

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

SAN DIEGO DISTRICT OFFICE  
7575 METROPOLITAN DRIVE, SUITE 103  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92108-4402  
VOICE (619) 767-2370  
FAX (619) 767-2384



# W17a

## ADDENDUM

**December 13, 2022**

**To:** Commissioners and Interested Persons

**From:** California Coastal Commission  
San Diego Staff

**Subject:** Addendum to **Item W17a**, Coastal Commission Permit Application **No. A-6-NOC-22-0023 (Passon)**, for the Commission Meeting of December 14, 2022

---

The purpose of this addendum is to make minor corrections and respond to comments received in response to the publication of the staff report. Staff recommends the following changes be made to the above-referenced staff report. Deletions shall be marked by ~~strikethrough~~ and additions shall be underlined:

1. Add the following to the list of Exhibits on Page 4:

[Exhibit 10 – Applicant’s Rendering](#)  
[Exhibit 11 – Skylight Plans](#)

2. Correct the second paragraph on Page 9 as follows:

In May of 2021 ~~January of this year~~, the applicant submitted the above revisions to the City to be approved through a Substantial Conformance Review process (SCR).  
[...]

3. Correct the last sentence of the first full paragraph on Page 10 as follows:

The appellant filed a Coastal Commission appeal on May ~~April~~ 13, 2022.

4. Add the following after the third full paragraph on Page 12:

In a letter responding to the Commission’s staff report, the appellant asserts that the change in the bridge height will further impact public views, specifically the sunset views during the spring and vernal equinox, when the sun sets directly between the two western structures. As previously discussed, the iconic sunset

views are from within the existing site seaward of the approved new building; the public view opportunities from outside of the Salk property are limited to a very small section of the sidewalk adjacent to North Torrey Pines Road and are partially obstructed by existing development, landscape, and topography. The applicant has submitted an additional rendering that demonstrates that the reduced height of the bridge will result in a minor improvement in the views from North Torrey Pines Road from what was previously approved (ref. [Exhibit No. 10](#)). The applicant has also confirmed that the Institute is open to the public during both equinoxes, so the public may request entrance and enjoy unobstructed views for both sunsets.

The appellant's letter asked whether the glazing on the atrium will be reflective and therefore view obstructing, and whether the split roof design is two separate structures, or if there's glass connecting the two sides of the roof. The applicant has confirmed that the glazing will have minimal reflectivity and the roof design includes a glazed skylight connecting the two parts of the roof structure (ref. [Exhibit No. 11](#)).

An additional letter submitted by a member of the public, Don Wood included assertions that the proposed changes will obstruct both public views and will limit public access. The views from North Torrey Pines road are currently limited and partially obstructed, and the proposed design revisions will not have a negative impact on these existing views. Regarding public access, the changes are minimal and are a part of a building that will be located where currently a private parking lot exists. There will be no change in public access either to the Salk Institute or to the ocean resulting from the development.

5. Add the following after the second paragraph on Page 14:

In a letter responding to the Commission's staff report, the appellant asserts that Substantial Conformance Review process failed to include review by the City's Historical Resources Board. While the Historical Resources Board was not consulted in the SCR process, the initial Historical review included a requirement that the building "shall feature a ground-level, two-story transparent atrium space designed to permit limited visibility along the same axis as the courtyard of the original laboratory building." The two-level atrium is still being provided and, as revised, the width of the atrium has been increased from 63-feet-wide to 70-feet-wide. Therefore, the design revisions proposed maintain and exceed the requirements of the original historic review and additional review by the Board is unwarranted.