

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE ISSUED:	March 17, 2011	REPORT NO. PC-11-032
ATTENTION:	Planning Commission, Agenda of M	larch 24, 2011
SUBJECT:	FLEISHER RESIDENCE - PROJECT PROCESS TWO	TNO. 218795
OWNER:	Mark R. Fleisher and Bruce R. Fleishe Trust (Attachment 12)	er, Trustees of the Fleisher Family
APPLICANT:	Michael E. Turk, Permittee	

SUMMARY

Issue(s): Should the Planning Commission approve or deny an appeal of the staff decision to approve the construction of a three story, 2,226 square foot single family residence on a vacant lot at 1056 Chalcedony Street in the Pacific Beach Community Planning Area?

Staff Recommendation: Deny the appeal and uphold the staff decision to Approve Coastal Development Permit No. 779217.

<u>Community Planning Group Recommendation</u>: The Pacific Beach Planning Board voted to recommend denial of the project on October 27, 2010, by a vote of 11-0-0 with recommendations (Attachment 11).

Environmental Review: This project is not pending an appeal of the environmental determination. The environmental exemption determination for this project was made on October 1, 2010, and the opportunity to appeal that determination ended October 22, 2010 (Attachment 8).

Fiscal Impact Statement: None. All staff costs associated with the processing of this project are paid from a deposit account maintained by the owner.

<u>Code Enforcement Impact</u>: There are no zoning or building code violations on the property.



Housing Impact Statement: The Pacific Beach Community Plan designates the 0.07 acre site as low-medium residential density at 9 to 15 dwelling units per acre. Based on this land use designation the project could accommodate 1 dwelling unit. The proposed project would result in construction of 1 single-family dwelling unit on a vacant lot. The proposed project is not subject to the Affordable Housing requirements of the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. The project qualified for the Affordable-In-Fill Housing and Sustainable Building Expedite Program because it will provide 50% or more of its projected total electrical energy consumption by utilizing a photovoltaic renewable energy system. Therefore, the project meets the "sustainable buildings" definition as established by Council Policy 900-14.

BACKGROUND

The 0.07 acre project site is located at 1056 Chalcedony Street in the Pacific Beach Community (Attachments 1 and 2). The property is located in the RM-1-1 Zone, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Parking Impact Overlay Zone, within the Pacific Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (Attachment 3).

The rectangular shaped flat lot is vacant and was previously utilized as a landscaped open yard for the residence on the lot to the west. The southern property boundary fronts on Chalcedony Street, and the northern property boundary fronts on an unnamed 20 foot wide alley. Residential properties are adjacent to the western and eastern property boundaries. The adjacent land uses are residential. Site elevations range from approximately 74 feet at the southern property boundary to approximately 76 feet Mean Sea Level at the northern property boundary. The project is located above the 100-year floodplain, is not located within or adjacent to the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), and is not located in or adjacent to any Environmentally Sensitive Lands. The property is located approximately a half mile from the waters of the Pacific Ocean. No public views are impacted by the development. The proposed development will take place entirely within private property and will not encroach onto or impact any existing or proposed physical public access ways.

DISCUSSION

Project Description:

The proposed development is located in the non-appealable Coastal Overlay Zone requiring a Coastal Development Permit. The project proposes construction of a new sustainable three story 2,226 square foot single family residence on a vacant lot (Attachments 5 and 9). Construction includes a detached 400 square foot two car carport, a 66 square foot second story balcony, and a 338 square foot third story roof deck. The carport and decks total 804 square feet and are not included as gross floor area. Solar panels will be located on the roof of the residence. The three story residential building will be a maximum height of 29 feet 9 inches, and the carport 12 feet 1 inch in height. The buildings will be under the maximum 30 foot Coastal Height Limit allowed by the zone.

The zone designates the property as multi-family residential RM-1-1. The purpose of the RM zones is to provide for multiple dwelling unit development at varying densities. The RM zones individually accommodate developments with similar densities and characteristics. Each of the RM zones is intended to establish development criteria that consolidates common development regulations, accommodates specific dwelling types, and responds to locational issues regarding adjacent land uses. The RM-1-1 zone allows a maximum permitted density of 1 dwelling unit for each 3,000 square feet of lot area. The lot is a 3,125 square foot site allowing 1 unit. The lot width and frontage are 25 feet. However, the minimum required lot size is 6,000 square feet, with a 50 foot wide lot and frontage. Though the project does not meet these criteria, the lot is a legal lot as defined by SDMC 113.0237(a). The SDMC states that any lot or parcel that does not comply with the minimum lot area or required lot dimensions may nevertheless be used in compliance with the applicable zone if the lot is a legal lot as determined by Section 113.0237(a). The required lot depth is 90 feet and the lot depth exceeds this amount at a depth of 125 feet.

The project does not exceed the gross floor area allowed by the zone. The zone allows a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.75 and the project is designed at 0.71 FAR. The maximum FAR of 0.75 times the 3,125 square foot lot area allows a 2,344 square feet FAR. The project requests 2,226 square feet FAR meeting this requirement. The FAR does not include 404 square feet of decks and 400 square feet for the carport as these areas are exempt from the FAR calculation. The project meets the required zoning yard setbacks. The front yard setbacks are 15 feet for 50% of the width of the building and 20 feet for the remaining area, along the southern frontage on Chalcedony Street. The minimum side setbacks adjacent to the western and eastern residential properties are 3 feet based on the premises that is 25 feet wide or less (SDMC 131.0443(d)(2)(B). The rear yard abuts the alley, therefore the allowed setback is 5 feet. The project will provide 2 off-street automobile parking spaces in the carport which is accessed from the alley. The project was designed in conformance with the underlying zones and is not requesting deviations or variances to the Land Development Code (Attachments 4, 6 and7).

Community Plan Analysis:

The purpose and intent of the Pacific Beach Community Plan is to promote the development of a variety of housing types and styles to provide a greater opportunity for housing that is both affordable and accessible to everyone. The residential goals are to enhance the neighborhoods by establishing and maintaining street tree patterns and promoting general maintenance and improvement. Design standards are to be implemented to ensure properties reflect the scale and character of the established neighborhood. The implementation of the Community Plan policies and recommendations are accomplished by applying the Land Development Code regulations in effect for the site. The RM-1-1 Zone in combination with the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone effectively limits the bulk and scale of the building by placing a height limit, establishing staggered setbacks which create off-setting planes and building articulation.

The project is located at 1056 Chalcedony Street within the Pacific Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan. The Pacific Beach Community Plan designates this site for Low-Medium Density (9 to 15 dwelling units per acre). This density category is characterized by lower intensity multifamily housing, such as two-on-ones or duplexes. The project proposes 1 dwelling unit on a 0.07 acre legal lot for a density of 14 dwelling units per acre. The project is therefore consistent with the prescribed density in the community plan.

Development in the vicinity is characterized by one, two, and three story single and multi-family homes with various architectural styles. The proposed three story residence is consistent with the surrounding development. Although the project site is not located within a designated view corridor in the Community Plan, a view to the ocean exists through Chalcedony Street looking west. The project observes the required front setbacks, therefore the functional view corridor down the street is maintained. The project site is located within Community Tree District 3 in the community plan. The proposed street tree selections are consistent with the allowable trees in District 3. The Conservation Element of the City's General Plan contains Climate Change and Sustainable Development Goals and Policies which exceed the expectations of the Sustainable Building Expedite Program. The project is a "sustainable building" as established by Council Policy 900-14, therefore will provide photovoltaic panels for electrical energy located on the roof top of the buildings. The building also adds sustainable features which include energy star appliances, high efficiency lighting, natural ventilation, dual pane low-E glazing on windows, low VOC materials, engineered wood, permeable paving areas, water conserving native and pest resistant plants, rain sensor shut off devices, and a high efficiency irrigation system. The project is consistent with the Conservation Element of the General Plan.

The proposed structure is designed in a Spanish Colonial style of architecture with white stucco, dark wood accents, variegated clay roof tile and hammered iron railings. The building exterior will be stepped several times and use detailed architectural features to create a textural change and an offset appearance for the walls. Beyond physical setbacks, several decks, railings and balconies were included to soften and delineate the three levels for a stepped back appearance for the structure. The landscape plan includes native and accent planting to create a stylistically appropriate setting as well as comply with the sustainable features of the project design criteria. The project conforms to the 30 foot Coastal Height Limit requirement, and meets the required zoning yard setbacks. No public view or public access to the water would be adversely affected by the approval of this project. The project meets the intent of the guidelines for the Coastal Overlay and Coastal Height Limitation Overlay zones, and the Pacific Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan.

<u>Project Appeal Issues</u>:

A Process 2 decision for this project was approved by the Development Services Department (DSD) staff on December 17, 2010. An appeal of this decision was filed January 11, 2011 by the neighbors (Attachment 10). The appeal issue with a response is provided below:

Issue - Bulk and Scale:

The appeal states that the project does not conform to the community due to bulk and scale. The neighbors feel that the proposed project is an eyesore for the community with no aesthetic value to the look of the height, lacking consistency with the existing structures in the area.

Staff Response – Staff found the project to meet the requirements of the Community Plan and the underlying zones. Staff notes that the implementation of the Community Plan policies and recommendations are accomplished by applying the Land Development Code regulations in effect for the site. The RM-1-1 Zone in combination with the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone effectively limits the bulk and scale of the building by placing a height limit, requiring staggered

yard setbacks which create off-setting planes and building articulation. The proposed single family residence does not exceed the allowed density. No variance or deviations to the SDMC are being requested. The project meets the required step-backs and yard setbacks which limit construction in the setback areas. The proposed landscaping meets the landscape regulations. The project is limited to a maximum height of 30 feet by the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone. Neither the Community Plan nor SDMC limit a structure to two stories. Applying the RM-1-1 development regulations effectively regulates the bulk and scale of the new development per the recommendations of the Community Plan.

Community Group:

The Pacific Beach Planning Board voted to recommend denial of the project on October 27, 2010, by a vote of 11-0-0 with recommendations (Attachment 11). The denial was based on the Board's opinion that the carport should be included in the FAR as historically these carports have been enclosed after completion.

Staff Response – SDMC 113.0234(a)(6) exempts carports from the FAR calculation when they are constructed and maintained with more than two elevations of the element that are at least 75 percent completely open. The proposed carport meets this criteria, therefore is not included in the total FAR for the project. The project does not exceed the FAR allowed by the zone. Any future conversion to enclose an approved carport would become a neighborhood code compliance issue. To address the Board's concern, staff and the applicant agreed to add Permit Condition No. 17 to clarify the requirement for an open carport otherwise the project might exceed the allowable FAR for the zone (Attachment 6).

Conclusion:

In summary, staff recommends denying the appeal and upholding the DSD decision to approve the project as the project is consistent with the recommended land use, design guidelines, and development standards in effect for this site per the adopted Land Development Code, Pacific Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan, and the City of San Diego General Plan.

