

**LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**

Meeting Minutes – August 18, 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:**

- 3 vacancies on committee. Send any nominees to Diane.

---

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

---

**ITEM 1: FINAL REVIEW 8/18/2020**

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

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.

**8/18/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

- Aerial Site plan and section exhibit.
- Location of crosswalk and Hawk light
- 1924 parcel exhibit "state street" now Amalfi.
- City owned parcel and how obtained from county in 1947.
- Maintained as private road.
- "not dedicated, not exclusive easement" not formally a street.

**8/18/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**

- none

**8/18/2020 COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**

- Leira – There is additional area of wider ROW besides these 4 parcels. LJ needs this road, may need additional width. Suggest an EMRA for development but not a vacation.
  - Christensen – To west, there is no possibility to be widened. To East there is a pie shape of ROW, but city has just completed new soil nail wall at current roadway edge. Unreasonable to expect additional widening.
- Costello – Something may need to be done here that we don't know yet ... Turn-out, Transit stop, other opportunities. Not a good idea.

#### **8/18/2020 COMMITTEE MOTION**

Findings **CANNOT** be made for the vacation. (Costello/Leira)

- Leira envision additional lane for transit.
- In Favor: Blackmond, Costello, Kane, Leira
- Opposed: Jackson
- Abstain: Will (as chair)
- Motion Passes 4-1-1

---

#### **ITEM 2: FINAL REVIEW 8/18/2020**

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

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.

#### **8/18/2020 Applicant updates to project description above:**

- Existing residence to be demolished is 3,196 sf GFA
- Proposed residence is 4,923 sf GFA (.54 FAR, .56 Allowed)
- Lot area is .21 Acres (8,988 sf)

#### **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.
- **8/18/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**
  - Initial comments and context
    - GFA of existing of 3,196 measured to current definitions
    - FAR is a 50% increase from existing.
    - Additional garage on Romero to increase off street parking
    - Owners elected to do a full CDP rather than 50% remodel to make best and most sensitive use of lot
    - Up hill neighbor acknowledged potential for taller home to be built

- Designed to maintain private view from up hill neighbors corner window
- Shared plans with neighbors and revised to suit neighbor concerns
- Work with, not fight topography. Only small master on uphill side of second floor, could have built secondary bedrooms on second floor, but chose to locate them in a new basement to protect private views.
- Deliverables
  - Petition submitted and signed by 12 neighbors includes misrepresentations.
  - Construction plan:
    - Garage area on Romero will be excavated first and provide parking and staging off of Romero. There is legal on-street parking on Romero adjacent to site and additional on street parking nearby.
  - Rendering looking up Remley at project, building stairsteps up hill like other homes
  - Section on both sides of Remley with proposed home demonstrate consistent massing
  - Sections across site from Remley through Romero
  - Section through building at 6' intervals to demonstrate compliance with height below limit at each location
  - Landscape plan provided
  - Geo-report that project will improve stability on hillside.
    - Leira – What kind of soil do you have at basement (Randall (applicant team): Friar's formation, relatively impervious, There is waterproof retaining walls and drains to collect any subsurface water)
    - Leira – Where does the water go? (Randall/Valdez: discharged to street below from French drains)
    - Lazarides – Next door property had a major subsidence during previous construction. Is this addressed in construction plan? (Peterson: cannot comment on other sites)
  - FAR range .16 to .59 on street. Proposed is .54
  - Satellite image shows other large homes in area. Neighborhood views from open space to North side of Remley homes. Views from Romero.
  - Neighbor's arguments changed from views to Bulk and Scale
  - Homes along Remley
  - Incorporated stone garage to blend into hillside
  - House stairsteps up the hill
  - Good visibility to garage entrance off Romero. Site visibility distances is better than most homes on Romero: 250' vs 400' where others had site lines of less than 150'
  - Project complies with all zoning requirements, no variances or deviations
  - Project adds more parking to reduce impacts on Remley.
  - Proposed is more sensitive than possible than a 50% remodel would allow.
- Costello – regarding neighboring site stability, could the engineers comment?
  - Randall – There will be some shoring during construction, extremely stable on either side but still some shoring required, street will be shored when basement bedrooms go in.
- Kane – Appreciate display of neighboring properties FAR. Where did proposed fit in spectrum?
  - Peterson – Proposed .54. Others .51, .59, (.16 and .24 on large lots) "Kind of slightly higher than the mid-point. Not the largest.

