



L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

**Project Information**

**Project Nbr:** 266702      **Title:** VILLAGE AT ZION  
**Project Mgr:** Black, Laura      (619) 236-6327      Lblack@sandiego.gov



**Review Information**

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Planning Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Abalos, Raynard (619) 446-5377	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 4.00	<b>Started:</b> 03/29/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 03/29/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (10 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 135 reviews, 61.5% were on-time, and 50.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

**Mand Prelim Jan 2012**

**Project Information**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within the RS-1-7 Zone, the Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone, the Airport Influence Area (Review Area 2), the FAA Part 77 Notification Area, the Montgomery Field Overflight Notification Area, the Grantville Redevelopment Project Area, and the Navajo Community Plan Area. [Info Only - No Response Required] (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	This Affordable Housing Project proposes a 58 dwelling unit, senior housing facility with surface parking, accessory uses and structures on a vacant 1.21 acre lot. [Info Only - No Response Required] (From Cycle 4)

**Discretionary Actions**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The project requires the following discretionary permits and approvals. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Rezone  A Rezone is requested to change the existing RS-1-7 zone to the RM-3-8 zone. See issues under "Zone" below and issues from Long-Range Planning's review for additional comments. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	CPA  A Community Plan Amendment (CPA) is requested. See Long-Range Planning's review for comments and proposed amendment details. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	SDP  A Site Development Permit (SDP) is requested for deviations for an Affordable Housing Project qualifying under SDMC 143.0915. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	CUP  Although not identified on Sheet 1, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is also required for development of senior housing. Housing for senior citizens is subject to the separately regulated use requirements in SDMC 141.0310. This section allows 1 parking space per dwelling unit, so a deviation is not required as requested by the applicant. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	The project appears as though it could meet all the requirements in SDMC 141.0310, however, please provide a written response (separate document) indicating how the project complies with each requirement in SDMC 141.0310. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	To comply with SDMC 141.0310(e)(5), LDR-Planning recommends that a trash chute be located on each floor and located closer to the center to provide convenient access to all residents. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Please add the CUP request under "Project Narrative" on Sheet 1. (From Cycle 4)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Raynard Abalos at (619) 446-5377. Project Nbr: 266702 / Cycle: 6





**Issue**

**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 11 The applications for all discretionary actions and permits shall be consolidated for processing and shall be reviewed by a single decision maker. This project shall be decided in accordance with Process Five with the City Council as the decision maker. The City Council may approve the project only if all required findings are made. The findings required for approval of each permit shall be considered individually, consistent with SDMC 126.0105. [Info Only - No Response Required] (From Cycle 4)
- 12 Provide draft findings for the SDP with the next submittal. The required findings are as follows:  
  
SDP - SDMC 126.0504(a) and (m)  
CUP - SDMC 126.0305  
(From Cycle 4)

**Zone**

**Issue**

**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 13 The proposed RM-3-8 zone allows a density of one dwelling unit per 800 sf of lot area (approximately 55 dwelling units per acre), allowing approximately 66 dwelling units on the 1.21 acre project site. The project proposes 58 dwelling units (48 dwelling units per acre). [Info Only - No Response Required] (From Cycle 4)
- 14 As an alternative to the RM-3-8 zone, the RM-3-7 zone would allow approximately 53 dwelling units on the project site. The project may qualify for a density bonus, as provided in SDMC Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 7, to achieve the requested 58 dwelling units and may also qualify for development incentives, possibly negating the need for a Site Development Permit for deviations. Please review SDMC Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 7 for requirements and discuss the requirements with Housing Commission staff. (From Cycle 4)
- 15 The existing RS-1-7 zone allows a density of one dwelling unit on the existing lot. [Info Only - No Response Required] (From Cycle 4)

**Deviations**

**Issue**

**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 16 The project requests the following deviations:  
  
- A reduction from 240 cubic feet of required personal storage space per unit to 136 cubic feet. In addition, the floor plans show that the storage space is located in the unit. Per SDMC 131.0454, the storage space must be located outside the unit. Revise or identify this as an additional deviation request and provide justification. (From Cycle 4)
- 17 - Elimination of motorcycle parking spaces (see Transportation for comments). (From Cycle 4)
- 18 - 1 parking space per senior housing unit. This is not a deviation. See Issue #7 above for clarification. (From Cycle 4)
- 19 Provide a completed request for deviations form listing all requested deviations along with justification for why each deviation is necessary, and how the findings can be met. The approved form is available from the Development Project Manager. (From Cycle 4)

**Corrections**

**Issue**

**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 20 SDMC 131.0455(c) require at least 75 percent of the dwelling units provide at least 60 square feet of usable, private, exterior open space abutting the unit with a minimum dimension of 6 feet. The open space may be located in the required front yard, but shall be no closer than 9 feet to the front property line. Unit types B and C do not comply. Please revise. (From Cycle 4)
- 21 Sheet 1 indicates a total of 3,600 sf of common open space is provided. Provide a diagram or plan showing the location, dimensions and features within the common open space. The common open space shall conform to SDMC 131.0456. (From Cycle 4)
- 22 The required setbacks are as follows:  
  
Front - 10 feet minimum and 20 feet standard  
Side - 10 percent of lot width (16 feet)  
Street Side - 10 percent of lot width (16 feet) (50% of building may encroach up to 5 feet into the setback)  
Rear - 5 feet  
(From Cycle 4)
- 23 Show, label and dimension all required setback lines on the site plan. (From Cycle 4)
- 24 Revise to comply with the street side setback requirement along Glenroy Street. (From Cycle 4)
- 25 Overall structure height is measured from the lowest point of existing grade or proposed grade, whichever is lower, within 5 feet of the structure's perimeter to the highest point (367.32'). The elevations and sections show an incorrect low point for this measurement. The low point should be 5 feet from the south wall at approximately 322'. Please revise. (From Cycle 4)
- 26 Under "Project Data" on Sheet 1, provide the total proposed FAR for the entire project. Clarify in the same section that 2/3 of the maximum allowable FAR can be used for non-parking uses. (From Cycle 4)
- 27 Under "Project Data" on Sheet 1, change "Gross Building Area" to "Gross Floor Area." (From Cycle 4)
- 28 Revise the scales. When handscaled, the dimensions provided on the plans are incorrect. (From Cycle 4)





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

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

- 29 On the site plan on Sheet 1, the section cut line for Section A - 2 points west. The section on Sheet 2 is from a cut line facing east. Please correct the callout. (From Cycle 4)
- 30 Revise the directional arrow on the Landscape Plan. (From Cycle 4)

**1st Exp Rev March 2012**

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

- 31 The project has been redesigned and the plans now show the residential structure moved back from the front and street side property lines and parking along the street perimeter. The applicant is proposing a CUP for Senior Housing in order to reduce the parking rate to 1 per dwelling unit. These parking reductions, coupled with the separately regulated use requirements in SDMC 142.0310, is intended to facilitate pedestrian access to nearby services for the residents of the proposed housing, where either the resident does not drive, does not have a car, or chooses to walk.  
  
