

**LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**

Meeting Agenda – Tuesday May 8, 2018 – 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 April 17, 2018

---

**3. FINAL REVIEW 5/8/18**

Project Name:	Colima Street 623 Colima Street	Permits:	CDP
Project No.:	575043	DPM:	Morris Dye
Zone:	RS-1-7	Applicant:	Elizabeth Carmichael

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing single dwelling unit and construct two, new, two-story residential units totaling 5,675 square feet (sf) (2,777 sf west unit, and 2,898 sf east unit) located at 623 Colima Street. The 0.11 acre site is in the coastal (Non-Appealable) overlay zone in the RS-1-7 base zone of the La Jolla Community Plan area.

**3/13/2018 - APPLICANT PRESENTATION AND QUESTIONS** Elizabeth Carmichael

- Currently two lots with one house and pool. Proposing two, two story residences (one on each lot).
- Current drive off Colima. Proposed two driveways off Colima.
- No roof decks (second floor decks, but not roof)
- Traditional architecture, mix lapped siding, shingle, stone
- Drought tolerant landscape
- West 25'-1.5" high, East 27'-11.5" high
- Neighbor West concerned about backyard privacy. No second floor windows on that side.
- Not an improved alley. City is not asking for alley access. Otherwise driveways would not be allowed.
- 8' between buildings, desire to differentiate
- Lots are 4,859 each. They were never joined.

**3/13/2018 - PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- Miller – what does this look like next to neighbors?

**3/13/2018 - COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**

- Kane – Looks busy, suggest to tone down, see in context of street
- Welsh – side facades are long and flat.
- Kane – Does single structure defacto consolidate the lots? Leira – Yes.
- Gaenzle – Thank you for garages. Concerned that additional curb-cut reduces parking.
- Collins – What is side setbacks. 4’ each, yielding 8’ separation at the narrowest.
- Gaenzle – Trees? Two king palms to be replaced with Jacaranda. Tree in property interior to be removed. New trees proposed but current will not remain.
- Kane – Can existing trees be temporarily stored and re-used on site?
- Collins – how long is unpaved alley? Entire block.

### **3/13/2018 - DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**

- Context with neighbors. Bulk and Scale, parking.
  - Street elevation or montage with both neighbors and both structures
  - Aerial photo with super-imposed project
  - Site plan with to include adjacent curb cuts and parking impact
- 3D or elevation to see how buildings stagger and corner materials.
- Materials board
- Evidence why alley can’t be used. City’s reasoning.

### **4/17/2018 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION** Elizabeth Carmichael

- Demo existing house that straddles 2 separate lots, replace with 2.
- Each unit has 2 car garage,
- All standard setbacks
- Craftsman style, comp roof, stone accents, shingles, batten board, horizontal siding
- Two story homes on either side
- Lapped (horiz) on one unit, vertical board and batten on other.
- Existing lots never consolidated (legally)
- City review produced certificate of compliance that it is two lots
- .60 FAR allowed for each (.59 and .57 proposed)
- Adding 4 extra feet to driveway width (net combined).

### **4/17/2018 – PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Adding a curb cut for second driveway, street loses on parking space.
- Mark Clevinger (neighbor to West) – Would like to see elevations to scale, Colima is a view corridor, Canary date palms to be removed? (yes), Will plans address storm-water drainage to street (Applicant Yes). (Landscaping adjacent to his property). Will city trees in greenway stay? (yes). Rendering is not precise or to scale. Where is proposed house relative to neighbors. Window at South West 2nd floor is intrusive. VERY concerned about that window as relates to pool and personal spaces on his property. Concerned about 1st floor windows viewing over fence into pool. FF of proposed is 6” higher than existing. Requested designer to visit property.
- Sally Miller – Air-conditioned? Where? (condenser required 4’ from PL, but don’t know where.)

### **4/17/2018 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**

- Straddled lot “means” they are combined (if not legally consolidated).
- Sensitive to issue of window looking into backyard.
- Glad you have garages

- How is neighborhood laid out.
- Immediate neighbor issues are still community issues.

**4/17/2018 – DELIVER FOR NEXT TIME**

- Section through, with fence and outline of house
- Overall dimensions to compare.
- Montage to see homes 2-3 on either side.
- Hard elevations including adjacent neighbors
- Please consider removing window
- Any necessary exhibits to demonstrate privacy
- Aerial photo of the entire block, one with proposed home.

**City approval of two distinct lots.**

---

**4. FINAL REVIEW 5/8/18**

Project Name:	Bonair Townhomes CDP 744 Bonair Street	Permits:	CDP
Project No.:	579587	DPM:	<b>Martha Blake</b>
Zone:	RM-1-1	Applicant:	Joshua Kordesiewicz

(Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing duplex and construct two (2) new detached two (2) story single dwelling units with Unit A construction of 2913 square feet and Unit B construction of 2903 square feet for a total of 5816 square feet located at 744 Bonair Street. The 0.14 acre site is in the Coastal (Non-Appealable) overlay zone in the RM 1-1 base zone of the La Jolla Community Plan Area.

