

DATE ISSUED:	February 21, 2012	REPORT NO. PC-11-095			
ATTENTION:	Planning Commission, Agenda of March 1, 2012				
SUBJECT:	Jack in the Box (1110 C Street) – C Permit/Planned Development Perm Neighborhood of the Downtown Co	it No. 2011-04 – East Village			
OWNER/ APPLICANT:	Victoria Land Partners, L.P. / Jac	ck in the Box, Inc.			

SUMMARY

Issue(s): "Should the Planning Commission ("Commission") APPROVE OR DENY Centre City Development Permit/Planned Development Permit (CCDP/PDP) No. 2011-04 allowing the reconstruction of a Jack in the Box restaurant ("Project") located at 1110 C Street in the Downtown Community Plan (DCP) Area?"

Staff Recommendation: That the Commission denies CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 for the Project based on the following: 1) the required findings for approval of a CCDP/PDP cannot be made; and, 2) approval of the Project is inconsistent with the goals and policies of the DCP.

<u>Community Planning Group Recommendation</u>: On November 9, 2011, the Centre City Advisory Committee (CCAC) voted 13-7, with two recusals to recommend that the Commission grant CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 for the Project.

<u>Centre City Development Corporation ("Corporation") Recommendation</u>: On November 16, 2011, the Corporation Board of Directors voted 4-3 to recommend that the Commission deny CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 based on the inability to make the required findings for approval.

Environmental Review: This activity is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 Replacement or Reconstruction (Class 2) and Section 15303 New Construction (Class 3). Class 2 applies to replacement or reconstruction of commercial structure with a new structure of substantially the same size, purpose and capacity and Class 3 applies to construction of new structures under 10,000 square feet in floor area. The project consists of the demolition and reconstruction of a new 2,156 square-foot restaurant; and therefore, the Class 2 and Class 3 exemptions are applicable. Planning Commission Agenda of March 1, 2012 Page -2-

Fiscal Impact Statement: None.

Code Enforcement Impact: None.

Housing Impact Statement: None.

BACKROUND

On December 8, 2012, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider this application. After receiving the staff report and public testimony, continued the hearing until February 2, 2012 to allow the applicant to reevaluate the proposed design of the project. On February 2, 2012 the applicant requested additional time and the Planning Commission continued the hearing to March 1, 2012.

DISCUSSION

The proposed Project includes the demolition of the existing 2,340 square-foot Jack in the Box building to accommodate the construction of a new 2,156 square-foot, single-story, 21-foot-tall building with a drive-thru and seven parking spaces.

At the December 8, 2012 hearing, the Planning Commission expressed serious concerns with the design of the Project. The Commission's concerns were based on the fact that the proposed design was standard and inadequate for its location. Since the last meeting the following revisions have been made:

- Design modifications have been made to include upgraded materials such as brick veneer with metal panels and glass accents. Previously the design was primarily stucco finish with varying size reveals and aluminum accents. The building will be accentuated with dark grey metal awnings and black decorative goose neck lighting fixtures. The existing surface parking lot is proposed to be re-paved and striped.
- 2. The driveway along C Street has been revised to be entrance only to avoid conflicts with narrow drive aisle adjacent to drive-thru lane (vehicle exiting site would block driveway and result in vehicles blocking sidewalk or drive aisle).
- 3. The project will also include new landscaping and public right-of-way improvements consistent with the Centre City Streetscape Manual (new sidewalks, street trees, street lights, etc.).
- 4. Trash and recycling will be fully enclosed.
- 5. All rooftop mechanical equipment will be screened.
- 6. No pole sign will be incorporated.

Planning Commission Agenda of March 1, 2012 Page -3-

No changes have been made relative to the stacking of vehicles on-site to avoid cars queuing on C Street.

CONCLUSION

While the design of the Project has improved, Corporation staff must evaluate all applications relative to their consistency with the long-term goals and policies for the redevelopment of downtown. It is staff's conclusion that: 1) approval of the Project is inconsistent with the goals and policies of the DCP; and, 2) the required findings for approval of a PDP cannot be made. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission denies CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04.

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

If the Commission can make the required findings for approval of the CCDP/PDP, then the Commission may approve CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04, subject to the conditions as shown in the attached Draft Permit, including:

1. The drive-thru lane shall accommodate at least three vehicles on-site before any location of a menu board/order station to avoid cars queuing along C Street.

pectfully submitted, Senio anner

Concurred by:

Brad Richter Assistant Vice President, Planning

Attachments: A – Planning Commission Staff Report dated December 8, 2012 B – Revised Basic/Concept Drawings

S.\Contreras\DEVREVJack In The Box/Jack In The Box - Planning Commission Report- CONTINUANCE MARCH IST.Doc



DATE ISSUED:	December 1, 2011	REPORT NO. PC-11-095
ATTENTION:	Planning Commission, Ag	enda of December 8, 2011
SUBJECT:	Permit/Planned Developmen	eet) – Centre City Development nt Permit No. 2011-04 – East Village town Community Plan Area.
OWNER/ APPLICANT:	Victoria Land Partners, L	.P. / Jack in the Box, Inc.

SUMMARY

Issue(s): "Should the Planning Commission ("Commission") APPROVE OR DENY Centre City Development Permit/Planned Development Permit (CCDP/PDP) No. 2011-04 allowing the reconstruction of a Jack in the Box restaurant ("Project") located at 1110 C Street in the Downtown Community Plan (DCP) Area?"

Staff Recommendation: That the Commission denies CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 for the Project based on the following: 1) the required findings for approval of a CCDP/PDP cannot be made; and, 2) approval of the Project is inconsistent with the goals and policies of the DCP.

<u>Community Planning Group Recommendation</u>: On November 9, 2011, the Centre City Advisory Committee (CCAC) voted 13-7, with two recusals to recommend that the Commission grant CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 for the Project.

<u>Centre City Development Corporation ("Corporation") Recommendation</u>: On November 16, 2011, the Corporation Board of Directors voted 4-3 to recommend that the Commission deny CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 based on the inability to make the required findings for approval.

ATTACHMENT A

401 B Street, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92101-4298 Phone 619-235-2200 Fax 619-236-9148 www.ccdc.com

Planning Commission Agenda of November 10, 2011 Page -2-

> **Environmental Review:** This activity is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 Replacement or Reconstruction (Class 2) and Section 15303 New Construction (Class 3). Class 2 applies to replacement or reconstruction of commercial structure with a new structure of substantially the same size, purpose and capacity and Class 3 applies to construction of new structures under 10,000 square feet in floor area. The project consists of the demolition and reconstruction of a new 2,156 square-foot restaurant; and therefore, the Class 2 and Class 3 exemptions are applicable.

Fiscal Impact Statement: None.

Code Enforcement Impact: None.

Housing Impact Statement: None.

BACKGROUND

Jack in the Box, Inc. ("Applicant"), based in San Diego, is a fast-food restaurant company that operates and franchises Jack in the Box restaurants in 19 states. The Applicant is seeking approval of CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 to allow the construction of a new replacement 2,156 square-foot, one-story (21-foot-tall) restaurant with a drive-thru on a 10,000 square-foot parcel located at 1110 C Street within the East Village neighborhood of the DCP area. The proposed construction does not conform to the land use provisions and development standards of the Centre City Planned District Ordinance (CCPDO) including, but not limited to, land use requirements of the Residential Emphasis (RE) Land Use District minimum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and minimum street wall height.

ROLE	FIRM/CONTACT	OWNERSHIP
Property Owner/Landlord	Victoria Land Partners, L.P. David Trackman	Privately Owned
Applicant/Tenant	Jack In the Box, Inc. Mike Hogenboom	Privately Owned Corporation (See Attached Executive and Board of Directors List)
Architect/Project Manager	PM Design Group David Lundy	David Lundy Privately Owned
Public Relations Consultant	Focuscom, Inc.	Dan Hom, President and CEO (Privately Owned)

DEVELOPMENT TEAM

Planning Commission Agenda of November 10, 2011 Page -3-

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following is a summary of the project:

Site Area	10,039 sq. ft.	
Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Permitted	10.0	
Minimum FAR Required	6.0	
Proposed FAR	0.21	
Stories / Height	Single-story/21 feet	
Amount of Retail Space	2,156 sq. ft.	
Parking		
Required	None	
Proposed	7	
Assessor's Parcel Nos.	534-193-05	

DISCUSSION

<u>Site Description</u> – The Project is proposed on a 10,000 square-foot site located on the northeast corner of Eleventh Avenue and C Street. The Project site lies within the RE District, which is intended to accommodate primarily residential development. Small-scale businesses, offices, services and ground-floor commercial uses are allowed, subject to size and area limitations. Within the RE District, at least 80 percent of the gross floor area must be occupied by residential land uses. Non-residential uses may not occupy more than 20 percent of the gross floor area. The site is also located within the Commercial Street Overlay along C Street, which requires a minimum of 60 percent of the street-level frontage to be designated for active commercial uses.

The site is relatively flat and is currently developed with a 2,340 square-foot, single-story Jack in the Box with a drive-thru including seven parking spaces. Other uses on the block include surface parking lots, a one-story Del Taco restaurant with a drive-thru to the north, the four-story Baltimore Apartments located on the northwest corner of the block and a single-story tire repair shop to the east. Surrounding uses include surface parking lots to the west, San Diego City College to the east and the Smart Corner mixed-use project, C Street Trolley tracks and MTS transit station to the south. The Base Minimum FAR for the site is 6.0 and the Base Maximum is 10.0.

<u>Project Analysis</u> – The proposed Project includes the demolition of the existing 2,340 square-foot Jack in the Box building to accommodate the construction of a new 2,156 square-foot, single-story, 21-foot-tall building with a drive-thru and seven parking spaces.

Stand alone eating and drinking establishments with drive thru facilities are no longer permitted uses within the DCP area. The existing Jack in the Box was established under development regulations which permitted its construction and use, and is therefore considered an existing

Planning Commission Agenda of November 10, 2011 Page -4-

"previously conforming structure and use" under the City of San Diego's ("City") Land Development Code (LDC) provisions for Previously Conforming Premises and Uses. The proposed demolition of the existing Jack in the Box building eliminates the property's previously conforming status, and the proposed reconstruction and replacement is therefore subject to the design and development standards of the CCPDO. These standards include, but are not limited to, minimum FARs, minimum street wall height, and minimum residential use requirements.

The Project is proposed to contain a total of 2,156 square feet of floor area. This equates to a 0.21 FAR on the 10,000 square-foot site. The DCP and CCPDO require a minimum FAR of 6.0 with a maximum FAR of 10.0. Adjacent sites to the west and south also have significant development potential and are currently developed with low-density buildings and at-grade surface parking lots. The East Village's long-term goals are envisioned to contain high-density residential with a variety of commercial neighborhood services. Therefore, the Project as currently proposed does not comply with the goals and policies of the DCP or the development standards of the CCPDO. As an alternative to demolition and reconstruction, the CCPDO would allow for the remodel of the existing Jack in the Box building. Additionally, the CCPDO allows an increase in 100 percent of the floor area of a previously conforming structure with approval of a Neighborhood Use Permit.

