

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday July 21, 2020 – 4:00 pm

Because of the continuing COVID-19 emergency, 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/2019-agendas/> Applicants (or opposition) please send all materials to the DPR chair (brianljcpa@gmail.com) no later than 3pm on Monday 7/20/2020. 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 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. If another member of the public has already said the same thing tonight or at a previous meeting, please move on to new information. It is not necessary to repeat previous comments.*
 4. ***Applicants:** Please present your project as succinctly as possible. Speak clearly and **CONCISELY**.*
-

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

ITEM 1: FINAL REVIEW 7/21/2020

- Project Name: Bellevue CDP – 5610 Bellevue Ave
- Permits: CDP
- Project No.: 660209 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
- Zone: RS-1-7 Applicant: Adrienne Perkins
- Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/660209>

LA JOLLA - (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing detached garage, and to remodel an existing 1,002 square-foot one story single-family residence. Remodel includes a 773

square-foot first floor addition, 250 square-foot attached garage, 1,189 square-foot second floor addition with three decks, and one third floor deck located at 5610 Bellevue Avenue. The 0.14-acre site is in the RS-1-7 and Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. CD1

- **6/9/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

- Originally permitted as a 50% exempt remodel. One of the walls was temporarily laid down to shore up the foundation.
- Subsequently added one window otherwise the project is unchanged.
- Property at corner of Forward and Bellevue.
- Shared images of existing house and neighboring development.
- Artist rendering of proposed two story house with roof decks, “Craftsman meets Modern style.
- Second floor steps back on all street and alley sides. Only the West property line is shared with a neighbor.
- One enclosed garage and one carport off alley
- Materials pallet. Stucco, wood, stone, standing seam roof
- Clarification of parking.

- **6/9/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Merten: Site plan? (yes shared) Elevations did not relay articulation on Bellevue but floor plan does.
- Feeney: Neighbor across Bellevue. Believes there were more changes in a previous design iteration. (applicant: That was all resolved prior to the wall issue and CDP. At this point because the 50% rule no longer exists a window was added at the kitchen sink and is the only change) The site is a mess. All walls were laid down at one time or another. Side setback to West is 4’-2”. Those are existing walls to remain. Surveyor has confirmed that the setbacks are correct. Concerned that carports get enclosed and 3rd parking space uses yard. There are 2 roof decks.
- Ashley Mackin: What are rights with respect to roof decks? Opposed to roof deck. Confirm Feeney comments. Work has been very slow and not professional. (Applicant: Original permits in May, then permit issue with property size halted project, then CDP issue halted it again.) It’s a messy work site.
- Riley: Live 2 houses East. Oppose roof top deck, deck travels up hill, up Forward st.
- Neil: There is a large two story mass adjacent to West property. (Applicant: There is a major step back in the center of the West façade and various step backs.)
- Wilkinson: First floor plan shows a 1-car garage and looks like it could be converted to a bedroom. (applicant has no interest in doing that)

- **6/9/2020 COMMITTEE REVIEW**

- Costello: Would like to see the East elevation. Concerned about carport and pushing FAR envelope.
- Fremdling: Live up the street. It’s been unfortunate. It made a travesty of the 50% rule. Concerned about the Feeney’s front door is on Forward. Car parked on Bellevue. Should not have to see that. Decks are excessive. What is square footage of deck? Put up large rendering on front of job sites. Thank you for doing that.
- Gaenzle: Site plan is not adequate. Where are the trees? Upper windows in center of West façade look directly into neighbor. Would prefer to see them gone since sliding doors on opposite side of hall. Too many roof decks ruin neighbors privacy. Concerned about height

limit. Front steps are higher. Please clarify which trees will remain or be replaced. Colors look heavy.

