



UPTOWN PLANNERS

Uptown Community Planning Committee
Public Facilities Subcommittee

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Thursday, March 19, 2009 – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Café Bassam, Bankers Hill
3088 Fifth Avenue (corner of Fifth and Redwood)

- 1) Parliamentary Items**
 - a. Introductions
 - b. Adoption of Agenda and Rules of Order
- 2) Public Communications -- Non-Agenda Public Comment (3 minutes each).**
- 3) Information Item – General:**
 - a. Update on First Avenue Bridge Rehab Project
 - b. Status of Future Uptown Parkland “Wish List” Inventory
- 4) Action Items – General:**
 - a. West Lewis/Falcon St. Mini-Park – Response to Development Services Dept.’s Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
- 5) Discussion Items – General:**
 - a. Parking-Revenue Oversight – Update
 - b. Police Feedback RE: Increased Graffiti Problem
 - c. Marston Hills Pergola – Update
- 6) Discussion of Future Public Facilities Topics**
- 7) Adjourn**
- 8) Next Meeting: April 23, 2009, at Café Bassam, 3088 Fifth Avenue, Bankers Hill**



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

March 12, 2009

Mr. Scott Spencer
7527 Girard Avenue
La Jolla, CA 92037

Dear Mr. Spencer:

Subject: Berger Residence First Assessment Letter; Project No. 173195;
Job Order No. 43-2059; Uptown Community Plan Area

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

Variance to allow increased building height for an approximately 1,261-square-foot addition to an existing single family residence located on a 0.15-acre site at 3919 Pringle Street, in the RS-1-7 Zone.

Enclosed is a Cycle Issues Report (Enclosure 1) which contains review comments from staff representing various disciplines, outside agencies 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.

- I. **REQUIRED APPROVALS/FINDINGS** - Your project as currently proposed requires the processing of a Process Three Neighborhood Development permit to allow development on a site which contains environmentally sensitive lands and a Process Three Variance to allow the increased height.

All actions will be consolidated under this application and processed concurrently, pursuant to the Consolidation of Processing regulations contained in Municipal Code Section 112.0103. The decision to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the project will be made by the Hearing Officer (Process Three).

In order to recommend approval of your project, certain findings for the Neighborhood Development Permit and Variance 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.

FAA Part 77 Noticing Area - The project is subject to FAA Notification (see Information Bulletin 520, Federal Aviation Administration Notification and Evaluation Process). Please provide a copy of the FAA's determination as soon as it is available. Your project can not proceed to a public hearing until this determination is received. Please see LDR-Planning's comments in the attached Cycle Issues Report for more information.

LDR-Planning – Staff can not support the requested variance because not all of the required findings can be made. Specifically, the finding that the requested variance is the minimum amount necessary to allow reasonable use can not be made. There is an variance approved for the site which allowed development of the existing single-family residence, which has established reasonable use of the property.

LDR-Engineering – An access agreement for the existing public storm drain will be required. Also, a standard Storm Water BMP report is required for this project.

- IV. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS:** Our current accounting system does not provide for real-time information regarding account status, however, our records show approximately \$750 remaining in your deposit account. Based on the processing point, unresolved issues, and level of controversy of your project, an additional deposit of \$2,000 will be required with your resubmittal. Please be aware that additional deposits may be required prior to scheduling the project for a public hearing.

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.

Page 4
Mr. Scott Spencer
March 12, 2009

C. Account: Pay the enclosed invoice. Checks should be made payable to the "City Treasurer." Please include the project "work order" number 43-2059 on your check.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,



Paul Godwin
Development Project Manager

Page 5
Mr. Scott Spencer
March 12, 2009

Enclosures:

1. Cycle Issues Report
2. Required Findings
3. Submittal Requirements Report
4. Invoice
5. Information Bulletin 520

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



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 173195 **Title:** BERGER RESIDENCE
Project Mgr: Godwin, Paul (619) 446-5103 pgodwin@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/22/2009	Deemed Complete on 02/04/2009
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2009	
Reviewer: Abalos, Raynard (619) 446-5377	Assigned: 02/09/2009	
Hours of Review: 6.50	Started: 03/04/2009	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 03/05/2009	
	Completed: 03/06/2009	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 03/12/2009	

- . 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 36 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 97 reviews, 83.5% were on-time, and 48.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Rev March 09

Project Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within the RS-1-7 Zone, the Brush Management Zone, and the Uptown Community Plan Area. The site is designated for single-family residential at a density range of 5-10 dwelling units per acre, with the southeastern portion of the lot designated as open space in the Uptown Community Plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The project site is also located within the FAA Part 77 Notification Area for Lindbergh Field and North Island NAS. The project shall be reviewed by the FAA for an aeronautical study. Please see Info Bulletin #520 for more information. To view online, please visit www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/pdf/infobulletin/ib520.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Development or construction permits for structures may not be approved until notice from the FAA has been received by the City. Please provide a copy of the FAA's determination. (New Issue)

Discussion

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The project site is subject to Variance No. C-18323, which allowed a 0-foot street side setback. The existing variance allowed the project to observe the 0-foot setback to avoid development down the slope and into the canyon. One of the findings for the variance was that the development was the minimum necessary for reasonable use. Therefore, LDR Planning cannot support the proposed variance since reasonable use (existing residence) was already established. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	In addition, the site is identified in the community plan as part of the Washington Street canyon system and the Biological/Geological Zone (Zone 1). Policies in the community plan (see Open Space element in the community plan) discourages grading or vegetation removal of undeveloped portions within this zone. The plan also recommends that hillside development minimizes disturbance of the topography and that development encroachment and grading on-site should be kept to the absolute minimum. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Staff cannot support the proposed development on the open space portion of the lot. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Several walls are proposed to be demolished. The additional portions of the structure that create the over height situation should also be demolished so that no variance is needed for height. LDR-Planning recommends that the project comply with the height requirement and all other applicable development regulations. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	If the applicant chooses to continue processing the project with staff recommendation of denial, please revise the plans per the following review. (New Issue)

Permits

Variance

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	The project requires a Variance to allow the project to exceed the maximum height requirement. Staff has determined that the project exceeds the height requirement when measured for overall and plumb height in accordance with SDMC 113.0270, and the angled building envelope requirement required per SDMC 131.0444 (see "Height" below). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	The project also proposes encroachment into the required setbacks (see "Setbacks" below) and may also exceed the maximum allowable FAR (see "FAR" below). (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Raynard Abalos at (619) 446-5377. Project Nbr: 173195 / Cycle: 3