ALTERNATIVE(S)

- 1. Deny the appeal and Approve Coastal Development Permit No. 779217, with modifications.
- 2. Approve the appeal and Deny Coastal Development Permit No. 779217, if the findings required to approve the project cannot be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Westlake Program Manager Development Services Department

Mulad

Diane Murbach / Project Manager Development Services Department

MW/DM

Attachments:

- 1. Project Location Map
- 2. Aerial Photograph
- 3. Community Plan Land Use Map
- 4. Project Data Sheet
- 5. Project Rendering
- 6. Draft Permit with Conditions
- 7. Draft Permit Resolution with Findings
- 8. Environmental Exemption
- 9. Project Plans
- 10. Copy of Appeal
- 11. Community Planning Group Recommendation
- 12. Ownership Disclosure Statement
- 13. Project Chronology





Project Location Map FLEISHER RESIDENCE - PROJECT NO. 218795

1056 Chalcedony Street - Pacific Beach

ATTACHMENT 1

North





Aerial Photograph FLEISHER RESIDENCE - PROJECT NO. 218795

1056 Chalcedony Street - Pacific Beach



ATTACHMENT 2

ATTACHMENT 3



Community Plan Land Use Map



FLEISHER RESIDENCE - PROJECT NO. 218795

1056 Chalcedony Street - Pacific Beach

ATTACHMENT 4

	PROJECT DATA SHEI				
PROJECT NAME:	Fleisher Residence – Proj	Fleisher Residence – Project 218795			
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Construction of a three story 2,226 square foot single family residence on a vacant lot at 1056 Chalcedony Stree				
COMMUNITY PLANAREA:	Pacific Beach				
DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS:	Coastal Development Permit				
COMMUNITY PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION:	Low-Medium Density Residential (9-15 du/ac).				
LOT SIZE: 6, FLOOR AREA RATIO: 0. FRONT SETBACK: 15 SIDE SETBACK: 34 STREETSIDE SETBACK: NA REAR SETBACK: 54	75 feet/20 feet feet minimum A	Jveriay Zone			
ADJACENT PROPERTIES:	LAND USE DESIGNATION & ZONE	EXISTING LAND USE			
NORTH:	Low - Medium Density Residential and RM-1-1	Multi Family Residential			
SOUTH:	Low - Medium Density Residential and RM-1-1	Multi Family Residential			
EAST:	Low - Medium Density Residential and RM-1-1	Multi Family Residential			
WEST:	Low - Medium Density Residential and RM-1-1	Single Family Residence			
DEVIATIONS OR VARIANCES REQUESTED:	None				
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP RECOMMENDATION:	On October 27, 2010, the Pacific Beach Planning Board voted 11-0-0 to deny the project with recommendations.				



FLEISHER RESIDENCE - PROJECT NO. 218795

1056 Chalcedony Street - Pacific Beach

North

ATTACHMENT 5

RECORDING REQUESTED BY CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES PERMIT INTAKE, MAIL STATION 501

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT PERMIT CLERK MAIL STATION 501

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE

INTERNAL ORDER NUMBER: 24001121

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 779217 FLEISHER RESIDENCE – PROJECT NO. 218795 PLANNING COMMISSION

This Coastal Development Permit No. 779217 is granted by the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego to Mark R. Fleisher and Bruce R. Fleisher, Trustees of the Fleisher Family Trust, Owner, and Michael E. Turk, Inc., Permittee, pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code [SDMC] section 126.0708. The 0.07 acre site is located at 1056 Chalcedony Street in the RM-1-1 Zone, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Parking Impact Overlay Zone, within the Pacific Beach Community Plan. The project site is legally described as: Lot 27, Block 113, Map 1042, Pacific Beach, City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California.

Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit, permission is granted to Owner and Permittee to construct a three story 2,226 square foot single family residence and detached carport on a vacant lot described and identified by size, dimension, quantity, type, and location on the approved exhibits [Exhibit "A"] dated March 24, 2011, on file in the Development Services Department.

The project shall include:

- a. Construction of a three story 2,226 square foot single family residence on a vacant lot. Construction allows a 400 square foot two vehicle carport, a 66 square foot second story balcony, and a 338 square foot third story roof deck for a total of 804 square feet not included as gross floor area;
- b. Landscaping (planting, irrigation and landscape related improvements);
- c. Off-street parking;

- d. A roof-mounted photovoltaic system consisting of solar panels sufficient to generate at least 50 percent of the project's projected energy consumption in accordance with Council Policy 900-14; and
- e. Public and private accessory improvements determined by the Development Services Department to be consistent with the land use and development standards for this site in accordance with the adopted community plan, the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] and the CEQA Guidelines, the City Engineer's requirements, zoning regulations, conditions of this Permit, and any other applicable regulations of the SDMC.

STANDARD REQUIREMENTS:

1. This permit must be utilized within thirty-six (36) months after the date on which all rights of appeal have expired. If this permit is not utilized in accordance with Chapter 12, Article 6, Division 1 of the SDMC within the 36 month period, this permit shall be void unless an Extension of Time has been granted. Any such Extension of Time must meet all SDMC requirements and applicable guidelines in effect at the time the extension is considered by the appropriate decision maker.

2. No permit for the construction, occupancy, or operation of any facility or improvement described herein shall be granted, nor shall any activity authorized by this Permit be conducted on the premises until:

- a. The Owner/Permittee signs and returns the Permit to the Development Services Department; and
- b. The Permit is recorded in the Office of the San Diego County Recorder.

3. While this Permit is in effect, the subject property shall be used only for the purposes and under the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate City decision maker.

4. This Permit is a covenant running with the subject property and all of the requirements and conditions of this Permit and related documents shall be binding upon the Owner/Permittee and any successor(s) in interest.

5. The continued use of this Permit shall be subject to the regulations of this and any other applicable governmental agency.

6. Issuance of this Permit by the City of San Diego does not authorize the Owner/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 [ESA] and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.).

7. The Owner/Permittee shall secure all necessary building permits. The Owner/Permittee is informed that to secure these permits, substantial building modifications and site improvements may be required to comply with applicable building, fire, mechanical, and plumbing codes, and State and Federal disability access laws.

8. Construction plans shall be in substantial conformity to Exhibit "A." Changes, modifications, or alterations to the construction plans are prohibited unless appropriate application(s) or amendment(s) to this Permit have been granted.

9. All of the conditions contained in this Permit have been considered and were determinednecessary to make the findings required for approval of this Permit. The Permit holder is required to comply with each and every condition in order to maintain the entitlements that are granted by this Permit.

If any condition of this Permit, on a legal challenge by the Owner/Permittee of this Permit, is found or held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, unenforceable, or unreasonable, this Permit shall be void. However, in such an event, the Owner/Permittee shall have the right, by paying applicable processing fees, to bring a request for a new permit without the "invalid" conditions(s) back to the discretionary body which approved the Permit for a determination by that body as to whether all of the findings necessary for the issuance of the proposed permit can still be made in the absence of the "invalid" condition(s). Such hearing shall be a hearing de novo, and the discretionary body shall have the absolute right to approve, disapprove, or modify the proposed permit and the condition(s) contained therein.

10. The Owner/Permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its agents, officers, and employees from any and all claims, actions, proceedings, damages, judgments, or costs, including attorney's fees, against the City or its agents, officers, or employees, relating to the issuance of this permit including, but not limited to, any action to attack, set aside, void, challenge, or annul this development approval and any environmental document or decision. The City will promptly notify Owner/Permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and, if the City should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the Owner/Permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or its agents, officers, and employees. The City may elect to conduct its own defense, participate in its own defense, or obtain independent legal counsel in defense of any claim related to this indemnification. In the event of such election, Owner/Permittee shall pay all of the costs related thereto, including without limitation reasonable attorney's fees and costs. In the event of a disagreement between the City and Owner/Permittee regarding litigation issues, the City shall have the authority to control the litigation and make litigation related decisions, including, but not limited to, settlement or other disposition of the matter. However, the Owner/Permittee shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement unless such settlement is approved by Owner/Permittee.

AFFORDABLE/SUSTAINABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS:

11. Prior to the issuance of building permits, construction documents shall fully illustrate the incorporation of a roof-mounted photovoltaic system consisting of solar panels sufficient to generate at least 50 percent of the project's projected energy consumption, in accordance with Council Policy 900-14.

ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS:

12. Prior to foundation inspection, the Owner/Permittee shall submit a building pad certification signed by a Registered Civil Engineer or a Licensed Land Surveyor, certifying that the pad elevation based on USGS datum is in accordance with the approved plans.

13. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications, satisfactory to the City Engineer.

14. Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee 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, satisfactory to the City Engineer.

15. This project proposes to export 8 cubic yards of material from the project site. All export material shall be discharged into a legal disposal site. The approval of this project does not allow the onsite processing and sale of the export material unless the underlying zone allows a construction and demolition debris recycling facility with an approved Neighborhood Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit per LDC Section 141.0620(i).

PLANNING/DESIGN REQUIREMENTS:

16. Owner/Permittee shall maintain a minimum of 2 off-street parking spaces on the property at all times in the approximate locations shown on the approved Exhibit "A." Parking spaces shall comply at all times with the SDMC and shall not be converted for any other use unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate City decision maker in accordance with the SDMC.

17. The carport shall be constructed and maintained with at least two sides that are at least 75 percent completely open. The carport shall be included in the calculation of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) if less than two sides of the carport are 75 percent completely open. The project may not exceed the allowable FAR of the zone.

18. A topographical survey conforming to the provisions of the SDMC may be required if it is determined, during construction, that there may be a conflict between the building(s) under construction and a condition of this Permit or a regulation of the underlying zone. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the Owner/Permittee.

19. All private outdoor lighting shall be shaded and adjusted to fall on the same premises where such lights are located and in accordance with the applicable regulations in the SDMC.

WATER & SEWER REQUIREMENTS:

20. All proposed private sewer facilities located within a single lot are to be designed to meet the requirements of the California Plumbing Code and will be reviewed as part of the building permit plan check.

21. The Owner/Permittee agrees to design and construct all proposed public water and sewer facilities in accordance with established criteria in the most current edition of the City of San Diego Water and Sewer Facility Design Guidelines and City regulations, standards and practices pertaining thereto. Water and sewer facilities as shown on the approved Exhibit "A," shall be modified at final engineering to comply with standards.

22. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, the design and construction of new water service(s) outside of any driveway, and the removal of all existing unused services, within the right-of-way adjacent to the project site, in a manner satisfactory to the Director of Public Utilities and the City Engineer.

23. Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy, all public water and sewer facilities, including services and meters, shall be complete and operational in a manner satisfactory to the Director of Public Utilities and the City Engineer.

24. No trees or shrubs exceeding three feet in height at maturity shall be installed within ten feet of any water and sewer facilities.

INFORMATION ONLY:

- The issuance of this discretionary use permit alone does not allow the immediate commencement or continued operation of the proposed use on site. The operation allowed by this discretionary use permit may only begin or recommence after all conditions listed on this permit are fully completed and all required ministerial permits have been issued and received final inspection.
- Any party on whom fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions have been imposed as conditions of approval of this Permit, may protest the imposition within ninety days of the approval of this development permit by filing a written protest with the City Clerk pursuant to California Government Code-section 66020.
- This development may be subject to impact fees at the time of construction permit issuance.

APPROVED by the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego on March 24, 2011 and Resolution No. PC-_____.