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION (2/13/2018) Joshua Kordesiewicz**

- Currently there is a two-story single family home.
- Proposed 2 freestanding 2-story over basement townhomes
- 60'x102' lot in RM-1-1 zone, .75 FAR, .749 proposed
- Four parking spaces in 2 garages and 2 carports, Auto lift in one garage provides 5<sup>th</sup> parking space. (allowed per tandem overlay zone)
- Roof decks with PV panels over no deck area
- 29'-10" max height from low side of lot. 10' ceilings first floor with sunken living room at 13'9" ceiling. 9' and 10' ceilings upstairs
- Approximate 5' grade front to back

**PUBLIC COMMENT (2/13/2018)**

- Davidson: next door neighbor, concerned about size of project, roof decks impose on privacy.
- Merten (representing Davidson): Drafted 3 letters to city regarding issues (circulated to committee members).
  - Building is too big, portion of carport with habitable above should be counted in FAR. Phantom floor area in living room should be counted. Basement areas over 3.5' above

- grade should be in FAR. The living room floor to floor above exceeds 15' which triggers the phantom floor rule and FAR should be counted twice for that area.
- There is a vertical wall that encroaches into the 45 degree angled front setback
- There are drawing inconsistencies. A window on the front elevation is shown as a parapet wall in section.
- Bathtub pop-outs encroach into side setback
- Suggestion to remove parapets and end vertical wall at gravel stop flush to roof surface
- Not enough parking provided, 4 proposed, 5 required
- Architectural design elements (horizontal bands) reduce the internal spacing between buildings to less than 6'
- Vertical wall on deck of easterly unit blocks neighbors view
- Applicant response to above items: (the applicant presented an updated set of drawings from those distributed to LJCPA and reviewed by Merten)
  - The habitable/enclosed space over the carport was pulled back and overhangs less than 4' and is exempt from FAR. The carport is 75% open on 2 sides
  - The lot has a slope exceeding 5% allowing 5' of basement projection before counting as FAR, basement does not exceed 5' above grade
  - The bathtub pop-outs meet the city definition of a bay window and are exempt from FAR
  - A 5<sup>th</sup> parking space is provided by car lift in a tandem parking zone allowable
  - The floor to floor height which exceeded 15' was reduced to less than 15', no need to double count FAR
  - The code allows roof overhangs to encroach into setbacks and solid elements including walls to encroach into the angled front and side setbacks up to 1/3 of the envelope width.
- Merten: The neighbors request that the master bedroom ceiling be lowered by 1' and that the parapets be removed per the detail provided
- Sim: applicant has maximized every allowable "trick" in the municipal code. There is a dark canyon between the buildings, the car lift is an unrealistic solution to parking concerns. The driveway width should be limited to 12'. Privacy concerns over proximity of rear patios to neighbors. There are many duplexes in the neighborhood that use a common-wall design.
- Metz: Applicant may wish to apply for future lot split and thus needs separate buildings

#### **SUBCOMMITTEE DELIBERATION (2/13/2018)**

- Gaenzle: How do the roof decks relate to adjacent properties?
- Ragsdale: What is the area of the "carports"? A: approx. 190 sf
- Kane: Asked about permeable vs impermeable lot coverage
- Leira: Prefer to see a commonwall design without the 6' space in between and apply that space to side setbacks
- Will: How did you arrive at a 14' curb-cut? Is 12' required in parking impact zone?
- Leira: The dominant pattern in the neighborhood is 50' wide lots with single structures. Two separate townhomes disrupts the character.
- Kane: The 6' space between buildings is a lost opportunity, dark, ugly. The applicant has an opportunity to lower the height at least 1-2'
- Leira: The 30' height limit is appropriate for pitched roofs. Flat roofs should be lower.

- Will: Before next meeting please confirm if there is or is not a condo conversion or small lot subdivision planned.
- Costello: Missed opportunity to transition between old and new and consider needs of neighbors. Wish to see garage/carport called a garage and see the FAR reduced elsewhere. Combine the buildings into one and increase side setbacks
- Gaenzle: Design is out of character, remove walls on front balconies, carports are ugly full of garage “stuff” no one wants to see.
- Will: What is the width of each of your units compared to neighbor to the east? A: Lot width of proposed is 60’ with two units. Lot next door is 30’ wide with one unit.

### **RECOMMENDATION TO DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION (2/13/2018)**

1. Please consider the following design changes.
  - enclose the carport and lose the FAR on the 2nd floor
  - combining both structures into one to increase side setbacks and replicate single structure massing/rhythm on street
  - lower the structure height including reducing parapets
  - remove vertical element on South East corner of front balcony
  - stepping the second floor back from the street and the wall below
2. Please provide a streetscape image/collage showing the proposed structure relative to the neighbors
3. Provide a section through the proposed structures and the immediate next door neighbors
4. Provide justification for the 5% lot slope
5. Provide a birdseye or satellite view with the proposed structure, identify location of roof decks relative to uses of neighboring homes
6. Provide a materials board
7. Identify and provide exhibit to identify window alignment between proposed structures and with next door neighbors

---

### **5. FINAL REVIEW 5/8/18**

Project Name:	Webber Residence 622 Palomar Avenue	Permits:	CDP
Project No.:	587593	DPM:	Paul Godwin
Zone:	RM-1-1	Applicant:	Michael Morton

(PROCESS 2) Coastal Development Permit for the remodel of a 1,005-square-foot two story detached single family residence and converting a 488-square-foot existing detached second floor office to a companion unit at 622 Palomar Avenue. The 0.12-acre site is located within the RM-1-1 zone, Coastal (Non-appealable) overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

### **4/17/2018 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION Michael Morton**

- RM-1-1 Multi-Family zone. Area was spec homes in 60s.
- 8700sf lot, Existing 2 units plus detached 2-car garage with office above.



2. The Committee may elect to impose time limits on presentations by the Applicant, comments by Members of the Public, and other participants as judged by the Committee to manage available time.
3. The Committee may, by a unanimous vote, proceed to consider a vote of recommendation on a project presented for Preliminary Review.
4. This Meeting will adjourn no later than 7:00 pm, regardless of the status or progress of any presentation or other business.