

**LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION  
2<sup>ND</sup> AND 3<sup>RD</sup> TUESDAYS; 4:00PM

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/2022-agendas/> Applicants (or opposition) please send all materials to the DPR chair (brianljcpa@gmail.com) no later than **24 hours before the meeting** . 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 24 hours before the meeting on the LJCPA website or 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. It is not necessary to repeat previous comments.*
- 

**COMMITTEE MEMBER ATTENDANCE:**

**NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:**

none

**POSSIBLE ACTIONS ITEMS:**

**ITEM 1: ~~FINAL REVIEW 9/20/2022~~**

Project Name: ~~La Jolla Christian Fellowship – 627 Genter~~  
Applicant: ~~Kevin Leon/ Mark Lyon~~  
Project #: ~~PRJ 1055455~~

~~Neighborhood Development Permit for 1,926 square feet of new construction to include the addition of 680 square feet to the existing 1<sup>st</sup> floor, the addition of 680 square feet to the existing 2nd floor and the addition of 566 square feet to create a 3rd floor on the existing 2-story Education Building. Located at 627 Genter St. the 0.48-acre site is in the RM-1-1 and Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable Area) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.~~

### **8/9/22 Applicant Presentation:**

- ~~Project Introduction~~
- ~~Church owns residential property immediately adjacent and South of the construction area.~~
- ~~Goals of addition~~
  - ~~Safely get children from drop-off to facilities~~
  - ~~Space for family and individual counseling~~
  - ~~Day care during church facilities~~
  - ~~Tuesday and Wednesday bible study classes~~
- ~~Addition on West side of existing 2-story building~~
- ~~RM 1-1 zone primarily residential, church is allowed and designation is an allowed-commercial use.~~
- ~~15,098sf proposed where 15,741sf allowed (.75 FAR)~~
- ~~Rendering of addition adjacent to existing, modern structure, darker color than existing-white~~
- ~~Existing is potentially historic so will remodel according to SI standards but not pursuing-historic designation.~~

### **8/9/22 Discussion:**

- ~~Miller: Questions about project:~~
  - ~~Applicant: Do not have heights of existing structures~~
  - ~~Applicant: Primary entrance to building will come from alley and from Draper and-main entry of building is in NW corner of building. Existing stairs will be replaced~~
  - ~~Applicant: Addition where existing patio/play area~~
- ~~Fitzmaurice: Lovely job, fits neighborhood, member of church, place of worship but also a-place of community and assistance for families. Support approval~~
- ~~Kulidjian: Live immediately behind main church. In favor of project and does not look-taller than main sanctuary, don't see any down-sides. Church provides strong positive-influence for the community~~
- ~~Villano: Live across street on Draper and slightly elevated. Concern with privacy into-home. Concerned with additional impact (general expansion) of facilities in modest-neighborhood.~~
- ~~Russell: Question with drop-off (applicant: prefer to have children drop-off from Genter-gate and this creates access to the building closest to that central corridor.) 3<sup>rd</sup> floor-outdoor? (applicant: outdoor area will be used for quiet discussion, not a playground)~~
- ~~Kane: Parking? (street and off-site with shuttle) Congregation (350 ppl)~~
- ~~Platnik: Own properties near church. How will renovation affect my properties? (applicant:-adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> story structure adjacent to taller church and existing 2 story structure.~~
- ~~Koester: Parking is a feeding frenzy on Sunday. My car has been hit twice. Don't like the-white tents on site currently.~~
- ~~Gallegos: Goal of project to bring the noise from outside the structure back inside and-reduce neighborhood disruption. No intended to expand congregation but to keep groups-inside instead of relying on outdoor space. Children are never unsupervised.~~
- ~~Wiggins: Question of cycle issue (applicant: Historic reviewer asking for 17', proposed-plans comply with code, still in negotiation) HS does not have parking agreement.~~
- ~~Jackson: Agreement with HS? (applicant: nothing formal and using golf cart to shuttle)~~
- ~~Williams: Questions of days and use.~~

