

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday July 21, 2020 – 4:00 pm

Because of the continuing COVID-19 emergency, this meeting will be held online. You must register in advance to attend. Instructions and links are at <https://lajollacpa.org/ljcpa-online-meeting-instructions/>

Presentation materials will be made available in advance of the meeting through links on <https://lajollacpa.org/2019-agendas/> Applicants (or opposition) please send all materials to the DPR chair (brianljcpa@gmail.com) no later than 3pm on Monday 7/20/2020. This should include the following:

- **Your submitted drawings in a single PDF (required)**
- **Your most recent Assessment Letter and Cycle Issues combined in a single pdf (required)**
- **Your presentation slides (if to be presented) in a single pdf (optional)**

-
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:

- None
-

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

ITEM 1: FINAL REVIEW 7/21/2020

- Project Name: Bellevue CDP – 5610 Bellevue Ave
- Permits: CDP
- Project No.: 660209 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
- Zone: RS-1-7 Applicant: Adrienne Perkins
- Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/660209>

LA JOLLA - (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing detached garage, and to

remodel an existing 1,002 square-foot one story single-family residence. Remodel includes a 773 square-foot first floor addition, 250 square-foot attached garage, 1,189 square-foot second floor addition with three decks, and one third floor deck located at 5610 Bellevue Avenue. The 0.14-acre site is in the RS-1-7 and Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. CD1

- **6/9/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

- Originally permitted as a 50% exempt remodel. One of the walls was temporarily laid down to shore up the foundation.
- Subsequently added one window otherwise the project is unchanged.
- Property at corner of Forward and Bellevue.
- Shared images of existing house and neighboring development.
- Artist rendering of proposed two story house with roof decks, “Craftsman meets Modern style.
- Second floor steps back on all street and alley sides. Only the West property line is shared with a neighbor.
- One enclosed garage and one carport off alley
- Materials pallet. Stucco, wood, stone, standing seam roof
- Clarification of parking.

- **6/9/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Merten: Site plan? (yes shared) Elevations did not relay articulation on Bellevue but floor plan does.
- Feeney: Neighbor across Bellevue. Believes there were more changes in a previous design iteration. (applicant: That was all resolved prior to the wall issue and CDP. At this point because the 50% rule no longer exists a window was added at the kitchen sink and is the only change) The site is a mess. All walls were laid down at one time or another. Side setback to West is 4'-2". Those are existing walls to remain. Surveyor has confirmed that the setbacks are correct. Concerned that carports get enclosed and 3rd parking space uses yard. There are 2 roof decks.
- *unknown*: What are rights with respect to roof decks? Opposed to roof deck. Confirm Feeney comments. Work has been very slow and not professional. (Applicant: Original permits in May, then permit issue with property size halted project, then CDP issue halted it again.) It's a messy work site.
- Riley: Live 2 houses East. Oppose roof top deck, deck travels up hill, up Forward st.
- Neil: There is a large two story mass adjacent to West property. (Applicant: There is a major step back in the center of the West façade and various step backs.)
- Wilkinson: First floor plan shows a 1-car garage and looks like it could be converted to a bedroom. (applicant has no interest in doing that)

- **6/9/2020 COMMITTEE REVIEW**

- Costello: Would like to see the East elevation. Concerned about carport and pushing FAR envelope.
- Fremdling: Live up the street. It's been unfortunate. It made a travesty of the 50% rule. Concerned about the Feeney's front door is on Forward. Car parked on Bellevue. Should not have to see that. Decks are excessive. What is square footage of deck? Put up large rendering on front of job sites. Thank you for doing that.
- Gaenzle: Site plan is not adequate. Where are the trees? Upper windows in center of West façade look directly into neighbor. Would prefer to see them gone since sliding doors on

opposite side of hall. Too many roof decks ruin neighbors privacy. Concerned about height limit. Front steps are higher. Please clarify which trees will remain or be replaced. Colors look heavy.

- Kane: Who is AMD Architecture (Applicant: I work for them) Will clients live on property? (applicant: yes). Prefer to reduce roof decks and pull back from edge of roof. Carports are excessive, let's see landscaping. Noticing: Was anything required when it was 50%, no. Contemporary Craftsman, front elevation is unfortunate, and diminish size of roof deck might improve that. Removing guest suite could add second garage and improve yards and landscape. Prefer to see roof deck railing buried behind sloping roofs.
- Leira: Drawings are very difficult to read. Full site plan is needed. Concerned about carport. Clarify building heights. Roof decks are becoming fashionable but they need to relate the edges to the perimeter of the building and site lines. Location should be careful to protect privacy of neighbors. Color of glass (applicant: standard clear) Not in favor of smoked tinting. Prefer not to see people on roof decks. Prefer a solid parapet.
- Jackson: Could we see 3D rendering from all 4 corners of entire house.
- **6/9/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**
 - Confirmation from Surveyor that setbacks conform
 - Tally square footage of decks
 - Enlarged site plan on separate sheet with gates and fences.
 - Site sections both ways with survey of existing grade. (to go all the way across Bellevue and Forward.)
 - Street montage of full blocks (West view and North view)
 - Elevations with grade in foreground to lowest point on property.
 - Landscape plan show existing and new trees
 - West Elevation with dashed or shaded location of opposite structure and their windows
 - Elevations are hard to read, perhaps shading to illustrate articulation or additional 3D views.
 - Color code floor plans on site plan (to help illustrate articulation/step backs)
 - FAR and Lot coverage numbers along with permeable/impermeable numbers
 - Outline with colors/shading, working drawings
 - Satellite image with footprint of proposed project to include 300' radius.
 - Key in locations of homes in neighborhood photos.
 - Take a look at stepping back further and improve Craftsman roof lines
- **7/14/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**
 - the set back issue will soon be resolved.
 - When you and your clients see the Companion Unit being built in the view path of the rear roof deck, and consider the neighbor's comments, you just might reconsider that roof deck. It will save money too.
 - Open floor to ceiling glass looks wonderful. But think about living behind it. The attached is the design, and house, of an award winning Architect. It is at 6005 Avenida Cresta, corner of Cam. de la Costa. Facing the street and right side on both levels are floor to ceiling glass. It looks wonderful! However, two weeks after the Architect and his family moved in, the ugly drapes appeared. That was 12 years ago.
- **7/21/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

