

LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday June 9, 2020 – 4:00 pm

Because of the continuing COVID-19 emergency, this meeting will be held online. You must register in advance to attend. Instructions and links are at <https://lajollacpa.org/agenda-instructions-for-online-dpr-meeting-4pm-6-9-2020/>

Presentation materials will be made available in advance of the meeting through links on <https://lajollacpa.org/agenda-instructions-for-online-dpr-meeting-4pm-6-9-2020/> Applicants (or opposition) please send all materials to the DPR chair (brianljcpa@gmail.com) no later than 3pm on Monday 6/8/2020. This must include your most recent Assessment Letter and Cycle Issues in addition to your presentation materials.

-
- 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**.*
-

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Costello: Notice regarding new city process, will we be able to review them in advance.
- Merten: Plans used to be available as hard copy. That is still the case at Alcorn&Benton. Is it possible to view them online. Could CPA post them?
- Kane: Rec center will come next week for information item.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

ITEM 1: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 6/9/2020

- Project Name: Cass St ROW Vacation
- Permits: ROW Vacation
- Project No.: 659043 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
- Zone: RS-1-7 Applicant: Charlie Sher
- Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/659043>

LA JOLLA (Process 5) Public Right of Way Vacation to vacate a portion of Cass Street and a portion of

the alley abutting 990 Van Nuys Street. The 0.117-acre site is in the RS-1-7 Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.

- **6/9/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

- West Driveway is unusable, Easterly driveway is on EMRA and could be lost in the future.
- Approached city to acquire and expand land.
- Inadequate back-out clearance. Additional area would provide room to turn around before leaving driveway.
- Driveway will remain in same place
- Lot Line Adjustment to expand size of lot
- Applicant will abandon request to abandon the alley.

- **6/9/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Merten:
 - Map to describe property.
 - There was a previous attend from neighbor to East to acquire diagonal space behind their lots. That may have gone through.
 - Google view, Some growth in middle of lot. Amazing cactus garden and trail. Like Anza Borrego.
 - Beautiful view has potential as park with a trail and some benches. Used to be a plicy in community to preserve unused ROW space as potential park.
 - Ask committee to visit site. Decide for yourself if this has public value.
 - Some large trees close to applicant's property. Would hate to see those lost or negatively impacted. (per owner: those trees are not there)
- Edge:
 - Father built first motels in the area. Bought both sides of LJ Mesa Vista and subdivided both.
 - I'm fine with Sher vacating this section of Cass street. Per comments to me, nothing can be built there. But nothing concrete can be built there.
 - Have a problem with vacating the alley. That is a critical access. (applicant agreed to abandon the request to abandon this alley).
 - Need to put a fence around my property. In favor of closing Cass street. No one should use it.

- **6/9/2020 COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

- Costello: How far up Cass st will vacation go (entire height of his property, up to but not including alley) How would properties above ever be accessed?
- Fremdling: All trees are gone, desolate, He seems to be using that area already. Would prefer to see applicant build a garage at street level. Some of these lots were previously available for sale. Could it be public park? It's currently an eyesore.
- Gaenzle: Could the applicant request an EMRA expansion instead of lot line agenda. (Yes, that is possible and city would likely grant it without community review.)
- Hunt: Confused by existing garage orientation (One garage with doors on both sides – drive-through). Would it be possible to regrade to make drive work? (applicant: no) Was there already an Easterly expansion? (yes to add second driveway) How wide is the additional area? (applicant: about 8' wider)

- Leira: Have problems vacating streets. Lots behind have no other access. Prefer to see Cass street whole. There is a solution. Lower the garage pad to also extend pad and make space. Was not that big of a deal. We should not vacate ROWs.
- Kane: Agree with Leira comments. What is owned by others? Advocate for a pocket park. The Spanish Steps in Rome is an example of an excellent public use of steep property.
- Will: Is there a cost (no) There is new development potential with a larger lots.
- **6/9/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**
 - Google/satellite map to include 200' perimeter
 - subdivision map with area in question highlighted overlaid with topo
 - Site plan of all in context.
 - Site section from Van Nuys to Alley through the parking area.
 - Exhibit identifying all private ownership parcels surrounding.

ITEM 2: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 6/9/2020

- Project Name: Bellevue CDP – 5610 Bellevue Ave
- Permits: CDP
- Project No.: 660209 DPM: Benjamin Hafertepe
- Zone: RS-1-7 Applicant: Adrienne Perkins
- Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/660209>

LA JOLLA - (Process 2) Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing detached garage, and to remodel an existing 1,002 square-foot one story single-family residence. Remodel includes a 773 square-foot first floor addition, 250 square-foot attached garage, 1,189 square-foot second floor addition with three decks, and one third floor deck located at 5610 Bellevue Avenue. The 0.14-acre site is in the RS-1-7 and Coastal Overlay (Non-Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. CD1