(continued below)  
(New Issue)
- 32 Therefore, LDR-Planning recommends that the project be redesigned to create a more pleasant walking experience by moving the building back towards the front and street side property lines as originally proposed. If deviations are necessary to accommodate this design, staff may support them if they result in a better project. LDR-Planning suggests contacting both LDR-Planning and Long-Range Planning to discuss further. (New Issue)
- 33 In addition to the above, issues from the first review have not been adequately addressed or the redesign has created additional issues. Please revise per the following. (New Issue)
- 34 Issue #8 - The applicant provided a written response to the fence regulations in SDMC 142.0310. Issue #8 from the previous review requested a written response to how the project complies with the Senior Housing requirements in SDMC 141.0310 not the regulations in SDMC 142.0310. Please provide. (New Issue)
- 35 Issue #12 - The applicant did not provide draft findings for SDMC 126.0504(m) (SDP Affordable Housing Deviations findings). Staff will review the applicant's draft findings for SDMC 126.0504(m) when provided, however, as proposed, LDR-Planning cannot make the findings in SDMC 126.0504(m) for the project. (New Issue)
- 36 Issue #16 - Staff does not concur with the applicant's justification for a deviation to the storage area requirements. SDMC 131.0454 requires personal storage areas outside the unit. The intent is to provide a storage space for items not typically stored within a dwelling unit, such as bulky items, boxes, furniture, etc., or items typically stored in a garage. The project proposes no personal storage areas. The proposed interior areas are closets.  
  
(continued below)  
(New Issue)
- 37 In addition, these areas appear to be reserved for a water heater. LDR-Planning cannot support the deviation as proposed. Staff may consider a deviation to allow smaller personal storage areas, only if located outside the dwelling units, if the applicant can provide documentation that shows that seniors do not require as much storage as indicated by the applicant in the submitted deviations justification letter. (New Issue)
- 38 Issue #21 - The project does not comply with the common open space requirements in SDMC 131.0456. Please review this section and revise to comply. (New Issue)
- 39 Parking may not be located within the 16-foot street side setback. The exemption in SDMC 131.0443(f)(3)(B) that allows a 5-foot encroachment into the setback is only for the building façade and not for parking. Please revise to comply. (New Issue)
- 40 Relocate the refuse and recyclable materials storage area. As proposed, the area is located within the street yard (area between the street wall and street side property line). SDMC 142.0810(b)(2) does not allow a refuse and recyclable materials storage area to be located within the street yard. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Environmental	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Shearer-Nguyen, Liz (619) 446-5369	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 4.00	<b>Started:</b> 03/29/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/04/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 04/04/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 16 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (16 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 93 reviews, 33.3% were on-time, and 51.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 1st MIR Review 1/12

### Air Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	A development that exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations including air toxics could have a potential air quality impact. The technical study is required to provide an analysis of any potential impacts to this use resulting from automobile emissions (i.e. diesel-exhaust particulates). (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	A development that causes deterioration of a primary arterial may cause an increase in CO emissions, which could result in a significant air quality impact. Therefore, should the traffic study identify significant impacts to various intersections, a hot spot analysis may also be required to be conducted. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Construction grading could also affect air quality during and after construction. The analysis should include potential short-term impacts, if any, due to construction dust (the analysis should also include information pertaining to the project phasing, i.e., how long an area would be subject to earth movement per day, and what would be the duration of such activities. It should be noted that a project would not result in a significant impact if specified dust controls are included on the project plans. (From Cycle 4)

### Health & Safety (ALUCP)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	The project is required to be submitted to the Airport Authority for a consistency analysis determination with the adopted ALUCP for Montgomery Field. Please provide copies of any correspondence related to the project. (From Cycle 4)

### Noise

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Noise is defined as unwanted or objectionable sound. Noise levels compatible with a person's life, health and enjoyment of property are regulated by State, Federal, and local regulations, including the City of San Diego General Plan, City Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance, California Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24), the State Public Utilities Code regulating airports, as well as other regulations. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Current and future traffic volumes could result in significant adverse noise impacts since noise levels may exceed the 65 dB[A] CNEL exterior usable space standard and/or the 45 (dB(A) CNEL interior noise standard for the proposed project. In addition, any temporary construction noise which exceeds the 75dB(A) Leq at a sensitive receptor would be considered significant. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Consequently, an acoustical analysis is required in order to assess potential future traffic noise impacts on the project site and surrounding area plus identify the measures needed to reduce future predicted noise levels to allowable limits. Please note that interior noise levels are regulated pursuant to Title 24, and those noise levels are a separate concern than the exterior noise levels discussed above. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Additionally, the acoustical report needs to provide analysis on temporary construction noise due to the nature of the project and make recommendations on mitigation measures to be implemented. The report should also include a ground borne vibration and/or noise vibration analysis. (From Cycle 4)

### Paleontological Resources

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Liz Shearer-Nguyen at (619) 446-5369. Project Nbr: 266702 / Cycle: 6





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Grading activities would occur within the Lindavista Formation, which has a high sensitivity rating for paleontological resources. Paleontological monitoring during excavation and earth work activities would be necessary for projects that require 1,000 cubic yards of cut at a depth of ten feet or greater.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Monitoring may also be required for shallow grading (less than ten feet) when a site has been previously graded and/or unweathered formations are present at the surface. The site appears to have been graded. Please provide any additional information (e.g. soils reports) that would verify the soils that exists on the project site. (From Cycle 4)

**Public Facilities (Parks)**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	Park and Recreation Department has determined that the 58-unit project would generate approximately 127 residents based on a density factor of 2.60 persons per household unit (according to SANDAG's forecasts). At 2.60 acres per 1,000 persons, 0.36 acre of useable park land is required to serve the proposed population. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Per the City's Significance Determination Thresholds a project that would conflict with the community plan in terms of the number, size, and location of public facilities could result in a significant impact to public facilities as it relates to Parks. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines identify if a project would result in a substantial adverse physical impact from construction or alteration of governmental facilities need to maintain acceptable service rations or performance objectives for a public service. Therefore, the evaluation of impacts should focus on physical effects of constructing or altering public facilities. EAS will coordinate with Long-Range and Park and Recreation staff to identify, what if any impacts would result and any required mitigation. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	New Issue (6152557) (From Cycle 4)

**Public Facilities (libraries)**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	The General Plan establishes guidelines and standards for branch libraries. Ideally, branch libraries should serve a residential population of 30,000. The Environmental Section of the environmental document should identify the location of the nearest libraries and the distance from the project site. Serra Cooperative library facilities should also be identified within the Environmental Setting should the project be located on or near the limits of the City of San Diego. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Per the City's Significance Determination Thresholds a project that would conflict with the community plan in terms of the number, size, and location of public facilities could result in a significant impact to public facilities as it relates to libraries. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines identify if a project would result in a substantial adverse physical impact from construction or alteration of governmental facilities need to maintain acceptable service rations or performance objectives for a public service. Therefore, the evaluation of impacts should focus on physical effects of constructing or altering public facilities. EAS will coordinate with Long-Range to identify, what if any impacts would result and any required mitigation. (From Cycle 4)

**Public Utilities (solid waste)**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	The California Public Resources Code requires each city within the state to divert at least 50 percent of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, composting, and transformation. The City of San Diego has enacted codes and policies aimed at helping achieve a 50 percent diversion level. Projections indicate that diversion rates achieved by the various City of San Diego regulations and ordinances alone will not be sufficient to achieve the 50 percent diversion level.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	At this rate of waste disposal, the City's only landfill, the Miramar Landfill, will be filled to capacity by 2016, making efforts that preserve landfill space especially important. Based on the City of San Diego's Significance Determination Thresholds, a project that includes 40,000 square-feet or more of building space may generate 60 tons of waste or more and are considered to have a cumulative impact on solid waste facilities. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Construction of 58 residential units would exceed the threshold for solid waste generation; therefore the project must prepare a conceptual waste management plan that must be reviewed and accepted by Environmental Services Department and EAS. Please refer to the City of San Diego Significance Thresholds for what items and/or information is required in the waste management plan. (From Cycle 4)





