

June 15, 2020

via email: [jessgonzales4299@gmail.com](mailto:jessgonzales4299@gmail.com)

Jess Gonzales  
CDGI, Inc.  
P.O. Box 84180  
San Diego, CA 92138

Subject: K-4 Residence, Project Assessment Letter; Project No. 522708;  
Internal Order No. 24007080; La Jolla Community Plan

Dear Mr. Gonzales:

The Development Services Department has completed the third review of the project referenced above and described as the demolition of an existing dwelling unit and construction of an approximately 8,101 square-foot, two-story over basement dwelling unit with guest quarters located at 7595 Hillside Drive. The 0.797-acre site is in the Single Family (SF) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, and Coastal (Non-appealable) Overlay Zone within the La Jolla Community Plan.

Enclosed is a Cycle Issues Report (Enclosure 1) which contains review comments from staff representing various disciplines, outside agencies and the community planning group. The purpose of this assessment letter is to summarize the significant project issues and identify a course of action for the processing of your project.

If any additional requirements should arise during the subsequent review of your project, we will identify the issue and the reason for the additional requirement. To resolve any outstanding issues, please provide the information that is requested in the Cycle Issues Report.

The Development Services Department will generally formulate a formal recommendation for your project subsequent to completion of the following milestones: 1) After the City Council recognized Community Planning Group has provided a formal project recommendation; 2) After all City staff project-review comments have been adequately addressed; and 3) During the final stages of the environmental review process.

As your Development Project Manager, I will coordinate all correspondence, emails, phone calls, and meetings directly with you – the assigned “Point of Contact.” Please notify me if your role should change during the processing of this project.

**I. REQUIRED APPROVALS:** Your project as currently proposed requires the processing of:

- Process 2, Coastal Development Permit, for development within the Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay Zone; and
- Process 3, La Jolla Shores Planned District Permit (Site Development Permit) for development in the La Jolla Shores Planned District.

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

**II. SIGNIFICANT PROJECT ISSUES:** As noted previously, the significant project issues are provided in the Cycle Issues Report. Resolution of these issues could affect your project. Please carefully review the City staff comments and respond accordingly.

- On November 25, 2019, you presented your project to the La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board (Board) and the Board voted to recommend denial of the application. However, you mentioned your desire to return to the Board again and attempt to obtain a positive recommendation. Therefore, please contact Marlon Pangilinan, Planning Dept./Sr. Planner at 619-235-5293 or by email at [MPangilinan@sandiego.gov](mailto:MPangilinan@sandiego.gov), to schedule your project for a presentation before the Board at their next available meeting.
- The requested Biology Report was not submitted during the project's latest review and therefore, submittal of the Biology Report is required along with the other project review documents. The previous separate review of the Biology Report has been removed and incorporated into your next project submittal.

**III. STUDIES/REPORTS REQUIRED:** A number of documents have been identified as necessary to the project's review. Reference the attached Submittal Requirements Report (Enclosure 2).

**IV. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS:** Our current accounting system does not provide for real-time information regarding account status and majority of the recent City staff charges have not been posted on the account. However, our latest data indicates you have a deficit amount of approximately \$812.00 in your deposit trust account.

During the processing of your project, you will continue to receive monthly statements with the break-down of staff charges to your account. The minimum balance required for a Site Development Permit application is \$5,000.00, <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/dsdib503.pdf>. To avoid project delays due to insufficient account funds, please ensure that your deposit account maintains the minimum account balance at all times. **Please pay the invoice** (Enclosure 3).

For your convenience, deposits can be made anytime online through Open DSD, <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/opendsd/>, and by entering your project number in the "Project ID" field, <http://opendsd.sandiego.gov/web/approvals/>. Also, any invoices can be paid online by searching for the invoice number, <http://opendsd.sandiego.gov/web/invoices/> or in person at the Cashier, located on the 3rd Floor of the Development Services Center.

- V. TIMELINE:** Upon your review of the attached Cycle Issues Report, you may wish to schedule a meeting with staff and your consultants prior to resubmitting the project. Please telephone me if you wish to schedule a meeting with staff. During the meeting, we will also focus on key milestones that must be met in order to facilitate the review of your proposal and to project a potential timeline for a hearing date. Your next review cycle should take approximately 20 working days to complete.

Municipal Code Section 126.0114 requires that a development permit application be closed if the applicant fails to submit or resubmit requested materials, information, fees, or deposits within 90 calendar days, **by no later than September 15, 2020**. Once closed, the application, plans and other data submitted for review may be returned to the applicant or destroyed. To reapply, the applicant shall be required to submit a new development permit application with required submittal materials, and shall be subject to all applicable fees and regulations in effect on the date the new application is deemed complete.

If you wish to continue processing this project, please note that delays in resubmitting projects and/or responding to City staff's inquiries negatively impact this Department's ability to effectively manage workload, which can lead to both higher processing costs and longer timelines for your project.

- VI. RESUBMITTALS/NEXT STEPS:** *COVID-19 Update* - To ensure the health, safety and well-being of customers and department staff, the Development Services Department has implemented operational service changes that will be in effect until further notice. Please visit the Development Services Department webpage for the current status on submittal, plan pick up, will call, and payments; <https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/covid-19-public-notice>. Please be prepared to provide the following:

A. Plans and Reports: Provide the number of sets of plans and reports as shown on the attached Submittal Requirements Report. The plans should be folded to an approximate 8 ½ x 11-inch size.

B. Response to Cycle Issues Report: Prepare a cover letter that specifically describes how you have addressed each of the issues identified in the Cycle Issues Report and any issues identified in this cover letter, if applicable. Or, you may choose to simply submit the Cycle Issues Report, identifying within the margins how you have addressed the issue. If the issue is addressed on one or more sheets of the plans or the reports, please reference the plan, sheet number, report or page number as appropriate. If it is not feasible to address a particular issue, please indicate the reason. Include a copy of this Assessment Letter, Cycle Issues Report and your response letter if applicable, with each set of plans.

C. Deposit Account: Please pay enclosed invoice prior to your project re-submittal. The re-submittal **cannot** be distributed to City staff when an invoice is outstanding.

**VII. COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP:** Staff provides the decision maker with the recommendation from your locally recognized community planning group. If you have not already done so, please contact Diane Kane, Chairperson of the La Jolla Community Planning Association at (858) 459-9490 or email [info@lajollacpa.org](mailto:info@lajollacpa.org), to schedule your project for a recommendation from the group. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the community planning group, in your resubmittal, if applicable, please indicate how your project incorporates any input suggested to you by the community planning group.

