



La Jolla Community Planning Association

PO Box 889, La Jolla CA 92038
<https://lajollacpa.org>
info@lajollacpa.org

Regular Trustee Meeting
Thursday 7 May 2026, ~6 pm
La Jolla Recreation Center
615 Prospect

President: Lisa Kriedeman
Vice Presidents: Greg Jackson
Harry Bubbins
Secretary: Adrian Feral
Treasurer: Glen Rasmussen

Regular monthly meetings: 1st Thursday. The public is encouraged to participate in Committee/Board meetings before LJCPA discussion:

PDO – Planned District Ordinance Committee, Chair Deborah Marengo, 2nd Monday, 4:00 pm

DPR – Development Permit Review Committee, Chair Brian Will, 2nd & 3rd Tuesday, 4:00 pm

PRC – La Jolla Shores Permit Review Committee, Chair Andy Fotsch, 3rd Thursday, 4:00 pm

T&T – Traffic & Transportation Board, Chair Erik Gantzel, 3rd Tuesday, 4:00 pm

Materials LJCPA makes available online or at the meeting are solely to support discussion of associated Agenda items at the meeting. Such materials may be subject to copyright; if so, they may not be copied, distributed, or used for other purposes without permission from their creator(s)

Attendance: Amos, Brady, Bubbins, Dye, Etienne, Feral, Jackson, Kriedeman, Leon, Pleiss, Rasmussen, Remen, Sacks, Venno, Will, J. Williams

Absent: Soriano (Williams resigned)

1. Approve Agenda

Motion to approved by PLEISs 2nd : SACKS

2. Approve Minutes

Motion to approve by LEON 2nd: Feral

Trustee Leon recommends that the times of Events be listed on the Agenda and minutes for the public be aware.

3. Swear in remaining Trustees

Trustee Amos and Trustee Sacks were sworn in by Council President Representative Juquin Quintero

4. Non-Agenda Public & Trustee

Comments Items not on the agenda, 2 minutes or less. No votes or action.

Ms. Emerson announces Tide of Creativity on June 20th

Ms. Neil kindly announced the risks of the proposed Capital Improvement Project for guardrail replacement on Torrey Pines Road. She presented a handout and had a PSA for the risks to tourists and bikers alike on the dangers of routing through this construction during the peak traffic season.

Trustee Brady brought to our attention the proposed city budget cuts to a potential closure of the LJ Rec Center and believes the City underestimates the use of the rec center for constituents of all of the City , not just that of the La Jolla Community Plan.

Consent Agenda

5. Consolidate & Adopt Committee Judgments Action Committee

The Consent agenda is approved by consent.

“APPROVE” or “REJECT” recommendations to which no Trustee objects, and which therefore become LJCPA’s judgments by unanimous consent without presentation, discussion, or debate. Anyone attending the meeting may object to and “pull” Consent items, but ONLY by citing grounds listed in OP §3.1.4. “Pulled” items ordinarily are voted on at a subsequent Trustee meeting.

5.1. 7460 Olivetas Av (1141236, Ma/Lopez)

Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to convert the existing grade level storage area of a 5-story multifamily building into a residential unit with a new elevator and access from the basement, located at 7460 Olivetas Avenue, also known as Assessor’s Parcel number 350-570-1800. The 1.55-acre site is in the La Jolla Planned District (LJPD-5) Zone, Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Coastal (Appealable) Overlay Zone, Coastal Overlay Zone First Public Roadway, Transit Priority Area, a High Paleontological Sensitivity area, within the La Jolla Community Plan Area. Council District 1. DPR 14 April: APPROVE, 6-0-1 (Materials: <https://bit.ly/4clRS8D>)

5.2. 5386 Galumet Av (1151746, Wellman)

Project is pulled from consent by audience participant : Tom Kook from Surfrider Foundation citing the 13’ proposed cliff set back of the building envelope is not in conformance with the Local Coastal Program.

