

**LA JOLLA DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

- TUESDAY 4 PM -

La Jolla Recreation Center – 615 Prospect Street, Room 2  
La Jolla, California

**Applicants:**

- Please email your submitted plan set and Latest cycle issues and assessment letter to the DPR chair (brianljcpa@gmail.com) no later than **24 hours before the meeting** .
- Presentation materials for the meeting should also include materials board and/or color renderings, Aerial photo and neighborhood context exhibits showing the proposed renderings or site plan in context.
- Easles should be made available on-site. IT is recommended you bring some foam board to attache your drawings for presentation.

- 
1. *Public comments are an opportunity to share your opinion with the committee members. Comments should not be directed at the applicant team*
  2. *Public comments will be strictly limited to **2 minutes per person**. Please review the following meeting minutes. It is not necessary to repeat previous comments.*
- 

**COMMITTEE MEMBER ATTENDANCE:**

John Shannon, Brian Williams, Angeles Leira, John Fremdling, Greg Jackson, Brian Will, Glenn Rasmussen

**NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**POSSIBLE ACTIONS ITEMS:**

**ITEM 1: FINAL REVIEW 3/21/2023**

Project Name: Carvalho De Mendonca Residence – 6208 Ave Cresta  
Applicant: Flavia Gomes  
Project Info: <https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Projects/Details/690811>

LA JOLLA (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit to demolish the existing residence and portion of garage to construct a new two story, single-family residence with attached garage, balcony and patio for a total gross square footage of 7,497 at 6208 Avenida Cresta. The 0.20-acre site is in the RS-1-5 zone and Coastal (Appealable Area) Overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan and Council District 1.

**9/20/22 Applicant Presentation**

- Video presentation of project.
- Front fascade cast in place walls with perforated façade element “Cobogo” by well known Brazilian artist.

- Map of modern/cubic architecture
- Map of buildings that do NOT have red tile roof
- Laundry no longer encroaches, Added 24' height limit on plans and further from setbacks
- Comply with all limits
- Landscape plan will stay the same, renderings don't show landscape, but landscape will be planted per plans
- Owner have been contacted and in support. Immediate neighbors are in support. Neighbor sold lot with view easement which has been honored.

### **9/20/22 Discussion**

- Miller: Square footage to be demo'd (app: 2,035 sf, doubling the existing square footage, 400sf below max FAR)
- Miller: aerial or street view in context (app: showed aerial view, smaller than many in area)
- Merten: Angled building envelope, heights of walls exceed 24' on the side setback. (app demonstrated how it stepped back)
- Miller: Consider neighbors privacy (yes, they reviewed and are in favor)
- Jackson: Previous design required tall building forced to front, creates large mass in front, one concern was stark white/overbearing, this is better, understated, muted colors, interesting. Can the bulk be softened at front. Can the artistic part be smaller? No need to worry about red tiles.
- Rasmussen: the element left of stairs on first floor was exceeding something? (Height is 9'-6", new design does not increase height of this element to remain which has the previously conforming setback, no more balcony or handrail) what is glass column? (panoramic elevator)
- Will: 22' at street, 24' for elevator is not very tall.
- Costello: Very significant departure from character of neighborhood. Street is eclectic but this is extreme. Water concerns: I don't believe we should have swimming pools anymore, make sure landscape is drought tolerant.
- Shannon: Not engineered yet, the structure may change. (we have discussed with engineers and it is possible withing basic structure outlined)
- Rasmussen: Front yard setback (20', the laundry encroaches but not increasing the height, averaging high and low)
- Costello: would like to see more detail on landscape. Don't think it's compatible.

### **9/20/22 Deliver for next time**

- Add angled setback at each section
- Show street rendering superimposed with neighbors buildings on either side. How does it look in context?
- Dash in roof of existing garage on section through proposed laundry room to demonstrate no part is higher than existing. Do 50% of walls remain to retain previous conforming rights?
- More detail on landscape and watering requirements with respect to drought tolerance.