<u>Design Review</u> – The new building will consist primarily of a stucco finish with varying size reveals and aluminum accents. The exterior paint colors include beige, gray, wheat and dark rust as well as Jack in the Box Corporate red. The building will be accentuated with black metal awnings and decorative goose neck lighting fixtures. The Project will also include new landscaping and public right-of-way improvements consistent with the Centre City Streetscape Manual (new sidewalks, street trees, street lights, etc.). The existing surface parking lot is proposed to be re-paved and striped. One of the key design issues is that that proposed building is designed to reflect Jack in the Box's corporate standard and construction style and does not exhibit a higher level of design as would typically be expected in an urban setting. While the Corporation Board of Directors voted to recommend denial of the Project based on the inability to make the findings for approval of the CCDP/PDP, there was a general consensus that the proposed design was inadequate and should be upgraded if the land use permits were to be approved by the Commission.

ENTITLEMENTS

<u>Centre City Development Permit</u> – Under the CCPDO, construction with 1,000 square feet or more of gross floor area requires approval of a CCDP. Under the adopted Design Review thresholds of the CCPDO, developments containing less than 100,000 square feet of gross floor area or less than 50 dwelling units are reviewed and approved administratively by staff on behalf of the Corporation President. A development permit may be granted if the decision-maker finds that the proposed development is consistent with the DCP, Centre City Redevelopment Plan, Planning Commission Agenda of November 10, 2011 Page -5-

CCPDO, LDC, and all other adopted plans or policies of the City or Redevelopment Agency pertaining to downtown.

The following goals and policies of the DCP should be evaluated in the context of the proposed Project:

• Goals: Development Intensities and Incentives, and Plan Buildout

3.2-G-1: Target a residential population of approximately 90,000, and downtown employment of over 165,000 by 2030, to create vitality, a market for a broad array of supporting stores and services, opportunities for living close to jobs and transit, and support regional growth strategies.

• Policies: Development Intensities and Incentives, and Plan Buildout

3.2-P-1: Require a minimum FAR on all development sites, as shown in Figure 3-9, avoid exceptions unless conditioned on finding of hardship, exceptional circumstances, or public health and welfare.

• Policies: Housing

3.3-P-1: Establish minimum FARs to achieve city and regional goals for making downtown a major population center.

3.3-P-3: Achieve a mix of housing types and forms, consistent with FAR and urban design policies.

<u>Planned Development Permit</u> – The Applicant is requesting deviations to the following key development regulations of the CCPDO:

- Land use requirements of the RE District The CCPDO requires new developments within the RE District to provide a minimum of 80 percent residential land uses and no more than 20 percent non-residential uses. The Applicant is seeking a deviation to allow 100 percent commercial use within the RE District.
- 2. Minimum FAR The minimum FAR for the site is a 6.0 under the CCPDO and DCP. Deviations to the Base Minimum FAR are being requested to allow a 0.21 FAR.
- 3. Street Wall Height The CCPDO requires developments to provide a minimum street wall height of 45 feet along 100 percent of the street frontage, with limited exceptions (public parks, courtyards, auto courts, etc.). The Applicant is requesting a deviation to allow a 21-foot-tall street wall and surface parking lot.

Planning Commission Agenda of November 10, 2011 Page -6-

4. Vehicular Access – The Applicant is seeking deviations to the Vehicular Access requirements of the CCPDO, which limit the amount of curb cut to one linear foot per 500 square feet of site area. Sites of 10,000 square feet or less may double this ratio. Under the CCPDO, the Project site would be limited to a total of no more than 40 feet of curb cut. Additionally, the CCPDO requires that curb cuts serving up to 10 parking spaces be between 12 and 20 feet wide. The Applicant is proposing to utilize the existing curb cuts located along 11th Avenue and C Street, which are approximately 37 and 30 feet, respectively.

While staff does not support the requested deviations, the LDC allows an Applicant to apply for and seek approval of a PDP. The purpose of the PDP procedures is to establish a review process for development that allows an applicant to request greater flexibility from the strict application of the regulations.

Under Section 112.0103 of the LDC, projects requiring the approval of multiple permits are required to be consolidated for processing and acted upon by the highest level of authority for the consolidated application. In this case, the PDP is a Process Four and requires final approval by the City of San Diego Planning Commission (with potential appeal to the City Council).

<u>PDP Findings</u> –The findings for approval of a PDP listed below are evaluated to determine if the proposed deviations facilitate a project that is beneficial to the community and results in a more desirable project than could otherwise be achieved if the project were required to rigorously adhere to the development regulations.

In order to grant approval of a PDP, the following findings must be made:

1. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan.

The goals and polices of the DCP are intended to ensure that downtown develops into a high-density, mixed-use urban center. The FAR requirements of the DCP were established to ensure that the population and employment goals of the DCP can be met by future development. Approval of the Project as proposed would limit the redevelopment potential of the site which, due to its RE designation and allowable 10.0 FAR, has an extremely high residential development potential. The site could also be combined with the adjoining underdeveloped sites to the north and east to create a redevelopment project consistent with the DCP. Any proposed development project on this site would be required to comply with the goals and policies of the DCP, which require a minimum FAR on all development sites except in conditions of hardship, exceptional circumstances, or public health and welfare. The Project contains approximately 2,156 square feet of gross floor area, which equates to approximately 0.21 FAR where the

Planning Commission Agenda of November 10, 2011 Page -7-

minimum FAR for the site is a 6.0 FAR. In order to meet the goals and policies of the DCP, the site will need to be redeveloped with a much higher intensity project. Therefore, the Project as currently proposed adversely affects the applicable land use plan.

2. The proposed development will not be detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare.

While the proposed Project will not result in any immediate negative impacts to public health, safety, and welfare of the downtown community, the current proposal to redevelop the site in this manner could lead to its being grossly underutilized for a larger period of time in conflict with the redevelopment, housing and urban development goals for downtown. In order to meet the DCP's housing goals, minimum FAR and residential requirements of the in the RE Districts were established. The approval of this Project and potentially other similar projects, could conflict with the housing needs of the downtown area.

3. <u>The proposed development will comply with the regulations of the Land Development</u> <u>Code including any proposed deviations pursuant to Section 126.0602(b)(1) that are</u> <u>appropriate for this location and will result in a more desirable project than would be</u> <u>achieved if designed in strict conformance with the development regulations of the</u> <u>applicable zone, and any allowable deviations that are otherwise authorized pursuant to</u> <u>the Land Development Code.</u>

The CCPDO contains regulations and controls pertaining to land use, density and intensity, building massing, architectural design and other development regulations, with the intent of implementing the goals and polices of the DCP. Therefore, all development downtown is required to conform to these regulations. As previously mentioned, the proposed Project does not comply with any of the land use and development regulations of the CCPDO, including those pertaining to density, intensity, street wall height, and the 80 percent residential requirement of the RE District. Implementation of the Project requires significant deviations to the regulations of the CCPDO. While the purpose of the PDP is to allow a process whereby a development may request exemptions that will result in a more desirable project design, it is not intended to permit project designs that require deviations from the vast majority of the development standards contained in the CCPDO, especially without any mitigating benefits. The proposed Project is located within the RE District of the DCP area, which requires a minimum of 80 percent residential uses and a maximum of 20 percent non-residential uses. It is also located within the East Village neighborhood, which is envisioned to become a thriving residential and mixed-use community containing the highest residential intensities downtown. The East Village also contains the largest amount of property with redevelopment potential and is anticipated to experience the most growth and considerable transformation over the next 15-20 years.

Planning Commission Agenda of November 10, 2011 Page -8-

The Project is located on a site with significant redevelopment potential and is inconsistent with the provisions of the CCPDO and the goals and policies of the DCP for this area. Therefore, the construction of a new 2,156 square-foot, 23-foot-tall single-story fast-food establishment is not appropriate at the proposed location and does not result in a more desirable project than would be achieved if designed in strict conformance with the development regulations of the CCPDO.

Based on the discussion above, staff cannot support the findings required in order to grant approval of a PDP for the Project. The Applicant has provided an analysis of the findings in Attachment C to this report.

<u>Environmental Impact</u>: This activity is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 Replacement or Reconstruction (Class 2) and Section 15303 New Construction (Class 3). Class 2 applies to replacement or reconstruction of commercial structure with a new structure of substantially the same size, purpose and capacity and Class 3 applies to construction of new structures under 10,000 square feet in floor area. The project consists of the demolition and reconstruction of a new 2,156 square foot restaurant; and therefore, the Class 2 and Class 3 exemptions are applicable.

CONCLUSION

Corporation staff must evaluate all applications relative to their consistency with the long-term goals and policies for the redevelopment of downtown. It is staff's conclusion that: 1) approval of the Project is inconsistent with the goals and policies of the DCP; and, 2) the required findings for approval of a PDP cannot be made. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission denies CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04.

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. If the Commission can make the required findings for approval of the CCDP/PDP, then the Commission may approve CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04, subject to the conditions as shown in the attached Draft Permit, including:
 - 1. Design modifications made to include upgraded building materials with a prohibition of stucco or plaster materials.
 - 2. Driveway along C Street to be entrance only to avoid conflicts with narrow drive aisle adjacent to drive-thru lane (vehicle exiting site would block driveway and result in vehicles blocking sidewalk or drive aisle).
 - 3. Adequate stacking on-site minimum three cars on site before menu board/order station to avoid cars queuing along C Street.

Planning Commission Agenda of November 10, 2011 Page -9-

- 4. Minimize driveway widths of 24 feet.
- 5. Installation of full street improvements consistent with the Centre City Streetscape Manual.
- 6. Trash and recycling to be fully enclosed.
- 7. All rooftop mechanical equipment to be screened.
- 8. No pole sign shall be permitted.
- 2. Continue the public hearing for 45-60 days if the Commission can make the findings for approval of the CCDP/PDP with direction to the applicant to continue working on the design of the building.
- 3. Approve CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04, subject to the Draft Permit and future Design Review approval by the Corporation Board of Directors.