- ~~Leira: In the past this would have been a CUP. Sometimes CUPs would require use schedules and number of users. This structure is potentially historic and should meet SI standards. New elevation does not seem to complement existing structure~~
- ~~Jackson:~~
  - ~~How does the addition fit within total "campus" complex?~~
  - ~~Sunday is also impacted by walk up Genter to Sunday market, parking deserves more attention.~~
  - ~~Chapter and verse on RM-1-1 zone and commercial use.~~
  - ~~Nervous about height and 3 story~~
  - ~~Can the tent city and white plastic fence go away or be approved~~
- ~~Pastor Adam: yes, tent city will go away, COVID thing. Tom Grunow working with facilities to improve trees, greenery, bring kids inside, get kids to play somewhere other than parking lot. Bought a bus to be able to take kids to rec center. Installed \$40k AC so doors can be closed during events. All access will come from main entrance on Genter, natural hedge to replace white fence)~~
- ~~Shannon: Rendering is helpful. Pleased to see community involvement~~
- ~~Kane: Can't find uses as described. Will you be undergrounding? Landscaping?~~
- ~~Grunow: Engaged with Todd Frye and Jennifer for landscape masterplan and undo plastic fencing. Addition is wedged into an unused space which minimizes community impact.~~
- ~~Pastor Adam: HS parking is a public space and church goers are allowed to park there. Counted 82 available spaces. Highest use is 42 people have used that parking, lowest is 12. If anyone would like to come over and see space. Come over, see what's happening~~

#### **8/9/22 Deliver for next meeting:**

- ~~Site aerial photo with proposed addition as colored rectangle and second color to outline rooftop fenced area all the way to Fay (maybe two images)~~
- ~~Schedule of users (time and occupancy) on the property~~
- ~~Pedestrian access study (site plan with colored arrows showing circulation)~~
- ~~Elevation to show changes to existing structure and new part.~~
- ~~Chapter and verse on RM-1-1 zone and commercial use. (please scan/screen shot from code)~~
- ~~Detailed height lines (coastal AND plumbline)~~
- ~~Document other 3 story buildings within 3 blocks or so.~~
- ~~Proposed future landscaping and fencing.~~

#### **9/13/22 Summary of Discussion Items—Requests for Additional Info:**

~~(see meeting recording at [lajollacpa.org](http://lajollacpa.org) for further detail)~~

- ~~Detail (including clearly comprehensible plans) for where the required parking spaces are, and if they're not on the subject parcel, then written confirmation from the applicant that the required spaces will be deed restricted (or some such) to the expanded use.~~
- ~~A member of the public pointed out that if the project is going to serve more than 300 people, it may require an SUP in addition to the NDP, and that the SUP may entail additional requirements the project needs to satisfy. Please respond to this, citing specific provisions as necessary.~~
- ~~Several participants pointed out that the expanded activity at the project site will exacerbate what are already difficult traffic and noise conditions, and as such may affect the health of~~

~~the neighborhood sufficiently that the necessary NDP findings cannot be made.~~

## **ITEM 2: FINAL REVIEW 9/20/2022**

Project Name: Nilforoushan Residences: 7788 & 7798 Prospect Pl  
Applicant: Kevin Leon/Mark Lyon  
Project #: PRJ-1058871

Coastal Development Permit for demolition of existing residence and detached garage for the construction of 1 new 5,418 square foot two-story single family residence at 7798 Prospect Place and 1 new 3,600 square foot three-story single family residence with attached 785 square foot accessory dwelling unit at 7788 Prospect Place. The 0.24-acre site is in the RS-1-7 Zone, and Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay, Coastal Height Limitation Overlay, and Residential Tandem Overlay Zones within the La Jolla Community Plan area, Council District

### **9/13/22 Summary of Discussion Items – Requests for Additional Info:**

(see meeting recording at [lajollacpa.org](http://lajollacpa.org) for further detail)

- Summary of discussions with neighbors, including issues they raise and applicant's response
- Explore ways that the project's height and impact on neighborhood character might be mitigated

### **9/20/22 Applicant Presentation**

- Follow-up previous comments
  - Met with neighbors E and W. View concerns. Gone through design to maintain views as best possible.
  - Sections illustrate how building was set as low as street and driveway would allow.

