will then build another structure? Since there was less than a year between demolition and the new project, was there project splitting?

Black: *We can't speculate what an owner will do.*

recorder setting 17 00 51 32

Dan Soderberg, Chair of Neighborhood Historic Preservation Coalition, VP SOHO: The City was notified twice that Windemere was being reviewed at the State Office for Historic Preservation for State designation. No action should have occurred during this process. We heard that the Cottage was not approved for designation, but that doesn't tell the whole story. 1) The Legacy 106 historic report by Ron May was not allowed to be entered into the HRB designation record (Moomjian objects). The author was not allowed to be questioned by the HRB. 2) Presentations to HRB were made that the historical integrity had been lost (owner removed windows). Integrity is not important for designation. 3) One HRB member never votes to designate if the owner objects to designation, he should have recused himself as a biased person.

Paul Johnson, AIA & Preservationist: I have experience with single walled construction. The historic value of the Windemere Cottage was extreme. There were only 6 single walled, two story constructions in San Diego. That makes it unique, as such it should have been designated.

Kane: You were in the building, was the structure sound? **Johnson :** To bring it up to Alternative Code compliance would have required some work, certainly to rehabilitation standards.

Kane: Would removing the eaves and brackets de-stabilize the building? **Johnson:** Yes, the joint was critical. They provided structural support.

recorder setting 17 01 00 34

Don Schmidt, LJHS: Definitely project splitting occurred, like moving Cave St cottages for a parking lot. Referred to the suppressed Legacy 106 historical report.

John Eisenhart, AIA: Specializing in historic structures. Hired by previous owner in April to Oct 2010. Worked with Jim Miller, Engineer, and they believed the building was structurally sound at that time. We were in the process of bringing it up to date, and placing an addition on the back. Concerned from a historic point of view that an owner can destroy a structure to obtain a condemnation, and demo permit. We don't want this to be a precedent setting situation.

Thorsen: questions CEQA, demolition. Concerned about conflict of interest by Moomjian.

Kane: here we have a continuity of intent and personnel, Golba and Moomjian, all to the same goal. There was a cynical approach to the development process. There was a break down of process at City Hall. Will the new Mayor look at this differently?

Collins: Let's hear the architecture; set aside the CEQA and history.

Benton: We make recommendations about the SD Land Development Code, any discussion on how we should proceed?

Merten: The Municipal Code says if there are conflicting provisions in the law the more restrictive / conservative stands. The City issued a demo permit without the benefit of CDP, that permit is deficient, not in compliance with the Coastal Act. Do we stop the review at this point? Or continue as suggested by Mr. Collins? We can ask the applicant to get an after the fact CDP and return, there is precedent for that. We can ask the applicant to assemble a well documented file with all relevant material for a historical record for the Community.

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:

(Costello/Kane 8-0-1) To require the Applicant to apply for a Coastal Development Permit to demolish the previous structure at 1328 Virginia Way, and to return to La Jolla Development Permit Review as part of the review process and present CEQA and other environmental documentation.

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Merten, Thorsen, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton

MOTION PASSES

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION:

(Merten/Thorsen 8-0-1) Findings can not be made for a Coastal Development Permit for construction at 1328 Virginia Way. Specifically, the proposed project is not in conformity with the specified implementation program (ie the Municipal Code requirement for a Coastal Development Permit for the demolition of the previous building).

In Favor: Collins, Costello, Grunow, Kane, Liera, Merten, Thorsen, Welsh

Oppose: 0

Abstain: Benton

MOTION PASSES

recorder setting 17 01 30 16

4. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 12/11/12 + FINAL REVIEW 12/18/12Project Name: **LIEM RESIDENCE**

7324 La Jolla Boulevard	Permits:	CDP
Project #: PO# 300425	DPM:	Paul Godwin 619-446-5190
Zone: RM-1-1		PGodwin@sandiego.gov
	Applicant:	Jeanne Liem 408-391-1938

Scope of Work:

Coastal Development Permit (process 2) for a proposed 1614 sq ft new 2-story single family residence with a 175 sq ft roof deck, detached 356 sq ft. 2 car carport with a 107 sq ft 2nd story play area (accessory , unconditioned structure) above the carport on a vacant 2500 sq ft lot located at 7324 La Jolla Blvd. In the RM-1-1 zone, CHLOZ, N-App-2, PIOZZ – Coastal Impact, RTPOZ, TAOZ, Geo Haz 53

Presenter: Jeanne Liem**APPLICANT PRESENTATION 12/11/12:**

The lot, 25x100 ft, is off the alley. 2-story, with exterior stairs to a roof deck, car port. Pre-fabricated in Utah, move in six modules. 4 bedrooms, 2 parking spaces. Providing 17 ft front yard setback (15 required). 3 ft sideyard setback on South side, 6 ft on the alley side, North. Encroachments in front, bay window, and rear setbacks, carport with 3 sides open. Stucco finish and some cedar siding. Shingle roof. Energy efficient, and drip irrigation.

Collins: What is the structure length? **44 ft** Is the City asking for 2.5 ft for extra alley width? **No, there is room to maneuver our cars without a wider alley.**

Benton: Do you have a landscaping plan? **We are just keeping the 2 large pines trees in front and adding some ground cover.**

Kane: What is the lot coverage? **Not regulated in RM-1-1**

Merten: there are required findings for a CDP, one being a project must be consistent with the LJ Com Plan. RM-1-1 allows greater density. If there were two- story buildings next door this would be consistent. It also addresses transition between existing and new construction requiring that buildings greater than one-story will step back the upper level to provide a transition. A 3 ft setback gives a blank wall to the neighbor to the South. Not sure this fore fills that section of the LJ Com Plan.

Liera: You could articulate the setback. You could play with the windows. A two story building could go in a one story situation by articulation the roof line. Think about articulation of the sides. Look at Sea Lane and the narrow houses. They have the benefit of landscaping. You need a landscaping plan, how about flower boxes?

Kane: Think about a balcony with flower boxes.

Benton: See if you can't provide some articulation on both the North and South sides.

Collins: Maybe inset or angle the windows.

recorder setting 17 02 03 41

Provided for FINAL REVIEW 12/18/12:

1. Study articulation of both North and South sides. **North side will have battens on the cement fiber board, recessed windows. South side will have battens and a recessed wall.**
2. Study articulation of the front. **East side faces LJ Blvd. 2nd floor recessed 2 ft back. Cement fiber board for texture, color green. Some cedar siding too. Flower boxes.**
3. Provide a landscaping plan. **2 existing pine trees will remain, paving stone walkway, mulch under trees. Just mulch on South sideyard. Paving stones and mulch in backyard. No fence in alley, 3 ft solid fence in visibility areas.**

4. Provide a study of neighborhood context and character (a block in each direction?) *Some commercial and residential. Both new and older. seven narrow lots, six are 1 story, two are adjacent to 1 story houses.*
5. Provide a photo study of the neighborhood. *Provided a complete photographic survey of the block.*
6. Meet with neighbors. *Met with one, on the South side and the other across the alley. South neighbor's house is across from Liem's backyard, their garage is across from the Liem's house, they are happy with this.*
7. Please provide information about other 25 x100 ft lots with a second level on the block. *There are 6 each 25x100 ft lots with a 2 level on the block.*

DISCUSSION 12/18/12:

Merten: yours is not a common color pallet, but it works well in the location with the trees. There are examples of 2 level projects on narrow lots on Sea Lane, no problem. Here the neighbor to the South has a 1 level house, to the North is 1 level as well. Questions contrast of the tall narrow structure to low single level. **Collins:** Questions compatibility.

Liera: applicant didn't understand that by neighborhood context, we need a section showing neighbors houses on each side, East – West, North – South. Uneasy about the precedent this could set and that others will want to do the same. If you had done the analysis we asked you could see what this transition looks like. How you make the transition between old and new needs to be shown.

Liem: *Explains some examples down the alley.*

Liera: Fine, but you need to show the schematics of neighborhood. Could do more, recess, transition.

Hayes: Neighbors are OK with the fit, because the way the second story is positioned.

Kane: I agree with Angeles, we need to see how this fits with neighborhood. You have taken articulation request to heart.

Thorsen: this may be the best one can do with the limited lot.