Permit Type/PTS Approval No.: CDP No. 779217/PTS 218795 Date of Approval: March 24, 2011

AUTHENTICATED BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Diane Murbach Development Project Manager

NOTE: Notary acknowledgment must be attached per Civil Code section 1189 et seq.

The undersigned Owner/Permittee, by execution hereof, agrees to each and every condition of this Permit and promises to perform each and every obligation of Owner/Permittee hereunder.

[FLEISHER FAMILY TRUST] Owner

By

Mark R. Fleisher Trustee

[MICHAEL E. TURK, INC.] Permittee

By

Michael E. Turk President

NOTE: Notary acknowledgments must be attached per Civil Code section 1189 et seq.

ATTACHMENT 7

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. PC-____ COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 779217 FLEISHER RESIDENCE – PROJECT NO. 218795

WHEREAS, Mark R. Fleisher and Bruce R. Fleisher, Trustees of the Fleisher Family Trust, Owner, and Michael E. Turk, Inc., Permittee, filed an application with the City of San Diego for a permit to construct a three story 2,226 square foot single family residence and detached carport on a vacant lot, as described in and by reference to the approved Exhibits "A" and corresponding conditions of approval for the associated Coastal Development Permit No. 779217, on portions of a 0.07 acre site;

WHEREAS, the project site is located at 1056 Chalcedony Street in the RM-1-1 Zone, Coastal Overlay Zone (non-appealable), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Parking Impact Overlay Zone, within the Pacific Beach Community Plan;

WHEREAS, the project site is legally described as Lot 27, Block 113, Map 1042, Pacific Beach, City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California;

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2010, the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego considered Coastal Development Permit No. 779217 pursuant to the Land Development Code of the City of San Diego;

BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego as follows:

That the Planning Commission adopts the following written Findings, dated March 24, 2011.

FINDINGS:

<u>Coastal Development Permit Findings – Section MC 126.0708</u>

1. The proposed coastal development will not encroach upon any existing physical access way that is legally used by the public or any proposed public accessway identified in a Local Coastal Program land use plan; and the proposed coastal development will enhance and protect public views to and along the ocean and other scenic coastal areas as specified in the Local Coastal Program land use plan.

The project is located at 1056 Chalcedony Street in the Pacific Beach Community. The southern property boundary fronts on Chalcedony Street, and the northern property boundary fronts on an unnamed alley. Residential properties are adjacent to the western and eastern property boundaries. The adjacent land uses are residential. The project is located in the non-appealable Coastal Overlay Zone requiring a Coastal Development Permit. The project is not located on or adjacent to a coastal bluff, coastal beach, or any Environmentally Sensitive Lands. The project is located approximately a half mile from the waters of the Pacific Ocean.

The 0.07 acre parcel is vacant and was previously utilized as a side yard with landscaping for the residence on the lot to the west. The project site is a rectangular shaped flat lot. Site elevations range from approximately 74 feet at the southern property boundary to approximately 76 feet Mean Sea Level at the northern property boundary. The project proposes a new 2,226 square foot single family sustainable residence with a detached 400 square foot two car carport, 66 square foot second story balcony, and a 338 square foot third story roof deck. The carport and decks total 804 square feet and are not included as gross floor area. The three story residential building will be a maximum height of 29 feet 9 inches, and the carport 12 feet 1 inch. The buildings will be under the maximum 30 foot Coastal Height Limit allowed by the zone. The residential building will include a photovoltaic system supplying more than 50% of the project's total electrical energy consumption in conformance with Council Policy 900-14 requirements. The solar panels will be located on the roof of the residence.

The proposed development will take place entirely within private property and will not encroach onto or impact any existing or proposed physical public access ways. Access to the coastline is provided via the adjacent public right-of-ways. The proposed development is not located between the shoreline and the first public roadway, therefore no views to the ocean are required to be preserved. The proposed development will adhere to the required yard area setbacks pursuant to the Land Development Code in conformance with the underlying RM-1-1 Zone. No public access will be affected by this project. The proposed development will not impact any physical access way and will protect public views as recommended in the Pacific Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan. Therefore, the proposed coastal development will not encroach upon any existing physical access way that is legally used by the public or any proposed public access way identified in the Local Coastal Program land use plan; and the proposed coastal development will enhance and protect public views to and along the ocean and other scenic coastal areas as specified in the Local Coastal Program land use plan.

2. The proposed coastal development will not adversely affect environmentally sensitive lands.

The project is located at 1056 Chalcedony Street in the Pacific Beach Community. The adjacent land uses are residential. The proposed development will take place entirely within private property. The City of San Diego conducted an environmental review of this project and determined that the project was exempt per the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15303. The project site is above the 100 and 500-year floodplain, is not within or adjacent to the Multiple Species Conservation Program, Multiple Habitat Planning Area, and is not located in or adjacent to Environmentally Sensitive Lands. Therefore, the proposed coastal development will not adversely affect environmentally sensitive lands.

3. The proposed coastal development is in conformity with the certified Local Coastal Program land use plan and complies with all regulations of the certified Implementation Program.

The project is located at 1056 Chalcedony Street within the Pacific Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan. The Pacific Beach Community Plan designates this site for Low-Medium Density (9 to 15 dwelling units per acre). The project proposes 1 dwelling unit

on a 0.07 acre legal lot for a density of 14 dwelling units per acre. The project is therefore consistent with the prescribed density in the community plan. Development in the vicinity is characterized by one, two, and three story single and multi-family homes with various architectural styles. The proposed three story residence is consistent with the surrounding development. Although the project site is not located within a designated view corridor in the Community Plan, a view to the ocean exists through Chalcedony Street looking west. The project observes the required front setbacks, therefore the functional view corridor down the street is maintained.

The project conforms to the 30 foot Coastal Height Limit requirement, and meets the required zoning yard setbacks. No public view or public access to the water would be adversely affected by the approval of this project. The proposed development is not located between the shoreline and the first public roadway, therefore no public views to the ocean shall be preserved. The project meets the intent of the guidelines for the Coastal Overlay and Coastal Height Limitation Overlay zones, and the Pacific Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan. Therefore, the proposed coastal development is in conformity with the certified Local Coastal Program land use plan and complies with all regulations of the certified Implementation Program.

4. For every Coastal Development Permit issued for any coastal development between the nearest public road and the sea or the shoreline of any body of water located within the Coastal Overlay Zone the coastal development is in conformity with the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act.

The subject property is not located between the nearest public road and the sea or the shoreline of any body of water. Therefore, the project is not required to demonstrate conformance with the public access and recreation policies of the California Coastal Act as required by this finding.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, based on the findings hereinbefore adopted by the Planning Commission, Coastal Development Permit No. 779217 is hereby GRANTED by the Planning Commission to the referenced Owner(s)/Permittee(s), in the form, exhibits, terms and conditions as set forth in Coastal Development Permit No. 779217, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Diane Murbach Development Project Manager Development Services

Adopted on: March 24, 2011

Internal Order No. 24001121

İ.

NOTICE OF EXEMPTION

(Check one or both)

TO: <u>X</u> RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK P.O. BOX 1750, MS A-33 1600 Pacific Hwy, Room 260 San Diego, CA 92101-2422 FROM: CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT 1222 FIRST AVENUE, MS 501 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH 1400 TENTH STREET, ROOM 121 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

PROJECT TITLE/ NO.: FLEISHER RESIDENCE /218795

PROJECT LOCATION-SPECIFIC: 1056 Chalcedony Street, San Diego, CA 92109

PROJECT LOCATION-CITY/COUNTY: San Diego/San Diego

DESCRIPTION OF NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT: Applicant is requesting a COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to construct a 2,226-square foot three-story single-family residence with 239 square feet of balcony and roof deck area combined, and a 400-square-foot carport. In addition the project would also construct various site improvements, which includes associated hardscape and landscaping. The 0.0717-acre project site is located 1056 Chalcedony Street; the project site is designated Low-Medium Density (9 to <15 dwelling units per acre) and is within the RM-1-1 (Residential–Multiple Unit) Zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable 2 Area); and the Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone within the Pacific Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Area. (LEGAL: Lot 27, in Block 113, Map No. 1042).

NAME OF PERSON OR AGENCY CARRYING OUT PROJECT: West of Ingraham, LLC, 4641 Ingraham Street, San Diego, CA 92109, (858) 488-2382.

EXEMPT STATUS: (CHECK ONE)

- () MINISTERIAL (SEC. 21080(b)(1); 15268)
- () DECLARED EMERGENCY (SEC. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a))
- () EMERGENCY PROJECT (SEC. 21080(b)(4); 15269 (b)(c))
- (X) CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION: 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures)
- () STATUTORY EXEMPTIONS:

REASONS WHY PROJECT IS EXEMPT: The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study that determined that the project would not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment in that the project is consistent with the density as determined by the community plan and implemented by the applicable zone. The project would not result in any significant impacts to biological resources, historical resources, traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality. The project meets the criteria set forth in CEQA Section 15303 which allows for the construction of a duplex in an urbanized area; and CEQA Section 15332 which allows for the construction of infill development within an urbanized area that can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. In addition, the exceptions listed in CEQA Section 15300.2 would not apply.

LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON: E. Shearer-Nguyen TELEPHONE: (619) 446-5369

IF FILED BY APPLICANT:

- 1. ATTACH CERTIFIED DOCUMENT OF EXEMPTION FINDING.
- 2. HAS A NOTICE OF EXEMPTION BEEN FILED BY THE PUBLIC AGENCY APPROVING THE PROJECT?
 - () YES () NO

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS DETERMINED THE ABOVE ACTIVITY TO BE EXEMPT FROM CEQA.

NGPhu

SIGNATURE/TITLE

<u>October 1, 2010</u> DATE OF PROJECT APPROVAL

CHECK ONE: (X) SIGNED BY LEAD AGENCY () SIGNED BY APPLICANT

DATE RECEIVED FOR FILING WITH COUNTY CLERK OR OPR:

FLEISHER RESIDENCE 1056 CHALCEDONY ST. PACIFIC BEACH, CA 92109



A SOLAR POWERED PROJECT COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

ATTACHMENT 9

Révision Revision	

Sheet I Of 12

Revision 14

Project Name:

Sheet Title:

RESIDENCE

COVER SHEET

PACIFIC BEACH, CA 9210

Project Address

(619) 231-9905 tax: 231-4286

Prepared Bu:

REBECCA MARQUEZ 025 West Loure Street

Revision	13:
Revision	12:
Revision	:
Revision	$ O_i $
Revision	9.
Revision	B:
Revision	7:
Revision	б;
Revision	5:
Revision	4.
Revision	3,
Revision	2.11-30-10
Revision	1: 09-03-10

1.0

or Design hd 92101 231-4288

san Diego

FLEISHER RESIDENCE

SPECIAL INSPECTIONS:

a se anno 10 a

ADDERAL RECEIPTION

- I. The designer must provide a complete and compression listing designing according to the location on the plang all more regarding sector. Inspection the list must be project steamed in duling composition to the regarding for the duling according to the structure drawed for the art of the
- 2. THE (2) PROPERLY COMPLETED AND SIGNED COPIES OF THE SPECIAL REFECTION INSTRUCTIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED AT THE FERSIST SERVICES DIVISION PRIOR TO RESIANCE OF THE FERSIST.

