



UPTOWN PLANNERS

Uptown Community Planning Committee

AGENDA

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

August 5, 2008 (Tuesday) – 6:00 p.m.

Joyce Beers Community Center, Uptown Shopping District

(located on Vermont Street between the Terra and Aladdin Restaurants)

- I. Board Meeting: Parliamentary Items/ Reports: (6:00 p.m.)**
 - A. Introductions
 - B. Adoption of Agenda and Rules of Order
 - C. Approval of Minutes
 - D. Treasurer's Report
 - E. Website Report
 - F. Chair/ CPC Report

- II. Public Communication – Non-Agenda Public Comment (3 minutes); Speakers are encouraged, although not required, to fill out public comment forms and provide them to the Secretary at the beginning of the meeting. (6:15 p.m.)**

- III. Representatives of Elected Officials: (3 minutes each) (6:30 p.m.)**

- IV. Consent Agenda -- None**

- V. Action Item: Projects (6:45 p.m.)**
 - 1. OLIVE STREET PROPERTY – Bankers Hill/ Park West -- Stacey Lo Medico, Park and Recreation Department Director – Recommendation sought as to the future use of a 16,000 sq. ft. property owned by the City of San Diego, located at the corner of Third Avenue and Olive Street, which according a Revocable Permit Agreement entered into in 1961, an adjoining property owner was allowed to maintain the site as a public park in exchange for access to their property over the site. (6:45 p.m.)**

 - 2. PRESIDIO CANYON RE-DIRECTION OF FLOW STUDY – Mission Hills -- Metropolitan Wastewater Department – Study to determine if it is technically and financially feasible to re-direct sewage flow out of three small canyons areas on the western edge of Mission Hills into water mains in the City right-of-way. (7:15 p.m.)**

 - 3. 3360 REYNARD WAY (“REYNARD WAY ROWHOUSES”) – Process Two – Mission Hills – Neighborhood Development Permit to demolish existing apartments and construct eight residential for rent units with reduced front, rear and side-yard setbacks on a 8,759 sq. ft. site at 3360 Reynard Way in the MR-1000 Zone; Airport Influence Area; Part 77 Flight Path. (7:40 p.m.)**

VI. Information Item -- none

VII. Subcommittee Reports: Action/ Information Items (8:00 p.m.)

1. **Bylaws Subcommittee:** -- Action Item -- Don Liddell: Status of Uptown Planners bylaws re: clarification of two provisions so they are not interpreted to required deviations from City Council 600-24.
2. **Historic Resources Subcommittee** -- Report
3. **Public Facilities Subcommittee** – Report

VIII. Community Organizations: Reports (8:20 p.m.)

IX. Adjournment. (8:30 p.m.)

X. NOTICE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Design Review Subcommittee: Next meeting: August 19, 2008, at 4:30 p. m.; location to be announced.

Historic Resources Subcommittee: Next meeting will be Tuesday, August 12, 2008, at 1:15 p.m., at Jimmy Carter's Restaurant in Bankers Hill/ Park West.

Uptown Planners: Next meeting: Tuesday, September 2, 2008, at 6:00 p. m. at the Joyce Beers Community Center, Hillcrest.

Note: All times listed are estimates only: Anyone who requires an alternative format of this agenda or has special access needs, please contact (619) 835-9501 at least three days prior to the meeting. For more information on meeting times or issues before Uptown Planners, contact Leo Wilson, Chair, at (619) 231-4495 or at leo.wikstrom@sbcglobal.net . Correspondence may be sent to 1010 University Ave, Box 1781, San Diego, CA 92103 Uptown Planners is the City's recognized advisory community planning group for the Uptown Community Planning Area.

Visit our website at www.uptownplanners.org for meeting agendas and other information

UPTOWN PLANNERS

Project Pipeline: 1 Aug 2008

101 DICKINSON STREET (“SHIRAZ MEDICAL CENTER”) – Process Five – North Hillcrest – Site Development Permit and Rezone from RS-1-1 to demolish existing structures and construct a four-story medical building with height and setback deviations on a 1.4 acre site at 101 Dickinson Street within the Uptown Community Plan, FAA Flight Path, Community Plan Implementation Overlay Area B.

Distribution Sheet dated 25 Jun 2008 and re-issued 11 Jul 2008; Notice of Application dated 11 Jul 2008.

A proposal to demolish seven existing residential structures (three built in 1940; one built in 1948; one built in 1924; one built in 1948; one built in 1929, and replace them with a medical office building with underground parking. The four- story medical office building would be above two floors of ground level parking; and two floors of underground parking.

+ Would require a rezone from MCPD-NP-1 to MCPD-RS-1; is within Community Plan Implementation Overlay Area (“CPOZ”) B; (Note: MCPD stands for “Medical Complex Planned District.”) The site plans indicated a Site Development Permit for CPOZ will be sought.

+The maximum height permitted is 70- feet (based on 50- foot height limitation; plus 10- foot bonus for having underground parking; and grade differential bonus of another 10- feet). Applicant is requesting a height variance to allow building to a height of either 98 feet or 105 feet (site plans indicate two different heights)

+ Maximum lot coverage is 50%; project proposes 70% lot coverage; setback deviations also sought.

+ Parking requirement is 317 spaces; project will provide 323 parking spaces. An encroachment into the public-right-of-way is requested, which will be within five feet of the center line of the street, and will be for the underground parking garage.

+Project is located one block east of UCSD Medical Center in the Hospital District-- immediately to the west of the multi-story parking garage on Bachman Place.

EIGHTH AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATION – Process Five – Hillcrest – Right-of-Way Vacation for a portion of 8th Avenue adjacent with lots 47 and 48, portion of lot 10, Map 1185, located in the RS-1-7 Zone; Brush Zone with 300-foot buffer; Transit Area Overlay Zone; Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, FAA Part 77.

Distribution Form dated 23 Jun 2008.

Notice of Application dated 14 Jul 2008.

The project is associated with the property located at 3606 Eighth Avenue.

