

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) before your projects may be placed on the Agenda.
- 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.
- A laptop with USB will be available for projector presentation

-
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:

- Attendance

La Jolla CPA

Brian Will present
Mike Costello present
Greg Jackson
John Fremdling present
Glenn Rasmussen present

La Jolla Town Council

Diane Kane present
Angeles Leira present
John Shannon present
Brian Williams present
vacancy

- Costello: This is my last meeting as a committee member. I am retiring from the committee. Thank you

POSSIBLE ACTIONS ITEMS:

ITEM 1: FINAL REVIEW

Project Name: LJ Country Club CUP - Continuation
Applicant: Jeanette Temple
Project Info: PRJ-1104046

The proposed project is the continuation of the use of the activities permitted with Coastal Development Permit (CDP)/Conditional Use Permit (CUP)/Hillside Review Permit (HRP) No. 94-0564, through the removal of Condition No. 22 of the vested permit. Permit No. 94-0564 allowed the renovation of portions of, and add additional floor area to the La Jolla County Club existing clubhouse, construction of a new halfway house (Near Hole No. 10), modifications of the parking facilities, and other accessory improvements. Condition No. 22 stated, "This Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for and expire after a period of 30 years for that area defined as, and identified on the approved Exhibit "A" Site Plan, as the club improvement area. This area consists of the clubhouse, half-way house (near hole no. 10), parking lots and general adjoining landscaped areas. There is no expiration date applied to the active golf area consisting primarily of the balance of the La Jolla Country Club property." There is no new construction proposed as a part of this permit amendment.

- Discussion 11/14/2023
 - Is this in public good? (Rasmussen)
 - 100% privately owned
 - Originally approved in '94 and built shortly thereafter
 - No work proposed
- Findings can be made to amend and remove expiration (Williams/Costello)
- PASSES 7-0-1

ITEM 2: FINAL REVIEW

Project Name: Coast Walk Lots 2 and 17
Applicant: Haley Duke
Project Info: PRJ-10741072

Project Description:

LA JOLLA – Project proposes a Site Development Permit (SDP) and Coastal Development Permit (CDP) to demolish a portion of an existing tennis court and site improvements (hardscape and landscape) and construct a 2-story, 5,478 square foot Single Family Dwelling with garage parking for 2 vehicles, and a 1-story detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) with garage parking for 2 vehicles. The project is located within Lot 2 (APN 350-130-02) and Lot 17 (APN 350-131-29) in Block 46 of La Jolla Park Map (adjacent to Coast Walk) in the RS-1-7 zone, Coastal Overlay Zone, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Coastal), Transit Area Overlay Zone, Transit Priority Area, and Mobility Zone 2 within the La Jolla Community Planning Area.

DEMOLITION OF PORTION OF EXISTING TENNIS COURT AND RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS
- NEW 5,478 SQ. FT. (GFA) SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE PLUS 491 SQ. FT. GARAGE
- NEW 440 SQ. FT. (GFA) DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT PLUS 451 SQ. FT. GARAGE

- Presentation 11/14/2023
 - Deliverables from last meeting
 - Everything accessed from rear. Lots are 55' wide, aligned front to back.
 - Using string line between adjacent homes
 - Staging will be done on vacant lot 18. No construction traffic on Coast Walk.
 - No lot line adjustments proposed
 - Site drainage and landscape plan ... Soils engineer suggested not to allow infiltration on site, recommend collection and discharge to storm drain, existing landscape along coast walk remains, water detention happens behind that (for filtration and retention) Some large mature trees to remain on site and new mature trees planned to supplement,

