

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Agenda – Jan 12, 2021 – 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/2021-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 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: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 1/12/2021

Project La Jolla View Reservoir
Applicant: City of San Diego: Bilal Oriqat, Gretchen Eicher
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/331101>

LA JOLLA-, Coastal Development and Site Development Permit Process CIP-2 (WBS# S-15027.02.06) for a proposed 3.11 million gallon circular concrete reservoir to replace the existing reservoir, replace the existing Muirlands Pipeline in County Club Drive with a larger 30" PVC pipeline; and to demolish the existing La Jolla View Reservoir. Coastal Non App 1, Council District 1, Notice Cards 3. Notice of Final Decision to go to CCC.

- Project previously reviewed by DPR & CPA has not changed.
 - CEQA-related Environmental Document has evolved from an MND to an EIR.
 - Committee discussion will focus on potential project impacts and mitigation measures identified in the EIR. Committee Findings and Recommendations will result in Draft CPA response to EIR. Draft response will be discussed/ratified at February CPA meeting.

ITEM 2: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 1/12/2021

Project: 9044 La Jolla Shores Ln
Applicant: Bob Trettin
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/667987>

LA JOLLA; (Process 4) After-fact SDP for the Emergency Agreement (PTS# 660175) issued for the relocation of failed coastal bluff materials that threatened ancillary residence and tram landing at the base of the coastal bluff located at 9044 La Jolla Shores Ln. within the RS-1-1 and RS-1-4 Base Zones, and Coastal (Appealable), Sensitive Coastal Bluff, and MHPA Overlay Zones and Geo Hazard Area 41 within the La Jolla Community Plan. Council Dist. 1

ITEM 3: ACTION ITEM 1/12/2021

Project: CODE UPDATE
Applicant: Diane Kane
Project Info: <https://lajollacpa.org/2021-agendas/>

- 2021 Code Update:
 - Status report of LDC code revisions submitted to City in 2020; brainstorming session on potential Code Revisions to submit in 2021 cycle.
 - See Materials page of CPA website for list of previously submitted issues. 2021 submittals may include additional items not identified on 2020 list.

ITEM 4: FINAL REVIEW 1/12/2021

Project Name: Villa K-L – 1228 Park Row
Applicant: Scott Kivel
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/619886>

LA JOLLA (Process 2) - A NDP and amendment to CDP No. 1217056 for new work at 1228 Park Row that includes a steel lattice structure, barbeque, metal rods at roof parapet, vehicle gates that encroach into the public ROW, and air conditioning condensers on the garage roof. Fences, retaining walls, trees in ROW, and carport opening identified in the IC notice dated 4/17/19. The 0.22-acre site is located in the RS-1-7 Zone, and Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-App.) within the La Jolla CPA, and CD 1.

2/12/2019 APPLICANT PRESENTATION: Kivel, Epley

- Request gates in public ROW, needed to correct visibility triangles
- EMRA for walls in ROW, city planner is waiting for NDP/CDP to approve EMRA
- Walls were built higher than permitted, neighbors are happy with existing conditions

- Abided by CDP, footprint is identical to CDP
- Issues are visibility triangle, trellis, and gates, AC condensers
- Driveway gates and wall were built in ROW – should not have been built ~8” into ROW (on Park Row)
- Curb to PL is 13’ on Park Row
- Walls in ROW on Silverado, gate is not far enough from back of sidewalk (should be 20’)
- Asking for colonnade to be dimensioned and shown to be outside of front setback
- Applicant follow-up post public comment
 - City does not find height issue
 - Cut down wall within visibility triangle
 - State boards issues with previous architect

2/12/2019 PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Merryweather: Disturbed by anything in PROW. Drove the circle, not a single gate to garage on entire circle. This is only one. Seems out of place
- Weiss: mother in law was next door neighbor, she and her husband do not endorse these gates. Illegal and does not fit in neighborhood. There are other issues as well. Building and height issues as well.
- McInerney: Went to trial and exonerated. Issues tonight have nothing to do with work I did. Applicant continued additions after release of architect. Specificity of site. Silverado and Park (commercial and residential). Kivel has not been forthright. Has not abided by floor plan, enclosed a previously approved carport and now exceeds the limit of FAR, Drawings presented to committee are copyright infringement and edited to be false. 2 neighbors in favor does not constitute a community. Park Row gates are 4’ over PL, Silverado gate is 1’ over PL. Risk backing out of driveway, Visibility triangle is imperative. Need to remove existing structure to create visibility. Chain link is not allowed in front yard setback. Street trees do not satisfy approved tree list. Plans have been “bleached” to suit current agenda. Pergola is in setback. BBQ is in setback. Metal poles are all above the height limit. Accessory structure has a 15’ height limit. Drawings provided by applicant are false.
- Benton: 20’ pull-in required before garage doors AND gates. Ask for additional information and look at photos.
- Merten: City is liable for whatever is built in PROW, if gate is in view triangle and injury results, it becomes the city’s liability.