2965 FRONT STREET (“QUINCE STREET REZONE/ VACATION”) – Process Five – Bankers Hill/ Park West -- Public Right of Way Vacation to vacate a portion of West Quince Street and Rezone from RS-1-2 and RS-1-7at 2965 Front Street; within Airport Influence Zone, FAA Part 77, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area.

Notice of Application dated 25 Feb 2008.

Distribution Form dated 11 Feb 2008.

Site Plans – Existing parking – 32 compact; 1 assessable- 57 total; proposed parking 54 standard – 3 accessible – 57 total; new project results in eight fewer required off-street parking spaces.

Assessment Letter/ Cycle Issues dated 4 Apr 2008. The City is requiring a site plan that shows the various boundaries of the property; cannot make a recommendation on the project until the site plans and other necessary documents are received. Steep hillsides and sensitive biological resources may be present; a biological survey and archeological survey is needed – a site development permit may be required. Brush management requires a 35/ 65 foot-wide zone – which could impact sensitive biological resources.

There needs to be an explanation of why the street vacation is required. There is an existing sewer main, sewer lateral and manhole within the area proposed for vacation. A historic photographic survey of existing structures also needs to be furnished.

Public right-of-way street vacations may only be granted if the following findings can be made:

- (a.) There is no present or prospective public use for the public-right-of-way, either for the facility for which it
- (b.) The public will benefit from the action through improved use of land made available by the vacation;
- (c.) The vacation does not adversely affect any applicable land use plan or; and
- (d.) The public facility for which the public-right-way was originally acquired will not be detrimentally affect by the vacation.

3252 FRONT STREET SDP (“MACKENZIE RESIDENCE”) – Process Three – Bankers Hill/ Park West – Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands for a new pool with landscape improvements on a 0.45 acre site with an existing single family residence at 3252 Front Street in the RS-1-7 and RS-1-2 Zone; FAA Part 77; Residential Tandem Parking; Transit Area.

Distribution Form dated 18 Jul 2008.

3535 INDIA STREET CUP (“ROUTE 66 GAS STATION”) -- Process Three – Middleton -- Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to amend CUP # 85-0789 to demolish existing mini-mart and construct a 3,398 sq. ft. convenience store for an existing gas station with two new gas dispensers on a 0.50 acre site at 3535 India Street in the CL-6 Zone; Airport Influence Area, FAA Part 77; AAOZ;

Distribution Form dated 23 May 2008.

Notice of Application dated 5 Jun 2008.

Assessment Letter dated 27 Jun 2008; Cycle Issues dated 27 Jun 2008;

Project seeking to amend existing CUP to provide for demolition of existing mini-mart and construction of new 3,398 foot store; a Site Development Permit required because deviation is sought to Mid-City PDO requirement for off-setting plans. Planning staff can support the technical deviations as the building is articulated along the street-side of the building.

The project is below 30 feet in height so conforms to AAOZ; has no residential, so is not regulated by the Airport Environs Overlay Zone. The project must be reviewed for consistency with the ALUP, and by the FAA.

Project proposed a 14-foot retaining wall; however, the plans show only a 12-foot retaining wall; only a 12-foot retaining wall is permitted. Unclear if transparency requirement for street wall from three to 10 feet in length is being met.

A driveway entrance can only be 30-feet wide; site plans show a 36-foot driveway; must be narrowed to 30-feet in width.

Traffic impact analysis is required:

1 TRIP GENERATION-The proposed 3,389 sq ft convenience store minus the removal of the existing 400 sq ft mini mart, resulting in a net increase of 2,989 sq ft is expected to generate 1,189 average weekday trips (ADT), using the rate of 700 ADT/1,000sq ft (allowing a credit of 100 sq ft per fueling stations, resulting in 1200 sq ft credit in trip generation calculations), with 107 AM, and 83 PM peak hour trips. The proposed 4 additional fueling stations are expected to generate 600 average weekday trips (ADT), at a rate of 150ADT/ fueling station, with 48 AM, and 48 PM peak hour trips.

Water quality study required; also a hazardous waste questionnaire must be completed. Planning staff recommends that because of extent of hardscape; permeable surfaces and other measures be used to prevent storm water run-off.

A total of 12 parking spaces required; 13 are provided; lighting must be updated to meet code. Two telephone poles; utilities should be placed underground.

Use of solar and the provision of alternate fuels should also be considered. Landscape design statement requested, which indicates landscape theme of project. Eight street trees required.

LOMA PASS CANYON SEWER MAINTENANCE ROAD SDP – Process Two – Mission Hills – Site Development Permit for the creation of permanent access and maintenance of approximately 1655 linear feet of existing eight-inch sewer pipe and 11 manholes within the Lomas Pass Canyon; which will consist of cleaning and grubbing of a three-foot wide access path for foot traffic.

Distribution Sheet dated 25 Jul 2008.

The Canyon Sewer Cleaning Program was initiated in an effort to reduce and/or eliminate sewage spills and avoid fines from the Regional Water Quality Control Board; required the City clean all canyon sewer mains by 31 mar 2004.

“The sewer mains within this canyon are adequately maintainable from the streets, as per the WWC maintenance crew: “Walking Access Paths” paths will be constructed along the length of the canyon in order to provide access to each internal manhole. These paths will be created by clearing and grubbing vegetation in order to provide maintenance crews with a three-foot wide path access for foot traffic.”

4047 NORMAL STREET CUP(“CASA SAN JUAN”) – Process Four – Hillcrest – Conditional Use Permit for a 40 bed residential care facility in an existing building on a 15.750 sq. ft. site at 4047 Normal Street in the MR-800B Zone; Residential Tandem Parking; Transit Area.

Distribution Sheet dated 23 Jun 2008; previous Distribution Sheet dated 2 Apr 2008 and 14 Dec 2007

Letter from Catholic Charities dated 18 Jul 2008; new site plan has been prepared and submitted; parking spaces including a handicapped space and pathway have been repainted to meet current regulations. Now 13 parking spaces provided

Notice of Application dated 14 Dec 2007;

Site Plans indicate the project is provided by Catholic Community Services. The Description of a Proposed Use of Facility.

