



## **UPTOWN PLANNERS**

### **NOTICE OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

#### **Design Review Subcommittee**

**August 19, 2008 – 5:00 – 6:30 p.m. (Monday)**

### **SPECIAL MEETING LOCATION**

**Meeting Location: Swedenborgian Church  
4144 Campus Avenue, University Heights  
(Southwest corner of Campus Avenue and Tyler Street)**

- I. Call to Order and Introductions (5:00 p.m.)**
- II. Adoption of Agenda and Rules of Order;**
- III. Recusals and Disclosures**
- IV. Public Comment**
- V. Action Items: Projects:**
  - 1. 412 WASHINGTON STREET (“COMERICA BANK”) – Process Three** -- 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. **(5:05 p.m.)**
  - 2. 1804 MISSION CLIFF DRIVE NDP (“MOTT RESIDENCE”)** -- Process Two – University Heights – Neighborhood Development Permit Environmentally Sensitive Lands for previous grading and containing 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. **(5:30 p.m.)**
- VI. Adjournment: (5:50 p.m.)**

**Note: All times indicated are only estimates:** Anyone who requires an alternative format of this agenda or has special access needs contact (619) 835-9501 at least three days prior to the meeting. For more information on meeting times or issues before Uptown Planners, please contact Leo Wilson, Chair, at (619) 231-4495 or at [Leo.Wikstrom@sbcglobal.net](mailto: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.com](http://www.uptownplanners.com)  
for meeting agendas and other information*



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](mailto: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)



L64A-003A

## Project Information

**Project Nbr:** 153675      **Title:** MOTT RESIDENCE  
**Project Mgr:** Godwin, Paul      (619) 446-5103      pgodwin@sandiego.gov



## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Planning Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Braun, Corey (619) 446-5311	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/19/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 4.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/14/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/16/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 117 reviews, 78.6% were on-time, and 44.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

### Project Scope

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project is the restoration of steep hillsides on a property that was graded and had retaining walls constructed without permits. The project is to return the site to its previous condition before the work without permits was done. The site has Environmentally Sensitive Lands on it for both Steep Hillsides and Sensitive Biology (MHPA).

(New Issue)

### Sensitive Biology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	A biological survey is required to determine the exact location of the Sensitive Biological Resources on the slope and to determine the species of native plant material that will be required for the revegetation of the slope.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	a revegetation plan is required to establish the plant species, manner of planting and irrigation to be used for the revegetation of the slope (see LDR-Landscape review comments).

(New Issue)

(New Issue)

### Steep Hillsides

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The proposed grade elevations appear to tie into the elevations of the slope on the adjacent properties where they meet at the property lines, but the contour of the slope on the subject site does not appear natural. The grade elevations should be contoured to appear more like the pre-existing natural slope and not in straight lines across the property. Please adjust the contours and undulation of the slope to appear more like a natural hillside.

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Environmental	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Cass, Marc (619) 446-5330	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/19/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 4.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/21/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/21/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/21/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 96 reviews, 72.9% were on-time, and 52.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Initial Study

### MHPA

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The site lies partially within and is adjacent to the Mutli-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Please delineate the MHPA boundary on the plans. If encroachment into the MHPA is requested, a boundary line adjustment or correction would be needed. Plan-MSCP would take the lead on MHPA adjustments/corrections; therefore, the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) defers to MSCP. (New Issue)

### Biology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The site is mapped as supporting sensitive biological resources (chaparral). Provide a Biological Assesment, prepared in accordance with the City's Biological Guidelines (July 2002), incorporating the Restoration/Revegetation Plan. The assessment should clearly describe any pre-existing sensitvie biological resources, quantify those resources and include any mitigation, as appropriate. The General Outline for the Revegetation/Resoration Plan can be found as Attachment "B" of the City's Biology Guidelines. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	As indicated by Chris Brennan (MMC) and Neighborhood Code, it appears that the project impacted Maritime Chaparral (Tier I) habitat. The biology report will ultimately confirm the sensitive biological resources that were illegally impacted. However, please not that as mitigation for impacts to Tier 1 habitats, mitigaion ratios would require more than a 1:1 ratio all impacts, except for impacts occurring outside the MHPA with mitigaion being provided inside the MHPA. Please see page 16 of the Biology Guidelines. (New Issue)

### Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The Geotechnical Investigation, dated February 7, 2008, should be updated to include appropriate Factor-of-Safety ratios. Geology would take the lead on reviewing the report. However, EAS can not make an environmental determination until the geology report has been deemed adequate. (New Issue)

### Conclusion

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Until the issues outlined above have been cleared/resolved, EAS can not make an envornmental determination.

Contact Marc Cass at 619-446-5330 with questions. (New Issue)







L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Engineering Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Torres, Sean (619) 446-5305	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/18/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 3.50	<b>Started:</b> 06/25/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/08/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 8 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 93 reviews, 87.1% were on-time, and 41.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 1st Review

### Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	There will be a requirement for a grading permit for the restoration of unauthorized grading, per SDMC 129.062(b). Please revise the plans to reflect this requirement. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Per my site visit, it appears that there are private structures within the Mission Cliff Drive right-of-way. Please provide documentation which allows the enhanced driveway pavement, red brick pavers, site drain, and concrete wall within the public right-of-way. If documentation can not be provided, there will be a requirement to obtain an Encroachment Maintenance and Removal Agreement (EMRA) for said structures. Please revise the plans to reflect this requirement. (New Issue)

### Comments/Corrections

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please revise the Grading Plans, as follows:  ADD NOTE TO PLANS - Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant 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"/>	4	ADD NOTE TO PLANS - Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant 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"/>	5	Under the Benchmark heading, please add "MSL" after the elevation "347.121". (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	On sheet 2, please show all existing private and private improvements along Mission Cliff Drive, adjacent to the site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Please provide curb to property line, curb to centerline and centerline to property line distance on Mission Cliff Drive, per drawing 948-D. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	On the Grading and Drainage Notes heading, "Drainage" is spelled incorrectly. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Fire-Plans Officer	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Medan, Bob (619) 236-6262	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/18/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.50	<b>Started:</b> 06/18/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 06/18/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Fire-Plans Officer on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Fire-Plans Officer performed 27 reviews, 92.6% were on-time, and 60.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Fire Dept. issues (1st review)

	<u>Issue</u>
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u> <u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 No issues/objections based on this submittal. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Community Planning Group	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Godwin, Paul (619) 446-5103	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/26/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.00	<b>Started:</b> 06/26/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 06/26/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 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 2nd complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 82 reviews, 65.9% were on-time, and 42.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Chair for the Uptown Planners, Leo Wilson, at (619) 231-4495 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. (New Issue)



# Cycle Issues



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

7/28/08 10:34 am

Page 6 of 11

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Park & Rec	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Harkness, Jeff (619) 533-6595	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/19/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.50	<b>Started:</b> 07/10/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/10/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Park & Rec on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Park & Rec performed 40 reviews, 82.5% were on-time, and 79.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Review 7-16-08

	<u>Issue</u>	
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	There are no open space or population-based park issues associated with this project. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Neighborhood Code	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Diamond, Leslie (619) 236-5500	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.60	<b>Started:</b> 07/10/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/10/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Neighborhood Code on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Neighborhood Code (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Neighborhood Code performed 5 reviews, 80.0% were on-time, and 100.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