- **6/9/2020 APPLICANT PRESENTATION**
 - Originally permitted as a 50% exempt remodel. One of the walls was temporarily laid down to shore up the foundation.
 - Subsequently added one window otherwise the project is unchanged.
 - Property at corner of Forward and Bellevue.
 - Shared images of existing house and neighboring development.
 - Artist rendering of proposed two story house with roof decks, “Craftsman meets Modern style.
 - Second floor steps back on all street and alley sides. Only the West property line is shared with a neighbor.
 - One enclosed garage and one carport off alley
 - Materials pallet. Stucco, wood, stone, standing seam roof
 - Clarification of parking.
- **6/9/2020 PUBLIC COMMENT**
 - Merten: Site plan? (yes shared) Elevations did not relay articulation on Bellevue but floor plan does.
 - Feeney: Neighbor across Bellevue. Believes there were more changes in a previous design iteration. (applicant: That was all resolved prior to the wall issue and CDP. At this point

because the 50% rule no longer exists a window was added at the kitchen sink and is the only change) The site is a mess. All walls were laid down at one time or another. Side setback to West is 4'-2". Those are existing walls to remain. Surveyor has confirmed that the setbacks are correct. Concerned that carports get enclosed and 3rd parking space uses yard. There are 2 roof decks.

- Ashley Mackin: What are rights with respect to roof decks? Opposed to roof deck. Confirm Feeney comments. Work has been very slow and not professional. (Applicant: Original permits in May, then permit issue with property size halted project, then CDP issue halted it again.) It's a messy work site.
- Riley: Live 2 houses East. Oppose roof top deck, deck travels up hill, up Forward st.
- Neil: There is a large two story mass adjacent to West property. (Applicant: There is a major step back in the center of the West façade and various step backs.)
- Wilkinson: First floor plan shows a 1-car garage and looks like it could be converted to a bedroom. (applicant has no interest in doing that)
- **6/9/2020 COMMITTEE REVIEW**
 - Costello: Would like to see the East elevation. Concerned about carport and pushing FAR envelope.
 - Fremdling: Live up the street. It's been unfortunate. It made a travesty of the 50% rule. Concerned about the Feeney's front door is on Forward. Car parked on Bellevue. Should not have to see that. Decks are excessive. What is square footage of deck? Put up large rendering on front of job sites. Thank you for doing that.
 - Gaenzle: Site plan is not adequate. Where are the trees? Upper windows in center of West façade look directly into neighbor. Would prefer to see them gone since sliding doors on opposite side of hall. Too many roof decks ruin neighbors privacy. Concerned about height limit. Front steps are higher. Please clarify which trees will remain or be replaced. Colors look heavy.
 - Kane: Who is AMD Architecture (Applicant: I work for them) Will clients live on property? (applicant: yes). Prefer to reduce roof decks and pull back from edge of roof. Carports are excessive, let's see landscaping. Noticing: Was anything required when it was 50%, no. Contemporary Craftsman, front elevation is unfortunate, and diminish size of roof deck might improve that. Removing guest suite could add second garage and improve yards and landscape. Prefer to see roof deck railing buried behind sloping roofs.
 - Leira: Drawings are very difficult to read. Full site plan is needed. Concerned about carport. Clarify building heights. Roof decks are becoming fashionable but they need to relate the edges to the perimeter of the building and site lines. Location should be careful to protect privacy of neighbors. Color of glass (applicant: standard clear) Not in favor of smoked tinting. Prefer not to see people on roof decks. Prefer a solid parapet.
 - Jackson: Could we see 3D rendering from all 4 corners of entire house.
- **6/9/2020 DELIVER FOR NEXT PRESENTATION**
 - Confirmation from Surveyor that setbacks conform
 - Tally square footage of decks
 - Enlarged site plan on separate sheet with gates and fences.
 - Site sections both ways with survey of existing grade. (to go all the way across Bellevue and Forward.)
 - Street montage of full blocks (West view and North view)

- Elevations with grade in foreground to lowest point on property.
- Landscape plan show existing and new trees
- West Elevation with dashed or shaded location of opposite structure and their windows
- Elevations are hard to read, perhaps shading to illustrate articulation or additional 3D views.
- Color code floor plans on site plan (to help illustrate articulation/step backs)
- FAR and Lot coverage numbers along with permeable/impermeable numbers
- Outline with colors/shading, working drawings
- Satellite image with footprint of proposed project to include 300' radius.
- Key in locations of homes in neighborhood photos.
- Take a look at stepping back further and improve Craftsman roof lines

ITEM 3: DISCUSSION ITEM 6/9/2020

- Discussion of a draft letter on the **CITY'S NOTICING PROCEDURES** that is follow-up from our last meeting
- If a vote is to be taken, this will require a motion and vote to make this an action item per ...
 - *CP 600-24 Article VI, Sec. 2(a)(6) Brown Act. Sec. 54954.2(b)(2)*
 - *Adding an action not noticed on the agenda if 2/3 of the voting*
 - *membership, or every member present if less than 2/3 present,*
 - *agrees, BUT only if the need for action came to the attention*
 - *subsequent to the agenda being posted.*
- **6/9/2020 DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC COMMENT**
 - Will: Request button on DSD Home Page to link to existing map of permits.
 - Gaenzle: Project sign the size of real estate signs.
 - Kane: Letter includes reference to excellent noticing procedures in Pasadena.
 - We will add this to agenda next week
 - ...
 - Side discussion: Should DPR bring projects up for community review even if applicant does not want to advocate for projects.