

**Mira Mesa Community Planning Group
Draft Agenda & Public Notice**

Date/Time: October 20, 2014 7:00pm

Location: Vulcan Materials Conference Room, 7220 Trade Street, San Diego CA 92121

Action/Information: All items noted as (Action) items may be moved/seconded as a Question for discussion and vote. All items not so noted will be information items.

Order of Consideration: Items on this agenda may be discussed in an order different than shown here for the convenience of elected officials, representatives of government agencies or other participants. The Chair will present such changes in the order of consideration for unanimous consent if there are no objections, or subject them to a motion/second and 2/3 vote as indicated by Robert's Rules (11th Ed., pg. 363).

Call to Order – In attendance:

1. Non-Agenda Public Comments: 3 Minutes per speaker. No discussion will be entertained nor action taken at this meeting on matters raised in Non-Agenda Public Comments, but a matter may be referred for further study and possible action at a future meeting.
2. Adopt Draft Agenda (Action)
3. Adopt Previous Meeting Minutes (Action). The minutes will be circulated among the members of the Executive Committee as a PDF document prior to the meeting via email. An opportunity to request corrections will be made at this point in the meeting. Should no such requests be made, the Chair will deem the minutes adopted by unanimous consent.
4. Old Business
 - a. Jolene Tomenga: Requesting stop sign at Acama & Andesol.
 - b. Sorrento Gateway SCR. (Action)
5. New Business
 - a. Crescent Heights Lot Split (see attached drawings). Lot split solely for brush management and not development.
 - b. Traffic Issues at Mira Mesa Blvd. & Westmore
 - c. Sorrento Ridge/Camino Santa Fe traffic signage/signaling.
 - d. Sorrento Valley Town Council Signage Request (Action)
6. Elected Officials/Government Agencies
 - a. United States Congress – California 52nd District
 - b. California Senate – District 39

**Mira Mesa Community Planning Group
Draft Agenda & Public Notice**

- c. California Assembly – District 77
 - d. San Diego County – Board of Supervisors District 3
 - e. San Diego – Mayor’s Office
 - f. San Diego – City Council District 6
 - g. San Diego Unified School District
 - h. MCAS Miramar
 - i. CalTrans
7. Announcements: 2 Minutes per speaker. Community groups are encouraged to promote awareness of their events at this point in the meeting.
8. Reports
- a. Report of the Chair: See assorted information attached to the agenda.
 - b. Stone Creek Subcommittee
 - c. Community Planners Committee
 - d. Los Peñasquitos Canyon Citizen’s Advisory Committee

Adjourn: 8:30pm – 9:00pm



UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION
P.O. BOX 452001
SAN DIEGO, CA 92145-2001

11103
CP&L/386196
September 30, 2014

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
ATTN: JEANETTE TEMPLE
1222 FIRST AVENUE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-4154

RE: MIRA MESA COMMUNITY PLAN; 4930 DIRECTORS PLACE, SORRENTO
GATEWAY LOT 2, PN 386196, APN 340-090-60

Dear Ms. Temple,

This is in response to the project review package from the City of San Diego which proposes a three-story medical office building and elevated parking deck within the Mira Mesa Community Planning area. On one previous occasion (July 2007), Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar submitted comments to the City of San Diego on a project at the same location. Due to project design and safety criteria changes, this letter now supersedes any previous findings.

On October 2, 2008, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) approved the adoption of a revised MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) that is consistent with the 2005 MCAS Miramar Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Update. As a result, any future development on this site is subject to new guidelines and recommendations consistent with the 2005 AICUZ Update, and will be examined using these safety, height and noise and overflight standards.

The proposed site is contained within the "MCAS Miramar AICUZ Study Area" identified in the 2005 AICUZ Update for MCAS Miramar. The project is: 1) within the adopted 2008 MCAS Miramar ALUCP Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area I, 2) within the 60-65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contours, 3) within Accident Potential Zone (APZ) II, 4) beneath the Outer Horizontal Surface of MCAS Miramar (Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77), and 5) beneath and/or near establish fixed and rotary-wing flight corridors for aircraft transiting to and from MCAS Miramar.

The legal parcel is approximately 6.96 acres in size and AICUZ guidelines specifically state that: 1) certain land uses are not recommended within APZ II; and 2) there should only be a maximum of 25 people per acre in APZ I and 50 people per acre in APZ II.

It has been determined that the proposed project is consistent with AICUZ noise compatibility guidelines. However, in order to be consistent with safety guidelines, we recommend that the project adhere to the following stipulations: 1) at any given time, there should not be more than 348 people on the entire parcel site (6.96 acres * 50 people per acre = 348); and 2) the maximum floor area ratio on the parcel site should be 0.22.

The proposed structural height does not appear to penetrate the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Outer Horizontal Surface and/or any Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS) surfaces. However, please note that the FAA is the only agency that can officially determine if a structure exceeds an airspace surface and/or what impact it would have on air navigation. Any negative determination would be inconsistent with AICUZ guidelines for safety of flight.

