

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday May 19, 2020 – 4:00 pm

Due to the current public health emergency, LJCPA and its committees are meeting online rather than physically. Those who wish to attend (including viewing, listening, and possibly speaking at the meeting) must register in advance. To register for the DPR meeting, please visit <https://lajollacpa.org/agenda-instructions-for-online-dpr-meeting-4pm-5-19-20/> at your convenience. Registration will remain open until the meeting ends.

Presentation materials will be made available in advance of the meeting through links on <https://lajollacpa.org/agenda-instructions-for-online-dpr-meeting-4pm-5-19-20/> Applicants (or opposition) please send all materials to the DPR chair (brianljcpa@gmail.com) no later than 3pm on Monday 4/20/2020. This must include your most recent Assessment Letter and Cycle Issues in addition to your presentation materials.

-
- 1. Public comments are an opportunity to share your opinion with the committee members. Comments should not be directed at the applicant team*
 - 2. Plans are available for in-depth review by contacting the project manager at the city's Development Services Department before the meeting.*
 - 3. Public comments will be strictly limited to **2 minutes per person**. Please review the following meeting minutes. If another member of the public has already said the same thing tonight or at a previous meeting, please move on to new information. It is not necessary to repeat previous comments.*
 - 4. **Applicants:** Please present your project as succinctly as possible. Speak clearly and **CONCISELY**.*
-

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Costello – Committee appointments coming up on CPA. If you are interested in joining this or similar committee submit your interest to LJCPA or The LJ Town Council.
- Kane – 3 DPR vacancies are all LJ Town Council
- Kane – city noticing is inadequate, need large scale signs, only noticing is easily discarded and confusing. PM refused to re-notice on another project. Barbara Bry got an ear full.
 - We have already asked for it in next code update.
 - Initial noticing is mailed out and it can be months before first meeting
 - Notice should include opensds website. This would future proof changes in PM
 - Folded piece of paper looks like an add. Tenants might throw away mail.
 - We are keepers of community meeting, can we better notify neighborhood
 - If new neighbors move in after notice, no info.
 - What if we asked applicant to post a tag on site.
 - What if ask city to add “email info@lajollacpa.org to be kept apprised of future community meetings.” Might be lowest hanging fruit to achieve.

- Mapping on DSD home page.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

ITEM 1: FINAL REVIEW 5/19/2020

Project Name: Kolmar Residence – 304-306 Kolmar St
Permits: CDP
Project No.: 639405 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
Zone: RM-1-1 Applicant: Tim Golba
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/639405>

LA JOLLA - (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish a single-dwelling unit and to construct two (2) two-story, single-dwelling units located at 304-306 Kolmar St. **Unit 1: 1,859 sf. Unit 2: 1,875 sf.** The 0.11-acre site is in the RM-1-1 Zone, Coastal Overlay (N-APP-2) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. CD1.

5/12/2020 - APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- 5 lots up from Vista del Mar. Existing house cleared historic review. Existing single family home plus garage conversion unit done without permit so no parking on site currently.
- Site photos, Kolmar almost flat until just west of this lot. Then drops quickly. Bulk of Western neighbors mass is at rear.
- Showed additional context photos on the street. Large project at the corner of Vista del Mar and Kolmar. Another 3 story project under construction adjacent to that.
- Photos from alley as well. Westerly neighbor is very tall at rear (alley) side. Tall homes across alley as well.
- 2 legal lots: house built across both properties; still two separate legal parcels.
- 2 single family homes, one on each legal underlying lots. Owner will live in West unit and sell East unit.
- Front Setbacks are larger than current building. No increase in size, each lot meets all requirements as a stand alone. As two separate lots or as a multifamily duplex, you still would have the density allowance for two units.
- **Square footage numbers on description is wrong. 1,875sf is max allowable FAR: 1,859 and 1,874sf for two units**
- Larger front setback to Eastern unit since no view. FAR exceeds 50% at 20' full setback.
- Mass appears 20'-10" above Kolmar. Only glass roof deck at 24'-4" setback from street.
- Positioned view windows further forward toward street and over neighbors garage to maintain neighbors privacy.
- Full 3D mock-up of neighbors building to show relationship.
- Materials: Stucco, precast tiles, metal fascia
- Two off-street parking provided with carport (2 sides open, but garage doors to alley)
- Each floor is under 1,000sf

- Zone survey to show all 25' wide lots in this area.
- Comparison of what is allowable and how much bigger the building could be.
- 50% increase in cumulative sideyard setbacks by not doing a duplex
- All cycle issues closed – not asking for any variance or deviation
- Increased pride of ownership with detached home. Individual fee simple lots.