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Please provide required findings for any additional variance requests. (New Issue)

NDP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	The project requires a Neighborhood Development Permit for development on a site that contains Environmentally Sensitive Lands (steep hillsides and potentially for sensitive biological resources - see "ESL" below). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	A Neighborhood Development Permit may be approved or conditionally approved only if the decision maker makes all of the findings in Section 126.0404(a) and the supplemental findings in Section 126.0404(b). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	When an applicant applies for more than one permit for a single development, the applications shall be consolidated for processing and shall be reviewed by a single decision maker. The decision maker shall act on the consolidated application at the highest level of authority for that development as set forth in SDMC 111.0105 (Process Three Hearing Officer decision for this project). The findings required for approval of each permit shall be considered individually, consistent with SDMC 126.0105. (New Issue)

Height

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	The project does not comply with the maximum allowable height as measured for both overall and plumb height in accordance with SDMC 113.0270. Although the project proposes to reduce the maximum overall height by demolishing a portion of the existing roof, the additions (main level and lower level) and the proposed chimneys also exceed the height limit in terms of plumb height. Demonstrate conformance with the plumb height requirement (measured in accordance with SDMC 113.0270) or call this out as a variance request. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Show the required 45-degree angled building envelope measured 24' above grade from the required side setbacks as outlined in SDMC 131.0444. Demonstrate conformance with this requirement or call it out as a variance request. (New Issue)

ESL

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	The applicant did not provide substantial evidence (see preliminary review PTS #169044) demonstrating that the existing slopes are manufactured or disturbed via a valid grading permit. No written opinion from a professional geologist was provided, indicating that the disturbed slopes were a result of either the original subdivision or subsequent development in which a grading permit was not required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Further research has also revealed that the building permit issued in 1997 for an addition to the house (Plan File No. A102696-97) indicated that the addition was placed on native/undisturbed soil. The remainder of the site was not examined but it could be inferred from this information that the native/undisturbed soil would continue to the bottom of the slope. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Staff shall therefore consider all undeveloped steep slopes on the property to be steep hillsides as defined in SDMC 113.0103 and further described in the City's Steep Hillside Guidelines. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	In addition, there may be sensitive biological resources on site. Please submit a Biology Letter Survey report in accordance with the City's Biology Guidelines. To view online, please visit www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/pdf/landdevmanual/lndmbio.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Show the limits of steep hillsides on the site plan and the distance from the top of slope to the proposed addition. Include the areas of the steep hillside that continue offsite. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Show the limits of sensitive biological resources on the site plan (consistent with the information provided in a biology letter survey report) and the distance from the resource to the proposed addition. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	The project is subject to the ESL regulations outlined in SDMC Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 1, the City's Steep Hillside Guidelines, and the City's Biology Guidelines. (New Issue)

GFA

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Please be aware that if the more than 50 percent of the lot area contains steep hillsides, the maximum permitted floor area ratio shall be based on the following in accordance with SDMC 131.0446(a)(2): (A) The area of the site not containing steep hillsides or the minimum lot area required by the applicable zone, whichever is greater; plus (B) 25 percent of the remaining lot area not included in (A), above. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Please recalculate maximum allowable FAR per the above and revise the project to comply. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Staff has calculated GFA in excess of what is indicated on Sheet 1-A. Please provide a Gross Floor Area diagram sheet (of all levels, both "existing to remain" and "proposed") with crossed hatched areas showing all portions included in the calculations so that the FAR may be verified (in accordance with the Rules for Calculation and Measurement of GFA as outlined in SDMC 113.0234). Shade any areas not calculated in the FAR and state the reason (include Municipal Code section) those areas, if any, were excluded from the calculations. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	Please be aware that underfloor area is included in the calculation of FAR. Please include the underfloor area/crawlspace in the FAR/GFA calculation in accordance with SDMC 113.0234. (New Issue)

Setbacks

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	The setbacks are shown incorrectly. The front property line is the north property line along Pringle. The street side property line is the northwest property line along Pringle. The rear is the southwest property and the remaining are interior sides. The project therefore encroaches into the rear setback of 13 feet measured from the southwest property line. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	In addition, the porch shown on Sheet 2 encroaches into the street side setback and exceeds the allowances for architectural encroachments outlined in SDMC 131.0461(a)(6). (New Issue)

Max 3rd Story Dim

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	The proposed underfloor area is considered a story per SDMC 113.0261. The main level is therefore considered the third story. As outlined in SDMC 131.0460, the width of the third story is limited to 70 percent of the width of the lot. The depth of the third story is limited to 50 percent of the depth of the lot or 100 percent of the maximum width dimension, whichever is greater. (New Issue)

Other

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	Label floors consistently on the plans. For example, "Upper Floor" and "Main Floor" are shown on the elevations but are shown as "Second Level" and "Ground Level" on the floor plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	On the floor plans, clearly label the existing residence and the areas of the addition. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Provide north arrows on the floor plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	Include a floor plan of the proposed underfloor area/crawlspace. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Revise Sheet A-1 per the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change allowable height from "30' + 10" to "30 feet." - Change the allowable FAR based on the discussion above. - Provide the lot dimensions (lot width, lot depth, street frontage, etc). - List the required setbacks. (continued below) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	- List and quantify the specific variance request(s) (e.g. Overall height of 42.5 feet where 40 feet max is required). - Include the proposed lot coverage (the maximum permitted lot coverage is 50 percent if more than 50 percent of the premises contain steep hillsides). (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/22/2009	Deemed Complete on 02/04/2009
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2009	
Reviewer: Canning, Jack (619) 446-5425	Assigned: 02/04/2009	
Hours of Review: 5.00	Started: 03/02/2009	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 03/05/2009	
	Completed: 03/04/2009	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/12/2009	