This location will experience noise impacts from the Lakee, Seawolf and Ground Controlled Approach (GCA) Box Pattern Flight Corridors for fixed-wing operations. The site will also experience noise impacts from the Beach, Fairways and GCA Box Pattern Flight Corridors for helicopter operations.

Occupants will routinely see and hear military aircraft and experience varying degrees of noise and vibration. Consequently, we are recommending full disclosure of noise and visual impacts to all initial and subsequent purchasers, lessees, or other potential occupants.

Since the project is within the AIA for the MCAS Miramar ALUCP, and to ensure that the project is consistent with ALUCP guidelines, we recommend that ALUC staff be contacted to determine if an official consistency determination is required.

Normal hours of operation at MCAS Miramar are as follows:

Monday through Thursday	7:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight
Friday	7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
Saturday, Sunday, Holidays	8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

11103
CP&L/386196
September 30, 2014

MCAS Miramar is a master air station, and as such, can operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Fiscal and manpower constraints, as well as efforts to reduce the noise impacts of our operations on the surrounding community, impose the above hours of operation. Circumstances frequently arise which require an extension of these operating hours.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this land use proposal. If we may be of any further assistance, please contact us at (858) 577-6603.

Sincerely,



J. H. LIAS
Community Plans and Liaison Office
By direction of the Commanding Officer

Copy to:
Mira Mesa Community Planning Group, Chair, John Horst
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, Ed Gowens

From: [Balben, Craig](#)
To: [wateracademy](#)
Subject: SDCWA - Citizens Water Academy
Date: Thursday, September 18, 2014 4:30:52 PM

Dear Planning Group Leader:

I'm writing to let you know about an exciting new program the Water Authority recently launched called the Citizens Water Academy. This fall, we will hold the inaugural class. We would appreciate your help nominating other future and emerging leaders from throughout the San Diego region for the first session, which begins October 28 and runs for four sessions through November 15. There are three evening classroom sessions (5:30 to 8:30 p.m.) on October 28, November 5 and 12, and one half-day (9 a.m. to 1 p.m.) facility tour and graduation luncheon on Saturday, November 15.

The goal of the Academy is to help increase awareness of important water issues affecting the San Diego region and awareness of the historic, current and future efforts by the Water Authority and its member agencies to provide a safe and reliable water supply for San Diego County. Through the Citizens Water Academy, we are looking to expand and sustain a diverse network of influential individuals from across the region who are knowledgeable about key water issues and regional programs and strategies, and who are willing to help expand that knowledge by serving as outreach ambassadors and by referring/nominating others to future Academy sessions.

Here is a link to the online nomination form: <http://www.sdcwa.org/citizens-water-academy-nomination-form>.

Here is a link to the online application form: <http://www.sdcwa.org/citizens-water-academy-application>.

Please feel free to fill out forms for as many candidates as you wish. Also, please help us recruit good candidates by forwarding this email to others.

The deadline for applications for the inaugural session is October 3, 2014.

If you have questions about the Academy, please let me know.

Best, Craig

Craig Balben
Public Affairs Representative
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Avenue
San Diego, California 92123
(858) 522-6726 Fax (858) 268-7841
cbalben@sdcwa.org
www.sdcwa.org

Learn more about the Citizens Water Academy, a unique water leadership program, here: www.sdcwa.org/citizens-water-academy. Apply or nominate a future and emerging leader today!



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
PUBLIC UTILITIES

City of San Diego Water Conservation Program

#WNWwednesday Directions and Tips

Updated: September 23, 2014

Directions:

- 1) Change your Facebook profile picture on Wednesdays to the attached San Diegans Waste No Water graphic.
- 2) Post the weekly "San Diegans Waste No Water" tip. See the list of tips below.
- 3) Make sure to tag #WNWwednesday in every message.
- 4) Invite and challenge your friends and family to do the same.
- 5) Don't forget to like us on Facebook ([@SanDiegansWasteNoWater](https://www.facebook.com/SanDiegansWasteNoWater)).

Date	Tip
September 24, 2014	It's #WNWwednesday! Join me and @SanDiegansWasteNoWater to only wash full loads in the dishwasher. You could save up to 30 gallons a week. Find more tips at www.WasteNoWater.org
October 1, 2014	Apply mulch around the plants in your garden this #WNWwednesday to reduce the need to water as often. Check out Miramar Greenery for info on mulch and more tips at www.WasteNoWater.org
October 8, 2014	Today is #WNWwednesday! Defrost frozen foods overnight in the refrigerator instead of using running hot water to thaw. This will save up to 50 gallons a week. Find more tips at www.WasteNoWater.org
October 15, 2014	Join @SanDiegansWasteNoWater this #WNWwednesday and replace your regular showerheads with low-flow showerheads. You could save up to 55 gallons a week. Find more tips at www.WasteNoWater.org
October 22, 2014	It's #WNWwednesday! Replace your older toilets with new high-efficiency models to save up to 150 gallons a week. Check out these toilet rebates starting at \$100 at www.socalwatersmart.com and get more water saving tips at www.WasteNoWater.org
October 29, 2014	Know when to water this #WNWwednesday. A water schedule change is upon us. November to May: Water before 10 a.m. and after 4 p.m. Find more info at www.WasteNoWater.org

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

Following is a summary of the 54 amendments organized into Permit Process, Use, Measurement, Parking, and Sign Regulations, and Minor Corrections categories. Within each category the amendments are listed in order of the associated code sections to be amended.

