

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Agenda – Tuesday Nov 19, 2019 – 4:00 pm
La Jolla Recreation Center – 615 Prospect Street, Room 1
La Jolla, California

-
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.*
-

1. NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

- Meeting Nov 12, 2019
-

3. FINAL REVIEW - 11/19/2019

Project Name: Pearl Mixed Use– 801 Pearl St
Permits: CDP
Project No.: 638970 DPM: Will Zounes
Zone: RM-1-1 Applicant: David Bourne
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/638970>

LA JOLLA- (Process 2)*AFFORDABLE HOUSING EXPEDITE PROGRAM* CDP to clear the site of a demolished service station, to construct a 20,595 SF 2 story mixed use building consists of 2 retail units, & 26 residential rental units with on grade garage. The project will include 2 affordable housing units, located at 801 Pearl Street. The 0.48-acre site is in Zone 4 of La Jolla Planed District, the RM-1-1 Zone & Coastal Overlay (non-appealable 2) of the La Jolla Community Plan Area. Council District 1.

11/12/2019 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION (Bourne, Murfey, Charles)

- Certain parts of LJ are less than attractive, intend to build something beautiful and LJ can be proud of. Assembled a top notch team to build something positive.
- Need: LJ rents are expensive and very few new units
- Why not build the previous 12 unit condo project? Current proposed is a better fit to needs in LJ, smaller total area, smaller commercial space, similar residential area.

- Result will be less traffic, attractive building.
- Walkable effective retail, Fewer inhabitants than previous 12 unit condos,
- Designed to accommodate future generations, young professionals, teachers, fireman, police can live in the community they serve.
- Some units will be partially subterranean
- At grade parking off Eads not visible
- Trash on Bishops Ln
- 4' grade differential
- 6 ground level units with basement in back (South)
- 18' from back of building to rear (South) PL
- 6 units at rear 400sf on grade, + 400sf basement
- Entry to second floor NE corner, outdoor open to sky circulation between units.
- Upstairs 4 units over commercial on Pearl
- 2 2bedrooms along Eads and Bishops each
- 3 1 bedrooms open towards the interior of lot
- 6 studios along the rear property
- Balcony each 4 facing Pearl
- Stucco, split face CMU, Glass, Tile, Metal
- Two balconies on Bishop's Ln, Screened enclosure for parking
- Eads St – Open garage entry two balconies, plus outdoor BBQ common area at corner of Eads/Pearl
- 12-10 floor to floor, 14 floor to ceiling, just under 30' at upper limit
- SDGE easement at SE corner, 10' x 47' loading zone
- No back door to commercial
- Turnaround space in covered garage.
- ADA along streets and sidewalk, from parking, out to street. Only ground floor units from ramp and back walkway – no elevator access anywhere
- 5 spaces for retail provided. 18 spaces for residential for 26 units.
- Applicant would like to see bus connection to trolley, willing to support however follow.

11/12/2019 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Orvis – density is too much, too many units, furnished implies transient in nature, we don't want that. Not family oriented. Eads is already a parking dilemma
- Amorosa – Any plan to change traffic on Pearl, new light? Other? (applicant does not know), seen many accidents, nearly hit daily. Incredibly concerning from safety standpoint. (Kane: what traffic improvements could be made?) Amorosa doesn't know either. Too much going on.
- Hammond: I was hit at this intersection, unprotected
- Wolfgang: Need a project on this lot. Gas station is not it. Prior proposal was better. Too dense. Increased traffic on Eads will be substantial. Turning left out of that driveway will cause accidents. Trucks will impact Bishop's Ln. Been hit at this intersection. Will hurt property values. Eads already has small rental units and this project will effect those rates.
- Moranville: requests a traffic study, last study done on a Sunday. Need to see school day congestion.
- Anastazi: Speed on Eads is excessive, Racing to beat stop light, retail space abundance of vacancy in LJ. No parking good luck getting tenants. (Applicant must do retail, not by choice, but proposing smaller commercial footage than previous design)
- Hammond: Red curb on Pearl? Currently red between gas station curb cuts. Will they add parking on Pearl? (Applicant: closing curb cuts will increase safety) Probably no parking there.

