

**La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee Minutes**  
4:00 p.m. Tuesday, August 26, 2014  
La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect Street, La Jolla, CA

**Committee members in attendance:** Phil Merten (interim chair), Tim Lucas (acting secretary), Laura DuCharme-Conboy, Janie Emerson, Myrna Naegle, John Schenck, Bob Steck. **Absent:** Dede Donovan (secretary)

**1. Welcome and Call to Order:** Phil Merten, Interim Chair

**2. Adopt the Agenda:** Motion: Emerson, Second: Conboy. Motion carries 6-0-1 (chair abstains)

**3. Non-Agenda Public Comment:** none given

**4. Committee Member Comments:** none given

**5. Chair Comments:** none

**6. Project Reviews**

**6A. Del Oro Court Homes**

- Project No. 333430
- Type of Structure: Two Single Family Residences
- Location: 8351 Del Oro Court
- Applicant: Rebecca Marquez , Golba Architect Inc. 619-231-9905
- Project Manager: Jeff Peterson 619-446-5237 [JAPeterson@sandiego.gov](mailto:JAPeterson@sandiego.gov)

**Project Description:** 'SUSTAINABLE EXPEDITE PROGRAM' PROCESS 3 - CDP, SDP to demolish an existing 2,217 s.f. single family residence and 430 s.f. garage; and construct a new 5,807 s.f. 2-story single family residence and detached 4 car garage with a 691 s.f. guest quarters above on a 29,800 s.f. lot, located at 8351 Del Oro Court, in the Single Family Residence Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit and Parking Impact Overlay Zones within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Project proposes a FAR of 0.21 and 43% landscape coverage.

Before the issue could be heard it was brought up by Lucas that there was a discrepancy in the noticing for the project. The address provided on the agenda, and the address on the public notice was listed as 8361 Del Oro Court. The correct house number is 8351 Del Oro Court. The public notice was posted on the 8351 property, but the incorrect 8361 address was indicated on the notice. It appears that the public notice that went out to residents within 300' had the incorrect house number as well. In addition, the project description was obsolete and described a proposal for a lot split and two separate houses to be built. The project has changed since the notice was sent out. Committee discussion followed regarding the situation. Two neighbors were present and had not been affected by the discrepancies, but neighbors above on Calle del Cielo or behind the project on Calle de la Garza may not have realized which property was actually being developed. Lucas noted that the cycle letters that had been emailed to the committee did not reference a project address only a project name, and it was possible that some of the cycle reviews were based on the wrong parcel. Varone responded that the city had the correct project package for review. Lucas was concerned that without a correct address being referenced, there was no way to be sure of that. There could be potential repercussions and delays later in the process if this was not confirmed now. The committee had many concerns, but felt that it was appropriate to have the project presented, since several neighbors were present (Margaret Fell, Eric Vickers). No decision on the project will be made by the committee at this meeting. Merten (chair) advised the project representatives that the city project manager be contacted regarding this and that a corrected notice with an accurate project description would most likely need to be sent out.

**Presented by Sasha Varone, Golba Architecture & Jim Neri, Neri Landscape Architecture**

The project has changed since the original proposal and notice. There will not be a lot split and two separate houses. They are now proposing a two-story single family residence with an attached 4 car garage, and a detached 4 car garage with a guest suite above it. Existing structures on the lot will be demolished. This project will qualify for the Sustainable Expedite Program. The neighboring house to the rear (south off of Calle de la Garza) is a 10,000 ft development with trees in between for screening between the two houses. This is a traditional style house, with colonial style columns in front.