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	While all projects are required to comply with the City's waste management ordinances, cumulative impacts are mitigated to below a level of significance through the implementation of the project -specific waste management plan. (From Cycle 4)
<b>Leed Sustainable Dvlpt</b>		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	The applicant is encouraged to utilize energy efficiency factors in the design of the proposed project following the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system. If energy efficient features will be incorporated into the project design, please describe them. (From Cycle 4)
<b>Visual Quality (retaining wall)</b>		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	23	The plans submitted indicate that retaining wall, with an approximate linear length of 74 feet and a maximum height of 9 feet, would be constructed for the project. Retaining walls which exceed 50 feet in length and/or 6 feet in height could result in a significant adverse visual impact. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	24	This condition can become more significant if visible from designated open space area, roads, parks, or recognized visual landmarks. Please demonstrate in a typical cross-section measures that would be implemented to reduce the visual impacts of the retaining walls, such as color and texture, landscaping used to screen the walls from public view, or other means to reduce visual impacts to below a level of significance. EAS will coordinate with Landscape staff on this issue. (From Cycle 4)
<b>Water Quality</b>		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	25	Engineering Review is requesting that a water quality technical report be submitted; please provide a copy of the technical study to EAS. Please refer to comments provided by Engineering Review on this issue. (From Cycle 4)
<b>Hydrology</b>		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	26	Engineering Review is requesting that a hydrology/drainage study be submitted; please provide a copy of the revised technical study to EAS. Please refer to comments provided by Engineering Review on this issue. (From Cycle 4)
<b>Deviations</b>		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27	The project is requesting various deviations. Please provide a breakdown of the requested deviations so that the information can be included within the appropriate environmental document. This information is necessary prior to distribution of the document for public review. (From Cycle 4)
<b>Nesting Bird Disclosure</b>		
<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	28	--INFORMATONAL ONLY--  Please note that nesting birds may be present during construction, and are protected under Federal and State Law including the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and in particular, State Law - Fish and Game Code - Section 3503.  CDFG Code 3503 states: "It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto." (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	29	The intent of these comments are to alert the property owner/agent that they are responsible for compliance with these laws, and that they may be subject to fines/prosecution should the laws be violated. It is recommended that this information be placed on the construction plans to ensure compliance.  For more information on Section 3503 please refer to <a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=fgc&amp;group=03001-04000&amp;file=3500-3516">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=fgc&amp;group=03001-04000&amp;file=3500-3516</a> (From Cycle 4)
<b>CDFG Fees</b>		





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30	--INFORMATONAL ONLY--
		The City of San Diego is responsible for collecting a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Filing Fee mandated by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and authorized under the Fish and Game Code section 711.4 for projects involving adverse impacts to biological resources (AB 3158). (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	31	The purpose of this fee is to defray the CDFG costs of managing and protecting fish and wildlife trust resources, including, but not limited to, consulting with other public agencies, reviewing environmental documents, recommending mitigation measures, development monitoring requirements for purposes of the CEQA. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	32	A Notice of Determination (NODs) must be filed after project approval and all appeal periods have been exhausted for your project. This would complete the CEQA process and filing of the form limits the filing of a legal challenge to your project to 30 days. Every project that has an environmental document (ND/MND/EIR) must either pay a filing fee or provide a 'no effect' form from the CDFG. The applicant is asked to contact CDFG for the "No Effect Determination" once a draft environmental document has been distributed. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	33	The fee required is either \$50.00 with the original signed "No Effect Determination Form" or \$2,094 (\$2,044 CDFG fee + \$50 handling fee for the County). The check needs to be made payable to the "County Clerk and must be submitted prior to the hearing and/or mailed to the Project Manager at 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34	This fee will be sent to the County Clerk along with a NOD form after all project appeals are exhausted. The City appreciates your response to this matter. Please be aware that the CDFG can increase fees without notice. (From Cycle 4)

**Environmental Det**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	35	Until the requested information has been provided, staff is not able to complete the Initial Study for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	36	Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. Additionally, the new information may lead to the requirement of new and/or additional technical studies. A determination as to the appropriate environmental document will be made based on all reviewed and submitted information. (From Cycle 4)

**2nd Review 3/12**

**Air Quality**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	EAS has reviewed and accepted the air quality analysis prepared by RECON Environmental Inc. (March 22, 2012). The study determined that no impacts (construction or operational) would result; therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. EAS has no further comments related to this issue. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	Please be aware that the Planning Review and Plan-Long-Range Planning staff have requested various redesign considerations and would therefore require that the technical study be revised to incorporate the new information and/or the analysis being revised. (New Issue)

**Health & Safety (ALUCP)**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	EAS is in receipt of the consistency determination. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. EAS has no further comments related to this issue.  (New Issue)

**Noise**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	EAS has reviewed the environmental noise assessment prepared by Dudek (December 2011) and is requesting the following revisions. (New Issue)





- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>   |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 41               | 1. Currently the project analyzes only those areas determined to meet the required open space requirements of the zone. Please revise the report to include an analysis of all open space areas associated with the project. (e.g. all balcony and common open areas). Should it be determined that an impact would result, the report needs to provide recommendations on mitigation measures to be implemented that would reduce potential noise impacts to below a level of significance.<br>(New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 42               | Please be aware that the Planning Review and Plan-Long-Range Planning staff have requested various redesign considerations and would therefore require that the technical study be revised to incorporate the new information and/or the analysis being revised.<br>(New Issue)   |

**Paleontological Resources**

- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>   |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 43               | Per the plans submitted (Preliminary Grading and Utility Plan, Sheet 10 of 11), grading proposed (approximately 500 cubic yards with a depth of cut of 2 feet) would not exceed the significance determination thresholds regarding paleontological resources. Therefore monitoring during grading activities is not required. EAS has no further comments regarding this issue.<br>(New Issue) |

**Public Facilities (Parks)**

- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>  |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 44               | Issues raised by Park and Recreation have been resolved. The applicant will be required to pay development impact fees at the time of building issuance to satisfy the population-based park requirements. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. EAS has no further comments related to this issue.<br>(New Issue) |

**Public Facilities (libraries)**

- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>   |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 45               | The applicant will be required to pay development impact fees at the time of building issuance. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. EAS has no further comments related to this issue.<br>(New Issue) |

**Public Utilities (solid waste)**

- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>   |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 46               | ESD has requested revisions to the waste management plan prepared by RECON Environmental Inc. (dated March 22, 2012); please provide a copy of the technical study to EAS. Please refer to comments provided by ESD on this issue.<br>(New Issue) |

**Visual Quality retaining walls**

- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>  |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 47               | Reviews of the plans indicate that the proposed retaining wall heights are now in conformance with the land Development Code. Additionally, landscaping will be incorporated. EAS has no further comments regarding this issue.<br>(New Issue) |

**Water Quality**

- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>  |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 48               | Engineering Review is requesting revisions to the water quality technical report; please provide a copy of the technical study to EAS. Please refer to comments provided by Engineering Review on this issue.<br>(New Issue) |

**Hydrology**

- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>  |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 49               | Engineering Review is requesting revisions to the hydrology/drainage study; please provide a copy of the revised technical study to EAS. Please refer to comments provided by Engineering Review on this issue.<br>(New Issue) |

**Deviations**







L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 50 The project is requesting various deviations. Please provide a breakdown of the requested deviations so that the information can be included within the appropriate environmental document. This information is necessary prior to distribution of the document for public review.  
(New Issue)

**Environmental Det**

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 51 Until the requested information has been provided, staff is not able to complete the Initial Study for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts.  
(New Issue)
- 52 Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. Additionally, the new information may lead to the requirement of new and/or additional technical studies. A determination as to the appropriate environmental document will be made based on all reviewed and submitted information.  
  