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
Permit Process Amendments: The following 22 amendments are proposed to improve the permit process and address inconsistencies.			
1	Regulatory Reform	62.1205 129.0642 129.0643 129.0743 129.0744	<p><u>Process for Grading and Right-of-Way Improvement Permits</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The code sets deadlines (180 days each) for “utilizing” and “maintaining utilization” of permits in addition to a permit expiration date. If work authorized by the permit has not begun within 180 calendar days, or if work is suspended or abandoned for a continuous period of 180 calendar days the permit becomes void. Eliminating the 180 day utilization requirement will provide greater predictability for enforcement of the 2 year expiration. Work is already ensured to be completed or restored to prior condition by financial sureties/bonds (SDMC 129.0119). • Remove references to Section 129.0104(a)(15), which does not exist.
2	Regulatory Reform	112.0102	<p><u>Expiration of Application</u></p> <p>The application expiration date for Process One maps and construction permits should allow time for corrective action in response to code enforcement civil penalty notices. Amend 112.0102 to clarify that applications associated with a code violation case under “civil penalty notice & order” will be automatically extended beyond the two year expiration period to accommodate the time set forth for “civil penalty notice & order” dates plus an additional 180 calendar day extension to allow for corrective action on the part of the applicant and time for staff issuance of the permit or map.</p>
3	Regulatory Reform	112.0103	<p><u>Process to Approve Water Supply Assessments</u></p> <p>A water supply assessment required by CEQA and the state Water Code requires a noticed public hearing by the City Council. However, the water supply assessment is not required to be consolidated for processing with associated development permit applications. The amendment will clarify that the City Council must consider and approve a water supply assessment for a project prior to the lower decision making body’s consideration of the project and environmental document.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
4	Regulatory Reform	112.0103	<p><u>Consolidation of Processing in Relation to Code Violations</u> This code section has created issues for processing of corrective actions to address code violations when development permits are in process. The amendment will clarify that corrective actions to address a code violation shall not be consolidated for processing with other permit applications in order to expedite the corrective action and minimize potential for delay.</p>
5	Clarification/ Consistency with State Law	112.0301 112.0303	<p><u>Published Notice Requirement for Ad Hoc Fees</u> Section 112.0301(c)(3) requires that the City Manager publish the Notice of Public Hearing (in addition to mailed notice) in accordance with Section 112.0303 at least 10 business days before the date of the public hearing. The Mitigation Fee Act applies to ad hoc fees imposed by the City Council (i.e. Community Plan Amendment) and requires special noticing per Government Code Section 6062a. Amend the code as advised by the City Attorney to clarify that special notice for ad hoc fees is required to be published in the newspaper as two published notices with at least 5 days intervening between the first and last publication dates (not counting the publication dates).</p>
6	Clarification/ Regulatory Reform	112.0309	<p><u>Clarification Regarding Claims of Failure to Receive Notice</u> Section 112.0309 was modeled after Government Code Section 65093 and provides that failure to receive notice shall not constitute grounds to invalidate an action taken by the City for which notice was provided. Amend the code as advised by City Attorney to clarify that the action shall not be held invalid for noticing errors, unless there was a prejudicial error.</p>
7	Clarification/ Consistency with State Law	112.0504	<p><u>Appeal Period for Map Waivers and Tentative Maps</u> Amend Section 112.0504(a)(2) to clarify that the time for filing an appeal is 12 business days, except where more time is afforded by State law. The code would clarify that pursuant to Subdivision Map Act section 66452.6(e), an applicant has at least 15 calendar days to file an appeal if their application for EOT for a map waiver or tentative map is denied. In that case, the maximum time period for filing an appeal would be the greater of 15 calendar days or 12 business days.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
8	Regulatory Reform	125.0141	<p><u>Process to Modify Conditions of Approval of Recorded Maps</u> The existing code requires City Council approval for requests to modify conditions of approval for recorded maps, but sets a lower process level for new map applications. The proposed change would allow for requests to amend a map to be processed through the same process level that would apply to a new application for an equivalent map proposal.</p>
9	Regulatory Reform	125.0461 126.0108 126.0111	<p><u>Extension of Time Applications for Tentative Maps and Development Permits-</u> Sections 125.0461 (tentative maps) and 126.0111 (development permits) provide for extensions of time (EOT) up to a maximum period of 72 months total.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, EOT applications must be submitted within a 60 day window of the expiration period. Applicants have indicated the existing 60 day requirement is problematic and easily missed. Amend the code to allow EOT applications for TMs and development permits to be submitted within 12 months of expiration date instead of the existing narrow 60 day application window. • Clarify that if granted, the time period for development permit EOTs begins from the date of expiration of the previously approved development permit. • The code currently provides for timely submitted development permit EOT applications to be extended 60 days or until a decision is made on the application, whichever occurs last. This has created confusion on what should happen in cases where a decision on the application does not occur until after the 72 month expiration. Modify the provision for development permit EOTs to be consistent with language applicable to tentative map EOTs to read “whichever occurs first”.
10	Clarification	125.1030	<p><u>Process for Easement Vacations</u> Easement vacations decided by the City Council are not required to obtain a PC recommendation prior to City Council (Section 125.1030). Section 112.0509(d) allows the PC recommendation requirement to be waived. Amend the code to allow easement vacations with a Coastal Development Permit to be exempt from a PC recommendation if the CDP is required solely for the easement vacation.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
11	Regulatory Reform	126.0108 126.0109	<p><u>Utilization of a Development Permit</u> Eliminate the maintaining utilization section of the code. The amendment will provide greater predictability regarding permit expiration and will facilitate enforcement of the existing 36 month expiration date.</p>
12	Clarification	126.0110	<p><u>Cancellation or Rescission of a Development Permit</u> Amend the code to clarify that a decision to cancel or rescind a development permit needs to be recorded with the County Recorder. Currently a permit holder may request cancellation of a development permit at any time before utilization of the permit, or can submit an application to rescind the development permit after it has been utilized. The code specifies that cancellation of a permit must be recorded with the County Recorder, but rescission of a development permit (after utilization) also needs to be officially recorded to help clarify that the permit no longer applies.</p>
