



L64A-003B

Project Information

Project Nbr: 611654 **Title:** Tuszynski Residence- CDP/SDP
Project Mgr: Mendoza, Pancho (619) 446-5433 Fmendoza@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/25/2018	Deemed Complete on 10/25/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 10/25/2018	
Reviewer: Feilen, Kristal (619) 446-5405 Kfeilen@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/26/2018	
	Started: 11/19/2018	
Hours of Review: 6.00	Review Due: 11/27/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/21/2018	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 11/30/2018 from 11/30/2018 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 49 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).

11/20/2018

Info

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within the RS-1-7 zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (CST-APP), the Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, the First Public Roadway, the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (PIOZ-Beach-Impact & PIOZ-Coastal-Impact), the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, the Transit Areas Overlay Zone, the FEMA 100-year Floodplain, has ESL (Sensitive Coastal Bluff), and is within the La Jolla Local Coastal Program and Community Plan area. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The project scope is the addition and remodel of existing single-family residence and a new 2 car garage and remodel the existing guest house with new master bathroom and closet. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue)

CDP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Demolition of more than 50% of the exterior walls and an increase in square footage of more than 10% requires a Coastal Development Permit (CDP, Process 3, appealable to Coastal Commission) per SDMC 126.0704. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Per SDMC 126.0704(a)(4) a CDP is also required for any significant alteration of land forms including removal or placement of vegetation, on a beach, wetland or sand dune, or within 100 feet of the edge of a coastal bluff. Please outline the limits of the Coastal Bluff on a vicinity site plan. Per City mapping the coastal bluff edge is within the westerly property. Site is within 100 feet of the coastal bluff edge. Please see definition of coastal bluff in SDMC 113.0103. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Demolition of more than 50% of the exterior walls and an increase in square footage and structure height of more than 10% requires a Coastal Development Permit (CDP, Process 3, appealable to Coastal Commission) per SDMC 126.0704. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Please provide required findings as outlined in SDMC 126.0708(a). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Please provide a demolition wall matrix for proposed demolition to current development on site. Please provide this on a separate demolition sheet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	A demolition sheet requires a fully dimensioned sheet for each floor that shows all walls, windows, and doors changed, exterior walls enclosed by new construction, areas where top/bottom plates and studs have been removed, changed and/or modified. Include a wall matrix listing all walls in linear feet and percentages of walls removed and retained. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	When a window opening is increased horizontally (thru demolition of at least one of the two king studs & trim) to accommodate a modification of that opening, then the entire existing width of the opening to remain, plus any additional linear feet of wall demolished to modify the opening, is counted toward demolition. Any portion of the existing opening which will be framed in may be counted as remaining. When a window opening is increased vertically (through demolition of the header or sill), but not horizontally, then no linear feet of demolition is counted (unless the top plate is impacted). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Please add construction notes at windows and doors identifying whether these elements are existing to remain; to be filled in; to be framed in with smaller opening; to be enlarged; to be shifted; to be replaced with new window/door of the same size; etc, and how these openings will be modified (removal of header, sill, king stud, or any combination thereof). (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Kristal Feilen at (619) 446-5405. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 2





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	If the second floor addition requires new posts and beams as the supporting members, any existing top plates and sill plates that would be penetrated by the new structural members shall be counted as the "wall to be removed" for the width of the penetration. (New Issue)

SDP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Per the definition of Sensitive Coastal Bluff (SDMC 113.0103), it is a coastal bluff that is designated within hazard category numbers 41 through 47, plus the area of an additional 100-foot strip located landward and contiguous to the coastal bluff edge. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Development is proposed within 40 feet of the bluff edge. Development is not allowed to encroach past a 40-foot setback from the sensitive coastal bluff face edge. If a shoreline protective device (seawall) is present on the property, no reduction in the 40-foot setback is allowed. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Please clearly outline and label the bluff face edge, the 40-foot setback, and 100-foot setback on the Site Plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Please clearly outline and label the shoreline protective device (seawall) on the Site Plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Please provide draft SDP findings as outlined in SDMC 126.0505. Planning does not support the findings as the project is currently designed. (New Issue)

Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Per the La Jolla Community Plan (p. 40) On coastal bluff property, when redevelopment of an existing previously conforming structure includes the demolition or removal of 50% or more of the exterior walls, require the entire structure to be brought into conformance with all policies and standards of the Local Coastal Program, including, but not limited to, bluff edge setback. Additions that increase the size of the structure by 50% or more, shall not be authorized unless the structure is brought into conformance with the policies and standards of the Local Coastal Program. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	The additions proposed exceed 50% of existing development and the entire property must be brought up to code to comply with setbacks, height, coastal bluff regulations, etc. Please redesign the proposal to meet these requirements. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Previously conforming regulations (SDMC 127.0106) outline: (c) For structures located on a premises that contains or abuts a coastal beach or a coastal bluff edge, new additions or improvements to existing structures may be permitted subject to a Coastal Development Permit, in accordance with Section 126.0707, provided that all such new additions or improvements themselves do not increase the degree of non-conformity and comply with all of the following: [CONTINUED] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	[CONTINUED] (1) The proposed coastal development is in conformity with the certified Local Coastal Program land use plan; (2) The proposed coastal development does not alter more than 50 percent of the exterior walls of the structure as measured in accordance with Section 127.0111; [CONTINUED] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	[CONTINUED] (3) The proposed expansion does not exceed 500 square feet, except additional floor area may be permitted in exchange for the removal or relocation of an equivalent amount of existing floor area (from the primary structure or an accessory structure) from within a required setback from the coastal bluff edge or side yard setback to a location at least 40 feet from the coastal bluff edge; (4) The proposed expansion does not include development of a basement with building area 5 feet or more below grade or the use of caisson foundations; [CONTINUED] (New Issue)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	[CONTINUED] (5) The proposed expansion does not result in a cumulative increase greater than 50 percent of the gross floor area of the structure, where the total expansion area is measured over time and includes the sum of all additions to the structure approved on or after October 13, 2016. The applicant shall provide evidence of the nature and extent of the cumulative changes at the time of application for any construction permit. (6) The proposed coastal development does not rely on existing shoreline protection; and [CONTINUED] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	[CONTINUED] (7) The applicant agrees to execute and record a waiver of future shoreline protection, and the execution and recordation shall occur prior to the issuance of the first building permit. (d) In the Coastal Overlay Zone, the previously conforming status for a structure located on a premises that contains or abuts a coastal beach or a coastal bluff edge shall terminate upon: [CONTINUED] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	[CONTINUED] (1) destruction, demolition, or removal of 50 percent or more of the structure's exterior walls, on a cumulative basis, which is any destruction, demolition, or removal that has occurred on or after October 13, 2016, which shall be measured in accordance with Section 127.0111, and for which the applicant shall provide sufficient evidence of the nature and extent of the cumulative changes at the time of application for any construction permit to rebut a presumption that the development is not entitled to previously conforming status, or [CONTINUED] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	[CONTINUED] (2) upon destruction, demolition, or removal of 50 percent or more of the capacity of the lateral or vertical load resisting system of the previously conforming structure, as determined by the Building Official. Upon termination, the development standards applicable to new structures shall then apply to the entire structure. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	In summary, the expansion of floor area more than 50% and the demolition of exterior walls more than 50% require that the entire premises be brought in conformance with zoning and Sensitive Coastal Bluff regulations. A total redesign is required to conform to these policies. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	As currently designed the Coastal Commission will appeal the development. (New Issue)

Zoning Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Sheet T cites SDMC 131.0446(a)(2)(b) for garage exemption. The correct code citation is SDMC 131.0446(b). This does not apply to the RS-1-7 zone, please include the entire garage floor area in the FAR calculation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	All proposed development must adhere to current regulations. Zone is RS-1-7. Front yard setback is 15 feet. Side setback is 0.08 x lot width. Lot width is 70.25 feet. Side setback is 5.62 feet (5'-7 1/2"). Street side setback is 0.10 x lot width. Street side setback is 7 feet. Rear setback is 13 feet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Please add a setback table to Sheet T. Please outline how side yard setback was calculated. The dimensions of the front property line cannot be found or confirmed. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	Please provide the calculation for the percentage of hardscape within the front yard. Per SDMC 1310447(a) the front yard shall be limited to a maximum of 60% of paving and hardscape. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	The proposed addition in the front is encroaching into the front setback. The front setback is 15 feet. Please ensure the structure conforms to this setback. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	New garage location does not provide the 20-foot driveway length as required in SDMC 142.0560(j)(4). Driveways that serve as direct access to off-street parking spaces and that traverse a sidewalk or curb shall be at least 20 feet long measured from the back of the sidewalk to that portion of the driveway most distant from the sidewalk. Please redesign. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	Please provide the driveway width to conform to SDMC Table 142-05M. Site is located within Parking Impact Area and the maximum driveway width is 12 feet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Please dimension the two required off-street parking spaces in the garage to conform with Table 142-05K, 9' x 18'. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	Please calculate FAR and all square footages as one lot. Do not separate the two lots, development is crossing the property line and ties them together to make one lot. Sheet A-0 is totaling square feet for the lots separate and should not be. Is this the entire lot size? (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Kristal Feilen at (619) 446-5405. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 2