(New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Landscaping	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Spindell, Glenn (619) 446-5353	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 8.00	<b>Started:</b> 03/22/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 04/03/2012	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Change In Project Scope.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 22 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (21 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 51 reviews, 72.5% were on-time, and 53.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Review 011712

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Landscape Regulations Applicability: the proposed development, located within the Navajo Community Plan and Grantville Redevelopment Subarea 'C', is subject to the City-wide Landscape Regulations for multiple dwelling-unit residential development (SDMC 142.0402). (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Street Trees: are required to be planted in the right-of-way at the rate of one per thirty frontage feet. The plans appear to show planting areas in the undeveloped right-of-way (between sidewalk and property line), however these planting areas do not appear to be utilized for street trees. Please revise plans accordingly, using as a species selection basis the City's Streets Division Street Tree Guide. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Relation of Streetscape to Street Yard: note that planting area in the public right-of-way is not counted towards fulfillment of the required street yard planting area. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Street Yard Calculations: the plans include a Landscape Area Diagram, however no Street Yard Calculations were provided. Please provide these calculations with revised plans. Review staff estimates the Street Yard at approximately 7,300 s.f. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Vehicle-Use Area Calculations: review staff estimates the vehicle-use area within the Street Yard at approx. 1,000 s.f. rather than the 1,538 s.f. indicated by applicant, and VUA outside the Street Yard at approx. 18,800 s.f. rather than the 19, 845 s.f. indicated. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Additional VUA requirements: indicate by dimensions and note on plans that no parking space is greater than 30 feet from a tree (20 ft. where palms are used). (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Minimal Planting Area: A minimum root zone of 40 square feet, with a minimum dimension of 5 feet, shall be provided for all trees. All other required planting areas shall be greater than 30 square feet in size with a minimum dimension of 3 feet. Please provide dimensions of planting areas as labels and provide above regulation as note on plan. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Additional residential yard requirements: a minimum distance of 6 feet shall be provided between any tree and building. The tree plantings at north side of building do not meet this minimum distance. Please revise plans accordingly. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Please provide with re-submitted plans correspondence describing how the issues identified in this review have been addressed. Additional comments may be recommended pending further review or any redesign of this project. (From Cycle 4)

## Review 032712

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Issues from the previous review which have not been fully addressed are shown in this report as not cleared, and are restated and clarified as follows: (New Issue)

### Consistency Between Plans

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Provide on the Landscape Plan visibility area graphics and labels for driveways and intersections consistent with the Site Plan. Note on the site plans and landscape plans that no objects between 3 feet and 6 feet in height will be proposed in the visibility areas. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Hardscape Features: identify proposed features such as disabled access and /or pedestrian paths, permeable or patterned paving, drive aisles and other hardscape enhancements. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Show and label the proposed overhang area on Landscape Plan consistent with the Site Plan. Note that the length of a parking space may overhang a raised curb or wheel stop and a required landscape area by a maximum of 3 feet, provided that the area of overhang is not part of a required pedestrian path (142.0560[h][5]). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	The lot size shows on Site Plan as 52,707 square feet; on the Landscape Plan it is shown as 55,039 s.f. Revise accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Avoidance of Utility Conflicts: show on the Landscape Plan, consistent with Site Plan, all existing and proposed utilities and other right-of-way development features such as water, sewer, gas lines; overhead, underground lines or cables; vaults, pedestals and signage. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Site Development Features: provide consistency between the landscape plan and site plan by providing the same labeling on site development features such as property lines, setbacks, easements, accessory structures. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Provide in a design statement on Landscape Development Plan how Low Impact Development [LID]/ Best Management Practices [BMP] are incorporated into project design i.e.how irrigation, precipitation runoff and/ or roof drain discharge is treated by landscaping and/or permeable paving prior to discharging to the storm water conveyance system. (New Issue)

**General Requirements**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	All required planting areas (other than those for trees) shall be greater than 30 square feet in size with a minimum dimension of 3 feet. [2nd Request] Provide dimensions of planting areas and provide above regulation as note on plan (SDMC 142.0403). Certain planting areas shown on plan do not appear to meet this requirement. Planting areas which do not meet this requirement will not be counted toward planting area requirements. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Planting Legend: revise to show mature height/spread of trees and shrubs (11.1.4- Project Submittal Requirements). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Requested Omissions Omit the referenced County Landscape Regulations; they do not apply to this project. Remove unnecessary graphics from the Landscape Development Plan such as contour intervals and spot elevations, as they detract from the legibility of the plans. Omit landscape calculations for: > Commercial development; > Industrial development; > Large retail center development. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	A vehicular use area located within the street yard shall be separated from the right-of-way by a required planting area at least 8 feet wide (142.0406[c]). This shall be planted to screen the vehicular use area with densely foliated, evergreen species that achieve a minimum height of 30 inches within 2 years of installation over at least 80 per cent of the length of the required planting area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Screening may also be achieved through the use of berms, solid fencing, walls, plant material, or any combination of these that provides an equivalent screen. Additionally, Long-Range Planning has indicated in their comments the use of mounded earth forms in areas of level terrain to add interest to the landscape, to hide parking and to separate functions, per the recommendations of the Navajo Community Plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Multiple Dwelling Unit Residential Development shall provide 50 per cent of the Street Yard as landscaping, with at least one-half of the required planting points achieved with trees [Table 142-04C]. Note that excess points may be used to reduce the required planting area up to 25 percent (142.0405[a][3]). The Landscape Plan proposes a Street Yard planting area approximately 60 per cent of that required, with one-third of the amount of trees required. Refer to issues pertaining to proposed LDC Deviations. (New Issue)