13	Regulatory Reform	126.0112	<p><u>Minor Modifications or Amendments to a Development Permit</u> Allow projects to have the benefit of new regulations without a need to amend their development permit (i.e. CUP) if the changes substantially conform to the approved permit.</p>
14	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	126.0113	<p><u>Flexibility for Modifications to Industrial Development</u> Streamline the process for changes to design guidelines and planned industrial development permit requirements that don't meet the criteria for Substantial Conformance Review. Reduce from a Process Four Permit Amendment to a Process Two NDP (staff level decision appealable to Planning Commission) if the development meets specified criteria, including: no impact to public health, safety, and welfare; conformance to the code; no adverse affect to the land use plan; and location at least 1,000 feet from residential development. This change in permit process will benefit manufacturers (i.e. breweries that utilize outdoor silos for grain) because it's common for older industrial development permits to have explicitly excluded outdoor tanks in the permit conditions.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
15	Clarification/ Regulatory Reform	126.0502 129.0710 143.0365 Repeal CP 700-18	<p><u>Process for Underground Encroachments</u></p> <p>Sections 126.0502(e)(5) and 129.0710(c) were amended to reflect the repeal of outdated Council Policy 600-16 (adopted 1962, amended 1975, repealed 2013) which required Council approval for major overhead and underground structures that span the right-of-way. The City Engineer noted that existing Council Policy 700-18 (adopted 1975) relating to underground structures in the right-of-way is also outdated and addresses encroachment scenarios that are not expressly identified in the current code. Amendments will transfer the design requirements and process exceptions from CP 700-18 to Sections 126.0502, 129.0710, and 143.0365 and allow for repeal of CP 700-18.</p>
16	Clarification/ Regulatory Reform	127.0102 127.0103 127.0104 127.0105 127.0106 127.0108 127.0109	<p><u>Previously Conforming</u></p> <p>The City's previously conforming regulations are in need of clarification due to the potential for multiple interpretations counter to the intent of the Land Development Code. The amendments will facilitate consistent application of the regulations and a more predictable outcome for applicants and the community. The greater predictability and certainty will increase opportunities and the likelihood for reinvestment in the City's older neighborhoods. This item deals with a highly complex subject matter. See the attached "Summary of Previously Conforming Regulations" for additional details regarding the purpose and intent and an explanation of the proposed permit process for various previously conforming development scenarios.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
17	Regulatory Reform/ Consistency with State Law	128.0209 128.0306 128.0310 128.0312	<p><u>CEQA Document Processing Requirements</u></p> <p>The following changes will create consistency between the City’s CEQA requirements and state law, and will protect the City from certain CEQA document challenges that are currently being filed based on existing local requirements that are more restrictive than state law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strike 128.0209(b). There is no requirement under state law to provide a cover letter when a previously certified document is used. Transfer this project submittal requirement from the code to instead be published in the City’s environmental review procedures and information bulletin 401. Staff reports will continue to include environmental determination statements for projects. • Revise 128.0306(b) to be consistent with the time period provided for by state law. • Revise 128.0310 and 128.0312 to separate references to the final EIR from the candidate findings and statement of overriding considerations (SOC) for the project. Remove the reference to the 14 day requirement for providing candidate findings and SOC before a public hearing in order to be consistent with state law criteria. The current requirement is unnecessarily causing delay to the processing of final EIRs. The candidate findings and SOC will still be available to the public for review with other project materials before the public hearing.
18	Clarification	129.0702	<p><u>When a Public Right-of-Way Permit is Required</u></p> <p>Amend the code to clarify that a public right-of-way permit is required for public improvements by a private or public entity other than the City. The existing code allows the City Engineer to waive the permit requirement as appropriate (i.e. circumstances where another governmental agency has an agreement in place with the City) pursuant to Section 129.0702(b)(2).</p>
19	Clarification	129.0720	<p><u>Qualifications to Prepare Plans and Perform Work in the Public Right-of-Way</u></p> <p>Replace the term “required” with the term “regulated” in Section 129.0720, and clarify that right-of-way work (regulated by Ch 12, Art 9) must be performed by a licensed contractor, with stated exceptions for public utilities and for homeowners to perform grading at their primary residence.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
20	Regulatory Reform	131.0202	<p><u>Applying OP Zone to City Parkland Prior to Dedication</u> As requested by the Planning Department, amend Section 131.0202 to allow the OP (open space-park) zone to be applied to City fee-owned designated park lands that have not, or will not, be formally dedicated by City ordinance or State statute. The goal is to facilitate application of the OP zone to future parkland during the community plan update process. It is common for parkland to be acquired by the City, designated for developed park purposes, and held until park facilities can be constructed, or until the property can be traded or sold to acquire land of a higher value for park purposes.</p>
21	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	142.0670	<p><u>Clarification of Street Light Requirement</u> Street lights are a public improvement that is required of private applicants as part of a new subdivision design. The existing code does not specify the public improvement requirement is tied to subdivision maps, which has caused the need for frequent conflict resolution for businesses in existing subdivisions who have been asked to provide new street lights while processing minor improvements via a grading permit or public right-of-way permit. Street lights will continue to be required of new subdivisions, or will otherwise be provided subject to available funding via the capital improvement program in accordance with Council Policy 200-18 (Mid-Block Street Light Policy for Developed Areas).</p>
22	Regulatory Reform	143.0212	<p><u>Exemptions from Historic Resources Site Survey</u> Section 143.0212 applies to all development that is 45 years or older and that has not been designated a historic resource. Amend Section 143.0212 to provide new exemptions from the requirement for a historic resources site survey for in-kind foundation repair and replacement, and for construction of swimming pools in the rear yard (except that property with a likelihood of archaeological sites still requires a site survey). The code already exempts in-kind roof repair/replacement, and minor interior modifications limited in scope to an electrical or plumbing/mechanical permit.</p>
<p><u>Use Amendments:</u> The following 11 items clarify the application of existing use categories, create new use subcategories, and streamline the process for approval of various use types:</p>			