- . 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 71 reviews, 85.9% were on-time, and 45.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Engineering 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input 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 Decision. Upon resubmittal, we will complete our review of the Variance Permit Plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Revise the Site Plan Sheet A1. Revise the call out for the existing storm drain. Call out the pipe is an 18" RCP Public Storm Drain. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Revise the Site Plan Sheet A1. Per the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual, an access easement is required for the existing Public storm drain. Show and call out the applicant shall grant to the City of San Diego a ten ft wide storm drain and access easement. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Revise the Site Plan A1. Per the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual, structures are not permitted within Public storm drain easements. Show the addition at the Main Level will not be within the required storm drain easement. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Revise the Site Plan Sheet A1. Show the existing and proposed grading contours and spot elevations. Add the finished floor elevations. Add a Grading Data table with cut/fill and import/export quantities, plus the depths of cut and fill. If the quantities are ZERO, add that value to the required Grading Data Table. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Revise the Site Plan Sheet A1. Show and call out the location of the roof drains and deck drains and how they are discharged. If roof or deck drains are proposed to be discharged on the existing slope call out what energy dissipator will be used at the discharge location to reduce discharge to non-erodeable velocities. If no roof or deck drains are proposed, add a note stating: NO ROOF OR DECK DRAINS ARE PROPOSED FOR THIS PROJECT. (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. Revise the Site Plan Sheet A1 to remove the "Owner's Certificate Standard Single Family Residential Project for Post Construction BMPs". Owner's Certificates are no longer accepted as Development Project BMP requirements. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Submit a Standard Storm Water BMP Report, listed as a Water Quality Study in next time documents, that Identifies Pollutants from the Project Area (pg 13) and addresses how the 9 possible Low Impact Development (LID) BMP's and 6 possible Source Control BMP's (pgs 18-23) have been incorporated into the project. If any of the 15 possible BMP's have not been used in the project design, add a discussion in the report why the omitted BMP's are not feasible or not applicable. Please Note: A Water Quality is required not a Water Quality Technical Report.

(continued below)

(New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Jack Canning at (619) 446-5425. Project Nbr: 173195 / Cycle: 3





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	City's Storm Water Standards are available online at: http://www.sandiego.gov/development/services/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Revise the Site Plan Sheet A1. Show the Water and Sewer Mains, including laterals that serve the project. Call out the City Improvement Plan numbers. A search of City Records by your office may be required. If the existing water service and sewer lateral will be used, call out on the plans the existing services will remain. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Show and dimension the garage parking spaces shown on the Ground Level Floor Plan Sheet A2, so they can be verified they meet San Diego Municipal Code Table 142-05J. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Revise the Site Plan Sheet A1. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall enter into an agreement to indemnify, protect and hold harmless the City, its officials and employees from any and all claims, demands, causes or action, liability or loss because of, or arising out of surface drainage entering into the property from the Right-of-Way due to the design of the Pringle Street Right-of-Way. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Revise the Site Plan Sheet A1. Add a note that states: The applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement, from the City Engineer, for the concrete step, private storm drain and catch basin in the Pringle Street Right-of-Way. (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)





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

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/22/2009	Deemed Complete on 02/04/2009
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2009	
Reviewer: Godwin, Paul (619) 446-5103	Assigned: 03/03/2009	
Hours of Review: 0.00	Started: 03/03/2009	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 03/05/2009	
	Completed: 03/03/2009	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/12/2009	

- . 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 62 reviews, 50.0% were on-time, and 48.4% 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)



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/22/2009	Deemed Complete on 02/04/2009
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2009	
Reviewer: Arnhart, James (619) 446-5385	Assigned: 02/04/2009	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Started: 02/05/2009	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 03/05/2009	
	Completed: 03/05/2009	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/12/2009	

- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental 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 LDR-Environmental performed 81 reviews, 58.0% were on-time, and 52.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

CEQA Exemption

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The Environmental Analysis Section has reviewed the project and determined the project would not have the potential to result in a significant environmental impact. The project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA State Guidelines, Section 15301(e) [Existing Facilities]. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/22/2009	Deemed Complete on 02/04/2009
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2009	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296	Assigned: 02/05/2009	
Hours of Review: 3.50	Started: 02/05/2009	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Review Due: 03/05/2009	
	Completed: 03/03/2009	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/12/2009	

- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 64 reviews, 95.3% were on-time, and 60.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review/Cycle 3 Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within geologic hazard zone 52 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 52 is characterized by other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain with favorable geologic structure, low risk. (New Issue)

1st Review/Cycle 3 References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Berger Residence Addition, 3919 Pringle Street, San Diego, California, prepared by Geotechnical Exploration, Inc., dated November 26, 2006 (their project no. 07-9430). Site Plan, 3919 Pringle Street Residence, San Diego, California, prepared by Scott A. Spencer & Associates, dated January 15, 2009. (New Issue)

1st Review/Cycle 3 Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The referenced geotechnical documents have been reviewed. Based on that review, the geotechnical consultant has adequately addressed the soil and geologic conditions potentially affecting the proposed project for the purposes of Environmental Review. (New Issue)

Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Additional geotechnical review may be required during the ministerial permitting process if building or grading permits are required. (New Issue) [Recommended]





THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

January 26, 2009

Mr. Daryl Lantz
Lantz Design Group
15576 Paseo Jenghiz
San Diego, CA 92129

Dear Mr. Lantz:

Subject: Hamilton Residence Second Assessment Letter; Project No. 158881;
Job Order No. 43-1126; Uptown Community Plan Area

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

- Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) for Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) to construct a single family residence on a 0.32-acre site at 4496 Arch Street in the RS-1-7 & RS-1-1 Zones, 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 processing of a Process Two, Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) to allow the development of a single-family home site which contains Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL).

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:

- LDR-Planning: There is a discrepancy regarding the height of the proposed structure. Please correct the plans as requested.
- Environmental Analysis Section: Please revise the Biological Letter Report as requested in the Cycle Issues Report. Also, please provide a grading amounts table on the project plans and ensure that the brush management plan is accurately reflected on the project plans and biology report.
- LDR-Engineering: Please revise the Water Quality Technical Report as requested in the Cycle Issues Report. Also, please add visibility area triangles to the site plan as previously requested.
- LDR-Landscaping: The project is subject to the Brush Management Regulations. Please revise the plans as requested to demonstrate compliance with these regulations.
- Fire Officer: Please coordinate with the Fire Officer Reviewer, Bob Medan, in revising your brush management plan, as described in the attached Cycle Issues report.

III. STUDIES/REPORTS REQUIRED: A revised Biological Letter Report and revised Water Quality Technical Report have been identified as necessary to the project's review. Please provide the number of copies requested for each report as listed in the attached Submittal Requirements Report (Enclosure 3).