**New Issue Group (962120)**

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This grading plan and NDP application is intended to provide compliance with a Civil Penalties Notice dated October 31, 2007. Violations included unauthorized grading activity on ESL steep hillsides and sensitive biological resources. Grading activity included placement of undocumented fill material, construction of a series of keystone retaining walls, and dumping of loose soil and debris in the canyon. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Per biological assessment by acting City Biologist Chris Brennen, Southern Maritime Chaparral (tier I; Rare Uplands) native habitat has been impacted as a result of the unauthorized construction activity. The grading plan does not include proper biological evaluation of impacted area and no native revegetation plan has been included. Required documentation should be submitted for review by environmental and landscape staff. (New Issue)







L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Geology	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/18/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 4.00	<b>Started:</b> 06/19/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/15/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 74 reviews, 91.9% were on-time, and 63.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

### 1st Review/Cycle 2 Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within geologic hazards zone 53 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 53 is characterized by level or sloping to steep terrain with unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk. In addition, on-going slope instability has been documented at the site in the referenced geotechnical reports. (New Issue)

### 1st Review/Cycle 2 References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Grading Plan, Mott Residence, Lot 49, Map 2268, San Diego, California, prepared by Sol Engineering, Inc., print dated June 11, 2008.  Limited Geotechnical Engineering Evaluation Report For Mission Cliff Drive Wall Evaluation Project, 1804 Mission Cliff Drive, San Diego, California, prepared by Solid Rock Engineering, Inc., dated February 7, 2008 (their project no. 61000388-01). (New Issue)

### 1st Review/Cycle 2 Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	An update geotechnical report that addresses the project plans currently proposed (PTS No. 153675) must be submitted for review. The geotechnical report must demonstrate that the proposed slope will have a factor-of-safety of 1.5 or greater with respect to gross and surficial slope stability following project completion. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The geotechnical consultant must determine if unfavorable geologic structure exists at the site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The update geotechnical report must clarify the proposed limits of development and provide a cross-section to illustrate the relationship between the limits of proposed development, any remedial grading recommended, property boundaries, and environmentally sensitive lands. The geotechnical consultant should coordinate with the project civil engineer and architect. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports." (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Plan-MSCP	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Krosch, Jeanne (619) 236-6545	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/26/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 3.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/25/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/25/2008	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-MSCP on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Plan-MSCP (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Plan-MSCP performed 17 reviews, 70.6% were on-time, and 60.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## MSCP Comments - 7/08

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please add the MHPA boundary line to the plans. Due to the adjacency to the MHPA, the development will need to conform with the applicable Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (Section 1.4.3) of the MSCP Subarea Plan for drainage and landscaping:  Drainage should be directed away from the MHPA, or if not possible, must not drain directly into the MHPA, Instead runoff should flow into sedimentation basins, grassy swales or mechanical trapping devices prior to draining into the MHPA. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Per the Notice of Violation, restoration/revegetation of the site is required. No invasive non-native plant species shall be planted in or adjacent to the MHPA. Please provide an analysis of the vegetation that existing on-site prior to the violation and impacts that occurred as part of the illegal activities. Provide mitigation and a restoration/revegetation plan consistent with the City's Biology Guidelines. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/11/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/17/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Landscaping	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/17/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Oakley, Jeffrey (619) 446-5355	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/19/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 3.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/16/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/16/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/16/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 07/28/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/21/2008 from 07/21/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 77 reviews, 85.7% were on-time, and 41.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please address the following issues in regards to the proposed restoration of the disturbed steep slope prior to resubmittal. You may contact the Landscape Planner (Jeff Oakley) at (619) 446-5355 with any comments or questions. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Informational Item: The Landscape Plan Review web page contains links to the following information, consolidated in one location:  - Landscape Regulations - Landscape Standards - Submittal Requirements - Landscape Calculation Worksheets - No Fee Street Tree Permit Application - and more...  <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/landscape.shtml">http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/landscape.shtml</a> (This information is located on the Development Services web page under Forms & Guidelines.) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	A separate Revegetation/Restoration Plan is required as per the Landscape Standards and Biology Guidelines [Refer to Attachment "B," GENERAL OUTLINE FOR REVEGETATION/RESTORATION PLANS] of the City of San Diego's Land Development Manual and shall comply with Item's 11.2 - 11.2.4 of the Project Submittal Requirements for Development Permits. Please provide a separate plan that demonstrates compliance with these regulations. The Submittal Requirements can be found at the following webpage:  <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/codes.shtml#submanual">http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/codes.shtml#submanual</a> (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Please provide all Grading Notes from sheet 1 on the Revegetation/Restoration Plan as well as the following "Revegetation and Erosion Control" note:  "All required revegetation and erosion control shall be completed within 90 calendar days of the completion of grading or disturbance" [LDC 142.0411(c)]. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	It appears that there may be sensitive vegetation (i.e. native "Chaparral") existing on the subject property as well as a Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) located at the northern end of the property. Since the native vegetation and/or MHPA may have been impacted by the illegal grading for the retaining walls; please provide a copy of a Biological Assessment Report to LDR-Landscape staff upon resubmittal. Refer to LDR-Environmental and Plan-MSCP staff for further issues in regards to this. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	It appears from Sheet 3 and from an aerial map that there are mature trees still existing on the disturbed slope. Please identify these trees in the revegetation plant legend. Provide the common and botanical names, the caliper size, and if the trees are existing "to remain" or "to be removed." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	It appears that the total elevation of the steep slope disturbed by the grading is approximately 35 feet. As per LDC Table 142-04F of the Landscape Regulations; any slope within 100 feet of areas of native or naturalized vegetation with a slope height greater than 15 feet, shall also require "native or naturalized trees and shrubs (minimum 1 gallon size) planted at a minimum rate of one plant per 100 square feet of disturbed area" in addition to the proposed non-irrigated hydro-seed mix.
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	[See next issue] (New Issue) Establishment of the disturbed slope shall require an "automatic, above grade, temporary irrigation system" as required in Table 142-04F. Please provide notes on the revegetation/restoration plan that describe the type of temporary irrigation proposed for the establishment of the hydro-seed mixes as well as the native trees and shrubs. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Provide the following note on the revegetation/restoration plan:  "The Permittee or Subsequent Owner shall ensure that all proposed landscaping, especially landscaping adjacent to native habitat and/or MHPA, shall not include exotic plant species that may be invasive to native habitats. Plant species found within the California Invasive Plant Council's (Cal-IPC) Invasive Plant Inventory and the prohibited plant species list found in "Table 1" of the Landscape Standards shall not be permitted." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Clearly identify the "limit of work" lines for the restoration of the impacted slope areas on the revegetation/restoration plan. (New Issue)





## THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

August 6, 2008

Michael Fontanilla  
Childs Mascari Warner Architects  
1717 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Fontanilla:

Subject: Shiraz Medical Center Assessment Letter; Project No. 157724; Job Order No. 43-1028;  
Uptown Community Plan Area

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

Site Development Permit and Rezone from RS-1-1 to NP-1 to demolish existing structures and construct a four-story medical building with height and setback deviations on a 1.40 acre site at 101 Dickinson Street.

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 processing of a Site Development Permit (SDP) and a Rezone. The SDP is required to allow for the requested deviations and the Rezone is required to change the existing RS-1-1 residential zone to NP-1, which is a neighborhood professional use zone. Your project will require a recommendation from the Planning Commission (Process Four) and a decision from the City Council (Process Five). 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:**

**BDR-Structural** – These comments have been provided to assist you in identifying any major structural or building code issues early in the project. This is not intended to be an in-depth or complete structural review. No response is required to these issues as BDR-Structural will not be reviewing your discretionary submittals.