“The Residential Care Facility will provide temporary housing for undocumented aliens under a contractual agreement with the office of the U. S. Marshall, residents will be males, ages 13 – 17, and older females with children, the residents will be awaiting court appearance as witnesses, they will not have been charged with any wrongdoing, the U.S. Marshall will not assign any potential troublesome persons to the facility.

The maximum number of residents to received complete room and board care will be 35. There are 13 bedrooms or various sizes with a total capacity of 40 beds, and 10 bathrooms, to serve these needs.

Interior recreation rooms on each floor, and copious exterior recreation yards are more than adequate to serve this facility. A staff of 6 will operate the facility; no staff member will live, or sleep, at the facility. City Engineering suggests a need for 8 off street parking stalls; 9 stalls are provided.”

Assessment Letter/Cycle Issues dated 21 Dec 2007. The site has been under its current use since 1981; the CUP has been renewed twice, the last time in 1997. The length of time for the third renewal is not stated in the application. The maximum number of residents under the CUP is 35; yet it provides for 40 beds. The current code requires 70 sq. ft. of sleeping space for each resident – only 39 sq. ft. is provided for 40 residents or 45 for 35 residents.

A city requirement for a residential care facility is there not be another one within one fourth of a mile; needs to be indicated in the application if there are any other such care families within this radius.

Letter from Applicant dated 1 Apr 2008: “Community Planning Group recommendation is pending our resubmittal to Mr. Leo Wilson of the Uptown Community Planning Group. When contacted Mr. Wilson asked up to wait for the First Assessment letter and resubmittal before re-contact. When he receives our resubmittal items we will obtain the recommendation at that time.

Assessment Letter/ Cycle Issues dated 21 Apr 2008; the applicant still needs to submit a revised site plan: “which is necessary for staff to continue their review of the project. Please ensure that your next submittal includes all requested site plans, floor plans, parking calculations, etc. so that staff can complete their review.”

The northwest portion of the parcel at one time had a dwelling unit on it; now is shown as a parking lot. Planning staff inquired what the current use of the northwest portion is presently, and will it be part of the CUP request? Still question whether the facility is for 35 or 50 residents? First CUP was for 35 residents; the CUP extension was for 40 residents.

The project appears to conform to Residential Care Facility regulations; only question is whether another facility located within a quarter mile radius – a map is needs to be submitted of other care facilities within this radius. Also question if a 70 sq. ft. foot of sleeping area is provided per resident; appears only 45 sq. ft. provided.

Second Cycle Issues sent out 21 Apr 2008; indicated that revised site plan needed to be submitted; and that outstanding issue remained such as the number of parking spaces, number of residents, and sleeping are per resident.

ST. PAUL’S CATHEDRAL SDP, NDP, Tentative Map – (Process Four) -- Affordable Expedite Program – Bankers Hill/Park West – Site Development Permit and Tentative Map to construct 112 residential condominiums with reduced setbacks & increased building height and renovate

the 18 existing residential units and rent as affordable housing on a 1.01 acre site at 2665 & 2761 Fifth Avenue in the CV-1 & MR-400 Zone; Includes encroachment into the PROW; Airport Approach Overlay Zone. **(UP: 2 Sep 2008)**

Distribution Sheet dated 25 Mar 2008; Previous Distribution Sheets dated 13 Nov 2006 and 25 Jul 200; Distribution Form dated 25 Apr 2008 26 new Distribution Form dated Jun 2008

Previous Assessment Letters/ Cycle Issues dated 16 Aug 2007; 7 Dec 2006:

The project would construct 130 residential condominiums (18 of the “new” units would be from rehabilitating the existing La Modern Apartments: Deviations requested include: (1.) reduced setbacks; (2.) reduced front yard requirements; (3.) lack of off-street loading area; (4.) reduced street wall heights in setback; (5.) deviation from the allowed percentage of vision glass; (6.) deviation to allow a higher building then allowed by the zoning;(6.) and permission to build into the Airport Approach Overlay Zone.

Proposed project would conform with Council Policy 600-26 criteria for Affordable/ In-Fill Housing Expedite Program by setting aside 10% of the dwelling units on-site (18 units) as rental units for households with income below 65% of the area medium income.

Assessment Letter and Cycle Issued 16 Jan 2008: Summary of issues indicated in latest review stated below, with comments from previous documents in indented text.

Environmental Review: Whether an EIR will be required will not be determined until more information provided regarding the project—remains in Extended Initial Study.

The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) requests further information, to determine the potential impacts of the project, appropriate mitigation, and whether an EIR are required.

A traffic report must be prepared, before the Environmental determination is made. The Airport Authority should also provide a consistency determination.

Environmental issues include potential visual impacts resulting from large buildings, and possible bulk and scale issues. Staff recommends scaling down of current height, bulk and scale.

Long Range Planning: “Large uniformly flat, repetitive glass facades are not characteristic of the development in the nearby vicinity. The upper tower glass curtain walls of the Nutmeg tower should sufficiently include wall texture variation, façade off-sets, ‘setbacks’ or material articulation, etc.”

One of the findings requires that the proposed development will be compatible with existing and planned land use on adjoining properties and will not constitute a disruptive element to the neighborhood and community. In addition, architectural harmony with the surrounding neighborhood will be achieved as far as practicable. It does not appear that this finding can be made.

Planning Review: Issues 20, 36, and 43 remain; the project has been redesigned to comply with the AAOZ; planning staff cannot support the deviations requested for height. “The proposed project does no relate to the scale and design of the neighborhood.

1. “The requested deviation from the underlying base zone 150 – foot height limit would be inconsistent with the purpose and intent of the AAOZ as stated by the City Council in Ordinance Number 0–17756. In adopting 0-17756, the City Council established a criteria for determining public health, safety, and welfare more restrictive than the criteria

established by FAA Part 77 approach and transitional surfaces to runway 27 for Lindbergh Field.”².

