

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee – Minutes

Tuesday, February 23, 2010

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment - None
2. Chair Comments: Upcoming Projects: Return of Ninkovic, 8490 Whale Watch, Hooshmand will make for a crowded agenda.
3. Project Review (see A – B below)

A. McClelland Residence – Third Hearing

PROJECT NUMBER: 195996

- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: Type V, NR
- LOCATION: 8360 La Jolla Shores Drive
- PLANNER: Jeannette Temple; Ph. 619-557-7908; E-mail: jtemple@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Richard Gombes Ph. 858-663-2045; E-mail rgombes@san.rr.com
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 2nd and 3rd story addition (to 4190 sq.ft. total) to an existing single family residence on 0.12 acre site in the SF Zone of La Jolla Shores Planned District. Coastal overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit, and Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zones within the La Jolla Community Plan area. (City NOA Info) Also Beach Parking Overlay per Cycle review.
- SEEKING: Site Development Permit (SDP) & Coastal Development Permit (CDP)
- Other: This property was issued approval #586174 for Project #163792 on 10/31/2008 (per plans) According to architect e-mail: the previous project that was permitted in 2008 was completed through the foundation & framing stage.

Previous Action: February 17.

Motion: Merten Second: Schenck

Findings can not be made for a SDP because the project does not comply with the general design regulations of the PDO, and the roof elements guidelines of the La Jolla Shores design manual.

Motion failed 2-2-0 Approve: Merten, Schenck; Oppose: Morrison, Lucas; Abstain: Boyden

Motion: Lucas Second: Morrison

Continue item to next Tuesday's regular meeting. 3-1-1

Approve: Morrison, Lucas, Schenck; Oppose: Merten; Abstain: Boyden

Please see February 17 minutes for comments made then

Other notes from December 22 hearing:

-1140 sq feet – orig house. detached garage 438 sq ft; garage now located to front of lot

-After first reconfiguration: 1043 sq ft first floor living area. Garage 438 sq ft.

-Exterior stairs not included in measurements

-open patio 741 sq ft. below second floor included in FAR, other patios not included

Previous December action:

Motion Furtek: Second: Schenck

Review project again after second cycle issues have been released by city. There are too many issues identified in first cycles issue that need to be cleared before any vote can be taken.

4-0-0; Approve: Furtek, Morrison, Schenck, Lucas

Oppose: None

Abstain: Boyden.

Presented by: Richard Gombes at February 23rd meeting

Response to whether roof structure is compatible: The key word is compatible. LJSPDO “No structure shall be approved which is substantially like any other.” Pictures were presented of neighborhood houses including one showing a white stucco house 2 doors south that has steeply angled pitches. Another photo shows a house to north with 10 in 12 roof pitch. Other photos show nearby houses on El Paseo Grande with a diversity of styles. Another photo shows a Cape Cod style house on Paseo del Ocaso that has grey siding and dormers on the 2nd story.

Boyden: Presented an overview of the neighborhood and gives perspective on the various types and styles of houses beginning at the corner to the north.

Morton: Is the city requiring planting in front? **Response:** Yes, two trees from the following types: trumpet tree, Hong Kong orchid, New Zealand Christmas. Questions about the dimensions of features on the front elevations and the second story...

Furtek: It is too massive and bulky. The homes with which the architect alleges the McClelland home is "compatible and consistent" are themselves examples of homes that violate the terms of the LJSPDO and the La Jolla design guidelines re: consistency, compatibility and continuity."

Merten: Roof lines and dormers do exist in the neighborhood. Design Manual: "Roof forms on any given street will be required to be 'compatible'" Should be in the neighborhood, not 2 blocks away. The design manual says: "To conserve important design characteristics in La Jolla Shores some uniformity of detail, scale, proportion, texture, materials, color and building form is necessary." Is this proposed project in relationship to the neighbors in this particular block? Does this have enough uniformity to meet the wording of the ordinance which says "unity with variety?" Is the project so different in its form to not be in relationship with the neighborhood? He is looking for a higher degree of unity.

Boyden: The Design Manual uses the words consistency, compatibility, and continuity to describe desirable roof forms.