**LDR-Planning** – The southern portion of the site which is currently zoned RS-1-1 may not be developable due to the potential presence of Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL). Please provide evidence that this portion of the site does not meet the City's ESL definition or demonstrate how a deviation from the ESL requirements is warranted for the proposed development. Additionally, please provide more information regarding the proposed side yard setback deviation so staff may determine if it is supportable. Staff is not supportive of the requested overall structure height deviation based on the current design. The deviation request must meet the intent and purpose of the regulation and the requested height deviation could result in bulk and scale issues for the building.

**LDR-Environmental** – A Biological Letter Report will be required to assess the potential biological impacts of the project and provide support for the requested zone change and ESL issues raised by LDR-Planning. A Geologic Reconnaissance Report will also be required with your resubmittal. Based on LDR-Planning and Long-Range Planning's comments regarding the proposed deviations in conjunction with the bulk and scale of the project, the project may result in significant impacts to neighborhood character. Please provide the detailed deviation justifications requested and demonstrate how the project would not adversely effect the Uptown Community Plan. Also, please provide copies of the previously prepared historic resource reports for the existing structures with your resubmittal.

**LDR-Engineering** – The underground parking garage encroachments into the right-of-way can not be supported as proposed. The applicant will be required to submit a Water Quality Technical Report with their next submittal.

**LDR-Wastewater** – Sewer calculations will be required with your resubmittal to ensure that the proposed sewer improvements are sized correctly for the project.

**LDR Transportation** – A traffic study must be prepared for the proposed project. The two proposed project driveways would not be allowed per the Municipal Code which states one driveway would be allowed. A City standard cul-de-sac at the end of Dickinson Street is also required.

**Long-Range Planning** – As raised previously by other disciplines, please explain the justifications for the proposed encroachment into ESL and the requested height deviations.

- III. STUDIES/REPORTS REQUIRED:** A Water Quality Technical Report, Biology Report, Geology Report and Traffic Study have all been identified as necessary to the project's review. LDR-Planning has also requested copies of the previously approved historic reports for the existing structures. Please reference the attached Submittal Requirements Report (Enclosure 3) for the number of copies needed of each report.
- IV. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS:** Our current accounting system does not provide for real-time information regarding account status, however, our records show approximately \$10,000 remaining in your deposit account. Although no deposit is required at this time, additional deposits may be required as the review progresses. 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:** 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.

Page 5  
Mr. Fontanilla  
August 6, 2008

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) 44-5103 or via e-mail at [pgodwin@sandiego.gov](mailto:pgodwin@sandiego.gov).

Sincerely,



Paul Godwin  
Development Project Manager

Enclosures:

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

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



L64A-003A

## Project Information

**Project Nbr:** 157724      **Title:** SHIRAZ MEDICAL CENTER  
**Project Mgr:** Godwin, Paul      (619) 446-5103      pgodwin@sandiego.gov



## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Planning Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Braun, Corey (619) 446-5311	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/27/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 10.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/23/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/28/2008	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 9 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Project Scope

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

- |                                     |   |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The proposed project is to demolish nine residential buildings and construct a single, 4-story, 79,360 sq. ft. medical office building over a 2 level open parking structure above 2.5 levels of underground parking on a 31,745 sq. ft. parcel in the NP-1 zone of the Mid-City Communities Planned District and the RS-1-1 zone in the Medical Complex neighborhood of the Uptown Community Plan area. |
|                                     |   | (New Issue)  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2 | The project includes a request to rezone the southern approximately 70 feet of the project site from RS-1-1 to NP-1. The project also requests deviations to the development regulations for the maximum building height, the maximum overall structure height, and the rear yard setback.   |
|                                     |   | (New Issue)  |

## Rezoning

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

- |                          |   |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | The Letter of Request along with its attachments state that this evidence provided shows that the intent of the City Council was to change the land use designation of the site from Open Space to Hospital and therefore to rezone the property from RS-1-1 to NP-1. While the evidence does show that the Council changed the designation and zone of the north 3/4 of the eastern end of the site, it does not show that this change included the southern portion of the site. There is no evidence that the intent was to redesignate and rezone the entire parcel.                       |
|                          |   | Continued...   |
|                          |   | (New Issue)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | The RS-1-1 zone is a very low-density residential zone that was placed on the canyons and hillsides in the area as a way of preserving the environmental resources in that part of the city. It may be that the northeastern part of the lot was removed from the RS-1-1 zone because it was no longer considered an environmental resource after the adjacent UCSD parking structure was built and thereby removed any environmentally sensitive hillsides or biological resources. It does not appear from the evidence that this opinion was also held for the southern portion of the lot. |
|                          |   | Continued...   |
|                          |   | (New Issue)  |







L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	In order to justify a rezone from the RS-1-1 zone to the NP-1 zone, evidence will need to show that the southern portion of the lot is no longer an environmentally sensitive area and so no longer needs the protection of the very low density zone and the city's Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) regulations should not apply to this site. In other words, evidence needs to show that slope on the southern portion of the lot does not meet the city's definition of a steep hillside or a sensitive biological resource (see SDMC 143.0110 & 113.0103).
		Continued...
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Under the ESL regulations, development would not be allowed to encroach into the area that is determined to be an environmental resource, regardless of the underlying zone. The southern portion of the lot, if it still meets the definitions mentioned above, would be protected by the ESL regulations and the intent of the RS-1-1 zone on this property would therefor be redundant.

(New Issue)

**Development Regulations**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Rear Yard Setback SDMC 1512.0311(b)(2)(B) - The project proposes a rear yard setback of 10 ft. 1 inch where a rear yard setback of 15 feet is required. This 33% deviation from the requirement can be supported because of the situation of the lot and the adjacent parking structure. The rear property line is situated where, because of the steep terrain and the configuration of the lots, it is not readily visible and appears more like an interior side property line, which would only require a 6 foot setback for the first two floors, 9 feet for the third floor and 12 feet for the fourth floor.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Side Yard Setback SDMC 1512.0311(b)(2)(B) - The project description does not mention the deviation shown on the plans to have a side yard setback of 5 feet for all four floors on the west elevation where a 6 foot setback is required for the first two floors, a nine foot setback is required for the third floor, and a 12 foot setback is required for the fourth floor. This constitutes 3 deviations of up to 58% from the regulation. Please provide evidence as to why these deviations are necessary and how the project still meets the purpose and intent of the interior side yard regulation.
		(New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Front Yard Area SDMC 1512.0311(b)(2)(A) - The project description does not mention the deviation shown on the plans to have a front yard area of approximately 2,583 square feet where a front yard area of 2,994 square feet is required. This deviation of about 14% from the requirement is in keeping with the purpose and intent of the regulation and staff can support this deviation.
		(New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Building Height Limit SDMC 1512.0311(b)(3) - The proposed project would have a building height at the highest point above grade of 94 feet where the maximum building height allowed (where the building is above underground parking) is 60 feet. However, where the project is visible from the street, the project will appear as a 4 story building with a height ranging from 63 feet to 69 feet. This 5% to 15% deviation in the height limit from the main public view of the building is in keeping with the purpose and intent of the regulation and staff can support the deviation.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Overall Structure Height SDMC 1512.0311(b)(3) - The proposed project would have a overall structure height of 104.75 feet where the maximum overall structure height allowed is 70 feet. The intent of this regulation is to limit the bulk and scale of structures where they occur on sites with severe topographical differences. The proposed 49% deviation from the regulation is not consistent with the purpose and intent of the regulation and staff cannot support it.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Offsetting Planes SDMC 1512.0312(a)(1) - Please provide a graphic to show how the project will meet the requirements for offsetting planes contained in Municipal Code section 1512.0312(a)(1).