2. “San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 132.0205 states that “No structure shall be constructed or altered and no use shall be established that results in any permanent encroachment within 50 feet of the FAA-established approach paths as set forth in Drawing No. C – 926.” As such, the proposed 150-foot height limit deviation for the Nutmeg St. building does not comply with the AAOZ supplemental development regulations where the deviation would exceed the AAOZ height limit.”

3. “City staff is requesting that the proposed Nutmeg St. Building be redesigned, so that it does not exceed the AAOZ surfaces. This includes locations where the AAOZ surfaces limit heights would restrict building heights below the Mid-City Communities Plan District CV-1 base zone 150-foot height limit.”

4.” Although building heights are regulated by zoning, recommendations in the community plan call for limiting development intensities where it could affect airport operations for the purpose of ensuring public safety. Based on comments provided by LDR-Planning and Planning-Airport, outstanding issues remain. Staff recommends reducing building heights to comply with applicable height regulations and/ considering a reduction in market-rate unit size to add more for-sale units.”

5.” The Uptown Community Plan designates the 1.95 acre proposed project site for Commercial/ Residential (approx. 1.15 acres) and Very High Residential (approx. 0.80) acres. Both land use designations allow a residential density of 73 to 110 dwelling units per acre. Based on the proposed area of the site, 142 to 215 dwelling units would be allowed on site. A development proposal consisting of a total of 130 units would not meet the recommended density called for by the community plan.”

6. “Staff calculates 212 units are permitted under the base zones. The base zone allows 1 dwelling unit per 400 square feet of lot area. Since the project proposes 130 units, the project is not eligible for an affordable housing density bonus.”

“Staff recommends that the applicant not request a deviation from the Airport Approach Overlay Supplemental Development Regulations, and lower the height of the Nutmeg structure to comply with the Airport Approach Path Buffer. The justification for requesting this deviation is flawed, as the proposed project does not exceed the allowable density of the base zone and is not eligible for an affordable housing density bonus.”

“Staff strongly recommends eliminating any height deviations requested both for the zone height and for the Airport Approach Path Buffer. The Determination of No Hazard Letters from the FAA, dated 5-31-07 are recognized, the SDRAA has not yet reviewed the project to determine whether or not they concur with the FAA determination.”

“Due to the height of the proposed project (2 towers), and possible bulk and scale issues associated with the development, a potential visual impact is present. In order to reduce the potential impacts to below a level of significance, staff recommends scaling down your current height, bulk and scale.”

“Due to the height of the proposed project (2 towers), and possible bulk and scale issues associated with the development, a potential visual impact is present. In order to reduce the potential impacts to below a level of significance, staff recommends scaling down your current height, bulk and scale.”

Acoustical report must be prepared; visual simulations also need to be prepared, which provide numerous angles designed to demonstrate the buildings from public view locations.

Transportation Review: *A conceptual traffic plan must be submitted, showing pedestrian pathways, proposed vehicle routes and widths, number of lanes, areas of closure, impacts on neighboring properties, etc.*

6.) The project proposes 112 dwelling units which will generate 672 average car trips a day, and there will be additional impacts resulting from the church and rental property. A traffic study will be required. The La Modern will retain its previously conforming rights to have no onsite parking – however, St. Paul's will still be expected to provide the 36 spaces that would have been waived by this variance.

Housing Commission: *The proposal to use the existing La Modern apartments as the site of the 18 affordable units; the La Modern will provide 8,900 sq. ft. of affordable housing, the project is required to provide 12,100 sq. ft. Another 3,200 sq. ft must be provided, or in lieu fees paid.*

Question if any parking is provided for the affordable units in the La Modern Apartments.

Encroachment Review: *City staff continues to oppose the proposed subterranean encroachment in the public right of way.*

7. "The underground encroachments depicted on the project exhibits cannot be supported. Underground encroachments only up to the curb line can be supported."

The proposed underground encroachment into the street right-of-way is required to be scheduled for early consideration by the City Council in accordance with Council Policy 699-19;

Historic Resource Related Issues:

Historic assessment of queen palms needed, including for each tree that could be removed during construction

Two towers proposed are a significant departure in architectural style and theme from the existing cathedral. Applicant encouraged to redesign project to incorporate various styles, elements, themes, building materials, etc of the existing cathedral and/or La Moderne Apartments..."and emphasize the significance of these historic properties on a more grand and comprehensive scale, while also incorporating wall texture variations, façade offsets, upper story setbacks, and utilizing varied roof forms."

330 WASHINGTON ('HILLCREST SHELL CUP') – North Hillcrest --Conditional Use Permit to demolish existing store and construct a 2,178 sq. ft. convenience store and 900 sq. ft. car wash for an existing gas station on o a 0.37 acre site at 330 Washington Street in the CB-1A Zone; FAA Part 77; Residential Tandem Parking; Transit Area.

Distribution Form dated 6 Jun 2008.

Notice of Application dated 19 Jun 2008.

Site Plans indicate original store built in 1969; car wash would operate between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. The existing store is 783 sq. ft; existing three- bay mechanic shop is 1059 sq. ft. The proposed new store will be 2,178 sq. ft., and the new car wash will be 900 sq. ft.

Parking requirement is 7 spaces; which are being provided (including one handicapped).

412 WASHINGTON STREET (“COMERICA BANK”) – North Hillcrest – Site Development Permit to allow for 100% bank and 92 sq. ft. addition to an existing 2,430 sq. ft. space at 412 Washington Street in the CN-1A Zone: FAA 77, Residential Tandem Parking, Transit Area.

Distribution Form dated 7 Mar 1008.

Assessment Letter dated 8 Apr 2008; Cycle Issues dated 15 Apr 2008.

Project is a remodel, with a 92- sq. foot addition, to an existing 3,430 sq. ft. restaurant building, which will turn it into a bank.