- o Required 4' side setbacks, proposed are wider than that.
- o No proposed work seaward of Coast Walk, percentages are compliant even when not counting large area of lot seaward of CW.
- o FAR counted on true lot size (out to mean high tide) (.46 allowed, .36 proposed) FAR could be a lot larger.
- o Studied spacing and window alignment with neighbors houses
- o Peterson presentation of parcel maps
 - No work adjacent to Coast Walk, no access taken from Coast Walk. No change to current conditions along either side of Coast Walk.
 - Some members of public would like owners/applicants to dedicate land to turn around/parking along Coast Walk.
 - Lots are the same since 1887 original subdivision map
 - City right of way may have a claim to paved portion, but no further ROW and applicants are not challenging that.
- Public Comment
 - o Jackson: Have you studied access off Coast Walk? ... (Applicant: Yes, preferred less intrusive option and building fewer homes ... currently plan to use existing driveway width) Jacksons would prefer to keep it as 12' as proposed.
 - o Solomon: Is Feb 2022 the most recent city opinion? (applicant: yes)
 - o Merriweather: 20 year project to claim this land from owners. City did a map NV5. Working to get 2 cars off bluff and move parking to inland side of paved surface. (applicant: that map is not accurate and was abandoned by city) Would like to champion a turn around. Coastal Commission wants 2 spots off bluff side and moved to inland side on applicants property.
 - o Jackson: When does this stop, when can this be resolved. City and neighbors are all in agreement, why is this being fought by "community".
- Committee Members
 - o Kane: Trying to understand lots. (applicant: Tax assessor does not assess for open space or beaches or bluffs used by public. Taxes associated with developable area) Does this affect community plan? (applicant: it predates the community plan. Record a covenant of easement that you cannot develop it. Also no argument to any claims if existing trails need to be covenant of easement) Any changes to shared driveway connection to Coast Walk at Torrey Pines. (applicant: will not make any changes except repairs)
 - o Shannon: Coast Walk originally called Cave Street in original maps. Seems to sound like it should be maintained. (applicant: we are not challenging city's acceptance of Coast Walk)
 - o Leira: Does this lot serve any run-off function all these years? (applicant: yes, the proposal will handle all water)
 - o Rasmussen: Information city has is incorrent. Use and acceptance are only two. The property was taken by someone.
- MOTION: Findings CAN be made with recommendation that owners not fight city determination as to where public ROW boundaries are (Rasmussen/Kane)
 - o Rasmussen – yes
 - o Costello – yes
 - o Leira – yes
 - o Shannon – yes
 - o Williams – yes
 - o Kane – yes
 - o Will (chair abstains)
 - o Fremdling – yes
 - o PASSES

ITEM 3: DISCUSSION

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.

The project was denied by Hearing Officer and sent back to LJCPA

- Presentation by Merten
 - Hearing Officer Minutes:
 - Project Denied due to encroachment
 - Should be properly designed to observe setbacks
 - This committee recommended that finding CAN be made
 - This project did not meet code
 - Encroached into setbacks
 - City PM asked why did second floor encroach into setback
 - It was NOT “mechanical equipment”
 - Appellate Court Decision on another project that regulatory agency has discretion of which regulations to enforce.
 - We need to continue to enforce code even if city does not.
 - Plans did not include many common drawing elements.
 - Buildings that exceed 2 stories in height require Architects Stamp and Signature.

ITEM 4: PROCEDURES DISCUSSION

Discussion for instructions and reasonable expectations for DPR Applicants. Items may include ...

- Send City Assessment Letter and Cycles Issues Letters to the DRP Chairman before agenda
- A presentation to the DPR Committee works best if done by PowerPoint or other projection software.
- The usual points for a presentation are:
 - Illustrate how the Project complies with the LJ Community Plan to “avoid extreme and intrusive changes to the residential scale of La Jolla’s neighborhoods and to promote good design and harmony within the visual relationships and transitions between new and older structures”.
 - Neighborhood Satellite image w proposed footprint
 - Street view collage with adjacent homes and proposed drawing/rendering
 - Is there a Coastal View Corridor requirement?
 - Are there any requests for Deviations or Variances?
 - Has there been a meeting with the neighbors?
 - Recusal of any committee members who are neighbors (500’)?
 - Disclosure of any public commentators who are neighbors or may have personal concerns not general community/public concerns

- o Any special or unusual items?
- o Illustrate compliance with the:
 - 30 foot height limit
 - FAR
 - angled plane
 - setback requirements, (Are there any projections into the setbacks?)
 - Landscaping Plan
 - Parking
- For projects located between the coast line and the first PROW, should it be DPR Policy not to approve of a Project at the first Review.
- Historic Recommendations
- Environmental Review
- Construction Management plans for difficult sites
- What FINDINGS can be made.