### **3/21/23 Presentation**

- Presented items from previous list
- McGinnis – How many bed/bath/garage spaces
- Applicant – 2 car garage, 3 bedrooms

- Leira – Pool concerns about structural
- Leira – any view corridors (applicant: none except for view easement owned by neighbor requires second floor setback.
- Leira – prefer to see more
- MOTION – Findings CAN (Jackson/Fremdling)
- Passes 5-1-1 (chair abstains)

## ITEM 2: FINAL REVIEW 3/21/2023

Project Name: Castellana Residence  
Applicant: Shani Sparks  
Project Info: PRJ-1062557

Process 2 - Coastal Development Permit (CDP), Process 3 – Site Development Permit (SDP) To construct a three-story, 10,120-square-foot 6,292 (SF) residence on an existing vacant parcel (APN: 350-541-0600) located at Castellana Road, near Crespo Drive. The 0.27-acre site is in the Residential Single Dwelling Unit (RS-1-5) Base Zone, Coastal (Non-Appealable), Coastal Height Limitation and Geological Hazard Categories (12, 53, 27) Overlay Zones in the La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Plan area.

### 2/21/2023 – Presentation

- Project Orientation
  - Actual GFA is 6,292sf where 6,312sf allowed
  - ROW dedication and street widening,
  - Underground parking/basement, 2 story above, 4 parking spaces
  - 1' below 30' Coastal Height Limit
  - Living on First Floor, 4 bedrooms on 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor
  - Tree well through decks
  - FAR conforms, Conforms to All Height Limits, Planning cleared these items
- Public Comment
  - Miller – What does glass look towards (distant views toward pier)
  - Merten – North elevation, NE corner projects above angled building envelope (applicant: will review and respond). NW corner of open trellis over height limit, 36' (applicant: will review and respond, roof projections allowed to encroach and vehicle access area does not define grade) Area to right (West) of garage door is not vehicular area.
  - Brun – Concerned with size and erosion during construction, not consistent with neighborhood size.
  - Ahern – Many neighbors have similar concerns, has there been Geotech review? Massive.
  - Henegar – Existing easement on East side of lot (applicant: easement is on neighbors property, will double check with Civil Engineer) Excessive bulk and scale.
  - Kinsella – Bulk and Scale, does not fit neighboring size trend, assuming this is a spec house, does not belong here.
- Committee Discussion
  - Leira – sections show 3 floors, take a look at 3 story façade, what happens to view from Crespo drive
  - Kane – My neighborhood, really big, out of context, right on street, vertical stone elements don't help, dramatic but inappropriate, Push it back from street. Subterranean areas need

- closer scrutiny, we've proposed code amendments, very formal landscape could be more organic – shouting “look at me”
- Shannon – Sometimes we focus on square footage, agree it stands out and could be softened, subterranean area can have destabilizing affects on soil stability and drainage
  - Williams – Question about geo hazard numbers
  - Jackson – Geo hazard brought up in cycle issues, What was required and done? (applicant: all this is closely reviewed, there is some bad soil on lot, excavation is helping with stability of hillside, great care taken with slope stability and shoring)
  - Costello – Would like to see geo report
  - Jackson – Do we have a clear criterion for bulk and scale? Not really.
- Deliver for Next Time
    - Extend section through lot Crespo to Valdes and homes on Valdes drive.
    - Review existing vegetation and what is planned to remain
    - Consider pushing it back
    - Consider overall height
    - Provide Geotechnical report

### 3/21/23 Presentation

- Handouts to respond to requests
- Project is not in steep hillsides
- Increased landscape in front – natural AND native
- Conforms to FAR
- Street to street section addressing neighbors views
- Adhere to codes for Bulk and Scale
- Project helps to stabilize slope due to existing slope wash and deep caissons to lock in place.
- Davis → Guest parking plus 4 cars in garage
- McGinnis → 6 bedrooms
- Shannon – Does basement deflect subterranean water flow onto neighbors? (applicant: waterproofing collects water at uphill wall and feed water to subsurface drainage to control water and prevent off site redirect.
- Ahern – Neighbors are concerned with bulk and scale, one sits across street and intends to plant large plants to block view.
- Unknown – Why SDP (first time lot developed)
- Williams – Roof eave compliance
- Leira – Is the neighbors sewer easement being used for a neighborhood path? (app: none on-site,
- Rasmussen – Would prefer to see house pushed back.
- Leira – would prefer to see pushed back. (app: can't bury 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, would loose bedroom egress windows
- Shannon – Why not push a retaining wall back to add giant light well
- Rasmussen – Prefer to see 2<sup>nd</sup> floor pulled back.
- MOTION – Findings CAN (Jackson/Fremdling)
- PASSES – 4-2-1 (chair abstains)

**ITEM 3: FINAL REVIEW 3/21/2023**

Project Name: 812 Havenhurst Pt  
Applicant: Jess Gonzalez  
Project Info: PTS-697754

LA JOLLA. (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for the demolition of an existing single family residence and the construction of a 12,979 sq. ft., 3-story single family residence at 812 Havenhurst Point. The 0.51-acre site is in the RS-1-4, Coastal (Non-appealable) overlay zones within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.