### **9/20/22 Discussion**

- Miller: How bulk/scale compare? Character compare?
  - App: Both 2-story (1-has small 3<sup>rd</sup> story at rear) 2 and 3 story is typical of this street, as is modern architecture.
- Merten: House on parcel 1, SW exterior wall adjacent side setback line, building violates 24' angled building envelope. 131.0444a
  - App: We will look at it.
  - App: That is a rear yard setback and angled setback does not apply. Why is rear setback 7.5'? 10% of lot depth.
- Costello: Did you meet neighbors? (yes) Do they agree?
  - ( neighbor SW are still concerned about their private views, they understand those are not protected, views for neighbor to SE are improved by removed trees and they will plan their deck accordingly)
- Fremdling: Has historic signed off? (signed off in 1991 and again for this CDP “not eligible for designation)
- Fremdling: Colors, material pallet (app: owner has chose white stucco)

### **9/20/22 Motion**

- Findings CAN (Jackson/Rasmussen)
- Jackson, Costello, Fremdling, Rasmussen, Williams

- PASSES 5-0-1 (chair abstains)

### ITEM 3: FINAL REVIEW 9/20/2022

Project Name: Javaheri Residence – 2072 Via Casa Alta  
Applicant: Sheila Fortune/CA Marengo  
Project #: PTS 698915

LA JOLLA (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for a new 16,251-square-foot 2-story single dwelling unit over basement and accessory structure and pool, 4 levels total, on a vacant lot. located at 2072 Via Casa Alta. The 0.77-acre site is in the RS-1-1 Zone and Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.

#### 9/13/22 Summary of Discussion Items – Requests for Additional Info:

(see meeting recording at [lajollacpa.org](http://lajollacpa.org) for further detail)

- Drainage plan
- Better aerial view of broader context for site

#### 9/20/22 Applicant Presentation

- Aerial, Drain line and collection/sump at bottom of development area, pump up to BMP filter, 3% on property then after retention to street.
- Removed cantilever to maintain 6' structure separation.

#### 9/20/22 Discussion

- Merten: What is raised area between buildings? (app: dirt)
  - Will: DSD director confirmed retaining wall does not link separate structures for restarting overall structure limit.
- Merten: Exterior walls on side setback line. Contends that 24' angled setback follows contour of lot so at downhill end the building does not comply.
- Merten: Lowered grade in side yard. Is there a retaining wall? "You need to tweek it."
- Rasmussen: Is circular stair in lieu of connection (yes)

#### 9/20/22 Motion

- Findings CAN (Jackson/Rasmussen)
  - PASSES 4-1-1 (chair abstains)

### ITEM 4: FINAL REVIEW 9/20/2022

Project Name: Martin Residence – 1456 Nautilus St  
Applicant: Sheila Fortune/CA Marengo  
Project #: PTS 699238

LA JOLLA: Process 2 Substantial Conformance Review for changes to CDP No. 11492 for Parcel 1 and 11493 for Parcel 2 (PTS No. 3188) to reconfigure single dwelling units and driveway located at 1456 Nautilus St. The 2.78-acre site is in the RS-1-4 Zone and Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay Zone of the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1.

**9/13/22 Summary of Discussion Items – Requests for Additional Info:**

(see meeting recording at [lajollacpa.org](http://lajollacpa.org) for further detail)

- Photo montage, if possible, showing how proposed structures will affect the current view when coming down Nautilus
- Better renderings of how houses will look from Nautilus

**9/20/22 Applicant Presentation**

- Exhibit to show further back from street
- Rendering to show second house stepped down
- Materials inspiration, clean roofs because highly visible from above

**9/20/22 Discussion**

- Miller: Thank you for renderings, happy to see view
- Merten: Has the committee seen previously approved designs?
  - Rasmussen: yes
- Fremdling: in comparison 2 vs 3 houses is better. Scale is lower and appropriate
- Williams: agree, maintaining view is wonderful

**9/20/22 Motion**

- Findings CAN (Williams/Jackson)
  - PASSES 5-0-1

**ITEM 5: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 9/20/2022**

Project Name: 6083 La Jolla Scenic S – Sewer Vacation  
Applicant: Alexander Griswold  
Project #: PRJ 1062291

LA JOLLA: Process 2 - Easement vacation of a sewer easement in lot 2 of map no. 7859 at 6083 La Jolla Scenic S Drive. The 0.109-acre site is located in the RS-1-1 and ESL within the La Jolla Community Plan and Council District 1.