(New Issue)

**Environmentally Sensitive Land**

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





L64A-003A

**Issue**  
**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 13 As stated in Issue #6 above, the south end of the project site appears to have environmentally sensitive lands in the form of steep hillsides and/or sensitive biological resources. If so, encroachment into the steep hillsides will not be allowed according to the ESL regulations SDMC 143.0110. Either provide evidence that the south end of the property does not meet the City of San Diego's definition of steep hillsides and/or sensitive biological resources or redesign the project so that it does not encroach into this area.

(New Issue)

**FAA Part 77 Notification**

**Issue**  
**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 14 The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has notified the City that the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for all Airports in the City do not include all areas that are subject to Federal notification requirements and structure height limits near airports.

(New Issue)

- 15 Due to the height and proximity of the proposed project to Lindburgh Field, your project must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for Obstruction Evaluation and Airport Airspace Analysis as required by the Code of Federal Regulations Title 14 Part 77, Subpart B to ensure that the structure will not be an obstruction or hazard to air navigation. The following is a link to the FAA website for submitting projects (form 4760-1) to the FAA: [www.oaaaa.faa.gov](http://www.oaaaa.faa.gov).

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Environmental	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Benally, Rhonda (619) 446-5468	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/25/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.00	<b>Started:</b> 08/01/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 08/04/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 08/05/2008	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 13 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

### Review 8/5/08

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) has reviewed the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Additional information is required to determine if identified Biological Resources, Geology, Historical Resources (Archaeology), Land Use/Neighborhood Character, Paleontology and Traffic/Parking/Circulation impacts would be considered significant. Until this information is provided, EAS is not able to complete the Initial Study. The project will remain in Extended Initial Study (XIS) and the CEQA processing timeline will be held in abeyance. (New Issue)

### Biological Resources/Land Use

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The project has the potential to impact biological resources in the area; therefore a Biological Letter Report shall be completed for this project. The report needs to address potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts that may occur to sensitive habitats and species in the area and MHPA adjacency and designated open space. Therefore, the report shall be prepared in accordance with the City of San Diego's Biological Review References (July 2002). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	(Continued) Based upon site photos, it appears that mature eucalyptus trees exist on site. Therefore, the report shall address the potential for noise impacts from construction noise on sensitive species (i.e. raptors) which may be located in the area. (New Issue)

### Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The project is located in Geologic Hazard Category 52 which is characterized as other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure and low risk. The City of San Diego's Geotechnical Guidelines recommends that projects located in the Geologic Hazard Category 52 requiring a Site Development Permit (CDP) for Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) should prepare and submit a Geologic Reconnaissance (GR) Report for the proposed project. Please submit a report to LDR-Geology Staff for review and provide a copy of the report to EAS staff in your next submittal. (New Issue)

### Historical Resources (Archaeol)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	A review of maps in the Entitlements Division identifies several archaeological sites within a mile of the project site. It appears the project may be partially or in close proximity to a highly sensitivity area for historical resources; therefore an archaeological survey and report may be required. (New Issue)

### Historical (Architectural)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	If a residence is greater than 45 years or older, then the residence may be considered potentially historically significant. The building records indicate that the existing residences were constructed from approximately 1924 to 1948 and are proposed for demolition. Site specific Historic Resource Research Reports were prepared for several of the properties but the properties were determined not to meet local designation criteria. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	The Plan-Historic Staff determined that no further review would be required unless substantial new information regarding the significance of the sites. Refer to Plan-Historic Reviewer's comments for additional information. Please provide a copy of these reports to EAS Staff in the next submittal. This information will be discussed in the environmental document. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Rhonda Benally at (619) 446-5468. Project Nbr: 157724 / Cycle: 2





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

### Land Use/Neighborhood Characte

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	The proposed height and setback deviations in conjunction with the project's bulk and scale may be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood character and underlying zone. A project that exceeds the allowed height or bulk regulations and existing patterns of development in the surrounding area by a significant margin could be considered significant. In coordination with Long Range Planning provide justification for the proposed deviations and how such deviations would not adversely impact the goals, objectives and recommendations of the Uptown Community Plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	(Continued) Refer to Long Range Planning for additional comments. (New Issue)

### Paleontology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," the subject property is underlain by Lindavista and Mission Valley Formations. The LindaVista Formation has been assigned a moderate resource potential and the Mission Valley Formation has been assigned a high resource potential for paleontological resources. The Preliminary Grading Plan (Sheet 2) indicates approximately 42,000 cubic yards of soil would be graded to a depth of 56 feet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	(Continued) If the grading for the proposed project is to exceed 2,000 cubic yards of soil at a depth of cut of 10 feet or greater then there is potential for significant impacts to paleontological resources, and monitoring will be required. (New Issue)

### Transportation/Parking/Circula

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	LDR-Transportation has indicated a Traffic Study will be required. Please provide a copy of the report to EAS staff in your next submittal. EAS will coordinate with transportation staff regarding if the project meets its parking requirements. (New Issue)

### FAA Notification Area

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	The proposed project is located within the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Notification Area for Lindberg Field. LDR-Planning has determined an FAA determination is required. Refer to LDR-Planning reviewer's comments for additional information. (New Issue)

### Water Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	LDR-Engineering has determined that a Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR) is required. Provide EAS staff with a copy of the WQTR in the next submittal. (New Issue)

### New Issue Group (976737)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Please note additional environmental issues may arise as the review progresses. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Engineering Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Canning, Jack (619) 446-5425	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 6.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/11/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/23/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 15 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Engineering 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Engineering Review Section has reviewed the subject development and have the following comments that need to be addressed prior to a Public Hearing. Upon resubmittal, we will complete our review of the Site Development Permit Plans.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The project proposes parking structure encroachments into the Dickinson Right-of-Way farther than 3 feet behind the curb. Therefore per Council Policy 700-18, this will require Process 5, Council Approval.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Parking structure encroachments into Dickinson Right-of-Way are not acceptable. Per Council Policy 700-18, top of the underground structures encroaching into the Right-of-Way shall be a min 3 feet below the existing curb grade. Plans show the top of the structure to be at sidewalk grade which is unacceptable. Per Council Policy 700-18, if top of the underground structure is 15 ft below street grade, the structure may encroach to within 5 ft of the street centerline. Project proposes to encroach within 2'-11" of the C/L which is not acceptable. Revise all plans to adhere to Council Policy.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Revise the Site Plan. Show and call out the location of the roof drains and how they are discharged.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Revise the Grading plan Sheet 2. Identify the source and date of the topography. Add the elevation and MSL datum to the Bench Mark.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	The applicant did not complete the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist correctly. The correct response to Part A, Item No.7 is YES, this project is directly adjacent to a Water Quality Sensitive Area. Submit a revised checklist on the next submittal.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	This project is subject to the regulations contained in the revised City's Storm Water Standards dated March 24, 2008.  The revised Storm Water Standards are available online at: <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/developmentservices/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf">http://www.sandiego.gov/developmentservices/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf</a>  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Based on the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, this project is a Priority Project and requires BMPs. The applicant shall submit a Water Quality Technical Report consistent with the revised City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards. The report shall include, but not be limited to, BMP maintenance schedules and maintenance costs and the responsible party for future maintenance and associated costs. (continued below)  (New Issue)