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
23	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	131.0112 131.0623	<p><u>Manufacturing Uses (Light manufacturing v.s. Heavy manufacturing)</u> Provide an exception to Section 131.0623(e) to identify beverage production as an allowable light manufacturing use in the IP-1-1 zone. Clarify that light manufacturing does not allow the use of explosives or unrefined petroleum. (Petroleum based products are okay.) Also clarify that the use category for light manufacturing includes the manufacturing of a wide variety of products including, but not limited to food, beverages, durable goods, machinery and equipment. (Manufacturing of beer fits in this category.) Heavy manufacturing involves large outdoor equipment such as cranes and large tanks to produce unpackaged bulk products such as steel, paper, lumber, fertilizer, or petrochemicals, and manufacturing that typically produces disturbing noise, dust, or other pollutants capable of harming or annoying adjacent uses.</p>
24	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	131.0112 131.0222 131.0322 131.0422 131.0522 131.0622 141.0507	<p><u>Tasting Rooms versus Retail Tasting Stores</u> Amend Section 131.0112 to create a new commercial subcategory for tasting rooms. And create a new separately regulated use category for tasting stores. Require a Process Two Neighborhood Use Permit for stand-alone tasting stores. Allow tasting rooms that are accessory to a beverage manufacturer in an industrial zone to be allowed by right. Amend the Chapter 13 use tables accordingly.</p>
25	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	131.0112 131.0222 131.0422 131.0522 131.0622 142.0530 Table 142-05G	<p><u>Distribution and Storage Uses</u> Clarify the description of the distribution and storage use category and subcategories, and eliminate duplicative language. Use of the terms “wholesale” (a type of sales transaction) and “warehouse” (a type of building) as use category types has created confusion for applicants seeking to locate their businesses, especially since the category descriptions are very similar. The amendment will result in three subcategories: equipment and materials storage yards (outdoors), moving and storage facilities, and distribution facilities. Revise the Chapter 13 use tables and associated parking table 142-05G accordingly to reflect the name of the new use categories.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
26	Regulatory Reform	131.0222 131.0422 131.0522 131.0622 141.0602 142.0530 Table 142-05G 155.0238 Table 155-02C 1510.0303	<p><u>Assembly and Entertainment Uses, Including Churches</u></p> <p>Create a new separately regulated use (Section 141.0602) for Assembly and Entertainment Uses to regulate these facilities based on the size of the establishment. Set the process level based on the maximum capacity for assembly (i.e. allowing up to 300 people as limited use and creating conditional use criteria for larger facilities subject to CUP). The City currently regulates “churches and places of religious assembly” and “assembly and entertainment” as “permitted by right” or “not permitted” in most zones, but still requires a CUP for churches in a few specialized zones (i.e. AR, SEPDO, and CUPDO). The City can best avoid challenge by treating churches like other assembly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend CUPDO Section 155.0238 to reflect citywide changes in CU-1, 2, 3. • Amend La Jolla Shores PDO: Informal request to require a CUP for churches in SF zone, which could require additional amendments to MF, CC, and Visitor (In any zones where assembly uses are allowed, the process for churches can’t be more restrictive). Option would be to make churches “not permitted” in the SF zones consistent with the citywide code.
27	Regulatory Reform	131.0222 131.0322 131.0422 131.0522 131.0622 141.0607	<p><u>Drive-in and Drive-through Eating and Drinking Establishments</u></p> <p>Create a new use category for drive-in and drive-through eating and drinking establishments to regulate this type of development as a separately regulated use. The current code treats drive-in and drive-through components as a design feature of a restaurant. The new separately regulated use category will allow for this type of development to occur where it is appropriate for the location. This includes requirements for limitations or conditions to be placed on the development in certain zones to minimize detrimental effects to neighboring properties. Set 7 year amortization period for drive through hours of operation in previously conforming establishments adjacent to residential.</p>
28	Regulatory Reform	131.0322 141.0302	<p><u>Process For Companion Units in Agricultural-Residential Zones</u></p> <p>The existing code indicates that a Conditional Use Permit is required for a companion unit in the agricultural-residential zones. This should be changed to a “limited” use to allow companion units in accordance with a Process One approval if they meet the requirements in 141.0302.</p>