A deviation will be required to allow the bank to occupy 100% of the ground floor of the project site; the underlying CN-1A Zone only allows 50% for office/ professional use in buildings with a least 100 feet of street coverage. Planning staff can support the deviation. Another deviation required as code requires to pedestrian entries; and proposed bank will only have one; planning staff cannot support it until there is evidence to justify it.

The building required to have six off-setting planes on Washington Street; proposed project, with addition, does not have them. Planning staff recommends the six off-setting planes be added elsewhere. The existing driveway on Fourth Avenue and the curb ramp must be reconstructed; and bus stop pad in front of bus stop must be constructed.

No new parking required by change from restaurant to bank use; seven spaces required, and nine provided.

WEST LEWIS & FALCON SDP (“WEST LEWIS MINI-PARK”) – **Process Three** -- Mission Hills – Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands for a .033 acre park located over a vacated portion of Falcon Street and a section of West Lewis Street; FAA Part 77.

Notice of Application dated 15 Apr 2008.

“The project proposes improvements to a 0.33 acre passive park located over a vacated portion of Falcon Street and a paper section of West Lewis Street, adjacent to open space canyon. The improvements would include finish grading, concrete walkways, stabilized decomposed granite surfacing, interlocking concrete paved areas, temporary irrigation systems, and native plants landscaping.”

Distribution Form dated 3 Mar 2008.

Assessment Letter/ Cycle Issues dated 6 May 2008; project the development of a small park at the intersection of West Lewis and Falcon Street as Phase I; and at Goldfinch and West Lewis Street as Phase II; within the RS-1-1 and MR-1000 zones.

“The Phase I project proposes development of park design east of the proposed foot bridge and includes finish grading, drainage, pedestrian ramps, hardscape, mow curbs, decomposed paving, decorative boulders, temporary irrigation and planting.”

“Phase II proposes construction of a steel supported pedestrian bridge with wood treads and a trail development of the park design; western portion (Goldfinch Street) and includes finish grading, drainage, pedestrian ramps, hardscape, decomposed granite paving, decorative boulders, temporary irrigation and plantings. The park will have lookouts to the natural canyon to the north”

The project must comply with brush management regulations, particularly in the case of the pedestrian bridge. The bridge design must be fire rated.

The bio study prepared for the project states that impacts would not have to be mitigated below the level of significance; this is a misinterpretation of the City's Significant Determination Thresholds – to qualify for an exemption the total impacts to upland habitat must not exceed 0.1 acres; the combined project impacts would exceed .19 acres and so mitigation would be required. Biological report must include mitigation measures.

A brush management plan must be provided, and it must be clarified who is responsible for maintenance of the brush management. The city open space lots involved are rated "highly flammable."

Must comply with the City's storm water requirements; also, parking requirements must be determined. City standard curbs, gutter, sidewalk and pedestrian ramps must be installed along the frontage and at intersections. An exposed onsite sewer pipe exists on the vacated portion of West Lewis Street, which may have been improperly abandoned. Any sewer pipes within three feet of the ground level are required to be removed – if belong to any adjacent houses, the owner is required to connect to a main fronting their property.

A total of 130 cubic yards of material will be exported from the project site;

Process Two Projects

(Reviewed by Staff; Potential Appeal to Hearing Officer)

MARSTON CANYON SEWER MAINTENANCE ROAD ("I-163 NORTH CANYON SEWER LONG-TERM ACCESS PROJECT") – Process Two/ Substantial Conformance Review - Hillcrest – The project proposes maintenance and access for sewers in I-163 North Canyon and is part of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (LDR No. 42-0077) and Master SDP/CDP.

Distribution Sheet dated 6 Apr 2008 was received 7 Jun 2008.

Notice of Future Decision dated 20 Jun 2008.

Introductory letter from Patricia Grabski, project manager, dated 12 Jun 2008.

Final Biological Resources Report and Impact Assessment dated April 2008:

Site Location: "The 163 North Canyon study area is bounded by Robinson Avenue to the north, Upas Street to the south, State Route (SR) to the west and Park Boulevard to the east. The 163 North Canyon study area includes two canyons that extend in a west-northwesterly direction from SR 163; the main canyon which originates near the intersection of Park Boulevard and Robinson Street, and a smaller canyon to the north, which originates at Vermont Street.

"Highway 163 North Canyon Long Term Maintenance and Emergency Access Plan, prepared by the City of San Diego Engineering and Program Management, Metropolitan Wastewater Department"; dated 8 June 2008.

The majority of the project is located in the MHPA of the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program area.

"The ROF study and cost benefit analysis was prepared by Water & Sewer Design Division, E & CP Department and recommended the Leave in Place Alternative. Based on the study and site investigation, the widening of the existing access footpath to some areas along the canyon . . . to 8 feet is planned in order to accessed sewer mains and manholes by WWC crew to perform

preventive maintenance. The west of Richmond Street canyon area will need about 1,468 feet of existing access paths to be widened to 8 feet and approximately 383 feet of new 8-foot wide access path for three manholes of different locations.“

“The proposed 8 foot wide new access path will be accomplished by clearing and grubbing of existing trees and vegetation. These access path construction and widening including storm water runoff crossings shall conform to council policy and community input. All canyon habitat that are disturbed will be restored.”

Also received, a “Long Term Access Path Re-vegetation Plan: Hwy 163, North Canyon, prepared by Metropolitan Wastewater Department on May 2008; and a “Highway 163 North Canyon Redirection of Flow Study For the Community of Balboa Park, dated June 2006.

“City of San Diego Memorandum from Patricia Grabski, Development Project Manager, Development Services Department”, dated 4 Jun 2008:

“To comply with the Council Policy 400-14’s requirement for community outreach, a community information session sharing the results of the study was held on May 22, 2006. Residents were provided a comment form and based on their feed back; they preferred the leave in place alternative. After some additional discussion the community voted to leave the sewer in place”.