- Hammond: Biking on Pearl is very dangerous, please do not propose parking that would narrow Pearl further. Question about climate/green (Applicant: 2 EV charging stations, Meet/Exceed T24, San Diego CAP – Climate Action Plan, No solar currently proposed. Construction environmental sensitivity, diverted from land fill) How many bedrooms? (30 bedrooms total) Only 23 parking spaces.
- Wolfgang: How many parking spaces in previous project? (40)
- Moranville” Condition of soil with respect to contaminants (Applicant: Former tanks were relatively new, tanks removed, additional potential contaminants, County has Voluntary Action Plan, you have to build a project, county monitors soil excavation and removal, and then will provide clearance, overseen by county Health Department)
- Thompson: Why furnished? (App: Don’t want overly large furniture brought in, damage and disruption, They will look better “staged”. Young or young at heart walking residents, modern lifestyle)
- Anon: Concerned with short term rentals. (There will NOT be short term rental.) Will there be a resident manager (Yes) (Higher sales prices – lower cap - for apartments than for hotel)

11/12/2019 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Costello – PDO requires 600sf loading zone.
- Costello – Bacteria likely degrades hydrocarbons over the past 10 years.
- Jackson –
 - Physical impact of building, but not out of character from Pearl
 - Logistics of use, parking, traffic, concerned about parking
 - Looks like a hotel, Short-term rental ... that’s worrisome
- Jackson – Can applicant propose traffic safety ideas, if only as a proof of concept
- Kane – Commercial is not so robust downtown. Anything we can do. We need affordable housing, not. Can we assist with variance from PDO?
- Will – Comments about increased density, increased residents might improve LJ retail. Young people do not want single ownership cars. Ace parking is preparing for a paradigm shift.
- Kane – moderating a webinar regarding housing situation, need something new, up-zoning increasing density along transportation corridors. Why isn’t it being built? This is a nice building, still need to see how it addresses the transition to SFR to the South. Thank you to the team to add density in an attractive manner.

11/12/2019 – DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION

- Bring full-size drawings
- Demonstrate how back of project interfaces/transitions with adjacent residential to South
- Demonstrate vehicular circulation and parking
- Satellite/Aerial photos
- Street scape montage along Eads
- South elevation
- Traffic Study – and proposed solutions?
- Materials Board
- Landscape Plan
- Location of Bus Stops
- Cross section N/S showing building and adjacent residential to South
- Consider making a note on the project title sheet that you will not make short term rentals (less than 30 days)

- Streetscape montage (with your project along Pearl).
- Cross Sections to demonstrate relative massing
- Think about how we can help you to eliminate retail requirement.

4. FINAL REVIEW 11/19/2019

Project Name: La Jolla Mesa – 5911 La Jolla Mesa
Permits: CDP/SDP
Project No.: 639439 DPM: Xavier Del Valle
Zone: RS-1-2 Applicant: Tripp Bennett
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/639439>

LA JOLLA - (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for an addition to an existing 4,135 SF one-story single family residence over a basement at 5911 La Jolla Mesa Dr. The scope includes construction of a 1,175 SF master suite to the existing home, and a 907 SF companion unit over a basement. The 0.77-acre site contains ESL, and is in the RS-1-2 Zone and the Coastal (Non-APP. 1) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan Area, and Council District 1.

