

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee Minutes

4:00 p.m. Tuesday, January 22, 2013

Committee members in attendance: Helen Boyden (chair), Laura DuCharme-Conboy, Dolores Donovan, Janie Emerson, Tim Lucas, John Schenck. **Members absent:** Phil Merten, Myrna Naegle

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment --None

2. Chair Comments

- 7940 Costebelle was pulled from the LJCPA January consent agenda by trustee Nancy Manno for a full hearing.
- At its January 15 meeting, the LJS AB recommended that a two-story 991 sq ft addition to 8733 Dunaway Drive be considered major in scope but said it met LJSPDO standards. It also advised the applicant at 2264 Paseo Dorado met PDO standards and was minor in scope.
- LJS AB agendas have an official posting URL of: <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/lajolla/pddoab.shtml>
- The Viterbi project will not be heard until some issues are resolved with the City.
- Hillel project: the draft EIR from November was withdrawn by the applicant. It is being revised and will be re-submitted in full with a new 45 day comment period. According to the La Jolla Light the reason was that the house at 8976 Cliffridge Avenue is over 45 years old and is subject to historical review, which was not addressed in the draft EIR.
- The City has sent notice of an amendment to the Sudberry project on Calle del Cielo which we expect will go through the community review process soon.

3. Project review Trogen Enterprises CDP

- Project No. 302415
- Type of Structure: existing Single Family Residence
- Location: 7949 Lowry Terrace
- Project Manager: Morris Dye; 619-446-5201; mdye@sandiego.gov
- Owner's rep: Golba Architecture-Cathy Coleman; 619-231-9905;ccoleman@golba.com
-

Project Description: Demolition of a 3,912 sf existing single family residence and two car garage on a 14,217 sf lot.

Seeking: Coastal Development Permit (non-appealable)

Presented by: Sasha Varone, of Golba Architecture.

This property has been acquired and the owners will be building a new house, but it has not been designed yet. They are trying to get the demolition done first as this is a neighborhood eyesore.

The property was lost by the previous owner at a tax sale. The previous owner had hoarding issues and the house was in disrepair and was filled with piles of "stuff" which the new owners have spent a lot of time clearing out. One neighbor reported that the general consensus of the neighbors is that they want the building removed.

There were a lot of comments from the City in the cycle letter. Most of those comments had to do with the archaeological and paleontological monitoring needed if the ground was being disturbed. Our compromise with the City is that we will just remove the structure down to the slab and leave the slab on grade as it is. There will be no excavation. The construction fence has been put up due to ongoing issues with trespassing by the previous owner. The sooner the house can be demolished the better off the neighborhood will be. This is a 45-year-old house and the City will determine whether it is historic or not. The City has asked for additional documentation regarding the history of the house which has been provided. We are expecting the City to complete their review within the next few days. We anticipate it will be found non-historic.

Boyden: One never knows. It could have been designed by a famous architect or had a Nobel prize winner reside there...

Conboy: Or once you restore it you might find it to be an excellent example of a certain architectural style. **Donovan:**

There was a time on the street when there was a Japanese influence and some of the homes had a Japanese style. Not sure if

this is one of those? **Emerson:** Believes it is. **Varone:** We have done the research and believe that nobody famous lived there and it wasn't designed by a noted architect. We don't believe that there is anything valuable about the structure.

Schenck: What happens after the house is demo-ed? What will the erosion and drainage issues be? **Varone:** They will use BMP (best management practices) to control runoff during demolition. The landscaping will remain the same, so there shouldn't be any change in the drainage over what is in place now. **Schenck:** Will the construction fence stay up? **Varone:** They want to have it removed, but it will depend on if there are continuing issues with the previous owner.

Emerson: Who are the owners? I have concerns, because there are several properties in the LJ Shores that have been acquired as spec homes by a person that has not maintained the properties. One of these properties is next to me and there has been a water leak issue going on affecting my house and others that they can not get resolved. **Boyden:** According to the plans, the owners are Trogen Enterprises LLC giving Golba Architecture's address as theirs. **Varone:** This is common. She does not know the names of the company officers. **Emerson:** I hope that these are not the same owners and that they will be responsible. **Eric Dye** (neighbor): I have met the owners and believe that they are good people. They have spent a lot of time trying to clean up the property. I do not believe that these are the same owners that the committee member has concerns with.