1804 MISSION CLIFF DRIVE NDP (“MOTT RESIDENCE”) -- Process Two – University Heights – Neighborhood Development Permit Environmentally Sensitive Lands for previous grading and retaining walls on a 0.16 acres site with an existing single family residence at 1804 Mission Cliff Drive in the RS-1-7 and RS-1-1 Zone; Brush Zone Overlay, Brush Zone with 300 ft Buffer, Residential Tandem Parking; Transit Area.

Notice of Future Decision dated 1 Jun 2008.

Distribution Form dated 18 Jun 2008.

Site Plans; Demolition –

1. Remove existing keystone retaining wall and all associated materials.
2. Remove existing slope planting and irrigation above all keystone retaining walls that are to be removed.
3. Remove all temporary slope protection and other existing erosion control measures to facilitate construction repair activities.
4. Remove existing access stairs.
5. Protect existing masonry retaining walls in place.

Site Plans; Grading and Drainage Notes –

1. Re-establish pre-existing slope in coordination with the project geotechnical engineers.
2. Contract must confine work to property limits unless given written permission.
3. Protect existing masonry retaining wall in place.
4. Protect existing stairs in place.
5. Protect existing wood deck and observation gazebo in place.
6. Remove existing tree stump and fallen tree.
7. Protect existing curb, gutter and sidewalk in place during construction activities.
8. Install permanent landscaping or slope protection measures on slope once grading activities are complete.

Assessment Letter dated 28 Jul 2008;

“Neighborhood Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands resulting from a Code Enforcement action related to previous unpermitted grading and retaining walls on a 0.16-acre site with an existing single family residence at 1804 Mission Cliffs Drive . . . “

A biological report must be submitted which needs to include: (1.) re-vegetation plan and (2.) have project will conform to multiple habitat planning guidelines. The sensitive biological habitat is maritime chaparral – more than 1: 1 mitigation required.

Grading contours need to be revised to create more natural and less linear appearance, so that the finished slope more resembles a natural slope. Revisions required to the geotechnical report.

Also appear to be private structures within the Mission Cliffs Drive right-of-way; including red brick pavers, site drain and concrete wall; must show a permit for the improvements or a encroachment maintenance and removal agreement must be obtained.

3360 REYNARD WAY NDP (“REYNARD WAY ROWHOUSES”) – Process Two – Mission Hills – Neighborhood Development Permit to demolish existing apartments and construct eight residential for rent units with reduced front, rear and side-yard setbacks on a 8,759 sq. ft. site at 3360 Reynard Way in the MR-1000 Zone; Airport Influence Area; Part 77 Flight Path.

Distribution Sheet dated 19 Jun 2008; Notice of Future Decision dated 7 Jul 2008.

This is a resubmittal of a project approved by Uptown Planners on its consent agenda on 7 Feb 2006: below is the description of the project on the consent agenda:

Assessment letter dated 28 Jul 2008; Existing zoning allows six to nine units on the site; project proposed eight units.

Project proposed front, side and rear deviations which planning staff cannot support; the Mid-City PDO only allows deviations up to 20%; the deviations proposed exceed 20%. Planning staff requires the project be redesigned to conform with the Mid-City PDO Neighborhood Development Permit requirement that deviations be below 20%;

- + Front deviation must be 10 feet; interior side must be six feet; rear deviation must be 15 feet;*
- + Several encroachments in the setback area, which are not permitted;*

The driveway on the site plans is too close to the intersection of Curlew Street and Reynard Way, and will need to be relocated. The driveway in particular is too near the cross-walk and curb ramp. The existing curb ramp will need to be repaired.

A storm water- related report will be required; and the project must be reviewed by the Airport Authority for conformity with the ALUCP.

The style of the building appears contemporary; need to call out five aspects of the architectural style in the project.

A question if FAR, with deviation allowed for enclosed parking, is exceeded; three off-setting planes must be shown on the portion of the building facing street.

Front yard fence may not exceed three feet; site plans indicate this height may be exceeded.

Garage does not count as a basement, so the project is four stories and therefore must be sprinkled. Landscaping plans need to show more detail.

1. **3360 REYNARD TOWNHOME APARTMENTS NDP – (Process Two)** – Bankers Hill- Park West -- Neighborhood Development Permit to demolish existing apartments and construct seven residential (for rent) units on an 8,759 sq. ft. site with increased floor area, reduced front yard setback, and reduced front yard open space at 3360 Reynard Way in the MR-1000 Zone. (*Approved 7-0-2; with condition that overhead utilities be put underground*)

4005 STEPHENS STREET NDP (“SPURLOCK RESIDENCE”) – Process Two – Mission Hills – Neighborhood Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands for previously constructed retaining walls and 216 sq. ft. deck attached to an existing single family residence on a 9, 350 sq. ft. site at 4005 Stephens Street in the RS-1-1 Zone.

Distribution Sheet dated 3 Apr 2008.

Site Plans state: “This Neighborhood Development is being processed in order to seek compliance with the City of San Diego (Code Enforcement) Civil Penalty Notice and Order dated September 27, 2007. The deck and retaining walls were built without permit; question on the garage.

Notice of Future Decision dated 15 Apr 2008.

Assessment Letter dated 23 May 2008; cycle issues dated 29 May 2008; project area has steep hillsides, possible sensitive lands, and is an existing code compliance case. Brush management issues also exist.

The project proposes retaining walls, stairs and fountain, a balcony/deck, conversion of den to bedroom, conversion of garage into workshop, and other minor interior and exterior improvements.

Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) required for a single family development on a lot less than 15,000 sq. ft., which also contains environmentally sensitive lands.

Requirements:

1. Sensitive biological habitat and mature trees should be preserved;
2. As much as feasible, development should not encroach into steep hillsides;
3. Retaining walls should be used to reduce the extent of grading.

Uptown Plan allows low density residential and also designates as open space – is identified as a “highest priority preservation zone”: (1.) Development should be kept to a minimum; (2.) No grading or vegetation removal in the undeveloped portion of the zone; (3.) Any graded areas should be re-vegetated with native species.