IV. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS: Our current accounting system does not provide for real-time information regarding account status, however, our records show approximately \$100 remaining in your deposit account. Based on the outstanding issues and level of review, an additional deposit of \$2,000 will be required with your resubmittal. Please note, 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:

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 21 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.

Page 4
Mr. Daryl Lantz
January 26, 2009

Include a copy of this Assessment Letter, Cycle Issues Report and your response letter if applicable, with each set of plans.

C. Account: Pay the enclosed invoice. Checks should be made payable to the "City Treasurer." Please include the project "work order" number 43-1126 on your check.

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

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

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

Sincerely,



Paul Godwin
Development Project Manager

Enclosures:

1. Cycle Issues Report
2. Submittal Requirements Report
3. Invoice

cc: File
Leo Wilson, Chair, Uptown Community Planning Group
Reviewing Staff (Assessment letter only)
Marlon Pangilinan, Long-Range Planning



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 158881 **Title:** HAMILTON RESIDENCE
Project Mgr: Godwin, Paul (619) 446-5103 pgodwin@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/10/2008	Deemed Complete on 12/11/2008
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 12/11/2008	
Reviewer: Braun, Corey (619) 446-5311	Assigned: 12/11/2008	
Hours of Review: 3.50	Started: 12/24/2008	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 01/12/2009	
	Completed: 01/05/2009	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/20/2009	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/15/2009 from 01/15/2009 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 3rd 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 2 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (2 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 106 reviews, 73.6% were on-time, and 51.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review 08/18/08

RS-1-7 Zone Regulations

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The side setback required may be 4 feet on one side as long as the total setback for both sides combined equals 20% of the lot width. The plans state that the lot is 67 feet wide, therefore, the total width of both side yards combined must be 13 feet 5 inches. The plans show the east side of the property to have a 4-foot setback so the west side of the property would need to have a setback of at least 9 feet 5 inches. The plans show the west side to have a setback of about 5 feet 6 inches. Please revise the plans to meet the side setback regulations.

(From Cycle 2)

Environmentally Sensitive Land

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	All drainage from the developed area of the site must be directed away from the top of the steep slopes and the drainage from irrigated areas with non-native plants must be directed away from the MHPA area. Please show how the drainage from the developed area of the site will be directed to the street drainage sewer system.

(From Cycle 2)

FAA Part 77 Notification

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Due to the height and proximity of the proposed project to Lindbergh 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.oaava.faa.gov .

(From Cycle 2)

2nd Review 12/24/08

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	The project as redesigned is over height. Height is measured to the top of the spark arrester for the chimney. The plans have the spot elevation for the top of the chimney incorrectly marked at 363.56'. This is the elevation shown for the top of the roof and the chimney is clearly higher than the roof. The grade immediately below the location of the chimney is shown at an elevation of 333.1', therefore, the top of the spark arrester for the chimney can be no higher than an elevation of 363.1'. Please revise the plans accordingly.

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	9	The following conditions will be added to the NDP: 1. All drainage runoff shall be directed away from the steep hillside into a City storm drainage system. 2. No water from the irrigated, ornamental landscaped are of the property shall be allowed to drain into the MHPA area.
--------------------------	---	---

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/10/2008	Deemed Complete on 12/11/2008
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 12/11/2008	
Reviewer: Benally, Rhonda (619) 446-5468	Assigned: 12/12/2008	
Hours of Review: 0.00	Started: 01/09/2009	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 01/15/2009	
	Completed: 01/16/2009	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 01/20/2009	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 23 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (27 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 92 reviews, 54.3% were on-time, and 58.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review 9/4/08

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" 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/Land Use, Geology, and Historical Resources (Archaeology) 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. (From Cycle 2)

Biological Resources/Land Use

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" 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. Therefore, the report shall be prepared in accordance with the City of San Diego's Biological Review References (July 2002). Additionally, based upon an aerial photo of the site, it appears trees may exist on site within the MHPA. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Therefore, the report shall address the potential for noise impacts from construction noise on sensitive species (i.e. California Gnatcatchers, raptors) which may be located in the area. Also see Plan-MSCP for additional comments.

(From Cycle 2)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	EAS received "Geotechnical Report for Hamilton Residence 4496 Arch Street, San Diego, California (May 9, 2008)," prepared by Southern California Soil and Testing, Inc.. Refer to LDR-Geology for additional comments. (From Cycle 2)

Historical Resources (Archaeol

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	A review of maps in the Entitlements Division identifies the project site in a high sensitivity area for archaeological resources and several archaeological sites within a half mile of the project site; therefore an archaeological survey and report may be required. (From Cycle 2)

FAA Notification Area

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	The proposed project is located within the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Notification Area for Lindberg Field and Montgomery Field Airports. LDR-Planning has determined an FAA determination is required. Refer to LDR-Planning reviewer's comments for additional information. (From Cycle 2)

Water Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	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. (From Cycle 2)

New Issue Group (992863)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Rhonda Benally at (619) 446-5468. Project Nbr: 158881 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Please note additional environmental issues may arise as the review progresses. (From Cycle 2)

