

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Agenda – September 13, 2016 – 4:00 pm
La Jolla Recreation Center – 615 Prospect Street, Room 1
La Jolla, California

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

Issues not on agenda and within LJ DPR jurisdiction. Two minutes maximum per person.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Meeting August 16, 2016

3. FINAL REVIEW 9/13/16

Project Name:	Sea Ridge SDP / CDP	Permits:	CDP & SDP
	417 Sea Ridge Drive		
Project No.:	484426	DPM:	Morris Dye
Zone:	RS-1-7	Applicant:	Michael Morton

LA JOLLA - (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for the coastal bluff stabilization, existing deck demo, new deck with caissons, remove and install new retaining wall to reinforce pool structure. The 0.24-acre site is located within the coastal (Appealable) overlay zone at 417 Sea Ridge Drive in the RS-1-7 zone of the La Jolla community plan area within Council District 1. Prior Permit CDP#95-0310 SDP#74117 Active Code Enforcement Division Case No. 231149

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 8/16/16 (Michael Morton)

The various conditions and configurations of the project were presented. The area that is the subject of the Code Compliance case was presented. This is an area of weak soil that is primarily slope wash which has been eroded and then naturally recomposed in the area. The applicant reviewed the various repairs at the bluff edge of the property. The area is located above an area of frequent pedestrian traffic along the beach and the bluff frontage.

This condition has been monitored by the geotechnical consultant for signs of new movement and new erosion. The long-term goals are to provide a more stable bluff face, with materials that will be more durable and yet not deteriorate the condition of the bluff, to remove the slope protection elements that are not effective or which impose an unneeded load on the bluff, and ultimately to transition to landscaping placed with the intention that it will provide the long-term stabilization of the bluff face.

Several improvements at the face and the top of the bluff will be removed to reduce the load on the bluff face. These include the retaining wall, some columns, walk areas, and planters. The swimming pool (15'x40', with the

deep end at the west) will remain, and the weak soils adjacent to the pool will be removed as well. Additional supports will be added so that the pool will be stabilized to provide support at soils at a lower elevation in the bluff. The upslope area behind the swimming pool will be reinforced by the placement of a grid of piers in that area.

The Applicant relayed the opinion of Jim Quinn and the geotechnical consultant that the proposed work will not worsen the stability of the adjacent bluff.

A water collection system will be provided which will collect stormwater and runoff water from the roof and paved areas before it runs over the face of the bluff, with drains and piping that lead to a sump and pump which ejects that water to the street.

DISCUSSION

A discussion ensued about the approach to stabilize the site, and the concept of planned retreat of the bluff. The project appears to trade the existing improvements for materials that are erodible and will stabilize other parts of the site.

Mary Lynn Hyde has observed repeated failures of the bluff, and look forward to an improved condition of the bluff. She recommends that the pool should be removed, as it appears to be exacerbating the stability of the bluff. She has noted two sea caves have formed in the toe of the bluff, and they appear to be accelerating the erosion of the bluff. Lynn Reineman, who has lived in the area since 1977 has observed the area and would like to note that owners of the house to the west observed excessive planting and irrigation of the subject property which dramatically hastened the erosion. Annalese Kapteina observed that the cobbles and gravel on the beach are of a much smaller scale than the boulders that have been proposed for protection at the toe of the bluff. She also notes that the face of the bluff is contacted by water and waves during high tide.

Member Costello presented a review of photographs of the area and the condition of the bluff. The existing building appears to have undergone recent renovation and frequently has many cars in the area. The erosion of the bluff face appears to be continuing, and evidence of some local failures was shown. An area of cast concrete was observed at the bluff face, and it was noted that this was a part of the unpermitted work that was included in the Code Compliance case. The extent of the manmade work was shown in the photographs.

Member Welsh discussed improvements where some walls and a decorative treatment was installed.

The existing pumps are now working and ejecting stormwater and runoff water to the street.

PLEASE PROVIDE FOR FINAL REVIEW:

Please provide for the next presentation:

- a. Geologic report with recommendations and estimate of the future bluff life, and the effect that this project will have on the adjoining projects, both in the presence of wind erosion and slope raveling, and wave action.
- b. A site plan showing all landscaped areas on the site. Provide a landscaping report on the approach to the landscaping, areas of landscaping, and how the proposed work will conform to the landscaping requirements.
- c. A summary of the variances that may be needed for the parking and the two driveways.
- d. Please provide the business license and/or permits for the current use as a short term vacation rental.
- e. If the existing concrete mass at the west side is to be preserved, please provide more information on the extent of that mass and evidence that it will be stabilized.
- f. Provide a detailed drainage plan that includes the roof areas.

- g. Provide structural plans and sections through the deck and the swimming pool. There are voids shown that appear to not have been addressed.
- h. The erosion at the sea caves should be addressed as a part of the erosion mechanism, including projection of the future rate of erosion in those areas.

This matter is continued to a later meeting.

4. FINAL REVIEW 9/13/16

Project Name:	Steel Residence 7991 Prospect Place	Permits:	CDP
Project No.:	497507	DPM:	P.J. Fitzgerald PJFitzgerald@sandiego.gov (619) 446-5107
Zone:	RS-1-7	Applicant:	Kevin Steel

(Process 3) Coastal Development Permit for a 5,922 square foot addition to an existing 833 square foot residential single dwelling unit for a total of 6,755 square feet. The 0.126 acre site is located at 7991 Prospect Place in the RS-1-7 zone and Coastal (Appealable) Overlay zone of the La Jolla community planning area within Council District 1.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION 8/16/16: (Lisa Kriedeman, Kevin Steel, Drex Patterson)

The project was presented, with a review of the site conditions and restrictions. The driveway to the east side of the site is an easement for the rear properties. The various additions to the building were shown, in relation to the proposed project. Two parking spaces are provided, plus up to four parking spaces are provided in the basement that are served by a lift. The basement comprises 3500 square feet of the proposed building area. The addition to the house will be 63 feet from the street, and will provide a connection between the existing front and rear buildings. The Master Suite is located at a new top floor of the rear building.

The front building is a designated historic resource. The additions are planned to conform to the standards of the Secretary of the Interior. The historic review comments requested information about the support of the house while it is lifted to place the basement, on the roof shingles that will differ from those on the existing, and a protocol on the maintenance and repair of the existing windows. Members of the committee were concerned that the measures appear to create too great a distinction between the historic building and the proposed building.

A photo montage was presented which indicates the proposed addition in relation to the existing structures. The context of the neighborhood and the scale of the neighboring houses were shown in photographs.

PLEASE PROVIDE FOR FINAL REVIEW:

- a. Provide a large google photographic map of the area
- b. Consider changes to the design of the exterior that demonstrate that the proposed design is more compatible with the historic context, considering that this site was part of a larger site which was redeveloped with historic and new buildings. The primary approach could be the finish materials and the slope of the roof. It is noted that it appears that the neighborhood character has many examples that have the same roof slope.
- c. Materials sample board of both the existing with the proposed.