3/14/23 Presentation

- Applicant: Owner demolishing current 1-story house (2000 sq ft?) and building 12,000 sq ft 2-story+basement house where owner's own and extended family will live. House generally within existing footprint on street side, most expansion is toward and down canyon side. Much of space is underground in basement with windows/patio on canyon side, so excluded from FAR. 2 meetings with neighbors, some adjustments as a result. Applicant showed model of proposed house.
- Kharrati (neighbor): neighborhood long ago agreed to certain standards, and process for exceptions. Proposed house required exception to add second story, exception was denied twice by committee (even after adjustments).
- Jackson: DPR does not enforce CC&Rs, that's a matter for lawyers and civil litigation.
- Leira: Fair enough, but CC&Rs provide useful information about neighborhood character, which DPR can and should consider, and so the fact that proposed house is deemed by neighbors to be inconsistent with CC&Rs raises questions about whether it disrupts rather than enhances the neighborhood.
- Committee chair (I didn't catch name): talks about committee process.
- (much back and forth between neighbor and applicant about how proposed house blocks view, disrupts character, etc)
- Fremdling: Ceiling heights?
- Applicant: 10 feet.
- Fremdling: how can basement+2 floors with 10-ft ceilings comply with 30-foot limit?
- Applicant: 2nd story begins where basement ends, so there's no plumb line taller than 30 ft
- Leira: Model is great, but it just shows the proposed house in isolation, not in street/neighborhood context, and DPR needs the latter to judge compliance with LJCP.
- (more neighbor/applicant interaction--neighbors are clearly very out of joint about applicant's decision to ignore the CC&Rs; committee lawyer points out that "opposing counsel" isn't present, so clearly there are already lawyers jousting)
- Bring for next time:
  - aerial montage (3-5 houses each way) with proposed house inserted
  - streetscape montage ditto
  - whatever other photos or montages will help DPR understand how the drastically larger structure will fit into the area as viewed from neighbors, street, across canyon, etc.
  - cross section running from other side of the street through proposed house and down canyon to property line.
  - drawing or diagrams showing how proposed house's walls align with neighboring houses across setbacks.

○landscape plan

### 3/21/23 Presentation

- Exhibits to review bulk and scale
- Micheletti – There is a style, Maintained by CCRs, CCRs exist to keep style in harmony, All homes in cul-de-sac are single story from street and may have walk out basement, project was story-poled. Recently approved projects on street maintain similar style.
- Schwartz – Community of one story homes, only one 2-story home in 35 years. 57 homes exist, avg is 3,095 sf.
- Kharrati – Photos of all single story homes and impact on his private views
- Kirk – Concerned about ocean view corridors.
- Barlow – 14 opposed in the room
- Applicant – 6 homes are not their own CCR, Largest home in Sub-division is 6,757 sf, City letter states this is a 7,069 sf, Story poles were of original scale before concessions to neighbors, upper floor reduced 27% floor area, 30% reduction on length of upper level (perpendicular to view) View is already blocked, only 4' further into canyon, 2<sup>nd</sup> story set far back from street, overall height lowered 2'
- Jackson – distinction of numbers for comparison, FAR vs Habitable Area – 9,590 sf,
- Leira – Difficult to see outdated model, Scale and Character in neighborhood is CA Ranch, one-story, rambling, simple, cul de sac is an entity in itself for character and is consistently one-street from street, Committee really understood CCRs, 2 and 3 story houses set back from front of view
- Jackson – What is our role here, If issue with neighbors Tort matter. Neighborhood has tried to govern itself through contract, should have consequences, also not our committee's role, Muni code: Specific limitations were not covered during this (technical issues), Plan issues, judgements is “good for LJ” Community character ... this is our core job.
- Rasmussen – What is our role
- Shannon – We are a community group if valuable insight, So many neighbors have come in ... neighborhood sentiment, invest in your committee, State allowance for ADUs does not allow for push back, Design is nice, second floor would be better if removed
- Findings CANNOT be made (Rasmussen/Leira) Does not conform to neighborhood character in bulk and scale
- Passes 5-1-1

