LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE

LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Agenda – Tuesday May 15, 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 May 8, 2018

3. FINAL REVIEW 5/15/18

Project Name: Bonair Townhomes CDP Permits: CDP

744 Bonair Street

Project No.: 579587 DPM: Martha Blake

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 5th 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.
 - o 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.
 - o There is a vertical wall that encroaches into the 45 degree angled front setback
 - o There are drawing inconsistencies. A window on the front elevation is shown as a parapet wall in section.
 - o Bathtub pop-outs encroach into side setback
 - Suggestion to remove parapets and end vertical wall at gravel stop flush to roof surface
 - o Not enough parking provided, 4 proposed, 5 required
 - Architectural design elements (horizontal bands) reduce the internal spacing between buildings to less than 6'
 - o 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
 - o The bathtub pop-outs meet the city definition of a bay window and are exempt from FAR
 - o A 5th 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
 - o 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.
 - o enclose the carport and lose the FAR on the 2nd floor
 - o combining both structures into one to increase side setbacks and replicate single structure massing/rhythm on street
 - o lower the structure height including reducing parapets
 - o remove vertical element on South East corner of front balcony
 - o 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

4. PRELIMINARY REVIEW 5/15/18

Project Name: The Reserve SCR (Encilia Res.) Permits: SCR

6850 Country Club Dr.

Project No.: 582128 DPM: Glenn Gargas Zone: RS-1-4 Applicant: Kent Coston

(Process 2) Substantial Conformance Review to PTS 292065 for a 5000 SF two story residence. The site is located at 6850 Country Club Dr. in the La Jolla community and is within Zone: RS-1-4 / Coastal Overlay (Non- Appealable) /Coastal Height/ Parking Impact/Brush Management/ Very High Fire Hazard/ Earthquake Fault Buffer zones. Council District 1.



MEETING PROTOCOLS

- 1. The Meeting will proceed in three parts:
 - i. **Presentation by the Applicant.** The Applicant presents the proposal and Members of the Committee may request information or clarification. No public comment is heard in this part.
 - ii. **Public Comment.** Members of the Public may address the Committee about the proposal.
 - iii. **Deliberation by the Committee.** The Members of the Committee discuss the proposal. Note that the Members of the Committee may initiate questions of the Applicant and the Members of the Public during this part. The deliberation may lead to requests for additional information or to a resolution and voting.
- 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.