~~Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing one-story, 1,957-square-foot single dwelling unit in order to construct a new two-story, 4,388-square-foot single dwelling unit with an attached garage and associated site improvements located at 5386 Galumet Avenue. The 0.15-acre site is in the RS-1-7 Base Zone, Coastal (Appealable) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan Area. Council District 1. DPR 21 April: APPROVE, 5-0-1 (Materials: <https://bit.ly/4tPsnIU>)~~

5.3. 8171 Prestwick Dr (1130929, Buchanan)

Applicant: The complete remodel and addition to the existing one-story single-family residence. The existing 2,151 sf will be remodeled and the addition will include 671 sf to the first floor and 3,157 sf to the second floor. The project will include new covered patios to the front and rear of the building on the ground floor and a new terrace and balconies on the second floor DSD: Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for a complete demolition of an existing 2,737-square-foot single-dwelling unit residence and construction of a new two-story, 5,979-square-foot single-dwelling unit residence with a 719-square-foot three-car garage. The proposed development includes new covered patios to the front and rear of the residence on the ground floor and a new terrace and balconies on the second floor. PRC 16 April: APPROVE, 4-3-0, chair broke tie (Materials: <https://bit.ly/489RgAi>)

5.4. 8504 Prestwick Dr (1113950, Marengo)

Applicant: The project site is located at 8504 Prestwick Drive, San Diego, California 92037, within the La Jolla Community Plan area, in the La Jolla Shores Planned District – Single Family (LJSPD-SF) Base Zone (APN 346-680-09-00). The lot is approximately 20,452 square feet (0.46 acres) in size. The site is located within the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone (CHLOZ – 30 feet), the Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable Area 2), and the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Campus Impact), and is mapped within a High Affordable Housing Parking Demand Area and a Moderate Paleontological Sensitivity Area. The proposed development includes demolition of the existing 2,637-square-foot single-story single-family residence and associated site improvements. The project proposes construction of a new single-story contemporary single-family residence of approximately 6,678 square feet with five bedrooms and five-and-one-half bathrooms, along with associated site improvements including a pool, hardscape, drainage improvements, and landscaping. DSD: Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing 2,637 square foot single-story unit located at 8504 Prestwick Drive. The 0.46-acre site is in the La Jolla Shores Planned District -SF Base Zone, Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Parking Impact Overlay Zone coastal impact and campus impact, Affordable Housing Parking Demand, Paleontological Sensitivity Area, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan Area. Council District 1. PRC 16 April: APPROVE, 6-0-1 (Materials: <https://bit.ly/4mF80pa>)

5.5. 2349 Rue Adriane (1145966, Magnus)

Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish a one-story dwelling of 2,046 square feet with an attached garage of 593 square feet and construct a two-story single dwelling unit of 3749 square feet over a basement 3-car garage of 901 square feet, and associated site improvements include retaining walls, located at 2349 Rue Adriane. The 0.41-acre site is in the La Jolla Shores Planned District-SF Base Zone, Coastal (Non-Appealable N-APP-1 & 2) Overlay Zone, Coastal Height Limit Overlay, Complete Communities Mobility Choices Zone 4, Environmentally Sensitive Area, Very High Fire Hazard Sensitive Area within the La Jolla Community Plan Area. Council District 1. PRC 16 April: APPROVE, 6-0-1 (Materials: <https://bit.ly/4txkRfu>)

Comments from Elected Officials, Agencies, & Other Entities

• Council 1 (LaCava): Joaquín Quintero, 619-510-6873, jquintero@sandiego.gov • SD Mayor's Office (Gloria): Fátima Maciel, 619-218-7083, FaMaciel@sandiego.gov • County 3 (Lawson-Remer): Quinton Grounds, 858-285-5243, Quinton.Grounds@sdcounty.ca.gov • Assembly 77 (Boerner): Sarah Shulkin, 858-481-7704, sarah.shulkin@asm.ca.gov • Senate 38 (Blakespear): Aurora Livingston 760-642-0809, aurora.livingston@sen.ca.gov • SD International Airport, Ivonne Velázquez, 619-400-2453, ivelazqu@san.org • SD Planning: Melissa Garcia, 619-236-6173, magarcia@sandiego.gov • UCSD Planning: Anu Delouri, 858-610-0376, adelouri@ucsd.edu

Pulled & Major Projects

“Major” if project (a) gross floor area grows >6,000 sq ft, (b) units increase >4, (c) units fall short of zoning limits by >4, (d) requires variance/waiver of major Code/PDO provisions, (e) is Process 4 or 5, and/or (f) is so designated by Committee/Board.

6. 2734 Bordeaux Av (1087614, Vercio) Action President Kriedeman Recused From Vote, Acting President Jackson is Abstained from Vote. Motion to Approve the Committees recommendation to REJECT the proposal as presented passes with a 8 yes 7 no 1 abstained (8-7-1) was brought by Brady 2nd Rasmussen. The project is NOT approved.

