



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 416650 **Title:** Cortes Residence NDP
Project Mgr: Mendoza, Pancho (619) 446-5194 Fmendoza@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/16/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/16/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 04/16/2015	
Reviewer: Lizzi, Philip (619) 446-5159 plizzi@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/16/2015	
	Started: 05/05/2015	
Hours of Review: 6.00	Review Due: 05/14/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/14/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/19/2015 from 05/19/2015 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 14 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 134 reviews, 44.0% were on-time, and 46.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Information

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

- 1 The project site is located in the RS-1-4 zone; Project proposes a single family dwelling on a site containing Environmentally Sensitive Lands.

A Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP) is required due to the presence of Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL). The project may be processed in accordance with Process Two if it is designed to meet all regulations of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands section. Depending on ESL/deviations this could result in a Process 4 decision. Process 4 is a Planning Commission decision. The decision could be appealed to the next highest level. (New Issue)
- 2 Per LDC section 112.0103, this project shall be consolidated at the highest decision level established by the required discretionary permits for this project (should any additional permits be required), with all supplemental findings to be developed by the applicant and to be submitted for staff to review as the project nears a hearing date. (New Issue)
- 3 Please note if the project is redesigned to include retaining walls the following would apply. The retaining wall height within the 6 foot Front Yard setback shall not exceed 3 feet, pursuant to LDC, section 142.0340 (c). (New Issue)
- 4 Outside of the front yard setback the maximum height for a single retaining wall, measured from grade to grade, shall be 10 feet. When the overall retained height would exceed 10 feet, the retaining wall shall be broken into multiple stepped walls, with no individual wall height exceeding 6 feet. A minimum horizontal distance of 3 feet shall be maintained between each individual wall in the stepped wall system, and shall be landscaped. (New Issue)
- 5 Also, consider retaining walls that are incorporated into the design of the structure so that they become part of the structure. The color of retaining walls should blend with the natural terrain and the color of the structures on the site. See Retaining Wall regulations in SDMC Section, 142.0340. (New Issue)

Community Plan

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

- 6 The project site is located on Norman Avenue in the Navajo Community and is designated low density residential and located within an area identified as having steep hillsides. Allowable density is 0-8 dwelling unit per acre. Density conforms to the Community Plan. (New Issue)

ESL

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

- 7 Development Area
The allowable development area is limited to previously disturbed areas (areas not containing steep hillsides), except that development is permitted in steep hillsides if necessary to achieve a maximum development area of 25 percent of the premises, LDC, section 143.0142(a) (2). (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Philip Lizzi at (619) 446-5159. Project Nbr: 416650 / Cycle: 2





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	The "Limit of Work/Development Line" has been shown on the Site and Grading Plan. Once this line is established per Exhibit "A", development/grading/encroachment shall not be permitted beyond this line. Development area shall include all graded/disturbed/developed/brush management zone 1 areas. Please shade this area on the plans and provide the area calculation. This line of development shall coincide with the Covenant of Easement boundary, please revise plans accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Requirement for Covenant of Easement: Per 143.0152 assurance of the continued preservation of the remainder portion of the site will be achieved with the requirement for the property owner to record a covenant of easement against the title to the property that will maintain that portion of the property in its natural state. Provide the area (square footage) of the proposed Covenant of Easement on the Site/Grading plan. The Easement shall be a condition of the SDP and shall be recorded prior to Grading Permit approval. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Clearly demonstrate that development is complying with the standards of the Steep Hillside Guidelines. It shall be demonstrated that proposed development results in the most sensitive design possible (refer to the Steep Hillside Guidelines, pages 16-18). Manufactured grade/contour lines should blend with existing native terrain/slope. newly created manufactured slopes should be landform graded with undulating slopes, irregular/varying gradients, and with the top and bottom of new manufactured slopes rounded to resemble natural landforms. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Pursuant to ESL regulation 143.0142 (c), newly created slopes shall not exceed the slope gradient in section 142.0133. Revise the proposed grading to a maximum of 50 percent gradient (2:1). Slopes steeper than 50 percent gradient (2:1) may be authorized by the City Engineer pursuant to section 142.0133(d). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Per SDMC Section 143.0141(1), all development occurring in sensitive biological resources is subject to a site-specific impact analysis conducted by the City Manager, in accordance with the Biology Guidelines in the Land Development Manual. The impact analysis shall evaluate impacts to sensitive biological resources and CEQA sensitive species. The analysis shall determine the corresponding mitigation, where appropriate, and the requirements for protection and management. Mitigation requirements will be determined by the LDR-Environmental reviewer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Grading and offsite disturbance of Environmentally Sensitive Lands shall require a site specific analysis of each lot. Impacts to Steep Hillside shall conform to SDMC, Section 143.0142. Provide a steep slope analysis for the adjacent lots. The environmental document shall also include an analysis of impacts to sensitive biological resources, SDMC, Section 143.0141. (New Issue)