**Project highlights:**

- 29,800 s.f. lot
- 5,807 s.f. 2-story single family residence with 430 s.f. attached garage
- Detached 4 car garage with a 691 s.f. guest suite above on second floor
- Setbacks: Front 25' 5", Rear 13', west side yard 85' 6", east side yard 67', detached garage 8' 9", cabana 7' 6", house second story setback varies from 16' 5" to 27' 6"
- Single curb cut 16' wide (existing)
- Bedrooms; 5 main house, 1 guest suite
- Guest suite has wet bar. No kitchenette or stove.
- Project is in the Beach Impact Parking Overlay Zone
- A pool will be at the south-west corner of property near Calle de la Garza

**Landscaping:**

- 43% greenscape (30% required)
- Will save 8 existing trees (Italian stone pines) and preserve several hedges for privacy and beauty
- Intent is to make the landscape a feature of the home
- An orchard and garden area will be installed on the west slope of property
- The driveway curves around and goes between the two structures. It will be hidden by the landscaping where it curves.
- There will be a decomposed granite walking path at rear easement connecting to Calle de la Garza.
- There is a pergola, fountain, and a pool.

**Committee questions:**

**Naegle:** how much slope is there at the orchard and garden area? **Varone:** 10' difference in elevation of lot from top to bottom.

**Conboy:** Plan for solar panels since this is Solar Expedite Program? **Varone:** They will produce 50% of the power required to run the house. The solar plan has not been developed yet. There is adequate south-facing roof and eave space for panels. Will split panels between upper and lower roof sections. **Conboy:** Solar panels can have a big impact visually. Is concerned that too many panels will be needed. Requests that a solar plan be presented next time.

**Schenck:** Drainage plan? **Varone/Neri:** The low point for water flow is on the Calle de la Garza side of the property. There will be bi-retention basins on site to capture as much water as possible. Water will overflow to Calle de la Garza during heavy storms, which is what happens currently. There is a collection spot on north side that will feed lawn area.

**Merten:** Questions about pool area measurements and slopes which were answered. Would like drawings for pergolas and the cabana. What is on the neighbor's side of the pool area? **Varone:** A driveway on the west, Calle de la Garza on the south. The pool equipment will be installed next to the pool along the west property line, which has the neighbors driveway behind. Noise shouldn't be an issue.

**Public comment**

**Eric Vickers,** Calle del Oro Ct.: What grading will be required? **Varone:** There will be some grading, mainly around the pool area. They are not leveling the lot and are not planning on removing fill. **Vickers:** When would you start? How long is the process? **Varone:** There is no hard schedule at this time. They do not anticipate the permits issued before February. Length of construction is estimated at 8 months.

**Committee discussion:**

**Emerson:** Would like to see plan of the neighboring properties bordering pool area and rear of property. **Varone:** Showed

the plans. **Emerson:** How close is the guest house to the house on de la Garza? **Varone:** The guest house (detached garage) is setback 15' from property line. **Naegle:** swimming pool setback to property line? **Varone:** 7' 6". **Merten:** Setback from cabana to side property line? **Varone:** 9' to existing retaining wall. Wall is 6' high

**Conboy:** The front rotunda columns are colonial style and not traditional to La Jolla. They don't really fit in with other properties in the area. **Varone:** They were trying to preserve much of the existing structure feeling and have a similar front entrance way. **Merten:** The east elevations of guest house are not very sensitive with respect to the neighbors. The look is a bit stark and plain. Recommends trying to rework the look.

The committee requests that the project return with:

- Solar panel plan
- Site sections on retaining wall
- Pergola site sections
- Cabana site sections
- Adjust photo with the rear property line superimposed on it. (line is inaccurate)
- Neighborhood setback survey
- Correct the project notice to have the correct address and description. Re-notice neighbors as required.
- Confirm that cycles pertained to the correct property.
- East elevations of guest house are stark with no articulation. Possible rework?

#### 6B. McClelland Residence CDP

- Project No. 355787
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8352 La Jolla Shores Drive
- Applicant: Richard Gombes 858-456-4070 RGombes@san.rr.com
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas, 619-446-5142 GGargas@sandiego.gov

**Project Description:** PROCESS 3 - CDP and SDP to demolish an existing structure and then construct a 4,060 sq. ft. two-story single family residence on a 5,500 sq. ft. property. The project site is located at 8352 La Jolla Shores Drive, in the Single Family Residence Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (non-appealable) Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Limit, within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

#### Presented by Richard Gombes, Architect

The project was presented at the previous meeting. He will be addressing items requested by the committee at that previous meeting.

