

La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee Minutes
Tuesday June 25, 2013
La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street, La Jolla, CA

Committee members in attendance: Dolores Donovan, Tim Lucas, Phil Merten (acting Chair), John Schenck, Tony Crisafi (ex-officio). Absent: Laura DuCharme Conboy, Janie Emerson, Myrna Naegle, Bob Steck.

Due to absence of several committee members, Tony Crisafi, president of the La Jolla Community Planning Association will be joining the board as ex-officio for today's meeting. Only the Dimenstein project will be heard, as Crisafi is presenting the Sudberry project and would have to recuse from the board, breaking the quorum.

Motion: Donovan **Second:** Lucas

Motion to appoint Phil Merten the Chair Pro Tem for this meeting.

Motion carries: 4-0-1

Approve: Crisafi, Donovan, Lucas, Schenck. Abstain: Merten

1. Non-Agenda Public Comment – 2 minutes each for items not on the agenda

Tony Crisafi: The CPA is looking for volunteer scribes for the sub committees to help with the minutes. They have put out a notice with UCSD and potentially there 4 or 5 students that are interested. They are still trying to work on the details. The students would not be available until the start of the fall quarter.

Merten: The city Planning Commission has 2 new commissioners. These new commissioners appear to research projects carefully and not take staff recommendations on face value.

2. Chair Comments

- A brief outline of the community review process was given for those in attendance.
- On June 18 the LJSAB considered the McIlvaine Project and a concept proposal.
- 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.

- 3. Election of PRC officers for June 2013 to May 2014 –** Postponed to next meeting due to absence of committee members. Phil Merten will continue on as acting chair and will prepare the agenda for the next meeting. Donovan has an interest in becoming chair, but has taken a new job that requires travel and may not be able to make it work. Donovan and Schenck will miss the July meeting. Discussion regarding committee attendance and notification to the committee regarding planned absences was made. It may be that the committee will want to adopt rules similar to the La Jolla Community Planning Association and the La Jolla Shores Association regarding attendance: miss 3 meetings in a row or 5 in a year and the committee member is deemed to have resigned.

4. Project review

- A. **Sudberry Residence 8039 and 8053 Calle Del Cielo - Will be heard next month.**
- B. **Dimenstein Residence, 8445 La Jolla Scenic Drive**

4B. Dimenstein Residence

- Project No. 313406
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8445 La Jolla Scenic Drive
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas; 619-446-5245; ggargas@san Diego.gov
- Owner's rep: Scott Spencer; 858-459-8898; scottspencerarchitect@gmail.com

Project Description: Remodel and construct a 6,000 sf two-story addition to a 3,775 sf SFR to total 8,733 sf SFR on a 21,665 sf site at 8445 La Jolla Scenic Drive. Coastal Height Limit and Campus Impact Parking Zones.

- Lot size: 21,665 sf (0.497 acres)
- Existing Sq/Ft: 2488 plus 1287 garage =3775 sf
- Proposed 1st story addition: 2752.0 sf
- Proposed 2nd story addition: 3266.0 sf
- Total Sq/ft 7971.0 sf plus 752.0 garage
- GFA 8423.0 sf
- Percent of lot covered: 25.2%
- Floor area ratio: .402
- Height: 30'-0"
- Front yard setback: 28'-0"
- Side yard setback: 13'-0" and 4'-0"
- Rear Yard setback: 84'-0"
- Percent of green softscape: 42.6%
- Off street parking: 3 car garage

The project is seeking: Site Development Permit (SDP)

Previous PRC Action: May 28, 2013 (Please see minutes for additional notes)

Motion: Merten Second: Schenck

Findings for a SDP can not be made because the setback at the upper level along the northern property line is not in conformity with other second level side yard setbacks in the vicinity.

Motion carries: 4-1-1

Approve: Donovan, Merten, Naegle, Schenck, **Oppose:** Lucas, **Abstain:** Boyden
(Emerson had to leave before motion was made)

Note: The applicant chose to revise the project and return to the PRC

Previous PRC Action: April 23, 2013 (Please see minutes for additional notes.)

Motion: Lucas **Second:** Conboy

Continue the item to a future meeting. Would like the following information from the applicant:

- Setback survey with street addresses added and averages provided to committee
- Provide a streetscape showing proposed structure and photos of the other houses. Make a reasonably accurate presentation, and include the 2 houses to the north and the 3 to the south – six in all
- Parking plan with parking spaces identified and measured
- Single curb cut and north driveway issue resolved with the city
- Update on seismic information if available
- Pool equipment location and sound mitigation

- Pool drainage plan
- Will they be adding solar voltaic panels? If so, how will they be situated?
- Landscape plan. What trees will be retained?

