

Notice to the community: Review of Community Plan Update elements can be time intensive – Please be advised that the committee may not complete discussion on all elements listed on the agenda – as a result some elements may have to be continued to a future meeting.

## Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee

September 09, 2015

6:30 PM

Balboa Park Golf Course Clubhouse, 2600 Golf Course Drive

[www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpg](http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpg)

Please see agenda on website listed above for any attached information

**Call to Order** \*\*6:30

**Additions and/or Deletions to Agenda**

**Approval of Minutes:** 6/22, 7/08, 8/12, & 8/26

**Governmental Reports**

Community Police Officer – Kevin Vasquez {619.674.7268 or [kvasquez@pd.sandiego.gov](mailto:kvasquez@pd.sandiego.gov)} (TABLED)

39th Senate District – Joyce Temporal {619.645.3133 or [joyce.temporal@sen.ca.gov](mailto:joyce.temporal@sen.ca.gov)} (TABLED)

53rd Congressional District – Lee Steuer {619.280.5353 or [lee.Steuer@mail.house.gov](mailto:lee.Steuer@mail.house.gov)} (TABLED) \*Newsletter Opt-in Website <https://susandavis.house.gov/>

Council District 3 – Molly Chase {619.236.6633 or [mchase@sandiego.gov](mailto:mchase@sandiego.gov)}

City Planner – Bernard Turgeon {619.533.6575 or [bturgeon@sandiego.gov](mailto:bturgeon@sandiego.gov)}

**Chair (Chollas Creek), Vice Chair, and CPC Report(s)**

**Non Agenda Public Comment**

**Consent Agenda**

**Action Items**

- **City Lights Townhomes: Jason Maune, Architect** (Information attached)
- **Community Plan Update, Bernie Turgeon:** Wrap-up issues continued from August 26<sup>th</sup> special meeting. Review Mobility, Land Use, & Recreation elements.

**Information Items**

**Sub-Committee Updates**

Historic\* – David Swarens {[loscalifornios@aol.com](mailto:loscalifornios@aol.com)}

**Adjournment**

\*If you are interested in attending the Historic meeting please email the appropriate committee to confirm meeting and agenda.

\*\*All times are estimated – Action Items may also be taken before Information Items.

The City of San Diego distributes agendas via email and can also provide agendas in alternative formats as well as a sign language or oral interpreter for the meeting with advance notice. To request these services, please contact the City at 619.236.6479 or [sdplanninggroups@sandiego.gov](mailto:sdplanninggroups@sandiego.gov)

BRIERTON COMMENTS ON PLAN UPDATE:

I. RECREATION (page 107)

In summary: Park equivalencies are the biggest issue. Some of them seem appropriate, others, not so much. (pages 111, 112, 113 (Table 7-1), 114

And, they should not be counted as parks unless and until the improvements described to benefit Golden Hill have in fact been made been made.

\*Ones that seem OK to me:

--3.05 acres for the expanded 28th Street children's playground;

--12.53 acres for Golden Hill Park

--0.61 acres next to Community garden

--0.37 Grape Street dog park

-----

22.56 acres towards the 61.8 park acres needed

\*Ones I have questions about:

--If canyon trails (4.67 acres) are counted as parks, would this impact the

requirements for multiple species conservation/habitat?

--If the trailheads count as parks, would they then have trash cans that would be emptied?

\*Ones that are proposed for counting, that do not seem appropriate unless Golden Hill residents are given some kind of special consideration in use.

--community garden as park (0.28 acres)

--Rec Center (7.26 acres)

--Ops site (5.00 acres)

--Skate/bike site (10.00 acres)

OTHER:

\*P. 118 Are listed trees drought resistant & consistent with Urban Design (page 69)?

\*p. 120 (RE 3-4, 3-5) Bridge from City Ops Yard to Balboa Park?