See Appendix: Public Comment Notes at the end of this document.

Applicant: Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for a proposed detached accessory structure consisting of a guest quarter and accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at an existing single-family residence located at 2734 Bordeaux Avenue. The 0.91-acre site is in the La Jolla Shores Planned District – Single Family / Residential Single Unit-1-7 (LJSPD-SF/RS-1-7) Zone, Coastal Overlay Zone (NonAppealable2), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, and Parking Impact Overlay Zone (PIOZ Coastal and Campus Impact) of the La Jolla Community Plan area within Council District 1 DSD: An amendment to the previously issued Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit 41-0314 for the Koster Residence for the proposed detached 1,190-square-foot (sf) accessory dwelling unit and associated site improvements located at 2734 Bordeaux Avenue. The 0.91-acre project site is in the La Jolla Shores Planned District – Single Family (LJSPD-SF) and Residential Single Unit (RS-1-7) zones within the Coastal Overlay Zone, the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Campus Impact), the Parking Standards Transit Priority Area, the Transit Priority Area, the Paleontological Sensitivity Area, and the Environmentally Sensitive Lands in the form of Coastal Sage Scrub, Torrey Pine, Steep Hillsides within the La Jolla Community Plan area, Council District 1. PRC 16 April: REJECT, 6-0-1 (Materials: <https://bit.ly/4clJuWx>, MND <https://www.sandiego.gov/ceqa/final>) Would set new precedent for encroachment into the canyon Proposed development significantly out of character with community Major per criterion (f), so designated by PRC

Other Items (Action as noted)

7. Capital Improvement Program (Emerson) Action: Motion to approve JACKSON 2nd KRIEDEMANN

The CIP is a multiple year forecast of the City's capital needs. A capital need includes various project types such as airports, bikeways, bridges, storm drainage and flood control facilities, libraries, park and LJCPA Trustee Meeting 7 May recreation centers, police, fire, and lifeguard facilities, street improvements and signals, sidewalk improvements, utilities undergrounding, water and sewer facilities, and pipelines. LaCava: “Unlike previous years where we sought your priorities, this year we are seeking your thoughts on the cuts, or finding alternative cuts as needed to balance the budget.” LJCPA list of CIP items and ideas to be discussed and approved by Trustees. LJSA, LJCPA, LJ&B, and BRCC will combine all items, bring back for final approval at May or June meetings, and then forward combined list to Councilmember. Materials: <https://bit.ly/3QHkMaH>

8. Treasurer Report

March 2026 Beginning Balance \$1,127.36 Donations +0.00 Expenditures -23.19 April 2026 Ending Balance \$1,104.17

9. Adjourn to Next Trustee Meeting 4 June 2026

Appendix: Public Comment Notes

6. 2734 Bordeaux Av (1087614, Vercio)

President Lisa Kriedeman has recused herself from the Trustees deliberation and vote on this item. Vice President Greg Jackson is acting President , whose vote was abstained.

The Applicant representative gave a project presentation on the scope of work. Emphasis on grading and as graded and prior CDP approval was had on the project site. The applicant thanks the CPA on scope clarification between the Development Services Department defined scope and scope of the applicant.

Public comment was open and the majority of the present audience made statements against the proposed development.

Holly Gibbon , a neighbor, wished to state the proposed development would be the only habitable space in the entire canyon and would set a precedent for encroaching into the canyon.

Emma Early wished to view more information on the as graded vs approved graded site and questioned the declared grading permits previously issued boundaries not being respected and limits being used to encroach into canyon space.

Gabriel Goodman, a neighbor, spoke to the facts and opinions in the biology report and wished to know if the facts were verified by the city reviewers. . The applicant principal, Toni Crissafi asserted that the facts were segregated from opinions by DSD staff and review comments had been addressed for the site to the satisfaction of the City Biology Review Teams.

Slain Schnieder , a neighbor of 56 years on the site, spoke to the natural wonders of the canyon to the dragon fly migrations, and seasonal variation of the canyon climate and fauna. She spoke to the permit experience of the prior development and community outreach experience and willingness to accept development within developable boundaries, and that this project also is pushing the boundaries of bulk and scale of the current site. She is opposed to encroaching into the canyon, even if it is in previously disturbed and graded soil as presented by the applicant.

Morene Mathews Brown , also a resident since 1979, spoke to the nature element and importance of the canyon scape, habitat , and prior preservation efforts of residents and community members of the canyon.