Respectfully submitted, Senior Planner

Concurred by:

Brad Richter Assistant Vice President, Planning

Attachments:

A – Project Drawings

- B Existing Site Photos
- C Applicants' Analysis of PDP Findings
- D-FAR Maps
- E Jack in the Box Executive and Board of Directors List
- F Draft CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04

S:\Contreras\DEVREV\Jack In The Box\Jack In The Box - Planning Commission Report-JH Edits Final.Doc



MK9A_SM2 1110 C STREET SAN DIEGO, CA

						BOLEASE: MOV 17, 2001					
	LEGEND & AB					DEFERRED SUBMITTALS	PLANNING NOTES	s	HEET INDEX	(IDFAL OF 12 SHEETS)	PH UPDATES JAN 5, 2010
	ALSO REFER TO LECEND & AGOREWA & KUTCHEN GRATINGS.	A 800	P	P.C.	PLUMBARE CONTRACTOR PLASTIC LAMONATE OF	THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS WILL BE SUBMITTED \$7 A FUTURE DATE:	THE FOLLOWING ARE ARENITECTURAL & SITE REVIEW CONDITIONS:	Into had model	GENERAL		SUBMITTAL BATE:
-			CHOR BOLL MALLING COMONICE EXPLANES COMONICAL EXPLANES DESCARE DIVERTIMAN DESCARE DIVERTI	2	PLANSING CONTRACTOR PLASSING LAMBAR OF PART PARALLAN (BEAK) PLAT PROPERTY LINE A.118000			2012 ALLA SURVEY			E JULE 16, 2010 2 JULY 8, 2011
1410	MOICATES SHEARMALL LOCATIONS WHERE NO CONDUT OR PUPING MILL	AD AAS AD	DAS BE COUNT PANEL DECARS INTH PRABUINCS ACT		A THEOD			3072 MILLINGHT CHARGE & C 4077 LANDSCAPL PLANTING PLAN 3077 LANDSCAPL CALCULATIONS	ANALACI PLAN		1 <u>1</u>
	BE PERMITTED TO PENEZBATE SALL OR FOP PLATE SEE PLANS FOR	AFS. AND MUMA AUX	DIE FINEN FLAGE	19	POUNDS POR SE INDI			Sel121 DOUDLITON SITE PLAN			40 .
	ADDITIONAL NOTES	ALLAL ALL A.A.A. ALL A.D.C. ALLA ALC: ALC: ALLA ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC: ALC:		04	QUART THE			Tenzi Salt PLAN Boriz DVERALA RLOOR PLAN			CONSIDUCTION:
2000	BATY INSULADON		REALS	810 DE 19)	ALLEY ALL			10/12 CXEROR (LCW.htms			REVISIONS
	NGO HOULATION		DCEME MEDAITY MAL AU THEM OF JOIST	4C	SAM-OUT JOHT			Heart CARRIER LLCWARDINS			A PLAN COMMENTS
	CYPSUM BOARD	BOT. UT (1) BOT	1986 er Jost Li uf Regime 1986		94611 548,40 94811 48844			12WIT SHE SCORDES			
		5 St	niteri Fili uni	3PTC-(\$)	SHELT MERKE SCHEN				ELIGENTS.		Δ
	CERAMIC AND QUARRY THE	Cas Do	HIDA JOST (COLS JON)	art C	SAM-GUT JOHT SOCEPALE SHELT SHELT SHELT SHELT SHELT SUMA SUMA SUMA SUMA SUMA SUMA SUMA SUMA	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	CONSULTANT INFORMATION	1 SIN PHONO REA MAP			<u> </u>
	PL 19000		And an and a second second	THE	STRATING AREA AREA AREA AREA SHEPCHARE STRATE BECK	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	CONSULTANT INFORMATION				△
	CONCRETE	CONC. 100				ING PERFORMENT PERFORMENT THE DEVELOPMENT DEVELOPMENT DEVELOPMENT DEVELOPMENT PERFORMENT PERFOR	ARCHITECT: OWNER: PM DESIGN GROUP, INC. JACK IN THE BOX				
				0	NOPENCE (I (LIPCES SURC) INSCRICTS		ROY PEORD, ARCHITECT MIKE HOGENBOOM, CONST MANAGER				
	MASONRA	COMPANY COM	WALLS (SIN)		READULT & CHOCHE	ON SITE MOME MALL MICLUOC LANDSCAPES, PANING FOR THE DEVE- BHD AND MILLEMAYS, NEW TRASK Childrenie, and paning spaces.	44TO TANKE				
	ASPHALTIC CONCRETE PAWNG	00L (m	URLE GREE MAC RET KLODMA, KLODMA,	() 	RP OF FROME	OT SE NOM NOLLOCS INSTALLANDA OF PINCE MEE ALONG IT IN ANDRE.	PHONE: (914) 415-5336 PHONE: (415) 706 =9024 rpedro@pmdgins.com wike hogenbeom@jschinthete.com				
TITTT	CARTH GRADE	SSTREES	CONVA.	IR.	12) Elimpication ((Timpican tune)) Inconcerne Inconcern	PROPRISED USES/ACTIVITIES IN-IT INLL OCCUR ANSIDE THE BUILDING ARE THREAL RESTAURIANT/FAST FOOD DAMIG ACTIVITIES INICAN INCLUDE PREPARATION OF FOOD, TARE-OUT/DIVIC-THINY IDANSACTORS					
			(1)	UAC	UNITOIN BUILDING COOL UNLESS OPPERMISE NOTED	AND SEATED DAMAG	CIVIL ENGINEER:				
	SAND BASE	555	CH IEIRICAL CONBLACTION CH FADE IYA BOH		WITH BALLENATING	PROPOSED USES/ACTIVITIES THAT THE OCCUR OUTSIDE THE BUILDING ANGLING & DRIVE THINK LANE. CUSTINGER PARKING, AND TRACH PREF-UP.	TLA ENGINEERING & PLANNING PATRICK LONGTR, CIVIL CHCHAGEA				
			CYABON GE INNA GE OF DOMAN NOT /	2	-	HOLIES OF OPERATION ARE INCREAT-SUMPAS & DAM-MONICUL FOR THE DRIVE ROOM, AND 24 MR	1528 EUREAA ROAD, SUITE HIRI ROSCIALE, CA 93681				1
NITCHEN	ROOM MANE	(1 or - 10	ER HAM ER DY COMMENT ER DY COMPAGN HAL COMPAGN HANGING	a.L.s.	BARCH RESISTANT CHPSUN BOARD	OPERATON FOR THE DRIVE THAT	PHONE: (919) 766-0683				
110	ROOM HUNBER		Placetoni DCR DCR mi	at a	NORTH MIL HERE	tolal header of darloyets an lances such t	CVAL plangtin@tla-inc.com				
(18)	NTEOR OWSES	4.4 0.5 6.0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	PARTICUM DATE OF CALL MACA INDO MACA INDO INT CALSS DOB DA INAL CC 4F (FLAM CC 4F (FLAM CC 4F (FLAM CC 4F (FLAM CC 4F (FLAM CC 4F (FLAM INT) AND INT INT CALSS INT CALSS IN				LANDSCAPE				
	HIDRON PROPER	fut na					MARLA WAISHA RUTH, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT				
	ITEMS SUPPLIED BY OWNER	TUR. 140					NT TULUPA CIRCLE SANTA ROSA, CA 93403				
	TICKS SUPPOCO OT GINOS	COP. 144 TAS 144	CC OF BUSCHET CC OF POSI CC OF STUD				PHONE. (702) 545-1294				DIE
	CATERTOR MATERIAL / FINISH		ERGLASS NOW/DACCO PANEL NOR Shuk (1 Offine								
	CHIERIOR COLOR	FE (94	Office C								1 11-8
(10)2	IN REPHOR ELEVATION	141 80 83 80 54 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	UCE (CARE) Prove BOARD BEARD, CONTRACTOR LINAR(T) LINAR(T) LINAR(T) B BOOM ME-LANDATOR BEAM					1			group
Y Y		41 6AU CLB 9L6	C -LANNAL TED DEAL								
			ADCH								en 70 * 0 * ode mil P.S. Suite A.S. E OCLIER C.A. 9367*
0	DOOR SIMBOL					VICINITY MAP	PROJECT IN	FORMATION			सा साथ बाउ-5358 सन्दर्भ
0	SHEARBALL / ANCHOR BOLT SYMBOL	121 10	De Autorise BOLT				OWNER JACK IN THE BOX, INC.	YEAR BUILT	1985		iphone product corr
	INCHER BULL / INCHER BULT SYMBOL		talan lata Calica				WULDING ADDRESS: 1110 C STREET	LEGAL DESCRIPTION	LOIS T' MAD T & BLOCK	24. OF HORIDA'S ADD TION	
			at a the Back Inc.				LECAL JURSDICTION SAN DEGO, CA APN NUMBER: 534-193-09-000		IN THE EITY OF SAN DECO SIATE OF CALFORNIA, ACC NO. 389, FILED IN THE OFF RECONDER OF SAN DECO	COROING TO MAP THEREOF	SITE INFORMATION
	FOOTING STUBOL		1.0				MPN NUMBER: 534-193-05-000 PLANNING 20HE: CCP0-W		RECORDER OF SAN DECO	COUNTY	WK THPE: 9A_SH2-0PT1 .49 # 0031
0	OETAN, MUMBER						MUNICIPAL CODES: 2007 E.B.C., 2007 C.P.C., 2007 E.W.C., 2007 C.F.C. 2007 C.F.C. AND ALL APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STAT	PARKING RECUMED:	PROJECTS UNDER 30,000 S		ACCRESS.
	SHEET HUNDER	985. 44 983. 845 96. 845 96.22 86	COME BOLT			SITE LOCATION	200T C.F.E. AND ALL APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STAT LAWS AND RECULATIONS		& SPACES + 1 HANDICAP S		SAN DEGD, CA
A							USE/000/PARCT A-2 / HES14/4/4/1	HOURS OF OPEANON	A DO AN TO NOMENT FOR 24 HR OPEANTON FOR ON	DHANG ANEA	5 ULUU, UN
350	MALL SECTION NUMBER / CLEV NO SHEET NUMBER		ECTLEMEDUS Na Smitch Bondo System Sha Ni Pencinolago System Sa Smitch Bondo				CONSTRUCTION TWYC: C-9	FLOOR AREA 4410			DRAMM BT:
Ā			NAL				THIS THIG BUILDING AREA: 2,340 S.F TO BE DEMOLISHED PROPOSED BUILDING AREA: 2,156 S.T		REQUIRED MAXWED 1 PROVIDED 2	15	PHOJECT & _1810007
(1)	BLDG. SECTION NUMBER SHEET NUMBER		- Multe				TOTAL SITE AREA: 10.039 S.F				SCALE:
		01.CL 00	NEA TURNEDUCA. MINISTERI ANNO 7051E HAND CONE			NORTH	LANDSCAPE MRONDED 1.085 S.F.				TITLE
	REVISION STINUOL	onic on	Owe				SCATING: 34 S(475 (INDOOR)				
+	CLEVATION/DATIN WARK					$(\mathbf{x}_{1}, \mathbf{y}_{2}, y$					SHEET
						\bullet					
											1 of 12
											(

ATTACHMENT A





m 2





esign







CONCEPT DESIGN STATEMENT

DESIGN OBECTIVE CHEAT ACLE CHIPLE PITE

DESION ELEMENTS 1 (89 % < 43 - 42 M = 10 M = 1

IPSCHE CLIMN"] MOARS SCREPHILM COLUMN OF REAL PROCESS
SCREPHILM OF REAL PROCESS
</

AB 1881 LANDSCAPE DOCUMENTATION

Q	MDUTC! BITORIAN ROM
	#CEPP R4 80m
	SHIDEOD CA
	"014LUBIOBCAPTIO + INP B.F.
	NEW PROJECT

PROPERTY DAMON - IN COAP Last NEOD - WAS INCOMENDATION - APPLICATING COMING - IN COAP Last NEOD - WAS INCOMENDATION - APPLICATING COMING - APPLICATING - APPLICATIN

A THE PARTY CANENAL THE PARTY NOW SHELT ADDREEDING THEM PROVIDED AT LE UNITED STATES

PIC DIRCY	14.2	MERVICE	ANG.A 5.2 .	LOF (ANCIECNEY MEA	PLANT FACTOR
248	SHYNAME& LANDEVING	0466	11	1074	4
111	THEE Brandisk FRIG	ONP	-	WITHES MAYS	

(a. Mar 1 (12) 1040/03 x 307 (1040/03 x 307 (1040/03 x 307 (1040/03 x 307) (1040/03 x 307)

Sta municipation POST CRADING HORTICLE THIRK, APPRIANEL, RECURSED INFERDED OF PLANT BELOCTION REQUIRED VETV TENT REDUCTS.