- A Street scene was presented, large scale, showing the homes along La Jolla Shores Drive. A google map showed the properties. An overhead drawing of the project and its neighboring houses was also presented showing their relationship and also indicating FARs for each house.
- Rear setback: 22'6" to house, 16' from deck. Setbacks of neighbor behind and south: 19'3", neighbor behind and north 33' (but 3.5' to shed structure). Average rear setbacks for the neighborhood is approx 20'. Height: 29.5' to top of chimney.
- A rendering of the front of the structure was presented. Concrete with cherry stain wood siding. Stucco on upper level.
- Materials board: cherry stained Acova wood siding. Basalt flat work is dark gray/charcoal, white stucco on upper level. The poured in place concrete is gray.
- FAR for proposed structure: 0.74 for the living space, but if counting the covered patio is 0.89. The rear of the property has been designed with step-backs to not be looming over the neighbors to the west. The covered patio at the rear of this project accounts for a FAR of .15, but isn't living space. FAR can be a good tool for determining bulk and scale, but for this project, the street view from the public right of way is better indicator than FAR.

**Committee questions:**

**Schenck:** The chimney on the roof deck looks short? **Gombes:** The chimney has a 7'6" draw which is sufficient. He has built projects with a 6' draw that performed great, this is taller and will work fine.

**Lucas:** Has concerns about the roof deck and privacy. **Gombes:** Drawings were shown in response. The chimney structure will shield the neighbors to the north. There is another structure on the south that shields those neighbors. There is a small portion of the deck at the rear (west) that is not shielded, but there should be no privacy concerns as this is set back 22' from south property line.

**No public comment was given.**

**Committee Discussion**

**Conboy:** Likes contemporary look and the way it is broken up. What makes newer houses look bulky, is very high ceilings. The house two lots north has a high second floor and appears bulky. This house looks balanced and not top heavy.

**Schenck:** The FAR for this project is large. It is the fourth largest house in the area and part of a trend for larger homes.

**Gombes:** From the public right of way, it looks small. This project has larger setbacks than other houses in the area. The covered patio adds .15 to the FAR, but it is pushed down, not adding to the bulk and scale. **Emerson:** The feel of these larger houses is different from surrounding blocks. It is not a good trend. **Merten:** With the broken up scale, this project may feel softer.

**Lucas:** What neighbors were contacted? **Gombes:** Several neighbors on Paseo del Ocaso and de Calle de la Garza. No one on La Jolla Shores drive was contacted. Note that the owner of this property also owns the adjacent property to the north on LJ Shores Drive. **Lucas:** What is the greenscape? **Gombes:** 1600 sf is required, this project has 2400 sf. **Lucas:** Is that actual greenscape and not deck areas? **Gombes:** Actual greenscape.

Comments on the motion. **Steck:** The articulation on this project is good.

**Motion:** Steck Second: Conboy

**Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and a Site Development Permit for project #355787, 8352 La Jolla Shores Drive. 4-3-0**

Approve: Conboy, Lucas, Steck, Merten. Oppose: Emerson, Naegle, Schenck.

**Merten:** Due to the close split of the vote, this item will most likely be pulled from the consent agenda. The applicant can contact the LJ CPA for further information on the process.

**6C. Lambert Felice Residence**

- Project No. 288444
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 2382 Via Capri Court
- Owner's Rep: Scott Spencer: 858-459-8898 scottspencerarchitect@yahoo.com
- Project Manager: Paul Godwin; 619- 446-5190; pgodwin@sandiego.gov

**Project Description:** PROCESS 3 – Coastal Development Permit (CDP), and a Site Development Permit (SDP) to add 1,840 square foot of additional enclosed floor area to an existing 4,204 square foot single family residence on a 0.30 acre site in the Single Family Residence Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (non-appealable) Overlay Zone, 300 foot Brush Management Buffer Zones, Coastal Height Limit, within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

- Lot size: 13,250 sf
- Existing Sq/ft: 4204 sf
- Proposed Sq/ft 1 st additions: 1,840 sf
- Total Sq/ft: 6,044 sf
- Percent of lot covered: 44%

- Floor area ratio: 0.45
- Height: 30'-0"
- Front yard setback: 10'
- Side yard setback: Street side: 21'; side: 5', rear: 19'
- Landscape: 36.2%
- off street parking: 4

**Presented by Scott Spencer:**

The aesthetics are slightly different from the original structure. He considers this a face lift to an older building. The footprint is very similar to the original structure, but there are a few areas where it sticks out more. They are adding an interior courtyard.