\*p. 122 (RE 4.4) Add Trash receptacles as amenities

\*page 109: NOTE: Table RE 2 not found

ADD: BOTH 32ND ST CANYON AND 34TH ST CANYONS TO BE DESIGNATED AS MULTIPLE SPECIES/HABITAT OPEN SPACE

II. LAND USE (page 14)

\*p. 14: GOALS: Add

--Historic District

--Views preserved in east/west and north/south corridors

--support small scale, locally-owned businesses

P.15, Table 2-1 Add:

--Historic District

--Multiple species conservation/habitat

P. 17, Policies

\*LU 1.1: add "small scale" residential community

\* LU 1.2: Add: protection of canyons/open space/multiple species/conservation areas

P. 18

--Open space, utilities: Add species/habitat protection

--"Semi public": Define further. Does this include community-based organizations, prison reentry, drug.rehab, group homes?

P. 20

--City Ops Yard. Pedestrian bridge Golden Hill/Balboa Park?

--Delevan Drive: Possible pedestrian link between 32nd St canyon & 34th St canyon? See page 37, ME 1.9

(Q: Re semis problem: prohibit overnight parking? prohibit turns exiting Hwy 94 from Broadway to 30th Street?)

P. 21: Add policy: Protect canyons/open space/hillsides/views from residential encroachment

P.23: Why do commercial areas in Figure 2-2 differ from those in Figure

4-1 (Urban Design Concept Map, p. 56)

P. 24: Based on discussion here, change Figure 4-1 (page 56, Urban Design Concept Map)

P. 25: Any error in Open Space zoning?

P. 29: Add to LU 2.21--Promote disabled mobility

III. MOBILITY (page 32)

P. 34: (Figure 3.1)

-- Pedestrian access should be shown along the entirety of Golf Course Drive;

--Why is "C" Street not a corridor?

--Cedar St east to 33rd South to "C" Street is how many parents take their kids to school

P. 36, Figure 3-2 (Planned Bicycle Facilities):

\*Golf Course Drive should be shown as multi-use for pedestrians and bikes

\*Is the bike route on Fern/30th consistent with streetcar there? (Figure 3-3, page 39)

P.38, 3.2

\*If there is to be a new rapid bus route for Bus 2, can it still be said that Bus 2 serves Golden Hill Community needs?

\*Will the 30th Street/downtown streetcar line be consistent with proposed bike path?

P. 40, 3.3. Add: Continue to ensure access to the south of the 94 freeway on 25th, 28th, 30th and 32nd Streets

P. 43, ME 4.4. Question: What is "unbundled" residential parking?

P. 43, Parking management: Prohibit garbage cans on street on non-trash pickup days?



L64A-003A

## Project Information

**Project Nbr:** 369887      **Title:** City Lights Townhomes  
**Project Mgr:** Hempton, Alexander      (619) 446-5349      Ahempton@sandiego.gov



## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/29/2015	Deemed Complete on 06/29/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Planning Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/29/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Gibbs, Antoinette (619) 446-5475 AGibbs@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/30/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 07/14/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 3.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/10/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Conditions	<b>Completed:</b> 07/14/2015	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/14/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2015 from 07/17/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 145 reviews, 52.4% were on-time, and 57.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

### 1st Exp Rev Aug 2014

#### Land Use Plans

##### Issue

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
-----------------	------------	-------------------

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	On a separate document, please provide a written statement identifying how the project satisfies the design guidelines for new development. (From Cycle 6)
-------------------------------------	----	--

#### GHPD Regulations

##### Issue

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
-----------------	------------	-------------------

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	In addition, the overall height measurement is not shown correctly. SDMC 113.0270(a)(2)(B) states that the overall structure height shall not exceed the maximum permitted structure height of the applicable zone plus an amount equal to either the maximum grade differential within the structure's footprint or 10 feet, whichever is less. The grade differential shown on the elevations does not illustrate the grade within the structure's footprint. Please revise. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	The project is subject to the Single Family Scale requirements in SDMC 158.0301(b)(8), which requires that premises must be single family in scale and character as viewed from the street elevation(s). (From Cycle 6)

#### Other Corrections

##### Issue

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
-----------------	------------	-------------------

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27	The project proposes overheight retaining walls. Reduce the height of the retaining walls to comply with the requirements in SDMC Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 3. Height of the walls shall be measured in accordance with SDMC 113.0270(b). (From Cycle 6)
-------------------------------------	----	--

### 2nd Exp Rev Mar 2015

##### Issue

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
-----------------	------------	-------------------