L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	The report will also need to address water quality, by describing the type of pollutants which will be generated during post-construction, the pollutants to be captured and treated by the proposed BMPs and the quality of the resultant discharge. To comply with the updated regulations, the project will be required to incorporate "Low Impact Development" features among other requirements.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Revise the Site Plan and Grading Plan. Show and call out the proposed BMP's called out in the required WQTR.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Revise Site Plan. Call out a suitable energy dissipater to reduce the discharge to non-erodable velocities for the proposed brow ditch discharge locations.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Revise the Site Plan and Grading Plan. Add the visibility area triangle, per San Diego Municipal Code Diagram 113-02QQ, for the proposed driveway. Call out no obstruction including landscaping or walls in the visibility area shall exceed 3 feet in height.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	The number, location and width of the proposed driveways, plus issues regarding a required public turn-around on Dickinson Street will be addressed by Transportation Review.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Additional comments may be recommended pending further review or any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive.

Should you have any questions or comments, please call Jack Canning at 619 446-5425.

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Fire-Plans Officer	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Medan, Bob (619) 236-6262	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 1.00	<b>Started:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 06/24/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Fire-Plans Officer on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with Fire-Plans Officer (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Fire-Plans Officer performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Fire Dept. issues (1st review)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Comply with City of San Diego Landscaping Technical Manual for brush and landscaping. (Appendix II-A, Section 16) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Call Bob Medan at 619-446-5444 for an appointment to discuss these requirements. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Provide the following Fire note: "Firelane will support 95,000 pounds". (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Discuss the fire lane - it appears that it is under the overhang of the building. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Project does not meet 150' hose coverage requirement. Discuss fire sprinklers as mitigation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Discuss aerial ladder access requirements for buildings more than 35' tall. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Community Planning Group	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Godwin, Paul (619) 446-5103	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/26/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.00	<b>Started:</b> 06/26/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 06/26/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 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 2nd complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Chair for the Uptown Planners, Leo Wilson, at (619) 231-4495 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. (New Issue)



# Cycle Issues



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

8/6/08 7:58 am

Page 10 of 24

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Park & Rec	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Harkness, Jeff (619) 533-6595	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/27/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.50	<b>Started:</b> 07/23/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/30/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/24/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Park & Rec on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Park & Rec performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Review 7-30-08

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	There are no open space or population-based park issues associated ith this proejct. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> BDR-Structural	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Papuga, Matt (619) 687-5952	<b>Assigned:</b> 07/01/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 2.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/03/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/03/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for BDR-Structural on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 9 outstanding review issues with BDR-Structural (all of which are new).
- . Last month BDR-Structural performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## New Issue Group (959500)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The new jaged opening is inside of 10'... it must be 1 hour constrution inside of 10' (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Medical office builiding that large??..... It's not an I occupancy? (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	My check is per the 2007 California Building Code not the muni-code. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Per the CBC you are unlimited in # of stories, height and square footage for a type 1A construction for B occupancies.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Level 2..... 65 parking spaces would reuired 3 disabled parking spaces. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	You probably should have a diable parkingon grad at one...., not everyone is wheel chair bound. You might get a community complaint. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Actually to be practical, since it is a medical facility, all levels should require 3 disabled parking places. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Table 704.8..... for the B-occupancy.... only 45% of the walls can have window area... It looks like you make it but you should check. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Open parking less than 10' to the property line unlimited openings per table 704.8--- just a note.... positive. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

**Cycle Type:** 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)      **Submitted:** 06/12/2008      Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008  
**Reviewing Discipline:** SANDAG-Land Use & Transportati      **Cycle Distributed:** 06/24/2008  
**Reviewer:** Godwin, Paul      **Assigned:** 06/26/2008  
(619) 446-5103      **Started:** 06/26/2008  
**Hours of Review:** 0.00      **Review Due:** 07/23/2008  
**Next Review Method:** Submitted (Multi-Discipline)      **Completed:** 07/24/2008      **COMPLETED LATE**  
**Closed:** 08/06/2008

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for SANDAG-Land Use & Transportation on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month SANDAG-Land Use & Transportation performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Although SANDAG has no comments on the site design, we believe this project, with an estimated 3,960 daily trips, could have a significant effect on the regional transportation system, and we would like to be made aware of the environmental document as soon as it is available. If a CEQA exemption is proposed, we would also like to be made aware of this. (New Issue)







L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Plan-Facilities Financing	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Galvez III, Oscar (619) 533-3685	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 1.00	<b>Started:</b> 06/27/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/30/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 06/27/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Facilities Financing on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Plan-Facilities Financing (all of which are new).
- . Last month Plan-Facilities Financing performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Fees

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	A Development Impact Fee (DIF) is required at building permit issuance based on increased square footage over what currently exists on the site. The currently adopted Uptown DIF rate for nonresidential development is \$119 per trip and \$74/1,000 gross square feet for fire. Fees are subject to change upon Council approval of an update to the Public Facilities Financing Plan and/or at the beginning of the new fiscal year (July 1), requiring developer's verification of fees prior to finalization of the building permit process. Contact: Oscar Galvez III, Facilities Financing, (619) 533-3685. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Landscaping	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Hooker, Craig (619) 446-5376	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 6.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/30/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/31/2008	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 34 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## First Review

### General Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Informational: The project as submitted appears to propose new structures, changes or modification to the public right-of-way, deviations to heights and setbacks, underground encroachments into the ROW, removal of large trees and shrubs adjacent to open space areas, and new trees or shrubs in the public right-of-way. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Informational: The Landscape Plan Review web page contains links to the following information, consolidated in one location:  - Landscape Regulations - Landscape Standards - Submittal Requirements - Landscape Calculation Worksheets - No Fee Street Tree Permit Application - and more...  <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/landscape.shtml">http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/landscape.shtml</a> (This information is located on the Development Services web page under Forms & Guidelines.) (New Issue)

### Submittal Requirements

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Informational: The project as presented is required to submit a Landscape Development Plan that is consistent with the Land Development Manual's "Project Submittal Requirements for Development Permits" - Section 4 (available at <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/pdf/psmsec4.pdf">http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/pdf/psmsec4.pdf</a> . Before continuing with the design please review the requirements for landscape submittals for each item required on the landscape development plan. An incomplete submittal will only delay your project unnecessarily. Please note the requirement for at least two tree species for each form and funct (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Informational: LANDSCAPE REGULATIONS: Please review and comply with the Landscape Regulations found on the City's Municipal Code website at: <a href="http://clerkdoc.sannet.gov/legtrain/mc/MuniCodeChapter14/Ch14Art02Division04">http://clerkdoc.sannet.gov/legtrain/mc/MuniCodeChapter14/Ch14Art02Division04</a> . (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Existing Trees and Shrubs: Show all existing trees (two-inch caliper or greater) and shrubs. Label each as "to be removed" or "to remain". Identify trees and shrubs with a dashed symbol, define limits of drip lines, and label height and spread. Provide the botanical and common name and caliper size. Provide the name and condition of any groundcover to remain. There is a variety of native tree form shrubs ( <i>Rhus integrifolia</i> , <i>Malosma laurina</i> , <i>Heteromeles arbutifolia</i> ) present on-site particularly on the South East side. Please identify these plant materials on the site as to remain or to be (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Limits of Work Line: Where the entire site is not being developed, indicate with a dashed line the limits of work [LDM 9.1.9]. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Utilities: Show all proposed utilities located within the public right-of-way, including underground water, sewer, gas, and overhead and underground electric and telephone cables. [Submittal Requirements] (New Issue)