Review 1/14/09

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	EAS is not able to make a determination at this time. Additional information is required to determine if identified Biological Resources/Land Use and Neighborhood Character/Land Use 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"/>	11	EAS received "Results of the Biological Survey for the Hamilton Residence (RECON Number 4884B) (October 17, 2008)," prepared by Recon and determined the following revisions are required; (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Page 1, Provide Project no. 158881 to title. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Page 1, first paragraph, second sentence: This sentence states "The survey area is in the City of San Diego, within the Community of University Heights." Revise sentence to "The survey area is in the City of San Diego, within University Heights of the Uptown Community Plan." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Page 2, Section 2.2, Land Cover Types: This section indicates that 0.01 acre of a natural flood channel occupies the project site and is located at the base of the canyon and runs from east to west. The natural flood channel is also shown on Biological Resources Map (Figure 5). Please expand the discussion regarding the natural flood channel identifying the wetland jurisdiction, soil, vegetation and source. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Page 3, Section 3.2, Sensitive Vegetation Communities: This section indicates Chaparral (Tier IIIA) habitat is located beneath several Eucalyptus trees. However, the City's GIS map layer identifies this area as Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub. Clarify if the chaparral onsite is considered Tier II habitat instead of Tier IIIA. Revise report for consistency, if necessary. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Page 3, Section 3.3, Sensitive Plants, first sentence: This sentence indicates that "No sensitive plant species were observed on the Hamilton Parcel and none are expected to occur on the property. However a portion of the parcel is located within in the MHPA and Table 1 of the report also indicates that 0.12 acres of chaparral habitat on site. In addition, Section 2.2-Land Cover types indicates a portion of the site is dominated by lemonade berry and California buckwheat. Clarify the sensitive plants onsite. Revise this statement accordingly for consistency. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Page 4, Section 4.0, Impacts: This section delineates the potential impact of the proposed project to the project site. Provide a table delineating the habitat types, tiers, acreage of habitat on-site, and quantify (in acres) the impact inside/outside the MHPA. Clarify if the Brush Management Zone I would impact sensitive habitat (i.e. chaparral). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Page 4, Section 5.0, Mitigation, first sentence: Revise sentence to "To avoid impacts to raptors, no grading activities would occur within 300-500 feet of a nest during their breeding season (February 1 through September 15). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Page 4, Section 5.0, Mitigation, third sentence: Revise sentence to "If nests are present no construction would be allowed within 300-500 feet of any identified nest(s) until the young fledge." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Page 4 and 5, Section 5.0, Mitigation, first paragraph, fourth and fifth sentences: These two sentences state "Indirect noise impacts to nesting raptors within the MHPA may occur if construction is conducted during raptor breeding season," and "If the habitat is not occupied by raptors, there are no further grading restrictions associated with raptors." Delete these two sentences from the report. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Page 5, Section 5.0, Mitigation, MSCP/MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines: Refer to MSCP reviewers comments regarding MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines and conditions. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Figure 5: Biological Resources: Illustrate the development footprint on figure including any proposed decks, etc.. Delineate the Multi-Habitat Planning boundaries and Brush Management Zones I and II on figure and provide a symbol(s) in the legend. Figure 5 and 6 may be combined into one figure. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Provide four copies of the revised biological report for the Project Manager, EAS, MSCP and LDR-Landscaping in the next submittal. (New Issue)

Plans

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Clearly delineate the Brush Management (BM) Zones I and II on Site Plan (Sheet A-1). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	The parcel is partially located within the City of San Diego's MSCP/MHPA. Revise text for MSCP Symbol on plan to MHPA. Revise all plans and figures for consistency. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	The Landscape Plan (Sheet L-1) indicates a proposed wooden deck on the northern side of the proposed residence. It appears the proposed deck may be located within the Brush Management (BM) Zone I. No flammable structures are allowed within BM I Zone. However, the Floor Plan (Sheet A-4) indicates a non-combustible deck with 42" guardrail. Clarify the type of deck on all plans for consistency. Refer to LDR-Landscaping and Fire Plan's officer for additional comments. (New Issue)

MSCP





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	Refer to MSCP reviewer's comments regarding MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines and conditions. (New Issue)
Brush Management		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Refer to LDR-Landscaping for additional comments regarding Brush Management Zones. (New Issue)
Grading Data		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	LDR-Engineering has stated that a Grading Data Table needs to be provided on the plan. The plans show the proposal of a basement with the single-family residence. The site is located within the LindaVista Formation which is moderately sensitive for paleontological resources. Until this information is provided, EAS is not able to determine if monitoring for paleontological resources will be required. Provide grading/excavation (e.g. quantify in cubic yards, depth) information as requested by LDR-Engineering in the next submittal. Refer to LDR-Engineering for additional information. (New Issue)
Geology		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30	EAS received "Geotechnical Report for Hamilton Residence 4496 Arch Street, San Diego, California (May 9, 2008)," and "Response to City of San Diego Geotechnical Review Letter Hamilton Residence 4496 Arch Street San Diego, California (November 6, 2008) prepared by Southern California Soil and Testing, Inc.. This will be discussed in the environmental document. (New Issue)
Water Quality		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	EAS received "Water Quality Technical Report 4496 Arch Street, San Diego, California 92116 (PTS No. 158881) (October 20, 2008)," prepared by Coffey Engineering, Inc. LDR-Engineering indicated that the Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR) requires revisions. Provide a copy of the WQTR to EAS staff in your next submittal. (New Issue)
Historical (Architectural)		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	32	The building records indicate that the existing residences were constructed approximately 1927. The City of San Diego's CEQA Significance Determination Threshold Guidelines states that if a residence is greater than 45 years or older, then the residence may be considered potentially historically significant. However, the City's Plan-Historic Staff has indicated that the project was previously reviewed by EAS Staff under Project Tracking System (PTS) no. 149409 and that a Site Specific Historic Report was not necessary. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	33	(CONTINUED) This issue was cleared by Plan-Historic staff (Review Cycle 2) on August 5, 2008. (New Issue)
Neighborhood Character/Land Us		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	LDR-Planning has stated in their comments that the proposed project is over height. The City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Threshold Guidelines states that if a project strongly contrasts with the surrounding development or natural topography through excessive height, bulk, signage, or architectural projections then potentially significant impact. EAS will coordinate with LDR-Planning regarding excessive height and if mitigation would be required. Refer to LDR-Planning for additional comments. (New Issue)
Historical Resources (Archaeol		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	35	City Staff has reviewed the project and no further archaeological analysis will be required. (New Issue)
FAA Notification Area		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	36	EAS received a copy of the FAA determination (dated September 12, 2008) that the project is not a hazard to Air Navigation. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/10/2008	Deemed Complete on 12/11/2008
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 12/11/2008	
Reviewer: Torres, Sean (619) 446-5305	Assigned: 12/12/2008	
Hours of Review: 5.00	Started: 12/26/2008	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 01/12/2009	
	Completed: 01/07/2009	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/20/2009	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/15/2009 from 01/15/2009 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 3rd 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 17 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (11 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 82 reviews, 81.7% were on-time, and 48.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	On the title sheet, please delete the Owner's Certificate. A Water Quality Technical Report is required (see items 11 and 12). (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	On the site plan, call out the driveway as "existing driveway to be replaced to current standards." (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	On the title sheet, in the vicinity map, call out the name of the north-south street across from the site. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	On the site plan, in Arch Street, remove the cars and the rectangular symbols and call out the distance between the wing of the existing driveway and the wing of the southerly adjacent property's curb cut. Using dashed lines for the existing wings of the 21'-9" driveway, show a new wing on the site frontage so that the distance from the side property line is 17 feet at the front property line, plus a 3-foot wing. On the neighbor's side, show a driveway which goes from the property line to the existing wood landscape border, where the new wing will begin. (see comment 19 for the continuation) (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	On the site plan, call out the interior dimensions of the proposed 1-car garage and the adjacent exterior parking space. The minimum for each is 9'-6". (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	On sheet A-9, on the left side, there is a callout for a 4" drain. Please show the location of the drain. Also, change "waterproofing" to "waterproofing" in two places. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	On the site plan, the finish floor elevation is called out as 103.3. However, the spot elevations are all in the 340 range. Please resolve this discrepancy. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	On the site plan, add the attached Owner's Certificate for Post-construction BMP's and have it signed by the property owner. Please do not staple or attach the certificate to the plans. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	On the site plan, add the following note : 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. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	On the site plan, add the following note : 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. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	(1 of 2) The project is subject to Priority Permanent Storm Water BMP requirements. Therefore, the applicant shall submit a Water Quality Technical Report consistent with the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards Appendix D. The report shall include, but not be limited to how Low Impact Development (LID) and Source Control BMPs have been incorporated to the project, selection and calculations regarding the numeric sizing treatment standards, BMP maintenance schedules and maintenance costs and the party responsible for future maintenance and associated costs. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	(2 of 2) The report will also need to address water quality, by describing the type of pollutants which will be generated post-construction, the pollutants to be captured and treated by the proposed BMP's and the quality of the resultant discharge. If substantial impacts are anticipated, list the measures which must be taken to mitigate such impacts. ***In addition, address erosion control measures/detention basin(s) requirements per City Ordinance 0- 17068. The Storm Water Standards are available online at http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	On the site plan, using arrows, indicate the drainage pattern for the entire site. Drainage is not allowed to flow to adjacent properties. (From Cycle 2)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Sean Torres at (619) 446-5305. Project Nbr: 158881 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 14 On the site plan, show and call out the visibility area triangles, per SDMC Sec. 113.0273, Diagram 113-02RR, for the driveway. No structures may be located within a visibility area unless otherwise provided by the applicable zone or the regulations in Chapter 14, Article 2 (General Development Regulations). (From Cycle 2)
- 15 To summarize, from the side property line, the new driveway will extend 17 feet plus a 3-foot wing on the site frontage, and about 10 or so feet (call out exact dimension) with a 3-foot wing on the neighbor's frontage. Call out the total width of the new driveway, as well as the portions, and call out the remaining (existing) portion of the existing driveway on the neighbor's frontage as "portion of existing driveway to be closed." Show the existing wood landscape border and the short brick wall adjacent to the neighbor's frontage. (From Cycle 2)
- 16 On the site plan, the minimum interior length of the proposed garage must be 19 feet, and the minimum interior width must be 9.5 feet. The same width requirement applies to the proposed space adjacent to the garage. On sheet A-3, the door between the garage and the outside parking space must be replaced with a sliding door which will not open into either parking area. If the applicant wants the door from the garage to open as currently proposed, then the 19 distance must be measured from the point where the door is fully open. The door to storage is OK as is. (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review