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34	Items left unchecked remain outstanding. Some required further clarification which has been provided below. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	35	Issue #5 remains outstanding. The findings are the basis for approval of the project and many times the applicant input on how the findings can be made is crucial. Findings provided by an applicant allow City staff to make determinations of support, but ultimately it will be the City project manager that refines the draft findings to include them in the resolution of approval. Please address the proposed deviations within the findings. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	36	Issue #14/15 remains outstanding. It appears the project may comply with the minimum street yard requirement, however, it is not shown correctly on Sheet A1.6. The street yard is measured from the front property line to the building façade. The street yard shall not be measured beyond the front 70 ft or 50 percent of the lot depth whichever is less, as measured from the property line. Please revise the yard calculations to show the street yard from the property line to nearest building façade. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	37	The applicant is proposing to deviate from the maximum permitted height for both plumb and overall height. Please clearly identify the maximum proposed height for both plumb and overall. This should be clearly illustrated on the plans and identified on Sheet T-1.1 under "Deviation Request". Please provide draft findings and explain how this would be a better project than strict application of the zone regulations. (From Cycle 8)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	38	The applicant is proposing to deviate from the maximum permitted FAR of .60. The project site is permitted to have a maximum FAR of 7,508 sf the project is proposing to deviate with a .81 FAR (10,337sf). On Sheet T-1.1 within the "Deviation Request" section please clearly identify the proposed deviations. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	39	The project is proposing a lot coverage of 48 percent where the zone allows a maximum of 35 percent lot coverage. Is the applicant proposing to deviate? If so, please provide the necessary finding of support and list this within the "Deviation Request" section. If not, please demonstrate compliance. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	40	Item #19 remains outstanding. It does not appear Building A, Unit A2/A3 are providing a single family scale or character as viewed from the 27th Street. Please explain how this structure provides that single family scale. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	41	It appears that a portion of Unit A3 is located within the front yard setback. Please show the center radius to clearly identify the front and street side yards. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	42	The walls located within the front yard (patio) are over height. Per SDMC Section 142.0310(c)(1(A) - Solid fences located on the front or street side property line shall not exceed 3 feet in height. The wall shown scales at 4-ft please indicate the height of proposed wall. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	43	The project has been submitted for Affordable Housing where at least 10 percent of the units will be set aside for income at or below 65 percent AMI for rental, the applicant is proposing to set aside 1 of the 8 proposed units as affordable the applicant is not requesting a density bonus. The project is consistent with Council Policy 600-27. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	44	There appears to be several deviations identified which are not listed on sheet T-1.1 within the Deviation Request section. Please identify all proposed deviations which should include what is proposed and what is required perhaps in a table format. (From Cycle 8)

**Correction/clarification**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	45	Correction to #43. The project is no longer proposing an affordable housing project the project has been changed to a sustainable project. The applicant has provided a note on the plans the project will be consistent with Council Policy 900-14. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	46	The project is not proposing any deviations from the development regulations. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/29/2015	Deemed Complete on 06/29/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Environmental	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/29/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Sebastian, Lindsey (619) 236-5993 Lsebastian@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/29/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 07/13/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 1.25	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/21/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Conditions	<b>Completed:</b> 07/14/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/14/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2015 from 07/17/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 121 reviews, 45.5% were on-time, and 53.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 2nd EXp Review 3/15

### Circulation/Parking

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Issues raised by Transportation have been resolved. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. EAS has no further comments related to this issue.  (From Cycle 8)

### Hist Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	SECOND REQUEST  The original MND identified that archeological monitoring during grading activities would be required and consequently the current project would also be required to implement archaeological monitoring. Therefore upon project resubmittal, written acknowledgement by the applicant to implement the specific historical resources mitigation, monitoring and reporting program is required prior to staff making a formal environmental determination on the project. (From Cycle 8)

### Hydrology/Drainage

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Engineering Review is requesting revisions; please provide a copy of the revised technical study to EAS. Please refer to comments provided by Engineering Review on this issue. (From Cycle 8)