A CERTIFICATE OF SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF MORE REGURANS SPECIAL INSPECTION MUST BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED TO THE FELD INSPECTION DIVISION."

4. "An application for opposite partication must be substited to the fiblic non-site function for approval from to partication."

5. "A GERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE FOR OFF-AITE PARICATION MIGT DE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED TO THE FIELD INFECTION DYNAMIN PRIME TO EMECTION OF PREPARICATED COMPONENTS."

The Fromosod Influe development (froment at ... Street relached the some of the condenvation element of the City of Ban desca general flam

N STORT TO REACH THESE GOALS THE PROJECT MILL SHELOY THE

- SOLAR PHOTO VOLTALS SYSTEM FOR SOURATING PORER ON DITE. SOLAR PHOTO VOLTALS SYSTEM FOR SOURASS HERE ANTLICABLE HIGH ETELACY LIGHTING OR OCCUPACY STREAMS ANTLICABLE BERGY STAR ANTLIANCES DIAL PARE LOYE 3 CALL HINDORIS WE OF LOW YOU PARTS AND LOW ENTITING ADELIVES, COATINGS, CARTES AND OTHER FINANCES HERE FLASSLE USE OF ENGINEERS FOOD PRODUCTS HIERE AFFLICABLE NATURAL COOLING-VOID HICTORY AND A CHARGE ATTLICABLE NATURAL COOLING-VOID HICTORY NATURAL COOLING-VOID NATURAL USE OF FROM CALLE PACING FLAGGELE USE OF FROM CALLE PACING TO CONCESS NASH ETHORNOL OF TOCKCOS NASH ETHORNOL OF TOCKCOS NASH ETHORNOL OF TAXABLER BOUNDARY, CONCEPTION RATE OF THE ART LOW FRECHTATION RATE STREAMER BOUNDARY,

80. 81.04. 827, 84,4.

CAR. CRC. CL. GR. CLO. CAR. CON. CON. CON. CONT.
6A. 6ALV. 6EN. 6L. 6ND. 6R. 67P. BD.

HD. HDMD. HDM. HR. HR. HT. HT. H.V.A.C. HM.

in, Incl. Incl. Incl. Int. Int. Intern.

JAAL JT.

KIT.

Mach. Maint. Mas.





PROJECT DATA COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AND DETACHED CARPORT. PROJECT DESCRIPTION 1006 CHALCEDONY STREET FACING BEACH CA 4210 SITE ADDRESS 415-440-15-00 AGGESOCRS PARCEL NUMBER LEGAL DESCRIPTION LOT THENTY SEVEN (21), IN BLOCK 18, MAP 1042

PREVIOUALY DISTRIBUTION

5125 67.

WA.

R-3

2007 686

TYPE VS

N/A THREE

NA 24'-4'

EMPTY LOT SNGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE

2545.15 S.F. (0.15 X 5125 S.F.)

COASTAL HEIGHT LIMIT, CITY COASTAL, PARKING INFACT

EXISTING SOIL CONDITIONS. LOT USE

EXCENTING: TROPOSED:

EXISTING: TROPOSED

EXISTING: TROPOSED:

LOT ZONNIE OVER AY 2018 DEMONATION

LOT NOT

LIVING AREA. ENTRY LEVEL = 464 S.P. UPPER LEVEL = 460 S.P. THERE LEVEL = 261 S.P. TOTAL LIVING AREA = 2226 S.F. 4 2348.75 S.F. ALLONABLE

FAR, ALLONED = 2546.75 S.F. (0.15 X 5)25 S.F.)

BALCONY & DECK AREA

SECOND FLOOR BALCONY = 66 5.F. ROOF DECKS <u>536 5.F.</u> TOTAL DECK AREA = 404 5.F.

PARKING CALCULATIONS.

2 PARKING SPACES PROVIDED FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE HITH & BEDROOMS. (400 S.F. CARPORT)



POST-CONSTRUCTION BMP REPORT

PROJECT: CHALCEDONY RESIDENCE 1056 CHALCEDONY ST. PACIFIC BEACH, CA 92109

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: THE PROJECT IS THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES IN PACIFIC BEACH, IT IS ACCESSED DIRECTLY FROM A CITY ROW, (NO DRIVEWAY) ON A LEVEL

ACCORDING TO APPENDIX A, STORM WATER REQUIREMENTS APPLICABILITY CHECKLIST, THIS PROJECT IS SUBJECT ONLY TO THE STANDARD PERMANENT STORM WATER BMP REQUIREMENTS. IT IS ALSO RATED "LOW PRIORITY" FOR THE CONSTRUCTION SITE.

<u>POLIDITANTS:</u> THE POTENTIAL POLIDITANTS ACCORDING TO SECTION BILLA THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THIS PROJECT MOULD BE SEDMENTS, NUTRIENTS, PESTICIDES, TRASH, DEBRIS, OXYGEN DEMANDING SUBSTANCES, OLIGREADE AND BACTERIA/VIRUSES.

<u>SITE DESIGN BMF9:</u> MITHIN THE SITE DESIGN WE HAVE INCORPORATED BOTH PERMEARUE LANDSCAPING AND CONCRETE MALKMAYS. THE FRONT YARD IS OVER 50% PERHEABLE LANDSCAFE THE ROOF DRAINS SLOPE TO THE PERIMETER SIDE YARDS.

<u>Source control BMPs;</u> There will be no hazardois waste stored. Plants are those recommended and approved by the landscape dept. Irrigation will be predominately drip system. Trash storage areas shall IRRIGATION MILL BE PREDOMINATELY DRIP SYSTEM. TRAGH STORASE AREAS SHALL BE: (I) PAYED MITH AN IMPREVIOUS SURFACE, DESIGNED NOT TO ALLON RUN-ON FROM ADJOINING AREAS, I SCREENED OR WALLED TO PREVENT OFF-SITE TRANSPORT OF TRASH, I (2) CONTAIN ATTACHED LIDS ON ALL TRAGH CONTAINERS THAT EXCLIDE RAIN. USE PLANT PST-RESITANT OR WELL-ADAPTED PLANT VARIETIES SUCH AS NATIVE PLANTS I DISCOURAGE PESTS BY MODIFYING THE SITE AND LANDSCAPING DESIGN. DISTRIBUTE IMPEDICATIONAL MATERIALS TO FUTURE RESIDENTS. EMPLOY RAIN SHUTOFT DEVICES TO PREVENT IRRIGATION DURING I AFTER PRECIPITATION. DESIGN IRRIGATION SYSTEMS TO EACH LANDSCAPE AREAS SPECIFIC WATER REQUIRENTS. USE FLOW REDUCERS OR BUTOFT VALVES TO CONTROL WATER LOSS IN THE EVENT OF BROKEN SFRINKLER HEADS OR LINES.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE. MAINTENANCE WILL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE OWNER. THE OWNER AGREES TO KEEP THE LANDSCAPE AREAS TRIMMED AND CLEARED OF DEDRIG. INDIVIDUAL REFUSE TRASH BINS TO BE STORED IN EACH UNIT AND EXTERIOR TRASH STORAGE AREA LOCATED AT EASTERN WALL NOTCH. DRAINS AND IRRIGATION WILL BE INSPECTED ANNUALLY. NATURAL FORMS OF FEST CONTROL WILL BE IMPLEMENTED.

STORM WATER QUALITY NOTES CONSTRUCTION BMP'S

THIS PROJECT SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF THE STATE PERMIT; CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, SAN DIEGO REGION, ORDER NO. 20010119705 NO. CASOLOGISS

NOTES 1-6 BELOW REPRESENT KEY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSTRUCTION EMPIS

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANUP OF ALL SILT AND MUD I. THE COMMACTOR STALL BE REPUMBIBLE FOR CLEANING FOR ALL SULT AND MUD ON ADLACENT STREET(5), DUE TO CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES OR ANY OTHER CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY, AT THE END OF EACH WORK DAY OR AFTER A STORM EVENT THAT CAUSES A BREECH IN INSTALLED CONSTRUCTION BMPS WHICH MAY COMPROMISE STORM MATER GUALITY MITHIN ANY STREET(5), A STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION EXIT MAY BE REQUERED TO PREVENT CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES OR EQUIPMENT FROM TRACKING MUD OR SULT ONTO THE STREET.

ALL STOCKPILES OF SOIL AND/OR BUILDING MATERIAL THAT ARE INTENDED TO BE LEFT FOR A FERIOD GREATER THAN SEVEN CALENDAR DAYS ARE TO BE COVERED ALL REMOVABLE BAR DEVICES SHALL BE IN PLACE AT THE BND OF EACH WORKING DAY WHEN THE FIVE DAY RAIN PROBABILITY FORECAST EXCEEDS 40%.

 A CONCRETE WASHOUT SHALL BE PROVIDED ON ALL PROJECTS WHICH PROPOSE THE CONSTRUCTION OF ANY CONCRETE IMPROVEMENTS WHICH ARE TO BE POURED IN PLACE ON SITE.

4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL RESTORE ALL EROSION/SEDIMENT CONTROL DEVICES TO MORKING CREER AFTER EACH RUN-OFF PRODUCING RAINFALL OR AFTER ANY MATERIAL BREACH IN EFFECTIVENESS.

5. ALL SLOPES THAT ARE CREATED OR DISTURBED BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY MUST BE PROTECTED AGAINST EROSION AND SEDIMENT TRANSPORT AT ALL TIMES.

6. THE STORAGE OF ALL CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT MUST BE PROTECTED AGAINST ANY POTENTIAL RELEASE OF POLLUTANTS INTO THE ENVIRONMENT

PLUMBING:

I. THE WORK CONSISTS OF A COMPLETE SYSTEM AS AN EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM INCLUDING SERVICE CONNECTIONS, DRAIN-WASTES, VENT, HOT AND COLD WATER, AND GAS LINES. EXCAVATION AND COMPACTED BACK-FILL REQUIRED AND THE INSTALLATION OF AL! FIXTURES AND TRIM AND APPLIANCES.

2. SEMAGE CONNECTIONS SHALL BE MADE BY THE CONTRACTOR. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE DEPTH AND PROPER SLOPE FOR WASTE LINES PRIOR TO ESTABLISHING FLOOR HEIGHT.

3 MATERIALS SHALL BE STANDARD U.O.N. WATER LINES. ABOVE GRADE, WASTE AND VENT SHALL BE ABS/DWV

4. FIXTURES, TRIM, AND APPLIANCES; THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL ALL FIXTURES, TRIM AND APPLIANCES TO BE CONNECTED TO THE PLUMBINS SYSTEM. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSPECT ALL UNITS MHEN THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BATES THE UNITS FREE DELVERED TO THE JOB SITE AND REJECT ALL DAMAGED OR INCOMPLETE HEMS. ALL ACCEPTED UNITS SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR UNTIL COMPLETION OF THE JOB.