- Existing non-conforming W setback, We will relocate this wall if required to by committee.
- Further reduced front deck, owner would like to keep rear deck, railings enclosed (solid) up to 32" to maintain viewing from seated position but protect privacy down into adjacent properties.
- Owner would like to keep the glass element at front stair element, auto rolling shades will be installed.
- **7/21/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**
 - none
- **7/21/2020 COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**
 - Will: Asked for explanation of 3'-5" side setback
 - Costello: recommend applicant to push back wall, otherwise appreciate changes made. Please do not transition carport into garage. Code compliance is actually following up on this. See this favorably.
 - Leira: Prefer to use new setbacks, if so, in support of project. Glad to see broken up parapets and extending pitched roofs
 - Jackson: agree to move wall to 4.2' setback
 - Fremdling: Appreciate cooperation and changes blend in with neighborhood better and you've improved the Craftsman character. Ambivalent about wall but prefer to see wall on proper location.
- **7/21/2020 COMMITTEE MOTION**
 - reconsider last week's vote (Costello/Kane)
 - unanimous
 - findings can be made (Jackson/Costello)
 - 5-0-1 (Will, as chair)

ITEM 2: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 7/21/2020

- Project Name: 1821 Torrey Pines Rd
- Permits: CDP/VAC
- Project No.: 648590 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
- Zone: RS-1-5 Applicant: Tony Christensen
- Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/648590>

LA JOLLA - (Process 5) Public Right-of-Way Vacation and Coastal Development Permit to vacate a portion of Torrey Pines Road located at 1802 Amalfi Street, 1834 Amalfi Street, 1821 Torrey Pines Road & 7840 Sierra Mar Drive. The site is in the RS-1-5 Base Zone and Coastal (Appealable) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Planning Area, and Council District 1.

- **7/21/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**
 - Created in 1906 as easement 150' wide
 - CL of improvements are 10-11' north of CL of easement
 - Seek vacation beginning 10' from curb to PL (42' wide vacation)
 - 15' stormdrain and ATT, SDGE, COX reservation of easements to remain.
 - No structures can be constructed in this area
- **7/21/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**
 - none

• **7/21/2020 COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**

- Jackson: What is current status of land and current vs proposed use, any money changing hands
 - Applicant: no construction or change of grade, landscaping would be allowed, This land was a ROW easement, we are undoing this easement. No compensation
- Fremdling: Are any of homes currently in easement? (Applicant: no) Larger properties could be subdivided. 1802 Amalfi is historic. Larger lot allows for larger building FAR(App: no discussion of further development).
- Leira: Protective of public lands. Sidewalks are inadequate. TP is a critical link. We will need this land. We could need this area for transit stops, cycle lanes are inadequate. This is a critical area
- Kane: Agree with Leira, live right up the hill, area could be used to improve turn lane onto Hillside, sidewalks are inadequate. Cannot support. TP is horrendously fast
- Costello: need a lot of convincing, short on visuals
- Kane: Is Amalfi a public or private street (App: Amalfi is NOT dedicated, it is not a public street)
- Kane: Need to pull out and see how all of this connects to surrounding transportation patterns.
- Jackson: Does this have traffic implications, should it see TNT. Diane will ask Dave Abrams.

• **7/21/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**

- Would like to see cross section of lots to street from property across TP, curbs, structures through to houses on subject properties.
 - Please show where cross walk and hawk light
 - See plan from Prospect place to Hillside with all lanes, sidewalks
 - Show parcel maps and provide explanation of Amalfi as ownership from subject properties to Hillside.
- Applicant will return first meeting in August.

ITEM 3: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 7/21/2020

Project Name: Remley Pl
Permits: CDP
Project No.: 649756 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
Zone: RS-1-4 Applicant: Trip Bennett
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/649756>

LA JOLLA (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit for the demolition of an existing 1,608 square-foot single-family residence and to construct a new 4,685 square-foot single family residence located at 7342 Remley Place. The 0.20-acre site is in the RS-1-4 and the Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area, and Council District 1.