Motion carries: 6-0-1

Approve: Conboy, Donovan, Emerson, Lucas, Naegle, Schenck; abstain: Boyden (chair)

6-25-2013 Project Review

Presented by Scott Spencer:

There were two main issues that were of concern to the committee at the last meeting. They have addressed these two issues:

1. There was a proposed block wall at the front was 6' in height and solid, set back 1' from the front property line. The committee felt that it did not comply with the city-wide fence ordinance.

Resolution: Moving the wall and gate back even with the garage, 28' from the front property line. There is also a 10' setback from the curb, so effectively the wall is 38' from the curb. There will be a wrought gate installed in the wall to allow access the non-covered parking spaces at the south side of the house.

2. Second story setback at the north property line was not set back enough and there were privacy concerns. **Resolution:** They have moved the entire second floor back from the side property line. The closest point is now 10' from the property line and the setback varies from 10' to 13'. The house orientation is slightly skewed, so as you go to the rear of the lot (east) the house angles away from the property line. There are pop-outs and other features to soften up the planes and minimize the affect of the second story. Elevations were presented to the committee showing these changes. A comparison was made with the Aron residence to the south. The Aron structure is parallel with the property line and is 10' back at the second floor along a 30' portion of the building. It changes to 5.6' for a outside stairway, and then goes to 12' for a small portion of the building towards the rear. There is another property three lots away with a second story and it is set back 8' from the property line. The Dimenstein proposal angles away from the property line as the building goes towards the rear of the lot, is 10' at its closest for the second floor and has interesting features to soften the mass. We feel that this proposal is in conformance with the other houses in the vicinity.

Lucas: What is the height of the fence at the north property line, and where would it come up to if you were to draw it on the side elevation? **Spencer:** The fence varies between 5' and 6'. If drawn on it would come up to about the top third of the first floor windows. **Lucas:** The existing first floor building envelope will remain the same? Can you review the second floor setbacks on the north property line. **Spencer:** The existing first floor envelope will remain the same at the north property line with the exception of removing a shed which is 1' from the property line. The first floor setback is 6' at the closest (near the garage). The second floor goes from 10' to 12', then back to 10' and ends up at 13' at the rear of the lot.

Schenck: Can you show the west elevation and show how shifting the second floor affects the view of the building from the street? **Spencer:** Using the elevation showed how the building shifted and how it has minimal affect of building appearance from the street.

Donovan: Regarding the landscape plan, what trees will be removed? **Spencer:** The are only able to retain the one mature tree in the front on the South west corner of the property. The three trees along the side and rear of the property will be removed due to being too close to the foundation. Another tree is where the swimming pool will be. **Donovan:** Is the single curb cut issue with the city fully

resolved? **Spencer:** Yes. The city agrees with having a single standard width curb cut. **Donovan:** Have you decided to install solar panels? **Spencer:** They have not made that decision, but is doubtful as the roof orientation and building design are not really conducive to solar. **Donovan:** Did you address the pool equipment and the pool drainage issue? **Spencer:** Yes that was presented at the previous meeting. The pool pump and filtration equipment will be sited at the south-east corner of the pool and sited in a sound shielding enclosure. They have a reversible pool pump and a hose that can reach the street in front. Draining a pool would be a rare event. **Lucas:** Rare, but if a failure occurred with the pool, you could drain it safely and not destabilize the hillside.

Crisafi: Had questions regarding the site section and the street scape. **Spencer:** Presented the site section and the streetscape and answered questions regarding setbacks.

Public Comment:

Kim Whitney (La Jolla Shores resident): Thinks it is beautiful building and a good project.

Motion: Schenck: **Second:** Donovan

Findings can be made for a Site Development Permit to remodel and construct a 6,000 sf two-story addition to a 3,775 sf SFR to total 8,733 sf SFR on a 21,665 sf site at 8445 La Jolla Scenic Drive.

Discussion on the motion:

Merten: Pulling the second floor back from the property is good and the right thing to do. The approach taken does not affect the floor plan and results in a better project. The building on the north side will look better with these changes.

Motion carries 5-0-0 (Approve: Donovan, Emerson, Merten, Schecnk, Crisafi)

4A. Sudberry project: Was not heard due to recusal/quorum issues. However, when the project could be heard next was discussed. Holding a special PRC meeting could be done, but due to noticing requirements, would not get the project in front of the CPA any sooner than hearing it at the next regular PRC meeting. UCSD representative Anu Delouri (representing the property owner to the north) requested an extension until the environmental documents have been prepared. It was explained that community review is usually earlier on in the process before the environmental documents are finalized. The committee expects this project to be heard at the next meeting.

Motion to adjourn: Donovan, Second: Schenck. Motion carries: unanimous.