### Paleontological Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	SECOND REQUEST  Per the plans submitted (Sheet No. C1), the project is proposing approximately 2,300 cubic yards of grading with a maximum cut depth of 11.5 feet. The project would exceed the City's Significance Determination Thresholds. The original MND identified that paleontological monitoring during grading activities would be required and consequently the current project would also be required to implement paleontological monitoring. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	Therefore upon project resubmittal, written acknowledgement by the applicant to implement the specific paleontological resources mitigation, monitoring and reporting program is required prior to staff making a formal environmental determination on the project. (From Cycle 8)

### Water Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	Engineering Review is requesting revisions+; please provide a copy of the revised technical study to EAS. Please refer to comments provided by Engineering Review on this issue. (From Cycle 8)

### Environmental Det

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Lindsey Sebastian at (619) 236-5993. Project Nbr: 369887 / Cycle: 12





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	23	Until the requested information has been provided, staff is not able to complete the environmental review for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts.  (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	24	Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. Additionally, the new information may lead to the requirement of new and/or additional technical studies. A determination as to the appropriate environmental document will be made based on all reviewed and submitted information. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	25	Until the requested information has been provided, staff is not able to complete the environmental review for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. As previously identified, an Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 132506 was prepared for the original City Lights Townhomes project that was before City of San Diego Hearing Officer, which certified and adopted the MMRP on August 20, 2008 by Resolution No. HO-6050. (From Cycle 8)

**3rd Exp. Rev. (Cycle 12) 7/15**

**Project Scope**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	35	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED -  The project is no longer proposing an affordable housing project. The project has been changed to a sustainable project. The applicant has provided a note on the plans that the project would be consistent with Council Policy 900-14. (New Issue)

**Land Use**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	26	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED -  Issues raised by Planning Review have been resolved. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. EAS has no further comments related to this issue. (New Issue)

**Hist. Res. (Archv.)**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED - Per the submitted plans (Sheet T-1.1), the applicant provided written acknowledgment to implement the specific historical resources mitigation, monitoring and reporting program. EAS has no further comments related to this issue. (New Issue)

**Paleo. Res.**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	28	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED - Per the submitted plans (Sheet T-1.1), the applicant provided written acknowledgment to implement the specific paleontological resources mitigation, monitoring and reporting program. EAS has no further comments related to this issue. (New Issue)

**Hydrology/Drainage**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	29	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED - EAS defers to Engineering Review on hydrology/drainage issues; please refer to Engineering Review comments for additional information and/or clarification. Engineering Review staff has requested additional information. The Hydrology & Hydraulic Calculations prepared by BDS Engineering, Inc. dated May 22, 2015 (5th Submittal) was approved as submitted by Engineering Review. Issues raised by Engineering Review have been resolved. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34	EAS has no further comments related to this issue. (New Issue)

**Water Quality**





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30	- -INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED- - A Water Quality Technical Report prepared by BDS Engineering, Inc. dated May 22, 105 (5th Submittal) was accepted as submitted by Engineering Review. Issues raised by Engineering Review have been resolved. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. EAS has no further comments related to this issue. (New Issue)
-------------------------------------	----	--

**Environmental Det.**

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	32	All items requested per the environmental review have been submitted, reviewed and approved. As such, a CEQA Determination of Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has been made. The MND will require a 20-day (calendar) public review period. Appropriate mitigation measures (Archaeological Resources and Paleontological Resources) will be included within the MND. (New Issue)
-------------------------------------	----	--







L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/29/2015	Deemed Complete on 06/29/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Engineering Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/29/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Canning, Jack (619) 446-5425 jcanning@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/29/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 07/08/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 6.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/10/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Conditions	<b>Completed:</b> 07/10/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/14/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2015 from 07/17/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Conditions.
- . Your project still has 16 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (16 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 94 reviews, 80.9% were on-time, and 58.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Engineering 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	If F Street Right-of-Way will remain Public, the applicant will be required to show the proposed Public Storm Drain system with minimum current City Standard 18" RCP, Type B curb inlets, and D-42 concrete energy dissipater. All Public storm water will be required to be treated with a Structural Treatment Control BMP and Hydromodification Control Requirements because the total imperious surface within the Public Right-of-Way is greater than 5000 sq feet.  (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Project proposes to construct private improvements encroaching into the F Street Right-of-Way. Some of those improvements will be directly adjacent to SDG&E power poles. This will require SDG&E approval. Submit documentation from SDG&E stating they agree to allow the power poles to remain with the proposed adjacent private improvements.  (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	If SDG&E requires the power poles to be removed, show and call out the new location of the poles if the overhead utilities must be relocated. If they are to be relocated, add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by obtaining documentation an SDG & E job package has been issued to the SDG&E Construction Department, to relocate the existing power poles in F Street adjacent to the site, to a location approved by SDG&E, and satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Revise the Site Plan Sheet C2. Add the visibility area triangles, per San Diego Municipal Code Diagram 113-02SS for the driveway on F Street and intersection of the alley and F Street.  (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided.  (From Cycle 6)