**Deviations**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Applicant is encouraged to explore alternatives, such as permeable paving to count toward required planting area, and/ or larger trees to offset reduced planting area, to create a more substantially conforming proposal. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	The requested deviation to SDMC 142.0402[b][2][C], reducing the minimum distance from a tree to building from 6 feet to 3 feet, may be omitted. With respect to planting area proximal to the structural facade, the Land Development Code does not at present time make a distinction between planting of palm trees and trees with broader canopies and root zones. This proposal for palm tree planting areas, therefore, will be supported without a deviation request. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	The requested deviation to SDMC 142.0406(a) requires further clarification to determine whether this deviation is necessary, as the plan's graphics and notes appear to indicate compliance (one tree within 30 ft. of each parking space) with this regulation. Please specify which parking stalls are perceived as non-compliant. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	The following requested deviation is reiterated verbatim: "Requested Development Regulation Deviation: SDMC 142.0406C3 elimination of the required street yard remaining planting area area on Zion Avenue within the public right-of-way between a 3 foot minimum high solid wall and the curb. Street yard planting area along Zion Avenue to occur only within the 3 foot wide planting area, between the 3 foot minimum high solid wall and the vehicular use area." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	Please clarify the above statement, i.e. the reference to a wall to offset reduced planting area (as no wall is shown on plans), and distinguish between street yard and right-of-way issues. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Proposed deviations from Landscape Regulations must be clearly articulated in order to provide findings for a hearing body to consider. Such items to consider are: whether existing conditions and/or requirements of other review disciplines preclude strict regulatory application; whether available planting areas are maximized; and whether the proposed Development Plans meet the intent of the Landscape Regulations. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	The conclusions of this review may change in response to any project changes. Landscape staff will coordinate with other disciplines as the review progresses. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Engineering Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Canning, Jack (619) 446-5425	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 6.00	<b>Started:</b> 03/26/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 04/02/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (7 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 72 reviews, 97.2% were on-time, and 50.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Engineering 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The Engineering Review Section has reviewed the subject development and have the following comments that need to be addressed prior to a Public Hearing. Upon resubmittal, we will complete our review of the Site Development Permit Plans.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Site Plan Sheet 1 states the existing vault on Glenroy Street will be relocated. Contact SDG&E and obtain a letter (listed as a Letter of Request in next time documents), from them stating they agree the vault shall and can be relocated. Submit the approval letter on the next submittal. If SDG&E states it can not be relocated, revise the parking area access design from Glenroy Street that does not require relocation of the existing vault. Engineering Review can not support the project unless it is clear what SDG&E will agree to do with the vault.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 10. Show and call out the location of the roof drains and how they are discharged. If no roof drains are proposed, add a note stating: NO ROOF DRAINS ARE PROPOSED FOR THIS PROJECT.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	This project is subject to the regulations contained in the revised City's Storm Water Standards dated January 14, 2011. To comply with the updated regulations, the project will be required to determine if the proposed project is subject to hydromodification criteria among other requirements. If applicable, hydromodification management facilities shall be required to mitigate project-related increases to discharge rates and durations. The specific process is outlined in the San Diego HMP and summarized in Section 4.5 of the Storm Water Standards.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	All drainage calculations shall be based on the Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) requirements. Project must be designed so that runoff rates and durations are controlled to maintain or reduce pre-project downstream erosion conditions and protect stream habitat.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Based on the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, this project is a Priority Project and requires BMPs. The applicant shall submit a Water Quality Technical Report consistent with the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards. Required elements of a WQTR are provided in Appendix F on this manual. Details supporting all decisions made in accordance with Chapter 4 requirements shall be documented in the WQTR.  (continued below)  (From Cycle 4)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	The design of any LID or treatment control BMP which allows for infiltration of runoff should be accompanied by a Geotechnical Investigation of the surrounding soils. A Geological Investigation Report should be attached to the Water Quality Technical Report and prepared in conformance with the City of San Diego Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports.  The revised Storm Water Standards are available online at: <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/developmentservices/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf">http://www.sandiego.gov/developmentservices/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf</a>  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Revise the Site Plan. Show and call out the proposed Treatment Control BMP's that will be called out in the required WQTR.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Submit a Preliminary Drainage Study which addresses the existing and proposed storm water run-off and discharge locations for the project site.  (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 10 Bio-Retention Detail. Show and call out how storm water that enters the Bio-Retention system is collected.  (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1 and Grading Plan Sheet 10. Show and call out the existing Type B curb ramp adjacent to the project site at the T intersection of Zion Avenue and Glenroy Street.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Project proposes a new driveway where the existing curb ramp is located. This will require the applicant to relocate the curb ramp west of the project site on Zion Avenue at the T intersection of Glenroy Street. Show and call out the new Type B curb ramp per current City Standard SDG-132.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1 and Grading Plan Sheet 10. Show the limits of the existing driveways on Zion Avenue and Glenroy Street. Show and call out: The applicant shall close the non-utilized portions of the existing driveways with current City Standard curb, gutter and sidewalk, adjacent to the site on Zion Avenue and Glenroy Street.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1. Plan shows the proposed driveway on Zion Avenue will be a curb return driveway which is unacceptable. Show and call out the applicant shall construct a current City Standard maximum 25 feet wide G-14A concrete driveway for the two driveways proposed.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1 and Grading Plan Sheet 10. Add the visibility area triangles, per San Diego Municipal Code Diagram 113-02QQ, for the proposed driveways. Call out no obstruction including landscaping or walls in the visibility area shall exceed 3 feet in height.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1 and Grading Plan Sheet 10. Per current City Standard G-14, show and call out the proposed curb outlet shall be 6 feet clear from the proposed curb opening on Zion Avenue.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement, from the City Engineer, for the curb outlets in the Zion Avenue and Glenroy Street Right-of-Way.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	City Standards for curb ramps were revised in February, 2007. Therefore, on the Site Plan Sheet 1 and Grading Plan Sheet 10, show and call out the applicant shall reconstruct the existing curb ramp at the northwest corner of Zion Avenue and Glenroy Street, with current City Standard curb ramp Standard Drawing SDG-130 and SDG-132 with truncated domes.  (From Cycle 4)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1. Show the street lights, nearest the project site, in both directions and on both sides of Zion Avenue and Glenroy Street. Include the spacing between the street lights and the project site. If a street light is within the abutting project frontage, include the type of light standard, wattage and type of luminaire (low/high pressure sodium).  (continued below)  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	A determination will be made if the project is in compliance with current street light standards according to the City of San Diego Street Design Manual and Council Policy 200-18. The applicant may be required to, but not be limited to, install a new street light(s), upgrade the luminaire from low pressure to high pressure sodium vapor and/or upgrade the luminaire wattage.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent BMP maintenance, satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, 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.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	23	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit 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.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	24	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit the Owner/Permittee shall incorporate and show the type and location of all post-construction Best Management Practices (BMP's) on the final construction drawings, consistent with the approved Water Quality Technical Report.  (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided.  (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	26	Additional comments may be recommended pending further review or any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive. Should you have any questions or comments, please call Jack Canning at 619 446-5425.  (From Cycle 4)

**Engineering 2nd Review**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 10 Bio-Retention Detail. Add the impermeable liner and perforated pipe at the bottom of the growing medium. Show and call out the overflow catch basin to discharge the flood events, per Section 10 of the Water Quality Technical Report.  (second request)  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Revise the Site Plan Sheet 1 and Grading Plan. Show and call out the existing curb ramp adjacent to the project site on Zion Avenue. Show and call out the clear distance from the proposed D-25 curb outlet to the existing curb ramp. (second request)  (New Issue)

**Drainage Study**

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Jack Canning at (619) 446-5425. Project Nbr: 266702 / Cycle: 6





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	Revise Drainage Study Section 5.0 Summary of Calculations Existing Conditions. Calculations show a User Specified Runoff Coefficient of 0.41 which is unacceptable. Per the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual, minimum runoff coefficient for a commercial land use using a ratio of actual impervious to tabulated impervious shall be 0.50. Submit a ratio calculation of actual impervious to tabulated impervious to verify why the tabulated impervious of 80% with a coefficient of 0.85 should not be used and the ratio should be. Revise calculations, analysis and conclusions accordingly.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Revise Drainage Study Section 6.0 Summary of Calculations Proposed Conditions. Calculations show a User Specified Runoff Coefficient of 0.46 which is unacceptable. Per the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual, the minimum runoff coefficient for a commercial land use using a ratio of actual impervious to tabulated impervious shall be 0.50. Submit a ratio calculation of actual impervious to tabulated impervious to verify why the tabulated impervious of 80% with a coefficient of 0.85 should not be used and the ratio should be. Revise the calculations, analysis and conclusions accordingly.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	Revise Drainage Study Section 7.0 Downstream and Peak Flow Analysis. Section states at Final Engineering the existing City storm drain system will be studied to determine if there is sufficient capacity, which is unacceptable. Revise the drainage study to address the adequacy of the down stream systems and which demonstrates that no adverse impacts will occur to these systems as a result of the increased runoff from the proposed development. If impacts are anticipated, state the measures that must be taken to mitigate such impacts.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	Revise Drainage Study Section 8.0 Hydromodification Exemption Documentation. The project is exempt from Hydromodification management based on the analysis of the stabilized conveyance that has a direct discharge to the San Diego River. However no analysis of the existing impervious area percentage being greater than 40% of the watershed and potential impervious areas increases of 3% was given to state the project is in a highly urbanized area. Therefore either submit the analysis or remove that portion of the exemption statement.  (New Issue)