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

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

**IX. PROJECT ISSUE RESOLUTION CONFERENCE:** Project Issue Resolution (PIR) conferences provide customers an opportunity to have issues heard and considered by executive department management. A PIR will be considered if, after the issuance of the third Assessment Letter for discretionary projects, customers and staff have been unable to resolve project issues. The PIR would address issues such as disagreements between the applicant and staff on interpretations of codes or ordinances, requests for additional information or studies, or project-related processing requirements. Any determinations from a PIR are not binding on any City decision-making body, such as City Council, Planning Commission, or Hearing Officer. Qualifying PIR requests should be coordinated with your Development Project Manager.

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

**Open DSD:** To view project details online, visit: <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/opensd/>.

Page 5  
Jess Gonzales  
June 15, 2020

For modifications to the project scope, submittal requirements or questions regarding any of the above, please contact me prior to resubmittal. I may be reached by telephone at (619) 446-5356 or via e-mail at [TPDaly@sandiego.gov](mailto:TPDaly@sandiego.gov).

Sincerely,



Tim Daly  
Development Project Manager

Enclosures:

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

cc: File  
Chair, La Jolla Community Planning Association  
Reviewing Staff  
Marlon Pangilinan, Community Planner, Planning Department



L64A-003A

## Project Information

**Project Nbr:** 522708      **Title:** K-4 Residence  
**Project Mgr:** Daly, Tim      (619) 446-5356      TPDaly@sandiego.gov



## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 05/07/2020	Deemed Complete on 05/07/2020
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Planning Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 05/11/2020	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Lizzi, Philip (619) 446-5159 plizzi@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 05/12/2020	
	<b>Started:</b> 05/28/2020	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 2.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/28/2020	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 06/02/2020	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 06/15/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/02/2020 from 06/02/2020 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 4th 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 (4 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 80 reviews, 65.0% were on-time, and 54.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Action Items

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	Project is required to comply with the development regulations for sensitive biological resources, LDC, Section 143.0141. Planning will coordinate with the Environmental Analysis Section after review of the requested Biology information submitted by the applicant. Provide a copy to Planning staff as well for review. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	A Covenant of Easement is required per Section 143.0152, and shall be identified on Exhibit "A". On separate sheet, identify/call out the Covenant of Easement area. Also, provide the area calculation in acres/square footage on the plans. The easement area shall include all Environmentally Sensitive Lands (Steep Hillides, Sensitive Biological Resources) within the property boundary.
		Cont. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	Cont.
		The easement must be recorded prior to the issuance of any grading/building/map permit. Owner/Permittee shall execute a covenant of easement recorded against title to the affected premises and executed in favor of the City, SDMC 143.0152. (From Cycle 10)

## 10/17/19

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	A covenant of easement was discussed but not identified on the plans. In addition the area was not identified. Please indicate where the covenant of easement will be and how much area it will cover. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34	The applicant has indicated a low point five feet out from the structure which is at 299 feet 7 and 3/8 inches and a high point at the top of the roof at 340 feet exceeding the maximum height limit allowed. Please correct. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Please indicate the limit of development on the site plan. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	Planning will continue to coordinate with Environmental staff. (From Cycle 10)

## 3rd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	A covenant of easement has still not be identified. 3rd request. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	The proposed driveway does not comply with the San Diego Municipal Code. Please see Table 142-05B and footnote 1 and diagram 142-05A. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	Please respond to remaining uncleared issues. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	Because the companion unit has been changed to a guest quarters the applicant will be required to record a guest quarter agreement. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 05/07/2020	Deemed Complete on 05/07/2020
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Environmental	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 05/11/2020	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Holowach, Courtney (619) 446-5187 Cholowach@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 05/13/2020	
	<b>Started:</b> 06/01/2020	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 3.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 06/02/2020	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 06/01/2020	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 06/15/2020	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 46 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (12 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 64 reviews, 67.2% were on-time, and 49.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Cycle 10 - October 2019

### Biological Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	EAS is receipt of the 7595 Hillside Drive Biological Technical Report, Victor Novik Consulting, September 2019. EAS has the following comments: (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	Pg. 1, Abstract: You state that there are two sensitive habitats on-site but then qualify them as disturbed. It should be noted that the City of San Diego does not distinguish between disturbed and undisturbed in that all impacts are mitigated. If habitats are on site they must be defined as such with impacts and mitigation defined. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	Pg. 2, Botanical Resources - Flora: As discussed above, the qualifier of disturbed is not needed. Habitats on site must be clearly defined and mitigation assigned accordingly. Please quantify the habitats on-site and in table form show what tiers they are within the City. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Pg. 3, Wetland discussion: Does this qualify as a City defined wetland? If so, unless avoiding impacts, the City of San Diego will require an analysis of the project relative to its wetlands deviation process. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	Pg. 4, Wetland discussion: Does this qualify as a City defined wetland? If so, unless avoiding impacts, the City of San Diego will require an analysis of the project relative to its wetlands deviation process. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Pg. 5, Sensitive Wildlife: Please expand your Cooper's Hawk discussion. Is there suitable habitat on-site and will that habitat be impacted by the project? Clearly define what is the likelihood of Cooper's Hawk occurring, impacts that may occur, and mitigation measures if required. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	Pg. 5, Regulatory requirements: Please include all Federal, State, and local measures you are required to comply with. Include a clear statement you will be complying with all regulatory measures including MBTA. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	Pg. 7, "The disturbed seasonal wetland may be considered a wetland by the City of San Diego". This needs to be a definitive statement. If it is a City defined wetland clearly state it is. Provide impacts and mitigation if required. The preferred mitigation for impacts to wetlands is avoidance. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	Pg. 10, Mitigation and Monitoring Requirements: You state no impacts but appear to be providing mitigation. The report should also quantify all impact areas by Tier and should state recommendations to mitigate any potential significant impacts to biological resources. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	The Cooper's Hawk has been identified as having a high potential to occur onsite yet no mitigation is provided for direct or indirect impacts. Please clearly define if impacts would occur to this species and provide mitigation as necessary, including land use adjacency or biological monitoring. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	As previously discussed the wetland discussion needs to be expanded and much more clearly defined. In addition, implementation of BMPs is not a mitigation measure. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	41	The BTR as the technical document that informs those BIO measures should provide a narrative description also specifying what will be done- how many acres to offset what impacts, what method of mitigation - for mitigation. The BIO measures are then derived from the text in the BTR. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	For example: Mitigation for impacts to xx acre of what habitat will be accomplished through on-site restoration of xx acres of what habitat from disturbed habitat. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	The plans note an easement for biological resources. Is this easement intended as mitigation? Or is this a requirement going to be a permit condition through planning? Please clarify and include a discussion of this easement in the biology report. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	44	Further information regarding the City's Biology guidelines can be found here: <a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/amendment_to_the_land_development_manual_biology_guidelines_february_2018_-_clean.pdf">https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/amendment_to_the_land_development_manual_biology_guidelines_february_2018_-_clean.pdf</a> (From Cycle 10)