- Kane – How many driveways on Romero? *Peterson: None on this side of Romero until past the extents of Remley. Is the second access precedent setting? Peterson: It's a great design solution to the sloping lot. Is this a community character concern?*
- Leira – How many in immediate neighborhood have basements? *Peterson: unknown exact, but some on same side of Remley.*

**8/18/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Little - Is there import/export of dirt? (Net export approx. 640 yds), Do exhibits show existing or finished grade (Finished), What is grade differential on site? Height limit exhibit reference to SDMC Technical Bulletin
- Manoogian - Applicants presentation was filled with inaccuracies. There was no petition. Only 2 parties agree with proposal, all others oppose. Most of bigger homes are on the bigger lots. Neighborhood feels this is far too big for the lot. Will the rear drive set a precedent? Yes, it is a bad precedent. It is a safety hazard. House will be an eyesore. Project has changed since they presented, Romero driveway was added. Garage on Romero is an eyesore. If owners want to be "good neighbors" ... we have spoken.
- Neil – Location of massing seems wrong. Should not use technical bulletin for height.
- Sette – Long time resident and realtor, restored many homes in LJ. Nothing out of character with proposed home. My home maxed out FAR as well. She seems every home on caravan and the current structure is a "tear down" and this is a reasonable design and appreciate the accommodations made. Neighborhood is lucky to have them. Urge them to move forward.
- Smith – Concerns around safety, stability, and size. Live on Romero, concerned about driveway on Romero and safety of someone backing out. Can that be eliminated?
- Botini – Support proposed project. Traffic on Romero is light and support that driveway. Initial objections circle around impaired views. They are not protected but applicants still did their best to accommodate neighbor. Project will substantially improve the neighborhood.
- Casey – Think it will be a wonderful addition. Consistent, Beautiful
- McNeil – Negatively impacts some neighbor's views. We cherish our views. Clearly neighbor's views are impacted.
- Barnhorst – Concerned that the committee will consider letter. Only 4 people signed the letter. Misleading statements regarding size, this will not be only home with dual street access, There are 10 houses on Remley, 3 over 5000sf, 3 approx or over 4000sf. 12 of 18 houses in area are over 4000sf. Don't understand what all the fuss is about. 6 of 12 signatures have houses larger than proposed. We should be thrilled to have this addition and apologize for the unwelcome reception
- Lazarides – Had not heard about project. Stability concern, same type of soil on another failed. Live right on the Romero/Brodeia bend. Concerned about garage. Concerned about construction traffic and lack of parking.
- Baron – Appreciate Romero neighbors being contacted. Were not made aware until recently. Concerned about safety on Romero. We are bringing this up to avoid a problem. Does the project exceed height limit? Does it set precedent.
- Freeman – Did not sign group letter, wrote my own letter. Our view is impacted. We don't block anyone else's view. This is a bad precedent. We've never had this kind of community disruption.
- Tilghman – Have additional driveway, our situation is old.
- Noonan – Represented the Pintars in this purchase. Have assisted on the purchase or sale of many many homes in immediate area. The clients were exceptionally thorough in their due diligence prior to purchase and they worked tirelessly to design a consistent and sensitive structure. Disclosed to uphill buyers that the Pintars intended to remodel or demolish and reconstruct. Views may be altered or blocked. Manoogian should have been diligent prior to purchase.

- McCrory – Known Mrs Pintar for 25 years, great addition to neighborhood, I live at bottom of Remley. The existing house is a blight, Pintars listened to neighbors and we need this redevelopment. Bulk and Scale is a non-starter. They have a right to build this house.
- Sebrechts – Remley homes should not have Romero access

#### **8/18/2020 COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**

- Costello: house comes in at the 70<sup>th</sup> % in terms of FAR, This project I fear could go to court, I see nothing about this project that this project that should stop this project.
- Angeles: Show exhibits at 6' intervals, believe they are compliant with height limit. Garage on Romero seems detached from house. Could your client live without garage? The garage access seems to break from continuity of hillside. Which parking will be used for owners vs Guests
- Applicant: Bennett: There is no street parking on Remley. Parking for guests is inadequate. People will back out from garage. Stone cladding to diminish visual impact. 3 adult children who will be back from college and to keep cars off of Remley. Currently some residents are using the Pintars driveway.
- Applicant Team: Presented the 6' interval section cuts and demonstrated overall structure height and Prop D compliance.
- Jackson: Please confirm that there are two height criteria that at all points 30' plumb bob height limit and also horizontal red dashed line 40' above lowest point within 5' of building perimeter. Garage and house are adequately separated.
- Kane – Have heard concerns about this garage. I like this solution. There is never enough parking in this vicinity. Cars have to go somewhere.