29	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	131.0623	<p><u>Allowance for Live Entertainment in Industrial Zones</u></p> <p>Amend Section 131.0623 to allow eating and drinking establishments to have live entertainment in industrial zones, except for heavy industrial zones (IH zones).</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
30	Clarification/ Regulatory Reform	141.0405	<p><u>Satellite Antennas in Industrial Zones</u> Section 141.0405 is unclear as to what process is required for satellite antennas in industrial zones. The code makes an exception for satellite antennas in industrial zones to be exempt from a conditional use permit, and suggests that the use is permitted by right as an accessory use in industrial zones, but does not explicitly state that it is exempt from a discretionary permit.</p>
31	Clarification	141.0411 156.0315	<p><u>Historic Buildings Occupied by Uses Otherwise Not Allowed</u> Clarify that in cases where proposed reuse of a historic building includes a separately regulated use, the proposed use must be designed to meet the separately regulated use requirements as applicable to that use in order to minimize detrimental effects on the neighborhood. Amend the Centre City PDO per request by Civic San Diego to make the CCPDO consistent with citywide regulations for this use category.</p>
32	Regulatory Reform	141.0623	<p><u>Indoor Theaters less Than 10,000 sq ft in Size</u> Modify the threshold for requiring a discretionary permit to allow indoor theaters less than 10,000 square feet in size to be approved administratively. (The current code requires a discretionary permit for 5000 sq ft or greater.) Continue to require a Process Four CUP for all outdoor theaters and for indoor theaters greater than 10,000 square feet in size.</p>
33	Clarification/ Regulatory Reform	141.1003	<p><u>Marine-Related Uses in the Coastal Zone</u> Clarify that no limitations apply to this use category in industrial zones where the use is permitted (as indicated by a “P” in the Ch 13 use table). Commercial zones that require a conditional use permit will continue to be subject to the separately regulated use criteria in Section 141.1003.</p>
<p>Measurement Amendments: The following 5 items clarify how various things are defined or measured in the Land Development Code.</p>			
34	Clarification	113.0234	<p><u>Bay Windows</u> Amend Section 113.0234 (Rules for Calculation and Measurement for Gross Floor Area) to help clarify under what circumstances bay windows are exempt from the calculation of gross floor area. Bay windows are exempt if they are standard window sill height and have no structural supports, or have less than 5 feet of height between the finish-floor and the roof elevation immediately above.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
35	Clarification/ Regulatory Reform	131.0448 131.0461	<p><u>Garages and Accessory Structures</u> Strike the term “detached” in subsection (c) in reference to garages. Encroachments associated with garages and non-habitable structures are limited in accordance with LDC Section 131.0461. The accessory building can’t exceed 525 sq ft in RS zones. Clarify that an accessory building in the setback can’t share a common wall with the primary dwelling unit, but can be attached via a design element and still be considered a separate building.</p>
36	Clarification	131.0461	<p><u>Roof Projection into the Angled Building Envelope Plane</u> The existing regulation in Section 131.0461(a)(1)(D), which is depicted in Diagram 131-04S, has led to multiple interpretations about what is intended to be a limited allowance for a roof design to project into the angled building envelope plane (facing the front yard) under specified limitations. The proposed amendment would clarify that the roof design may project into the angled building envelope, but may not encroach into the setback.</p>
37	Regulatory Reform	142.0340	<p><u>Retaining Walls</u> Create an exception to allow retaining walls over 3 feet in height in the front and street side yards when the elevation of the street grade is higher than the building pad since the majority of the wall is not visible from the street. In such cases, the measurement would be taken from the adjacent street grade.</p>
38	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	142.0910	<p><u>Mechanical Equipment Used in the Manufacturing Process</u> Provide an exception from the requirement in Section 142.0910(a) and (b) for mechanical equipment screening for industrial development that involves light or heavy manufacturing when the appurtenances are not readily visible from any residential development.</p>
<p>Parking: The following 2 items address parking and driveway related regulations.</p>			
39	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	142.0530 Table 142-05G	<p><u>Parking Requirement for Capital Intensive Manufacturing</u> Create a new specified parking requirement at rate of 1 space per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area for capital intensive manufacturing involving the use of large equipment, tanks, vessels, automated machinery, or any similar combination of such machinery and equipment.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