WQTR

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Revise the WQTR Section 9 Source Control BMP's. All projects are required to address all fifteen of the possible Source Control BMP's listed in the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards. If any of the Source Control BMP's do not apply to your project, you should state the reason why they do not apply or justify why they are not feasible in your report. Your report only addresses 6 of the possible 15 Source Control BMP's.  (New Issue)







L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Submitted: 03/09/2012 Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Transportation Dev Cycle Distributed: 03/09/2012
Reviewer: Elhamad, Ismail Assigned: 03/09/2012
(619) 446-5494 Started: 03/23/2012
Hours of Review: 6.00 Review Due: 04/02/2012
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Completed: 04/02/2012 COMPLETED ON TIME
Closed: 04/04/2012

- The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: New Document Required.
We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Transportation Dev on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
Your project still has 12 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (7 of which are new issues).
The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
Last month LDR-Transportation Dev performed 24 reviews, 87.5% were on-time, and 52.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

24002401 CPA/RZ/SDP 1st rev 1/

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Contains 12 rows of issues related to project 24002401, including details on parking spaces, driveway conditions, and visibility triangles.

24002401 CPA/RZ/SDP 2nd rev 3/





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Scope of Work: Is a community plan amendment, Rezone from RS-1-7 to RM-3-7 and SDP to construct 58 for rent senior housing units including affordable units on a vacant 1.21 acre site at 5150 Zion Avenue with 58 parking spaces provided including 4 accessible spaces. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	The applicant is requesting a deviation to reduce the two bedroom parking ratio from 2 spaces/2-bdr-unit to 1 space/2-bdr-unit.  Senior Housing Units:  Unit A ( 1-bdr-unit) : 36 units x 1 space/unit = 36 Unit B ( 1-bdr-unit) : 12 units x 1 space/unit = 12 Unit C (2-bdr-unit) : 10 units x 1 space/unit = 10  Total = 36 + 12 + 10 = 58 spaces (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Zion Avenue is classified as a four-lane major street in the Navjo Community Plan with curb to curb width of 76' within 120' of right-of-way with U-4(b) parkway designation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	The Preliminary Grading and Utility Plan (Sheet 10 of 11) shows a proposed 8' parkway along the project's frontage. This proposed 8' parkway is less than the existing 10' parkway which is not acceptable. Please provide a minimum of 10' parkway along the project's frontage on Zion Avenue. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	The applicant shall provide a turnaround ability area at the end of the driveway aisle along Zion Avenue. This area can be equivalent to 1 parking space. The last space can be designated as 1 space turnaround area. The project is providing 59 spaces with less 1 space which equates to 58 spaces required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	The ARCHITURAL SITE PLAN (Sheet 1 of 11): The first parking space on the right hand side of the most southern driveway is 14' long on the passenger's side which is too short. This space has to be outside the right turning vehicle path measuring 15' minimum in length. Please revise accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	The ARCHITURAL SITE PLAN (Sheet 1 of 11): Please remove the circled number 10 as a subtotal number of parking spaces on the left side of the most northerly driveway. The subtotal number should add up to 11 spaces. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Fire-Plans Officer	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Carter, Ron (619) 446-5449	<b>Assigned:</b> 04/04/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 1.00	<b>Started:</b> 04/04/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 04/04/2012	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Fire-Plans Officer on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 4 outstanding review issues with Fire-Plans Officer (3 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Fire-Plans Officer performed 12 reviews, 50.0% were on-time, and 60.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Fire Dept issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Plans are not to scale. Provide site plan to engineering scale. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Show location of all existing hydrants, within 600', on site plan. (UFC903.2) (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Provide fire access roadways in accordance with FHPS Policy A-00-1 (UFC 902.1) (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Buildings over 35ft tall are required to have aerial ladder access with setback of 15-25ft from curb to face of building. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Email Ron Carter at rcarter@sandiego.gov for an appointment to discuss these requirements. (New Issue)

## Fire Dept issues 2nd review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Fire hydrant on Zion is beyond the 300' radius for the building. Show proposed new hydrant on site plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Show aerial ladder access on plan with setback as previously noted. This has to be shown how access is accomplished and not just a note. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Plan-Long Range Planning	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Monroe, Dan (619) 236-5529	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 5.50	<b>Started:</b> 03/29/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 03/29/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Long Range Planning on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 13 outstanding review issues with Plan-Long Range Planning (6 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Plan-Long Range Planning performed 7 reviews, 85.7% were on-time, and 57.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

LRP MPR Jan 2012

CPAI Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Upon submittal of the community plan amendment and development plans subsequent to the mandatory prelim review, please include detailed responses to each issue identified below as well as the draft text and graphics changes to the Navajo Community Plan. If more information is needed to adequately address an issue, e.g. traffic generation, please state that in your response. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Determine the appropriate land use designation and intensity for the site (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Evaluate traffic generation and circulation (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Evaluate the accessibility of transit (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Evaluate the ability of the project to incorporate of sustainable design features (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Determine the appropriate zone to implement the proposed use and provide compatible development regulations (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Evaluate urban design issues within the site with regard to neighborhood interface and pedestrian access and circulation (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Evaluate the provision of pedestrian amenities and streetscape improvements associated with new multi-family residential development (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Evaluate the need and ability to provide affordable housing in the community (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Planning Commission also identified three additional issues to be addressed during processing of the community plan amendment and review of the project proposal. These include ability to provide additional public park space in design of the project, ability to provide shared facilities and/or services to seniors in the greater Navajo Community, and evaluate the ability to design a project that achieves a LEED Silver rating or higher. (From Cycle 4)

Rezzone

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	With regard to issue number 7, LRP and the applicant discussed the potential to utilize the Density Bonus Regulations to achieve the desired number of units on-site for the affordable senior housing project. The proposed RM-3-8 zone would necessitate the inclusion of a new Density Range within the Navajo Community Plan (High Density) which does not currently exist. Please submit an evaluation of how the Density Bonus Regulations could be utilized with selection of a lower density zone and still achieve the project goals with submittal after the mandatory prelim review. (From Cycle 4)

Design/Accessibility

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	In accordance with issue number 8, consideration and evaluation of the potential for a pedestrian crossing and median refuge area on Glenroy to allow the residents of the affordable senior housing project gain direct access to the Allied Gardens Community Park and Recreation Center should be discussed with LDR Transportation and Traffic Engineering. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	The Navajo Community Plan recommends that apartment developments should be arranged in such a way as to harmonize with adjacent single-family developments. They should be designed to present less apparent bulk and to minimize the clash of scale and activity between apartments and houses. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	In accordance with the Navajo Community Plan and issue number 8 above, consideration should be given to stepping the development height back from Zion Avenue to relate with the single-family residential to the south. (From Cycle 4)

For questions regarding the 'Plan-Long Range Planning' review, please call Dan Monroe at (619) 236-5529. Project Nbr: 266702 / Cycle: 6





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 17 In accordance with issue number 9, consideration of providing a central courtyard area for the residents away from surface parking should be considered. (From Cycle 4)