### Geologic Conditions

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Courtney Holowach at (619) 446-5187. Project Nbr: 522708 / Cycle: 12





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	45	The proposed project is mapped within Geologic Hazard Category 27. Hazard category 27 is categorized slide-prone formations: Otay, Sweetwater and others. According to Information Bulletin 515, a geotechnical report is required for a development in these categories. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	EAS defers to LDR-Geology on determinations of geologic hazards. LDR-Geology is requesting revisions to the submitted geotechnical report. Please refer to their comments. (From Cycle 10)

**Cultural Resources (Paleontolo**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	Based on information provided by the applicant, the project will excavate 4400 cubic feet of material to a depth of up to 24 feet. Since the submitted grading quantities exceed the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds this project will require paleontological monitoring during construction activities. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	49	Previously EAS had identified that the project would require a Mitigated Negative Declaration for impacts to Paleontological Resources. However, on March 22, 2018 the City updated Section 142.0151 of the Municipal Code relating to Paleontological Resources. As such, a MND will no longer be necessary as the project will be required to comply with Section 142.0151. The project must comply with monitoring requirements as noted in this section. Compliance with Section 142.0151 will mean impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant and an exemption can be prepared. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	50	The following will become conditions of the permit: (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	1. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents in "verbatim" as referenced in the City of San Diego Land Development Manual for Paleontological Resources. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	52	2. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC)/Environmental Designee (ED) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI), Monitors, and all persons for the project and the names of all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring program, as identified in City of San Diego Land Development Manual for Paleontological Resources. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	3. MMC/ED will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI, Monitors, and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project. Professional Qualifications shall meet the following standards: (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	54	a) The Principal Investigator (PI) should have a Ph.D. or M.S. in a field related to paleontology, such as geology or biology with an emphasis in paleobiology. Four cumulative years of full-time professional field, research, and museum experience in working with the geological formations of Southern California is required. Two of the four years must be in a supervisory capacity (crew chief or above). (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	b) Paleontological Monitors should have a B.S. in a field related to paleontology, such as geology or biology with an emphasis in paleobiology. Two cumulative years of full-time professional field, research, and museum experience in working with the geological formations of Southern California is required. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	4. Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program. (From Cycle 10)

**Cultural Resources (Tribal Cul**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	58	This project is subject to Tribal Consultation under AB 52. EAS staff will distribute notification to the local Kumeyaay community for possible consultation on this project. Please note that a request for consultation must be submitted by the tribe within 30 days of initial notification. If no request is made, consultation will conclude. If a request for consultation is made, then the EAS environmental processing timeline will be held abeyance until the consultation process has been completed. (From Cycle 10)

**Water Quality**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	59	EAS defers to LDR-Engineering on issues of water quality. LDR-Engineering is requesting a Drainage Study and revisions to the Water Quality Study. Until the requested information is received EAS cannot make its determination. (From Cycle 10)

**Land Use**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	60	EAS defers to LDR-Planning on General Plan, community plan, and Land Development Code issues. Per the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, an inconsistency with a land use plan is not in and of itself a significant impact; the inconsistency would have to result in a secondary physical impact. EAS will coordinate with Planning Review staff. (From Cycle 10)

**GHG**

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

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Courtney Holowach at (619) 446-5187. Project Nbr: 522708 / Cycle: 12





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	61	On July 12, 2016, the City of San Diego adopted the Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist, which requires all projects subject to discretionary review to demonstrate consistency with the Climate Action Plan. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	62	The submitted Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist was reviewed by EAS staff. The following comments and issues were identified: (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	63	Previous comments have not been addressed. Please submit a revised CAP Checklist addressing previous comments. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	65	New Issue (14783725) (From Cycle 10)

### Environmental Determination

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	64	Other reviewing disciplines have requested additional information. An environmental determination cannot be made until all issues in this review are addressed and all other reviewing disciplines have cleared their issues. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	66	Until this information is provided, EAS staff is not able to complete the environmental review 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 10)

### Cycle 12 - June 2020

#### Biological Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	67	This submittal did not include a revised biological technical report. A separate review cycle has been set up for the biological resources report. Comments will be forthcoming. Until then all previous comments remain unclear. (New Issue)

#### Geologic Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	68	EAS defers to LDR-Geology on determinations of geologic hazards (New Issue)

#### Cultural Resources (Paleo)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	69	Based on information provided by the applicant, the project will excavate 4400 cubic feet of material to a depth of up to 24 feet. Since the submitted grading quantities exceed the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds this project will require paleontological monitoring during construction activities. Monitoring will be a requirement of the permit. (New Issue)

#### Cultural Resources (Tribal Cul)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	70	This project is subject to Tribal Consultation under AB 52. EAS staff will distributed notification to the local Kumeyaay community for possible consultation on this project on October 9, 2019. No request for consultation was submitted by the tribes within 30 days of initial notification. Since no request was made consultation concluded. No impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources are anticipated. (New Issue)

#### Water Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	71	EAS defers to LDR-Engineering on issues of water quality. LDR-Engineering is requesting a Drainage Study and revisions to the Water Quality Study. Until the requested information is received EAS cannot make its determination. (New Issue)

#### Land Use

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	72	EAS defers to LDR-Planning on General Plan, community plan, and Land Development Code issues. Per the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, an inconsistency with a land use plan is not in and of itself a significant impact; the inconsistency would have to result in a secondary physical impact. EAS will coordinate with Planning Review staff. (New Issue)

#### GHG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	73	On July 12, 2016, the City of San Diego adopted the Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist, which requires all projects subject to discretionary review to demonstrate consistency with the Climate Action Plan. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Courtney Holowach at (619) 446-5187. Project Nbr: 522708 / Cycle: 12