40	Regulatory Reform	142.0560	<p><u>Driveway Design to Meet Engineering Standards</u> Clarify the requirements to meet minimum driveway gradient standards. The amendment will help clarify the requirement in response to confusion that has resulted for staff and applicants because of the wording in the existing code.</p>
<p>Signs: The following 4 items address the corresponding regulations and approval process for signs.</p>			
41	Regulatory Reform/ Economic Development	126.0113 142.1208	<p><u>Signage in Planned Commercial and Industrial Developments</u> Provide for commercial and industrial development to add signage in accordance with the sign code without a need to amend applicable development permits that are outdated with respect to sign regulations. Also allow Process One approval per the current sign code for any sites subject to old comprehensive sign plans adopted prior to January 1, 2000. Clarify that the following signs would still require a development permit: comprehensive sign plans (adopted January 1, 2000 or later), revolving projecting signs, signs with automatic changing copy, or a theater marquee. Also, a <i>sign</i> that involves an alteration to the building where the proposed building alteration is not in substantial conformance to the applicable <i>development permit</i>; or any proposal that involves an <i>advertising display sign</i> would not be eligible for the proposed Process One exception.</p>
42	Regulatory Reform	129.0802 129.0804 129.0806 129.0811 129.0812 129.0813 129.0815	<p><u>Utilization of Sign Permits, Sign Stickers, and Sign Inspections</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the requirement for initial utilization and maintaining utilization of a sign permit. A two year permit expiration period applies. • Remove outdated code language that references “sign stickers” and inspections. Sign inspections will occur only in association with a related building permit or code violation case.
43	Regulatory Reform	141.1105 142.1210 142.1260	<p><u>Gas Station Electronic Pricing Signs</u> State law sets requirements for posting of gas station pricing. However, the City currently requires a Process Two Neighborhood Use Permit for any signs with changeable copy, including gas station electronic pricing signs. The amendment will allow gas stations to obtain staff approval (Process One) of signs that display gas prices electronically, and will eliminate the unnecessary discretionary permit expense for what is considered basic signage consistent with the industry trend.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
44	Regulatory Reform	142.1220 Table 142-12B 142.1225 Table-12C	<p><u>Walls Signs and Ground Signs</u> Currently, the wall sign area for an establishment is regulated with respect to the size of any ground signs. Ground signs, however, are tied to the street frontage and the adjacent street classification and speed limit of the premises as a whole. This has created unnecessary processing complications for new commercial tenants seeking approval of a wall sign, especially because the sign companies that process the permits tend to be different for wall signs versus ground signs. The change will help simplify the regulations and facilitate processing with a minimal increase, if any, to the signage as a whole. The existing requirement is a processing complication for applicants and can be especially unfair to businesses that aren't represented by the ground signage. The existing La Jolla Shores PDO sign requirement (applicable to a small specialized area) would remain unchanged.</p>
<p>Minor Corrections: The following 10 items would fix typos, punctuation and formatting errors, incorrect terms, and incorrect section references.</p>			
45	Incorrect Section References	54.0308 54.0309	<p><u>Vacant Structures</u> When the abandoned properties ordinance was adopted, section 54.0308 was reformatted so that subsections (a)(1) through (9) became (a) through (i). However, three references to the old code sections remain. The police department uses this section to enforce against trespassers in vacant structures and need these section references fixed. References to (a)(8) should be (h) and (a)(9) should be (i). Non-LDC change requested by City Attorney.</p>
46	Incorrect Spelling	98.0425	<p><u>Fee Payment</u> The term fee payment is misspelled as “free” payment in Section 98.0425. Non-LDC change requested by City Attorney.</p>
47	Incorrect Term	113.0103	<p><u>Definition of Reasonable Accommodation</u> Replace reference to “dwelling unit” with the term “dwelling” per state law definition.</p>
48	Missing Section Reference	123.0101	<p><u>Zoning and Rezoning Actions</u> The code currently references these as procedures for applying zoning to property in accordance with zones in Chapter 13. Add a reference to clarify that the procedures also apply to zoning and rezoning of planned district bases zones identified in Chapter 15.</p>