3. PROVIDE 24" CLEAR & TOILET FRONT (15" CLEAR & CENTERLINE OF TOILET TO TOILET SIDEWALLS.

6. ALL NEW TOILETS TO BE VILTRA-LOW FLUSH TYPE. (1.6 GAL FLUSH)

1. PROVIDE PERMANENT VACUUM BREAKERS AT AT ALL HOSE BIDS, NEH & EXISTING LOCATIONS TYP.

B. MAXIMUM FLOW AT ALL NEW FALKETS: 2.2 GAL PER MINITE /APM

minute (opp), Maximing Flow at all New Shomer Heads: 25 Gal Per Minute (opm),

. PROVIDE MIXING VALVES AT SHOWERS PER SEC. 416.0 CPC 2007

10. GAS VENTS AND NON-COMBLISTIBLE PIPING IN MALLS PASSING THROUGH THREE FLOORS OR LESS, SHALL BE EFFECTIVELY DRAFT STOPPED AT EACH FLOOR OR CEILING UBC SECTION THIS

II. WATER HEATER(S) SHALL COMPLY WITH SEC. 608.8 CPC 2007 FOR THERMAL EXPANSION REQUIREMENTS.

12 STATE HEALTH & SAFETY (200E SEC 104214 BANS THE USE OF CHLORINATED POLYVINYL CHLORIDE (CPVC) AND CROSSLINKED POLYETELYN (PEX) FOR INTERIOR WATER-SUPPLY FIPING

SMOKE DETECTORS:

NOTE: DETECTORS SHALL SOUND AN ALARM AUDIBLE IN ALL SLEEPING AREAS OF THE UNIT. SECTION 401,210,

IN NEW ADDITION PROVIDE WIRED IN SMOKE DETECTORS WITH BATTERY PONERED BACK UP PONER IN EACH SLEEPING ROOM AND IN A CENTRAL LOCATION TO PROTECT SLEEPING AREAS FER 2007 C.B.C. SEC. 4012.10.2

ROOM REQUIREMENTS:

I. CEILING HEIGHT AT ALL NABITABLE ROOMS (OTHER THAN KITCHENG AND BATHEL GHALL BE A MINIMIM OF THE (REFER TO PLANS FOR ACTUAL CEILING HEIGHTS).

2. CEILING HEIGHT AT ALL KITCHENS, HALLS, CORRIDORS, LAUNDRY ROOMS, AND BATHROOMS SHALL BE A MINIMIM OF 1-0" CLEAR, (REFER TO PLANS FOR ACTUAL CEILING

9. GLAZING ADJACENT TO DOORS AND GLAZING IN FIXED PANELS ADJACENT TO MALKING SURFACES MUST BE OF SAFETY GLAZING (TEMPERED GLASS) MATERIALS

4. PROVIDE SMOKE DETECTORS AT ALL BEDROOMS PER 2001 C.B.C. SECTION 501.2.10.1.2. HARDWIRE ALL SMOKE DETECTORS TO BUILDING ELECTRICAL AT NEW CONSTRUCTION

ELECTRICAL NOTES:

FURNISH ALL LABOR, MATERIALS, TOOLS, EQUIPMENT , TORNOR ALL DECORPORTATION, INCLUDING THE COSTS THEREOF, REQUEED FOR OR INCIDENTAL TO PERFORM ALL OPERATIONS AND INSTALL THE WORK COMPLETE AS AN EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM.

2. MAKE DETAILED ARRANGEMENTS WITH UTILITY COMPANIES FOR SERVICES, AND PAY ALL FEES AND CHARGES LEVIED BY THEM, NOTIFY UTILITY COMPANIES WHEN MORK UNDER THIS SECTION COMMENCES.

 COMPLETE POWER AND LIGHTING BRANCH CIRCUIT WIRING, INCLUDING JUNCTION BOXES, PULL BOXES, CITL BOXES, DEVICES, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT FOR A COMPLETE INSTALLATION. דיין ותגיו

4. COMPLETE LINE-VOLTAGE MIRING TO AND CONNECTION OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPHENT PROVIDED UNDER OTHER SECTIONS, INCLUDING APPLIANCES, PULL BOXES, OUTLET BOX

5. EXCAVATION, COMPACTED BACK FILL, AND CONCRETE WORK TO COMPLETE THE WORK WIDER THIS SECTION,

ALL OUTLETS AND SHITCHES TO BE DECORA' TYPE. COLOR: BY ARCHITECT.

1. FIELD VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS

DEMOLITION NOTES:

I. CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE EVERY PRECAUTION TO PREVENT DAMAGE TO ADJOINING AREAS, WHERE APPLICABLE.

2. CONTRACTOR TO REFERENCE NEW FLOOR PLANS AND SITE FLANS FOR PRECISE LIMITS OF DEMOLITION. CONSULT ARCHITECT IN AREAS OF UNCERTAINTY OR DISCREPANCY.

3 THESE DRAWINGS REPRESENT THE FINISHED STRUCTURE AND DO NOT INDICATE THE METHOD OF CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL TEMPORARY CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL TEMPORARY BRACING, SHORING, AND SUPPORT NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE THE FINISHED STRUCTURE.

4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS, ELEVATIONS AND SITE CONDITIONS BEFORE STARTING WORK, THE ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER SHALL BE NOTIFIED, IN WRITING, IMMEDIATELY OF ANY DISCREPANCIES. DIMENSIONS SHOULD NOT BE SCALED FROM PLANS ELEVATIONS, SECTIONS, OR DETAILS OF THESE DRAWINGS.

GENERAL NOTES:

19. THE 'GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION' STANDARD FORM OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, LATEST EDITION, IS HEREBY MADE A PART OF THESE DRANINGS

20. THE CONTRACTOR IS TO MAINTAIN ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS IN A MATERPROOF AND PROTECTED STATE DURING THE COURSE OF DEMOLITION AND ALL REPAIR AND CONSTRUCTION NORK

21. ALL FASTENERS ON THIS PROJECT ARE TO BE CORROSION RESISTANT, I.E. GALVANIZED STAINLESS STEEL OR EQUAL,

22. SMOKE DETECTORS SHALL, BE INSTALLED PER THE REQUREMENTS OF THE CURRENT EDITION OF THE UNFORM BUILDING CODE IN ANY ROOM AS REQURED PER THE CODE.

23. ALL SHEET METAL AND GUTTER INSTALLATIONS SHA COMPLY WITH THE LATEST EDITIONS OF THE SMAC.NA. ARCHITECTURAL SHEET METAL MANJAL.

24. All sheet metal plashing materials are to be prepared (Etchno) and primed on all suppaces prior to installation. Two coats of paint are to be applied to all suppaces. Provide Job toking prior to installation of any petal fields on which primer is scratched due to transformation or Job conditions.

25. ALL SURFACES, JOINTS, EDGES AND PLANES ARE TO BE MAINTAINED AND COMPLETED IN A MATERTIGHT MANNER. SHOLLD THE CONTRACTOR DISCOVER OR HAVE KNORLEDGE OF ANY DETAIL OR CONDITION THAT MAY NOT BE INATERTIGHT OR COMPETENT, THE CONSTITION SHOULD BE REPORTED TO THE ARCHITECT IMMEDIATELY FOR REVIEW AND ANY RECOMMENDATIONS.

26. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT IMPEDIATELY OF ANY DISCREPANCY OR VARIATION FROM THE PROPOSED DRAMINGS OR THE ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS THAT MOLD AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OR INSTALLATION OF ANY TYPICAL OR SIMILAR CONSTRUCTION DETAIL.

27, ALL PRODUCTS AND MATERIALS REQUIRE SHOP DRAWINGS AND SAMPLE SUBMITTAL FOR ARCHITECTS APPROVAL PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.

29. THE CONTRACTOR AND THEIR SUBCONTRACTORS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR REVIEWING THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS IN DETERMINING THAT THE NORK CAN THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING THAT THE NORK CAN BE PERFORMED AS SHOWN PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH THE MORK. IF ANY CONFLICTS ARISE, THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING A CLARIFICATION FROM THE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK IN GUESTION OR WITH RELATED WORK.

29. "TYPICAL" MEANS IDENTICAL FOR ALL SAME CONDITIONS UNLESS OTHERMISE NOTED, "SIMILAR" MEANS COMPARABLE CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE CONDITIONS NOTED. VERIFY DIMENSIONS AND ORIENTATION ON THE PLANS.

30. DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF STUDS AND/OR CONCRETE BLOCK UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED TO BE TO FINISH DIMENSIONS.

3L OWNER TO OBTAIN A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT FROM THE 31, OWNER TO OBTAIN A CONSTRUCTION PERMIT FROM THE ENGINEERING DETARTMENT AT LEAST 46 NOURS PRIOR TO WORKING IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, FAILURE TO DO SO MILL RESULT IN ISSUANCE OF A STOP WORK NOTICE AND COURLE FERMIT FEES, IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ONNER TO KNOW WHERE HIS/HER PROPERTY LINE IS.

32. VTILITIES EXISTING OR TEMPORARY SHALL BE LOCATED AND MARKED BY THE CONTRACTOR TO AVOID DAMAGE OR PERSONAL INJURY. CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE ALL TEMPORARY UTILITIES REQUIRED DURING CONSTRUCTION.

33. THE PROJECT AREA AND BUILDING SITE SHALL BE MAINTAINED IN A SAFE CONDITION FREE FROM THE ACCUMULATION OF DEBRIS AND SCRAP MATERIAL.

34. THE HIGHEST PROJECTION OF ANY PART OF THE BUILDING INCLUDING CHIMNEYS, VENTS, TOWERS, ETC. SHALL NOT EXCEED 30' ABOVE GRADE (APPLIES TO PROJECTS MEST OF INTERSTATE 5 ONLY)

35. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL, UPON SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION, FURNISH THE ARCHITECT AND HIS/ HER HENCHMEN WITH A CASE OF FINE IMPORTED WINE.