L64A-003A

**Issue**

**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 74 The submitted Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist was reviewed by EAS staff. The following comments and issues were identified: (New Issue)
- 75 Please ensure the project description matches the scope of work. (New Issue)
- 76 Step 1, Land Use Consistency: Please ensure this description matches the scope of work. This project is located in La Jolla, not Carmel Valley. (New Issue)

**Environmental Determination**

**Issue**

**Cleared? Num Issue Text**

- 77 Other reviewing disciplines have requested additional information. An environmental determination cannot be made until all issues in this review are addressed and all other reviewing disciplines have cleared their issues. (New Issue)
- 78 Until this information is provided, EAS staff is not able to complete the environmental review 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)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 05/07/2020	Deemed Complete on 05/07/2020
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Engineering Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 05/11/2020	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Abdelmottaleb, Noha (619) 685-1347 Nabdelmottal@sandiego.go	<b>Assigned:</b> 05/12/2020	
	<b>Started:</b> 05/28/2020	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 6.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/28/2020	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 05/28/2020	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 06/15/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/02/2020 from 06/02/2020 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 4th 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 24 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (16 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 67 reviews, 62.7% were on-time, and 45.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Engineering Review 10/2019

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	41	Following up with comment#6: Comment was not addressed. Please explain if proposed development will impact the waters of the U.S. Add a discussion to the Drainage Study stating if the proposed project is required to obtain approval from the Regional Water Quality Control Board Under Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) section 401 or 404. A complete explanation must be provided. Please note, if the proposed project is subject to regulations as set forth in CWA 401/404, approval from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board must be obtained prior to permit issuance.
		(From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	Add a Grading Data Table with cut/fill and import/export quantities, plus the depths of cut and fill outside and under the building footprint. If the quantity is ZERO, add that value to the required Data Table.
		(From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	Also, show the max cut and fill heights on the provided cross sections.
		(From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	44	Please remove the proposed retaining walls and stairs from the public right of way in all plans. Revise all plans to be consistent.
		(From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	45	Please show all existing and proposed improvements on all plans consistently.
		(From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	46	***Please combine The Drainage/BMP Plan Sheet C-1 with the Grading Plan Sheet AB.02 to have all existing and proposed improvements on one plan. Currently, each plan shows different improvements that are missing in the other plans. Also, revise the Site Plan accordingly.
		(From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	47	Following up with comment#8: The locations of the roof drains are not clear and are not consistent with the roof plan. Please revise.
		(From Cycle 10)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services Department  
1222 1st Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	48	Following up with comment#11: LDR-Engineering Review did not receive the required letter of permission from adjacent property. If project is still proposing work on any of the adjacent properties, please submit letter on the next review cycle. If not, please add a note to state: No soil disturbance or encroachment is proposed on adjacent properties.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	49	Following up with comment#13: On the Grading Plan Sheet AB.02, revise all Grading and Drainage notes and labels on the to match with plan and the proposed scope of work. Also add a legend with all used symbols on all plans.  (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	50	Following up with comment#16, 17 & 32: If driveway cannot be proposed per standards, please call out construction of a new 12 ft non-standard driveway on the Site Plan and Grading Plan. (Continued)  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	51	Please note that this project will be conditioned to enter into an agreement to indemnify, protect and hold harmless the City, its officials and employees from any and all claims, demands, causes or action, liability or loss because of, or arising out of surface drainage entering into the property from the Right-of-Way due to the design of the proposed driveways.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	52	Following up with comments#24: Please add the required note on the Grading Plan as well. Also add a note that states: No runoff increase is discharged onto adjacent properties.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	53	Following up with comments#26 & 27: Please add the requested info on the plans.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	54	Following up with comments# 25: Please address previous comment as requested.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	55	Following up with comment#29: Please show the water and sewer mains and laterals on the Site Plan and Grading Plan and add their reference drawing numbers.  (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	Following up with comment#33: Please show the visibility area triangles per SDMC Diagram 113-02SS on the Site Plan and Grading Plan.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	57	Following up with comments#38, 39 & 40: LDR-Engineering Review did not receive the water quality study. Please submit a completed Form I-4 and Form I-5 that addresses how the 8 possible Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs and 6 possible Source Control BMPs have been incorporated into the project. If any of the 14 possible BMPs have not been applied in the project design, add a discussion in the form why the omitted BMPs are not feasible or not applicable. A copy of the forms I-4 and I-5 can be downloaded from: <a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/standard_project_forms.pdf">https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/standard_project_forms.pdf</a>  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	58	Please remove the Storm Water Quality Notes for Construction BMPs from Sheet C-1.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	59	Please revise the private drainage system design to show how it is connected to the existing drainage system onsite. Also, show multiple discharge points as concentrated flows are not accepted. Revise the drainage study accordingly.  (From Cycle 10)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Noha Abdelmottaleb at (619) 685-1347. Project Nbr: 522708 / Cycle: 12





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services Department  
1222 1st Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	60	Please provide Q&V and IEs for all discharge points on the Grading plan.
-------------------------------------	----	--

(From Cycle 10)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	61	On the Grading Plan, please clarify where is the trench drain mentioned in the detail at the bottom of Sheet AB.02.
-------------------------------------	----	---

(From Cycle 10)

## 📁 Drainage Study - 1st Review

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	62	On Page 4: Please remove the statements "The detention system will be formally located with final project plans and grading permit; The final location and design will be coordinated in the grading permit". The drainage design system must be accurate.
-------------------------------------	----	--

(From Cycle 10)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	63	Please revise the Hydrologic and hydraulic maps/analysis for pre and post development, the exhibits must show the following information: a) Flow path of travel b) Discharge points (include elevation) c) Q & V at all discharge points. d) Area of each basin e) Drainage nodes All items described in pre and post development must match hydrologic maps.
-------------------------------------	----	---

(From Cycle 10)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	64	Please justify the high velocity value '14.50 ft/sec'.
-------------------------------------	----	--

(From Cycle 10)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	65	The exhibits show an existing 6" UV resistant HDPE corrugated slope drain, while under the existing/proposed conditions section, it is mentioned as 8". Please revise for consistency and clarify how the proposed drainage system is connected to the existing one.
-------------------------------------	----	--

(From Cycle 10)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	66	Please revise the pre and post exhibits and update the drainage study according to comment#59.
-------------------------------------	----	--