Chair Hayes: should we vote today or do you wish to come back with a study and elevation drawings, ie North-South, and along the alley East-West? **Liem:** *would like a vote to today*

Merten: The rectilinear blocks and their juxtaposition of that mass in relation the neighbors is the hard part. The articulation you have done helps break up that blocky mass, but still not enough, Modular prefab construction has limited you, yields to blocky-ness.

Liera: The evolution of that block will mean that it will eventually all be two story.

Merten: This is a multifamily zone, and it may be in transition. In time the street may be more like this. But you are stuck in that transition phase where we need to respect the current neighbors.

Collins: prefab modular construction prevents you from meeting the CDP requirements.

Hayes: Who is in favor of a final vote today? Five Members. Do we have a Motion?

SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION 12/18/12:

(Thorsen /Hayes 5-4-0) Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit for a 1614 sq ft 2-story single family residence with roof deck, detached car carport on a vacant 2500 sq ft lot located at 7324 La Jolla Blvd.

In Favor: Costello, Grunow, Hayes, Thorsen, Welsh

Oppose: Collins, Kane, Liera, Merten,

Abstain: 0

MOTION PASSES

The Applicant was advised that with a close DPR vote, the LJCPA will usually not pass a Project on the Consent Agenda. The Applicant can save a month's time by requesting the LJCPA Pres. Cristafi place her on the 3 Jan 2013 Agenda for vote.

5. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 12/11/12

Project Name: **XIONG RESIDENCE**

1553 Copa De Oro Drive

Project #: PO# 281986

Zone: RS-1-4

Permits: CDP

DPM: Paul Godwin

PGodwin@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Pam Swanson 619-224-8604

Paul John 858-756-2526

Scope of Work:

Coastal Development Permit (process 2) for a 866 sq ft addition to an existing single family residence on a 0.24 acre site at 1553 Copa De Oro Drive in the RS-1-4 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 12/11/12:

Doing more rearranging of rooms and opening space than expanding, adding 866 sq ft, along with extensive remodeling. Expanding some to the South and West. Solving some drainage issues. Maintaining the existing driveway and most of the garage. Keeping most of the landscaping. Master bedroom and great room switching places. Extending the flat roof out, not going up into neighbor’s view. Lot is 3 to 7.5 ft above street. Is there an HOH in this area? *No*.

Please provide for FINAL REVIEW:

1. Please provide a materials board.
2. Review the encroachment of the great room.
3. Provide a landscape plan and calculate the landscaped area.
4. Provide a drawing or photo-montage of the proposed house with the neighbor houses on each side.
5. Please provide a section, drawing or photo-montage showing the proposed house and the house across the street.

recorder setting 17 02 23 22

6. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 12/18/12

Note: Preliminary Reviews can be voted a Final Review by a unanimous DPR Committee approval.

Project Name: **GILLISPIE PLAYFIELD**

7411 Fay Avenue

Project #: PO# 284137

Zone: RM-1-1

Permits: CDP, CUP

DPM: Patrick Hooper

PHooper@sandiego.gov

Applicant: Scott Bernet 619-237-

9433

Scope of Work:

Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit to remove an existing single family residence at 7411 Fay Avenue and develop a playfield with associated landscaping, fences, walls, and signage adjacent to the Gillispie School in RM-1-1 Zone within Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area, La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan.

Presenters: Allison Fleming
Mike Ryan
Beth Bowen
Scott Bernet

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 12/18/12:

Allison: they have grades 1-6, but no green play field. School purchased lot next door to remove old house and build a playground.

The Cycles Issues Letters, CILs, are for an old version of the project which has been abandoned, therefore no sign, no variance (needed for previous playing field location), no shared parking agreement. Only CDP. CUP for lot consolidation.

Bowen: playfield is 49 x 170 ft lot off Fay Ave. Setback 33 ft from Fay. On alley, 6 ft solid wall with wrought iron on top. Student access directly from inside school grounds. Artificial turf with subterranean drainage. There will be a curved brick feature with steps set back from Fay. It will have a donor wall, wrought iron on top. Students will be dropped off in existing driveway.

Kane: Is the building to be removed historic? *No, we had Scott Moomjian review it*

Liera: It looks like early modern construction

Kane: Shouldn't there be a Historical review? The issue is the loss of these old beach cottages.