8/13/2019 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- The applicant requested to record this meeting. (no objection, applicant will share recording with Julie Hamilton)
- Building permit in place for existing one story, Active CCRs in place, CCRs don't allow second floor so project has to go out. Some back and forth with CCR jury, current clients have kids and want that extra footprint and accessory building. These were on the plans approved by CCR jury. They went back again to CCR jury and they were approved again.
- Site drops away from the street level.
- Addition at basement level. Single story at street level, then basement walk out and extends as single story at lower area where no floor above.
- FAR .21, 6,906 gross (includes all basement area), 33,815 lot size
- Roof deck from main street level, over extension of basement
- Detached companion unit even though no kitchen.
- Wood siding shingles and stone.
- Nothing proposed is taller than existing as viewed from neighborhood/street

8/13/2019 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Julie Hamilton:
 - Portion of these lots is designated parks and open space, need to see boundary before anything else.
 - Requested no roof deck of applicant, if done, requested cable or glass rail.
 - Companion unit is now 8' taller than previously reviewed
 - Serial permitting is a concern
 - Concerned about their private views being blocked.
 - Months of review and concerned if there are changes, would like more time to review.
 - Previously, there was good communication, recent activity has had less communication.

- Serial permitting even if a CDP still requires excess burden on neighbors
- John Frangos
 - LLC has owned this property since April 2016
 - Hillside review zone across my lot (per existing plans) would like to know where that line continues on subject property
 - CCRs/HOA: original plans were reasonable, then some more, then some more. Feb 2018 approval letter from CCR review, some elements have shifted since then.
 - Request story poles for latest revision of cabana.
 - Pool has risen in height, requires massive earth movement. 11' higher?
 - Would like to know more about drainage
 - Concerned about roof deck

8/13/2019 – COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

- See deliverables only

8/13/2019 – DELIVER FOR NEXT TIME

- Land use open space designation boundary
- Hillside Review boundary
- Satellite image wider
- Cross section to demonstrate recent grading
- Section showing 6' solid front wall proposed
- Do not want to see HOA/CCR issues unless tied to staff cycles.
- Layman's exhibit on drainage

8/20/2019 – APPLICANT PRESENTATION

- Clients are here today.
- Reviewed requested Deliverables
 - Open space boundary (planners say to default to ESL, city will request a covenant of easement. "red" Overlay confirming line for ESL. Development within 5' proposed ESL line.
 - Hillside Review defers to "Steep Hillsides" based on 25% for 50 feet or taller or 200% slope 10' tall.
 - Reviewed satellite views
 - Site sections: towards street and each longitudinal with neighboring homes shaded in. nothing proposed taller than street level. All down hill.
 - 6' solid wall replaced with 3' solid rock and 2' open on top. This is new and needs to go through CCR committee although less than previous. Trying to mimic neighbor. Wall is 2' back from PL with 2' planting.
 - Drainage: Collect and route to rip rap dissipator. Discharging to landscaped area.

8/20/2019 – PUBLIC COMMENT

- Julie Hamilton:
 - Development should minimize disturbance to hillside. Worried about natural features.
 - 10' between deck and edge of ESL. Building is further out than neighbor's buildings.
- Kiara O'Shea (owner): grade was going to hinder wishlist. Pool at grade would be 20'+ down from main house. Would not be used. Want to look for long-term livability.
- JohnFrangos: CCR approved plans have pool and cabana, it was fine with me. It was 5' lower. Disagrees with city determination of where open space line occurs.

- Stacy Kanaan: CCR juror and neighbor. Architect has been cooperative up until ... discussion of CCR approvals and private view concerns. Concerned about scale of project and harmony with neighbors. Will there be some way for neighbors to talk about it with applicant team?
- Ziegfried Reicht: what if everyone did that? No other structures go out that far
- Julie Hamilton: Began in 2016. Changes were being made and did not know until 11th hour. Would like to resolve this between neighbors.

8/20/2019 – COMMITTEE DELIBERATION

- Leira: consider less solid and more open front wall/fence.
- Leira: can you add pervious pavers around pool? (applicant's engineer: They are problematic)

8/20/2019 – DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION

- Discuss issues with neighbors
- Look at alternative to fit within slope like lowering the pool and cabana.