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	Sheet A-0, please provide the total current square footage on site. Planning has calculated the guest house, main house, and garages to be 1,408 square feet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	Sheet A-0, please outline the highest adjacent grade to the proposed structure., and also provide the lowest elevation point within 5 feet of the structure's perimeter. These are used for the overall height calculation. Prop D height will be checked by structural upon building permit review. Please see SDMC 113.0270(a)(2)(B) for how to measure overall height. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	Please add the following note to all elevations and sections: "Height shall comply with Proposition D height limits as outlined in the City of San Diego Technical Bulletin BLDG-5-4." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	Please provide the plumb height limit of 30 feet running parallel to grade on all elevations/sections. Please see SDMC 113.0270(a)(2)(A) for how to measure plumb height. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	41	Please label existing and proposed grade on all elevations and sections. If the grade is to remain the same, please label grade as "existing/proposed - not to change." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	The plumb height reference line should be taken from the lower of the two grades (existing or proposed). A combination of the two may be necessary. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	Will there be fences or retaining walls proposed as part of this development? Please clearly outline locations and heights. Property is within the first public roadway and the side yards are considered sensitive to any potential views. All fencing and other landscape must respect a 3-foot height limit. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	44	Please add the retaining wall heights on the elevations and sections. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	45	Please add property lines and setbacks for the full height of the structure on all elevations and section. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	Please outline the angled building envelope per Table 131-04H and SDMC 131.0444. If the lot is 75 feet in width or greater the angle is 30 degrees, if the lot is less than 75 feet then the angle is 45 degrees. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	47	Sheet A-4, East Elevation is showing a grade datum point to be 34' (assuming this is average mean sea level) and is labeled "Roof Ridge ELEV." Please update to correct label and note if this is average mean sea level. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	Per SDMC 132.0403(b), a visual corridor of not less than the yard setbacks or more than 10 feet in width, and running the full depth of the premises, shall be preserved as a deed restriction as a condition of Coastal Development Permit approval whenever the proposed development is located on premises that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway. Please call out and outline the view easements in hatching on the site plan. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	49	Open fencing and landscaping may be permitted within the view corridors and visual access ways, provided such improvements do not significantly obstruct public views of the ocean. Landscaping shall be planted and maintained to preserve public views. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue)

This is wrong. Should be 2400

Community Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	50	Per the La Jolla Community Plan (Residential Land Use Element), In order to maintain and enhance the existing neighborhood character and ambiance projects shall address bulk and scale as viewed from the public right-of-way (Page 90). The applicant shall site examples of how the proposed project is consistent with the above statement. This information will used to make the findings for the project. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	This project shall be presented to the La Jolla Community Planning Association to receive a formal recommendation. Planning will review Community Planning Group comments prior to sign off. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	52	The proposed residential project is consistent with the land use designation of low density residential development (5-9 DU/AC) in the La Jolla Community Plan (Figure 16, p. 82). [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	Proposed project is located within an intermittent or partial vista per La Jolla Community Plan visual resource map (Figure 9, p.36). Site is located within a visual corridor or public vantage point as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan (Figure 9, p. 35-36). The Community Plan also states that public views to the ocean from the first public roadway adjacent to the ocean shall be preserved and enhanced, including visual access across private coastal properties at yards and setbacks. View easements over the side setbacks will be a requirement per this Community Plan policy. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	54	The structure is encroaching into numerous setbacks. All setbacks must be respected as the addition is over 50% of the existing structure area. As designed the residence is not consistent with the La Jolla Local Coastal Program and Community Plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	Community Plan recommendation for visual resources also states that where new development is proposed on property that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway, preserve, enhance or restore existing or potential view corridors within the yards and setbacks by adhering to setback regulations that cumulatively form functional view corridors and prevent an appearance of the public right-of way being walled off from the ocean. View corridor easements as a condition of this permit must conform to this recommendation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	Development must be consistent with Visual Resource recommendations as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan (p. 54) Structure height needs to be confirmed in order to determine consistency with building envelope regulations which preserve public views through the height, setback, landscaping, and fence transparency parameters of the Land Development Code that limit the building profile and maximize view opportunities. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/25/2018	Deemed Complete on 10/25/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 10/25/2018	
Reviewer: Huynh, Khanh (619) 446-5299 KHuynh@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 11/07/2018	
	Started: 11/19/2018	
Hours of Review: 6.50	Review Due: 11/27/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/26/2018	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 11/30/2018 from 11/30/2018 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 17 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).

1st Review cycle

Cleared?	Issue Num	Issue Text
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Engineering Review Section has reviewed the subject development and have the following comments that need to be addressed prior to a Public Hearing. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The San Diego Water Board adopted Order No. R9-2013-0001, NPDES No. CAS0109266, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Draining the Watersheds within the San Diego Region. This project will be required to adhere to the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards in effect at the time of approval of ministerial permit. The current Storm Water Development Regulations became effective on February 16, 2016 and this project will be subject to those regulations. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Based on the scope of work, and the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, the project is identified as the Standard Development Project, and subject to Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs. Therefore, I-4 and I-5 forms are required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	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. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	A copy of the Standard SWQMP forms I-4 and I-5 can be downloaded from: (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/january_2018_storm_water_standards_manual_0.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Revise the Site Plan. Show and call out the location of the roof drains for the proposed structure, and how they are discharged into landscape area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Revise the Site Plan, show and call out drainage directions, and provide spot elevations supporting the call out. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Portion of the project is within the Special Flood Hazard Area, zone VE. Revise the plans, to show the limit of the zone VE. Please demonstrate how the project will adhere to FEMA Section 60.3(e) if applicable. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	On the Existing and Demo plan, sheet A-0, please screen back all the existing improvement (use lighter shade). Also, provide a legend for each call out. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Per the City of San Diego Street Design Manual, minimum parkway width configuration shall be 10 feet. Currently, Dolphin Place Right-of-Way is only 5 feet. Revise the Site Plan to show and call out the applicant shall dedicate and improve an additional 5.0 feet adjacent to the site on Dolphin Place, satisfactory to the City Engineer. Please note: Any private improvements within public right-of-way need to be approved by City Engineer through Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement (EMRA). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Per the SDMC, Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 5, page 54 item (10). It states: "All driveways shall lead to a legal, off-street parking area or loading area on the same premises" Therefore, revise the plans, to propose to close the non-utilized (west) driveway on Bird Rock Avenue and restore curb, gutter and sidewalk with current City Standard. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Project is within the PIOZ-COASTAL-IMPACT and PIOZ-BEACH-IMPACT. Per the SDMC, Table 142-05M, the max driveway's width within parking impact area shall be 12 feet. Revise the plan to call out 12 feet max driveway on Dolphin Place. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	The east existing driveway on Bird Rock Avenue is not ADA-compliant and not to current City Standard. Revise the Site Plan, to show and call out the removal and replacement of the existing driveway, per current City Standard. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Khanh Huynh at (619) 446-5299. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 2





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	On the proposed Site Plan, show the Water and Sewer Mains, including laterals that serve the project. Call out the City Improvement Plan numbers. A search of City Records by your office may be required. If the existing water service and sewer lateral will be used, call out on the plans the existing services will remain. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Please provide a detail written response to all comments whether you agree or not and in case of disagreement, express your reasoning. (New Issue)





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

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/25/2018	Deemed Complete on 10/25/2018
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 10/25/2018	
Reviewer: Mendoza, Pancho	Assigned: 10/29/2018	
(619) 446-5433	Started: 11/27/2018	
Fmendoza@sandiego.gov	Review Due: 11/27/2018	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Completed: 11/29/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 11/30/2018 from 11/30/2018 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 (all of which are new).

Contact Group

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Chair for the La Jolla Community Planning Association at 858.456.7900 or info@lajollacpa.org to schedule your project presentation. This Community Planning Group is officially recognized by the City as a representative of the community, and an advisor to the City in actions that would affect the community. The Development Services Department has provided the group a copy of the project plans and documents. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/25/2018	Deemed Complete on 10/25/2018
Reviewing Discipline: Coastal Commission	Cycle Distributed: 10/25/2018	
Reviewer: Mendoza, Pancho (619) 446-5433 Fmendoza@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/29/2018	
	Started: 10/29/2018	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 11/27/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/27/2018	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 11/30/2018 from 11/30/2018 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 Coastal Commission (all of which are new).

Contact Coastal Commission

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Commission staff has provided comments to the proposed project, via email, dated October 29, 2018. This email was forwarded to the point of contact on October 31, 2018.

For additional information, please contact Coastal staff noted below:

Alexander Llerandi
Coastal Program Analyst II
California Coastal Commission
San Diego District
7575 Metropolitan Drive #103
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 767-2370

email: Alexander.Llerandi@coastal.ca.gov (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/25/2018	Deemed Complete on 10/25/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 10/25/2018	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296 pathomas@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/25/2018	
	Started: 11/14/2018	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 11/27/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/26/2018	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 11/30/2018 from 11/30/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: New Document Required.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 16 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (all of which are new).