Response: The LJ Shores Design Manual is a guideline. Everyone has different interpretations

Lucas: House does look like ski chalet and a bit out of place. But the angled roof makes this 3 story house less massive and more like a 2-story house. I think that the north side looks too straight-sided and plain with the dark siding, and think some features could be added to help such as opaque windows, material variety, etc. There is 2-story Spanish style house next door at the maximum height 29.5' on the north side, which is straight sided and does not step back the 2nd floor per the La Jolla Community Plan: "Structures with front and side yard facades that exceed one story should slope or step back additional stories..." That house looks massive and intrudes on the neighbor's privacy. This proposed house looks a lot less massive and is more respectful of neighbor privacy. The Spanish house should not have been permitted in its present straight-sided form. Therefore I don't believe it should be used for criteria that determine the roof shapes/materials for the neighborhood.

Morton: Max height is 29.5' at ridgeline. Thinks house harkens back to earlier gabled houses, but with modern elements. [He likes this.] The rear of the house looks more modern and has fewer traditional elements. There is a lack of consistency from front to back. It is as if there is one house in the front and a separate house in the rear. Cottage style houses are common in the area.

Motion: Merten; Second: Schenck

Findings for a SDP can not be made because the project does not comply with general design regulations of the LJSPDO as further explained in the LJS Design Manual.

Motion fails due to tie: 4-4-0;

Approve: Schenck, Merten, Furtek, Naegle; Oppose: Morton, Boyden, Lucas, Morrison.

Motion: Lucas; Second: Morton

Findings can be made for a SDP. The home typifies the LJSPDO goal of unity with variety.

Motion fails due to tie: 4-4-0;

Approve: Morton, Boyden, Lucas, Morrison; Oppose: Schenck, Merten, Furtek, Naegle

Morton: Still has stylistic issues with the front of the house looking different from the rear. Would anyone support a continuance?

Naegle: Only if we give specific suggestions for changes.

Merten: Agrees with Morton that there are two buildings here. One in front and one in back.

Morton: Back needs Craftsman pitches from the front. Eaves and details.

Lucas: I just think that the north side needs to be broken up with a change of materials. The dark siding is too massive. Perhaps stucco to match the front could be added to the front lower corner below the lower eaves?

Schenck: Might support if changes such as remove dormers was made.

No further motions are made. The project will request a full review at the next CPA meeting

B. PALAZZO –Preliminary Review (No vote with respect to findings will be taken)

- PROJECT NUMBER: 195026
- TYPE OF STRUCTURE: 3- STORY WOOD FRAME
- LOCATION: 2402 Torrey Pines Road
- PLANNER: Tim Daly: Ph: 619-446-5356 Email: tdaly@sandiego.gov
- OWNERS REP: Paul Lamme: Ph: 858-875-5986; plamme@intergulfusa.com
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 52 residential condos (previously approved for 30 units) on a vacant 1.21 acre site at 2402 Torrey Pines Rd in the V Zone of La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit [City]
- SEEKING: (PROCESS 4) Coastal Development Permit (CDP), Site Development Permit (SDP) and Vesting Tentative Map to amend CDP 46240 and SDP 46241 [City]
- NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION: Visitor Zone

Michael Morton: Disclosed that his firm worked on the original proposal for this project 3 years ago. He has not done any work since then and does not have any financial interest in it.

Presented by: Paul Lamme; Steven Jones; Scott Ballard

Lamme: First revision was submitted in November. Changes have been made since then. The original project design received a Site Development Permit in 2007 (submitted 2005).

Original design was 14 townhomes plus 3-story condo project of 15 units. Parking was underground. There was a large arch in the middle of a building that fronted Torrey Pines road that cars would drive through to access the parking. Due to the economic downturn, they have changed the project to be more smaller units and a lower price, rather than the fewer, larger, higher-priced units.

New site design consists of: Three 3-story buildings and a row of 2-story townhomes along the east side next to the Sandpiper development. There are 52 units – smaller than original Palazzo design. Original 2500 sq ft unit size was scaled down to smaller approximately 1200 sq. ft. units Underground parking underlies most of the site. There is no vehicular access to the grounds, only to the underground parking. Entrance to the parking is through one driveway in the front at Torrey Pines road. There is a fire lane entrance not paved as for regular traffic.