In response to the committee's questions from the previous meeting:

- Elevations from street side, front and rear, were presented.
- They are keeping the existing 6' wall on east property line that will help shelter and add privacy from neighbor.
- The building is 13' high in most areas.
- There will be solar panels on the south side roof
- A 6' wall wraps around the property
- Materials board: Roof will have colored (green) aggregate to hide pipes from properties looking from above. There will be darker anodized window elements. The windows will be high end energy efficient with slight tint. The stucco is in lighter earth tones.
- Drainage plan: Currently water drains to the east untreated. A bio-swale is being added to treat the water runoff from the flat roof. Bio-swales will handle most of water. Overflow water will be treated by the bio-swales and the flow to Via Capri.
- Greenscape: 36% landscape area, but some is under the deck area on west side. Not counting this deck area:  $4826 - 550 / 13250 \text{ sf} = 32\%$ . The interior courtyard not included in calc.
- Bill Lewis, the architect for the original structure, says it is not historic and is due to be updated. He helped with some of the redesign and likes the present project. The project was presented to SOHO and the City Historic board. SOHO liked the design and participated in the presentation to the Historic board.
- The city reviewer determined that the two driveways for this property were to code based on three criteria. Two driveways are permitted if property has more than 200' of frontage (1 driveway per 100') which this project has, this project has frontage on two streets, this project is in conformity with the neighborhood as many other residences in area have circular driveways with two openings. Also, this project provides 4 parking spaces, so will not impact street parking.

**Emerson:** Doesn't like the pop-out panel over the garage. It juts out and is plain. **Naegle:** Is also concerned with 16' panel on top of garage. **Spencer:** The garage area and panel pop-out are setback 32' from the street. The narrow driveway has trees on either side. When driving by you would not see it due to the trees and the setback. There is no pedestrian traffic on this cul de sac.

**Merten:** Requested to see the roof plan. **Marengo/ Spencer:** will put gravel over black tar. **Merten:** The roof drains will most likely stand out from the properties and roadway above. One of the projects goals was to have a clean roof design. Merten and Spencer discussed options for the roof drains.

**Motion:** Steck Second: Conboy

**Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and a Site Development Permit for project No. 288444, 2382 Via Capri Court, 7-0-0**

Approve: Conboy, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Naegle, Schenck, Steck. Oppose: Abstain:

#### 6D. Stylli Residence

- Project No. 374040
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 2542 Paseo Dorado
- Applicant: Claude-Anthony Marengo 858-459-3769, CAMarengo@marengomortonarchitects.com
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas, 619-446-5142 GGargas@sandiego.gov

**Project Description:** PROCESS 2 - CDP and SDP for the remodel and 4,776 sq. ft addition with basement garage and second story single family residence at 2542 Paseo Dorado. The 0.47 acre lot is in the Single Family Residence Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (non-appealable) Overlay Zone , Coastal Height Limit, within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

**Presented by CA Marengo, Marengo Morton Architects:** Mostly a single story house except for north portion. CCRs have 2-story areas specified to preserve views. This is on the side of a hill with a steep front slope that meets the street above. The street curves around the parcel going from high to low. Lower level is 18' below highest street level on lot. A fence (3' solid) will be installed around the upper property along the street. Presently, people can walk right over the edge onto the slope which is a safety issue. They have an easement for the private road below. They are moving the driveway and garage to have access from this private road. The existing curb cut will be closed adding one more parking space for the street.

