

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANING ASSOCIATION

AGENDA FOR TUESDAY, OCT 20, 2009
LA JOLLA RECREATION CENTER, 615 PROSPECT ST. 4 PM

FINAL REVIEW

Project Name: **BELLEVUE LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT**
5421 Bellevue Ave. Permits: CDP & Parcel Map
Project #: JO#43-2394/180331 DPM: Michelle Sokolowski 619-446-5278
msokolowski@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-7 Applicant: Debi Bright (858) 614-5045
DBRIGHT@rbf.com
Steven Hawxhurst
SHAWXHURST@rbf.com

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit & Parcel Map for a Lot Line Adjustment to adjust the south property line of Lot 13 approximately 23 ft for inclusion to the neighboring property in the RS-1-7 zone within the La Jolla community plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area. Notice Cards =2.

Please provide the following for final review:

- 1.) Provide street photo of subject property**

Project Name: **DICKINS / JOHNSTON**
9410 La Jolla Shores Drive Permits: CDP
Project #: JO#43-0271/149344 DPM: Diane Murbach 619-446-5042
dmurbach@sandiego.gov
Zone: RS-1-4 Applicant: Heather Johnston 858-453-7666
hjarch@sbcglobal.net

Scope of Work:

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing residence and construct a 5,794 sf single family residence on a 15,061 sf site in the RS-1-4 zone within the La Jolla community plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Height Limit, First Public Road Way, Residential Tandem/Beach/Campus Parking Impact, MCAS, Potential Historic District, Notice Cards =1.

Please provide the following for final review:

- 1.) Provide evidence of neighborhood approval**
- 2.) Show angled setbacks on section**
- 3.) Provide photos of adjacent neighbors**

PRELIMINARY REVIEWS

Note: Final Action can be taken at Preliminary Review if the Committee feels that it is warranted.

Project Name: **PROSPECT RESIDENTIAL CARE**
484 Prospect St. Permits: CUP
Project #: JO#43-2406/180343 DPM: Helene Deisher 619-446-5223
hdeisher@san Diego.gov
Zone: 5A LJPDO Applicant: James Alcorn 858/ 459- 0805
james@jamesalcorn.com

Scope of Work:

(Process 4) Conditional Use Permit to change the use from office to residential care facility in an existing 17,838 sf building in Zone 5a of the La Jolla Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable & non appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem.

Project Name: **SOROKIN DUPLEX**
247 Kolmar St. Permits: CDP
Project #: JO#43-2604/190364 DPM: Tim Daly (619) 446-5356
tdaly@san Diego.gov
Zone: RM-1-1 Applicant: David Linn 858-459-8180
linnarch@gmail.com

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish existing residence and construct two residential for rent units on a 0.11 acre site in the RM-1-1 zone within the La Jolla community plan, Coastal Overlay (non - appealable), Coastal Height Limit, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area, Council District 1. Notice Cards =1.

Project Name: **MILLER RESIDENCE**
1505 Buckingham Dr. Permits: CDP
Project #: JO#43-2229/177757 DPM: Cherlyn Cac 619-446-5226
ccac@san Diego.gov
Zone: RS-1-1 Applicant: Bruce Peeling 619-224-8575
bpaia@cox.net

Scope of Work:

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing residence and construct a 9,621 sf single family residence on a 0.90 acre site in the RS-1-1 zone within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit. Notice Cards = 1.

This project was previously reviewed by the LJ DPR and a motion was made for preliminary approval on July 21, 2009.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION – *15 min time limit*

Topic: Categorical Exemptions for Single Family Development

- Review previous public meeting notes
- Updates from City
- Comments / Decisions

Last discussion on this topic by the LJ DPR was in April 2009 with Dan Joyce from the City. Notes from that meeting are attached.

La Jolla DPR Committee – Categorical Exclusion
Discussion Points from April 14, 2009

DRAFT

Categorically excluded projects (as qualified in the handout provided by City staff) would receive ministerial review and would be approved by City staff provided the project complied with all the applicable requirements of the Land Development Code. Staff also provided a breakdown that illustrated the reduction in structure size according to base zone. The concerns and discussion revolved around the following issues.

- Categorically excluded projects would not receive community review and input on consistency with the community plan. Related to this concern is that staff has from time to time missed items during the review process and that community review provides an extra set of eyes that can double check and perhaps catch missed items.
 - It was discussed that the purpose of the categorical exclusion is to offer incentives for smaller and shorter structures, and that every additional review adds to time, costs, and uncertainty to the process. A ministerial process is one that requires the project comply with the development regulations. Adding a community review to a ministerial process could prove to be frustrating in that community input that did not directly relate to implementation of the regulations would not need to be incorporated into the project.
 - It was discussed that perhaps something similar to a preliminary review process could be established that would allow the community group or committee to review projects. The timing of the review would need to occur before or during the City review period.
- Projects cannot be categorically excluded if they need a site development permit. Two concerns were raised related to hillsides and drainage.
 - Drainage was raised as a concern. It was felt that the regulations were not properly addressing how drainage patterns were being affected when grading was done. There were no drainage experts available to address the concern. Some thought that the categorical exclusion should address this. However, by the end of the discussion there seemed to be consensus that if in fact there was a problem with the citywide regulations for drainage then those regulations should be amended to address the problem in all of the city and not just the coastal areas.
 - Steep hillsides are considered environmentally sensitive lands and a Site Development Permit is required if there are impacts to steep hillsides. They are defined as a continuous system including off-site with an average gradient of 25 % or more and an overall height of 50 feet. Key is that the hillsides must be natural. Part of the concern relates to manmade hillsides that still function as

visual open space in the community. The concern regarding the steep hillsides seemed to focus on the larger parcels extending up onto the west facing hillsides. There was discussion that perhaps the categorical exclusion could be modified so that projects that impact any “Steep hillside” (including manmade) would be disqualified from the categorical exclusion. Another consideration was that perhaps the categorical exclusion place a limit on lot size since most of the properties of concern were significantly larger than most residential lots. Consideration could be to remove lots of more than 10,000 square feet or 15,000 square feet, or to remove from consideration zones that have a large minimum lot size.

- An overall discussion was that the categorical exclusion should be kept simple and not made overly complex. Creating an overlay complex or onerous process would remove any incentive to building smaller and shorter than otherwise permitted through a CDP.