There are 112 parking spaces provided compared to the 104 required by the city (1 per bedroom). There are three 1-bedroom units, one 3-bedroom unit, and the rest are 2-bedroom units. Greenscape = 30%; Lot coverage = 50%; Traffic Generation: 312 trips per day total.

Steven Jones: Showed massing study with sight lines/view corridors. Showed changes from November submission in response to city comments.

Instead of having one or two large buildings, having several smaller buildings allows view corridors and green areas in between which is much nicer. Also, the eastern view corridor is also a fire lane for fire truck access.

Driveway is approved at 24 feet width. City would like it larger, but builder wants it at this width for design and structural reasons.

Morton: Is there a curb cut for fire lane? Answer: No. Could fire lane be used for a loading zone? Probably not. Fire lane will be grass.

Roof plan currently does not show revised placement of air-conditioning equipment. They will use split air conditioning systems installed inside the building. The units are smaller and they plan to take out one bedroom per building to hide equipment in. This way it will be less visible to the neighboring developments.

Board comments:

Merten: Rear buildings are close to the property line which is a residential single family zone. LJSPDO states that setbacks in neighborhood should be in general conformance.

Helen: Isn't this the Visitor Zone? Answer: Yes. Any other hotels nearby other than the Hotel La Jolla? Answer: No. Size of site? Answer: 1.25 acres.

Public comment:

All four members of the public are from the Sandpiper development to the east.

Barbara Sheipe: She has concerns about underground parking garage that abuts the property line of the Sandpiper. How close does the structure come to the property line and how will they dig this? Answer: The underground garage will extend to the 5' setback of the property line. They will reinforce the dirt as they are digging. There will be no settling or undermining of the adjacent buildings.

John Novasloski : Concerned about the number of units jumping from 30 to 52 units. They only have 29 units in their development on a similar acreage. He is happy to see something going in to replace an empty lot. There are 2 schools, a fire station, a hotel, and a market in the area. Traffic is a real problem. He thinks that the driveway design, even with the stop light at the entrance, has a lot of the same issues that they have leaving their complex. It may be worse because there is no loading zone in front as a buffer and the road has narrowed and bike lane ended. This driveway is far more dangerous. He requests story poles for the buildings so that they could see the outline of the proposed buildings and the heights.

Roy Sheipe: Has concerns about too many smaller units. Now 1200 sq. ft. Where is the air vent for the parking garage?

Response: The builder does not know at present time where the exhaust will be located.

Susan Stillings : Has concerns that the 52 smaller units will turn area into renters' paradise like Pacific Beach. Two bedroom units will be sublet to help pay mortgages. There is not enough visitor parking, especially if sub-letting is going on. Will the buildings to the east side shade their site, especially the pool/recreation area? **Response:** the proposed buildings on the east side are 2-stories and a maximum height of 22'. Showed diagram showing open area with spa next to adjacent property pool area. They do not believe that there will be any shading with these buildings and in addition the ground level is slightly higher in the east.

Further board questions/comments:

Boyden: Sees problem turning into the driveway. Does not feel it is safe.

Lucas: This development has too much density and not enough green area 52 units and 104 bedrooms is the maximum permitted They should consider scaling back the development a bit The Sandpiper to the north has only 29 units and has more recreation areas including a pool and tennis court. There is not enough parking. Although there is more parking than the city requires, having only 8 visitor spaces is a problem. He shares concerns about subletting. They should cut down the number of units and bedrooms to improve the parking ratio. There is no loading zone and the parking garage is not high enough to allow moving van access. It will be difficult and a traffic hazard when people move in and out of the complex. **Response:** They will look at the feasibility of consolidating some smaller units into larger ones They do have a recreation area with a pool and barbeques.

Morton: Redesign the parking plan to gain more spaces. **Response:** Will look at tandem parking. There only two elevator units.

Schenck: Thinks that parking will not be an issue as many of the owners will be absentee and only visit certain times of the year. The residents can work out unofficial sharing schemes for parking.

Naegle: Thinks that the parking spaces are too far from the residential units. Parking garages are designed for cars and not people, and are unpleasant to be in.

The project would like to return next month. Boyden believes that the schedule is full as it is. She will work with them to schedule a return.

No further action taken. The meeting was adjourned.