2/12/2019 COMMITTEE DELIBERATION:

- Leira: was storage shed converted to garage? Community pattern is picket fences at PL. planter area on Silverado is too much. If it is not already permitted, perhaps it should go. Automobile gates are atypical for Park Row.
- Leira: gate on Silverado appears to be a hazard, they are inconsistent with scale and character of neighborhood.
- Costello: original project was well received. On another project where a gate was installed incorrectly, the owner/contractor are working diligently to fix it at great cost. Disappointed to see carport turned garage.

2/12/2019 DELIVER NEXT MEETING:

- 24x36 boards, presentation materials are inadequate
- Key photos to drawings

- Photos of streetscape adjacent to project along with aerial/satellite view
- Bring previously permitted Exhibit A
- Must correct or explain enclosed carport.
- Please ensure drawings are accurate, this is a controversial item
- Diagram with view triangle/gates/and yard setbacks, and gate clearance setback
- Exhibit for height conformance

2/19/2019 APPLICANT PRESENTATION Kivel, Epley

- Gates are discretionary. Have new larger exhibits and photos to share.
- 2 gates: 1 on park row, 1 on Silverado. City issue that there is not 20' auto "queue" space off the ROW. Applicant believes gates are in keeping with the character. Sliding gates do not interfere with pedestrian sidewalks.
- Not providing the 20' discourages parking from parking and blocking sidewalk.
- Gate is set back from line of white fence on property to East.
- Gate 2 (on Park Row). Very low planter curbs in ROW (requiring EMRA)
- Applicant believes they are beautifying street along Silverado.
- What is curb to gate and edge sidewalk to gate. 15'-8" back of sidewalk to gate on Silverado.
- 21'-5" from curb to gate. Backing out looking at 4 or 5' high wall.
- Perimeter walls were cut down to clear visibility triangle.
- Gates do NOT encroach into ROW. Contradiction to project description. Actually Park Row gate is in ROW.
- Costello, discussion of items that are non-compliant from city cycle issues. (all those items are being addressed, they are being corrected) AC units are now approved. Trellis is in setback. Bird wire height issue. Changing the plans. These issues are all on permit.
- Costello: Issues are on permit request, not actually approved. Do ACs pass Noise ordinance?
- Entire project under review.
- Bird stations exceed 15' height limit on accessory structure (approx. 16'-8")
- What other homes in area have a sliding gate? None identified. Some around the corner. Nearest are on Ivanhoe and Cave st (within 75 yds approx.)
- Per surveyor and applicant drawing, there is 13-7 curb to PL

2/19/2019 PUBLIC COMMENT

- Weiss – neighbor, trustee of CPA (would recuse if necessary). Factual observations: Own 3 houses in the neighborhood. Mother in law's house wraps around project site. Front side of park row gate is 4-5 into prowl, using 10' surveyors mark, 3-10 from sidewalk. Silverado gate not quite parallel to sidewalk and higher. Plan distance (center is 13-8 from sidewalk +/-3" each end). Transparency of gate should be 80% open above 3'. Driveway on park row is excavated, steep incline to Park Row. Retaining wall built to retain for excavation. 3' ht of wall should be relative to height of driver. But can't lower wall further. Concerned about main structure height. AC condensers are very close to adjacent house. Not shielded. Carport has been enclosed and may exceed FAR. House is quite different from neighborhood, gates exacerbate this. Applicant reported neighbors in support, I own the adjacent home on both streets and they are not in favor.
- 115" gate to curb
- Merten – Is the gate on the public side of the fence (yes). Is there any protective device to shield the public (No).

- Merryweather – Project is not in conformance with neighborhood, no sliding gates on park row or residential side of Silverado. Completely different than neighborhood.

2/19/2019 COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Concerns for sliding gates in PROW
- Costello: infrequent that city writes scathing cycle issues. City “unacceptable”. Can’t support this project. EMRA is not listed, not in favor. Gates should be corrected. Contention on height limit.
- Will: track appears a few feet into PROW from photos. Not adjacent to wall.

2/19/2019 DELIVERABLE FOR NEXT MEETING

- Accurate plans, exhibits should address all project parameters
- Better site photos.
- Committee members to measure this themselves.