(From Cycle 10)

## 📁 INFO

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	67	Development Permit Conditions will be finalized when all requested information is provided.
-------------------------------------	----	---

(From Cycle 10)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	68	With your next submittal, please provide a complete response to each of the issues listed in this report. The written response shall clearly, concisely and comprehensively address the issues raised and please specify on what page/sheet each issue was addressed.
-------------------------------------	----	---

(From Cycle 10)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	69	Additional comments may be recommended pending further review of any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive. Should you have any questions or comments, please contact Noha Abdelmottaleb at NAbdelmottal@sandiego.gov
-------------------------------------	----	--

(From Cycle 10)

## 📁 Engineering Review 05/28/20

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

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Noha Abdelmottaleb at (619) 685-1347. Project Nbr: 522708 / Cycle: 12





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services Department  
1222 1st Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

- | <u>Cleared?</u>          | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>  |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 82               | LDR-Engineering Review section did not receive a response letter for previous comments. Following up with previous comments and previous meeting dated 12/17/2019, please address the following comments:<br><br>(New Issue)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 83               | Show and dimension the garage parking spaces, so they can be verified they meet San Diego Municipal Code Table 142-05K.<br><br>(New Issue)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 84               | Revise the Site/Grading Plan and all other plans to demonstrate the minimum 20 distance from Property line to garage door per San Diego Municipal Code Diagram 142-05A. If project cannot adhere to the minimum required 20' distance from P/L to garage door, please show and identify two additional on-site parking spaces as required by the SDMC (footnote 1 of Diagram 142-05A). Also, please show curb to P/L distance on all plans.<br><br>(New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 85               | Show the driveway design into the garage. Per San Diego Municipal Code Section 142.0560 (j)(9)(c) and Diagram 142-05D driveway slopes greater than 14% there shall be transitions for the first and last 8 feet of the ramp. Add a detailed driveway profile with dimensions and slopes to verify the proposed driveway adheres to the Municipal Code.<br><br>(New Issue)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 86               | Following up with comments#42 & 43: Please revise the max cut & fill heights to clarify the proposed max cut & fill outside and under the building footprint. Also, please add the max cut & fill heights on the provided cross sections and make sure the information is consistent with the grading data table.<br><br>(New Issue)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 87               | Following up with comment#44: Comment has not been addressed. Please remove ALL encroachments from the public right of way, including stairs, retaining walls, fences, mail boxes, landscape.<br><br>(New Issue)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 88               | Also, please provide a detail for the newly proposed retaining wall next to the P/L and make sure no footings are encroaching in the public right of way.<br><br>(New Issue)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 89               | Following up with comment#47: Please show all roof drains on the grading plan sheet C-1.<br><br>(New Issue)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 90               | Following up with comment#50: Please revise the dimensions of the proposed driveway to have 25' max width per SDMC Diagram 142-05M.<br><br>(New Issue)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 91               | Following up with comment#56: Please revise the location of the visibility triangles on the Site Plan to be perpendicular to the property line per SDMC 113-02SS and show the visibility triangles on the Grading plan.<br><br>(New Issue)   |

## Draft Conditions

- | <u>Cleared?</u>                     | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u>   |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 70               | Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement, for the non-standard driveway and pavers in the Hillside Drive Right-of-Way, satisfactory to the City Engineer.<br><br>(From Cycle 10) |





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services Department  
1222 1st Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	71	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall enter into an agreement to indemnify, protect and hold harmless the City, its officials and employees from any and all claims, demands, causes or action, liability or loss because of, or arising out of surface drainage entering into the property from the Right-of-Way due to the design of the proposed driveway.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	72	The drainage system proposed for this development is subject to approval by the City Engineer.  (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	73	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain a bonded grading permit for the grading proposed for this project. All grading shall conform to the requirements of the City of San Diego Municipal Code in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	75	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 Part 2 Construction BMP Standards Chapter 4 of the City's Storm Water Standards.  (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	76	Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall assure by permit and bond the construction of new current city standard curb and gutter, adjacent to the site on Hillside Drive, satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	77	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement, for the non-standard driveway and pavers in the Hillside Drive Right-of-Way, satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	78	Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall enter into an agreement to indemnify, protect and hold harmless the City, its officials and employees from any and all claims, demands, causes or action, liability or loss because of, or arising out of surface drainage entering into the property from the Right-of-Way due to the design of the proposed driveway.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	79	The drainage system proposed for this development is subject to approval by the City Engineer.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	74	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 SDMC, into the construction plans or specifications.  (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	80	The project proposes to export 2000 cubic yards of material from the project site. All excavated material listed to be exported, shall be exported to a legal disposal site in accordance with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (the "Green Book"), 2015 edition and Regional Supplement Amendments adopted by Regional Standards Committee.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	81	Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain a bonded grading permit for the grading proposed for this project. All grading shall conform to the requirements of the City of San Diego Municipal Code in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer.  (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services Department  
1222 1st Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 05/07/2020	Deemed Complete on 05/07/2020
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Community Planning Group	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 05/11/2020	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Daly, Tim	<b>Assigned:</b> 05/13/2020	
(619) 446-5356	<b>Started:</b> 05/13/2020	
TPDaly@sandiego.gov	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/28/2020	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.60	<b>Completed:</b> 06/01/2020	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Closed:</b> 06/15/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/02/2020 from 06/02/2020 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 4th complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (2 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 48 reviews, 58.3% were on-time, and 54.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

### La Jolla CPG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	If you have not already done so, please contact Tony Crisafi, President of the La Jolla Community Planning Association at (858) 869-2831 or by email at info@lajollacpa.org, to schedule your project for a presentation before the group at their next available meeting. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the group and prior to scheduling any City public hearing for the application, please submit a copy of the recommendation and/or minutes from the meeting which includes the vote count and any draft conditions. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	If you have not already done so, please contact Diane Kane, President of the La Jolla Community Planning Association at (858) 459-9490 or by email at info@lajollacpa.org, to schedule your project for a presentation before the group at their next available meeting. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the group and prior to scheduling any City public hearing for the application, please submit a copy of the recommendation and/or minutes from the meeting which includes the vote count and any draft conditions. (New Issue)

