

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.

6/13/2023 PRESENTATION

- Refresh design ... existing front wall and garage to remain. House will be subordinate to that.
- Courtyard space harkens to previous design, made grove of trees in front courtyard and reduced basement area.
- House is 800sf smaller.
- Neighboring homes are all 2 stories with basements like subject property
- Leira – Met with applicant twice
 - Concerned with clearance of historic building and status
 - What does LJ Historic Society have to say
 - (applicant: spoke to LJ Historic Society, because of historic resource city requested the EIR ... estimating 6 months)
 - What is status of environmental document
 - Doing EIR right now precursor to going to HRB
 - What is status of cycle issues
 - No posted notice on site (Jackson – it was there at least 2 weeks ago)
 - Appreciate greater transparent/see-through area and hope that can be recorded in perpetuity.
- Jackson – Can you speak to angled building setback.
 - (applicant: The only place where building projects into angled setback is overhang (eave) and chimney (both of which may project). “Skinny columns” are chimneys for proposed fireplaces.
- Merten (not in attendance but relayed by Will) – Concerned with angled setback at West corners and asked if garage was new or existing, if new, does not meet 20’ parking requirement.
- Most of building allows view to ocean.
- Leira appreciate wide view corridor
- Clark (Sellers agent) Yorks are excited to see Master Architects making something beautiful on site.
- Leira – It’s unique but so transparent and so well placed.
- Costello – Appreciates historic buildings, if structure is not sound, moving this structure and preserving the garage and wall may be the best we can get and this is better than a Red Roost/Rest impass.
- Applicant – Been to HRB’s subcommittee and they have reviewed the alternatives and approved the list
- Solomon – What are alternatives discussed
 - Base project (rehabilitation)
 - Pushing existing structure back
 - Saving only back portion
 - Saving North wing and moving back from bluff edge
 - Relocation
- MOTION (Jackson/Williams)
 - We believe that based on info available today this project appears to be consistent We believe this project to be consistent with LJ Community Plan and recommend the city can make findings for a CDP.
 - In Favor 5
 - Opposed 1
 - Abstain 1 (Will as chair)

~~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~~