5/12/2020 - PUBLIC COMMENT

- Ruef: Reviewed objections. Too big, FAR numbers are too big, tight neighbors, hear each other sneeze. Would like to see FAR math, 3' side setbacks but would be 4' if it was a duplex or single home. Is there a 5' code minimum?
- Miller: Neighbor behind. No variances? Concerned about location of carports and where to trash cans go. Giving him 8.5" Very common for people to enclose garages and build over the top. Who is there to stop it? Bulk and scale is too big. Concerned that 25' lots are not typical or historically integral. Smaller setbacks result where abut neighbors.
- Carsell: Why do they call it on Kolmar?
- Heine: Community character is being destroyed by ugly boxes. Some of these homes are historic. Should not tear down older homes. Why can't a single family home be built with character.

5/12/2020 - COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Fremdling: horrified to learn it won't be restored, Mr. Golba has done well covering the code requirements and the number of 25' lots is compelling, the horse is out of the barn. Cannot suggest changes unless restore the house.
- Costello: consider privacy of neighbors. Prefer 4' setback
- Kane: Extensive aerial photo showed 25' lots. How many within 300 ft. radius? Inadequate transition to adjacent single story homes with pitched roofs. Carport with garage door is "cheating".
- Leira: Don't agree that Kolmar street has gone consistently 25', the street can still be saved. Prefer to see a project on a single 50' lot. The terraces with glass guardrails don't protect privacy for users or neighbors. Landscaping is important. There are some older buildings that are modern and stark but fit neighborhood with lush landscape.
- Gaenzle: Bulk and scale issues; carports are a trick that makes house 400sf bigger. Would prefer to see garages with 400 sf taken from house area. There is no transition between the old and the new. Prefer to see it reduced. Will fence at alley remain 3' (applicant: it will be 6')
- Jackson: Required notice does not appear to be posted on site. Agree with carport concerns.
- Will: roof deck glass rail hampers privacy; Happy to see see 21' height.

5/12/2020 - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

- Carport and trash spacing?
- What to do to preserve privacy: consider solid railing set back from wall edge.
- Consider 4' setbacks
- How many 25' lots within 300'.
- Reconsider glass guardrails
- Renderings with existing houses on both sides
- Fix rendering at rear fence
- Show Bulk and scale compared to existing.
- Overlay existing vs proposed footprint

- Investigate site noticing
- Street scape noticing
- Fly drone at edge of roof terrace and show what “look down” privacy concerns will be
- Shadow analysis mid morning and mid afternoon affect on neighbors.

5/19/2020 - APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- Client gave carte-blanche to suggest improvements as a result of community feedback.
- Reviewed figure grounds of existing and proposed development
- Aerial image of 25’ lots limited to 300’ radius
- Aerial of how many roof decks in neighborhood
- Design Updates since last week
 - Added some sloped roof to integrate with neighborhood character and shield/reduce roof decks
 - Smaller windows on East side for neighbor privacy and lowered roof parapet at that area
 - Photos from existing second floor windows (not drone). Only large windows are forward and look over garage, all West windows that look into Western house courtyard raised sill to 5’. Roof deck 50% solid rail discourages view into neighbors’
 - East facing privacy: replaced full height windows on East with high sill windows, only front windows that look at solid wall remain large. Added solid sloped parapet at roof deck.
- 3’ setback remains and is per code on 25’ lots.
- Modelled new house with existing in-situ. Existing house is closer to street and taller
- Shadow study:
 - Detached carports are allowed to encroach into setbacks
 - Fencing in 3D rendering updated to 6’ and demonstrate trash locations.
 - Two sides of carports are 85% open.
 - Demonstrated allowable (largest case) envelope vs proposed (much smaller/lower)
 - Noticing: Site notice was properly posted in July and is back up. City PM confirmed noticing went out. Provided evidence that neighbors received notices.
- Always multifamily zoned – R2 -> RM-1-1
- What is building height?
- Landscape plan not required
- No additional trees to be planted in front yard, but street tree proposed
- Material is wood siding, stucco, tile, metal fascia (white and gray tones)
- Side setbacks are 3 on each side (instead of 4) Total setbacks are (4x) 3’ not (2x) 4’
-