CITY REQUIREMENTS MET

CEDWORP OF BURNER HORN

2. You, IER USE = 442 n. F20 (PE a 1442/9 178.8 9 (PE m) 4 1 Mill 20 (PE a 1442/9 178.8 1 Mills Call, YR

CITY OF SAN DEGO

WATER CONSERVATION STATEMENT

5. Herea, an TRE BARG (1 - A ALE DAL, AN 2. Herea, an Tanka - Hank Count, an 2. Herea, an Tanka - Count, and Anno, and Anno Ang 2. Herea, and TRE BARG (1 - A ALE DAL, AN 2. Herea, and TRE BARG (1 - A ALE DAL, AN 3. Herea, and TRE BARG (1 - A ALE DAL, AN 3. Herea, and TRE BARG (1 - A ALE DAL, AN 4. HEREA, AN 4. HEREA,

.

JORGE CILLING HOUSE TO SHERGY CONSERVED HIT'Y THEE SHADING TOURA CONSIGNED AT Y LON TWATER USE PLANTING HON-ILAMMARLE 15OL LA HON LODG ENHACED LANDIG AND VEHICO FROM PUBLIC ARCAS PROMOED ADA-TCHIFLE HEOLTYLICAR ME. HON JAITE HEYAN HE BY A JUSTICE PROVIDED PER THEE - HEY DIVETORIA 7.

 Control (1997)
Control MIS OF VORDE ANEAS SORETHED INTO ST - EX-IP

CITY OF SAN DIEGO WATER CONSERVATION STATEMENT

W BOH TREES 74 45-4004.08.485.48 758-0070 STREET THEE MONES IN SOL PER CORD

TABLE 142-048 PLANT POINT SCHEDULE

Table 142-848 Plant Poigt Schadnie

Propened Pipet Material		Floet Points Achieved per Plant	Proped Pants
Plant Type	Plant Stor		
Proposed Starub	f-gallen	1.0	1141+15
	S-gallon	2.0	96 X 7 = 180
	LS-gallon of larges	14.0	
Proposed Dwarf Palas	Pac floor, of farmon multic foright	3.0	-
Proposed Teer	5-gallen	5.0	
	15-gallan	6.04	
	24-bock box	20.0	
	34-inch finst	500	3 x 90 + 190
	48-tack too and larges	100 0	
Proposed throad I seeded Postiver Palm Sine	Per fost of lerows trank lacight	10	
Proposed Peather Palm Tree	Per fost of broom trush height up in 20 ford in height.	30	
	mech funther palm pro-over 30 feet in buight	0.04	
Proposed I on Pales I rec	Par fact of lowers trank height up v6.20 Part to Josight	1.5	
	each fan paien tree over 54 fant in teaght	300	
		Think	264

Existing Plant Material	Plant Points Achieved	Propet	
Plant Type	Plant Size		
Existing March	12-tech -t 24-tech spread and height	4.0	0
	34-tuch field hopes speend and height	15.0	0
Exasting Hatter Front	2-unit colour manageal = 4 that charte grade	100.0	1
	each nightengi inch bey-and 2 impon	54.8	
Employ Non-Judry Tres	3-lock unique managed in (first above graph	90.0	1 4 90+90
	each additional look beyond 7 landers	25.0	
Existing Bread Clubbed Public Palm Tree	Par fast of Ireyus trank height	50	
Currenting Familiest Pains Treat	Pas sheet of prevent breast, holight up In. 20 fact in helight	30	1
	annis fintipit paks you over 20 fint in bages	9.00	f
Examing Pas Pales Trees	For that of brown trank talget up = 29 fort at height.	LI LI	
	ench fins pains was over find at height	30.0	



SOTA

3. Το τρογούζαι που το τρογούζαται το του το τρογούζαται το τρογούζατα το τρογούζαται το τρογούζοται το τρογούζοτα το τρογούζ

PLAYTER BOX INVERTING ALL REPORTED IN ALL MORATORY KON ANALYSIS CONT ANOLE IN "SECARC" ANNOUNCED BY AND PLAYED INDOMESIAN TONS. If ST TO PLAYE ANNU ILLS!

ርርሱ "የሐር" ጊዜ የኦ በፋርዚያቶርያን ገጋ የቶርካሪካይ የሥር ቢሆኑት የኮና ወን መልገድ ዓዙ 6 የተርንቀት ዕዙ መቅርት, ባር ራሱ የሞርያን ኮ, "ዛሬ ዩሮርስቲው ለዛሬ ቴሪታዊኒቲ ስ ቶርክርዚ, ባር ራሱ "የሞር ይያስታውስ ርስት በ የሞር ርዕርቶ ግርሮ ወሳዮ ዓ.መተናዮያ ራ ነይተዮና የሶ ኮኖ አስጋር ላይይ.

FINAL CERTIFICATION OF THE UNBROATER BETALLATION IS BECKINGD IN THE LANDREAFER AND CONTINUE FOR TO COMPACE LANDREAFER AND FREET IN-ADVESTIGNED FOR TO COMPLETION OF NA-WORK TO ANDREAFE APPENDENT INFORMATION AS AVAILED.

BECHELS, JHET BETTINT HOTELERER IN ALS RUPERS IN OF GREATER AT FREIL BRAUNC, BUL AND HETTING DETM, UN BREET LL SEE CAR, MIELTS FOR UPE CRADING BESICA.

ልሙ «ይታውስ ርጋሥ ብር መሆኑ። በርም «ይታውስ ርጋሥ ብር መሆኑ። በርም የሚያዝሩ ላና የሆኑ የሆኑ በርም ብር መሆኑ። የሚያስት የሚያስት የሚያስት የሚያስት የሚያስት የሚያስት የሚያስት የሚያስት የሚያስት የሚያ በርም የሚያስት የሚያስት

IN CONTRACTOR BASES HAVEN SHE EVENTION AND PROPOSITE SHE FET HE WAS AND INDERY INCONTRACT OF INFO DECADENANCES, SUMPLY TAKEN OF CHEMICAL CONDITIONS WAS SUPPLY THE

H COMBACTOR TO MO 425 A SEAMAN 25 & OFF MENA PROVING A 1 STRUCTURES.

NF CUT

a

ACLEY TO EDD (CENTR) SERVE & LANKING SERVE & LANKING CENTRAL (RADIOLADAL) 2005/01. DO (PLANTIN CALIFORM PERVICA RADIAN SERVE & LANKING CALIFORM DAL 2017/01. DO (PLANTIN CALIFORM) - PERVICA RADIAN SERVE AL 2017/01. DO (PLANTIN SERVEC) - PERVICA DAL 2018/01. DO (PLANTIN SERVEC) - PER

CARE TO BE TANEN TO PROBLE A REPORT AND BEAM AND A REAL AND A

group chilent

6470 THE - HE &A Sal

223. ROCKLIN CA \$5417 Ph [316] 415-5358 a-mod reeara@umdgen; cens

Ray Parts, Andreash

SHE INFORMATION

WA PAPE 94 SW2-OP11

JB # 0031

PMON3 .

9330 84,004 44CM/C SAN DECO, C4 92122

C 2007 Joch in the Box Inc.

has proper private or profitions on the property of any or the fact to one that are not separat in -spratter. If which is a proper writes approach

Barg Sprop of any 2 minute to which by entities 1 protocy do why modulous patients protoci of 3 who may any do solved of the damage damage is for table down of minute damage damage is for table down of minute patients of the patient listing and the patient patient listing patie

OAILS

REFASE: NOV 12, 2002

P# UPESITS JUN 5, 7010

2_

3____

REVISIONS

MRLA

11000

-

YIII UPA CIRCIS Rofa cal Potofia 4640

SUBMITINE DATE. 1 .84 4 6, 2010

00%5"RUC" (00

Δ

A

^

- 4 ALL MUTCHER, S AND EQUIPHEND PARTY OF HELL BE PREVED AND HELL ALE ON SHORE IN THE DE MEAS AND AS DESCRIBED IN THE SPECIFICATIONS EXCEPT AN INCOME STOLEN AND INSTALLED AND SHORE IN THE DE MEAS AND AS DESCRIBED
- n / A setted set at, bin 1 is TOP ORDADD AIR + x if reservablings or 12 at no round council or reprint an even of board.

NEWALKY STREET WICLS	+35.74.
CHINEWAY OUTS AND FIRE INCOLUNTS	+1 19.
UTBUTY BOARS MANAGER AND OTHER WELTTY SAVE TS. TOLEPHONE AND OTHER UTUTY POLISICAR AND MATER VETER AND MATE	* 1#1,
INTERIOR C PICINIE	4.25.FL
Mar HC SQuee 6	+ 30 FROM 31 B
STREET LIGHTS	IB Cl

- N ALL SATIACE WO SUB-BURACE IN BUS CHARNESS STRUCTURES AND PATTERING BARLINE WANTANES
- H. 4. KCP-GPD1 M/RCMPI HIM. THINKE? (CONTRACTOR VE 1 HE RETAINED 1.3 PERFORM ROUTER LANCE SUPPLE INCLUDING FOR STREET INELS. INC. ALL INDUSTANCE TO 29 PER CITY CODE.
- 11 LOCATIONS AND GLINA WHE'S OF EXECTING EXAMPLICATE NO TOTAL 2 AND APPROXIMITY.