### La Jolla Shores Planned Distri

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	If you have not already done so, please contact Marlon Pangilinan, Planning Dept./Sr. Planner at 619-235-5293 or by email at MPangilinan@sandiego.gov, to schedule your project for a presentation before the La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board at their next available meeting. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the Board and prior to scheduling any City public hearing for the application, please submit a copy of the recommendation and/or minutes from the meeting which includes the vote count and any draft conditions. (From Cycle 10)

### LJSPDAB Recommendation

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Nov. 25, 2019, the LJSPDAB voted 4-0-0 to recommend denial of the application (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 05/07/2020	Deemed Complete on 05/07/2020
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Geology	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 05/11/2020	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296 pathomas@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 05/12/2020	
	<b>Started:</b> 05/21/2020	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 3.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/28/2020	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 05/28/2020	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 06/15/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/02/2020 from 06/02/2020 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 4th complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 7 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (5 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 71 reviews, 78.9% were on-time, and 75.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

522708-10 (10/28/2019)

Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	The project site is located within geologic hazards zone 27 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 27 is characterized by slide prone formations. In addition, the geotechnical consultant has determined that the site is underlain by landslides. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	The project consultants could note that a NPDES permit may be required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board for ground water discharged through basement wall drains and pumped to a storm water conveyance system. The Geology Section will defer to LDR-Engineering for discharge permit requirements. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Storm Water Requirements for the proposed development will be evaluated by LDR-Engineering review. Priority Development Projects (PDPs) may require an investigation of storm water infiltration feasibility in accordance with the Storm Water Standards (including Appendix C and D). Check with your LDR-Engineering reviewer for requirements. LDR-Engineering may determine that LDR-Geology review of a storm water infiltration evaluation is required. (From Cycle 10)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Site Plan, K4 Residence, 7595 Hillside Drive, San Diego, California 92037, prepared by CDGI Concepto, dated September 30, 2017.  Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single-Family Residence, 7595 Hillside Drive, La Jolla, California; prepared by TerraPacific Consultants, Inc., dated January 8, 2016 (their project no. 15135). (From Cycle 10)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Submit an update geotechnical report that addresses the following: (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Based on the development as currently proposed (PTS No. 522708), clarify if the site will have a factor-of-safety of 1.5 or greater with respect to gross and surficial slope stability at the completion of the project. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	The geotechnical consultant indicates that no significant movement has occurred within inclinometer TCI-1 between the September 2013 reading and the most recent 2015 reading. The geotechnical consultant must indicate if there is any on-going movement and if the recommendations provided in their geotechnical report will mitigate any on-going movement. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	The geotechnical consultant must indicate that the proposed site development will be safe from geologic hazards and geotechnically stable. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	The geotechnical consultant must comment whether or not the proposed development as recommended will measurably destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Submit original quality prints and digital copies (on CD/DVD/or USB data storage device) of the geotechnical report listed as "References" and the requested geotechnical document for our review and for our records. (From Cycle 10)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services Department  
1222 1st Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	The geotechnical consultant opines that the site is underlain by at least 60 feet of landslide debris. The risk of future slope instability related to and resulting from failures within the composite landslide complex in the vicinity of and underlying the site is considered to be unknown. Therefore, a Notice of Geologic and Geotechnical Conditions must be recorded against the subject property. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Please verify the property A.P.N. and legal description. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	Please contact the reviewer at 619-446-5296 to obtain the finalized Notice of Geologic and Geotechnical Conditions at the completion of the next submittal and review cycle. (From Cycle 10)

**522708-12 (5/28/2020)**

**References**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Site Plan, K4 Residence, 7595 Hillside Drive, San Diego, California 92037, prepared by CDGI Concepto, dated April 24, 2020.  Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single-Family Residence, 7595 Hillside Drive, La Jolla, California; prepared by TerraPacific Consultants, Inc., dated January 8, 2016 (their project no. 15135). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Cycle Issue Responses-LDR Geology, Bremerton Residence, 7595 Hillside Drive, La Jolla, California; prepared by TerraPacific Consultants, Inc., dated September 6, 2019 (their project no. 15135).  Cycle Issue Responses-LDR Geology, K4 Residence, 7595 Hillside Drive, La Jolla, California; prepared by TerraPacific Consultants, Inc., dated December 16, 2019 (their project no. 15135). (New Issue)

**Comments**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Submit an addendum geotechnical response that addresses the following:  The geotechnical consultant must clarify if the recommendations provided in their geotechnical report will mitigate any on-going movement at the site. If not, LDR Geology will not be able to approve the project. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Based on the response to the provided PTS Cycle Issue No. 25, please contact the reviewer at 619-446-5296 to obtain the finalized Notice of Geologic and Geotechnical Conditions. Please verify the property A.P.N. and legal description. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	Submit digital copies (on CD/DVD/or USB data storage device) of the geotechnical reports listed as "References" and an original quality print and digital copy of the requested geotechnical response document for our review and for our records. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services Department  
1222 1st Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 05/07/2020	Deemed Complete on 05/07/2020
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Landscaping	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 05/11/2020	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Neri, Daniel (619) 687-5967 Dneri@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 05/13/2020	
	<b>Started:</b> 05/28/2020	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 4.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/28/2020	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 05/28/2020	
	<b>Closed:</b> 06/15/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/02/2020 from 06/02/2020 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 4th complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 25 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (21 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 43 reviews, 65.1% were on-time, and 37.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## 2nd Review 10/22/19

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Planting Palette (Sht. L-1): The grading plan (35556-7-D) established an approved planting plan for the Zone Two area. Update this project's Zone Two planting palette to conform with 35556-7-D and the slopes native plant species identified on the recent bio-report.  (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Irrigation Runoff: In accordance with SDMC 142.0412(h)(5)(C) overspray and runoff from the irrigation shall not drift or flow into adjacent areas of native or naturalized vegetation. Provide additional information to illustrate how the permanent Zone One irrigation will conform to the regulation.  (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Public Improvements / Street Trees: Street Tree Improvements (Sht. L-1): In accordance with DDMC [142.0409] provide a minimum of one 24-In canopy for every 30 linear feet of street frontage. By staff's calculations two Street Trees area required for this project. The existing tree is acceptable towards meeting the requirement, but an additional street tree that conforms to the La Jolla Community Plan's Tree District (3). Update the planting legend accordingly, and clearly identify the what trees are to satisfy the Street Tree requirement.  (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Review: Pending a redesign and/or comments from other reviewing disciplines, Landscape staff reserves the right to provide additional comments on subsequent review cycles.  (From Cycle 10)