Planning Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Parking: Provide the required parking space dimensions on the floor plans as specified in SDMC Section 142.0560(b), Table 142-05K. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/16/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/16/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 04/16/2015	
Reviewer: De Freitas, Natalie (619) 446-5187 Ndefreitas@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/17/2015	
	Started: 05/15/2015	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 05/19/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/18/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2015	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 4 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 109 reviews, 39.4% were on-time, and 40.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Extended Initial Study 5/15/15

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) has reviewed the referenced project and has determined that additional information is required for Biological Resources. Until the above issue has been addressed, the CEQA determination cannot be made and the environmental processing time line will be held in abeyance. (New Issue)

Biological Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The project is located within native habitat and has the potential to impact sensitive biological resources. Therefore, the preparation of biological technical report (BTR), prepared in accordance with the City's Biological Guidelines, would be required. The biological report should include the following: Location Map (800 Engineering scale) w/survey boundaries (Elevations/topography, north direction, and scale), Vegetation Map overlain by the development proposal Vegetation map (with ESL delineated) showing habitat, area of impact with habitat and plant species. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please demonstrate if there are additional seasonal/preconstruction surveys required for spring/breeding/wet conditions? The BTR should identify all potential direct and indirect impacts to biological resources (include all on- and off-site utility connections, staging areas, brush management zones, and access/staging areas. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The report should also quantify all impact areas by Tier and should state recommendations to mitigate any potential significant impacts to biological resources. Please identify if the project could impact sensitive avian species. Are any permits or legal compliance required (City, State, and/or Federal)? (New Issue)

Informational

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Historical Resources (Archeology): Even though the site is presently undeveloped, due to the 25% or greater slope for most of the site, staff determined an archeological survey would not be required. No further action is needed for this item (New Issue) [Recommended]





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/16/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/16/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 04/16/2015	
Reviewer: Florezabihi, Hoss (619) 446-5348 florezabihh@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/16/2015	
	Started: 05/14/2015	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 05/14/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/15/2015	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 05/22/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/19/2015 from 05/19/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 8 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 86 reviews, 83.7% were on-time, and 38.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please revise location of front property line on your Site Plan & Grading Plan to show/call out 10' curb to PL consistent with provided topo. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Please note all proposed non standard private improvements within public right of way will require Encroachment Maintenance & removal Agreement that must be processed during Ministerial review. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please note proposed drainage pattern for this project must mimic Existing condition (several drainage points in oppose to two concentrated point of discharge). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Please add a note on your Site Plan stating property owner bears the risk of private property accepting public water by providing " Hold City Harmless" form. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Please note no permanent structure will be allowed within sewer easement . This includes building caisson , deck , etc.. Please revise accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Please note per DS-560 , this is a "Standard Project" and is subject to LID (site design and Source Control) requirements. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Please note per DS-560 , Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) is required . Please refer to appendix G of storm Water Standard Manual for requirements . (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	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 Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/16/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/16/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 04/16/2015	
Reviewer: Mendoza, Pancho (619) 446-5194 Fmendoza@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/23/2015	
	Started: 05/19/2015	
Hours of Review: 0.30	Review Due: 05/14/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/19/2015	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 05/22/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/19/2015 from 05/19/2015 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 69 reviews, 49.3% were on-time, and 58.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Contact Group

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	If you have not already done so, please contact Matthew Adams, Chairperson of the Navajo Community Planners, Inc., at navajoplanners@cox.net to schedule your project for a recommendation from the group. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the community planning group, in your resubmittal please indicate how your project incorporates any input suggested to you by the community planning group. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/16/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/16/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 04/16/2015	
Reviewer: Kohakura, Vanessa (619) 446-5120 Vkohakura@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/16/2015	
	Started: 05/08/2015	
Hours of Review: 2.25	Review Due: 05/14/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/12/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/19/2015 from 05/19/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 55 reviews, 85.5% were on-time, and 41.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

