

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

- TUESDAY 4 PM -

Bishops School Main Dining Room 7607 La Jolla Blvd. La Jolla, CA 92037

Applicants:

- Please email your submitted plan set and Latest cycle issues and assessment letter to the DPR chair (brianljcpa@gmail.com) no later than **24 hours before the meeting** .
- Presentation materials for the meeting should also include materials board and/or color renderings, Aerial photo and neighborhood context exhibits showing the proposed renderings or site plan in context.
- Video Projector with HDMI is available. Please bring easels and rigid boards if you plan to present physical drawings and images

-
1. *Public comments are an opportunity to share your opinion with the committee members. Comments should not be directed at the applicant team*
 2. *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:

POSSIBLE ACTIONS ITEMS:

ITEM 1: FINAL REVIEW 6/13/2023

Project Name: 6110 Camino De La Costa
Applicant: Matthew Segal
Project Info: PRJ-1066101

LA JOLLA (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing 2-story residence and construct a new 3-story 10,567-square-foot residence with decks located at 6110 Camino de la Costa. The 0.37-acre site is in the RS-1-5 Zone and Coastal Overlay (Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.

11/8/22 Applicant Presentation

- Existing house footings beyond repair, must setback beyond bluff edge, exceeds 50%
- New building held back from bluff edge
- Garage variance reduced from one-story to two-story
- CCC demanding structure removed from site
- Concrete glass and wood
- Proposed basement will be slightly higher than existing basement

- 22' tall from street

11/8/22 Discussion

- Shannon – Existing disturbance on bluffs can allow future development
- Aguerre – Live across the street, this home is historic and cannot be torn down?
 - (applicant: CCC rejected proposal to add to house, footings are so deteriorated, CCC will not allow retrofit)
- Leira – Did you engage an engineer versed in historic preservation? (applicant: Rebar is completely exposed, CCC does not want any structure withing bluff setback)
- Smit – Any cantilever? (app: no) Amount of excavation? (app: Not much as current house already has lower level)
- McArther – One of the oldest homes in lower hermosa, report by Brian Smith and Jennifer Stropes addresses the properties significance. How does CCC trump historic status? The building will bedesignated.
- Merten – Plans submitted include elevation drawings, garage is on property line.
- Shannon – Property has not transferred out of York family
- Baratz – opposed, it appears to be 3 stories – Will a view easement be required (applicant: up to city)
- Kane – Have tried to get the definition of basements changed, Letter from LJ Historical Society opposes demolition and supports designation.
- Leira – Interested historic issue passes through HRB – from the ocean it appears as 3 stories

11/8/22 Deliver for next time

- Elevations and street context - Presentation is incomplete due to recent changes.
- Findings for variance to allow garage
- Review CCC vs Historic – show correspondence from CCC
- Historic submission report
- Photo montage with proposed house in context. – from street AND from ocean
- Side elevations and window alignment with neighbor (applicant: can't see neighbor to South, dense vegetation)

12/13/22 Applicant Presentation

- none

12/13/22 Discussion

- none

12/13/22 Action

- MOTION to postpone this conversation until after HRB (Kane/Fremdling)
 - Kane - Have not heard from HRB, should not confuse issue
 - Will – Suggest a motion that states we have not reviewed or comment on Historic Status and only opine on the quality of the proposed project
 - Segal – Existing house is failing, personal residence, time spent to prepare, disappointed if committee does not review.
 - Kane – read letter from Coastal Commission Representative (uploaded on website)
 - Segal – Letter from city that building should be removed and relocated.
 - Call the vote
 - Fremdling – yes
 - Jackson – no
 - Kane – yes
 - Leira – yes

- Rasmussen – yes
- Shannon – yes
- Williams – yes
- Will – Abstain
- Motion **PASSES 6-1-1**