- Kane: Who is AMD Architecture (Applicant: I work for them) Will clients live on property? (applicant: yes). Prefer to reduce roof decks and pull back from edge of roof. Carports are excessive, let's see landscaping. Noticing: Was anything required when it was 50%, no. Contemporary Craftsman, front elevation is unfortunate, and diminish size of roof deck might improve that. Removing guest suite could add second garage and improve yards and landscape. Prefer to see roof deck railing buried behind sloping roofs.
- Leira: Drawings are very difficult to read. Full site plan is needed. Concerned about carport. Clarify building heights. Roof decks are becoming fashionable but they need to relate the edges to the perimeter of the building and site lines. Location should be careful to protect privacy of neighbors. Color of glass (applicant: standard clear) Not in favor of smoked tinting. Prefer not to see people on roof decks. Prefer a solid parapet.
- Jackson: Could we see 3D rendering from all 4 corners of entire house.
- **6/9/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**
 - Confirmation from Surveyor that setbacks conform
 - Tally square footage of decks
 - Enlarged site plan on separate sheet with gates and fences.
 - Site sections both ways with survey of existing grade. (to go all the way across Bellevue and Forward.)
 - Street montage of full blocks (West view and North view)
 - Elevations with grade in foreground to lowest point on property.
 - Landscape plan show existing and new trees
 - West Elevation with dashed or shaded location of opposite structure and their windows
 - Elevations are hard to read, perhaps shading to illustrate articulation or additional 3D views.
 - Color code floor plans on site plan (to help illustrate articulation/step backs)
 - FAR and Lot coverage numbers along with permeable/impermeable numbers
 - Outline with colors/shading, working drawings
 - Satellite image with footprint of proposed project to include 300' radius.
 - Key in locations of homes in neighborhood photos.
 - Take a look at stepping back further and improve Craftsman roof lines
- **7/14/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**
 - the set back issue will soon be resolved.
 - When you and your clients see the Companion Unit being built in the view path of the rear roof deck, and consider the neighbor's comments, you just might reconsider that roof deck. It will save money too.
 - Open floor to ceiling glass looks wonderful. But think about living behind it. The attached is the design, and house, of an award winning Architect. It is at 6005 Avenida Cresta, corner of Cam. de la Costa. Facing the street and right side on both levels are floor to ceiling glass. It looks wonderful! However, two weeks after the Architect and his family moved in, the ugly drapes appeared. That was 12 years ago.

ITEM 2: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 7/21/2020

- Project Name: 1821 Torrey Pines Rd
- Permits: CDP/VAC
- Project No.: 648590 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
- Zone: RS-1-5 Applicant: Tony Christensen
- Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/648590>

LA JOLLA - (Process 5) Public Right-of-Way Vacation and Coastal Development Permit to vacate a portion of Torrey Pines Road located at 1802 Amalfi Street, 1834 Amalfi Street, 1821 Torrey Pines Road & 7840 Sierra Mar Drive. The site is in the RS-1-5 Base Zone and Coastal (Appealable) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Planning Area, and Council District 1.

ITEM 3: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 7/21/2020

- Project Name: Remley Pl
- Permits: CDP
- Project No.: 649756 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
- Zone: RS-1-4 Applicant: Trip Bennett
- Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/649756>

LA JOLLA (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit for the demolition of an existing 1,608 square-foot single-family residence and to construct a new 4,685 square-foot single family residence located at 7342 Remley Place. The 0.20-acre site is in the RS-1-4 and the Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area, and Council District 1.

ITEM 4: ACTION ITEM 7/21/2020

Review and Recommendation to CPA regarding response to **Complete Communities Proposal**

City staff formally stated that the FAR in the Coastal Zone was now 3.0. Our Community Plan & PDO requirements don't allow anything over 1.8 FAR to comply with the 30 ft. Coastal height limit.

Discussion:

Can these two parameters be reconciled without a ballot initiative? If so, how & where?

Would a 3.0 FAR work anywhere in La Jolla? Where?

Are focused locations for 3.0 FAR identified with Specific Plans & adopted with a ballot initiative acceptable? Or is the entire topic off the table?

Even a 2.0 FAR is over the 30 Ft. height limit. Hence, our Community Plan only allows up to 1.8 FAR.

But, something close to 2.0 FAR can be achieved by including basements, carports, covered balconies and other excrescences into FAR that are not now counted. We've already asked that at least 50% of basements apply toward FAR in this code update. Should we go for the whole enchilada in the Coastal Zone? Or, in targeted areas? Or, are basements altogether unwise, considering local geology?

Is even 2.0 FAR a bad idea? Should we just hunker down on the 30 ft. Coastal height limit? Are there other strategies/positions/options we haven't considered?

Use the MF buildings you're already designed for other communities, provide information on # of inclusionary units, height, lot size, number & size of units, construction cost/sq. ft. vs. land cost. Can you also place presentation images or massing studies of some of these buildings into various La Jolla contexts so people can see what they would look like? Try spots in LJ Shores, the Village & Bird Rock for comparison. What would it take to realistically provide inclusionary units in new buildings in La Jolla? Where is the tipping point between economic feasibility & failure?