611654-2 (11/26/2018)

Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within geologic hazards zones 47 and 53 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 47 is characterized by coastal bluffs, generally stable, favorable geologic structure, minor or no erosion, no landslides. Zone 53 is characterized by level or sloping terrain with unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Storm Water Requirements for the proposed conceptual 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. (New Issue)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Geologic Evaluation-Coastal Bluff, Property at 205-205-1/2 Bird Rock Avenue, La Jolla, California, prepared by Woodward-Clyde Consultants, dated March 17, 1989 (their project no. 8951020D-COS1). Coastal Development Plans for: Mark Tuszynski, 5692 Dolphin Place, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by Austin & Associates, dated September 28, 2018. (New Issue)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The referenced geotechnical report is over three years old and was prepared by a geotechnical firm that is no longer in business. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	An update geotechnical investigation report that addresses the geologic conditions at the site and the issues that follow must be submitted for review. The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports." https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/development-services/pdf/industry/geoguidelines.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Edge of Bluff: Provide a current determination of the bluff edge in accordance with the methods described in the Coastal Bluffs and Beaches Guidelines. https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/development-services/pdf/industry/landdevmanual/ldmcoastal.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Provide an accurate and precise topographic map of the ground surface at the property and beyond to aid in establishing the location of the coastal beach, coastal bluff face, and coastal bluff edge as defined in the City's Coastal Bluffs and Beaches Guidelines. Consideration should be given to providing elevation contours with an interval no greater than 2-feet. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Indicate the bluff edge on the topographic map, the site plan and site sections. The geotechnical consultant must provide three geologic cross sections through the lot, including the bluff edge. The cross-sections must match the site plan and include all geologic information. Show the existing gunite faced bluff, rock revetment, 25 foot and 40 foot coastal bluff edge setbacks and 1.5 factor of safety line on the site plan and sections. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Geologic units including fill soils and proposed lot improvements must be shown and labeled. Fill distribution and thickness should be based on subsurface investigation by the geotechnical consultant. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Bluff Recession: Please provide an average bluff recession rate in feet per year and the resulting feet of bluff recession in 75 years. Please provide photographic copies or high density scans of historic photographs used in the analysis (.jpg or .tif format) as well as copies of any other documents used. Please indicate the points measured as part of the analysis. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	A site-specific rate must be determined for the site by using historical data, such as historic aerial photographs. If the rate exceeds 25 feet in 75 years, please provide a bluff edge setback suitable to preclude erosion of the bluff affecting the lot improvements for the specified period of time (75 years). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Please provide an analysis of the potential effects on bluff stability of rising sea levels and of the potential effects of past and projected El Nino events on bluff stability, using latest scientific information. The report must also provide an analysis of whether this section of coastline is under a process of retreat. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Please address rising sea levels with respect to "California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance, Interpretive Guidelines for Addressing Sea Level Rise in Local Coastal Programs and Coastal Development Permits," adopted August 12, 2015 (available at: https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/slr/guidance/August2015/0_Full_Adopted_Sea_Level_Rise_Policy_Guidance.pdf). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Provide slope stability analysis for each geologic cross section. The consultant must demonstrate and conclude that the site will have factors of safety of 1.5 or greater with respect to gross and surficial bluff stability at the completion of the project. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Construction Impacts: The geotechnical consultant must comment whether or not the proposed scope of work as recommended will measurably destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Submit original quality prints and digital copies (on CD/DVD/or USB data storage device) of the referenced and requested geotechnical reports for our review and for our records. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/25/2018	Deemed Complete on 10/25/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 10/25/2018	
Reviewer: Lien, Terre	Assigned: 11/26/2018	
(619) 446-5327	Started: 11/26/2018	
tlien@sandiego.gov	Review Due: 11/27/2018	
Hours of Review: 1.50	Completed: 11/26/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 11/30/2018 from 11/30/2018 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 4 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (all of which are new).

1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	General Scope - CDP/SDP for additions/alterations to an existing single-dwelling unit with guest house. Located in a City-wide RS-1-7 zone in the La Jolla Community Planning area. Property includes Environmentally Sensitive Lands in the form of Sensitive Coastal Bluffs. According to current iteration of the plans, existing building footprint will not change in proximity to the coastal bluff and no work is proposed at the rear of the property. Per Google aerial maps, rear of property includes a masonry retaining wall and concrete decking with no landscaped areas. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Revegetation / Erosion Control - Based on current iteration of the plans, LDR-Landscape staff has no issue with the proposed project. However, should scope of the project change to include work in proximity of the coastal bluff, LDR-Landscape staff reserves the right to make further comments related to landscape components of slope/bluff stabilization and stormwater treatment. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Street Trees - Project is located in Residential Tree District 1 as set forth in the La Jolla Community Plan. Street tree(s) are to be provided in or adjacent to the right-of-way at a rate of one 24-in box canopy tree for every 30 linear feet of street frontage, excluding required curb cuts. However, due to site constraints, including non-standard right-of-way and existing utilities, it does not appear feasible to provide street trees along Dolphin Place, and only one tree can be provided along the Bird Rock frontage, approximately ten feet west of the existing electric transformer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	[cont. from above] Please provide, selecting species options from Residential Street Tree District 1 (see attached excerpt for your reference/use.) (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/25/2018	Deemed Complete on 10/25/2018
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Historic	Cycle Distributed: 10/25/2018	
Reviewer: Haggerty, Emma (619) 236-7173 EHaggerty@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/26/2018	
	Started: 11/27/2018	
Hours of Review: 0.00	Review Due: 11/27/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/27/2018	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 11/30/2018 from 11/30/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with Plan-Historic (all of which are new).

11.27.18

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The property located at 5692 Dolphin Pl, is not an individually designated resource and is not located within a designated historic district. However, San Diego Municipal Code Section 143.0212 requires City staff to review all projects impacting a parcel that contains a structure 45 years old or older to determine whether a potentially significant historical resource exists on site prior to issuance of a permit. (Info Only, No Response Required) (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2 | During this review buildings are evaluated for eligibility under local designation criteria. The designation criteria and guidelines for their application can be found on the City's website:

http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/historical/pdf/201102criteriaguidelines.pdf
(Informational Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | More information regarding this review process can be found in Information Bulletin 580:

http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/industry/infobulletin/ib580.pdf
(Informational Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4 | If City staff determines after review of these documents that no potentially significant historical resource exists on site, the parcel will be exempt from further historical review for five years from this date unless new information is provided that speaks to the building's eligibility for designation. (Informational Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5 | If City staff determines that a potentially significant historical resource exists on the site, all modifications and additions will be evaluated to determine consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties (Standards). If the proposed project is consistent with the Standards, the permit process may proceed and the parcel will require additional review for all future modifications. (continued...) (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6 | (...continued) If the proposed project is not consistent with the Standards, the applicant may redesign the project or prepare a historic report that evaluates the building's integrity and eligibility under all designation criteria. (Informational Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Staff has reviewed the photos; Assessor's Building Record; water and sewer records; listing of occupants; as well as any available historic photographs; Sanborn maps; and Notices of Completion. In addition, staff has considered any input received through applicable public noticing and outreach and have made the following determination: (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | Staff cannot make a determination with the information provided. Please provide the following documents: (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | The submitted discretionary documentation is incomplete. Please include a written description of any alterations including dates and the architect/ builder associated with the alterations and please include any permits regarding construction on the property. |

Note: The City of San Diego does not have building records older than 1955. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<p>Please include a Notice of Completion. It is typically provided as part of a chain of title search. It can also be found at the County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 103, San Diego CA 92101.</p> <p>If a Notice of Completion cannot be located, add the following note on the Building Record: "Notice of Completion cannot be located." (New Issue)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	<p>A Chain of Title was not included. It is available through title search companies or by conducting research at the County Administration Center. The Chain of Title must list the property's conveyance from seller to buyer (with date) since construction through the present day.</p> <p>Please note that deed copies do not satisfy this requirement. (New Issue)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	<p>The List of Occupants was incomplete. Please provide the missing data from 1989-2010. It is available in the City Directories at the San Diego Public Library, 820 E Street, San Diego CA 92101; or San Diego Historical Society Archives, 1649 El Prado #3, San Diego CA 92101.</p> <p>(New Issue)</p>





L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 611654 **Title:** Tuszynski Residence CDP/SDP
Project Mgr: Del Valle, Xavier (619) 557-7941 XDelValle@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/26/2019	Deemed Complete on 11/27/2019
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 11/27/2019	
Reviewer: Feilen, Kristal (619) 446-5405 Kfeilen@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 11/29/2019	
	Started: 12/18/2019	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 12/20/2019	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 12/18/2019	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/28/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/07/2020 from 01/07/2020 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 3rd 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 36 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (4 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 84 reviews, 73.8% were on-time, and 43.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

11/20/2018

CDP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Per SDMC 126.0704(a)(4) a CDP is also required for any significant alteration of land forms including removal or placement of vegetation, on a beach, wetland or sand dune, or within 100 feet of the edge of a coastal bluff. Please outline the limits of the Coastal Bluff on a vicinity site plan. Per City mapping the coastal bluff edge is within the westerly property. Site is within 100 feet of the coastal bluff edge. Please see definition of coastal bluff in SDMC 113.0103. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Please provide required findings as outlined in SDMC 126.0708(a). (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Please provide a demolition wall matrix for proposed demolition to current development on site. Please provide this on a separate demolition sheet. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	A demolition sheet requires a fully dimensioned sheet for each floor that shows all walls, windows, and doors changed, exterior walls enclosed by new construction, areas where top/bottom plates and studs have been removed, changed and/or modified. Include a wall matrix listing all walls in linear feet and percentages of walls removed and retained. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	When a window opening is increased horizontally (thru demolition of at least one of the two king studs & trim) to accommodate a modification of that opening, then the entire existing width of the opening to remain, plus any additional linear feet of wall demolished to modify the opening, is counted toward demolition. Any portion of the existing opening which will be framed in may be counted as remaining. When a window opening is increased vertically (through demolition of the header or sill), but not horizontally, then no linear feet of demolition is counted (unless the top plate is impacted). (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Please add construction notes at windows and doors identifying whether these elements are existing to remain; to be filled in; to be framed in with smaller opening; to be enlarged; to be shifted; to be replaced with new window/door of the same size; etc, and how these openings will be modified (removal of header, sill, king stud, or any combination thereof). (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	If the second floor addition requires new posts and beams as the supporting members, any existing top plates and sill plates that would be penetrated by the new structural members shall be counted as the "wall to be removed" for the width of the penetration. (From Cycle 2)