Issues Identified:

Retaining Wall: The un-permitted retaining wall must be removed; the deck may remain, but the slope must be restored; a grading permit must be obtained, and a grading plan submitted. Also topographic and biological surveys must be submitted. Site areas graded without a permit must be restored.

Brush Management Plan must be prepared and submitted – must be contained on “Zone 1” and have no off-site impacts to “Zone 2.” The site contains Tier II coastal sage scrub; also near Mission Hills Park.

Garage: Applicant must document the existing garage was converted legally; existing tandem parking spaces must be removed as location not in the tandem overlay zone.

Historic Review: The site is located in potential historic district; changes to exterior require review by the historic review division of the planning department; canyon area sensitive for prehistoric and historic resources; possible paleontological monitoring.

Re-submittals/ Partial Reviews/Inactive Projects (No Activity for Six Months or Previously Reviewed)

3558-3572 FIFTH AVENUE TENTATIVE MAP -- (Process Four) – Tentative Map to convert 12 residential units to condominiums on a --- sq. ft. site with the street address of 3558 – 3572 Fifth Avenue in the MCCPD-CV-1 Zone: Tandem Parking Overlay Zone; Transit Overlay Zone; Identified Historic Resource.

Assessment Letter dated 19 Nov 2007; was the fifth review of the 3558-3572 Avenue Tentative Map; two significant project issues identified:

1. *A building conditions report must be submitted;*
2. *Historic review has issues with project because the scope of work includes alterations.*

Cycle issues dated 19 Nov 2007; Five structures contain 12 dwellings – four duplexes and one two story building. Total floor area is 6,204; tentative map states structures built in 1959; however, County records show it was built in 1926. Current zoning would allow 17units.

Question if plumbing and mechanical systems have exceeded their life span. Current condominium regulations apply. Building conditions report necessary to address issues such as noise, emergency egress, smoke detectors, drywall replacement.

A historic report was prepared and submitted; HRB staff determined structures are architecturally significant. Were scheduled to be heard by HRB for potential historic designation at its September meeting; applicant withdraw the demolition request. The current scope of work does include proposed alterations that require HRB review.

Potential Historic Resource Summary:

1. *San Diego County Building Records show original project constructed in 1926; when site not zone. Five structures containing twelve dwelling units.*
2. *Existing submitted tentative map indicates structures constructed in 1959. Staff requests the maps be revised to show the 1926 date, or the discrepancy explained.*
3. *Current zoning would allow a maximum of 17 units.*
4. *Previous request to demolish the property was reviewed under pts # 127490. A historic resources report was submitted and reviewed. The HRB staff determined the structures were architecturally significant and meets Criteria C; applicant advised that property could be taken forward to HRB for review and possible designation at the September 2007 meeting.*
5. *Applicant withdrew demolition request, and property was not taken to HRB for designation. Instead, a condominium conversion was proposed, which included landscaping and no alterations to structures.*
6. *The current application does request alterations as described in the 17 Sep 2007 Buildings Condition Report. Some of these alternations, including exterior stucco repair, repair or*

replace original building windows to make operable, and preparation and painting of all exposed wood doors, window and trim, could result in an adverse impact to a potential historic resource.

7. *All exterior alterations, repairs, replacements, etc., must meet the Secretary of Interior standards for Rehabilitation or the property must be considered for historic designation.*

Sixth Assessment Letter/ Cycle issues dated 30 Apr 2008; significant issues; windows do not comply with California building codes for emergency egress; possible alternate compliance pursuant to California Historic Building Code should be looked into. Buildings condition report must be prepared; window issue, smoke detectors and other issues must be completed prior to issuance of final map.

Historic report prepared by Scott Moomjian, which indicated the building “retained a high level of historic integrity, that the property owner had agreed to perform all repair work consistent with the (Secretary of Interior) Standards.”

(Note: No indication in assessment letter or cycle issues that his project should be reviewed by Uptown Planners; but indicates: “This review is not counted as a full review because the customer elected to partially submit, or this is a review for a phased project.”)

THIRD AND UNIVERSITY – (Process Three) – Hillcrest – Map Waiver application to waive the requirements of a Tentative Map to construct a 10 story mixed use building with 34 residential units and 6,153 sq. ft. of commercial space on a 0.515 acre site at 301 University Avenue in the CN-1A and MR-800B Zone. The requirement for the site development permit has been removed from this project.

Distribution Form dated 24 Sep 2007.

Pursuant to court ruling, a full EIR is in the process of being prepared.

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report dated 21 Dec 2007.

711 UNIVERSITY AVENUE NDP (“WHOLE FOODS SIDEWALK CAFÉ”) – **Process Two** – Hillcrest – Neighborhood Development Permit and Encroachment Maintenance & Removal Agreement for a 246 sq. ft. sidewalk café for an existing food store located at 711 University Avenue in the CN-1A Zone; FAA Part 77 Overlay Zone; Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone; Transit Area Overlay Zone.

Notice of Future Decision dated 16 Jan 2008.



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

July 28, 2008

Mr. Andy Narendra
Sol Engineering
2605 Camino del Rio South, Suite 101
San Diego, CA 92108

Dear Mr. Narendra:

Subject: Mott Residence First Assessment Letter; Project No. 153675; Job Order No. 43-0673;
Uptown Community Plan Area

The Development Services Department has completed the first of the project referenced above, and described as:

Neighborhood Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands resulting from a Code Enforcement action related to previous unpermitted grading and retaining walls on a 0.16-acre site with an existing single family residence at 1804 Mission Cliff Drive in the RS-1-7 & RS-1-1 Zone within the Uptown Community Plan area.

Enclosed is a Cycle Issues Report (Enclosure 1) which contains review comments from staff representing various disciplines and the community planning group. The purpose of this assessment letter is to summarize the significant project issues and identify a course of action for the processing of your project.

If any additional requirements should arise during the subsequent review of your project, we will identify the issue and the reason for the additional requirement. To resolve any outstanding issues, please provide the information that is requested in the Cycle Issues Report. If you choose not to provide the requested additional information or make the requested revisions, processing may continue. However, the project may be recommended for denial if the remaining issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved and the appropriate findings for approval cannot be made.