AJOALSS 1010 C STREET SAN DIEGO. C4 OFFENS BE

PPOECE # 10007 LANDSCAPE

CALCULATIONS

5 OF 12

LANDSCAPE CONSTRUCTION NOTES EXMINALTION IS TO EXMEDIT A FIT O BY AT 6 AND IS TO BE FAMILIAR WITH DA EXERCISE AND PROPERTIES JULIET IND BUILDING AND IT A SAFE PROFE TO \$1481 (FIT WORK, M & AND/FITCHING, STR A MID AND US 6 A AND. CONTINUETOR SHALL I CRUTTE A: & RESTRIC UNITED ADD UNEARLY MONTH'S AND ATTC' OF ANY CONT. KTS. OPATING FOR SHALL I CRUTTE CARDON WAS A VIOLAND A THE VICINITY OF UNDERCORDED UNLIFIES.

- очинии по выда 1 изида счинов неи казана и та стоят от дискотора иделя стана. В собякства за располяда, така и тема на царкита, маката по станатора на станатора и по водата по станатора и казана и по станатора и по станатора на правита по водата станатора на станатора по станатора на постанатора и казана и по станатора на постанатора на правита по водата станатора на правита раска за се на правитора на правито на станатора на правита по водата на правита раска в насе, по станатора на правита на правита по водата по водата по такатора на правита раска в насе, по станатора на правита сила в насе, по станатора на правита на п

- 6 METER TO ANOHITECTURAL AND DAM, PLANS FOR DESCRIPTIONS IF DUSING HIS MODELED AND PLANS & CREETING THE POLLOWING WORKING SETSAGE DESTANCES FOR THEE PLANTING

EN STREET TALLS	* 35.39.
WY OUTS AND FIRE MORANTS	-117.
BOARS MANAROLE AND OTHER WELTER AND MARKED VELTER AND MARKS	* 1 <i>#</i> 1,
I-CHONE	135.
C BOHH 6	+ 38 FROM 21 BHCA



SCALE 1"=10"-0"

6 of 12

٦





SCALE 1"+10'-0"

CHESTING DRIVENIN'S WITH CUR (2) BO NTA

(2) DAL STREES WARNAUCHTS AND COLORE OTT SAME

 \mathbb{A}

۲

SCALE: 1"=10"-0" SITE PLAN

7 of 12

٦





8 of 12





-









West Elevation



Jack in the Box JIB#0031 1110 C STREET San Dicgo, CA



Clear Ar



East Elevation



Jack in the Box JIB#0031 1110 C STREET San Diego, CA





ATTACHMENT B









California 4470 Yankee Hill Rd. Suite 110 Rocklin, CA. 95677

P. 916-415-5358 F. 916-303-4340

Washington 1325 NW Whitman St. Camas, WA. 98607

P. 360.834.6536

Arizona 1425 N First Street Suite 101 Phoenix, AZ. 85004

www.pmdginc.com

In Partnership With Our Clients Pedro + McCracken Design Group, Inc.

j

April 13, 2011

Center City Development Corporation

RE: Jack in the Box 1110 C Street - Findings for PDP

Dear Development Services,

This letter will address the PDP draft finding as required by the Center City Planned District Ordinance and San Diego Land Development Code section 126.0604.

Jack in the Box has chosen to demolish their existing store and reconstruct a new Jack in the Box at this location. Jack in the Box has a long term lease on this site and does not plan to vacate the location anytime in the near future. By rebuilding the existing use the project will not meet all sections of the Center City Planned District Ordinance and Land Development Code but the proposed building and site improvements are a significant upgrade to the existing facility.

Instead of doing general maintenance to the existing building they would like to construct a new building that will be more attractive to patrons and fit in with the growth of the surrounding area. The existing Jack in the Box building on this site was originally constructed in 1965. The building is a very plain with white paint, a red standing seam metal roof, flat fascias, and a greenhouse. The building design is dated and is not very aesthetically pleasing. The proposed site plan and elevations will address many of the existing sites shortcomings and will be a definite improvement to the circulation on the site, through the drive thru, and the parking areas.

Deviations from Center City Planned District Ordinance

Land Use District: Residential Emphasis – Project will not have any residential.

Commercial Street Overlay: Commercial Street Overlay (-CS) – Project will be 100% commercial.

Limited Vehicle Access: On C Street and 11th Avenue – Existing curb cuts are not being modified. No additional curb cuts will be added.

Building Height Minimum: 45' above ground level – Proposed building is 21' to top of parapet. 13'-11" to top of roof deck.

improvement to the existing facility. High quality construction materials are proposed and the building will better fit into the downtown district.

(5) Any proposed deviations pursuant to Section 126.0602(b)(1) are appropriate for this location and will result in a more desirable project then be achieved if designed in strict conformance with the development regulations of the applicable zone.

Jack in the Box is proposing to make a substantial investment to improve the existing facility. This is an improvement project so strict conformance to the development standards should not be employed on this type of submittal. The deviations from the development standards already exist on the site and will continue to exist even if this project as submitted is not approved. The substantial improvements proposed will result in a more desirable project than the current existing condition.

Respectfully,

ł

David Lundy PM Design Group

M:\Jack in the Box\JIB10007 San Diego #31\Documents\PDP letter 4-13-11.doc

San Diego Municipal Code Final per City Council Action February 28, 2006





ATTACHMENT D

San Diego Municipal Code

Chapter 15: Planned Districts

Final per City Council Action February 28, 2006



Ch.	Art	Div.	
15	1	3	86

Jack in the Box Board of Directors

David L. Goebel Murray H. Hutchison Madeleine Kleiner Linda A. Lang Michael W. Murphy James M. Myers David M. Tehle Wendy M. Webb John T. Wyatt

Jack in the Box Corporate Governance

Linda A. Lang, CEO & President Lenny Comma, Executive Vice President Jerry P. Rebel, Chief Financial Officer Philip H. Rudolph, General Counsel Terri E. Graham, Senior Vice President Mark H. Blankenship, Senior Vice President & CAO Carol D. Raimo, VP of Investor Relations

ATTACHMENT E

RECORDING REQUESTED BY:

Centre City Development Corporation Architecture & Planning Division 401 B Street, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92101

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

Centre City Development Corporation Attn: Architecture & Planning 401 B Street, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92101

THIS SPACE FOR RECORDER'S USE ONLY NOTE: COUNTY RECORDER, PLEASE RECORD AS RESTRICTION USE OR DEVELOPMENT OF REAL PROPERTY AFFECTING THE TITLE TO OR POSSESSION THEREOF

CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT PERMIT/ PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT No. 2011-04 Jack in the Box - 1110 C Street (APN#534-193-05)
City of San Diego Planning Commission CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 Jack in the Box - 1110 C Street

WHEREAS, Victoria Land Partners L.P./Jack in the Box, Inc., Owner/Permittee, filed an application for a Centre City Development Corporation Development Permit/Planned Development Permit (CCDP/PDP) No. 2011-04 to allow the demolition of an existing drive-thru/walk-up restaurant and construction of a new, approximately 2,156 square-foot, drive-thru/walk-up restaurant, including outdoor dining, with deviations to the development regulations of the Centre City Planned District Ordinance (CCPDO), located at 1110 C Street within the East Village neighborhood of the Downtown Community Plan Area and more particularly describes in "Exhibit A" in the City of San Diego, State of California, according to map thereof made on file in the office of the County Recorder of San Diego; and,

WHEREAS, on December 8, 2011 the City of San Diego Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing and considered CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04, including a staff report and recommendation, and public testimony, and granted CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 pursuant to Sections 156.0304 (e)(D) of the CCPDO and Sections 126.0601-126.0604 of the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC); and,

WHEAREAS, the project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 Replacement or Reconstruction (Class 2) and Section 15303 New Construction (Class 3). Class 2 applies to replacement or reconstruction of commercial structure with a new structure of substantially the same size, purpose and capacity and Class 3 applies to construction of new structures under 10,000 square feet in floor area. The project consists of the demolition and reconstruction of a new 2,156 square foot restaurant and, therefore, the Class 2 and Class 3 exemptions are applicable.

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

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FINDINGS

1. The proposed development is consistent with the Downtown Community Plan, Centre City Redevelopment Plan, Centre City Planned District Ordinance, San Diego Land Development Code, and all other adopted plans and policies of the City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency pertaining to the Centre City Planned District.

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FINDINGS

- 1. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan.
- 2. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 JACK IN THE BOX

3. The proposed use or development will comply to the maximum extent feasible with the regulations of the Land Development Code including any deviations pursuant to Section 126.0602(b)(1) that are appropriate for this location and will result in a more desirable project than would be achieved if designed in strict conformance with the development regulations of the applicable zone, and any allowable deviations that are otherwise authorized pursuant to the Land Development Code.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that based on the above Findings hereinbefore adopted by the City of San Diego Planning Commission; that CCDP/PDP No. 2011-04 is hereby GRANTED to the Owner/Permittee to construct and operate uses as described and identified by size, dimension, quantity, type and location as follows and on the approved exhibits on file in the offices of the Centre City Development Corporation subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit.

1. General

The Owner/Permittee shall construct, or cause to be constructed on the site, the construction of a new replacement 2,156 square-foot, single-story (21-foot-tall) restaurant with a drive-thru, including seven off-street parking spaces at 1110 C Street within the East Village Neighborhood of the Downtown Community Plan Area.

2. Planned Development Permit

The City of San Diego Planning Commission hereby grants a Planned Development Permit (PDP) allowing for the following deviations:

- a. Deviations from the following development standards of the CCPDO:
 - 1. Section 156.0307(a) (7) Deviation to the Land Use Percentage Requirements of the Residential Emphasis (RE) District of a minimum of 80 percent residential and maximum 20 percent non-residential uses to allow 100 percent commercial use within the RE District.
 - 2. Section 156.0309 (a) Reductions to the Base Minimum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 6.0 to 0.21 FAR.
 - 3. Section 156.0310 Deviations to the Development Regulations for new construction including, but not limited to, minimum street wall height, ground floor heights, commercial space depth and lot coverage.
 - 4. Section 156.0313(1) (2) Deviations to the Vehicular Access requirements of the CCPDO requiring a maximum 40 linear feet of curb cut for the site and a maximum 20 foot curb cut for driveways serving up to ten cars to allow the existing curb cuts to remain and driveway dimensions to be reduced to a size acceptable to the City of San Diego Engineering Department.

PLANNING AND DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

3. Urban Design Standards

The proposed development, including its architectural design concepts and off-site improvements, shall be consistent with the CCPDO and Centre City Streetscape Manual. These standards, together with the following specific conditions, will be used as a basis for evaluating the development through all stages of the development process.

