

From: Mulloy, Richard <richard.mulloy@us.dlapiper.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 8, 2026 1:55 PM
To: Jean Crutchfield; Planning Mail Box; asmulloy3@icloud.com
Subject: Variance V25-002; 355 14Th Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of the Del Mar Planning Commission:

I am writing in support of the fence variance application for 355 14th Street. My wife and I live at 345 14th Street, which is next door to the property.

We have followed the Voigtlander remodeling project closely over the past 6 years. To say that they have invested substantial time, effort and resources into the modernization of their home is a massive understatement. Whereas the prior house, fence and yard were run-down and a refuge for rodents and other pests, the new, remodeled home enhances the neighborhood and our 14th Street community.

As far as the fence is concerned, it has been there for as long as we have owned our property. The recently replaced fence is much nicer than the prior fence, which was propped up by dilapidated wooden beams and bougainvillea plants that were not maintained and only further contributed to the rodent problem. We cannot see any difference in the height of the fence even though we have a reference point as a result of the connection between the Voigtlanders' 14th Street fence and the backyard fence that separates our two properties. In addition, requiring any additional work on the fence at this point will be disruptive to us and other neighbors on 14th Street.

We hope that you will consider supporting the Voigtlanders' request to maintain what has always been there.

If you can please confirm receipt of this correspondence, we would appreciate it. Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,
Rick and Andrea Mulloy
345 14th Street
(619) 743-4787

is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply to the sender and destroy all copies of the message. To contact us directly, send to postmaster@dlapiper.com. Thank you.



From: Janet Wilson <janet@silverhook.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 7, 2026 12:59 PM
To: Planning Mail Box
Cc: JGrewal@delmar.ca.us; PPosner@delmar.ca.us; PLeonard@delmar.ca.us; MRittenbaum@delmar.ca.us; MSpieker@delmar.ca.us; Karen Brindley; Amanda Lee; Jean Crutchfield
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting - Item 1 - Variance V25-002

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to support the staff recommendation to deny Variance Request V25-002. In general, I do not support any variance unless it improves public safety, and that is not the case here.

As the applicant states, the area is extremely busy because many Del Mar Plaza employees and customers park on these streets. Busy intersections require greater visibility. Additionally, the area lacks sidewalks, forcing pedestrians to walk in the street, where the only “safe harbor” is to step between parked cars. I have experienced this situation many times while walking with my dogs to the plaza.

For many years, the sightlines at both corners and along the driveways at this property have been obstructed. As noted in the staff report, the applicant has reconstructed the significantly over-height perimeter wall without prior approval and is now seeking a variance to retain those improvements.

Granting this variance would normalize a build-first, seek-permission-later approach, and the tall walls would continue to compromise public safety.

Cities have sightline ordinances because blocked visibility is a well-documented contributor to preventable accidents. In fact, Del Mar has many regulations requiring clear lines of sight at intersections, driveways, and pedestrian walkways:

30.86.150 - Street Corner Sight Distance

No structure, plant material, or other object shall be erected, placed, planted, or allowed to grow within 20 feet of the intersection of arterial streets or arterial-collector streets, as measured from the center of the nearest curb return or, where there is no curb, from the edge of pavement, in such a manner as to materially obstruct or impede vision from passing automobiles.

https://library.municode.com/ca/del_mar/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=TIT30ZO_CH30.86SURE_30.86.150STCOSIDI

23.08.074 - Regulatory Conclusions—Traffic, Parking and Pedestrian Circulation.

(G) The proposed development provides inadequate sight distances for motorists and pedestrians entering or exiting the property.

(H) The proposed development interferes with off-site circulation safety or efficiency.

https://library.municode.com/ca/del_mar/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=TIT23BUCO_CH23.08DERE_23.08.074RECORAPAPECI

30.92.040 - Development Standards

(B)(5)(e) ... Any vegetation proposed to be planted adjacent to a driveway shall be selected and located so as to maintain adequate sight lines to and from the property, and along the property frontage to the public street(s) and intersection(s).

https://library.municode.com/ca/del_mar/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=TIT30ZO_CH30.92HOELIMOVZO_30.92.040DEST

The staff report also notes that a new hedge has been planted along the street-facing walls and is “expected to grow denser and higher over time”. This new hedge, when fully grown, will further block sightlines, and if planted in the public right-of-way, it requires an encroachment permit. Any vegetation obstructing the specified pedestrian 5-foot “safe harbor” in the public right-of-way is prohibited.

23.28.040 - Prohibited Encroachments

4. Any Encroachment would create a trip hazard or other impediment that would interfere with safe pedestrian passage; and

5. Any Encroachment that would create an unsafe line of sight for pedestrians or motorists.

https://library.municode.com/ca/del_mar/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=TIT23BUCO_CH23.28ENPE_23.28.040PREN

110 Private Encroachments into the City Rights-of-Way

1.c) Interfering with or not accommodating safe pedestrian passage (retention/provision of a continuous, minimum five-foot-wide “safe harbor” along the edge of the paved roadway is the standard applied by the City)

<https://www.delmar.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/1956/110-Private-Encroachments-Into-City-Rights-of-Way-PDF>

Finding D(4) Would authorize or legalize the maintenance of any private or public nuisance. Approving this variance would allow excessively tall perimeter walls to continue obstructing sightlines, raising concerns under Finding D(4) because those blockages may constitute a public nuisance.

Del Mar’s regulations consistently emphasize preserving sightlines and visibility at street edges to ensure safe passage for pedestrians, and they serve a clear purpose. Approving this variance would be inconsistent with their intent and would introduce foreseeable risk to public safety.

Thank you for your time and effort on this important public safety issue.

Janet Wilson

Hoska Dr.