**9/20/22 Chair Will recuses**

**9/20/22 Applicant Presentation**

- Alexander: Propose to vacate easement in red which does not align with actual installed sewer, propose to dedicate new easement where sewer actually is.

**9/20/22 Discussion**

- How does this happen? (unknown, but probably more)
- Costello: attempted to make motion that findings CAN be made

**9/20/22 Motion**

- Make first meeting as FINAL (Rasmussen/Fremdling)
  - PASSES 5-0-0
- Findings CAN be made for easement vacation and replacement as presented (Costello/Fremdling)
  - PASSES 4-0-2

**ITEM 6: FINAL REVIEW 9/20/2022**

Project Name: Carvalho De Mendonca Residence – 6208 Ave Cresta  
Applicant: Flavia Gomes  
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/690811>

LA JOLLA (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit to demolish the existing residence and portion of garage to construct a new two story, single-family residence with attached garage, balcony and patio for a total gross square footage of 7,497 at 6208 Avenida Cresta. The 0.20-acre site is in the RS-1-5 zone and Coastal (Appealable Area) Overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan and Council District 1.

21\_1019 Applicant Presentation:

- Presentation: aerial photo, .56 FAR allowed, .55 proposed, sloping lot, complies with FAR, height, and setbacks
- Basement gameroom, main floor opens to rear, 3 bedroom upstairs
- House steps down with grade. Extensive articulation, cantilevered pool over walk out game room.
- Reinforced concrete, steel and stone.

21\_1019 Public Comment:

- Merten – Street is special, mix 1 and 2 stories many built in 30s or 40s, front of typical buildings articulate or angled to front setback. Two story portions step significantly back. Community plan says front and side second floor elements should stepback. Most homes are sloped (pitched) roofs with tyle. Preserve and Enhance existing character. Angled building envelope begins at 24' but exhibit must slope down with terrain. Upper floor does not step back enough. Findings cannot be made.
- Ruffier – Existing residence has no setback between homes, this appears to be taken care of with new proposed home.
- Merten – Renderings without landscape shows true bulk. City has no landscape ordinances to enforce them.

21\_1019 Committee Discussion

- Leira – Are there two driveways (no, dashed lines are the existing driveway to be removed), Sometimes modern architecture is a difficult fit in traditional neighborhoods, especially with stark colors. Ave Cresta has a dominant public space.
- Kane – Echo Leira comments, no context for home, how does it fit neighborhood, Garage side of house two story element seems harsh and not stepped back.
- Shannon – Blocky, Stark, perhaps with context or landscape would soften it. How does pool work?
- Kane – similar conversations in Bird Rock. Fear of modern buildings changing character
- Costello – Mixed feelings ... Larger homes happening in LJ, concerned at lack of transition. Should step-back. Back is more interesting than front. Too stark.
- Kane – Softening ...
- Rasmussen – Concur, concerned about envelope. Don't see point of elements in front. Why continuous roof which makes second floor one long line at skyline. Blend better.
- Leira – In the past those horizontal elements would have been wood.
- Will – Consider colors, long horizontal element on skyline, and grass/green roof at rear.

21\_1019 Deliver for next time

- Exhibits to show consistency with 24' height limit (at setback) measured from grade at all points
- Details of how treating public space from street to building, section from other side of street home, through street, to proposed house.
- Drawing showing treatment at rear of property, what is happening at rear property line retaining walls
- See this rendering with neighboring homes in view and landscape
- Colored Landscape plan
- Materials board, better idea of cladding

21\_1109 Applicant Presentation:

- Landscape added to renderings
- Lowered master bathroom where exceeded the 30% angled setback.
- Retaining wall at rear
- Palm tree (street) will remain
- Provided renderings in context
- Materials list provided. Stone at front left, Concrete/Aluminum front Fascia

21\_1109 Public Comment:

- Merten – There are some code issues here. Projecting element on front of building. Front setback is 20', existing garage is less than 20' and as such previously conforming, degree of non-conformance must not increase. Height of non-conformance will be extended approx.. 2' higher than existing. Grey roof element and wall are projecting into front setback and does not meet definition of an eave (water does not drip off of it.) Building does not fit community fabric.
  - Applicant: Was on committee that defined architectural style is not a component of compatibility. Bulk and Scale (and landscape) is the only reasonable argument. Neighbors purchased the subject property and placed a view easement over rear of property. Extreme modern is part of the LJ context.
  - Merten: It is the bulk and scale that is not compatible

21\_1109 Committee Comment:

- Kane – Looks like a box on street, poor transition to adjacent homes. Do the plans show existing garage that remains in front setback.
  - Applicant: Setback, height, and FAR compliance IS acceptable as community character.
- Leira – How does new design fit into context of street. More exhibits that illustrate this. Proposed looks barren. Show more of the “fit”. Color has a lot to do with the “fit”. Strong white/dark contrast hurt the perceived bulk and scale.
- Rasmussen – Overhang of roof and garage affects bulk and scale and nullifies required articulation.
- Costello – Larger (and modern) homes are the way of development in LJ. Mass from street is no where near as broken up and articulated as rear.
- Fremdling – Reiterate what most have said. Rear is not so bold. 20' setback should be followed.
- Will – “Visor” nullifies second floor articulation.
- Leira – White enhances shadows and adds articulation, “Visor” kills that. Landscape can break-up bulk.
- Kane – What is bugging me about this? Rear is light 1920s Neutra. Front is something else.
- Rasmussen – Is the increase into previous conformance is the height (applicant: yes)

21\_1109 Motion

- Findings CANNOT be made due to increase height of previously conforming garage walls, transition is not made to existing structures, the bulk and scale is too large as viewed from street, and landscape does little to improve the perceived bulk and scale. Black vertical walls and roof overhangs encroach into front setback. (Rasmussen/Fremdling)
- **Motion Passes 6-0-1 (chair abstains)**

**9/20/22 Applicant Presentation**

- Video presentation of project.
- Front facade cast in place walls with perforated façade element “Cobogo” by well known Brazilian artist.
- Map of modern/cubic architecture
- Map of buildings that do NOT have red tile roof
- Laundry no longer encroaches, Added 24' height limit on plans and further from setbacks
- Comply with all limits
- Landscape plan will stay the same, renderings don't show landscape, but landscape will be planted per plans



- Owner have been contacted and in support. Immediate neighbors are in support. Neighbor sold lot with view easement which has been honored.

### **9/20/22 Discussion**

- Miller: Square footage to be demo'd (app: 2,035 sf, doubling the existing square footage, 400sf below max FAR)
- Miller: aerial or street view in context (app: showed aerial view, smaller than many in area)
- Merten: Angled building envelope, heights of walls exceed 24' on the side setback. (app demonstrated how it stepped back)
- Miller: Consider neighbors privacy (yes, they reviewed and are in favor)
- Jackson: Previous design required tall building forced to front, creates large mass in front, one concern was stark white/overbearing, this is better, understated, muted colors, interesting. Can the bulk be softened at front. Can the artistic part be smaller? No need to worry about red tiles.
- Rasmussen: the element left of stairs on first floor was exceeding something? (Height is 9'-6", new design does not increase height of this element to remain which has the previously conforming setback, no more balcony or handrail) what is glass column? (panoramic elevator)
- Will: 22' at street, 24' for elevator is not very tall.
- Costello: Very significant departure from character of neighborhood. Street is eclectic but this is extreme. Water concerns: I don't believe we should have swimming pools anymore, make sure landscape is drought tolerant.
- Shannon: Not engineered yet, the structure may change. (we have discussed with engineers and it is possible withing basic structure outlined)
- Rasmussen: Front yard setback (20', the laundry encroaches but not increasing the height, averaging high and low)
- Costello: would like to see more detail on landscape. Don't think it's compatible.

### **9/20/22 Deliver for next time**

- Add angled setback at each section
- Show street rendering superimposed with neighbors buildings on either side. How does it look in context?
- Dash in roof of existing garage on section through proposed laundry room to demonstrate no part is higher than existing. Do 50% of walls remain to retain previous conforming rights?
- More detail on landscape and watering requirements with respect to drought tolerance.