Issues

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 23 There will be a requirement for an Encroachment Maintenance and Removal Agreement (EMRA) for the proposed sidewalk underdrains within the Arch Street right-of-way. Please revise the plans to reflect this requirement. (New Issue)

Comments/Corrections

A-1

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 24 Revise the Site Plan (A-1, sheet 2 of 13), as follows:

Please remove the Owner's Certificate for Post-Construction BMP's.
(New Issue)
- 25 On the Vicinity Map, provide a north arrow, call out "Arch Dr", as "Arch St" and call out the location of "New Jersey St". Please revise the Vicinity Maps on all other sheets, accordingly. (New Issue)
- 26 Please call out the top and bottom of wall elevations for the proposed wall in the front yard setback along Arch Street. (New Issue)
- 27 Please provide a grading data table with cut/fill and import/export quantities. (New Issue)
- 28 Show the drainage direction for the driveway area, consistent with Drainage Map 'B' of the Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR). (New Issue)
- 29 Show all proposed BMPs consistent with Drainage Map 'B' of the Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR). (New Issue)

WQTR

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 30 Revise the Water Quality Technical Report, as follows:

Revise the Water Quality Technical Report to document how all Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs and Source Control BMPs (See pages 18 thru 24 of the Storm Water Standards) are being implemented on the project. If any of the listed BMPs are not incorporated into the project, justification of their omission is required. (New Issue)
- 31 The Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR) was reviewed and requires revisions. The WQTR can be picked up at "Plan Pick Up" on the third floor of the Development Services Building. Please return the marked-up copy with the revised report. (New Issue)

Draft Permit Conditions

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 17 Prior to the the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent BMP maintenance.

(From Cycle 2)
- 18 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.
(From Cycle 2)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	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. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the applicant shall incorporate and show the type and location of all post-construction Best Management Practices (BMP's) on the final construction drawings, in accordance with the approved Water Quality Technical Report. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall assure, by permit and bond, the replacement of the existing curb with curb and gutter, and the replacement of the existing shared driveway with a new _____-foot driveway per the site plan, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	On the site plan, the minimum interior length of the proposed garage must be 19 feet, and the minimum interior width must be 9.5 feet. The same width requirement applies to the proposed space adjacent to the garage. On sheet A-3, the door between the garage and the outside parking space must be replaced with a sliding door which will not open into either parking area. If the applicant wants the door from the garage to open as currently proposed, then the 19 distance must be measured from the point where the door is fully open. The door to storage is OK as is. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall assure, by permit and bond, the replacement of the existing curb with curb and gutter, and the replacement of the existing shared driveway with a new 28'- 3" driveway per the site plan, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Maintenance and Removal Agreement, for the proposed sidewalk underdrains within the Arch Street right-of-way, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/10/2008	Deemed Complete on 12/11/2008
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 12/11/2008	
Reviewer: Godwin, Paul (619) 446-5103	Assigned: 01/15/2009	
Hours of Review: 0.00	Started: 01/15/2009	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 01/12/2009	
	Completed: 01/15/2009	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 01/20/2009	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/15/2009 from 01/15/2009 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 3rd 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 2 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (1 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 73 reviews, 53.4% were on-time, and 47.9% 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 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. (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The applicant has indicated that the project is scheduled to be heard by the Uptown Community Planning Group in January 2009. Please forward the group's recommendation to the Project Manager as soon as it is available. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/10/2008	Deemed Complete on 12/11/2008
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 12/11/2008	
Reviewer: Spindell, Glenn (619) 446-5353	Assigned: 12/11/2008	
Hours of Review: 5.00	Started: 12/26/2008	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 01/12/2009	
	Completed: 01/12/2009	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/20/2009	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/15/2009 from 01/15/2009 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 3rd 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 (11 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 72 reviews, 77.8% were on-time, and 50.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

First Review

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The project is subject to the Brush Management regulations contained in SDMC 142.0402. The purpose of these regulations is to limit fuel load by thinning the existing adjacent vegetation and developing a program for maintaining a defensible space between areas of vegetation and structures.