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

**Issue**  
**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 8 DESIGN STATEMENT: Thank you for providing a design statement. However please expand the discussion to include how the Landscape Design is addresses the recommendations of the Uptown Community Plan. In particular, "Streetscape Design and Landscaping (p. 80 and 81). Please see additional comments below as to suggested items to address. Items such as planting themes for screening open parking from adjacent views, site amenities seating areas and furniture, native planting schemes, pedestrian scale, etc. (LDM 11.1.8). Please include how 50 % canopy trees will be incorporated as street trees. (New Issue)

**Landscape Regulations**

**Street Yard**

**Issue**  
**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 9 Provide a minimum root zone of 40 square feet in area for all trees. The minimum dimension for this area shall be 5 feet [LDC 142.0403(b)(5)]. Clearly show and label typical tree growing areas on plan. The Dimensions are taken from the inside of curb to the inside of curb. (New Issue)
- 10 Please provide 0.05 plant points per square foot of total street yard area. Utilize Table 142-04B to determine plant point values. Please note that the points must be achieved with trees only (LDC 142.0404). This requirement is not being met. Street Yard Trees are NOT counted toward points please revise Site design and Calculations to show compliance. (New Issue)

**Remaining Yard**

**Issue**  
**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 11 These areas are not shown correctly. Please revise calculation areas to include the side and rear setbacks for the project that are outside of the street yard. (New Issue)

**Vehicular Use Areas VUA**

**Issue**  
**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 12 Vehicular Use Area (Within the Street Yard and Less than 6,000 square feet) - Provide 40 square feet of landscape area per tree and 0.05 points in the vehicular use area. Fifty percent of the points must be achieved by trees (LDC 142.0406, Table 142-04D). VUA includes access to spaces that are structured. Please revise calculations. (New Issue)
- 13 Please provide the required area, points and trees within the vehicular use are or within a maximum of 5 feet from the edge of the vehicular use area (LDC 142.0407[b]). (New Issue)
- 14 If palm trees are to be used to meet the VUA requirement, they shall be a minimum of 8-foot brown trunk height and they shall be within 15 feet of each parking space (LDC 142.0407[c]). Only palms that normally attain a minimum mature height and spread of at least 15 feet can be used. (New Issue)
- 15 Planting areas may be used to meet the VUA area requirements only if the planting area is greater than 30 square feet in size and has no dimension less than 3 feet (LDC 142.0407[d][2]). Please provide typical, inside dimensions for planting areas that do not appear to be meeting this requirement. (New Issue)
- 16 Raised Concrete Curb - Provide a curb at least 6 inches in height to all landscape areas in or adjacent to vehicular use areas. Please show and label the curb on the site plan and landscape plan. The minimum, inside dimension between curbs is 5 feet for trees and 3 feet for shrubs. (LDC 142.0406). (New Issue)

**Street Trees**

**Issue**  
**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 17 Provide street trees within the public right-of-way at a rate of one street tree per 30 linear feet of property frontage. All trees must be a minimum 24-inch box size and planted in an air and water permeable landscape area (LDC 142.0409). Provide street tree growing area at a minimum of 40 square feet per tree with a minimum dimension of five feet. Palms are required to be planted at one per 20 lf of Street frontage and be 10' BTH. Currently this requirement is not being met. Street trees should alternate canopy and palms to bring down the scale of the building & increase shade over paving (New Issue)

**Community Plan**

**Issue**  
**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 18 Please review the Uptown Community Plan for Design Related issues as they relate to Landscape. The community plan can be accessed online @  
  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/uptown/plan.shtml>  
  
The following issues relate to design recommendations in this plan. Please show how these issues are being addressed on the Landscape Development Plan and in the Design Statement. (New Issue)
- 19 Uptown Community Plan (p. 75) Preserve existing street trees and increase the quality and quantity of landscaping in the public rights-of-way and open spaces. (New Issue)
- 20 Uptown Community Plan "Streetscape Design and Landscaping (p. 80) Show how the Landscape Design is compatible with the scale and style of the development. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Uptown Community Plan "Steetscape Design and Landscaping (p. 80) #2 Street furniture, coordinated signage and lighting, planters, kiosks, public art, and plant material should be incorporated whenever possible to add to the vitality of the streetscape. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Uptown Community Plan "Steetscape Design and Landscaping (p. 80) #8 Specimen trees in key locations can be designated as a natural resource and become a community focal point. New development should be sited and built so that harmful impacts to all major trees and other significant resources are mitigated. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Uptown Community Plan "Steetscape Design and Landscaping (p. 81) #10 Excessive use of pavement within front yard areas should be avoided. (New Issue)

**Additional Comments**

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Please show the proposed ROW encroachment line on the Landscape Development Plan. Please provide a detail of how utilities and street trees will be accommodated over the structure. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Plant Pallate: Please revise the plant legend to propose native plant materials for all plant material form and functions. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Existing Plant Material and planting offsite: Please show the existing trees and planter areas directly adjacent to the property lines on all sides of the proposed structure that may be affected by grading and construction. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	Please provide a detail showing how planting will screen the open areas of structured parking from adjacent uses on the East and South elevations. In some cases 25' of building wall is open to views of parking. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Please call out the "historic sidewalks" on the landscape development plan Hardscape Materials legend. See long range planning comments for additional information. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	Please take Landscape related notes and information from the Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR) and provide that information for reference on the Landscape Development Plan. For example: indicate roof drain discharge into landscape areas (or note that it's piped), indicate permeable paving and other specific Permanent Best Management Practices that incorporate the use of specific landscape or irrigation measures. (New Issue)