Donovan: The City cycle document has an issue to be cleared about the possible nesting birds and Torrey Pines on the property. **Varone:** The project was evaluated under categories of geology and conservation efforts. They will have to follow the guidelines in the issued permit. They will be monitoring for the birds and for potential archaeological/paleontological findings. **Donovan:** Will the Torrey Pines be cut down? **Varone:** For this demolition phase, only the house will be removed. The slab and trees will remain. They are not sure what will happen in the future when the new house is designed. That will be addressed in a construction permit. **Lucas:** Torrey Pines have an extensive surface root system that can be damaging to structures and foundations. They may not be the best thing to have next to a house and may not be part of the new design.

Conboy: Biggest concern is the historical review. She does not feel it is appropriate for the committee to make a comment before the City weighs in on the historical review--especially if the City is close to finalizing its review. There are too many unknowns and she can not vote on a motion regarding approval or denial of the project. The Red Robin and Red Roost don't look like much now, but there is a lot of historical significance to them. Just because these are not in very good condition doesn't mean that there is no significance to them. **Varone:** There are two possibilities. Assume you make a positive recommendation. Either it is not historical and the demolition can proceed, or it is historical and the City will overrule your recommendation and not allow the demolition. **Emerson:** I have to agree with Conboy. This is too important a determination to make without key information. **Boyden:** Usually the historical issues are settled before this comes to the committee. **Varone:** They were hoping to have the determination from the City last week, but the packet submitted to the City was broken up and sent to the various departments, but the historical review was missed. The City caught the mistake and the historical information was re-submitted, but the City has not come back with a determination. **Conboy:** When was house built? **Varone:** The house was built in 1952.

Schenck: Could you have this information for next months meeting, February 26? **Varone:** Yes, but they would rather have a committee decision today. **Boyden:** The other possibility is to contact CPA president Tony Crisafi and have him put it on the agenda directly for the Feb 7 meeting if they have the historical determination from the City. **Emerson:** We are not trying to hold the project up, but historical determinations are important and we have a majority on the committee that feels uncomfortable making a decision without having all the facts in front of us. Our committee and CPA rules prevent us from making a conditional decision. **Varone:** We thought that we would have the decision by now and the neighbors are anxious to get this removed. **Conboy:** Is this just one vocal neighbor, or other neighbors? **Schenck:** I know one neighbor across the street that wants it down now.

Public comment

Eric Dye 7935 Lowry Terrace: Neighbors want this demo-ed. Letters have been written to the City. **Boyden:** They didn't come to this committee. **Dye** (not related to Morris Dye): (pointed out on the display and listed residents in the neighborhood that want it removed). This property is a health and safety hazard. It's a fire trap. Two weeks ago there was a termite storm coming from it. My mother-in-law lives two houses away and she doesn't feel safe walking by this. The new owners are a husband and wife that have been over on weekends cleaning the house. Last weekend they were sweeping off the roof.

End of public comment

Lucas: How fast can you get permits and demo this? In other words has this been scheduled for demo-ing next month, or April, or??? Will the committee not coming to a decision today affect your schedule? **Varone:** We have already gone through coastal, so all that remains is the historical determination and adherence to the paleontological and conservation issues noted in the cycles.

Kim Whitney: What is the reservation with not going directly to CPA? **Varone:** She needs to talk with the clients and find out how they want to proceed.

Boyden: We can take a vote on this today and if the committee decides to not make a decision and continue the item, and if project time-line is affected, the applicant can apply to CPA President Crisafi to be placed on the February CPA agenda for a full review. You would have to make a presentation there. **Conboy:** If the timing is critical, then you can present to the CPA that you were delayed by the historical review, and that you are not trying to skip the PRC subcommittee. And that the termites, break-ins, and other public safety issues warrant an expedited decision.(Further committee discussion ensued regarding timing issues and deadlines for the committee and CPA meetings)

Lucas: From a health and safety perspective, I would like to go ahead and vote on the project and not wait for the City. I don't think that the neighbors want it delayed further. I will make the motion that the committee can make the findings for a CDP permit.

Boyden: Any second? None – the motion dies.

Motion: Donovan **Second:** Conboy

To continue the project until the historical review has been completed by the City.

Approve: Conboy, Donovan, Emerson, Schenck

Oppose: Lucas

Abstain: Boyden

Emerson: If the historical review comes through in the next few days, could we hold a special meeting? **Boyden:** Yes, we could but even though the CPA meeting is 16 days away, there are noticing requirements. Special meetings require 7-days notice. If the applicant gets word back from the City by this Friday, it would be possible to schedule a special meeting.