BIDDING NOTES:

I. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSPECT THE PREMISES DURING THE COURSE OF BIDDING AND PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION IN ORDER TO BE FAMILIAR WITH POSSIBLE FIELD CONDITIONS THAT MAY ARISE. SUCH CONDITIONS ARE TO BE REFLECTED AND QUALIFIED IN THE BID

FIRE DEPT. NOTES:

I. INTERIOR FINISH SHALL COMPLY WITH CODES AS FOLLOWS: U.B.C. CHAPTER 8.

2. BUILDING NUMBERS SHALL BE EASILY VISIBLE AND LEGIBLE ROM THE STREET OR ROAD FRONTING PROPERTY. (U.F.C. SECTION 9014.4)

9. THE CONSTRUCTION, REMODEL, OR DEMOLITION OF A BUILDING SHALL COMPLY WITH U.F.C. ARTICLE 67.

VENTILATION NOTE:

EXHAUST FAN / VENTILATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE A THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING NOT CLOSER THAN 3 FT. ROM ANY EXTERIOR OPENING







ALC: UNCOUNT



and the second
FIRST FLOOR PLAN

56ALE: 1/4"=1"-0"



50ALE: 1/4"=1"-0"

CRALCEDONT RESIDE	INCIE	Sheet 6 OF 12
Sheet Titie: TTDST	8.	SECOND
FLOOR		

Project Name: Chalcedony residence

Project Address: 1056 Chalcedony St. Pacific Beach, ca 92109

Prepared By: REBECCA MARQUEZ 1025 Mest Laurel Street 6125 Past Loural Str Suite 106 San Disgo, CA 92101 (619) 231-9905 Fax: 231-4288

SCALE: 1/4"=1"-0"

)
\sim	/

Revision 14: Revision 13: Revision 12: Revision 10: Revision 9: Revision 3: Revision 5: Revision 5: Revision 5: Revision 3: Revision 2: 11-30-10 Revision 1: 09-03-10

08-24-10





SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"



ROOF PLAN

56-ALE: 1/4"=1'-0"

Sheet 7 Of 12 Sheet Title: THIRD FLOOR & ROOF PLAN

Project Name: CHALCEDONY RESIDENCE

Project Address: 1056 Chalcedony St. Pacific Beach, CA 92109

Prepared By: REBECCA MARQUEZ 1025 West Laurel Street Suite IC6 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 231-9905 fax: 231-4286

SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"



08-24-10





∽™ Š



Sheet Title: CARPORT PLANS & ELEVATIONS

Project Name: CHALCEDONY RESIDENCE

Project Address: 1056 Chalcedony St. Pacific Beach, ca. 92109

Prepared By: REBECCA MARQUEZ 1025 West Laurel Street Suite 106 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 231-9905 fax: 231-4288

56ALE: 1/4"=1'-0"

Revision 14, Revision 13: Revision 12: Kavision i2: Revision II: Revision II: Revision 4: Revision 7: Revision 5: Revision 5: Revision 4:

Ravision 3: Ravision 2: 11-30-10 Ravision 1: 09-03-10

08-24-10 Sheet 8 0† 12





Ы טוידויטנ





SCALE: 1/4'=1-0'



SOUTH ELEVATION

56ALE: 1/4°×1'-0*

Prepared By: REBECCA MARQUEZ 1025 Most Laurel Street Suite Ioé San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 291-9905 fax: 231-4286

Project Address: 1056 Chalcedony St. Pacific Beach, CA 92109

Project Name: Chalcedony residence

Sheet Title:

Rovision 14. Rovision 13: Rovision 12: Rovision 10: Rovision 4: Rovision 3: Rovision 5: Rovision 5: Rovision 3: Rovision 2: 11-80-10 Rovision 1: 09-03-10 Architecture Space Planning Interior Design 1025 West Laurel St. #106 San Diego California 92101 Phone: (619) 231-9905 Fax: (619) 231-4288

FLEISHER RESIDENCE 1056 CHALCEDONY ST. PACIFIC BEACH, CA

20

A 2.0

08-24-10

Sheet 9 Of 12

ELEVATIONS



and the second seco

5GALE: 1/4*=1'-0*



NORTH ELEVATION

Propared By: REDECCA MARQUEZ 1025 West Laurel Street Suite 106 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 291-9905 fax: 231-928

Project Address: 1056 Chalcedony St. Pacific Beach, CA 92109

Project Name: CHALCEDONY RESIDENCE

Sheet Title:

Revision 14: Revision 13: Revision 12: Revision 10: Revision 6: Revision 5: Revision 5: Revision 5: Revision 5: Revision 4: Revision 3: Revision 2: II-30-10 Revision 1: 09-03-10

08-24-10

Sheet 10 OF 12

ELEVATIONS

 Interior Design
 Calfonia 92101
 X: (619) 231-4288 Planning = San Diago Archttecture = Space Pk 1025 West Laurel St. #106 St Phone: (619) 231-9905 FLEISHER RESIDENCE 1656 CHALCEDONY ST PACIFIC BREACH, CA 100000 È NATE-10-14-10 A 2.1







(DN PRET) Linch = 19 fL

1056 CHALCEDONY STREET

WATER QUALITY STUDY



LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT BMPs REQUIREMENTS

- 1. CONSERVE NATURAL AREAS THIS SITE WAS 100% DEVELOPED PRIOR TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT. THERE ARE NO NATURAL AREAS REMAINING.
- 2. MINIMIZE IMPERVIOUS FOOTPRINT THIS PROJECT IS AN INFILL PROJECT WITH
- . MINIMUZE IMPENDIUUS FOOTPRINT THIS PROJECT IS AN INFLL PROJECT WITH 45% ROOF AND CAPPORT COVERAGE (IMPERVIOUS AREA) WICH IS BELOW THE % IMPERVIOUS FOR THIS TYPE OF ZONE*. FURTHER RESTRICTION OF THE IMPERVIOUS AREA IS LIMITED BY THE 30 FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT. "PER CITY OF SAN DIECO DRAMAGE DESIGN MANUAL FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LISE THE COEFFICIENT OF RUNOFF "C" IS 55.
- 3. WINIMIZE DIRECTLY CONNECTED IMPERVIOUS AREA THIS PROJECT IS AN INFALL PROJECT WITH A LARGE SINGLE FAMILY HOME AND A CAPAGE WHICH IS SEPARATE FROM THE HOME TO ALLOW STORM WATER INFILTRATION WITHIN THE LOT.
- MINIMIZE SOIL COMPACTION IN LANDSCAPE AREAS THE AREA OF LANDSCAPING WITHIN THE PROJECT WILL BE COMPACTED TO SUPPORT LAWN AND CARDEN USE.
- SOIL AMENOMENTS FULL USE OF SOIL AMENDMENTS WILL BE MADE BY THIS PROJECT IN THE LANDSCAPED AREAS.
- 5. CONVEY RUNDER SAFELY FROM THE TOPS OF SLOPES THERE ARE NO SLOPES WITHIN THE BOUNDARY OF THIS PROJECT.
- 7. VEGETATE SLOPES WITH NATIVE OR DROUGHT TOLERANT VEGETATION THERE ARE NO SLOPES WITHIN THE BOUNDARY OF THIS PROJECT.
- STABILIZE PERMANENT CHANNEL CROSSINGS THERE ARE NO CHANNEL CROSSINGS MITHIN THE BOUNDARY OF THIS PROJECT.
- 9. INSTALL ENERGY DISSIPATERS ALL STORM DRAIN WATER IS DIRECTED TO IMPROVE PUBLIC MIGHT OF MAYS TO LIMIT ANY EROSION EFFECTS. THE EXISTING STORM DRAIN SYSTEM OF CURB AND GUTTERS DISCHARGE TO MISSION RAY

POTENTIAL POLLUTANTS GENERATED BY SITE

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT - SEDIMENTS, NUTRIENTS, TRASH AND DEBRIS, OXYGEN DEMANDING SUBSTANCES, OIL AND GREASE, EACTERIA AND VIRUSES, AND PESTICIDES

SOURCE CONTROL BMPs

- 1. NO OUTDOOR MATERIAL STORAGE AREAS ARE PROPOSED FOR THIS PROJECT. ALL MATERIAL STORAGE WILL TAKE PLACE WITHIN THE SINGLE PAMILY HOME.
- 2. TRASH STORAGE WILL BE ETTHER INSIDE THE SINGLE FAMILY HOME OR IN THE "CITY APPROVED TRASH CONTAINER" PROVIDED FOR SINGLE FAMILY HOMES.
- 3. PEST MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES WILL INCLUDE PEST RESISTANT PLANTS.
- 4. IRRIGATION AND LANDSCAPE DESIGN THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM WILL EMPLOY RAIN SHUTOFF QEVICES TO PREVENT UNINECESSARY IRRIGATION. EACH UNUSCAPED AVEA IS TO BE IRRIGATED ACCORDING TO ITS REQUIREMENTS. FLOW REDUCERS AND SHUTOFF WAYES WILL BE INSTALLED TO SHUT DOWN THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM IN THE EVENT OF A BROKEN SPRINKLER HEAD OF LINE.
- 5. NO STORM DRAIN FACILITIES ARE PROPOSED FOR THE SITE SO NO STAMPING OR SIGNAGE IS REQUIRED.
- 6. THIS SINGLE FAMILY HOME WILL NOT HAVE A FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM THAT COULD IMPACT THE EXISTING STORM DRAIN SYSTEM.

LEGEND:	
PROPERTY LINE	
EXISTING BLOCK WALL	
EXISTING WATER METER	1220 C
EXISTING WOOD FENCE	
EXISTING WROUGHT IRON FENCE	
EXISTING SEWER MANHOLE	SMH
EXISTING BRICK SURFACE	481 1
ASPHALT SURFACE	AC
FLOW LINE	я
TOP OF CURB	RÇ
EXISTING WATER SERVICE	₩a B
EXISTING SITE WPERMOUS AREA = 687 SF	
PROPOSED SITE IMPERMOUS AREA = 1433 SF	\square

THTAE SUE AREA = 3116 SE OR 6.0716 ACRES.

.



	City of San Diego Development Services	····	Development I	Permit/	FORM
	1222 First Ave. 3rd Floor San Diego, CA 92101	Enviro	onmental Determi		
THE CITY OF SAN DIEG	(619) 446-5210		Appeal Appl	ication	May 2010
See Information	Bulletin 505, "Development	Permits Appe	al Procedure," for information or	the appeal p	rocedure,
1/Type of Appea Process Two D Process Three	il: Jecision - Appeal to Planning Co Decision - Appeal to Planning C Decision - Appeal to City Counci	mmission Commission	 Environmental Determinal Appeal of a Hearing Office 	lion - Appeal to er Decision to re	City Council svoka a permit
			/		
2. Appellant Piez 113.0103)	se check one 🔲 Applicant 🗅	J Officially reco	gnized Planning Committee 🛛 🛍 "In	terested Persor	1" (<u>Per M.C. Sec.</u>
Name: Eddie Silverberg	& Stephanie Roth		E-mail Address: Eddie@FlexibleAss	embly com	
Address:			ty: State: Zip Code:		
1050 Chalcedony 3. Applicant Nan	are (As shown on the Permit/App	<u>San Diego</u> roval being app	CA 92109 pealed). Complete if different from a	ppellant.	2/~1/1/
FLEISHER RESI	DENCE				
4. Project Inform	ation ntal Determination & Permit/Doc	ument No.:	Date of Decision/Determination:	City Project N	lanager:
PTS 218795	······································		December 17th, 2010	Diane Murba	°
Decision (describ)	a the permit/approval decision):		D an application for a Coastal Devel	onmest Permit	to construct a
		••• /			
11122 SULV 2.220	Square loor single laning recider	nce and detach	ed carport on a vacant 0.07 acre site		o chalcedony st
Factual Em	ppeal (Please check all that a) of (Process Three and Four decision 1 other matters (Process Three ark ot Supported (Process Three and F	is only) d Four decisions	New Information (Process only) City-wide Significance (F iy)		
Chapter 11, Articl	e 2. Division 5 of the San Diego	Municipal Code	tion to the allowable reasons for app 2. Attach additional sheets if necess . Our appeal to this development is r	ery.)	-
of the proposed r	project. The proposed construction	on is an eyesor	e for the community with no ascetic	value to the loo	<u>k or the height.</u>
The design of thi	s construction lecks any consiste	ancy with the ex	xisting structures in the area. This ki	nd of developm	ent would have
a severe impact (on the local Pacific Beach enviro	nm ent & com m	unity.		
We are not again	st new construction in the area l	however we are	against construction that takes awa	ay from the flavo	or of the
neighborhood an	d this proposed development ne	gatively impact	<u>s Pacific Beach. The reason we mo</u>	ved to Pacific B	each
and I believe oth	ers feel the same way is because	e of the charm	of the area. To start building homes	that lack any in	tegrity
will have a negat	ive impact on the whole commun	nity. This kind o	of construction will set a precedent fo	r other builders	to
construct oversiz	ed structures in other parts of Pi	acific Beach.			
I would like to en	tohasize that the Pacific Beach	Planning Group	o (PBPG) recommended that the city	r deny the propr	osed development
Their rationale being that there is a code compliance issue, it does not comply with the community plan in terms of bulk and scale					
of established neighborhoods. Among other reasons for denial the PBPG stated that the same developer has just completed and put					
for sale a project on Honeycutt with completely enclosed garages, clearly in violation of approved plans.					
6. Appellant's Signature: I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing, including all names and addresses, is true and correct.					
signature HEC	EIVED		Date:	<u> </u>	
Note: Faxed appeals are not accepted. Appeal fees are non-refundable.					
IAN 3 1 20 5 4 Printed presented napor Vietherrows site at www.sandiant.cov/devolopmant-services					
	Upon request, this Information ENT SERVICES		n alternative formats for persons with dis 031 (05-10)		Y PLANNING
	LIN DEHVICES			AL	N 13 2011
				REC	EIVED

Attention: City Of San Diego Development Service Department

RE: Appeal of Project "FLEISHER RESIDENCE", Permit # PTS 218795

The appeal to this development is related to the bulk and scale of the proposed project. The proposed construction is an eyesore for the community with no ascetic value to the look or the height. The design of this construction lacks any consistency with the existing structures in the area. This kind of development would have a severe impact on the local Pacific Beach environment & community.