Merten: what about your neighbor? **Allison:** they seem in favor, no negatives at all.

Liera: we need a section thru the field, the neighbor's property, showing 9 ft fence thru the setback to building next door

Collins: what about parking? *Parking spaces, 18 plus 7. no need for shared parking agreement.* Exclusive use by students? *Yes*

Costello: how many students? *265. (320 approved by CUP)*

Bowen: *lighting will be shielded.*

Merten: for a CUP, there are conditions for expanding in a multifamily area. The neighbor will be right next to the play ground, we will need a letter from the neighbor. They should be aware and ask you for conditions such as hours of use, limits on weekend use, noise, lights.

Please provide for FINAL REVIEW:

1. Historical review of the house
2. A section showing the neighbors house, the 9 ft wall, height of field, into the field
3. A list of Conditions for the CUP (for protection of neighbors).
4. Letter from the neighbor, with an understanding of limits of use for CUP

7. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 12/18/12

Project Name: **HUCKINS RESIDENCE**

1545 Virginia Way	Permits:	CDP
Project #: PO# 293001	DPM:	Laura Black
Zone: RS-1-7		LBlack@sandiego.gov
	Applicant:	Ricardo Torres 619-231-9905

Scope of Work:

Sustainable Expedite Program (process 2) Coastal Development Permit to construct a 3,818 sq ft, two-story, above basement, single family residence on a 7,000 sq ft vacant lot located at 1545 Virginia Way in the RS-1-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Ht Limit, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area.

Presenters: Sarah Horton
Ricardo Torres
Jim Neri

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 12/18/12: Project is a 2 story 3,798 sq ft house on a 7,000 sq ft lot. allowed FAR = .58, proposed FAR = .53. Lot has a significant slope. Surrounded by large houses. 15 ft front setback, both side yards require 4 ft, providing 6 ft for both. Max height 23' 9". 9 ft slope differential front to back.

Jim Neri: landscape plan. There will be a front stairway going across front, then to side of house for a main entry. Project has required street trees. In front there is visibility triangle for the driveway, the plants will be 3 ft or less. A very thorough plan with front yard, side yards and back yard landscaped, patios, decks, and retaining walls.

Horton: there will be a roof deck in the middle of the building, not visible from street.

Merten: how do the front yard setbacks compare to the neighbors? A foot print drawing would do showing neighbors too. Even a Google overhead photo with your project drawn in.

Dr. Wichersham: The neighbor up hill. Concerned about the abutting two 6 ft retaining walls. If constructed without a space between how are they maintained? How does Wickersham maintain? **Torres:** *we will have a civil Engineer look at the issue.*

Please provide for FINAL REVIEW:

1. Site plans showing foot prints, setbacks of the project with neighboring houses to compare setbacks and relative positions.
2. Have an Engineer examine the issue of the abutting retaining walls and explain any issues and solutions to the Dr. Wickersham.
3. Provide a neighborhood FAR study, include lot size, floor area, FAR.

8. INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION 12/18/12

Sharon Singleton on the **La Jolla Historic Cultural Landscape Survey**

Presenter: Sharon Singleton

PRESENTATION:

Presented large poster boards , maps of La Jolla each with different information, views, street trees and heritage trees, geology and parks

Started 10 years ago, visiting all of La Jolla and cataloging all the street trees, landscaping, sidewalks, that contributed to the cultural aspects of the Community. Made photographs, collected GIS data., view corridors, geology, cultural centers, interviewed people. Cataloged various cultural zones.

Jim Neri explained Heritage Trees, owners give consent.

Kane: How do we move this process forward?

Pat Ahern: we (LJP&B) use Jim Neri's Preliminary Coastal Plan even though it has not had official acceptance.

Neri: get it adapted as an element of the LJ Community Plan.

Merten: there is an update every decade or so.

Liera: It takes 7 yr to do an update.

Thorsen: let's get this an agenda voting item on 8 Jan 2013 DPR, send to the PDO and CPA. The objective being incorporation into the LJ Community Plan.

Liera: This can be approved as an overlay element to the Community Plan, get it done now, incorporate at the up-date.