



L64A-003B

Project Information

Project Nbr: 688686 **Title:** Digital 5522 Beaumont Res
Project Mgr: Galvez III, Oscar (619) 533-3683 GalvezO@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/18/2021	Deemed Complete on 11/18/2021
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 11/18/2021	
Reviewer: Garcia, Matthew (619) 446-5038 GarciaML@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 11/19/2021	
	Started: 11/22/2021	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 12/13/2021	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/22/2021	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 12/16/2021 from 12/16/2021 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.

1st Review 5-12-2021

Comments

General Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	The proposed FAR is not listed on Sheet T1.1. Action Required: List the proposed FAR on Sheet T1.1. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	The Site Plan and floor plans show a portion of the proposed structure that will encroach into the Side Yard Setback (SYSB) which is not allowed for the proposed light well. Action Required: Remove all portions of the proposed development outside of required yard areas unless explicitly allowed in the SDMC. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	According to the elevations it appears the proposed development will reach 33' in height. The height is limited to 30' due to the Project Site being located in the Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone. Action Required: Reduce the height of the proposed development so that the height measured from the tallest point of the development to the existing or proposed grade, whichever is lowest, is less than or equal to 30'. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	The Side Yard Setback (SYSB) is technically 3.2', not just 3' as shown in the Site Plan. Action Required: Show, label and dimension the SYSB as 3.2' and relocate encroaching portions of the development outside all required yard setbacks. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	It is not established why 561 SF of crawl space is exempt from the GFA calculations. To be exempt the crawl space must conform to SDMC 113.0234(a)(2). No dimensions are provided in the elevations to establish this. Action Required: Provide dimensions in the elevations establishing that 561 SF area as exempt from the GFA calculations per SDMC 113.0234 (a)(2), otherwise include some or all of the space in the GFA. (From Cycle 1)

Community Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	The issues in the general comments section may result in some redesigning of the project, as a result comments related to the Community Plan will be provided in the next review when the development resolves issues of height, parking and setback encroachments. (From Cycle 1)

2nd Review 8-24-2021

General Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Remaining Issue #6 The proposed FAR is still not provided on Sheet T1.1. Action Required: List the proposed FAR on Sheet T1.1. (From Cycle 2)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	<p>Related to Issue #7 (Remaining issue #13)</p> <p>The Side Yard Setback (SYSB) is listed as 3', however $0.08 \times 40' = 3.2'$. The Site Plan currently does not reflect this.</p> <p>Action Required: Change the SYSB to observe 3.2' instead of 3'. Conform the proposed development so that it is not located in the required setbacks. (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	24	<p>New Issue</p> <p>None of the required visibility areas that belong on both sides of the proposed driveway at the rear of the property are shown, labelled or dimensioned in the Site Plan.</p> <p>Action Required: Show, label and dimension all required visibility areas in the Site Plan in accordance with SDMC 113.0273 and SDMC Diagram 113-02SS.</p> <p>NOTE: No structures, including walls/fences may exceed 3' in height in a required visibility area. Reduce the height of all structures in the visibility areas. (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	25	<p>Related Issue #9</p> <p>The height is still not measured from the tallest point of the structure to the existing or proposed grade, whichever is lowest.</p> <p>Action Required: Dimension the height from the tallest point of the structure to the existing or proposed grade, whichever is lowest. In particular, the lowest dip in the grade to the tallest point of the structure on Sheet A2.0. (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	26	<p>Remaining Issue #16</p> <p>Although the exterior grade may be used for purposes of reducing height, it is not the same with area. The grade used for the area measurement will be the interior floor area, which is 8' per Sheet A3.0, therefore all the basement and storage space must be included in the area calculations.</p> <p>Action Required: Include the area of the basement and storage room in the area calculations and proposed FAR.</p> <p>NOTE: The area including the basement appears it will still be under the Max FAR limit. (From Cycle 2)</p>