We are not against new construction in the area however we are against construction that takes away from the flavor of the neighborhood and this proposed development negatively impacts Pacific Beach. The reason we moved to Pacific Beach and we believe others feel the same way is because of the charm of the area. To start building homes that lack any integrity will have a negative impact on the whole community. This kind of construction will set a precedent for other builders to construct oversized structures in other parts of Pacific Beach.

We would like to emphasize that the Pacific Beach Planning Group (PBPG) recommended that the city deny the proposed development. Their rationale being that there is a code compliance issue. It does not comply with the community plan in terms of bulk and scale of established neighborhoods. Among other reasons for denial the PBPG stated that the same developer has just completed and put for sale a project on Honeycutt with completely enclosed garages, clearly in violation of approved plans.

We are only a few of the local residents who are speaking out against this however we feel that our opinions regarding the denial of this development represent an overwhleming majority of the community in Pacific Beach.

WILLIAM & FU	SON WPE:	Im Jan 10	-11 LOUZ CA	HLCENOLY
Name	Signature	Date	Street Address	
Pale Wherste	Signature		1645 CHGLC: Street Address	tion y thith
VIVIAN BUT	LEN2 VI	in P Batter	1-16-11	1068 Chalcedony
Name	Signature	Date	Street Address	j j
Lisa Heinz	hisa Az	<u>~ 1/10/11</u>	1053 Chalcedony Street Address	ST.
Name	Signature	Date	Street Address/	
JADON 1	Josef	10/1	-10-11 1053	Chalcedowy
Name	Signature	/ N Date	Street Address	TTOU NAME
CHEUR	12005 b	7-11-11	Aug	
Name	' Signature	^L Date	Street Addrèss	
Jason Karniski	22	1-10-11	1064 Chalcedony	- Unit C
Name -	Signature	Date	Street Address	

Concerned Residents:
Attention: City Of San Diego Development Service Department

RE: Appeal of Project "FLEISHER RESIDENCE", Permit # PTS 218795

The appeal to this development is related to the bulk and scale of the proposed project. The proposed construction is an eyesore for the community with no ascetic value to the look or the height. The design of this construction lacks any consistency with the existing structures in the area. This kind of development would have a severe impact on the local Pacific Beach environment & community.

We are not against new construction in the area however we are against construction that takes away from the flavor of the neighborhood and this proposed development negatively impacts Pacific Beach. The reason we moved to Pacific Beach and we believe others feel the same way is because of the charm of the area. To start building homes that lack any integrity will have a negative impact on the whole community. This kind of construction will set a precedent for other builders to construct oversized structures in other parts of Pacific Beach.

We would like to emphasize that the Pacific Beach Planning Group (PBPG) recommended that the city deny the proposed development. Their rationale being that there is a code compliance issue. It does not comply with the community plan in terms of bulk and scale of established neighborhoods. Among other reasons for denial the PBPG stated that the same developer has just completed and put for sale a project on Honeycutt with completely enclosed garages, clearly in violation of approved plans.

We are only a few of the local residents who are speaking out against this however we feel that our opinions regarding the denial of this development represent an overwhleming majority of the community in Pacific Beach.

Concerned Residents:	Γ Λ	Δ.	
Stephanic R Name	oth type-il Signature	Lite 1/10/	11 1050 Chalcedon Street Address
Follow, Silver	-		
Name	Signature		1050 Chalcedon, St Street Address
Lalla	Jan Umas	Tan Violu	1829 Chaledony St.
Name	Signature	Date	Street Address
Redunon		NAN 1/10/11	1839 Chalcedary &
Name	Signature	Date	Street Address
Name	Signature	Date	Street Address
Name	Signature	Date	Street Address
Name	Signature	Date	Street Address

TO: Kelly Broughton, Development Services Director

From: John Shannon, Chairperson, Pacific Beach Planning Group (PBPG)

RE: "Carports" loophole exploited by developers in Pacific Beach

Date : December 8, 2010

1

CC: Kevin Faulconer, Counclimember District 2, Bill Anderson, Director of Planning, Lesley Henegar, Senior Planner, Thyme Curtis, District 2, Robert Vacchi, Deputy Director of Code Compliance, Jerry Sanders, Mayor, San Diego Community Planning Committee

The PBPG voted to send this letter informing you of a loophole in the municipal code that adversely effects the Community of Pacific Beach and wastefully increases workload on City staff. Using the loophole developers obtain approval for projects that are contrary to the community plan. Additionally, these projects are problematic and require move staff time for plan review, building inspection and code enforcement.

Over the last few years, several residential projects have included carports that misuse Municipal Code. Section 113.0234(a) (6) regarding gross floor area (GFA) calculations. The municipal code allows carports to be built and not included in the GFA if they maintain 2 elevations at least 75% open. Excluding Carport square footage, allows for more square footage in the primary building structure.

<u>Not in compliance with Community Plan</u> Adding more square footage to the building creates a more massive structure, effectively exceeding the Municipal code maximum GFA and conflicting with our community plan in terms of bulk and scale and established neighborhood standards. Most of these projects are created by demolishing a residential structure(s) on a 50 foot wide property and developing two separate 25 foot wide lots, thereby further emphasizing tall narrow structures, not in character with our community. See Attachment "A"

<u>Plan Review Phase</u>: In reality the carports, once built, appear like enclosed garages. As seen in attachment "B", they do not comply with the intent of an "open elevation". In terms of visual bulk and scale there is no difference between these garages and any garage not using this loophole in the municipal code. Considerable staff time has already been spent interpreting the complaints of our planning group and trying to add conditions the approval process.

<u>Building Phase</u>: Approved plans are vague in details for open walls. Building inspectors can't be expected to interpret and enforce the confusing "75% open elevation rule". As seen in attachment "C" buildings pass final inspection and do not comply with the 75% rule nor the intent of an "open elevation".

<u>Code Compliance</u>: Typically, after final building inspection, the developer sells the property and the new owner encloses the two "open elevations" with either rolling garage doors, windows, bars and nylon mesh or studs / drywall / stucco. Attachment "D" illustrates several projects in Pacific Beach with enclosed walls that are now code violations. Does neighborhood code compliance have the resources to play cat and mouse with these projects that were obvious code compliance disasters at the time of plan review?

The PBPG has been raising this issue with developers, architects and city planners for 3 years now. The only solution offered is a condition on the permit stating that the open walls will not be enclosed. We do not consider this an acceptable solution. Four of these projects have come before the PBPG in the last 2 months and we will continue to deny them. The situation is only getting worse and the code violations continue to proliferate. Do we really want to burden our community with regular reporting of violations and our Neighborhood Code Compliance Department with regular inspections?

This problem can be resolved by either a change in the municipal code or a change during the approval process. We respectfully request that you respond with a plan for resolving this issue

والمستقد والمراجب
ł

Attachment A

Tall Massive Narrow Structures



1161-1167 Oliver

4052 and 4056 Promontory



3943 thru 3947 Sequoia

Attachment B Carports appear like Garages



1161-1167 Oliver Ave

4052 and 4056 Promontory



1058 and 1064 Diamond

Attachment C Open Walls "as built" not in compliance with "75% open elevation rule"



Carports at 1058 & 1064 Diamond with 75% open elevations as they are typically approved and pass final building inspection





4

Open wall at 1165 Oliver

Attachment D Open Elevations in-filled after final inspection

4052 and 4056 Promontory Approved by City in 2008 Carport "open elevation" in-filled with studs / drywall / stucco



1161-1167 Oliver Ave Approved by City 2007, Project #106427 In-fill with bars and nylon mesh or studs / drywall / stucco



3943 thru 3947 Sequoia Approved by City in 2008, Project #137821 Carport "open elevations" as they appear now



4028 and 4032 Honeycutt Approved by City in 2009 Carport "open elevations" in-filled with rolling garage doors



6

F-EISHEN

212795

Murbach, Diane

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments:

. .

Chris Olson [surferoly7@att.net] Monday, November 01, 2010 5:56 PM Peterson, Jeff; Murbach, Diane Fleisher and Mudgett PBPG_MinutesOci2010.doc

Diane and Jeff

Attached are the draft minutes from the last meeting and it includes your project. You each have a project that is essentially identical with the same issues. You might want to read the portion just prior and just after the votes as it gives background information and the committee decision that we will hereafter deny all projects with carport / garages having 2 "open" walls and not included in the FAR calculation. The PBPG will be drafting a letter stating our rational for denying these projects and we will send it to the Director of Planning and Development. I tried the motion to approve with the condition on the title regarding the carport and the group did not accept it.

Thanks, Chris

PACIFIC BEACH PLANNING GROUP EARL AND BIRDIE TAYLOR LIBRARY DRAFT OCTOBER 27, 2010 MEETING MINUTES

6:34 p.m. meeting called to order, quorum established. Attendees: John Shannon, Marcie Beckett, Scott Chipman, Greg Daunoras, Diane Faulds, Blake Hysni, Chris Olson, Rosalie Schwartz, Baylor Triplett, Barbara Williams, Jim Morrison (6:40 p.m.) and Clif Smith (6:40 p.m.).

Agenda & Minutes: Chris Olson motioned to adopt the meeting agenda for the evening, Barbara Williams seconded, motion passed 9-0-0. Blake Hysni motioned to approve the September 2010 minutes, Diane Faulds seconded, motion passed 7-0-2. Those abstaining did not attend the September 2010 meeting.

Chair's Report: John Shannon discussed vacancies on the PB Planning Group and the upcoming city engineering meeting regarding the comfort station construction at Palisades Park.