• **7/21/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

- This will be the Pintar family home. Pintars reached out to all homeowners on Remley place. Had an open house in September and coordinated with those who could not attend. Posted in November. Made some changes to lower building in January at neighborhood request. 4 letters in support. Believe there is one neighbor here to object.
- Reviewed satellite view of all 11 homes on Remley.
- Remley is very narrow with no street parking.
- 40' of slope diagonal across site
- First floor is proposed 3' below Remley (at center of lot) 7' below towards uphill side of Remley
- 2 story over basement

- Pulled back from 11' setback to 16', only 6' required
- Side setbacks exceed minimum
- Pool and garage proposed off Romero to ease parking congestion on Remley
- Added 240sf of area compared to application, same size basement but moved west and counted in FAR
- Two story component pushed to East to stay well under height limit and transition well with 2-story to West and single story to East
- No variance, meet all requirements, only cycle issues related to city house keeping of sewer easement
- **7/21/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**
 - Manoogian: One house up-hill. None of neighbors are comfortable with scope or scale of project. As of architects last email there was no lower garage or pool. Proposed will not fit in. Triple the size of existing. Romero is too fast for a new garage. Made numerous suggestions to remove upper (Grand Bedroom) level.
 - Freeman: Owner of Lillian Rice. They did reach out and reviewed plans and views. This is just "too much in your face". Spoke with another neighbor (Jonathan Smock) too large in scale.
 - Fitzgerald: Would like to hear from Romero homes.
 - Pintar: (Owner) lived here 25 years and this will be our family home. Surprised to hear one owner claim others are opposed. Met with all neighbors a couple weeks ago.
- **7/21/2020 COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**
 - Kane: Masterful job with difficult lot. A lot of grading. How about staging and import/export of dirt. (applicant: staging will be difficult)
 - Leira: Deliverables
 - Jackson: Would like to see comparison to neighborhood
 - Kane: Would like to see impact from Romero
 - Fremdling: 4600sf is the norm, it is not unusual. Houses loom large on Remley. Handsome building. No roof deck ... thank you. Wonderful use of existing property.
 - Will: Consider stone at garage to make part of earth.
- **7/21/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**
 - Construction staging plan. This will take some thought.
 - Elevation along Remley showing buildings on either side with proposed in-situ
 - Expand sections to include streets curbs and some sense of building size across each street from subject
 - Site section A: Height of building to grade every 6' (BW Revit comment)
 - Landscape and vegetation plan
 - Geotechnical report
 - Addresses, lot area, FAR, and GFA of houses on Remley.
 - Please resolve what remaining 5 neighbors think
 - Photos from Romero and feedback from neighbors.

ITEM 4: ACTION ITEM 7/21/2020

Review and Recommendation to CPA regarding response to **Complete Communities Proposal**

City staff formally stated that the FAR in the Coastal Zone was now 3.0. Our Community Plan & PDO requirements don't allow anything over 1.8 FAR to comply with the 30 ft. Coastal height limit.

Discussion:

Can these two parameters be reconciled without a ballot initiative? If so, how & where?

Would a 3.0 FAR work anywhere in La Jolla? Where?

Are focused locations for 3.0 FAR identified with Specific Plans & adopted with a ballot initiative acceptable? Or is the entire topic off the table?

Even a 2.0 FAR is over the 30 Ft. height limit. Hence, our Community Plan only allows up to 1.8 FAR.

But, something close to 2.0 FAR can be achieved by including basements, carports, covered balconies and other excrescences

into FAR that are not now counted. We've already asked that at least 50% of basements apply toward FAR in this code update.

Should we go for the whole enchilada in the Coastal Zone? Or, in targeted areas? Or, are basements altogether unwise, considering local geology?

Is even 2.0 FAR a bad idea? Should we just hunker down on the 30 ft. Coastal height limit? Are there other strategies/positions/options we haven't considered?

Use the MF buildings you're already designed for other communities, provide information on # of inclusionary units, height, lot size, number & size of units, construction cost/sq. ft. vs. land cost.

Can you also place presentation images or massing studies of some of these buildings into various La Jolla contexts so people can see what they would look like? Try spots in LJ Shores, the Village & Bird Rock for comparison.

What would it take to realistically provide inclusionary units in new buildings in La Jolla? Where is the tipping point between economic feasibility & failure?

7/21/2020 DISCUSSION

- Kane: Look at opportunities to add FAR in LJ where we want it, not where someone else just puts it. All multifamily areas have hit the height limit already, where could it be used to our advantage.
- Fotsch presentation of two W&F projects outside of LJ that are built with FARs over 2.0.
- Will: Like to see walkable communities. Traffic may not necessarily increase.
- Leira: Keep a mix, not single use buildings. Encourage commercial and residential. Can we get rid of parking? We need retail/commercial. Activity that creates jobs. Need a good critical mix.
- Fremdling: 26 units on Pearl was ahead of the curb.
- Leira: Willing to see FAR bonuses WHEN incentives for low income or ...
- Will: Where are tall buildings that exceed 30' (map buildings)