As your Development Project Manager, I will coordinate all correspondence, emails, phone calls, and meetings directly with the applicants assigned "Point of Contact." The addressee on this letter has been designated as the Point of Contact for your project. Please notify me if you should decide to change your Point of Contact while I am managing this project.



Development Services

1222 First Avenue, MS 501 • San Diego, CA 92101-4155

Tel (619) 446-5460



- I. REQUIRED APPROVALS/FINDINGS** - Your project as currently proposed requires the approval of a Process Two, Neighborhood Development Permit for environmentally sensitive lands. In order to recommend approval of your project, certain findings must be substantiated in the record. Enclosure 2 contains the required findings.
- II. SIGNIFICANT PROJECT ISSUES:** The significant project issues are summarized below. Resolution of these issues could affect your project. Additional explanation is provided in the Cycle Issues Report.

KEY ISSUES:

- A biological survey report prepared in accordance with City of San Diego guidelines is required by LDR-Planning, LDR-Environmental, LDR-Landscaping and MSCP staff in order to complete their reviews of this project. The biological survey must also include a revegetation plan and must conform with the Multi-Habitat Planning Area adjacency guidelines. Please include the completed biological survey report with your resubmittal.
 - LDR-Planning staff has requested that the proposed contour grading lines be revised to create a more natural and less linear appearance so that the finished slope more closely resembles a natural slope.
 - LDR-Geology staff has requested specific revisions to the geotechnical report that was prepared for this project.
- III. STUDIES/REPORTS REQUIRED:** A Biology Report and revised Geology Report have been identified as necessary to the project's review, as referenced in the attached Submittal Requirements Report (Enclosure 3). Please provide the number of reports specified on the Submittal Requirements Report.
- IV. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS:** Our current accounting system does not provide for real-time information regarding account status, however, our records show approximately \$2,500 remaining in your deposit account. No additional deposit is required at this time, however, based on the processing point and complexity of the project, it is expected that an additional deposit will be required in the future.

During the processing of your project, you will continue to receive statements with the break-down of staff charges to your account. Should you have questions about those charges, please feel free to contact me directly.

V. TIMELINE:

Upon your review of the attached Cycle Issues Report, you may wish to schedule a meeting with staff and your consultants prior to resubmitting the project. Please telephone me if you wish to schedule a meeting with staff. During the meeting, we will also focus on key milestones that must be met in order to facilitate the review of your proposal and to project a potential timeline for a hearing date. Your next review cycle should take approximately 30 days to complete.

Municipal Code Section 126.0114 requires that a development permit application be closed if the applicant fails to submit or resubmit requested materials, information, fees, or deposits within 90 calendar days. Once closed, the application, plans and other data submitted for review may be returned to the applicant or destroyed. To reapply, the applicant shall be required to submit a new development permit application with required submittal materials, and shall be subject to all applicable fees and regulations in effect on the date the new application is deemed complete.

If you wish to continue processing this project, please note that delays in resubmitting projects and/or responding to City staff's inquiries negatively impact this Department's ability to effectively manage workload, which can lead to both higher processing costs and longer timelines for your project.

VI. RESUBMITTALS/NEXT STEPS: When you are ready to resubmit, please telephone (619) 446-5300 and request an appointment for a "Submittal-Discretionary Resubmittal." Resubmittals may also be done on a walk-in basis, however you may experience a longer than desirable wait time. In either case, please check in on the third floor of the Development Service Center (1222 First Avenue) to be placed on the list for the submittal counter. At your appointment, provide the following:

A. Plans and Reports: Provide the number of sets of plans and reports as shown on the attached Submittal Requirements Report. The plans should be folded to an approximate 8 ½ x 11 inch size.

B. Cycle Issues Report response letter: Prepare a cover letter that specifically describes how you have addressed each of the issues identified in the Cycle Issues Report and any issues identified in this cover letter, if applicable. Or, you may choose to simply submit the Cycle Issues Report, identifying within the margins how you have addressed the issue. If the issue is addressed on one or more sheets of the plans or the reports, please reference the plan, sheet number, report or page number as appropriate. If it is not feasible to address a particular issue, please indicate the reason. Include a copy of this Assessment Letter, Cycle Issues Report and your response letter if applicable, with each set of plans.

VII. COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP: Staff provides the decision maker with the recommendation from your locally recognized community planning group. If you have not already done so, please contact Leo Wilson, Chairperson of the Uptown Community Planning Group, at (619) 231-4495, to schedule your project for a recommendation from the group. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the community planning group, in your resubmittal, if applicable, please indicate how your project incorporates any input suggested to you by the community planning group.

Information Bulletin 620, "Coordination of Project Management with Community Planning Committees" (available at <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services>), provides some valuable information about the advisory role the Community Planning Group. Council Policy 600-24 provides standard operating procedures and responsibilities of recognized Community Planning Committees and is available at <http://clerkdoc.sannet.gov/Website/council-policy>.

VIII. STAFF REVIEW TEAM: Should you require clarification about specific comments from the staff reviewing team, please contact me, or feel free to contact the reviewer directly. The names and telephone numbers of each reviewer can be found on the enclosed Cycle Issues Report.

In conclusion, please note that information forms and bulletins, project submittal requirements, and the Land Development Code may be accessed on line at <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services>. Many land use plans for the various communities throughout the City of San Diego are now available on line at <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/index.shtml>

For modifications to the project scope, submittal requirements or questions regarding any of the above, please contact me prior to resubmittal. I may be reached by telephone at (619) 446-5103 or via e-mail at pgodwin@sandiego.gov.

Sincerely,



Paul Godwin
Development Project Manager

Enclosures:

1. Cycle Issues Report
2. Required Findings
3. Submittal Requirements Report

Page 5
Mr. Narendra
July 28, 2008

cc: File
Leo Wilson, Chair, Uptown Community Planning Group
Reviewing Staff (Assessment letter only)