Brush management regulations provide for a uniform Citywide 100 ft deep defensible space and require the establishment of brush management zones. Zone 1 includes irrigated, ornamental vegetation, and Zone 2 consist of non-irrigated and thinned native vegetation.
(From Cycle 2) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Provide a Brush Management Plan consist with the requirements as described in the above regulations. Brush management zones include a "Zone One" and "Zone Two." [142.0412(b)] Typically, Zone One is 35 ft. and Zone Two is 65 ft. [Table 142-04H]. The plan must identify and dimension both Zone One & Zone Two. Please show the entire parcel on Brush Management Plan.
(From Cycle 2) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Provide the brush management zones clearly on the plan and label the dimensions of each zone.

(From Cycle 2) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Color photographs must be provided with the brush management plan illustrating the type and density of all plant material on the site (excluding areas abutting the street). A key map must also be provided with the color photographs indicating the points where the photos are taken from. Provide an adequate number of photographs to clearly show all areas of vegetation. (From Cycle 2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Please provide a statement on the plan which outlines the Brush Management Program for the site. Use the outline from LDC 142.0412(g) and (h). Indicate any and all locations where this site has been required to provide additional fire protection (such as 1-2 hour rated structures). (From Cycle 2) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Brush Management (SDMC 142.0412) Brush management regulations are available on the www @ http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/brushmgt.shtml . |

Additionally:

FPB Policy B-08-1 Clarification of Brush Management Regulations and Landscape Standards (VI(B): Please review this document for a clarification to the Brush Management Regulations in the LDM 142.0412 as well as useful graphics to depict Brush Management requirements. This document is available online @:

<http://www.sandiego.gov/fireandems/pdf/brushpdf.pdf>

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 7 | FPB Policy B-08-1 Clarification of Brush Management Regulations and Landscape Standards (VI(B): Please add the following note: Canopies of existing trees that extend to within 10' of any structure shall be pruned to maintain a minimum horizontal and vertical clearance of 10' (From Cycle 2) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 8 | FPB Policy B-08-1 Clarification of Brush Management Regulations and Landscape Standards (VI(B): Please please review and comply with the Tree and Shrub Spacing Chart p.4: Show all existing tree and shrubs subject to brush management on site, including the species, common name and the canopy limits to demonstrate brush management will comply with the policy. (From Cycle 2) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 9 | Title the Brush Management Plan "Brush Management Plan." If the plan is both the Landscape Development Plan and the Brush Management Plan, then title the sheet "Landscape Development Plan and Brush Management Plan." (From Cycle 2) |





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	RE-SUBMITTAL REQUIRED: Re-submit revised plans with the above information provided to Plan Submittal on the 3rd floor. Re-submittals that are incomplete can delay plan processing.

Additional comments may be required based on reiew of additional information provided by the applicant.
(From Cycle 2)

2nd Review

Brush Management Plan

Brush Mgmt Modifications

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Proposed Brush Management Plan: the applicant proposes a Brush Management Plan consisting of zero [0] feet of Brush Management Zone One and one hundred [100] feet of Brush management Zone Two. This proposed Brush Management Plan cannot be supported in its current form. Recommend that the applicant meet with staff from Building Development Review (Landscape Assessment and Fire Plan Review) to discuss alternatives for brush management and fire resistivity standards. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Reduction to Brush Management Zone One: the provisions for reducing the Zone One width by proportionally increasing Zone Two do not apply to new development [SDMC 142.0412(h)(7)]. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Alternatives to Zone One reduction: where Zone One width is required adjacent to the MHPA, the front yard setback may be reduced by 5 feet [SDMC 142.0412(e)(1)]. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Existing Brush Management Zone One: 10 feet of unbuil development area exists between the MHPA boundary and the structure exterior. This area should be shown as part of Zone One [SDMC 142.0412(g)(1)]. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Structural Fire Resistivity Standards: reduction of Brush Management Zone One would require building features for fire protection, in addition to those required in accordance with SDMC 145.0501 (Additional Building Standards for Buildings Located Adjacent to Hazardous Areas of Native or Naturalized Vegetation), in order to achieve an equivalent level of fire protection. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Such modifications may include: deck construction of non-combustible materials, or deck construction that achieves a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating by way of heavy timber construction; and increasing the ratings of the walls and windows for both stories of the new dwelling. (New Issue)

Additional Brush Mgmt. Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Tree Clearance from Structures: canopies of existing trees that extend to within 10' of any structure shall be pruned to maintain a minimum horizontal and vertical clearance of 10'. The existing trees shown on plan appear to have canopies closer than ten feet to the proposed structure [SDMC 142.0410(g)(4)]. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Pruning and Thinning: Revise the Brush Management Plan labels and notes to show that existing mature trees and shrubs 4 feet or more in height in Zone Two shall be thinned by pruning one half of the lower branches to create umbrella-shaped canopies, rather than pruning from the top to reduce the height. (New Issue)

Additional Landscape Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Plant Point Calculations: these point calculations are not required per SDMC 142.0404 for the RS (Residential-Single Unit) Zones. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Photographic Survey: the response letter indicates a photographic survey was provided. It was not provided. Please provide in order that staff may better evaluate the existing conditions. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Existing Trees and Shrubs: indicate with a dashed symbol and label to be removed or to remain. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/10/2008	Deemed Complete on 12/11/2008
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-MSCP	Cycle Distributed: 12/11/2008	
Reviewer: Forburger, Kristen (619) 236-6583	Assigned: 12/26/2008	
Hours of Review: 3.00	Started: 01/14/2009	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Review Due: 01/12/2009	
	Completed: 01/14/2009	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 01/20/2009	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/15/2009 from 01/15/2009 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for Plan-MSCP on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with Plan-MSCP (4 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Plan-MSCP performed 20 reviews, 10.0% were on-time, and 78.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