Community Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27	<p>The proposed development is a two-story single family residence which generally conforms to the surrounding development which also contains many two-story single family residence. The proposed development generally conforms to the residential character and plan density of La Jolla's neighborhoods.</p> <p>(Information Only - No Action Required) (From Cycle 2)</p>

3rd Review 10-29-2021

General Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	29	<p>Remaining issues 6 and 20</p> <p>See these issues for issue descriptions and action required. (From Cycle 4)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30	<p>Remaining issues 13 and 21</p> <p>See these issues for issue descriptions and action required. (From Cycle 4)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	31	<p>Remaining issue #24</p> <p>See this issue for issue description and action required. (From Cycle 4)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	32	<p>Remaining issues 9 and 25</p> <p>See these issues for issue descriptions and action required.</p> <p>The height although satisfactory for purposes of the CHLOZ, it still exceeds the max height allowed for the RS-1-7 base zone.</p> <p>Action Required: Reduce the height of the proposed development so that it conforms to the 30' max for the RS-1-7 base zone. (From Cycle 4)</p>





L64A-003B

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

33 Remaining issues 16 and 26

See these issues for issue descriptions and action required. (From Cycle 4)

34 Additional issues may be provided pending further review or redesign of the plans.

(Information Only - No Action Required) (From Cycle 4)

Community Plan

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

35 Comments pending until issues that may cause redesign are resolved. (From Cycle 4)

4th Review 11-22-2021

Community Plan

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

38 The proposed development is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan for Low Density Development.

(Information Only - No Action Required) (New Issue)

General Comments

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

37 The proposed development is consistent with the RS-1-7 base zone.

(Information Only - No Action Required) (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/18/2021	Deemed Complete on 11/18/2021
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 11/18/2021	
Reviewer: Holowach, Courtney (619) 446-5187 Cholowach@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 11/18/2021	
	Started: 12/15/2021	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 12/16/2021	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 12/15/2021	
	Closed:	

The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.

📁 Cycle 1 - May 2021

📁 Extended Initial Study

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Additional information is required before an environmental review can be completed. The issues identified below and in any other discipline review comments must be addressed before an environmental determination can be made on this project. A determination of Negative Declaration (ND), Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be made based on the information provided in any subsequent submittals. (From Cycle 1)

📁 Land Use

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	EAS defers to Planning Review 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 1)

📁 Summary

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	At this time, there are outstanding comments from other disciplines that need to be addressed before EAS can make a final determination. Until the requested information has been provided 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 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Until the requested information has been provided 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. Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes. (From Cycle 1)

📁 Cycle 2 - August 2021

📁 Environmental Determination

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	At this time, there are outstanding comments from other disciplines that need to be addressed before EAS can make a final determination. Until the requested information has been provided 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 2)

📁 Cycle 4 - October 2021

📁 Environmental Determination

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	At this time, there are outstanding comments from other disciplines that need to be addressed before EAS can make a final determination. Until the requested information has been provided 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 4)

📁 Cycle 5 - December 2021

📁 Environmental Determination

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Courtney Holowach at (619) 446-5187. Project Nbr: 688686 / Cycle: 5





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	The proposed activity is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15303 (New construction or conversion of small structures) of the State CEQA Guidelines. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	This determination is preliminary until the Notice of Right to Appeal is posted. The date of the posting of the NORA represents the official environmental determination date. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/18/2021	Deemed Complete on 11/18/2021
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 11/18/2021	
Reviewer: Galvez III, Oscar (619) 533-3683 GalvezO@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 12/10/2021	
	Started: 12/10/2021	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Review Due: 12/13/2021	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 12/10/2021	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 12/16/2021 from 12/16/2021 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (None of which are new)

La Jolla Community Planning Gr

La Jolla Community Plan Area

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Submit the IB 620 Community Planning Committee Distribution Form online and/or provide minutes from the meeting which includes the vote count. (From Cycle 1)