LRP Review 3.29.12

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 18 Please provide a narrative describing in further detail how the issues identified as part of the CPA Initiation hearing have been addressed (Issues 4-12). These will be included as an attachment to the staff report for future PC hearing. (New Issue)
- 19 The redesign of the project has located surface parking adjacent to the public right-of-way on both Zion and Glenroy. The Navajo Community Plan requires adequate screening of off-street parking from public areas. Please include the height of the proposed landscaping at maturity for the streetyard area along Zion and Glenroy so staff can determine if adequate screening is being provided. (New Issue)
- 20 Issue 19 cont'd: The community plan also recommends use of mounded earth forms in areas of level terrain to add interest to the landscape, to hide parking and to separate functions. Please consider use of mounded earth forms in addition to plant screening to hide parking areas. (New Issue)
- 21 Unit mix calculations on sheet one do not match unit counts on sheets 3, 4 and 5. Please revise sheet one to match current site design and unit mix. (New Issue)
- 22 Staff understands that the redesign of the site layout is due in part to community input from the Allied Gardens Community Council. Has input regarding site design been received from the Navajo Community Planners, Inc who are officially recognized advisory group to City Council? Staff recommends input from the broader community representation on NCPI regarding both previous and present site design. (New Issue)
- 23 LRP staff has identified several pedestrian improvement opportunities which may increase pedestrian safety for senior residents and help increase mobility to access adjacent park, library, transit and shopping areas. Staff will coordinate with the applicant to discuss feasibility of these potential improvements. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Park & Rec	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Shifflet, Robin (619) 533-4524	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/12/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 5.00	<b>Started:</b> 03/12/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 04/04/2012	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Park & Rec on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Park & Rec (1 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Park & Rec performed 20 reviews, 80.0% were on-time, and 78.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Review 1-17-12

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	This project was reviewed for conformance with the City's General Plan standards for population-based parks, the Navajo Recreation Element and the Navajo Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP). (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The City's General Plan standard for population-based parks is 2.8 acres per 1,000 persons in the form of neighborhood and community parks (e.g., neighborhood parks of 3 to 13 acres for every 5,000 residents and community parks a minimum of 13 acres for every 25,000 residents). Community recreation facilities are provided as follows: a Recreation Center for every 25,000 residents and an Aquatic Complex for every 50,000 residents. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The development proposes 58 residential units. The current community plan anticipates 9 residential units but with the proposed community plan amendment there will be an additional 49 units and these units will be subject to population-based park standards which are calculated as follows: 49 units times a density factor of 2.60 persons per household (according to SANDAG projections) will generate 127 new residents. At 2.8 acres per 1000 persons, the proposed development requires 0.36 acres of "useable" park land. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	The General Plan defines "useable" park land as: "A graded pad not exceeding two percent rough grade, as required to provide for structured, public recreational programs of an active nature common to local parks in the City of San Diego (such as ball games or court games)." (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	"Or gently sloping land not exceeding ten percent grade for unstructured public recreational activities, such as children's play areas, appreciation of open spaces, or a combination, thereof, unconstrained by environmental restrictions that would prevent its use a park and recreation facility, free of structures, roads or utilities, and unencumbered by easements of any kind." (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	In addition, per General Plan, the proposed development is required to provide a pro rata share of the cost of a Recreation Center and an Aquatic Complex. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	The 0.36 acres of park land is to be provided onsite or within the community plan area. In lieu of providing park land onsite, the value may be paid as an Ad-Hoc fee at the time of building permit issuance. These fees are to be based on current fair market value of the land within that community and current design and construction costs, as determined by the Park Planning Section of DSD, at time of discretionary permit issuance. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	The estimated Ad-Hoc fees are approximately:  0.36 acres of Population-based Park: \$707,841 Pro rata share of Recreation Facility: \$46,798 Pro rate share of Aquatic Complex: \$18,557 Total Park Fee: \$773,195 (From Cycle 4)

## Permit Conditions 4-2-12

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Owner/Permittee shall pay the Navajo Development Impact Fee at the time of building permit issuance to satisfy the population-based park requirements for this affordable housing project. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Housing Commission	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Black, Laura (619) 236-6327	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 1.00	<b>Started:</b> 03/29/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 03/29/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Housing Commission on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 7 outstanding review issues with Housing Commission (1 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

## Mandatory Initial Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Prior to receiving the first residential building permit, Owner/Permittee shall comply with the provisions of Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 13 of the San Diego Municipal Code ("Inclusionary Affordable Housing Regulations") by performing one of the following, at the Owner's/Permittee's sole election, as and to the extent permitted by applicable law. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Payment to the City of San Diego of the full Inclusionary Affordable Housing Fee based upon the aggregate square footage of all residential units in the project, on terms set forth within the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Regulations; or (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Provide evidence to the San Diego Housing Commission, in the form of executed Exemption Agreements and Public Entity Agreements, as referenced with Part IV of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Implementation & Monitoring Procedures Manual ("Procedures Manual") approved by the City Council of the City of San Diego, demonstrating that the Owner/Permittee is exempt from the payment of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Fee based upon San Diego Municipal Code Section 142.0303(f) because the Owner/Permittee is receiving specific regulatory incentives and/or concessions from a public agency that (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	(cont. issue): result in identifiable, financially sufficient, and actual project cost reductions, including but not limited to expedited permit processing provided through the Affordable/In-Fill Housing and Sustainable Buildings Expedite Program and/or the approval of a deviation, waiver or reduction of development standards or regulations ("development incentives") and because the Owner/Permittee is voluntarily restricting rental units in exchange for such development incentives, as provided for within Part IV of the Procedures Manual; or (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Provide evidence to the San Diego Housing Commission, in the form of executed Exemption Agreements and Public Entity Agreements, as referenced with Part IV of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Implementation & Monitoring Procedures Manual ("Procedures Manual") approved by the City Council of the City of San Diego, demonstrating that the Owner/Permittee is exempt from the payment of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Fee based upon San Diego Municipal Code Section 142.0303(g) because the Owner/Permittee is voluntarily pursuing (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	(cont. issue): and receiving tax credits, multifamily housing bonds, below market interest rate government agency loans, and/or grants to facilitate the construction of the development. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Please fill out forms DS-530 (Affordable Housing Checklist) and DS-531 (Affordable/In-Fill Housing and Sustainable Buildings Expedite Program) as the forms have changed since the applicant submitted them to DSD. PM will provide these forms with the mandatory preliminary review letter and also at the mandatory preliminary meeting on 1/24/12. (From Cycle 4)

## First Review 04-02-2012

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Staff will forward any additional concerns from the Housing Commission Staff. To date, no additional information has been submitted from Housing Commission staff. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> PUD-Water & Sewer Dev	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Keshavarzi, Mahmood (619) 533-4692	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/13/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 4.00	<b>Started:</b> 03/28/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Conditions	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 04/02/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for PUD-Water & Sewer Dev on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 4 outstanding review issues with PUD-Water & Sewer Dev (4 of which are new issues).
- . Last month PUD-Water & Sewer Dev performed 66 reviews, 90.9% were on-time, and 78.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 1st Review Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Sheet 10: Revise legend and delete PRIVATE from water, fire and sewer services. The portion of water and sewer services located within public right-of-way is private. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Sheet 10: Please add the following note: All on site water and sewer facilities are private. (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Sheet 10: Please change Propose sewer lateral to EXISTING sewer lateral. (From Cycle 4)

## Draft Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, the design and construction of any new water and sewer service(s) outside of any driveway, and the disconnection at the water main of the existing unused water service adjacent to the project site, in a manner satisfactory to the Director of Public Utilities and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall apply for a plumbing permit for the installation of appropriate private back flow prevention device(s), on each water service (domestic, fire and irrigation), in a manner satisfactory to the Director of Public Utilities and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy, all public water and sewer facilities shall be complete and operational in a manner satisfactory to the Director of Public Utilities and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	The Owner/Permittee shall design and construct all proposed public water and sewer facilities in accordance with established criteria in the current edition of the City of San Diego Water and Sewer Facility Design Guidelines and City regulations, standards and practices. (New Issue)