MSCP Comments 8/22/08

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site lies partially within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the City's MSCP. Please provide a map of the MHPA boundary on the project plans, including Site Plan, Grading Plans and Landscape Plans. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Please provide a biological resources report prepared pursuant to the City of San Diego "Guidelines for Conducting Biological Surveys" (2002). The report should include a map depicting biological resources and MHPA boundaries. MHPA Guidelines, as described in the MSCP Subarea Plan, that apply to the site and any management conditions that would apply to the areas conserved as MHPA/open space should also be discussed in the report. All revisions to the Biology Report shall be in strikeout/underline format. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Due to the adjacency to the MHPA, the development will need to conform to all applicable Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (Section 1.4.3) of the MSCP Subarea Plan. In particular, lighting, drainage, landscaping, grading, access, and noise must not adversely affect the MHPA. Please address these issues in the project biology report and provide notes/conditions on the construction plans as appropriate. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Lighting should be directed away from the MHPA, and shielded if necessary. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	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. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	All manufactured slopes must be included within the development footprint and outside the MHPA. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	All Zone 1 brush management areas must be included within the development footprint and outside the MHPA. Brush management Zone 2 may be permitted within the MHPA (considered impact neutral) but cannot be used as mitigation. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Access to the MHPA, if any, should be directed to minimize impacts and reduce impacts associated with domestic pet predation. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	The following condition will be included in the permit: The issuance of this permit by the City of San Diego does not authorize the Permittee for this permit to violate any Federal, State or City laws, ordinances, regulations or policies including, but not limited to, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (EAS) and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. Section 1531 et seq.). CONTINUED (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	In accordance with authorization granted to the City of San Diego from the USFWS pursuant to Sec. 10(a) of the ESA and by the CDFG pursuant to Fish & Game Code sec. 2835 as part of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), the City of San Diego through the issuance of this Permit hereby confers upon Permittee the status of Third Party Beneficiary as provided for in Section 17 of the City of San Diego Implementing Agreement (IA), executed on July 17, 1997 and on File in the Office of the City Clerk as Document No. 00-18394. CONTINUED (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Third Party Beneficiary status is conferred upon Permittee by the City: (1) to grant Permittee the legal standing and legal right to utilize the take authorizations granted to the City pursuant to the MSCP within the context of those limitations imposed under this permit and the IA, and (2) to assure Permittee that no existing mitigation obligation imposed by the City of San Diego pursuant to this Permit shall be altered in the future by the City of San Diego, USFWS or CDFG, except in the limited circumstances described in Section 9.6 and 9.7 of the IA. CONTINUED (From Cycle 2)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	For lands identified as mitigation but not yet dedicated, maintenance and continued recognition of Third Party Beneficiary status by the City is contingent upon Permittee maintaining the biological values of any and all lands committed for mitigation pursuant to this Permit and of full satisfaction by Permittee of mitigation obligations required by this Permit, as described in accordance with Section 17.1D of the IA. (From Cycle 2)

MSCP Comments 1/14/09

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	A "Results of the Biological Survey for the Hamilton Residence" prepared by RECON (Oct 17, 2008) was submitted and reviewed by MSCP. The survey report is deemed complete and acceptable. No direct impacts to sensitive biological resources would result with project implementation; however, there is a potential for indirect impacts to nesting raptors and the adjacent MHPA. Therefore, mitigation included in the report would be incorporated into the environmental document to reduced potential indirect impacts to below a level of significance. (New Issue)

MSCP Conditions of NDP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Prior to recordation of the first final map and/or issuance of any grading permits, the on-site MHPA shall be conveyed to the City's MSCP preserve through either fee title to the City, or a conservation easement or covenant of easement granted in favor of the City and wildlife agencies. Conveyance of any land in fee to the City shall require approval from the Park and Recreation Department Open Space Division Deputy Director and shall exclude detention basins or other stormwater control facilities, brush management areas, landscape/revegetation areas, and graded slopes. continued.... (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	To facilitate MHPA conveyance, any non-fee areas shall have conservation easements placed over them if located in the MHPA, and be maintained in perpetuity by the Owner/Permittee/Applicant unless otherwise agreed to by the City. All other on-site areas can be conveyed through any of the three above methods. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Third Party Beneficiary Status shall be awarded to this property and comments 10-13 will be included in the NDP. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/10/2008	Deemed Complete on 12/11/2008
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 12/11/2008	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296	Assigned: 12/11/2008	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Started: 12/11/2008	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Review Due: 01/12/2009	
	Completed: 01/12/2009	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/20/2009	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/15/2009 from 01/15/2009 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (3 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 65 reviews, 78.5% were on-time, and 62.3% 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within geologic hazard zone 53 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 53 is characterized by level or sloping terrain, unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk. (From Cycle 2)

1st Review/Cycle 2 References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Site Plan, Hamilton Residence, 4496 Arch Street, San Diego, Ca.; prepared by Lantz Design Group, dated July 8, 2008. Geotechnical Report, Hamilton Residence, 4496 Arch Street, San Diego, Ca.; prepared by Southern California Soil & Testing, Inc., dated May 9, 2008 (their project no. 0811088, report no. 1). (From Cycle 2)

1st Review/Cycle 2 Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	An addendum geotechnical report must be submitted for review that addresses geologic hazards potentially impacting the project (PTS No. 158881) as currently proposed on the referenced site plan. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	The addendum geotechnical report must indicate if unfavorable geologic structure exists at the site. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	In addition, the addendum 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. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports." (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review/Cycle 8 Reference

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Response to City of San Diego Geotechnical Review Letter, Hamilton Residence, 4496 Arch Street, San Diego, Ca.; prepared by Southern California Soil & Testing, Inc., dated November 6, 2008 (their project no. 0811088, report no. 2). (New Issue)

2nd Review/Cycle 8 Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	The referenced geotechnical documents have been reviewed. Based on that review, the geotechnical consultant has adequately addressed the soil and geologic conditions potentially affecting the proposed project for purposes of environmental review. (New Issue)

Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Additional geotechnical review will be required if a ministerial building or grading permit is needed for the project. (New Issue) [Recommended]