First Review - 5/19/15

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Per the Public Facility Regulations, San Diego Municipal Code 142.0610 and 142.0611(c), this project is subject to street tree requirements. Propose street trees from the Street Tree Selection Guide found at the following link: http://www.sandiego.gov/street-div/pdf/treeguide.pdf Locate trees away from all underground utilities per SDMC 142.0409. Show the location, species, and size (min. 24" box) on the plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Street trees cont: Propose street trees at a rate of one canopy tree per 30 linear feet of street frontage or one palm tree per 20 lf of street frontage. Show any existing or proposed utility locations so staff can verify the minimum separation distances to trees. *Washingtonia robusta (Mexican fan palm) has been found to be invasive, and therefore, not allowed to be planted. If existing palm is a Mexican fan palm, please replace with another noninvasive species. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Provide the following note on the Landscape Plan: MINIMUM TREE SEPARATION DISTANCE Traffic signals / stop signs - 20 feet Underground utility lines - 5 feet (10' for sewer) Above ground utility structures - 10 feet Driveway (entries) - 10 feet Intersections (intersecting curb lines of two streets) - 25 feet (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/16/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/16/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Fire-Plan Review	Cycle Distributed: 04/16/2015	
Reviewer: Sylvester, Brenda (619) 446-5449 bsylvester@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/21/2015	
	Started: 05/14/2015	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 05/14/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/14/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/19/2015 from 05/19/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Fire-Plan Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Fire-Plan Review performed 36 reviews, 47.2% were on-time, and 73.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Fire Department Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	No corrections or issues based on this submittal. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	NOTE: (Information Only): Properties located in the very high severity fire zone may be subject to additional mitigation/upgrades to the structure if 100 ft. of defensible space can not be obtained per landscaping review. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/16/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/16/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Facilities Financing	Cycle Distributed: 04/16/2015	
Reviewer: Burgess, Victoria (619) 533-3684 vburgess@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/16/2015	
	Started: 04/20/2015	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Review Due: 05/14/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 04/20/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/19/2015 from 05/19/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Facilities Financing on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Plan-Facilities Financing performed 98 reviews, 92.9% were on-time, and 99.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Impact Fees

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Development Impact Fees (DIF) are required at building permit issuance based on increased residential development. The currently adopted Navajo DIF rate for residential development is \$7,214.00 per single-dwelling unit. Rates provided are subject to annual change on July 1 or updates to a Community Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP). (New Issue) [Recommended]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	City RTCIP Fees on residential development are required at building permit issuance. These fees were established to ensure that new Development invests in the Region's transportation system to offset the negative impact of growth on congestion and mobility. RTCIP Fee is \$2,625 per sdu and/or \$2,100 per mdu. Rates subject to change annually July 1. On-site affordable housing units are exempt from the City RTCIP Fee. To qualify for this exemption, a recorded Affordable Housing Agreement with the Housing Commission must be submitted to Facilities Financing prior to building permit issuance. (New Issue) [Recommended]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The Impact Fee Schedule outlines the fees which the Facilities Financing Section of the City collects at building permit issuance as part of the costs of land development in the City of San Diego. Fees are paid through OpenDSD at http://opensd.sandiego.gov/web/invoices/ . The schedule can be accessed on the City web site at: http://www.sandiego.gov/facilitiesfinancing/pdf/feeschedule.pdf (New Issue) [Recommended]





Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/16/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/16/2015
Reviewing Discipline: REA-Airports	Cycle Distributed: 04/16/2015	
Reviewer: Mendoza, Pancho (619) 446-5194 Fmendoza@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/23/2015	
	Started: 04/23/2015	
Hours of Review: 0.30	Review Due: 05/14/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 04/23/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/19/2015 from 05/19/2015 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 REA-Airports on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with REA-Airports (all of which are new).
- . Last month REA-Airports performed 1 reviews, 100.0% were on-time, and 100.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

First review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Although the location is not in the overflight notification area, it will be subject to aircraft overflights and noise. It is less than 5 miles from Montgomery Field and very close to the extended centerline for the main runway. (New Issue)