Martha Hillyard, a public member who served on various architectural committees, wished to speak of the conservation easement of prior development agreement violations, specifically to the limits of grading had at the time of the existing building being used as legal grading for this proposed development. She does not wish to see further encroachment into the canyon. From her perspective on her experience from within the canyon, the proposed structure would break the natural public view of the canyon.

Holly Gibbon brings into question the ADU regulation for the amount of stories allowed and gross floor area of the proposal. Though the project description claims a single story structure, the structure is a trilevel building. The buried area of the basement was questioned, but per SDMC definitions, buried basements are not counted in GFA calculations and thus the ADU proposed is in compliance with the state mandates maximum of 1200 sq ft, even though the structure's habitable space is larger .

Susan Pedigree , adjacent property neighbor owner, opposes the design, and encroachment into the canyon to maintain the canyon. She spoke of the natural fire cycles and risk the structure would have during a fire event and that those issues were not mitigatable and are reasons enough for relocation of the proposed structure.

Gabrie Goodwin , a neighbor, spoke to the prior development approval maximizing the building site already and the the adu exceed the bulk and scale of the properties ability to handle the development per the community plan. As a resident, Gabriel spoke to the disturbed drainage area as a by product of the construction and was not part of the approved development agreement, and that the city is overlooking the approved and actual disturbances. The drainage area was to be part of the conservation easement, yet the disturbed and graded area includes the drainage dedications and wished to understand the review process for determining previously committed areas as consideration for development in this case.

Kathleen Neil spoke in opposition , but would entertain a new version of the project in a less and more set back version. She applied to the aesthetics of the canyon, and reminded the audience of the unique situation this ADU proposes for the area. She reminded the audience and trustees of the LJ PDO and that this bulk and scale does not conform with the requirements of the PDO.

Jannie Emersion wished to know what extend of the dedication to ESL is replanted vs naturally occurring coastal sagebrush, and wished to remind the trustees that the disturbed areas would never be able to handle the sensitive vegetation the canyon has and replanting such species would not be a solution, as the biosphere has been altered and recovery is not possible after such extensive disturbance.

Mr Merten of Merten Architects, handed out a roadmap of the proposals violations of the municipal code. Speaking to the Fire Regulations, Sensitive steep hillside regulations, Merten asserts the project is in violation of multiple Municipal Regulations and should not be accepted

as proposed. 143.0142(a) (4)(A) is the principle regulation for steep hillsides in violation to the exceeding 25 percent of developed area proposed for the ADU in combination with the existing resident.

Mr. Crissafi , Principal of the Applicant, wished to confirm the main house is not part of this scope, that there are no variances, no violations, and that the audience presented several misstatements on the violation of the ADU into the steep hillsides development into existing grading area and that the owner wishes to preserve and enjoy the lot with an ADU.

A direct neighbor refuted the previous statement and confirmed that they are actually not living at the subject property since acquiring the property. .

Trustee Comments:

Trustee Leon, asked about the graded pad and as graded vs approved boundaries in the prior approval and if the grading review has already been performed for the project. Applicants spoke to the grading limits that were defined in the prior approved development agreement and are not being expanded under this proposal.

Trustee Bubbins, spoke to the need of more housing in the area as a matter of importance of collective experience, and that by adding more opportunities to share the environment the audience spoke to would allow for more advocacy and possible protection of the canyon preserve with greater numbers and community engagement.

Trustee Pleiss wished to clear the unfactual points and limits of the gradients in the proposed graphics displayed and confirmed there is confusion as to what is actually disturbed, and what was approved to be disturbed.

Trustee Etienne asked about clarification of the amounts of soilwork and the geotechnical reports confirmation of the depth of what was considered disturbed and is natural . The depth of the borings taken, and the change between the original geotechnical report for the existing development and the new confirmations asserted in the current geotechnical report submitted to the DSD .

The Motion to Ratify the Committee's recommendation to reject the proposal was discussed. Options were to vote to approve the rejection, deny the rejection and approve the project, or to table and have another project review at next meeting. The Motion to Ratify the Committee action was brought by Trustee Brady, and Seconded by Rasmussen. The vote was 8 y-7n-1abstained, and Trustee Kriedeman recused.

If error or omissions on public comments are present in these minutes , please contact: feralljcpa@gmail.com

— End of Public and Trustee Comment for Item 6—