3/14/23 Presentation

- Applicant: Net effect of feedback (or lack thereof) from HRB, City, and Coastal Commission is that current structure, although now designated historic, cannot be saved, and so will be demolished and a new modernist concrete-and-glass house will be built within the allowable part of the lot. Since the historic structure cannot be preserved, instead the applicants are required (and willing) to assemble a detailed record of its design, appearance, use, and historical role via interviews, documents, photographs, videos, and other media; all of that will be submitted to HRB and archived for the public record.
- Question (Jackson and others): Is this a new design? If so, then this should be a preliminary review, not a final review?
- Applicant: Yes, it's a totally new design to reflect the allowable footprint.
- Question: Do you have a first round of cycle issues from the City for the new design?
- Applicant: Orally, but not in writing. But insist that the project has been reviewed already, so want a vote
- Jackson suggests we see what applicant has brought, then decide whether it's actionable
- Applicant shows sections and a couple of renderings, limited floor plans. New design fits entirely with required setbacks and so forth; only variance required is for the garage's proximity to street.
- (general questions and discussion about structure design, generally positive)
- Leira: disagrees with applicant's assertion that nothing can be preserved from existing structure, wishes applicant would think more creatively about how to do so (eg, preserving elements, design features, etc)
- Kane: likes proposed design, but wants to know more concretely how the applicants propose to satisfy the historical requirements
- Merten: believes that architectural overhang supported by a column is a structure that extends outside the allowed building envelope (45° rule), and therefore must be modified.
- (long back-and-forth between Leira and applicant about preservation)
- Motion (Kane/Rasmussen or maybe Kane/Shannon): Appreciate applicant's commitment to meeting historical documentation requirements, findings can be made.
- Vote: 3 no (Leira, Fremdling, Williams, I think), 3 yes (Kane, Shannon, Rasmussen), 1 abstain (Jackson, as chair). Tie vote, chair can break tie. Chair declines to vote (believes that this should have been a preliminary review, not final, hence voting not appropriate), hence motion does not pass.
- Jackson asks whether there is another motion. No one makes another motion. Therefore, DPR has taken no action on this project.

ITEM 2: FINAL REVIEW 6/13/2023

Project Name: 625 Wrelton Dr

Applicant: Phil Quatrino
Project Info: PTS- 696528

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit to amend CDP No. 91-0400 for remodel and addition to existing two-story residence to become a three-story residence located at 625 Wrelton Drive. Work to include 186-square-foot first floor addition, 2,074-square-foot second floor addition, 115-square-foot penthouse, and decks. The 0.29-acre site is in the RS-1-7 Zone and Coastal Overlay (Appealable) Zone and Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

Presentation 5/16/23

- Complete remodel and roof top deck, no change to footprint,
- East half, extending from single story to two story
- Penthouse and roof top deck
- When was home built (early 1992)
- Neighbors: Looks big
- Shannon – Looks massive from parking lot.
- Leira – Height Concerns, FAR concerns, Most of neighborhood has pitched roofs, How does it fit?
- Neighbor – Most of neighbors are one story
- Penthouse is only about 6' above second floor roof.
- Leira – Heights and dimensions don't seem to be specific enough to be pushing the limit so close.
- Shannon – Does second floor half to step back? (Will – Setback from minimum setback or setback from what's below is not clearly defined in plan. West side is at setback and does not setback, but is existing condition)
- Leira – Wish we had a complete site section.
- Existing footprint encroaches across side setback at SW.
- Height of penthouse is close to height of existing clerestory/cupola.
- Leira – Don't have enough feel of context to see if it fits.
 - How does it look from both park and from street.
- Williams – Materials? (Stucco and fluted wood panelling, Travertine on first floor)
- Williams – Any meetings with neighbors? (not by applicant)
- Will – What was pre-existing grade on this site before terracing? Does it predate 1976?

Deliverables –

- Satellite Photo with plan layout on site (10-15 houses field of view)
 - Color code existing and proposed
- Section all the way down to parking lot and to other side of Wrelton
- Streetscape compared to existing
- Show Existing grade on site section