L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> BDR-Structural	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Shadyab, Mehdi (619) 446-5067	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/12/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.25	<b>Started:</b> 03/13/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 03/21/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 03/13/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for BDR-Structural on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 15 outstanding review issues with BDR-Structural (None of which are new)
- . Last month BDR-Structural performed 823 reviews, 92.5% were on-time, and 93.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

**Preliminary Review Comments**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	No Rechecks: Please be advised that the issues stated herein are preliminary and are advisory in nature. Their purpose is to give the design consultants an advanced notice of issues which have to be corrected and/or addressed when plans are submitted for the ministerial review. Plans for recheck of issues under this preliminary review need not be submitted and recheck will not be performed. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Scope of review: Please be advised that the scope of this review is limited to a discretionary plan review. The plans, drawings and reports have NOT been reviewed for the purpose of issuing a building permit. A comprehensive and complete review will be performed by City staff when a complete set of construction document drawings and reports are submitted for the purpose of ministerial review and for obtaining a building permit. The comments stated herein are advisory and are for information only. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Designer's responsibility: It is the responsibility of the architect or engineer of record to assure that all the requirements of the latest adopted edition of the CBC, as well as other regulations and ordinances of the City of San Diego are satisfied and incorporated in the plans, specifications and structural calculations. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Not a complete list: The following comments are only a partial list of issues discovered as a result of this discretionary review and responses to the specific questions asked. They are NOT to be construed as a complete list of corrections or a complete list of issues. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Disabled accessibility: The proposed project [the site, buildings, parking, path of travel, storage, etc.] must be accessible by persons with disabilities, and shall comply with the applicable provisions set forth in Chapter 11A (privately funded housing), Chapter 11B (public accommodations, commercial buildings and publicly funded housing), as well as with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations, Title II and Title III as applicable. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	ADA Regulations (1 of 2): The proposed project must also be in compliance with applicable accessibility provisions of the American with Disabilities Act. Please be advised that this jurisdiction has no legal authority to enforce and/or review construction plans for compliance with the ADA, disabled accessibility regulations. ADA requirements are strictly enforced by the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice of the Federal Government. This jurisdiction however has the legal authority to enforce the disabled accessibility requirements of the State of California, Title 24, Part 2. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	ADA Regulations (2 of 2): The Registered Design Professional of Record has the responsibility to assure that the proposed development project is in compliance with both, the governing Federal ADA, and the State of California disabled accessibility regulations. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Site plan: Site plan as submitted is conceptual and it does not show adequate information to review for site disabled accessibility provisions. When submitting complete construction plans for ministerial review, provide a site plan showing all applicable information pertaining to disabled accessibility features such as width of walkways, running slope, cross slope, change in level from top of accessible walkway and adjacent grade, detectable warnings, ramp and parkings details, etc. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	FAA-Part 77-Noticing Requirements: Due to the height and proximity of the proposed project to <Montgomery Field>, your project must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for Obstruction Evaluation and Airport Airspace Analysis as required by the Code of Federal Regulations Title 14 Part 77, Subpart B to ensure that the structure will not be an obstruction or hazard to air navigation. The following is a link to the FAA website for submitting projects (form 4760-1) to the FAA: <a href="http://www.oa.faa.gov">www.oa.faa.gov</a> . (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	FAA-Part 77, Contd.: Also, refer to Information Bulletin 520 for additional information. The City will not require notification to the FAA if a professional, licensed by the state of California complies with the self-certification requirements set forth under Section III. You may find this Info Bulletin on the Department web page at <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/">http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/</a> . Look for the 'FAA Notification' tab on the right hand side of the screen. (From Cycle 4)

For questions regarding the 'BDR-Structural' review, please call Mehdi Shadyab at (619) 446-5067. Project Nbr: 266702 / Cycle: 6





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Please be advised, a building permit will NOT be issued until FAA has cleared the issue associated with the height of the proposed building or, a professional, licensed by the state of California complies with the self-certification provision set forth under Section III of Information Bulletin 520 . (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Van Accessible Parking: Provide and show on site plan van accessible parking in accordance with the requirements of Section 1109A.8.6. Site plan as shown does not provide for van accessible parking. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Source of Funding: State on plan source of funding for construction of this project; Privately funded v. Publicly funded v. Federal funded and percentage of each as applicable. This will determine which set of accessibility provisions are applicable to the project proposed. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Sheet 9 of 10: Preliminary Grading Plan: When the slope in the direction of travel of any walk on an accessible route exceeds 1 unit vertical in 20 units horizontal (5-percent slope), it shall comply with the ramp provisions of Section 1114A. Please see the change in slope of 8.33% maximum shown in the walkway adjacent to accessible parking stalls. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	/// (From Cycle 4)





# Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Plan-Airport	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Galloway, Tait (619) 533-4550	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/12/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.10	<b>Started:</b> 03/12/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 03/21/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 03/23/2012	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 03/21/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Airport on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Plan-Airport (1 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Plan-Airport performed 7 reviews, 100.0% were on-time, and 42.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

### ALUCP 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Airspace: The proposed project's max height would be 367.32 feet Above Mean Sea Level for the buildings. The Part 77 notification surface (100:1) for Montgomery Field crosses this property at 587 feet AMSL. While the proposed residential buildings do not exceed the FAA Part 77 notification surface; the proposed project is within an instrument approach area and proximity to a navigation facility. Please provide notification to the FAA. Refer to Information Bulletin 520: <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/pdf/infobulletin/ib520.pdf">http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/pdf/infobulletin/ib520.pdf</a> (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	ALUC Determination: Since the project is proposing a community plan amendment and a rezone, the City is required to submit the proposed project to the Airport Authority, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), for a consistency determination with the adopted ALUCP for Montgomery Field to final approval by the City. The FAA determination letter(s) will need to be included with the ALUC application. Refer to Information Bulletin 519: <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/pdf/infobulletin/ib519.pdf">http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/pdf/infobulletin/ib519.pdf</a> (From Cycle 4)

### ALUCP 2nd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Issue 4 (FAA notification) from the first review has not been addressed. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Environmental Services Dept	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Wood, Lisa (858) 573-1236	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 3.00	<b>Started:</b> 03/26/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 03/26/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Environmental Services Dept on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Environmental Services Dept performed 3 reviews, 33.3% were on-time, and 66.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## New Issue Group (1516161)

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	DISPOSAL REPORTING. End of last paragraph page 6 add: "Per SB1016, these diversion requirements are translated into a mandatory per capita disposal limit. This regulatory change enforces a requirement to dispose of less waste, rather than to recycle more material." (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	PRECONSTRUCTION MEETING. Add ESD to invitees to precon for inspection of source separation. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	OCCUPANCY PHASE. Given challenges insuring waste reduction measures are implemented in occupancy phase, a commitment to providing at least a minimum amount of construction material with post-consumer content is desirable, but not required in this case. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 03/09/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/09/2012
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Community Planning Group	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Black, Laura (619) 236-6327	<b>Assigned:</b> 03/09/2012	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.50	<b>Started:</b> 03/29/2012	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Review Due:</b> 04/02/2012	
	<b>Completed:</b> 03/29/2012	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 04/04/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/04/2012 from 04/04/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 67 reviews, 55.2% were on-time, and 62.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Navajo Community Planners, Inc

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Chair for the Navajo Community Planners, Inc., Allen Jones, at 619.400.0134 or email ajones@hgfenton.com to make arrangements to present your project for review at their next available meeting. This Community Plannig Group is officially recognized by the City as a representative of the community, and an advisor to the City in actions that would affect the community. The Development Services Department has notified the group of your request and has sent them a copy of your project plans and documents. (New Issue)