SDP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Development is proposed within 40 feet of the bluff edge. Development is not allowed to encroach past a 40-foot setback from the sensitive coastal bluff face edge. If a shoreline protective device (seawall) is present on the property, no reduction in the 40-foot setback is allowed. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Please clearly outline and label the bluff face edge, the 40-foot setback, and 100-foot setback on the Site Plan. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Please clearly outline and label the shoreline protective device (seawall) on the Site Plan. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Please provide draft SDP findings as outlined in SDMC 126.0505. Planning does not support the findings as the project is currently designed. (From Cycle 2)

Issues

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Kristal Feilen at (619) 446-5405. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 7





L64A-003A

Cleared?	Issue Num	Issue Text
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Per the La Jolla Community Plan (p. 40) On coastal bluff property, when redevelopment of an existing previously conforming structure includes the demolition or removal of 50% or more of the exterior walls, require the entire structure to be brought into conformance with all policies and standards of the Local Coastal Program, including, but not limited to, bluff edge setback. Additions that increase the size of the structure by 50% or more, shall not be authorized unless the structure is brought into conformance with the policies and standards of the Local Coastal Program. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	The additions proposed exceed 50% of existing development and the entire property must be brought up to code to comply with setbacks, height, coastal bluff regulations, etc. Please redesign the proposal to meet these requirements. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Previously conforming regulations (SDMC 127.0106) outline: (c) For structures located on a premises that contains or abuts a coastal beach or a coastal bluff edge, new additions or improvements to existing structures may be permitted subject to a Coastal Development Permit, in accordance with Section 126.0707, provided that all such new additions or improvements themselves do not increase the degree of non-conformity and comply with all of the following: [CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	[CONTINUED] (1) The proposed coastal development is in conformity with the certified Local Coastal Program land use plan; (2) The proposed coastal development does not alter more than 50 percent of the exterior walls of the structure as measured in accordance with Section 127.0111; [CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	[CONTINUED] (3) The proposed expansion does not exceed 500 square feet, except additional floor area may be permitted in exchange for the removal or relocation of an equivalent amount of existing floor area (from the primary structure or an accessory structure) from within a required setback from the coastal bluff edge or side yard setback to a location at least 40 feet from the coastal bluff edge; (4) The proposed expansion does not include development of a basement with building area 5 feet or more below grade or the use of caisson foundations; [CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	[CONTINUED] (5) The proposed expansion does not result in a cumulative increase greater than 50 percent of the gross floor area of the structure, where the total expansion area is measured over time and includes the sum of all additions to the structure approved on or after October 13, 2016. The applicant shall provide evidence of the nature and extent of the cumulative changes at the time of application for any construction permit. (6) The proposed coastal development does not rely on existing shoreline protection; and [CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	[CONTINUED] (7) The applicant agrees to execute and record a waiver of future shoreline protection, and the execution and recordation shall occur prior to the issuance of the first building permit. (d) In the Coastal Overlay Zone, the previously conforming status for a structure located on a premises that contains or abuts a coastal beach or a coastal bluff edge shall terminate upon: [CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	[CONTINUED] (1) destruction, demolition, or removal of 50 percent or more of the structure's exterior walls, on a cumulative basis, which is any destruction, demolition, or removal that has occurred on or after October 13, 2016, which shall be measured in accordance with Section 127.0111, and for which the applicant shall provide sufficient evidence of the nature and extent of the cumulative changes at the time of application for any construction permit to rebut a presumption that the development is not entitled to previously conforming status, or [CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	[CONTINUED] (2) upon destruction, demolition, or removal of 50 percent or more of the capacity of the lateral or vertical load resisting system of the previously conforming structure, as determined by the Building Official. Upon termination, the development standards applicable to new structures shall then apply to the entire structure. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	26	In summary, the expansion of floor area more than 50% and the demolition of exterior walls more than 50% require that the entire premises be brought in conformance with zoning and Sensitive Coastal Bluff regulations. A total redesign is required to conform to these policies. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27	As currently designed the Coastal Commission will appeal the development. (From Cycle 2)

Zoning Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	28	Sheet T cites SDMC 131.0446(a)(2)(b) for garage exemption. The correct code citation is SDMC 131.0446(b). This does not apply to the RS-1-7 zone, please include the entire garage floor area in the FAR calculation. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	All proposed development must adhere to current regulations. Zone is RS-1-7. Front yard setback is 15 feet. Side setback is 0.08 x lot width. Lot width is 70.25 feet. Side setback is 5.62 feet (5'-7 1/2"). Street side setback is 0.10 x lot width. Street side setback is 7 feet. Rear setback is 13 feet. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Please add a setback table to Sheet T. Please outline how side yard setback was calculated. The dimensions of the front property line cannot be found or confirmed. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	Please provide the calculation for the percentage of hardscape within the front yard. Per SDMC 1310447(a) the front yard shall be limited to a maximum of 60% of paving and hardscape. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	32	The proposed addition in the front is encroaching into the front setback. The front setback is 15 feet. Please ensure the structure conforms to this setback. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	33	New garage location does not provide the 20-foot driveway length as required in SDMC 142.0560(j)(4). Driveways that serve as direct access to off-street parking spaces and that traverse a sidewalk or curb shall be at least 20 feet long measured from the back of the sidewalk to that portion of the driveway most distant from the sidewalk. Please redesign. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34	Please provide the driveway width to conform to SDMC Table 142-05M. Site is located within Parking Impact Area and the maximum driveway width is 12 feet. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	35	Please dimension the two required off-street parking spaces in the garage to conform with Table 142-05K, 9' x 18'. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	36	Please calculate FAR and all square footages as one lot. Do not separate the two lots, development is crossing the property line and ties them together to make one lot. Sheet A-0 is totaling square feet for the lots separate and should not be. Is this the entire lot size? (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	37	Sheet A-0, please provide the total current square footage on site. Planning has calculated the guest house, main house, and garages to be 1,408 square feet. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	Sheet A-0, please outline the highest adjacent grade to the proposed structure., and also provide the lowest elevation point within 5 feet of the structure's perimeter. These are used for the overall height calculation. Prop D height will be checked by structural upon building permit review. Please see SDMC 113.0270(a)(2)(B) for how to measure overall height. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	Please add the following note to all elevations and sections: "Height shall comply with Proposition D height limits as outlined in the City of San Diego Technical Bulletin BLDG-5-4." (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	Please provide the plumb height limit of 30 feet running parallel to grade on all elevations/sections. Please see SDMC 113.0270(a)(2)(A) for how to measure plumb height. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	41	Please label existing and proposed grade on all elevations and sections. If the grade is to remain the same, please label grade as "existing/proposed - not to change." (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	The plumb height reference line should be taken from the lower of the two grades (existing or proposed). A combination of the two may be necessary. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	Will there be fences or retaining walls proposed as part of this development? Please clearly outline locations and heights. Property is within the first public roadway and the side yards are considered sensitive to any potential views. All fencing and other landscape must respect a 3-foot height limit. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	44	Please add the retaining wall heights on the elevations and sections. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	45	Please add property lines and setbacks for the full height of the structure on all elevations and section. (From Cycle 2)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	Please outline the angled building envelope per Table 131-04H and SDMC 131.0444. If the lot is 75 feet in width or greater the angle is 30 degrees, if the lot is less than 75 feet then the angle is 45 degrees. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	47	Sheet A-4, East Elevation is showing a grade datum point to be 34' (assuming this is average mean sea level) and is labeled "Roof Ridge ELEV." Please update to correct label and note if this is average mean sea level. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	Per SDMC 132.0403(b), a visual corridor of not less than the yard setbacks or more than 10 feet in width, and running the full depth of the premises, shall be preserved as a deed restriction as a condition of Coastal Development Permit approval whenever the proposed development is located on premises that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway. Please call out and outline the view easements in hatching on the site plan. (From Cycle 2)