#### ITEM 4: REVISIT ITEM 3/21/2023

Project Name: Adelante Townhomes  
Applicant: Ryan Wynn  
Project Info: PRJ-1073585

Coastal Development Permit and Tentative Map for the demolition of an existing office building, subdivision of one lot into 13 condominium units, and construction of one new two-story multi-family residential building with a basement level, covered parking, and roof decks totaling 21,485 square feet located at 5575 La Jolla

Boulevard. The 0.30-acre site is in the La Jolla Planned District-4 Zone (LJPD-4) and Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable 2) within the La Jolla Community Plan area.

### 3/21/23 Presentation

- Presented chart of which codes sections are waived or used incentive
- Both earned through providing affordable housing at city discretion
- Density bonus allowed by state law is met
- Leitner – PDO is not met, Needs to be a letter from housing commission to allow bonus, Affordable unit cannot be very low “for sale” 6% density bonus and 1 waiver only, Waiver only when you CANNOT make the project work, Why would you need a waiver for driveway width, Does not comply with 30’ PDO height limit,
- Terry – Nice project, cannot review with consideration of what committee thinks code SHOULD say, Does not meet conditions for low income bonus, 3 incentives required to waive PDO commercial requirement,
  - PDO height 30’
    - App: confident it is met
  - 6% not 35%
    - App: For sale properties can still get bonus and incentives
  - Ground floor retail
    - Waived by incentive
  - 29 units/ac (1 per 1500sf) and FAR bonus for mixed
    - Waived by incentive
- Will – What is committee’s role?
- Leira – could it be adapted for retail in the future
- Jackson – initial review came to soon, notice was not made prior to first review
- Terry – 9 units to 12 units, 3 incentives
- Notice was dated Dec 23<sup>rd</sup>, but posted on site Dec 9.
- Schmidt – Too soon, needs more review
- 

### ITEM 5: PRELIMINARY REVIEW 3/21/2023

Project Name: 7443 Eads Ave  
Applicant: Deborah Marengo  
Project Info: PRJ-1070073

Process 2 Coastal Development Permit. The permit is for the addition of a new dwelling unit, a new accessory dwelling unit, and a new Junior accessory dwelling unit to an existing single-family residence located at 7443 Eads Avenue. The 0.16-acre site is in the RM-1-1 zone, Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay Zone, and Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone of the La Jolla Plan area.

### 3/21/23 Presentation

- Existing home plus JADU AND new unit plus full ADU and map waiver to split
- Add 286 JADU to front existing unit, Removing garage, adding new garage and full unit above with 800’ ADU. 3 stories total at rear unit, Existing house remains single story, 4

parking spaces

- 5,355sf Maxing out FAR plus 800 bonus for 6,155 sf. 29'-4" height
- Williams – Did neighbors review? No strong objections,
- McGinnis – Beds/Baths – 5 new bedrooms, 1 existing, 4 parking spaces
- Motion (Rasmussen/Williams) MAKE FINAL – Unanimous
- Motion Findings CAN (Jackson/Rasmussen) PASSES 6-0-1

**ITEM 6: REVISIT ITEM 3/21/2023**

Project Name: 6110 Camino De La Costa  
Applicant: Matthew Segal  
Project Info: PRJ-1066101

LA JOLLA (Process 3) Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing 2-story residence and construct a new 3-story 10,567-square-foot residence with decks located at 6110 Camino de la Costa. The 0.37-acre site is in the RS-1-5 Zone and Coastal Overlay (Appealable) Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.

**3/21/23 Presentation**

- Contradicting information that historic structure CAN be saved, Met with HR staff, Needs full EIR, some alternatives that preserve house are considered,
- Meets all 4 criterion for designation
- Engineer says not very difficult to preserve structure
- 4 alternatives presented which preserve all or parts of structure
- Motion to submit these recommendations to HRB (Leira/Rasmussen)
  - PASSES 5-1-1
- Jackson - Fundamentally unfair to take action without applicant present,