**Notes**

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Provide as a note on the plan: Non-biodegradable root barriers shall be installed around all new Street Trees (LDC 142.0403). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	Provide Table 142.04E (see below) on the Landscape Plan:  MINIMUM TREE SEPARATION DISTANCE Traffic signals (stop sign) - 20 feet Underground utility lines - 5 feet* Above ground utility structures - 10 feet Driveway (entries) - 10 feet Intersections (intersecting curb lines of two streets) - 25 feet Sewer line- 10 feet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	Provide the following standard note on the Landscape Plan: All graded, disturbed or eroded areas that will not be permanently paved or covered by structures shall be permanently revegetated and irrigated as shown in Table 142-04F and in accordance with the standards in the Land Development Manual [142.0411(a)]. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Provide the following note on the Landscape Development Plan: "All landscape and irrigation shall conform to the standards of the City-Wide Landscape Regulations and the City of San Diego Land Development Manual Landscape Standards and all other landscape related City and Regional Standards (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	Replace all references to the "Landscape Technical Manual" with "Land Development Manual - Landscape Standards." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Any required planting that dies within 3 years of installation shall be replaced within 30 calendar days of plant death with the same size and species of plant material shown on the approved plan. Required shrubs or trees that die 3 years or more after installation shall be replaced with 15 gallon size or 60-inch box size material, respectively. Development Services may authorize adjustment of the size and quantity of replacement material where material replacement would occur in inaccessible areas or where the existing plant being replaced is larger than a 15 gallon shrub or 60-inch box tree. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	Provide the following note on the Landscape Development Plan; fill in the blank with who shall be responsible for long-term maintenance (i.e. owner, project association, other):  "Maintenance: All required landscape areas shall be maintained by _____. Landscape & irrigation areas in the public ROW shall be maintained by _____. The landscape areas shall be maintained free of debris and litter and all plant material shall be maintained in a healthy growing condition. Diseased or dead plant material shall be satisfactorily treated or replaced per the conditions of the permit." (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Wastewater	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Bagheri, Hamid (619) 533-4239	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/25/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 4.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/18/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/23/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Wastewater on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 12 outstanding review issues with LDR-Wastewater (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Wastewater performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## LDR/MWWD-Wastewater Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	An existing 8 inch public sewer main is located in Dickinson Street and serves this site. Show the proposed sewer lateral(s) for this site on all future plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Prior to scheduling this project for any public hearing, the developer will be required to submit calculations, satisfactory to the Metropolitan Wastewater Department Director, for sizing of the sewer lateral(s) from this site to its connection with the public sewer main so that adequate capacity and proper velocity in the existing public mains can be verified. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	This calculation should include the increase of the flow due to the proposed development in the adjacent parcel (parcel 1 PM 12168) to the east of this project. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The developer will be responsible for any required upgrade to existing mains. Submit 3 copies of the sewer calculations to Senior Civil Engineer Barbara Salvini at 600 B Street, Suite 2210, San Diego, CA 92101. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Submit 3 copies of the sewer calculations to Senior Civil Engineer Barbara Salvini at 600 B Street, Suite 2210, San Diego, CA 92101. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Additional sewer capacity fees will be due and collected at the issuance of building. These fees are determined as part of the building permit process. Questions about capacity fees should be directed to Information and Application Services (619-446-5000). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	All proposed public sewer facilities are to be designed and constructed in accordance with established criteria in the most current City of San Diego Sewer Design Guide. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	All proposed private sewer facilities located within a single lot are to be designed to meet the requirements of the California Uniform Plumbing Code and will be reviewed as part of the building permit plan check. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	No trees or shrubs exceeding three feet in height at maturity shall be installed within ten feet of any public sewer facilities. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Utilization of existing sewer laterals is at the sole risk and responsibility of the developer to ensure the laterals are functional and connected to public sewer facility. Existing sewer laterals that have been unused over 5 years are considered abandoned and will need to be replaced if necessary for this development. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Contact Irina Itkin (619-533-4248) of the Wastewater Section for information on how to obtain a sewer will serve letter and the fees involved with this service. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Upon review of the first submittal, the Wastewater Section may have additional comments and will provide draft permit conditions. If you have any questions regarding the Wastewater Section comments or requirements, please call Hamid Bagheri at (619)533-4239. (New Issue)







L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Transportation Dev	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Khaligh, Kamran (619) 446-5357	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/26/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 12.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/28/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/30/2008	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Transportation Dev on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 12 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Transportation Dev performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

### 7/08 Review:

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	TRIP GENERATION-The proposed 79,360 sq.ft. medical office is expected to generate 3,968 average daily trips (ADT ) at a rate of 50 trips/1000 s.f. with 238 trips during the AM peak hour and 397 trips during the PM peak hour. A traffic impact study is required. Please have your traffic engineer consultant contact us to discuss the type and scope of this study prior to its preparation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	PARKING-The minimum parking requirement for the proposed 79,360 sq.ft. medical office is 317 parking spaces at the rate of 4 parking spaces/1000 s.f. per SDMC Table 142 05F. A minimum of 8 of these spaces should be accessible parking spaces. 32 of these spaces (at a required rate of 0.4 space/1000 s.f.) should also be designated and marked as carpool spaces (see Table 142-05F and Section 142.0530(d)). A minimum of 2 bicycle spaces and 2 bicycle lockers with shower (see Table 142-05F and Section 142.0530(e)) should also be provided and shown on the plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	OFF-STREET LOADING SPACES-Project should provide a minimum of one on-site loading space based on SDMC Section 142.1010 and Table 142-10B guidelines. This space should be shown and called out on the plans with its minimum dimensions of 12 foot wide by 35 foot long 14 foot vertical clearance. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	PARKING- Parking calculations with their applicable rates, and references to the specific sections and tables of the SDMC should be clearly called out on the plans. The required and provided number of parking spaces, accessible spaces, carpool spaces, loading spaces, bicycle spaces, bicycle lockers, and showers should all be listed. Parking spaces should be sequentially numbered from the first space to the last space, with a table providing the number of spaces on each floor. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	PARKING STRUCTURE ENCROACHMENT-The proposed encroachment of the parking structure into the public right-of-way of Dickinson Street as presented is not acceptable. Please see the Engineering Review comments on this issue. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	ON-STREET PARKING-Although none of the on-street parking spaces could be counted as part of the project's on site minimum parking requirement, in order to determine the net gain or loss of the on-street parking spaces on the project fronting street, the existing and the proposed on street parking spaces with dimensions and counts should be shown on the plans. The total net gain or loss of the number of on-street parking spaces should be called out. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	FRONTAGE-Project is required to construct a City standard cu-de-sac at the end of Dickinson Street. This is to comply with City standard design, and to provide adequate turn around for not only the emergency vehicles, but also for delivery, and passenger vehicles. Any needed additional right-of-way to install the cul-de-sac should also be dedicated, and called out on the plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	DRIVEWAYS-The proposed two project driveways as presented are not acceptable since they conflict with two SDMC Sections. The first conflict is with Section 142.0560j(8)(A) which dictates that no more than one driveway can be allowed for each 100 feet of street frontage. Since the project does not have 200 feet of street frontage, one of the proposed driveways should be eliminated. The second conflict is with Section 142.0560(j) (6) and Diagram 142.05C which requires 45 foot curb length separation between the two project driveways. Revise plans accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	DRIVEWAYS-The minimum and maximum two-way driveway width for a non-residential project is 24 and 30 foot respectively (per SDMC Table 142-05L). Accordingly the width of the project driveway on Dickinson Street should be within this range. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	VISIBILITY AREA-Project shall provide visibility areas per SDMC Section 113.0273 and Diagram 113-02QQ. Plans should clearly show the provision of the visibility areas at project driveway. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	GATES-Any proposed gate, or vehicular check in/check out booth should be called out and show on the plans. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	STREET LIGHTS-This project shall comply with all current street lighting standards according to the City of San Diego Street Design Manual (Document No. 297376, filed November 25, 2002) and the amendment to Council Policy 200-18 approved by City Council on February 26, 2002 (Resolution R-296141) satisfactory to the City Engineer. This may require (but not be limited to) installation of new street light(s), upgrading light from low pressure to high pressure sodium vapor and/or upgrading wattage. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Water Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Bagheri, Hamid (619) 533-4239	<b>Assigned:</b> 07/24/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 5.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/24/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 08/01/2008	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Water Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 12 outstanding review issues with LDR-Water Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Water Review performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Water Review Sec Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Public water facilities exist within the Dickinson and Front Street rights-of-way adjacent to the project site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	However, in order to provide the necessary fire flow and domestic demands for the project, the Owner/permittee will be required to replace the existing 4-inch diameter AC water main with a 12-inch diameter water main in Dickinson Street from Front Street to the frontage of the project. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	In addition, the Owner/permittee will be required to replace the portion of existing 8-inch diameter AC water main with a 12-inch diameter water main in Dickinson Street from Front Street to the frontage of the project. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The newly constructed parallel 12-inch diameter water mains must be cross connected to insure that fire and domestic service to the project is maintained at all times and that the new water mains are connected to the existing 12-inch diameter water mains in Front Street to meet the redundancy criteria of the City of San Diego's Water Design Guide. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The Owner/permittee will be required to reconnect the remaining portion of existing 8-inch diameter AC water main north of Dickinson Street to the newly constructed 12-inch diameter water mains. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	The Owner/permittee will be required to remove (kill) all existing unused water services and install new water services where appropriate. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	The Owner/permittee will be required to install fire hydrant(s) at locations within Dickson Street satisfactory to Fire Marshall and Director of Public Utilities. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	To reduce the potential of "stop work" orders being issued due to conflicts between engineering and building permits, the applicant should be diligent in providing appropriate locations for water services, meters, and BFPDs. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	All water services to the site, including domestic, irrigation, and fire, will require private, above ground back flow prevention devices (BFPDs). The Water Department will not permit BFPD installations below grade or within structures. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	All public water facilities, including services and meters, must be designed and constructed in accordance with established criteria in the most current edition of the City of San Diego Water Facility Design Guidelines and City regulations, standards and practices pertaining thereto. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Additional water capacity charges will be due at the time of building permit issuance. Capacity charges, as well as service and meter size, are determined by the Water Meter Data Card which is completed during the building plan review process. Any questions regarding water capacity fees should be addressed to Information and Application Services (619-446- (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Upon review of the next submittal, the Water Section may have additional comments and will provide draft permit conditions. If you have any questions regarding the Wastewater Section comments or requirements, please call Hamid Bagheri at (619)533-4239. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Plan-Historic	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Saunders, Kelley (619) 236-6545	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/25/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 1.00	<b>Started:</b> 07/17/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/23/2008	
	<b>Completed:</b> 07/17/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Historic on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Plan-Historic performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