- House 9,114.2 sf (existing 4900 + 4863 addition).
- Lot size: 20329 sf. House Footprint: 6037.68 sf 29.69%, FAR = 45%
- Landscape 9,680.66 sf 47.62%. Hardscape 4,613.93 sf 22.69%
- Setbacks: front: 20' (similar to existing). North side (next to neighbor) 28' to structure. Front yard 30'. Rear abuts easement and varies from 16' to 8' to 42'. These setbacks similar to neighborhood average. Setback survey was presented to committee.
- Materials board: Light color roof. Anodized bronze window frame, beige tiles, Santa Barbara color (beige) stucco.
- 3 car garage plus one exterior parking space. 4 total parking spaces.
- There are both internal and external stairs
- Pool is being moved north.
- The roofs will all be of a pitched type to preserve views from above and from cars driving by.
- Solar panels for hot water for pool and showers will be near the pool area.
- Drainage issues with present house. Proper drainage is being installed.

Note: The city had the wrong address on the noticing package to the planning groups, but the public notice and plan sets had the correct address.

**Lucas:** Will there be fill removed or grading done? **Marengo:** They are removing some fill and minor grading.

**Conboy:** Thinks the aesthetics are similar to other houses in the area.

**Motion:** Conboy second: Steck

**Findings can be made for a Coastal Development Permit and a Site Development Permit for the remodel of the property at 2452 Paseo Dorado, Project No. 374040. Approve 7-0-0**

Approve: Conboy, Emerson, Lucas, Merten, Naegle, Schenck, Steck. Oppose: Abstain:

## 7. Floor Area Ratio Limits in the LJSP District - Action Item

Previous PRC Action, July 22, 2014: Move that the PRC ask the CPA to appoint an ad hoc committee to research the process for a mini-update to the LJPDO. (Donovan / Conboy, 6-0-0)

### LJCPA Discussion, August 7, 2014.

Does the LJCPA want to revisit possible update to the Shores PDO? This could include working with the La Jolla Shores Association and the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance Advisory Board to engage the La Jolla Shores community, the City of San Diego, and Council District 1 in an open conversation regarding a targeted update.

### LJCPA Action, August 7, 2014.

To return the Item to the PRC asking them to be more specific. (Emerson, Outwater: 14-0-1).

#### Committee discussion:

**Naegle:** Keep LJS PDO as it is, but add FARs to it. **Conboy:** Some owners will consider this unfair "taking property".

**Naegle:** FARs had to be established sometime citywide, which would also would have faced similar issues. How was the city able to do it?

**Conboy:** We have had very little time to research changes. An Ad Hoc committee can explore the changes that need to be made. **Emerson:** The item on the CPA agenda was different from the motion provided by this PRC committee. We were asking to find out the process in general, and not how to make specific changes. **Kim Whitney:** Agrees with Emerson that this wasn't presented at the CPA the way the committee intended. Feels that FARs is the issue and should mentioned specifically. **Lucas:** Feels that there are other subjective areas in the PDO such as Bulk and Scale, Site Setbacks and building styles that need to be addressed and clarified. **Emerson:** The intent of the committee's motion was to find out the procedures for how an update or minor revision can be made. Unfortunately the CPA agenda item description did not reflect that. **Bob Whitney:** Leslie Henegar said that Development Services needed to allocate the funds and then assign a planner to this. They are in the process of working on other code reviews, so this is a lower priority. **Lucas:** Henegar over simplified the process. There is more to the process than just assigning a DSD planner. What community groups should be involved, how many public meetings held, what is the actual process and time frame, etc.? That is what we wanted an ad hoc committee to find out.

**Merten:** There are subjective criteria in the LJS PDO and the LJS Design Manual. The previous director of Development Services instructed the project reviewers to ignore the LJS Design Manual. That is why many projects that are out of character and don't comply have been permitted. There is a new director of DSD, Bob Vacchi. He would like CPA president Joe LaCava to contact Vacchi and ask if he will direct his staff to recognize the La Jolla Shores Design Manual. Committee members are also welcome to contact him directly and ask the same question.

The meeting had run late and there was not enough time to continue discussion and reach any conclusions.

**Motion:** Emerson Second: Conboy

**Continue this item to the next LJS PRC meeting, preferably as a first item. 5-2-0**

Approve: Conboy, Emerson, Naegle, Schenck, Steck

Oppose: Merten, Lucas

Adjourn