Government Office Reports:

Mayor Sander's Office – Not Present City Council District 2 – Not Present Long Range Planner – Not Present

Non-Agenda Public Comment:

Marcie Beckett discussed some misinformation regarding Proposition 19 on the upcoming Midterm election here in California.

Informational Items:

Don Gross provided an update on the Rose Creek Bridge Project.

Action Items:

PBPG Vice-Chairperson Election: Jim Morrison nominated Diane Faulds for the vacant position of PB Planning Group Vice-Chairperson, Scott Chipman seconded the nomination. After confirming with Diane Faulds that she would accept the nomination, Marcie Beckett motioned to elect Diane Faulds as PBPG Vice-Chair, Scott Chipman second. Motion **passed 10-0-1**. Diane Faulds abstained from voting.

Mission Bay High School Modernization Plan and Fund Allocation: Scott Chipman briefed the planning group on how Mission Bay HS did not receive an adequate amount of Proposition S funds as compared to other high schools within San Diego Unified and how certain areas of the campus such as the athletic fields are showing a deteriorating condition. Because of the poor condition of the athletic fields, many sporting events such as Track & Field must be held at other campuses throughout San Diego.

Vacation Rental Issue in residential areas and letter proposal was discussed by Rosalie Schwartz. The issue involves the question of whether a person or entity offering visitor accommodations in a residential dwelling within certain residential zones constitutes a commercial service.

The second question raised is, if a residential dwelling is offered for visitor accommodations in a residential zone (RS or RM) does this commercial service provider violate Section 131.0420 of the San Diego Municipal Code? Chris Olson motioned to send a letter to the city attorney and councilman for District 2 asking these questions, Scott Chipman second, motion passed 11-6-0.

CPC request of PBPG feedback on Council Policy 600-27 and proposed regulations for medical marijuana dispensaries. With regards to Council Policy 600-27, Scott Chipman motioned that the PBPG should consider affordable housing and sustainable development as separate issues, Clif Smith second. Motion passed 11-0-0. Regarding sustainable development, Marcie Beckett motioned that the PBPG oppose any incentive that compromises the Pacific Beach Community Plan on density bonuses, parking ratio reduction, conforming setbacks and allowing deviations from height limits, Scott Chipman second. Motion passed 11-0-0.

Regarding proposed regulations for medical marijuana dispensaries, Marcie Beckett motioned to support Community Planners Committee (CPC) Motion Number 2, Rosalie Schwartz second, PBPG motion **passed 11-0-0**. Marcie Beckett then motioned to support CPC Motion Number 1, excluding paragraph C, Scott Chipman second, PBPG motion **passed 9-2-0**.

Residential/ Mixed Use/ Commercial Subcommittee Report

Chris Olson stated that the subcommittee met on October 14, 2010 and there were 5 committee members present and 2 persons representing applicants. The next subcommittee meeting is scheduled for November 11, 2010 at 12:00 p.m.

1). Oliver Avenue Oceanfront Public Land: Development plan for the "paper street" and adjacent public right of way. Chris stated that Lane Mackenzie of the City of Sand Diego Real Estate Services Division has been working to get a title search and related restrictions and interpretation of the title language. His report is still forthcoming. Subcommittee members brought forth some possible uses: a) Meeting Hall / Community Room that will bring revenue, b) Concept like Spanish village in Balboa Park, c) Per community plan all unused right of ways should be used for pocket parks. Paul Ross added that the property is owned by the streets division and we should ask our councilmember to get it transferred to park division, carry out a short term plan (e.g. water meter and palm trees) then long term something else. Tim Golba agreed with Mr. Ross and added we might learn something from the experience of the OB gateway park which is a similar situation.

2). Development of RM-1-1 zoned properties: Chris Olson provided the background that is pertinent to these developments. There is a trend over the past few years to demolish existing structures built across two 25 foot wide lots and develop each 25 foot lot separately. This allows for each home to have a street front and alley access. It also gives the builder the advantage of a reduced parking requirement (5 for a 50ft wide development versus 2 for each 25ft wide development) and a reduced side yard setback (5 ft for a 50ft wide lot versus 3ft for a 25 foot wide lot). It is Mr. Olson's opinion that this creates the look of tall narrow structures that are very close together as seen in Mission Beach. Additionally, some developers have taken advantage of a municipal code loophole regarding "carports" built with "2 Open walls". The open walls allow that carport square footage is not included in the maximum square footage for the development. Thereby, the developer increases the square footage of the house and builds a more massive structure. These "carports" actually appear to be garages. Once the house is sold, the new owner encloses the open holes in the walls and it becomes a completely enclosed garage. Almost all of these structures built in the last couple years are now enclosed garages. Since it is obvious that buyers want an enclosed garage, they should be designed and built that way in the first place.

3). 4080 and 4084 Morrell St. Project #218555: CDP to demolish 2 existing residential units and construct 2 residential units zoned RM-1-1. Chris Olson explained that this project was similar to 4028 and 4032 Honeycutt (also presented by Golba Architecture) to the PBPG in June of 2008. The PBPG approved the Honeycutt project however Mr. Olson voted against it due to the issues already stated and especially the carport / open walls.

The Honeycutt project is now completed and the garage walls are enclosed. Mr. Olson has discussed the issue with the city planners and they have proposed a permit condition to address this problem. Mr. Golba presented the project and pointed out that these types of developments allow the lots to be developed as single family developments rather than multi-family developments.

¶′:

The side yard setback for the two lots provide 4×3 ft = 12 ft total which is more than 2×5 ft = 10 ft total for a 50 ft lot. Thereby, more open space is provided. The detached garage allows for a backyard between the house and the garage. The new design for the garage shows open walls on the side. Now, the owners will not need to enclose the garage for security reasons. Although, the two structures have the same floor plan they will have a different front design.

Chris Olson motioned to approve with the following condition placed upon the permit: "The carport shall be constructed and maintained with at least two sides that are at least 75 percent completely open. The carport shall be included in the calculation of FAR if less than two sides of the carport are 75 percent completely open. The project may not exceed the allowable FAR of the zone." This condition regarding the carport and FAR shall be reflected and disclosed on any future sale or lease agreement(s) of the dwelling units on this property, Barbara Williams second. Motion failed to pass 0-10-1.

Jim Morrison motioned to extend the PBPG meeting by 10 more minutes, Scott Chipman second, motion passed 11-0-0.

Chris Olson motioned to deny the project as the carport / garage should be included in the FAR and historically these carports / garages have been enclosed after completion, Diane Faulds second, motion passed 11-0-0.

4). 1056 Chalcedony St. Project #218795: CDP to construct a 2,226 square foot single family residence on a 0.07 acre site in the RM-1-1 zone. Mr.Golba presented the project and the primary difference is that this is a vacant 25ft wide lot that was recent sold separately from a larger parcel with a house on it. The lot is deeper than the previous projects and allows for a bigger rear yard.

Chris Olson motioned to deny the project as the carport / garage should be included in the FAR and historically these carports / garages have been enclosed after completion, Barbara Williams second, motion passed 11-0-0.

Chris Olson motioned to reschedule November's PBPG meeting within the first two weeks of December 2010, Scott Chipman second, motion passed 11-0-0.

Subcommittee Reports:

<u>Alcohol License Review</u>: Scott Chipman stated the next subcommittee meeting will be on Nov 9th at 6:30 p.m. here in the PB Library. <u>Election and Vacancies</u>: No report <u>Traffic and Parking</u>: Jim Morrison <u>Neighborhood Code Compliance</u>: No report <u>Special Events and Community Advisory</u>: No Report

Meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

	ATTACHMENT 12		
City of San Diego Development Services 1222 First Ave., MS-302 San Diego, CA 92101 The City of San Diego (619) 446-5000	Ownership Disclosure Statement		
Approval Type: Check appropriate box for type of approval (s) requested: Neighborhood Development Permit F Site Development Permit F Variance F Tentative Map F Vesting Tentative Map F Map Waive	Planned Development Permit Conditional Use Permit		
Project Title	Project No. For City Use Only		
1056 Chalcolor	<u>~1</u>		
Project Address: 1056 Chalcedor 1056 Chalcedor	ny 37		
Part I - To be completed when property is held by Individual(s)			
below the owner(s) and tenant(s) (if applicable) of the above referenced p who have an interest in the property, recorded or otherwise, and state the t individuals who own the property). <u>A signature is required of at least one</u> from the Assistant Executive Director of the San Diego Redevelopment Ag Development Agreement (DDA) has been approved / executed by the Ci Manager of any changes in ownership during the time the application is be the Project Manager at least thirty days prior to any public hearing on the information could result in a delay in the hearing process. Additional pages attached Yes No Name of Individual (type or print); <u>MABK FLE/SHUBR</u> Wowner Tenant/Lessee Redevelopment Agency Street Address:	ype of property interest (e.g., tenants who will benefit from the permit, all <u>of the property owners</u> . Attach additional pages if needed. A signature ency shall be required for all project parcels for which a Disposition and by Council. Note: The applicant is responsible for notifying the Project ing processed or considered. Changes in ownership are to be given to		
City/State/Zip:	City/State/Zip:		
$\frac{\angle A}{Phone} \frac{p_7}{E} \frac{E}{517} \frac{\angle B}{\angle B} \frac{9}{941}$ Phone No: Fax No:	Phone No: Fax No:		
619-890-6337 858-483-2057 Signature: Date:	Signature : Date:		
8-19-10			
Name of Individual (type or print):	Name of Individual (type or print):		
Owner Tenant/Lessee Redevelopment Agency	Cowner Tenant/Lessee Redevelopment Agency		
Street Address:	Street Address:		
City/State/Zip:	City/State/Zip:		
Phone No: Fax No:	Phone No: Fax No:		
Signature : Date:	Signature : Date:		

Printed on recycled paper. Visit our web site at <u>www.sandiego.gov/development-services</u> Upon request, this information is available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities.

Fleisher Residence - Project No. 218795

PROJECT CHRONOLOGY

Date	Action	Description	City Review Time	Applicant Response
09/03/10	Project Deemed Complete and accepted into the Affordable Sustainable Housing Expedite Program.	Applicant paid Affordable Housing Expedite program fees. Project distributed for City staff review as a Process 2.		
09/03/10 - 10/01/10	First Review and preparation of Initial Assessment Letter	Initial/First Assessment Letter to Applicant	19 days	
10/01/10	CEQA Notice of Exemption (NOE)	Environmental Exemption Determination		
10/02/10 - 11/29/10	Applicant resubmits for City review	2 nd project review resubmittal from applicant		38 days
10/22/10	NOE Final	Environmental determination final		
11/30/10- 12/14/10	2 nd Expedite staff review	Second Review to Applicant	10 days	
12/17/10	Process 2 Decision Noticed	Staff Decision - APPROVAL		
11/11/11	Appeal	Appeal of Staff Decision		
03/24/11	Public Hearing	Planning Commission		
TOTAL STAFF TIME		Review Working Days	29 working days	
TOTAL APPLICANT TIME		Review Working Days		38 working days
TOTAL PROJECT RUNNING TIME		From Deemed Complete submittal to Staff Decision - Approval (09/03/10 to 12/17/10)	3 Months, 14 days (Calendar Days)	