## 3rd Review - 5/28/2020

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Response to Comments: Applicant only provided comments from CDGI. Responses to landscape issues only stated "Landscape." This is not an acceptable response to comments from the applicant. Previous comments have remained uncleared as no response was provided. Next review shall detail page and action taken to address these comments. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Landscape Area Required Per PDO (Sht. T.01, A.01): Architectural plans state that the existing landscape area (E) is 24,287.04-SF, and the proposed (N) is 1,186.00-SF. Landscape required by the PDO is 30% of the entire lot, which may consist of the undisturbed portion of the lot, in addition to developed/designed landscape areas. In the Project Information, please include the total required landscape area (35,415-SF x 30% = 10,624.50) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Landscape Area Diagram - Demo Plan (Sht. D.01): It is unclear why there are landscape area calculations on the Demo Plan. Is this pertaining to the existing or new. In either case, they are unnecessary on a Demo Plan for the purposes of Landscape and should be removed. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Symbology on Site Plan (Sht. A.01): There are circles on the site plan with letters. It is unclear what these are as they are not represented in the legend. If they are landscape symbols, this would be captured on the landscape plans. On the site plan, this can simply be hatchmarked with a vegetation hatch and a reference to the landscape plans and the sheet number. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Public Utility Easement (Sht. A.01, C-1, C-2): Plans show an existing Public Utility Easement. It is unclear what this easement is for and if it is being vacated. Please provide further information, as the structure is proposed over the easement and staff could not find documentation on Map 01479. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Landscaping' review, please call Daniel Neri at (619) 687-5967. Project Nbr: 522708 / Cycle: 12





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	North Arrow (Sht. C-1, C-2): The North Arrow in the title block is an incorrect orientation. Please correct. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Sewer/Water Laterals (Arch and Civil Sheets): Arch and Civil sheets do not show the sewer/water laterals into the project site. Please show the laterals so that staff can verify that those shown on the landscape plans match. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	Sections (Architectural Sheets): Architectural Sections should show section through the deck and pool area as this will affect the Brush Management planning. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Title Block - Landscape Sheets (All Landscape Sheets): Project is in for a discretionary review. The title block used in the lower right hand corner of all landscape sheets is for grading or public improvements (referred to as "D-Sheets"). Please remove the D-Sheet format title block from all sheets, as these are not grading sheets, but in review for a Development Permit. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	Sheet Numbering (All Landscape Sheets): All landscape sheets shall be numbered as per the Landscape Cover Sheet. Currently, none of the landscape sheets have sheet numbers, which can make it a challenge to specify the sheet to correct. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Landscape Area: Provide a separate Landscape diagram which shows the entire parcel, the development areas and the landscape area do demonstrate that the landscape area required by the PDO is achieved. Per the PDO, structures, unplanted recreational areas, walks and driveways do not count towards landscape area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	North Arrow (Landscape Sheets): Please include a North Arrow on all Landscape Sheet plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	Scale and Graphic Scale Bar (Landscape Sheets): Please include a scale and graphic scale bar on all Landscape Sheet plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Required Landscape Sheets: The current project is a discretionary review for entitlements related to the SDP/CDP. Therefore, Irrigation sheets (Irr. Plan, Irr. Specs, Irr. Details) are not required on a discretionary review. Please remove these sheets and update the Landscape Sheet Index. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	Existing Pittosporum (Planting Plan): Please identify the species of the existing pittosporum and provide a photo. Depending on the species and photo, staff may consider this a street tree, in which case it should be listed under Street Trees in the Plant Legend. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Revegetation (Planting Plan): Revegetation areas should be moved from the Brush Management Plan to the Planting Plan. Please clearly show areas of disturbance on the Civil sheets so that staff can verify proper revegetation on the Landscape Sheets. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	Planters east of Pool (Sht. C-2, Planting Plan): The civil sheets show planter BMPs east of the pool, however these are not shown in the landscape plan. Please ensure all plans coordinate. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	Brush Management Plan: Zone One is measured from the façade out towards the native naturalized area, Therefore, areas of the deck up to the pool edge are part of Zone One. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	Brush Management Plan / Development Footprint: The project is subject to a Site Development Permit due to the presence of Steep Hillside and Sensitive Biological Resources - Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub. Therefore, the project site is limited to 25% development on the parcel. Brush Management Zone One is considered development footprint. As proposed the Brush Management Plan increases the development footprint of the site to approximately 50%, which will not be acceptable. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	Staff is unable to provide clear direction on Brush Management at this time because more information is required. Specifically, more accurate site/architectural sections. Furthermore staff needs to know the percentage of the current development footprint (from the pool deck and westward). This will determine how much more area can be used towards Brush Management Zone One. The Zone One proposed exceeds the development footprint previously approved on 35556-7-D. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	Alternative Compliance Required: The Southern and Northern facades will required Alternative Compliance as the project does not provide full defensible space towards the north and south. Depending on the amount of Zone One allowed towards the east, all eastern facades may require brush Management as well. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 12 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 05/07/2020	Deemed Complete on 05/07/2020
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Fire-Plan Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 05/11/2020	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Velasquez, Jaime (619) 533-4489 jvelasquez@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 05/12/2020	
	<b>Started:</b> 05/13/2020	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.50	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/28/2020	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 05/13/2020	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 06/15/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/02/2020 from 06/02/2020 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 4th complete submittal for Fire-Plan 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 Fire-Plan Review (None of which are new)
- . Last month Fire-Plan Review performed 75 reviews, 77.3% were on-time, and 77.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Fire Department Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Show hydrant locations on the site plan. (From Cycle 4)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	How does Fire Department access the property from Hillside Drive. (Retaining wall at front of property? Grade drops?) (From Cycle 4)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	If in the very high fire severity zone and 35 feet of Zone 1 and 65 feet of zone 2 can not be accomplished (per landscape review) additional mitigation is required with Fire Department. (From Cycle 4)