### 7/17/2008

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	101-102 Dickinson: The structures on parcel 444-311-10 were reviewed in April/May of 2007, at which time staff determined that the structures on site were not eligible for local designation under adopted HRB criteria, with the possible exception of the 1924 Craftsman structure, which staff determined required a site specific historic resource research report. That report was prepared by Scott Moomjian & submitted for review in early June 2007. Staff reviewed the report & concurred with the determination that the house was not eligible for local designation under any criteria. (See PTS 127144). (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	104-118 Dickinson Street: The applicant submitted a site specific historic resource research report for the bungalow court located on parcel 444-301-02 in September 2007. Staff reviewed the report prepared by Scott Moomjian and disagreed with the report's conclusion that the buildings were not significant. Staff docketed the item for review by the Historical Resources Board at the October 2007 hearing. The Board considered the property's eligibility for local designation, and the motion to designate the property failed. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	As the properties at 101-103 Dickinson Street were determined not to meet local designation criteria, and as the Board's motion to designate the property at 104-118 Dickinson Street failed, no further review by HRB staff or the Board is required, unless there is substantial new information regarding the significance of the sites. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 06/12/2008	Deemed Complete on 06/24/2008
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Plan-Long Range Planning	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 06/24/2008	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Pangilinan, Marlon (619) 235-5293	<b>Assigned:</b> 06/26/2008	
	<b>Started:</b> 07/01/2008	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 2.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 07/30/2008	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 07/28/2008	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 08/06/2008	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/04/2008 from 08/04/2008 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Long Range Planning on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 13 outstanding review issues with Plan-Long Range Planning (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Plan-Long Range Planning performed 0 reviews, .0% were on-time, and .0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Uptown Community Plan

### 1st Review Comments

#### Land Use

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Uptown Community Plan designates the proposed project site for Institutional-Hospital. Per City Council Resolution No. R-273376, the 1.40-acre site was redesignated from Open Space to Hospital on May 2, 1989. The proposal to develop a medical office on this site would implement the land use designation. A proposal to develop retail uses in addition to the medical office, would be allowed if such uses are permitted under the existing zone. Please refer to LDR-Planning comments regarding allowed commercial uses. The proposed commercial use(s) should not be the dominant use of the project (New Issue)

#### Transportation

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Please indicate how bicycle facilities can be accommodated on site. Such facilities should be located in convenient and secure areas. (New Issue)

#### Urban Design

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please indicate the removal of existing mature trees, if any. Existing mature trees should be preserved in place, relocated, or replaced if they require removal. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Page 102 of the community plan states that office use in the areas adjacent to the UCSD Medical Center should only be permitted with the approval of a Planned Development Permit, to provide for the review of design compatibility and traffic circulation impacts, as well as relationships with existing land uses. It has been determined that the proposed project requires a Site Development Permit. This discretionary review permit would allow the above mentioned review to be conducted by City staff. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The project proposes a deviation to the maximum building height. Please provide justification for additional height request detailing measures provided to offset the buildings maximum height (such as surface articulation, building setbacks over a certain number of stories, reduced encroachment into sensitive areas, similar building heights in the area, previous feasibility studies, etc.) and how such a deviation would not adversely impact the goals, objectives, and recommendations in the Uptown Community Plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Please provide justification for the proposed reduction in rear yard setback and how such a deviation would not adversely impact the goals, objectives, and recommendations in the Uptown Community Plan. (New Issue)

#### Open Space

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Although the project site was redesignated from Open Space to Hospital in 1989 and the plans submitted do not indicate any encroachment into adjacent Open Space designated areas, adjacent designated Open Space area should be treated sensitively. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	The project site is adjacent to areas identified in the community plan as a Biological/Geological Zone which is considered a high priority preservation zone. According to criteria in this zone, development encroachment and grading should be kept to an absolute minimum. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	No vegetation removal should be permitted within the undeveloped portion of this zone, unless required to stabilize other areas on the site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Revegetation programs should consist of native vegetation to minimize soil erosion and instability. (New Issue)

#### PROW Encroachment

For questions regarding the 'Plan-Long Range Planning' review, please call Marlon Pangilinan at (619) 235-5293. Project Nbr: 157724 / Cycle: 2





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 11 Since the Public-Right-of Way is often used and reserved for the placement and repair of public facilities and services (gas, electricity, sewer, water, etc.) and is necessary for meeting the objectives in the Community Facilities and Services of the community plan. The encroachment proposed by this project should not preclude the ability to provide these essential services or the ability for the systematic improvement and replacement of these facilities. To what extend would the proposed encroachment affect this ability? (New Issue)

**Historic and Cultural Resource**

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 12 The project proposes the removal of several structures older than 45 years. Please see Plan-Historic comments.

The Uptown Community is known to have a significant amount of historically scored sidewalks. The design of sidewalks should be in substantial conformance with the historic design of sidewalks on adjacent properties including location, width, elevation, scoring pattern, texture, color, and material. Contractor date stamps are also considered significant historic markings to be preserved. They should be preserved in place or relocated and set nearby.

(New Issue)

**Community Planning Group**

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 13 The proposed project should be presented to the Uptown Planners, the planning group for this community. Please contact Leo Wilson, Chair at (619) 231-4495 to be scheduled on their agenda. (New Issue)