## Hydrology & Hydraulics

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	38	Add a discussion regarding the required Public storm drain conveyance system in the Public Right-of-Way. Discuss the required two curb inlets and discharge device.  (From Cycle 8)
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	The Hydrology Study prepared by Thomas Jones RCE of BDS Engineering for the proposed City Lights Town Homes dated May 22, 2015 is approved as submitted. The project meets the Basic Objectives and Basic Policy on drainage design required by the City of San Diego Drainage Manual. The project manages increases in runoff discharge rates and durations that are likely to cause increased erosion, silt pollution generation or other impacts to beneficial uses and stream habitat due to increased erosive force.  (New Issue) [Recommended]

## WQTR

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
-----------------	------------------	-------------------

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Jack Canning at (619) 446-5425. Project Nbr: 369887 / Cycle: 12





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	37	Add manufacturer's literature for the Structural Treatment BMP chosen that verifies the numeric sizing. Also add literature that the Structural Treatment BMP chosen will mitigate the CWA 303(d) list impairments.  (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	39	Add a discussion regarding the required Public storm drain conveyance system structural treatment BMPs in the Public Right-of-Way. Discuss the required two curb inlets and discharge device.  (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	41	Add a discussion regarding the required current City Standard curb inlet at the proposed alley discharge location. Discuss the structural treatment BMPs that has been chosen to treat the Public storm water run-off at the two loations. Currently, the City has approved the following: EcoStorm Plus Stormwater Filtration System, Bacteria or Filterra Bioretention System, or Modular Wetlands Biofiltration System. Discuss which has been chosen for the project design. Add manufactures literature.  (From Cycle 8)
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	Water Quality Technical Report prepared by Thomas Jones RCE of BDS Engineering for the proposed City Lights Town Homes dated May 22, 2015 is acceptable as submitted and will be subject to final review and approval by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of any construction permit. Site Design, Source Control and Treatment Control BMPs analysis is adequate. Hydromodification controls will be designed so runoff rates & durations are controlled to maintain or reduce pre-project downstream erosion conditions & project stream habitat which adheres to the San Diego Storm Water Standards.  (New Issue) [Recommended]

**Engineering 2nd Review**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	40	Revise the Development Plans. Show and call out the required current City Standard curb inlet at the proposed alley discharge location. Show and call out the structural treatment BMPs that has been chosen to treat the Public storm water run-off at the two loations. Currently, the City has approved the following: EcoStorm Plus Stormwater Filtration System, Bacteria or Filterra Bioretention System, or Modular Wetlands Biofiltration System. Call out which is have bee chosen for the project design. (From Cycle 8)