Community Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	50	Per the La Jolla Community Plan (Residential Land Use Element), In order to maintain and enhance the existing neighborhood character and ambiance projects shall address bulk and scale as viewed from the public right-of-way (Page 90). The applicant shall site examples of how the proposed project is consistent with the above statement. This information will used to make the findings for the project. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	This project shall be presented to the La Jolla Community Planning Association to receive a formal recommendation. Planning will review Community Planning Group comments prior to sign off. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	Proposed project is located within an intermittent or partial vista per La Jolla Community Plan visual resource map (Figure 9, p.36). Site is located within a visual corridor or public vantage point as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan (Figure 9, p. 35-36). The Community Plan also states that public views to the ocean from the first public roadway adjacent to the ocean shall be preserved and enhanced, including visual access across private coastal properties at yards and setbacks. View easements over the side setbacks will be a requirement per this Community Plan policy. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	54	The structure is encroaching into numerous setbacks. All setbacks must be respected as the addition is over 50% of the existing structure area. As designed the residence is not consistent with the La Jolla Local Coastal Program and Community Plan. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	Community Plan recommendation for visual resources also states that where new development is proposed on property that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway, preserve, enhance or restore existing or potential view corridors within the yards and setbacks by adhering to setback regulations that cumulatively form functional view corridors and prevent an appearance of the public right-of way being walled off from the ocean. View corridor easements as a condition of this permit must conform to this recommendation. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	Development must be consistent with Visual Resource recommendations as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan (p. 54) Structure height needs to be confirmed in order to determine consistency with building envelope regulations which preserve public views through the height, setback, landscaping, and fence transparency parameters of the Land Development Code that limit the building profile and maximize view opportunities. (From Cycle 2)

12/18/2019

Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	57	Proposed addition does not exceed 500 sf but it is still unclear how much exterior demolition is proposed. After applicant provides a demolition matrix, planning should be able to confirm that site will not lose previously conforming right. (New Issue)

Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	58	Please provide the existing floor plan on separate sheets. There should be a first and second floor set. It is unclear which floor the addition will occur. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	59	Please outline all setbacks on the plot plan. Also please see previous comment #29. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	60	Please add garaged area to the floor area total for the site. Garages are not exempt from FAR in RS-1-7. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/26/2019	Deemed Complete on 11/27/2019
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 11/27/2019	
Reviewer: Szymanski, Jeffrey (619) 446-5324 jszymanski@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 12/05/2019	
	Started: 01/07/2020	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 01/07/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 01/07/2020	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/28/2020	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental 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-Environmental (5 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 83 reviews, 78.3% were on-time, and 43.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Extended Initial Study

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) has reviewed the referenced project and has determined that additional information is required for GHG, Historical Resources (Built Environment), Visual Quality, Geology, and Water Quality. Until the above issues have been addressed, the CEQA determination can not be made and the environmental processing time line will be held in abeyance. (From Cycle 2)

GHG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	EAS has reviewed the CAP checklist and has the following comments. While the project is a remodel there are substantial additions to the existing structure. In order to be found consistent with the City Climate Action Plan (CAP) the new roof elements must meet the requirements. On the checklist please indicate that roof would comply with one of the options on page 5 of the checklist. In addition, the project must also comply with the Plumbing fixture requirements found on page 6. (From Cycle 2)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please see comments from Geology staff as the report must be updated. The CEQA determination can not be made until all issues have been addressed. (From Cycle 2)

AB 52 Tribal Cultural Resource

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto 2014), more commonly known as AB 52, was signed into State Law July 1, 2015. Essentially, it requires that lead agencies throughout the State of California undertaking CEQA review, at the request of a California Native American tribe, begin "Government-to-Government" consultation with that tribal nations. If necessary a notice of the project will sent to local California Tribes once the CEQA determination is made. (From Cycle 2)

Historical Resources (Built En

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Please see comments from Plan Historic Staff. They do not have all the documentation that they need to determine if the structure is historic. EAS will need that information in order to determine if the project would result in an impact to a historical resource. (From Cycle 2)

Visual Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	In accordance with the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds significant Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character impacts may result from projects whose bulk, scale, materials, or style are incompatible with surrounding development, or would substantially alter the existing or planned character of the area. In addition, the project must not block view corridors. Please see comments from LDR-Planning. (From Cycle 2)

Water Quality

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Jeffrey Szymanski at (619) 446-5324. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 7





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Please see comments from LDR-Engineering. All comments must be addressed before EAS can make the CEQA determination. (From Cycle 2)

EAS Review 1/7/2020

GHG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Previous comments in regards to the CAP checklist were not addressed. Also, please note that all text boxes should be used to indicate how the question was answered. (New Issue)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Geology staff has not approved the geology report. EAS can not make a determination until all issues have been addressed. (New Issue)

Visual Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	Please see comments from Planning staff. The structure has been re designed in such a manner so that visual quality impacts would not occur. (New Issue)

Water Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Please see comments from Engineering staff. There are various comments remaining in regards to water quality, drainage, and flood zone. EAS can not make a determination until all issues have been addressed. (New Issue)

AB 52 Tribal Cultural Resource

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	The project has been scaled back and the property site has been previously disturbed. The project is consistent with AB 52. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/26/2019	Deemed Complete on 11/27/2019
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 11/27/2019	
Reviewer: Huynh, Khanh (619) 446-5299 KHuynh@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 12/02/2019	
	Started: 12/17/2019	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 12/20/2019	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 12/18/2019	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/28/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/07/2020 from 01/07/2020 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 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (3 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 72 reviews, 77.8% were on-time, and 38.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review cycle

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The Engineering Review Section has reviewed the subject development and have the following comments that need to be addressed prior to a Public Hearing. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The San Diego Water Board adopted Order No. R9-2013-0001, NPDES No. CAS0109266, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Draining the Watersheds within the San Diego Region. This project will be required to adhere to the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards in effect at the time of approval of ministerial permit. The current Storm Water Development Regulations became effective on February 16, 2016 and this project will be subject to those regulations. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Based on the scope of work, and the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, the project is identified as the Standard Development Project, and subject to Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs. Therefore, I-4 and I-5 forms are required. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	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. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	A copy of the Standard SWQMP forms I-4 and I-5 can be downloaded from: (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/january_2018_storm_water_standards_manual_0.pdf (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Revise the Site Plan. Show and call out the location of the roof drains for the proposed structure, and how they are discharged into landscape area. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Revise the Site Plan, show and call out drainage directions, and provide spot elevations supporting the call out. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Portion of the project is within the Special Flood Hazard Area, zone VE. Revise the plans, to show the limit of the zone VE. Please demonstrate how the project will adhere to FEMA Section 60.3(e) if applicable. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	On the Existing and Demo plan, sheet A-0, please screen back all the existing improvement (use lighter shade). Also, provide a legend for each call out. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Per the City of San Diego Street Design Manual, minimum parkway width configuration shall be 10 feet. Currently, Dolphin Place Right-of-Way is only 5 feet. Revise the Site Plan to show and call out the applicant shall dedicate and improve an additional 5.0 feet adjacent to the site on Dolphin Place, satisfactory to the City Engineer. Please note: Any private improvements within public right-of-way need to be approved by City Engineer through Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement (EMRA). (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Per the SDMC, Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 5, page 54 item (10). It states: "All driveways shall lead to a legal, off-street parking area or loading area on the same premises" Therefore, revise the plans, to propose to close the non-utilized (west) driveway on Bird Rock Avenue and restore curb, gutter and sidewalk with current City Standard. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Project is within the PIOZ-COASTAL-IMPACT and PIOZ-BEACH-IMPACT. Per the SDMC, Table 142-05M, the max driveway's width within parking impact area shall be 12 feet . Revise the plan to call out 12 feet max driveway on Dolphin Place. (From Cycle 2)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Khanh Huynh at (619) 446-5299. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 7





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	The east existing driveway on Bird Rock Avenue is not ADA-compliant and not to current City Standard. Revise the Site Plan, to show and call out the removal and replacement of the existing driveway, per current City Standard. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	On the proposed Site Plan, show the Water and Sewer Mains, including laterals that serve the project. Call out the City Improvement Plan numbers. A search of City Records by your office may be required. If the existing water service and sewer lateral will be used, call out on the plans the existing services will remain. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Please provide a detail written response to all comments whether you agree or not and in case of disagreement, express your reasoning. (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Please address all the outstanding issues. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Please provide a detail written response to all comments whether you agree or not and in case of disagreement, express your reasoning. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Please contact my office at KHuynh@sandiego.gov or (619)446-5299 if you have questions. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/26/2019	Deemed Complete on 11/27/2019
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 11/27/2019	
Reviewer: Del Valle, Xavier (619) 557-7941 XDelValle@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 12/10/2019	
	Started: 12/10/2019	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Review Due: 12/20/2019	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 12/10/2019	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/28/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/07/2020 from 01/07/2020 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 3rd complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (None of which are new)
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 50 reviews, 36.0% were on-time, and 38.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Contact Group

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Chair for the La Jolla Community Planning Association at 858.456.7900 or info@lajollacpa.org to schedule your project presentation. This Community Planning Group is officially recognized by the City as a representative of the community, and an advisor to the City in actions that would affect the community. The Development Services Department has provided the group a copy of the project plans and documents. (From Cycle 2)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/26/2019	Deemed Complete on 11/27/2019
Reviewing Discipline: Coastal Commission	Cycle Distributed: 11/27/2019	
Reviewer: Del Valle, Xavier (619) 557-7941 XDelValle@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 12/10/2019	
	Started: 12/10/2019	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Review Due: 12/20/2019	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 12/10/2019	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/28/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/07/2020 from 01/07/2020 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 3rd complete submittal for Coastal Commission on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Coastal Commission (1 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Coastal Commission performed 1 reviews, 100.0% were on-time, and 100.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Contact Coastal Commission

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Comission staff has provided comments to the proposed project, via email, dated October 29, 2018. This email was forwarded to the point of contact on October 31, 2018.
--------------------------	---	---

For additional information, please contact Coastal staff noted below:

Alexander Llerandi
Coastal Program Analyst II
California Coastal Commission
San Diego District
7575 Metropolitan Drive #103
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 767-2370

<input type="checkbox"/>	2	email: Alexander.Llerandi@coastal.ca.gov (From Cycle 2) Coastal Comission staff has provided comments by email to the updated set of plans. The email dated December 5, 2019 was forwarded to the applicant. For additional information, please contact Alexander Llerandi with the Coastal Commission at (619) 767-2370 or by email at Alexander.Llerandi@coastal.ca.gov. (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	--





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/26/2019	Deemed Complete on 11/27/2019
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 11/27/2019	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296 pathomas@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 12/02/2019	
	Started: 12/12/2019	
Hours of Review: 1.50	Review Due: 12/20/2019	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 12/17/2019	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/28/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/07/2020 from 01/07/2020 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 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 15 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (2 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 51 reviews, 94.1% were on-time, and 82.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

611654-2 (11/26/2018)

Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within geologic hazards zones 47 and 53 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 47 is characterized by coastal bluffs, generally stable, favorable geologic structure, minor or no erosion, no landslides. Zone 53 is characterized by level or sloping terrain with unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Storm Water Requirements for the proposed conceptual 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 2)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Geologic Evaluation-Coastal Bluff, Property at 205-205-1/2 Bird Rock Avenue, La Jolla, California, prepared by Woodward-Clyde Consultants, dated March 17, 1989 (their project no. 8951020D-COS1). Coastal Development Plans for: Mark Tuszynski, 5692 Dolphin Place, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by Austin & Associates, dated September 28, 2018. (From Cycle 2)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The referenced geotechnical report is over three years old and was prepared by a geotechnical firm that is no longer in business. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	An update geotechnical investigation report that addresses the geologic conditions at the site and the issues that follow must be submitted for review. The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports." https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/development-services/pdf/industry/geoguidelines.pdf (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Edge of Bluff: Provide a current determination of the bluff edge in accordance with the methods described in the Coastal Bluffs and Beaches Guidelines. https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/development-services/pdf/industry/landdevmanual/lmcoastal.pdf (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Provide an accurate and precise topographic map of the ground surface at the property and beyond to aid in establishing the location of the coastal beach, coastal bluff face, and coastal bluff edge as defined in the City's Coastal Bluffs and Beaches Guidelines. Consideration should be given to providing elevation contours with an interval no greater than 2-feet. (From Cycle 2)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Geology' review, please call Patrick Thomas at (619) 446-5296. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 7





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Indicate the bluff edge on the topographic map, the site plan and site sections. The geotechnical consultant must provide three geologic cross sections through the lot, including the bluff edge. The cross-sections must match the site plan and include all geologic information. Show the existing gunite faced bluff, rock revetment, 25 foot and 40 foot coastal bluff edge setbacks and 1.5 factor of safety line on the site plan and sections. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Geologic units including fill soils and proposed lot improvements must be shown and labeled. Fill distribution and thickness should be based on subsurface investigation by the geotechnical consultant. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Bluff Recession: Please provide an average bluff recession rate in feet per year and the resulting feet of bluff recession in 75 years. Please provide photographic copies or high density scans of historic photographs used in the analysis (.jpg or .tif format) as well as copies of any other documents used. Please indicate the points measured as part of the analysis. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	A site-specific rate must be determined for the site by using historical data, such as historic aerial photographs. If the rate exceeds 25 feet in 75 years, please provide a bluff edge setback suitable to preclude erosion of the bluff affecting the lot improvements for the specified period of time (75 years). (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Please provide an analysis of the potential effects on bluff stability of rising sea levels and of the potential effects of past and projected El Nino events on bluff stability, using latest scientific information. The report must also provide an analysis of whether this section of coastline is under a process of retreat. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Please address rising sea levels with respect to "California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance, Interpretive Guidelines for Addressing Sea Level Rise in Local Coastal Programs and Coastal Development Permits," adopted August 12, 2015 (available at: https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/slr/guidance/August2015/0_Full_Adopted_Sea_Level_Rise_Policy_Guidance.pdf). (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Provide slope stability analysis for each geologic cross section. The consultant must demonstrate and conclude that the site will have factors of safety of 1.5 or greater with respect to gross and surficial bluff stability at the completion of the project. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Construction Impacts: The geotechnical consultant must comment whether or not the proposed scope of work as recommended will measurably destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Submit original quality prints and digital copies (on CD/DVD/or USB data storage device) of the referenced and requested geotechnical reports for our review and for our records. (From Cycle 2)

611654-7 (12/17/2019)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Geologic Evaluation-Coastal Bluff, Property at 205-205-1/2 Bird Rock Avenue, La Jolla, California, prepared by Woodward-Clyde Consultants, dated March 17, 1989 (their project no. 8951020D-COS1). Coastal Development Plans for: Mark Tuszynski, 5692 Dolphin Place, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by Austin & Associates, dated September 28, 2018, revised August 22, 2019. (New Issue)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	The previous PTS Cycle 2 Geology review issues 4 through 16 remain unaddressed and uncleared. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/26/2019	Deemed Complete on 11/27/2019
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 11/27/2019	
Reviewer: Kohakura, Vanessa (619) 446-5120 Vkohakura@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 12/10/2019	
	Started: 12/20/2019	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 12/20/2019	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 12/20/2019	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 01/28/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/07/2020 from 01/07/2020 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 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (3 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 43 reviews, 60.5% were on-time, and 45.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	General Scope - CDP/SDP for additions/alterations to an existing single-dwelling unit with guest house. Located in a City-wide RS-1-7 zone in the La Jolla Community Planning area. Property includes Environmentally Sensitive Lands in the form of Sensitive Coastal Bluffs. According to current iteration of the plans, existing building footprint will not change in proximity to the coastal bluff and no work is proposed at the rear of the property. Per Google aerial maps, rear of property includes a masonry retaining wall and concrete decking with no landscaped areas. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Revegetation / Erosion Control - Based on current iteration of the plans, LDR-Landscape staff has no issue with the proposed project. However, should scope of the project change to include work in proximity of the coastal bluff, LDR-Landscape staff reserves the right to make further comments related to landscape components of slope/bluff stabilization and stormwater treatment. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Street Trees - Project is located in Residential Tree District 1 as set forth in the La Jolla Community Plan. Street tree(s) are to be provided in or adjacent to the right-of-way at a rate of one 24-in box canopy tree for every 30 linear feet of street frontage, excluding required curb cuts. However, due to site constraints, including non-standard right-of-way and existing utilities, it does not appear feasible to provide street trees along Dolphin Place, and only one tree can be provided along the Bird Rock frontage, approximately ten feet west of the existing electric transformer. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	[cont. from above] Please provide, selecting species options from Residential Street Tree District 1 (see attached excerpt for your reference/use.) (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review (Cycle 7) 12/20/19

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Landscape staff did not receive a response to comments. Please include a response to comments with the next submittal. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Street Trees: Project is located in Residential Tree District 1 as set forth in the La Jolla Community Plan. Street tree(s) are to be provided in or adjacent to the right-of-way at a rate of one 24-in box canopy tree for every 30 linear feet of street frontage, excluding required curb cuts. However, due to site constraints, including non-standard right-of-way and existing utilities, only one tree can be provided along the Bird Rock frontage, approximately ten feet west of the existing electric transformer. (continued below...) (New Issue)





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"/>	7	Please show and identify street tree on the plans. Select a species listed under Residential Street Tree District 1 from the Community Plan.

Identify species by both botanical and common name. Include the container box size on the plans.

(New Issue)





Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 11/26/2019	Deemed Complete on 11/27/2019
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Historic	Cycle Distributed: 11/27/2019	
Reviewer: Haggerty, Emma (619) 236-7173 EHaggerty@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/27/2020	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 01/28/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 12/20/2019	
	Completed: 01/28/2020	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 01/28/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/07/2020 from 01/07/2020 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for Plan-Historic on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 7 outstanding review issues with Plan-Historic (4 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Plan-Historic performed 318 reviews, 90.3% were on-time, and 90.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

11.27.18

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Staff cannot make a determination with the information provided. Please provide the following documents: (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	The submitted discretionary documentation is incomplete. Please include a written description of any alterations including dates and the architect/ builder associated with the alterations and please include any permits regarding construction on the property. Note: The City of San Diego does not have building records older than 1955. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Please include a Notice of Completion. It is typically provided as part of a chain of title search. It can also be found at the County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 103, San Diego CA 92101. If a Notice of Completion cannot be located, add the following note on the Building Record: "Notice of Completion cannot be located." (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	A Chain of Title was not included. It is available through title search companies or by conducting research at the County Administration Center. The Chain of Title must list the property's conveyance from seller to buyer (with date) since construction through the present day.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Please note that deed copies do not satisfy this requirement. (From Cycle 2) The List of Occupants was incomplete. Please provide the missing data from 1989-2010. It is available in the City Directories at the San Diego Public Library, 820 E Street, San Diego CA 92101; or San Diego Historical Society Archives, 1649 El Prado #3, San Diego CA 92101. (From Cycle 2)