Fire Department 2nd

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Fire Plan reviewer acknowledges the following comments and requirements were NOT requested in the first review cycle. Previous comments and new comments shall be provided with an appropriate response for clarification and compliance. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Provide a full size sheet titled "Fire Access Plan". Refer to policy A-14-1 for access requirements: sandiego.gov/fire, Services and Programs, Policies, Fire Access Roadways. The Fire Access Plan may also be referred to as the FAP in comment(s).  Plans must comply with the current adopted California Fire Code (to include appendix D as adopted) /California Building Code. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Provide Fire Access Plan at an engineering scale; 20, 30, 40, 50, 60. Turn radius shall comply with the following criteria, whichever is more restrictive: turns shall have a 30 ft. inside radius and a 50 ft. outside radius and/or comply with the SDFD turn radius template(s). If a copy of the turn templates is required to verify before submittal; contact Fire Plan reviewer, gcornell@sandiego.gov. A pdf of templates can be obtained via email. The user must verify that the templates hold scale upon reproduction. (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	SHOW on the Fire Access Plan ALL existing and/or proposed roadways, road widths, turn radius and setbacks from curb face or proximal edge access road/lane to facade(s) of building and/or plumb line of eave(s). (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	(Provide as a NOTE and SHOW on the Fire Access Plan) "Building Address number(s) location(s) shall be visible and legible from the street/road fronting the property per San Diego Municipal Code Section §95.0209"  (WHEN APPLICABLE TO PROJECT; Provide the following NOTE and SHOW on FAP) "For ADU/CDU; It shall be necessary to provide a separate address for the separate unit. The applicant will need to request that the Project Manager adds a review cycle for MIS Addressing to review the project to assign and/or re-assign a physical address with street name, number and/or unit designation." (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	(Provide as a NOTE and SHOW on the FAP) " All required hose pulls are shown to reach all portions of the exterior of the building(s) per policy A-14-1. Hose pull is measured from the fire apparatus (engine) when the fire engine is in a fire access road/lane. Hose pull can be measured from multiple locations within the access road/lane. The hose pulls must connect or overlap to show complete coverage. For a sprinklered building(s); the maximum hose pull is 200'. For non-sprinklered building(s); the maximum hose pull is 150'. Change in vertical elevation must also be accounted for." (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	(Provide as a NOTE and SHOW on the Fire Access Plan) "All existing and/or proposed fire hydrants within 600' of the project site and a 300' radius overlay shall be shown to encompass ALL portions of ALL structures as part of submitted project. SD Ordinance 17927."

\*\*\*Additional hydrant may be required to comply\*\*\* (From Cycle 10)

For questions regarding the 'Fire-Plan Review' review, please call Jaime Velasquez at (619) 533-4489. Project Nbr: 522708 / Cycle: 12





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	(Provide as a note on the Fire Access Plan) "Structures under construction, alteration or demolition shall be provided with not less than one approved portable fire extinguisher in accordance with Section 906 and sized for not less than ordinary hazard (2A10BC) as follows: 1. At each stairway on all floor levels where combustible materials have accumulated. 2. In every storage and construction shed. 3. Additional portable fire extinguishers shall be provided where special hazards exist including, but not limited to, the storage and use of flammable and combustible liquids. CFC 3315." (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	(Provide as a NOTE on the Fire Access Plan) " ALL buildings and sites undergoing construction, alteration, or demolition shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 33 of the CFC." (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Information: All new construction in the Very High Severity Fire Zone is subject to brush management requirements. Fire mitigation is required if 100 ft. of defensible space can not be provided; 35' of zone 1 and 65' of zone 2. Projects subject to Fire mitigation are based on Landscaping review. See Fire Department Policy B-18-01, sandiego.gov/fire, services and programs, Brush Management and Weed Abatement, Brush Mitigation Zones. (From Cycle 10)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	(Add NOTE) " All new construction in the Very High Severity Fire Zone is subject to brush management requirements. Fire mitigation is required if 100 ft. of defensible space can not be provided; 35' of zone 1 and 65' of zone 2. Projects subject to Fire mitigation are based on Landscaping review. See Fire Department Policy B-18-01, sandiego.gov/fire, services and programs, Brush Management and Weed Abatement, Brush Mitigation Zones." (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	(Provide as a NOTE on the FAP) "CFC 105.4.4 - Construction documents approved by the Fire Code Official are approved with the intent that such construction documents comply in all respects with the CFC/CBC. Review and approval by the Fire Code Official shall NOT relieve the applicant of the responsibility of compliance with these codes." (From Cycle 10)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	(Provide NOTE on FAP) "New structures built after January 2008 shall comply with CRC337/CBC7A. Additional mitigations may be required based on final determination of Zone 1 and Zone 2 boundaries by Landscaping. IF there is less than 35' from any portion of the Zone 1 boundary to the structure, then additional mitigations shall apply." (From Cycle 10)





# Submittal Requirements

6/15/20 12:02 pm

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Development Services Department  
1222 1st Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Page 1 of 1

L64A-001

## Project Information

**Project Nbr:** 522708      **Title:** K-4 Residence  
**Project Mgr:** Daly, Tim      (619)446-5356      TPDaly@sandiego.gov



## Review Cycle Information

**Review Cycle:** 14 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

**Opened:** 06/15/2020 11:47 am

**Submitted:**

**Due:**

**Closed:**

## Required Documents:

<u>Package Type</u>	<u>Pkg Qty</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Qty Needed</u>
Geotechnical Rpt (Addendum)	2	Geotechnical Report (Addendum)	2
Development Plans	8	Site Development Plans	8
Biology Study/Report	4	Biology Study/Report	4
Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist	2	Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist	2
Development Plans	8	Applicant Response to Issues	8



L64A-007

Invoice

Invoice Number: **939071**



Status: Invoiced

Issued: 06/15/2020 12:07 pm Daly, Tim

Voided:

Customer: Kooklani, M

Development: 77224 7595 Hillside Dr

Project: **522708** K-4 Residence

PM: Daly, Tim

(619)446-5356



Project Fees:

<u>Fee Description</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Fee Amount</u>
Deposit Account	8,000.00	Dollars	\$-8,000.00
Deposit Account	13,812.00	Dollars	\$13,812.00
<b>Approval Total:</b>			<b>\$5,812.00</b>
<b>Job Total:</b>			<b>\$5,812.00</b>
<b>Project Total:</b>			<b>\$5,812.00</b>
<b>Invoice Total:</b>			<b>\$5,812.00</b>

All fees are required to be paid prior to services being rendered. Payment of invoices is required immediately upon project setup/submittal and permit issuance per the San Diego Municipal Code 112.0102(b) and 129.0213(a). Unpaid invoices for permit applications will result in cancellation of submitted project within 2 business days. For your convenience, DSD offers online payments via OPENDSD (<https://opensd.sandiego.gov/Web/Invoices/Search>).