**Conditions**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	44	The project proposes to export 2230 cubic yards of material from the project site. All excavated material listed to be exported, shall be exported to a legal disposal site in accordance with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (the "Green Book"), 2009 edition and Regional Supplement Amendments adopted by Regional Standards Committee.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	45	The drainage system proposed for this development, as shown on the site plan, is public and private and both subject to approval by the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain a bonded grading permit for the grading proposed for this project. All grading shall conform to the requirements of the City of San Diego Municipal Code in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	47	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, the construction of a current City Standard 20ft wide concrete driveway, adjacent to the site on 27th Street, satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, to construct current City Standard concrete sidewalk, maintaining the existing sidewalk scoring pattern of the adjacent properties, per approved Exhibit 'A', adjacent to the site on 27th Street, satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	49	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, to construct current City Standard curb and gutter, adjacent to the site on 27th Street per approved Exhibit 'A', satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	50	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, to construct a current City Standard full-width alley, per approved Exhibit 'A', satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, to construct a current City Standard 18" RCP Public storm drain system, per approved Exhibit 'A', satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	52	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement, from the City Engineer for the private curbs, gutters, and retaining walls encroaching into the F Street and Alley Right-of-Way, per approved Exhibit 'A'.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent BMP maintenance, satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	54	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit the Owner/Permittee *Subdivider shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix E of the City's Storm Water Standards.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Water Quality Technical Report will be subject to final review and approval by the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	57	Any party, on whom fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions have been imposed as conditions of approval of this development permit, may protest the imposition within 90 days of the approval of this development permit by filing a written protest with the City Clerk pursuant to California Government Code 66020.  (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services  
1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/29/2015	Deemed Complete on 06/29/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Community Planning Group	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/29/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Hempton, Alexander (619) 446-5349 Ahempton@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 07/02/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 07/06/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.25	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/10/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 07/06/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/14/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2015 from 07/17/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (None of which are new)
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 71 reviews, 50.7% were on-time, and 61.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Greater Golden Hill

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Chair for the Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee, Ruchell Alvarez, at email goldenhillplanningcommittee@gmail.com, to make arrangements to present your project for review at their next available meeting. This Community Planning Group is officially recognized by the City as a representative of the community, and an advisor to the City in actions that would affect the community. The Development Services Department has notified the group of your request and has sent them a copy of your project plans and documents. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Please forward the recommendation from the Community Planning Group once the project has been presented to the group. (From Cycle 8)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/29/2015	Deemed Complete on 06/29/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> PUD-Water & Sewer Dev	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/29/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Keshavarzi, Mahmood (619) 446-5448 mkeshavarzi@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 07/06/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 07/10/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 6.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/10/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Conditions	<b>Completed:</b> 07/10/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/14/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2015 from 07/17/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for PUD-Water & Sewer Dev on this project as: Conditions.
- . Your project still has 8 outstanding review issues with PUD-Water & Sewer Dev (8 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month PUD-Water & Sewer Dev performed 140 reviews, 95.7% were on-time, and 84.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Sheet C1: Please revise legend to either delete the standard drawings for the proposed water and sewer items or revise the standard drawings per 2012 Standard Drawings for Public Works. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Sheet C3: The applicant must grant a minimum of 5-foot by 5-foot wide water easement for the proposed domestic meters adjacent to the alley west of the project within the proposed property. (From Cycle 6)

2nd Review Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Please revise location of the proposed storm drain cleanouts at the intersection of 'F' Street and Alley to maintain a 5 feet minimum (edge to edge) separation between the proposed water main and the proposed storm drain cleanouts. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Please provide the minimum separation between the proposed storm drain cleanouts and the existing sewer main per Sewer Design Guide. (From Cycle 8)

Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond the design and construction of an 8" public water main within "F" Street right-of-way adjacent to the project site as shown on the approved Exhibit "A", in a manner satisfactory to the Public Utilities Director and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond the design and construction of all public water and sewer facilities as shown on the approved Exhibit "A", in a manner satisfactory to the Public Utilities Director and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	The Owner/Permittee shall grant water easement for the proposed domestic water meters as shown on the approved Exhibit "A", in a manner satisfactory to the Public Utilities Director and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, the design and construction of new water and sewer services outside of any driveway or drive aisle in a manner satisfactory to the Public Utilities Director, the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall apply for a plumbing permit for the installation of appropriate private back flow prevention device(s), on each water service (domestic, fire and irrigation), in a manner satisfactory to the Public Utilities Director and the City Engineer. BFPDs shall be located above ground on private property, in line with the service and immediately adjacent to the right-of-way. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	No trees or shrubs exceeding three feet in height at maturity shall be installed within ten feet of any sewer facilities and five feet of any water facilities. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Prior to Final Inspection, all public water and sewer facilities shall be complete and operational in a manner satisfactory to the Public Utilities Director and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	The Owner/Permittee shall design and construct all proposed public water and sewer facilities, in accordance with established criteria in the current edition of the City of San Diego Water and Sewer Facility Design Guidelines and City regulations, standards and practices. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Submitted: 06/29/2015 Deemed Complete on 06/29/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Housing Commission Cycle Distributed: 06/29/2015
Reviewer: Hempton, Alexander Assigned: 07/02/2015
(619) 446-5349 Started: 07/02/2015
Ahempton@sandiego.gov Review Due: 07/10/2015
Hours of Review: 0.15 Completed: 07/02/2015 COMPLETED ON TIME
Next Review Method: Conditions Closed: 07/14/2015