5/19/2020 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Ruef – Children and neighbor on board. Children raised here
 - Concerns: Character, Bulk and Scale, Code Conformance
 - Photo of her home (immediately east of subject). Larger twin buildings to her East
 - Additional photos of existing homes in neighborhood. Some large new homes next to old smaller homes. In many cases the examples of large construction have small “cottage” neighbors

- Additional photos of “character” French country, tudor, Spanish, beach cottage. This project “Taps the Scales”
- Today’s presentation addressed privacy, wind/sun
- Code concerns: Applicant understands setbacks now. Setbacks are not always followed. Neighbor to her East has wall 30” from PL. Appreciate concessions but how do I know the houses will be 36”?
- Loosing sun, and wind. Can you move the entry bulk to other side of Lot 48.
- This is a family neighborhood, at least appreciate the concessions made.
- Miller – Garage set back will to to 1’-8”, won’t fit a trash can. Notice was received on July 10. Revised notice sent with wrong PM. Took a week to figure out who to talk to. Will sloped roof overhang into setback. They will overhang 6”. .11 acres is less than 5,000sf. Using .11 acre the FAR is too large. There are 4 or 5 25’ “split” lots on the block. Object to “split”. Bulk and Scale is too large where 1,700sf existed. This neighborhood will become Mission Beach. This is not the “Jewel”. Setback at Carport is 20” ? Are rules being followed? Concerned garage will be enclosed
- Heine – appreciate changes although still shadow to East. New home to old home does not “transition”. This speaks to Bulk and Scale. Appreciate mature landscape in surrounding homes. Proposed looks like Sore thumbs. No room for landscaping. We know the owners of neighboring “twin” buildings. Her mom never opened the curtains again. You hear everything from one house to another. Homes throughout neighborhood are too close.
- Forest – Live on 319 Gravilla. Added second floor addition which fits the neighborhood and protects hers and neighbors privacy
- Wampler – When did we go to 3’ setback. (Applicant: Code came out in 2000, not sure if it was there under R2) Will owner live on site (applicant: yes) Neighbor will be vested in neighborhood. In 90% of cases, next owner then fills it (garage) in. Character of neighborhood, there is a domino affect.
- Ruef, Shannon – Grew up in neighborhood, playing in yards, greenery, didn’t feel like city. These boxes rely of small houses to create character and daylight. Telling that project pushes all limits. Recognize law is followed to letter but not spirit. Project does not fit to the LJ that we know. People care about this.
- Miller, Janie – How big is this lot (applicant: 5,000sf. 25’x100’ (x2)) Neighbors in “twin” boxes are not happy. Stops being a neighborhood. Even in single family homes you hear the neighbors. These projects changes the character. Want to live in a neighborhood where neighbors get along
- Blackmond – Worked to save Ruby-Snell Cottage. Had to question everything and they found errors. On that project they made concessions that worked.
- Neil – What is process for a process 2 project

5/19/2020 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Costello – Happy to see when applicants acquiesce to be cooperative to neighbors, especially when owner will be a resident. Contact us when you want to know. I feel for all neighbors. The street is delightful. Good architect look at possibilities and constraints
- Fremdling – Expertise in historic preservation. Upset to see house demolished. Where is tipping point between modern and traditional? In some cases new projects were done to resemble former

residence. Doesn't startle. These are not LJ colors. Large homes are mostly still single family and traditional styles. Code is a problem ... Independent LJ might be the answer. We can have control of our own destiny. Burglary theft is going to require owners to illegal enclose garages. Setbacks are not adequate. What about ADA access. Can't go for it, even though appreciate changes