1.28.2020

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	The provide documentation does not include the Notice of Completion or a complete Chain of Title. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	If the Notice of Completion cannot be located, please provide in writing "Notic of Completion cannot be located". (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Like the provided List of Occupants, the Chain of Title must also be in a tabular format and must list the property's conveyance from seller to buyer (with date) since construction through the present day. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Please resubmit the required documentation to the Development Services Department for routing and review. Should you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact the "Reviewer" listed in bold at the top of this cycle issues report. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'Plan-Historic' review, please call Emma Haggerty at (619) 236-7173. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 7





L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 611654 **Title:** Tuszynski Residence CDP/SDP
Project Mgr: Del Valle, Xavier (619) 557-7941 XDelValle@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Submitted:** 07/28/2020 Deemed Complete on 07/28/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review **Cycle Distributed:** 07/28/2020
Reviewer: Messina, Ana **Assigned:** 07/29/2020
(619) 446-5131 **Started:** 08/13/2020
Amessina@sandiego.gov **Review Due:** 08/18/2020
Hours of Review: 4.20 **Completed:** 08/18/2020 **COMPLETED ON TIME**
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Closed:** 09/16/2020

- . The review due date was changed to 08/21/2020 from 08/21/2020 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 22 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (19 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 91 reviews, 56.0% were on-time, and 42.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

11/20/2018

CDP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Per SDMC 126.0704(a)(4) a CDP is also required for any significant alteration of land forms including removal or placement of vegetation, on a beach, wetland or sand dune, or within 100 feet of the edge of a coastal bluff. Please outline the limits of the Coastal Bluff on a vicinity site plan. Per City mapping the coastal bluff edge is within the westerly property. Site is within 100 feet of the coastal bluff edge. Please see definition of coastal bluff in SDMC 113.0103. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Please provide required findings as outlined in SDMC 126.0708(a). (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Please provide a demolition wall matrix for proposed demolition to current development on site. Please provide this on a separate demolition sheet. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	A demolition sheet requires a fully dimensioned sheet for each floor that shows all walls, windows, and doors changed, exterior walls enclosed by new construction, areas where top/bottom plates and studs have been removed, changed and/or modified. Include a wall matrix listing all walls in linear feet and percentages of walls removed and retained. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	When a window opening is increased horizontally (thru demolition of at least one of the two king studs & trim) to accommodate a modification of that opening, then the entire existing width of the opening to remain, plus any additional linear feet of wall demolished to modify the opening, is counted toward demolition. Any portion of the existing opening which will be framed in may be counted as remaining. When a window opening is increased vertically (through demolition of the header or sill), but not horizontally, then no linear feet of demolition is counted (unless the top plate is impacted). (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Please add construction notes at windows and doors identifying whether these elements are existing to remain; to be filled in; to be framed in with smaller opening; to be enlarged; to be shifted; to be replaced with new window/door of the same size; etc, and how these openings will be modified (removal of header, sill, king stud, or any combination thereof). (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	If the second floor addition requires new posts and beams as the supporting members, any existing top plates and sill plates that would be penetrated by the new structural members shall be counted as the "wall to be removed" for the width of the penetration. (From Cycle 2)

Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Per the La Jolla Community Plan (p. 40) On coastal bluff property, when redevelopment of an existing previously conforming structure includes the demolition or removal of 50% or more of the exterior walls, require the entire structure to be brought into conformance with all policies and standards of the Local Coastal Program, including, but not limited to, bluff edge setback. Additions that increase the size of the structure by 50% or more, shall not be authorized unless the structure is brought into conformance with the policies and standards of the Local Coastal Program. (From Cycle 2)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	<p>Previously conforming regulations (SDMC 127.0106) outline:</p> <p>(c) For structures located on a premises that contains or abuts a coastal beach or a coastal bluff edge, new additions or improvements to existing structures may be permitted subject to a Coastal Development Permit, in accordance with Section 126.0707, provided that all such new additions or improvements themselves do not increase the degree of non-conformity and comply with all of the following:</p> <p>[CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	<p>[CONTINUED]</p> <p>(1) The proposed coastal development is in conformity with the certified Local Coastal Program land use plan;</p> <p>(2) The proposed coastal development does not alter more than 50 percent of the exterior walls of the structure as measured in accordance with Section 127.0111;</p> <p>[CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	<p>[CONTINUED]</p> <p>(3) The proposed expansion does not exceed 500 square feet, except additional floor area may be permitted in exchange for the removal or relocation of an equivalent amount of existing floor area (from the primary structure or an accessory structure) from within a required setback from the coastal bluff edge or side yard setback to a location at least 40 feet from the coastal bluff edge;</p> <p>(4) The proposed expansion does not include development of a basement with building area 5 feet or more below grade or the use of caisson foundations;</p> <p>[CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	<p>[CONTINUED]</p> <p>(5) The proposed expansion does not result in a cumulative increase greater than 50 percent of the gross floor area of the structure, where the total expansion area is measured over time and includes the sum of all additions to the structure approved on or after October 13, 2016. The applicant shall provide evidence of the nature and extent of the cumulative changes at the time of application for any construction permit.</p> <p>(6) The proposed coastal development does not rely on existing shoreline protection; and</p> <p>[CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	<p>[CONTINUED]</p> <p>(7) The applicant agrees to execute and record a waiver of future shoreline protection, and the execution and recordation shall occur prior to the issuance of the first building permit.</p> <p>(d) In the Coastal Overlay Zone, the previously conforming status for a structure located on a premises that contains or abuts a coastal beach or a coastal bluff edge shall terminate upon:</p> <p>[CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	24	<p>[CONTINUED]</p> <p>(1) destruction, demolition, or removal of 50 percent or more of the structure's exterior walls, on a cumulative basis, which is any destruction, demolition, or removal that has occurred on or after October 13, 2016, which shall be measured in accordance with Section 127.0111, and for which the applicant shall provide sufficient evidence of the nature and extent of the cumulative changes at the time of application for any construction permit to rebut a presumption that the development is not entitled to previously conforming status, or</p> <p>[CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	25	<p>[CONTINUED]</p> <p>(2) upon destruction, demolition, or removal of 50 percent or more of the capacity of the lateral or vertical load resisting system of the previously conforming structure, as determined by the Building Official. Upon termination, the development standards applicable to new structures shall then apply to the entire structure. (From Cycle 2)</p>

Zoning Review

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Ana Messina at (619) 446-5131. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	29	All proposed development must adhere to current regulations. Zone is RS-1-7. Front yard setback is 15 feet. Side setback is 0.08 x lot width. Lot width is 70.25 feet. Side setback is 5.62 feet (5'-7 1/2"). Street side setback is 0.10 x lot width. Street side setback is 7 feet. Rear setback is 13 feet. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30	Please add a setback table to Sheet T. Please outline how side yard setback was calculated. The dimensions of the front property line cannot be found or confirmed. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	31	Please provide the calculation for the percentage of hardscape within the front yard. Per SDMC 1310447(a) the front yard shall be limited to a maximum of 60% of paving and hardscape. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	38	Sheet A-0, please outline the highest adjacent grade to the proposed structure., and also provide the lowest elevation point within 5 feet of the structure's perimeter. These are used for the overall height calculation. Prop D height will be checked by structural upon building permit review. Please see SDMC 113.0270(a)(2)(B) for how to measure overall height. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	39	Please add the following note to all elevations and sections: "Height shall comply with Proposition D height limits as outlined in the City of San Diego Technical Bulletin BLDG-5-4." (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	Please provide the plumb height limit of 30 feet running parallel to grade on all elevations/sections. Please see SDMC 113.0270(a)(2)(A) for how to measure plumb height. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	41	Please label existing and proposed grade on all elevations and sections. If the grade is to remain the same, please label grade as "existing/proposed - not to change." (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	42	The plumb height reference line should be taken from the lower of the two grades (existing or proposed). A combination of the two may be necessary. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	43	Will there be fences or retaining walls proposed as part of this development? Please clearly outline locations and heights. Property is within the first public roadway and the side yards are considered sensitive to any potential views. All fencing and other landscape must respect a 3-foot height limit. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	45	Please add property lines and setbacks for the full height of the structure on all elevations and section. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	46	Please outline the angled building envelope per Table 131-04H and SDMC 131.0444. If the lot is 75 feet in width or greater the angle is 30 degrees, if the lot is less than 75 feet then the angle is 45 degrees. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	Per SDMC 132.0403(b), a visual corridor of not less than the yard setbacks or more than 10 feet in width, and running the full depth of the premises, shall be preserved as a deed restriction as a condition of Coastal Development Permit approval whenever the proposed development is located on premises that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway. Please call out and outline the view easements in hatching on the site plan. (From Cycle 2)

Community Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	50	Per the La Jolla Community Plan (Residential Land Use Element), In order to maintain and enhance the existing neighborhood character and ambiance projects shall address bulk and scale as viewed from the public right-of-way (Page 90). The applicant shall site examples of how the proposed project is consistent with the above statement. This information will used to make the findings for the project. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	This project shall be presented to the La Jolla Community Planning Association to receive a formal recommendation. Planning will review Community Planning Group comments prior to sign off. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	Proposed project is located within an intermittent or partial vista per La Jolla Community Plan visual resource map (Figure 9, p.36). Site is located within a visual corridor or public vantage point as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan (Figure 9, p. 35-36). The Community Plan also states that public views to the ocean from the first public roadway adjacent to the ocean shall be preserved and enhanced, including visual access across private coastal properties at yards and setbacks. View easements over the side setbacks will be a requirement per this Community Plan policy. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	Community Plan recommendation for visual resources also states that where new development is proposed on property that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway, preserve, enhance or restore existing or potential view corridors within the yards and setbacks by adhering to setback regulations that cumulatively form functional view corridors and prevent an appearance of the public right-of way being walled off from the ocean. View corridor easements as a condition of this permit must conform to this recommendation. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	56	Development must be consistent with Visual Resource recommendations as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan (p. 54) Structure height needs to be confirmed in order to determine consistency with building envelope regulations which preserve public views through the height, setback, landscaping, and fence transparency parameters of the Land Development Code that limit the building profile and maximize view opportunities. (From Cycle 2)