- The review due date was changed to 07/21/2015 from 07/17/2015 per agreement with customer.
The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
We request a 3rd complete submittal for Housing Commission on this project as: Conditions.
Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Housing Commission (1 of which are new issues).
Last month Housing Commission performed 32 reviews, 37.5% were on-time, and 93.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Housing Commission

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Contains 3 rows of issues related to affordable housing regulations and financial contributions.

Draft Condition

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Contains 3 rows of draft conditions regarding residential building permits and exemptions.





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Prior to receiving the first residential building permit, Owner/Permittee shall comply with the provisions of Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 13 of the San Diego Municipal Code ("Inclusionary Affordable Housing Regulations") by paying to the City of San Diego the full Inclusionary Affordable Housing Fee based upon the aggregate square footage of all residential units in the project, on terms set forth within the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Regulations. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

7/17/15 4:07 pm

Page 1 of 2

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Project Information

**Project Nbr:** 369887 **Title:** City Lights Townhomes

**Project Mgr:** Hempton, Alexander

(619) 446-5349

Ahempton@sandiego.gov



## Review Information

**Cycle Type:** 13 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

**Submitted:**

Deemed Complete on 07/17/2015

**Reviewing Discipline:** Community Planning Group

**Cycle Distributed:**

**Reviewer:** Peterson, Jeff

**Assigned:** 07/17/2015

(619) 446-5237

**Started:** 07/17/2015

japeterson@sandiego.gov

**Review Due:** 07/31/2015

**Hours of Review:** 0.15

**Completed:** 07/17/2015

**COMPLETED ON TIME**

**Next Review Method:** Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

**Closed:** 07/17/2015

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 5th complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (None of which are new)
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 71 reviews, 50.7% were on-time, and 61.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Greater Golden Hill

### Issue

#### Cleared? Num Issue Text

- | Cleared?                 | Num | Issue Text   |
|--------------------------|-----|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1   | Please contact the Chair for the Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee, Ruchell Alvarez, at email goldenhillplanningcommittee@gmail.com, to make arrangements to present your project for review at their next available meeting. This Community Planning Group is officially recognized by the City as a representative of the community, and an advisor to the City in actions that would affect the community. The Development Services Department has notified the group of your request and has sent them a copy of your project plans and documents. (From Cycle 6) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2   | Please forward the recommendation from the Community Planning Group once the project has been presented to the group. (From Cycle 8)   |







# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services  
1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 13 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> Deemed Complete on 07/17/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Environmental	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b>
<b>Reviewer:</b> Sebastian, Lindsey (619) 236-5993 Lsebastian@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 07/17/2015 <b>Started:</b> 07/17/2015 <b>Review Due:</b> 07/21/2015
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.50	<b>Completed:</b> 07/17/2015 <b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Closed:</b> 07/17/2015

- . We request a 5th complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 121 reviews, 45.5% were on-time, and 53.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Environmental Det.

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	36	Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 132506 was prepared for the original City Lights Townhomes project that was before City of San Diego City Council, which certified and adopted the MMRP on August 20, 2008, by Resolution No. HO-6050. Currently, a Site Development Permit is being requested to construct eight two-story over basement garages rental townhomes. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	37	The current project amendment was reviewed by the Environmental Analysis Section and it was determined that in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162(a): (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	38	(1) no substantial changes are proposed to the project which would require major revisions of the previous MND; (2) no substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that would require any revisions to the previous MND; and (3) there is no new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known at the time the previous MND was certified. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	39	Therefore, no subsequent environmental document is required, in that no new additional impacts and/or mitigation measures are required beyond those that were analyzed in the original environmental document. All of the impacts were adequately addressed and disclosed in previously certified MND No. 132506. Additionally, the current project would be required to comply and/or implement all mitigation measures (Paleontological Resources and Historical Resources (Archaeology)) outlined within the previously certified MND. (New Issue)