- a. Architectural Standards The architecture of the development shall establish a high quality of design and complement the design and character of the East Village Neighborhood and the site's location along C Street as shown in the approved Basic Concept/Schematic Drawings on file with the Corporation. The development shall utilize a coordinated color scheme consistent with the approved Basic Concept/Schematic Drawings.
- b. Form and Scale The development shall consist of an one-story building with a maximum building height of 21 feet measured to the top of the parapet, with roof equipment enclosures, elevator penthouses, and mechanical screening above this height permitted per the Centre City PDO and the FAA. All building elements shall be complementary in form, scale, and architectural style.
- c. Elevations The development shall minimize the appearance of continuous solid walls on the east and west elevation by providing glazing, off-set planes, reveals, texture and distinct material/colors to create shadowing and texture, as shown in the Basic Concept/Schematic Drawings.
- d. Building Materials All building materials shall be of a high quality utilizing stone, tile and/or metal panels as approved by CCDC. No stucco or plaster materials shall be used on the building walls. All materials and installation shall exhibit high-quality design, detailing, and construction execution to create a durable and high quality finish. The base of the buildings shall be clad in upgraded materials and carry down to within 1 (one) inch of finish sidewalk grade. Any stone materials shall employ larger modules such as 12" x 24" and full-corner profiles to create a substantial and non-veneer appearance. All downspouts, exhaust caps, and other additive elements shall be superior grade for urban locations, carefully composed to reinforce the architectural design. Reflectivity of the glass shall be the minimum reflectivity required by Title 24.

All construction details shall be highest standard and executed to minimize weathering, eliminate staining, and not cause deterioration of materials on adjacent properties or the public right of way. No substitutions of materials or colors shall be permitted without the prior written consent of the Corporation. A final materials board which illustrates the location, color, quality, and texture of proposed exterior materials shall be submitted with 100% Construction Drawings

and shall be consistent with the materials board approved with the Basic Concept/ Schematic Drawings.

- e. Street Level Design Street level windows shall be clear glass and may be lightly tinted. Architectural features such as awnings and other design features which add human scale to the streetscape are encouraged where they are consistent with the design theme of the structure.
- f. Utilitarian Areas Areas housing trash, recycling, storage, or other utility services shall be completely concealed from view of the public right-of-way and adjoining developments, except for utilities required to be exposed by the City or utility company. The development shall provide trash and recyclable material storage areas per Municipal Code Sections 142.0810 and 142.0820. Such areas shall be provided within an enclosed area and shall be kept clean and orderly at all times. The development shall implement a recycling program to provide for the separation of recyclable materials from the non-recyclable trash materials.
- g. Circulation and Parking The Owner/Permittee shall prepare a plan which identifies the location of curbside parking control zones, parking meters, fire hydrants, trees, and street lights. Such plan shall be submitted in conjunction with 100% Construction Drawings.
- h. Open Space/Project Amenities A landscape plan that illustrates the relationship of the proposed on and off-site improvements and the location of water, and electrical hookups shall be submitted with 100% Construction Drawings.
- i. Roof Tops A rooftop equipment and appurtenance location and screening plan shall be prepared and submitted with 100% Construction Drawings. Any roof top mechanical equipment must be grouped, enclosed, and screened from surrounding views.
- j. Signage All signs shall comply with the City of San Diego Sign Regulations and the CCPDO. No pole signs shall be permitted.
- k. Lighting A lighting plan which highlights the architectural qualities of the proposed development and also enhances the lighting of the public right-of-way shall be submitted with 100% Construction Drawings. All lighting shall be designed to avoid illumination of adjoining properties.
- Noise Control All mechanical equipment, including but not limited to, air conditioning, heating and exhaust systems, shall comply with the City of San Diego Noise Ordinance and California Noise Insulation Standards as set forth in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. All mechanical equipment shall be located to mitigate noise and exhaust impacts on adjoining development, particularly residential. Owner/Permittee shall provide evidence of compliance at 100% Construction Drawings.

- m. Energy Considerations The design of the improvements shall include, where feasible, energy conservation construction techniques and design, including cogeneration facilities, and active and passive solar energy design. The Owner/Permittee shall demonstrate consideration of such energy features during the review of the 100% Construction Drawings.
- n. Street Address Building address numbers shall be provided that are visible and legible from the public right-of-way.
- 4. Off-Site Parking

Owner/Permittee shall maintain a minimum of seven off-street parking spaces on the property at all times in the approximate locations shown on the approved Exhibit "A." Further, all on-site parking stalls and aisle widths shall be in compliance with requirements of the City's Land Development Code. 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 decision maker in accordance with the SDMC.

- 5. Drive Thru
 - a. Owner/Permittee shall maintain adequate space to allow a minimum of three cars to be stacked on-site up to and including the area in front of the menu board/order station to avoid queuing along the C Street right-of-way.
 - b. The driveway located along C Street shall be utilized as a one-way entry only and shall be signed, including permanent markings.
- 6. On-Site Improvements

All off-site and on-site improvements shall be designed as part of an integral site development. An on-site improvement plan shall be submitted with the 100% Construction Drawings. Any on-site landscaping shall establish a high quality of design and be sensitive to landscape materials and design planned for the adjoining public rights-of-way.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, LANDSCAPING AND UTILITY REQUIREMENTS

7. Off-Site Improvements

The following public improvements shall be installed in accordance with the Centre City Streetscape Manual. The Manual is currently being updated and the Owner/Permittee shall install the appropriate improvements according to the latest requirements at the time of Building Permit issuance:

	C Street	11th Avenue
Paving	Standard Paving	Gateway Paving
Street Trees	Carrot Wood	Jacaranda
Street Lights	Standard Lights	Gateway Lights

All trees shall be planted at a minimum 36-inch box size with tree grates provided as specified in the Centre City Streetscape Manual, and shall meet the requirements of Title 24. Tree spacing shall be accommodated after street lights have been sited, and generally spaced 20 to 25 feet on center. All landscaping shall be irrigated with private water service from the subject property.

The Owner/Permittee will be responsible for evaluating, with consultation with the Corporation, whether any existing trees within the right-of-way shall be maintained and preserved. No trees shall be removed prior to obtaining a Tree Removal Permit from the Development Services Department per City Council Policy 200-05.

- a. Street Lights All existing lights shall be evaluated to determine if they meet current Corporation and City requirements, and shall be modified or replaced if necessary.
- b. Sidewalk Paving Any specialized paving materials shall be approved through the execution of an Encroachment Removal and Maintenance Agreement with the City.
- c. Landscaping All required landscaping shall be maintained in a disease, weed and litter free condition at all times. If any required landscaping (including existing or new plantings, hardscape, landscape features, etc.) indicated on the approved construction documents is damaged or removed during demolition or construction, it shall be repaired and/or replaced in kind and equivalent in size per the approved documents and to the satisfaction of the Centre City Development Corporation within 30 days of damage or Certificate of Occupancy.
- d. On-Street Parking The Owner/Permittee shall maximize the on-street parking wherever feasible.
- e. Public Utilities The Owner/Permittee shall be responsible for the connection of on-site sewer, water and storm drain systems from the development to the City Utilities located in the public right-of-way. Sewer, water, and roof drain laterals shall be connected to the appropriate utility mains within the street and beneath the sidewalk. The Owner/Permittee may use existing laterals if acceptable to the City, and if not, Owner/Permittee shall cut and plug existing laterals at such places and in the manner required by the City, and install new laterals. Private sewer laterals require an Encroachment Maintenance and Removal Agreement.

All roof drainage and sump drainage, if any, shall be connected to the storm drain system in the public street, or if no system exists, to the street gutters through sidewalk underdrains. Such underdrains shall be approved through an Encroachment Removal Agreement with the City. The Owner/Permittee shall comply with the City of San Diego Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Ordinance and the storm water pollution prevention requirements of Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 and Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 2 of the Land Development Code.

- f. Franchise Public Utilities The Owner/Permittee shall be responsible for the installation or relocation of franchise utility connections including, but not limited to, gas, electric, telephone and cable, to the development and all extensions of those utilities in public streets. Existing franchised utilities located above grade serving the property and in the sidewalk right-of-way shall be removed and incorporated into the adjoining development where feasible.
- g. Fire Hydrants If required, the Owner/Permittee shall install fire hydrants at locations satisfactory to the City of San Diego Fire Department and Development Services Department.
- h. Water Meters and Backflow Preventers The Owner/Permittee shall locate all water meters and backflow preventers in locations satisfactory to the Public Utilities Department and Corporation. Backflow preventers shall be located outside of the public right-of-way adjacent to the development's water meters, either within the building, a recessed alcove area, or within a plaza or landscaping area. The devices shall be screened from view from the public right-of-way. All items of improvement shall be performed in accordance with the technical specifications, standards, and practices of the City of San Diego's Engineering, Public Utilities and Building Inspection Departments and shall be subject to their review and approval. Improvements shall meet the requirements of Title 24 of the State Building Code.
- 8. Removal and/or Remedy of Soil and/or Water Contamination

The Owner/Permittee shall (at its own cost and expense) remove and/or otherwise remedy as provided by law and implementing rules and regulations, and as required by appropriate governmental authorities, any contaminated or hazardous soil and/or water conditions on the Site. Such work may include without limitation the following:

a. Remove (and dispose of) and/or treat any contaminated soil and/or water on the site (and encountered during installation of improvements in the adjacent public rights-of-way which the Owner/Permittee is to install) as necessary to comply with applicable governmental standards and requirements.

- b. Design construct all improvements on the site in a manner which will assure protection of occupants and all improvements from any contamination, whether in vapor or other form, and/or from the direct and indirect effects thereof.
- c. Prepare a site safety plan and submit it to the appropriate governmental agency, Corporation, and other authorities for approval in connection with obtaining a building permit for the construction of improvements on the site. Such site safety plan shall assure workers and other visitors to the site of protection from any health and safety hazards during development and construction of the improvements. Such site safety plan shall include monitoring and appropriate protective action against vapors and/or the effect thereof.
- d. Obtain from the County of San Diego and/or California Regional Water Quality Control Board and/or any other authorities required by law any permits or other approvals required in connection with the removal and/or remedy of soil and/or water contamination, in connection with the development and construction on the site.
- e. If required due to the presence of contamination, an impermeable membrane or other acceptable construction alternative shall be installed beneath the foundation of the building. Drawings and specifications for such vapor barrier system shall be submitted for review and approval by the appropriate governmental authorities.

STANDARD REQUIREMENTS

9. Environmental Impact Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

As required by the San Diego Municipal Code Section 156.0304 (f), the development shall comply with all applicable MMRP measures from the 2006 Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Downtown Community Plan.

10. Development Impact Fees

The development will be subject to Centre City Development Impact Fees. For developments containing commercial space(s) the Owner/Permittee shall provide to the City's Facilities Financing Department the following information at the time of application for building permit plan check: 1) total square footage for commercial lease spaces and all areas within the building dedicated to support those commercial spaces including, but not limited to: loading areas, service areas and corridors, utility rooms, and commercial parking areas; and 2) applicable floor plans showing those areas outlined for verification. In addition, it shall be responsibility of the Owner/Permittee to provide all necessary documentation for receiving any "credit" for existing buildings to be removed.