#### **8/18/2020 COMMITTEE MOTION**

Findings **CAN** be made (Jackson/Kane)

- In Favor: Blackmond, Costello, Jackson, Kane, Leira
- Opposed:
- Abstain: Will (as chair)
- Motion Passes 5-0-1

---

### **ITEM 3: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 8/18/2020**

Project Name: 6375 Avenida Cresta and 6360 Via Maria  
Permits: CDP  
Project No.: 667263 DPM: Ian Heacox  
Zone: RS-1-7 Applicant: Haley Duke/Tony Crisafi  
Project Info: <https://opensds.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/667263>

LA JOLLA- (Process 2) Coastal Development to demolish 2 existing residences on parcels 351-581-07-00 and 351-581-01-00. Proposing to construct a new 9,181 square-foot residence. Work to include site walls, new driveways and existing two lots to be tied together, located at 6375 Avenida Cresta and 6360 Via Maria. The 0.46-acre site is in the RS-1-7 zone within the Coastal Overlay (non-appealable) zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.



#### **8/18/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

- Site overview Winamar/Cresta/Maria corner
- Private home on West side of combined lot and ADU on East side and increased gardens
- Structure on Via Maria needed work.
- Site plan show existing and proposed and location of 2 story structure
- All setbacks exceeded, greatly increased setbacks from each corner by 20-40' respectively
- Small second floors cover less than 9% of site area.
- 7,500sf habitable, GFA is 8,900 was reduced since project submittal. 2,200sf less than allowed on both independent properties.
- West Corner rendering with archade facing coast. East corner rendering reduces linear feet of building façade and greatly increased setbacks
- Increased second floor stepback and increased side setbacks after meeting with neighbors
- Garden grade will be lowered from existing to create sunken level even with Ave Cresta
- Photo of similar home and material palette.
- All presentation materials were presented on site
- Addressed dust control and construction staging with neighbors
- Project is in complete conformance.
- *Leira – What is non-habitable space? The mechanical spaces and garages in basement*
- Presented blank Lot Tie form. *What conditions would be applied?*

#### **8/18/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**

- none

#### **8/18/2020 COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**

- Costello: What does muni and community plan say about density.
  - Duke: City cycle confirms it meets density requirements and project proposes a SFR and ADU.
- Kane: Are the lots being joined (This will be a lot tie not a lot merger. It could be redeveloped as two independent lots in the future and revert to underlying map. Complete demo of demo of center “swathe” could recreate two independent lots.) How does lot tie expire? (it would depend on agreement)
- Jackson: nice structure, it's tall.
- *Applicant Crisafi – Two story height is located near neighboring 2-story to improve transition.*
- *Leira – What are base subdivision (applicant: only two lots).*
- Costello: would like some time to do research on ramification on lot tie.
- Owners will likely not pay for an attorney to educate the DPR.
- Jackson: all info on lot ties is able

#### **8/18/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT MEETING**

- ~~Please confirm mechanism to tie and un-tie lot.~~ *presented*
- Applicant does not understand request. Neither does chair.

#### **8/18/2020 COMMITTEE MOTION**

Make FINAL (Will/Jackson)

- Any opposed? Costello (motion fails)

---

#### **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)

#### 8/18/2020 – DISCUSSION

Will: Presentation of Height Survey in La Jolla Village

Leira: Can squeeze 3.0 within 30' box with no articulation or setbacks.

Kane: Recent article on conversion of shopping centers to mixed use. Can we introduce flexibility in PDO or accept what is forced on us. Can we introduce height in village where no views impacted.

Leira: Could we look at retail as office space, live/work, people working from home.

UTC stole retail 30 years ago, now its stolen restaurants

Leira: What do we do with streets and public spaces? Critical to viability.

Kane: Trace Wilson on committee, urbanist, urban planner, looking at all these public spaces. Also what to do about LJ Blvd to Torrey Pines as a Boulevard, Attractive.