

Marnie Wright Barnhorst

7362 Remley Place
La Jolla, California 92037

marnie@barnhorst.com

858-456-4882

September 1, 2020

La Jolla Community Planning Association
% Greg Jackson
gjackson@outlook.com

Dear LJPC,

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the LJPC meeting on Thursday due to a previously scheduled Board of Directors meeting for another organization. I spoke at the LJDPRC on August 18, 2020 and would like to summarize my points made at that meeting and mention a few other points to be entered into the record at the LJPC meeting on September 1, 2020.

The points I made at the LJDPRC meeting were basically in response to a letter drafted by a new neighbor Scott Manoogian who is concerned about encroachment on his view by the Pintars' proposed house in spite of (1) not having a right to a view and (2) having signed an acknowledgment when he purchased his property that the Pintars owned the property next door and were planning on remodeling which might encroach on his view.

Knowing that the right to a view is an unjustifiable claim of right, the letter submitted to the LJDPRC instead framed the issues as concerns about (1) the **Size** of the proposed house, (2) the **Traffic Safety and Design**, (3) the **Construction Disruption** and (4) the **Rear Hill Stability**. My points at the LJDPRC and new points are summarized as follows:

(1) Size

- a.) Mr. Manoogian states in his letter that the Pintars' proposed house will **triple** the size of the house that exists on the property. However, the letter misstates the size of the proposed house as 4600 sq. ft. I understand from several documents that the proposed house is actually 4085 sq. ft. The letter also states that the size of the lot is .2 acre. I am not sure where that figure comes from, but Zillow lists the lot as .25 acre. I am not sure which figure is correct. The bottom line is that the proposed house has a FAR of .54 which is a **50% increase** over the .36 FAR of the house that is there now, not a **triple** increase. The municipal code allows up to .56 FAR on a lot the size of the Pintars'. They are within the allowable limit.
- b.) The Manoogian letter states that the proposed house will "**eclipse** the neighboring homes in relation to square footage...". There are 10 houses on Remley Place, three have a square footage of 5,000 sq. ft. or more with the largest being 6,285 sq. ft. Three have approximately 4,000 sq. ft. which is close to what the Pintars' propose at 4,085. There are also three houses that have less than 3,000 sq. ft. The Pintars' proposed house is right in the **middle** of the size range of the nine other houses on Remley Place.
- c.) The situation is similar regarding the 8 houses on Romero Drive between Brodiaea Way and Country Club Drive (the portion of Romero Drive that runs parallel to Remley Place). Three houses are larger than 5,000 sq. ft, the largest being 6,361 sq. ft., two are larger than 4,000 square feet and three are smaller than 3,000 sq. ft. The Pintars' proposed house is right in the **middle** of the size range of the eight houses on Romero Drive.

- d.) It is interesting to note that half of the neighbors (6 of the 12) who signed Mr. Manoogian's letter complaining that the size of the Pintars' proposed house is too large for the neighborhood own neighborhood homes that are larger in square footage than the Pintars' proposed home.
- e.) It is also interesting to note that only 4 of the 10 homeowners on Remley Place signed the letter. It is by no means a unanimous opinion that the proposed home is too large for our neighborhood.

(2) Traffic Safety and Design

- (a) Mr. Manoogian states in this section of his letter that the Pintars' "rear garage and driveway [on Romero Drive] would create a tremendous safety hazard....It is an accident waiting to happen." If that is so, the accident has been waiting to happen for 60-70 years because there have been 8 driveways opening onto this stretch of Romero Drive between Brodiaea Way and Country Club Drive since the houses were built in the 1950's and 1960's. The Pintars' would be the 9th driveway opening onto Romero Drive. And their driveway will be on the safer straightaway portion of Romero Drive, not up on the area of the street that "veers around the corner" as described in the letter. There are five driveways on that curved portion of Romero Drive and in the 18 plus years that I have lived in the neighborhood I have not been aware of a single accident caused by any of the driveways that open out onto Romero Drive, up around the curve or on the straightaway.
- (b) The letter states that the Pintars' home would "be the only home in the neighborhood with dual street access from both the **front** and **rear** of the property." I do not understand why this is a negative, but nonetheless, the statement is misleading. Yes, I do not know of another property that has both a **front** and a **rear** access, but there are four properties in the neighborhood that have "dual access" which the letter states is "unprecedented". I have a **front** and two **side** accesses and my neighbor across the street has dual **front** accesses. Two houses on Romero Drive between Brodiaea Way and Country Club Drive have **front** and **side** access. Not sure what the issue is here. But the statement that dual access is unprecedented in this neighborhood is just not true.

(3) Construction Disruption

- (a) Yes, there will be construction disruptions. Everyone hates it! But until all the 1950's houses in our neighborhood have been remodeled or replaced, we are going to have to put up with it and count the dollars that it increases our property values. These 1950's houses have become eyesores and their landscape has been neglected for decades. The Pintars have made arrangements to reduce the impact of construction by designing an off-street parking location on their property for deliveries and construction worker parking. But there will still be noise and traffic problems. There always are with new construction. Judging from the openness and accommodations the Pintars have made in planning the construction of their house, I am pretty sure that they will be attentive to valid complaints of the neighbors regarding its construction.

(4) Rear Hill Stability

- (a) This is a moot point as preconstruction studies will be conducted as required by law.

In summary, I encourage you to approve the Pintars' proposed plans to remove a 70 year old house and its neglected landscape and replace it with a moderately sized house with beautiful landscape as a home for themselves and their three children. It will be a benefit to our community and an improvement to the aesthetics of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Marnie Wright Barnhorst

cc: MaryAnne Pintar <maryanne.pintar@gmail.com>
Ted Pintar <tedp@rgrdlaw.com>