11. Construction Fence

Owner/Permittee shall install a construction fence pursuant to specifications of, and a permit from, the City Engineer. The fence shall be solid plywood with wood framing, painted a consistent color with the development's design, and shall contain a pedestrian passageway, signs, and lighting as required by the City Engineer. The fencing shall be maintained in good condition and free of graffiti at all times.

12. Development Identification Signs

Prior to commencement of construction on the Site, the Owner/Permittee shall prepare and install, at its cost and expense, one sign on the barricade around the site which identifies the development. The sign shall be at least four (4) feet by six (6) feet and be visible to passing pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The signs shall at a minimum include:

- --- Color rendering of the development
- --- Development name
- --- Developer
- --- Completion Date
- --- For information call ____

The sign shall also contain the Corporation "Paradise in Progress" logo and the Downtown Construction Hotline phone number. Additional development signs may be provided around the perimeter of the site. All signs shall be limited to a maximum of 160 square feet per street frontage. Graphics may also be painted on any barricades surrounding the site. All signs and graphics shall be submitted to the Corporation for approval prior to installation.

- 13. This Centre City Development 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 (EOT) has been granted. Any such EOT must meet all SDMC and CCPDO requirements in effect at the time of extension are considered by the appropriate decision maker.
- 14. Issuance of this Permit by the Centre City Development Corporation does not authorize the Owner/Permittee for this Permit to violate any Federal, State or City laws, ordinances, regulations or policies.
- 15. 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.
- 16. This development shall comply with the standards, policies, and requirements in effect at the time of approval of this development, including any successor(s) or new policies,

financing mechanisms, phasing schedules, plans and ordinances adopted by the City of San Diego.

- 17. No permit for construction, operation, or occupancy of any facility or improvement described herein shall be granted, nor shall any activity authorized by this Permit be conducted on the premises until this Permit is recorded in the Office of the San Diego County Recorder.
- The Owner/Permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its agents, 18. 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.

APPROVED by the City of San Diego Planning Commission on December 8, 2011

AUTHENTICATED BY THE CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Lucy	Contreras
Senio	r Planner

Note: Notary Acknowledgement 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.

Jack in the Box, Inc. Owner/Permittee

By: ____

NAME TITLE

Note: Notary Action Action Note: Notary Action Notary Action Note: Notary Action Not

S:\Contreras\DEVREV\Jack in the Box\Jack in the Box CCDPPDP 2011-04.doc



MK9A_SM2 1110 C STREET SAN DIEGO, CA

	END & ABBREVIATIONS		DEFERRED SUBMITTALS	PLANNING NOTES	SHEET INDEX (1014. OF 15 SHEETS	RELEASE: HOV. 12, 2005
EXTORN DAA EXTORN DAAA EXTORN DAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA	RALL LOCKTORE ALL LOCKTORE ADVA & ADVA & A		THE FOLLOWING OOCUMENTS WILL BE SUBMITTED AT A FUTURE DATE:	THE FOLLOWING ARE ARCHITECTURAL & SITE REVIEW CONDITIONS:	ALEXADAL Larki I. H.K. SHE(T) Jariz A.L.S. Sum(T) Jariz J.K. Sum (T) Jariz J.S. Sum (T) Jariz J.K. Sum (T)	Supertru, du R. k. <u>ALE 17, 2010</u> 2. <u>ALE 17, 2010</u> 2. <u>ALE 47, 2010</u> 3. <u>ALE 47, 201</u>
	CONT. Construction can't CONT. Construction can't CONT. Construction can't Contre. Construction Contre. Construction Constr	Up PF PF V Normany Barrowski Normany Barrowski V 4 Normany Barrowski Normany Barrowski V 5 Normany Barrowski Normany Barrowski <td>HE PROPAGE MALECT HOLIDES HE COMPLEX COMPLEX OF DESIDE 2.248 SOLMA (FOI HOC IN HE DO RETAINANT BIS DAY, BAN AND DOESBLETDE D' 5 HER 2.158 SOLMA (FOI HOC IN ESTAINANT BIS BAN-BAN OF DE GOM WILL MODIO LUBEDOING, PARES FOR THE EIN-C-MAR AND BULLINES, ACT BACK OKLUBAR, MR MARKS PACES OF DE GOM WILL MODIO LUBEDOING, PARES FOR THE EIN-C-MAR AND BULLINES, ACT BACK OKLUBAR, MR MARKS PACES OF DE GOM WILL MODIO SOLVAND OF STRET BILE ALDO 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO OF STRET BILE ALDO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL STRET BILE ALDO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL STRET BILE AL DO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL STRET BILE AL DO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL STRET BILE AL DO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL DO. 1154 ADDRE ADDRE</td> <td>ARCHITECT: OWNER: PM DESCIN GROUP, INC. JACK IN THE BOX AND TEXCEL, MODERCI, MARK DESCIN, MARKOR JACK IN THE BOX AND TEXCEL, MIL, RO, SURE 220 Mark DODORBON, CONST. MARKOR AND TEXCEL, MIL, RO, SURE 220 MARK DODORBON, CONST. MARKOR MODUL, C. (M. 85477 SAM BEDO, CA MODUL Product, (mil, B) 135–3386 PHOME (198) 208–8024 Product (mil) 135–3386 PHOME (198) 208–8024 TradeRERE, Cam Mark MagenboomBjackMithules com CVM. ENDORERENC, CA SOME 100 PHOME (198) 208–8024 MODUL, CA SOME 100 PHOME (198) 208–8024 MODUL, SNA, SURE 100 PHOME (198) 208–8025</td> <td></td> <td></td>	HE PROPAGE MALECT HOLIDES HE COMPLEX COMPLEX OF DESIDE 2.248 SOLMA (FOI HOC IN HE DO RETAINANT BIS DAY, BAN AND DOESBLETDE D' 5 HER 2.158 SOLMA (FOI HOC IN ESTAINANT BIS BAN-BAN OF DE GOM WILL MODIO LUBEDOING, PARES FOR THE EIN-C-MAR AND BULLINES, ACT BACK OKLUBAR, MR MARKS PACES OF DE GOM WILL MODIO LUBEDOING, PARES FOR THE EIN-C-MAR AND BULLINES, ACT BACK OKLUBAR, MR MARKS PACES OF DE GOM WILL MODIO SOLVAND OF STRET BILE ALDO 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO OF STRET BILE ALDO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL STRET BILE ALDO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL STRET BILE AL DO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL STRET BILE AL DO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL STRET BILE AL DO. 1154 ADDRE. MICHODO UNEX-LATINGE BOSTALINO AL DO. 1154 ADDRE	ARCHITECT: OWNER: PM DESCIN GROUP, INC. JACK IN THE BOX AND TEXCEL, MODERCI, MARK DESCIN, MARKOR JACK IN THE BOX AND TEXCEL, MIL, RO, SURE 220 Mark DODORBON, CONST. MARKOR AND TEXCEL, MIL, RO, SURE 220 MARK DODORBON, CONST. MARKOR MODUL, C. (M. 85477 SAM BEDO, CA MODUL Product, (mil, B) 135–3386 PHOME (198) 208–8024 Product (mil) 135–3386 PHOME (198) 208–8024 TradeRERE, Cam Mark MagenboomBjackMithules com CVM. ENDORERENC, CA SOME 100 PHOME (198) 208–8024 MODUL, CA SOME 100 PHOME (198) 208–8024 MODUL, SNA, SURE 100 PHOME (198) 208–8025		
	F & A. FLOOR RANK F < A.	ri 1000 na 10,00 aq 40,4	NITA MARTI OF DATIONES 14 NITA MARTI OF DATIONES ON LANCET SAFE &	CMAL planginBlo-inc.com LANDSCAPE: MRLA MMSHA MUTH, LANDCLAPE ARCHITECT ION TULAP CORLE SANTA ROSA, CA 55405 PROME: (207) 554-1299 molendadButCant		
1 7008MC STMERA 1 7008MC STMERA 1 1 7008MC STMERA 1	CHOR 50.7 STM00. R 2 / 1/LY HO MER 2 / 1/LY HO HO 2 / 1/LY			OWNER: ACK IN THE BOX, INC. BULLONG ACCORESS 1118 & STREET LICEL, LANSSOTTON SAN RECO. C.A. APH HUNBER: SAN RECO. C.A. APH HUNBER: SAN RECO. C.A. MANIMUM BONG: COPO-B MANIMUM CODES: SOT E.B.C., 2007 C.A.C., 2007 C.A.C., 2007 E.C.C., 2007 C.A.C.,	YCAR BULL: 1983 LEGAL DESCRIPTION: LOTS T AND T IN RUCC 24. OF HORTON'S ADDIDO STATE OF CALFORNAL ACCODENCE TO MAR HOREO STATE OF CALFORNAL ACCODENCE TO MAR HOREO MO. 386 FRUE No. New CORE OF MAR COMPTY RECOMPLY OF SAM OCCO COUNTY ELEMENT SPECIAL CONTY - UNCODENCE TO SAM OCCO STATE OF CALFORNAL ACCODENCE TO MAR HOREO	Pr. Mile 416-338 machrobionada Nachrobionada 14 * 168a surver SITE INFORMATION WE TIPE: <u>99_542=0P11</u> all £ <u>00.51</u> A00658 1110 C STREE? SAN DEGO, CB
	under und en (4) manager 0 5 en (50 searc) 0 7 en (50 searc) 0 7 en (50 searc) 0 8 en			USING UR THE T-4 EXESTING URANGE AREA: 2.154 57. TO BE DEMOUSHED PROPOSED BULERIC AREA: 2.154 57. TOTAL BITE AREA: 10,038 57. LANGSENER PROVIDED: LABS 57. SEATING: 34 SEATS (BODOR)	PLOOM AREA RETRO: RECOMPECT LANSING TO RECOMPECT LANSING 10 RECOMPECT	MOUTE F ATTONY

ATTACHMENT B







BINGING S

1330 BALBOA EVENUE SAN DEGO, CA 92123

© 2007 Jack in the Box In

Po de property of and a top for

DATES

A UPDATES AN 5 2010

2

3

REVISIONS

ANT A MANY A MAN

I'S RILLA ROAD STITF IN

799-4E etzat %a.me

a a a

group

ohite

EDELIN CA 9567

15 (14) 415-5258 0-1002 10-10-025-10-025-1-1-125

In Page Argund

MK THE 94 SW2-DPIT

IIID C STREET

SAN DIEGO. Ca

9CALE 1*=10'-0"

PRELIMINARY

GRADING PLAN

3 of 12

DRAIN IN: PROJECT # 1010007

esign

HOY 12, 2001

1: JAY 6, 70"

2243138

BATTAL DATE:

INSTRUCTION

 Δ







CONCEPT DESIGN STATEMENT

DESKIN CRECTINE

LE CREATE A CREATINA HIRECETAN DIGUGAT TOLERANT LANDELANT AND IS 1981

DESKON BLEMENTS

LOW MATTER THE PLANTINGS AND IN TO INDIAN IS AND ADDRESS MATE AND BULLED AND ADDRESS FOR ANTEREST AND PLAN COMBINER WITHIN S

MICHE BUILDING VELIDE Mag. int of column NOVER SHOE AND DREET WERE

AB 1881 LANDSCAPE DOCUMENTATION

-----------SAN BIRD

HIGH CONTRACT SAVESAVES AND ACCESS

MINOROME	-		1000A	N.OF UNRECHT	PLANE FACTOR
ra.		CRP	141 41	-	
LW	1945. SAID.078	-	-	-	

MORA-GUER DALVE ETALLAS & (LARLAS) E786+68 3 MP E786+71 JR3 (64,781

-----POLE ADVIDUEL VOCACIA RUBAL APPRAISE, RECLAREN RE-ENRANJER OF FLATF BELECHDA-RECLAREN RET REBLATS

CITY REQUIREMENTS MET

Ø

Ø

eí

Order-seveno

NO IMPAINT PLANTS CEED

- Aunts chourse a -reasones The statement of a state of the Augusta (1974) A Control (1974)
 Augusta (1 Ø ... PING POINTS REQUIRED POLICES OF STREET et 1405 3 65 F0072 + 45-P0073 7842 MINI 1475 3 65 F0074 + 151 F02875 APPLICABLE ADDILARCING MET POR TABLE VISION VIETNER ED NO POR VIETNER ING 161415 - MALE BATHER SE OF EACH PARENTS HE FORMTS-PER 27 JOH ALL ANEAS 0 99405 THE OF YORK AND A STREET WAS A STREET OF A STATE THE WE AND SHO MOUCHE HAN IS TALL AT
 - ------

CITY OF SAN DEGO WATER CONS

- 5 xm240t Ldd + 307.5 303 507 3 m3404 + 50,34 + (30.4),4 1 500 50 / 5 m3 + 11,664 60,700

CITY OF SAN DIEGO WATER CONSERVATION STATEMENT

40444, 40470 202022 - 52,00 50,01 40444, 40470 202 - 590 60,75 94-50 2020546 (202075 - 52 4040 54) 24077 1950-701 649702 704 440500000,010 54027 (4400

TABLE 142-048 PLANT POINT SCHEDULE

Table 142-048 Plant Point Schodole

Proposed First Material		Plant Palats Achieved per Plant	Project Peerla
Planat Vype	Plant Size		
Proposed Sizedo	1-gallers	1.0	18 X 8 w17
	3-galita	2.0	16 X F = 180
	U-galian as larger	12,0	
Proposed Doveri Palm	Per four of terring trank. Indight	2.0	
Proposed Tree	5-galain	3.6	
	15-gallion	19-4	
	24-rinch base	29.0	
	36-ledition	50.0	7 = .00 = 190
	44-lack box seet larger	190.0	
Proposed Broad Humini Feather Palm Tree	Per feac of insura truth taright	510	
Proposel Paginer Palae Tran	Fer float of brown trank bright up to 25 fant as brought	80	
	mails forther paint per over 30 feet as Inciple	64.8	
Properted Fain Palan Tree	Per feet of breas truck height to 30 feet in bright	13	
	stack this paint true over 30 fast to height	36.0	
		Belef	367

Extering Fluid Meterial		Plant Points Aphieved	Property
Plane Type	Plant Best		
Entiting Shiph	#2-inste us 24-inste spend and height	4.0	8
	24-mails may import spanned and insight	LL Ø	4
Balaning Harders Trees	3-linds subject Handsond & 4 first shares grade	0,001	-
	and additional last bay-and 2 hotes.	96.0	
Beating Han-Hatter Free	3-tach raliger summered as 4 first shore grade	9.00	1 4 50-0
	readors if have been been then	25.9	
Existing Second Hendred Pendow Padra Song	Per fact of inverse mant beight	P.D.	
Radoling Puntoer Palan Tree	Per free of trees much height up at 30 feet as height	30	
	anal-deather pairs next over 30 fest in height	eit.B	
Entering Fran Poline Tree .	For fast of brown trust beight up to 20 fast a bright	1.3	
	erch far pairs wet over 20 the a beight	EK.	
		105AL	

MRLA 101 YULUNA CIRCL 1124

B330 BALBOA EVENUE SAN DECO, CA 92123

@ 2007 Jock in the Box Inc.

Tette deligte, Division ted spatilisation are this property & Just a. Die Bes vo and Reff. rell for depired & representation without for provinse unified establish

 \triangle

 Δ

 $\overline{\Delta}$

 Δ



LANDSCAPE CONSTRUCTION NOTES

- COMPACTER & TO COMPACT & HISE REVEN WAS IN THE ACCOMPACT AND ALL CONTRACT AND PACKAGED ATTACHED AND THE FORMATING AND PACKAGED ATTACHED ATTACHED AND THE FORMATING AND PACKAGED ATTACHED AND THE FORMATING AND PACKAGED ATTACHED ATTACHED AND THE FORMATING AND PACKAGED ATTACHED ATTACHED
- י 1941, LUCKAL או באשוויה אפורות או אינוויות או אינוויות או געראין אינוויות או געראין אינוויות אינוויות געראין גאין באוינג באינוויות אינוויות או אינוויות או אינוויות או געראין אין או געראין אינוויות אינוויות אינוויות געראי
- NANCIOL & MERCHART LAN OFFICIAL REPARTS CHEMICAL HERITAGE
- Li URUNA de collectivativativa en la la realización del nanocial a nuevo de como la collectivativa de collectivativativa de la companya de consecutiva e nuevo companya de la collectivativa de la collectiva de la collectivativa de la collectiva de la coll
- ALL PLANTING ANDING, DIVILL OF 1075 SATERING AND A 7 SHOMAAN STEP LANDE OF 18"- " ONLINE, COMPARING COMPARING IN
- CARLING IN POLICIANS AND A STRACT AND AND AN AND A AND A

+48 F7 +48 F7 -494 F5

* 46/72 • 65 FAQUED 46 BACK HARDING TRANS IN LAND DOWNER AND

- N A UCCREASE AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS CONTACTOR VILL OF REVAILED AD PROVIDE ADDRESS ADDR ADDRESS ADD
- ** LOCATEDIE +** GANNETTER OF CHERRY LANDSCOPE BATERIALS AND AVVICABLE TE

- ACTION TO CONTRACT SWEETING FINALES AREAS MANY OR STRUCT HTO PLANTINE BEDS and ADDATE AND ADDATE AND
- FLANFER BOIL SHALL OF ANDIABLE OF BESCHARP OF A LAD
- CANTER LETTER IN BRITIS
- CATERN CETTHE LANDERCHTE NETWICK. TO NO REGULATED OF THE LANDERCHT TO COMPLET LANDECHTE NECHTELLET IN HEARE PROM TO COMPLETING WIDE FOR THE RECURSES SPE REVIEW HE MET OF SHE COMPLETING WORK 10 al
 - Leading Leading and a to became approach in neural states to an Automatic Media Langu Canada, C.C. REPLACE DOAL Consolitie, On application Automatism in the Social Media of Machan Automatic, Replaced Balance and Media Automatic Automatic Automatic Machan Automatic Replacement and Automatic Media Automatic Replacement and Automatic Media Automatic Replacement Automatic Media Automatic Replacement Automatic Media Automatic Replacement Automatic Media Automatic Replacement Automatic Media Automatic Automatic Media Automatic Automatic Media Automatic Me
- CARE TO US TARGET DESCRIPTION AND DESCRIPTION AND DESCRIPTION OF A DESCRIP
- BLORDS: AND NETTING TO BE INSEE OF ALL BLORDS IS IN BRAINS SET FINE BRAINS SEE AND BE PINE OF LAL ON SHEET IS THE CARL INSEETS FOR SHE drapping braces.
- CONTINUCTION SHALL HERE'N ALL CARTING AND PROVIDED BY'S BLORDARD BIO HOTA'N ANDAREST OF MAY BROARDING BLONGY DALL OF CHESTING CONSTRUMEND SUPPLIED BY DIVIDIS
- IT DEPENDENT TO PROVED A WARAW IN BLOPP AND PROVAL STRUCTURES



ERVATION STATEMENT			
	3	1	
	3		
	3	1	
	3		



SEALE 1"+15"-0"

6 of 12

7

VICINITY MAP SITE LOCATION -----0 0 0 0 © 1 0 · ۲ Ð Ċ. 5 -0 ž LU Nrst! R 3 5 CUMB 00 11 0017 "ONE- MAY, DO HOT 5 La" RAISET R E On SON NOT BITTE FRESTONE RINES 6 0 1)0 ~ . AND - BONCOULS ANA PAIN OF BLAND **TEK** CUSTOM 2.56 SO. FT. 1 -6 ------T 0 ۲ -() HER PARAGE LOT LIGHT STANDARD (TTP. OF 3) -6 190 War31'28'E 0 ------107.21 PA OFFSET LAS 114 84 . 0 -8 0 -----THE PROVIDE BULGING HOOMESS HANDROLS, HERE AND LESSEL FROM THE STREET ON HOME AND ADDITIONS THE PROPERTY PLOT AND THE (UPC SOLID 4), SEE CLEWINDER ON SHEET 5 OF US STREET (*) ATTANK SKI STA LADENT ADDE HOLD BALL 30 80 REDING MEA LORE MODE HAL OUSE BO REPID MEA SE STA DAMING TO HOR MORATON HANNE UP --



SITE PLAN NOTES

CORN TON (E)

> ALL STREET MPROVIDEDITS ACT COVINE CITY STAR



SITE INFORMATION W. THE: 94_\$42-0P1 # ¢ 0031 ACONESS 1110 C STREET SAN DIEDD, CA ------SCALE: 1"=10"-0" SITE PLAN

7 of 12

٦.

GH AA

HON3

SAN DECO. CA STEAM O 2007 Jack in the I

DATES

RELEASE NOV. 12. 2007 P & UPDATES: JAN 5. 2010 ANNATTAL DATE

3

REVISIONS

A MER FORD COMOLS MAIL

A COLUMNER CONTRACTOR IZAAL

A PLAN COMMENTS

CONSTRUCTION

Δ

Δ

1: JULY 18, 2010

2 JULY 6, 201





и пис 94_542-0071 н 6 0031 400435 544 DECO, CA 94440 HE 94450 94440 HE 94450 544 DECO, CA 94440 HE 94450 544 DECO, CA

8 of 12

IGN 49



٦.

GN. AA.

9 of 12







R00F PLAN

PROACT & JIS+0007 SCALE: 1/4" = 1"-0"









Jack in the Box JIB#0031 1110 C Street San Diego, CA