DRAFT Issue Matrix - 9th UPDATE TO THE LDC
September 30, 2014

No.	PURPOSE	CODE SECTION	AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION
49	Incorrect Reference	126.0502	<p><u>Capital Improvement Program Projects</u> The Council adopted a lower process for CIP projects in various circumstances. However, Section 126.0502(c)(4) and (5) only regulates private improvements and should not refer to a separate CIP process. Delete the incorrect CIP reference and restore to the original code language.</p>
50	Incorrect Reference	131.0540	<p><u>Regulation of Residential in Commercial Zones</u> The code contains an incorrect reference to a residential table 131-04B in a context where it should be referencing the commercial zone table 131-05B.</p>
51	Incorrect Section References/ Punctuation Errors	141.0619	<p><u>Push Carts and Retail Food Code</u> The pushcart regulations refer to outdated references in SDMC Chapter 4. Instead they should just reference the CA Retail Food Code/Health and Safety Code, which establishes the health regulations that apply to food handling, storage, etc. The health regulations are enforced by the County via the required health permit.</p>
52	Grammatical Error	142.0310(a)	<p><u>General Fence Regulations</u> Replace the term “an” with “a” under 142.0310(a)(1) in reference to a Public Right-of-Way permit.</p>
53	Italicization Error	144.0233	<p><u>Street System</u> “Street system” is not a defined term and should not be italicized under the section relating to acceptance of dedications. The term “street” is a defined term and can remain in italics, but the term “system” should not be italicized.</p>
54	Incorrect Section Titles	Ch 15, Art 17 Div 1-4	<p><u>Otay Mesa Planned District Ordinance (Repealed)</u> The Otay Mesa Planned District ordinance was repealed by the City Council (O-2014-87). However, the titles for the article and divisions were accidentally left in the code. This minor clean up action will clarify that the PDO was repealed in its entirety. Change requested by City Attorney.</p>

September 15, 2014

City of San Diego
Planning Department
1222 1st Avenue, MS 413
San Diego CA 92101

RE: Project 162742: Mira Sorrento

To John Fisher:

In October of 2010 the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group sent the attached letter in support of Project #162742. Preconditions for this project, specifically the Mira Mesa Direct Access Ramp, are on the cusp of fulfillment and we were recently asked to reconvene the Mira Sorrento Subcommittee which had been formed to provide a recommendation to the larger Planning Group.

We reconvened the subcommittee on August 18th of this year. Included in our discussions was the substance of the previous letter. We are pleased to hear that the developer is fully prepared to meet these previous commitments.

Because of the passage of time, we expect some details – especially with respect to design – to change. We have requested, and the developer has agreed, to be allowed to provide feedback on drawings and designs and to the details of traffic signaling, ingress and egress before they are submitted to the City.

We are pleased to report that the developer is looking forward to working with us to bring this project to the place where all City requirements are met. Please accept this letter as indicating our continued support for the project with these and the previously agreed upon conditions and commitments.

Cordially,



John Horst
Chairman, Mira Mesa Community Planning Group

Mira Mesa Community Planning Group

Date: October 25, 2010

To: City of San Diego, John Fisher, Project Manager

Subject: Project 162742 Mira Sorrento Place

Dear Mr. John Fisher,

As the Chair of the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group (MMCPG) I am please to inform you that MMCPG voted to support Mira Sorrento Place (162742) by a unanimous vote (11-0) on September 20, 2010.

The owner has collaborated with our subcommittee since 2008 to design a project well-suited for this challenging site. The project integrates into the surrounding community and will be an asset to the community. They also participated with the subcommittee for an adjacent site, which will be an SDG&E substation. I believe their participation improved the design at that site also.

We understand they are seeking a zoning change from Industrial Park & Open Space to just Industrial Park. Their presentation noted that no occupancy may occur until the DAR and other traffic mitigation projects are complete. This impressed the committee. In addition their presentation noted:

- Signalization at Mira Sorrento Blvd will be paid for by the project not from FBA funds.
- Roselle Street will be signalized
- Sorrento Valley Blvd at Vista Sorrento Pkwy – signal improvements for NB Vista Sorrento turning EB and a right turn lane to be added on Sorrento Valley Blvd.
- A shuttle will be provided to transport building occupants to the Coaster in perpetuity.
- Vista Sorrento at Mira Sorrento – 2 turn lanes.

Please let us know the hearing dates for this project, members of the MMCPG would like the opportunity to express their support for this project. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Linda Geldner
Chair MMCPG