- Gaenzle – Bulk and Scale: Carports are a cheat. Size would otherwise be reduced if not for this cheat. The LJ Community Plan says ... transition old to new, visual relief, articulation. Home to East by Master Architect Edgar Ulrich, it's small but lives large. This project should be 3-4 blocks East. Second floors should step back, this is not done. Everything meets code but you could build something else. You don't have to build this.
- Jackson – Torn: Parents built a house in the hills when young. Views would always be there? Now there are 12 houses on stilts in front and no views. Walking the neighborhood is beautiful, but the area is zoned Multi-family. When someone wants it to be something it is not in terms of rules that govern.
- Kane – Also torn. When looked at street, yes there are 25' lots, now land value makes it attractive to go back to 25'. Council policy 600-24 says we make recommendations with respect to community plan. Character, Bulk and Scale. City routinely ignored us. LJCPA has not one a single appeal in last 2 years. City does not look at community plan. Lots should have been tied when single house was built.
- Leira – Applicant has tried to address issues within framework he already established. I think there is a problem with the framework. Something could be better. Could better keep with scale and character of neighborhood.
 - Splitting parcel into 25' lots takes away flexibility.
 - Issue with carport/garage.
 - Scale is off
 - Terraces side by side is off, better if staggered.
 - Where is the vegetation? Vegetation can mask a lot of bad stuff.
 - Many owners live elsewhere
- Will – I'm impressed by how much smaller the proposed project is than the allowable envelope. One of the most important things we can achieve with this committee is to suggest/request improvements to projects that improve the community, and this applicant has made considerable concessions. There are aspects of the code we may not like and it is our job to try to change the code to better protect the community, but not to arbitrarily hold a specific project accountable to the way we wish the code was written. We are responsible to judge this project against the Land Development Code and the LJ Community Plan. This project meets all code requirements and the community plan specifically calls for Townhouses in this part of our community.

5/19/2020 – COMMITTEE MOTION

- Findings **CANNOT** be made due to failure to meet community plan, no transition new and old, no visual articulation and offsetting plans, and the open garage still adds to bulk and scale, and does not adhere to rhythm of 50' street frontages which are character of neighborhood, lack of vegetation. (Gaenzle/Costello)
- In Favor: Costello, Fremdling, Gaenzle, Jackson, Kane, Leira

- Opposed:
- Abstain: Will (as chair)
- Motion **PASSES** 6-0-1

ITEM 2: FINAL REVIEW 5/19/2020

Project Name: Bellava – 7306 Draper Ave
Permits: CDP/SDP/TM
Project No.: 655382 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
Zone: RM-1-1 Applicant: Shani Sparks
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/655382>

LA JOLLA (Process 3) Tentative Map, Site Development Permit, and Coastal Development Permit for demolition of an existing single-family residence, subdivision of existing lot into two single lots, and construction of a new 3,615-sq-ft. residence on the south lot and a new 3,470-sq-ft residence on the north lot located at 7306 Draper Avenue. The 0.14-acre site is in RM-1-1 and Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.

5/12/2020 - APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- First cycle issues just come back, small lot sub-division, have to meet normal perimeter setbacks to neighbors, but an inventive setback formula for internal setbacks. As such, exceeding required setbacks at the perimeter.
- Garage encroaches into setback (allowed)
- FAR conforms, roof decks positioned with privacy in mind.
- Stone and stucco, wood ceilings at overhangs
- City requested street widening, that was a city error, there will be a 5' dedication on Sea Lane.
- Only the elevator goes to third story roof, located centrally, and arrive slightly depressed at roof level.
- A lot of articulation
- One of the two homes will be the clients and then sell the Draper home.

5/12/2020 - PUBLIC COMMENT

- Lieberman – want to complement the design. Neighborhood is a hodgepodge, mine is similar, neighbors are cottages.

5/12/2020 - COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Fremdling: Nice looking, a lot of glass and flat, prefer to see traditional styles
- Costello: How it fits to neighborhood
- Kane: How does this density compare to rest of neighborhood
- Leira: Would like to review the building plans, corner helps, those are not La Jolla colors, prefer warm colors, prefer to see pitched roofs, even if combined with flat roof. Larger trees not just low landscape
- Gaenzle: More refreshing than last one. Huge glass windows, people move in and add drapes because they lack privacy.

- Jackson: my neighborhood: many old beach cottages, most crappy, some maintained, then some non-discript larger homes, then the variety of interesting modern types. Hodge Podge. Agree with warming up of colors. Other end of Cuvier and Sea Lane will go up two stories FYI.
- Will: Ask committee members to review materials before next presentation.

5/12/2020 - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

- More street scape context, photo montage with proposed project rendered next to adjacent homes. One along Sea Lane, one along Draper. (perhaps include the first building across the street and the two buildings adjacent on the same block)
- Post cycle letters
- Aerial, how many of surrounding properties are duplexes/small lots vs single family homes
- Highlight where roof deck is relative to neighbors.
- Consider taller mature landscape/trees

5/19/2020 - APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- Quick run-through. Small lot subdivision must respect original lot setbacks, proposed project meets or exceeds all setback requirements. Fully enclosed garages included in FAR.
- Full basements on each project. Overparked due to lift served subterranean parking.
- Basement has family room, office, and bedroom
- No removal of off-street parking on Draper.
- Only elevator towers are close to 30' height limit located towards center of building
- Dedicating 5' on sea view – landscaping will get wider. Current fence is in ROW, proposed will be further back.
- Delivery items:
 - Warmer color scheme, more in line with LJ character
 - Street scapes with rendering. Eclectic styles. Two story is common interspersed with cottages.
 - Neighbor only found out yesterday. Site noticed since February
 - We will maintain existing fence
 - Asked for privacy L/S along PL
 - Angle view at corner creates nice open feel.
- Landscape: There will be trees not shown in Architectural renderings, 9 trees total, 3 large Jacaranda. Privacy along fence with Star Jasmine allows some light through with privacy. This updated landscape plan is the current one and will be part of the project.
- In between buildings will be lower light well. With Jacaranda and planter in foreground. Space between buildings is 4'-4". Light well goes down to basement level, windows on one side, decorate green wall on opposite.
- Explanation of Small Lot subdivision. Space between is part of only one unit.
- FAR is to maximum $6,328 \times .75 = 4,746$

5/19/2020 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- McGoldrick – In Favor
- Koester – Concerned when saw letter and size but very pleased and re-assured when saw plans looking forward to this

5/19/2020 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Leira – very creative solution, you get some additional flexibility.
- Kane – Subtle differences to previous project are important.
- Gaenzle - pleased the size is not overwhelming
- Costello – Plans submitted on website don't zoom very well.
- Fremdling – Handsome, practical concern of walk out light well, watch your drainage.
- Gaenzle – I like it
- Jackson – Appreciate color change, goes well with neighborhood. Jacaranda stink after drop flowers. Gentle “river” is not well contained. I like this.
- Kane – Like this solution for 50' lots. Assume basement is not in FAR. (approx. 1,200 sf in each basement) Good example of where basements can help to add density without blowing out perceived bulk and scale. Congratulations
- Leira – like it. Originally thought to jarring. Corner lots can handle more. Fits better. LJ garden

5/19/2020 – COMMITTEE MOTION

- Findings **CAN** be made for the project (Jackson/Kane)
- In Favor: Costello, Fremdling, Gaenzle, Jackson, Kane, Leira
- Opposed:
- Abstain: Will (as chair)
- Motion **PASSES** 6-0-1

ITEM 3: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 5/19/2020

- Project Name: Eads Companion Unit
- Permits: CDP
- Project No.: 654641 DPM: Xavier del Valle
- Zone: RM-1-1 Applicant: Abbas Keshavarzi
- Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/654641>

LA JOLLA - (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to convert a portion of an existing 2,670 square-foot, two-story dwelling unit into a two-story, 894 square-foot companion unit at a site located at 7388 Eads Avenue. The 0.11-acre site is in the RM-1-1 Zone and Coastal (Non-Appealable Area) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, and Council District 1.

5/19/2020 - APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- No new construction. Only interior remodel. Conversion to ADU, unit is on second floor.
- ADU does not trigger any parking. Already 5 parking spaces. (overparked)
 - Project is in transit zone, so no parking required
- Closing an interior door to close off ADU

5/19/2020 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Neil – Were all neighbors notified? Project submitted 3 months ago. City PM confirmed it was sent. The notice was posted on the site in March.

5/19/2020 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- text

5/19/2020 – COMMITTEE MOTION

- Make this presentation a **FINAL** Presentation (Jackson/Kane)
- In Favor: Costello, Fremdling, Gaenzle, Jackson, Kane, Leira, Will
- Opposed:
- Abstain:
- Motion **PASSES 7-0-0**

- Findings **CAN** be made for this project. (Jackson/Kane)
- In Favor: Costello, Fremdling, Gaenzle, Jackson, Kane, Leira
- Opposed:
- Abstain: Will (as chair)
- Motion **PASSES 6-0-1**