12/18/2019

Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	57	Proposed addition does not exceed 500 sf but it is still unclear how much exterior demolition is proposed. After applicant provides a demolition matrix, planning should be able to confirm that site will not lose previously conforming right. (From Cycle 7)

Review

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

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Ana Messina at (619) 446-5131. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 8





Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 58 Please provide the existing floor plan on separate sheets. There should be a first and second floor set. It is unclear which floor the addition will occur. (From Cycle 7)
- 59 Please outline all setbacks on the plot plan. Also please see previous comment #29. (From Cycle 7)
- 60 Please add garaged area to the floor area total for the site. Garages are not exempt from FAR in RS-1-7. (From Cycle 7)

Recheck Comments 08/14/2020

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 61 From issue 4. Coastal bluff edge shown on Site Plan. Scope Change noted on most recent Plans reviewed under Cycle 8. Scope: New 494 SF 1-story addition for 2 bedrooms and baths to main SDU. (info only).
(New Issue)
- 62 From issue 6. Applicant did not provide any written findings, so staff will defer to DPM once Draft Findings are prepared. (info only)
(New Issue)
- 63 From issue 7. Please revise the Wall Demo Matrix shown on Sheet A-0.1 to indicate a 20'-0 wall length & 14% equivalent on Main Home structure. Demolition for Coastal Zones includes those portions of existing exterior wall that will be covered by new proposed development, like proposed bedroom #3, even if they are not physically removed they are no longer exterior walls.
(New Issue)
- 64 From issue 11. new proposed Scope does not include a 2nd story addition. (info only).
(New Issue)
- 65 From Issue 17 & 19. Staff agrees that development is not proposing to remove more than 50% of the existing exterior walls, but proposal would increase the SF of the existing main house (which encroaches into Coastal Bluff setback) by more than 50% as follows;
Existing SF = 1114, 50% = 557 SF
Proposed addition of new 494 SF + existing detached garage of 294 SF = 788 SF, > 50%
Therefore, based on Community Plan and SDMC sections noted before, the entire structure would need (New Issue)
- 66 (cont.) to be brought up to compliance with current regulations, which would mean compliance with the Coastal bluff setback of 40'-0 at rear and the Front Yard 15'-0 setback. In order for staff to be able to make findings for approval while keeping the existing structures as is, applicant needs to propose an addition to the Main SDU that does not exceed 557 SF and does not attach to the existing non conforming garage that encroaches in Front Yard. Sec. 131.0450 requires a min. 3'-0 separation between habitable and non-habitable structures for RS-1-7 zone.
(New Issue)
- 67 From issue 23. Applicant has stated that there is an existing permit for Shoreline protection, so please provide staff with more information as to what type of protections already exist and the type of permit it refers to. Regardless of the existing conditions, a requirement to Record a Waiver of Future Shoreline Protection needs to be executed prior to Issuance of a new building permit, as noted per Sec. 127.0106, so this will be included as a Condition of approval for the CDP.
(New Issue)
- 68 From issue 29 & 30. Setbacks noted per Table on sheet T are correct but please revise the Street Side setback dimension noted on the Site Plan sheet P and all other Floor plans to match the 7'-0 requirement. Plans now show an 8'-0 dimension.
(New Issue)
- 69 From issue 31. New scope does not propose any work in Front Setback.(info only)
(New Issue)
- 70 New development needs to comply with current SDMC regulations, therefore proposed bedroom walls along the S side Interior Yard need to meet required Interior Side setback of 5'-7-1/2, please revise wall location currently shown in line with the non conforming existing structure, sheet A-1.
(New Issue)
- 71 From issue 40. Please provide a Section view for the proposed addition.
(New Issue)
- 72 From issue 43. None provided. (info only)
(New Issue)





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"/>	73	From issue 45. Please revise sheet A-2 to correctly show edge of existing structure walls that are not at required Side Setback. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	74	From issue 46. Max height of addition is less than the 24'-0 height for Side Yards.(info only). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	75	From Issue 48 & 53. Requirement to provide a Visual Corridor is triggered by the location of this site as noted per Sec. 132.0403(b)(1), it is not dependent on whether the site has existing Easements or not. Please show compliance as requested by marking the Interior Side Yard as "Visual Corridor" on plans and make sure that any Landscaping or fencing (i.e gates shown) provide an "open" view from Street, see Sec. 132.0403(e). (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	76	From issue 50. Applicant did not provide any examples but per Scope Change proposal is for a 1 story addition only. Roof height for addition will exceed existing structure height but will still maintain a lower profile than most of the neighboring 2 story structures, and will be less than the 24'-0 height max allowance along Front and Side Yards. (info only). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	77	From Issue 51. Applicant response list indicates "Comment as noted", but staff needs to know if the project has been presented to the Community Planning Group and what their comments and decision (if any) were. Please clarify. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	78	From issue 57. Project proposes removal of less than 50% of existing total exterior walls.(info only). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	79	Before approval of any development permit, the applicant shall execute and record in favor of the City a hold harmless and/or indemnification agreement for the approved development, as necessary and appropriate. This may be a Condition on the CDP once need is verified with Geology & Environmental staff. (Info only) (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 07/28/2020	Deemed Complete on 07/28/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 07/28/2020	
Reviewer: Szymanski, Jeffrey (619) 446-5324 jszymanski@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 07/29/2020	
	Started: 08/21/2020	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 08/21/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 08/21/2020	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/16/2020	

- . 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 8 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (3 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 90 reviews, 66.7% were on-time, and 39.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Extended Initial Study

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) has reviewed the referenced project and has determined that additional information is required for GHG, Historical Resources (Built Environment), Visual Quality, Geology, and Water Quality. Until the above issues have been addressed, the CEQA determination can not be made and the environmental processing time line will be held in abeyance. (From Cycle 2)

GHG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	EAS has reviewed the CAP checklist and has the following comments. While the project is a remodel there are substantial additions to the existing structure. In order to be found consistent with the City Climate Action Plan (CAP) the new roof elements must meet the requirements. On the checklist please indicate that roof would comply with one of the options on page 5 of the checklist. In addition, the project must also comply with the Plumbing fixture requirements found on page 6. (From Cycle 2)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please see comments from Geology staff as the report must be updated. The CEQA determination can not be made until all issues have been addressed. (From Cycle 2)

AB 52 Tribal Cultural Resource

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto 2014), more commonly known as AB 52, was signed into State Law July 1, 2015. Essentially, it requires that lead agencies throughout the State of California undertaking CEQA review, at the request of a California Native American tribe, begin "Government-to-Government" consultation with that tribal nations. If necessary a notice of the project will sent to local California Tribes once the CEQA determination is made. (From Cycle 2)

Historical Resources (Built En

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Please see comments from Plan Historic Staff. They do not have all the documentation that they need to determine if the structure is historic. EAS will need that information in order to determine if the project would result in an impact to a historical resource. (From Cycle 2)

Water Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Please see comments from LDR-Engineering. All comments must be addressed before EAS can make the CEQA determination. (From Cycle 2)

GHG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Previous comments in regards to the CAP checklist were not addressed. Also, please note that all text boxes should be used to indicate how the question was answered. (From Cycle 7)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Jeffrey Szymanski at (619) 446-5324. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 8





Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Geology staff has not approved the geology report. EAS can not make a determination until all issues have been addressed. (From Cycle 7)

Water Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Please see comments from Engineering staff. There are various comments remaining in regards to water quality, drainage, and flood zone. EAS can not make a determination until all issues have been addressed. (From Cycle 7)

AB 52 Tribal Cultural Resource

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	The project has been scaled back and the property site has been previously disturbed. The project is consistent with AB 52. (From Cycle 7)

EAS Review 8/21/2020

CAP Checklist

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	As previously indicated all text boxes must provide an explanation as to how the project will respond to the question being asked. (New Issue)

Planning Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Please see comments from LDR-Planning the project must provide for the view corridor. If the view corridor is not provided a CEQA visual quality impact may occur. (New Issue)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Please see comments from Geology Staff, the CEQA determination can not be made until all issues have been addressed. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 07/28/2020	Deemed Complete on 07/28/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 07/28/2020	
Reviewer: Huynh, Khanh (619) 446-5299 KHuynh@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 07/28/2020	
	Started: 08/03/2020	
Hours of Review: 3.00	Review Due: 08/18/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 08/17/2020	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/16/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/21/2020 from 08/21/2020 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 9 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (6 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 78 reviews, 84.6% were on-time, and 37.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review cycle

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Revise the Site Plan, show and call out drainage directions, and provide spot elevations supporting the call out. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Portion of the project is within the Special Flood Hazard Area, zone VE. Revise the plans, to show the limit of the zone VE. Please demonstrate how the project will adhere to FEMA Section 60.3(e) if applicable. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	Per the City of San Diego Street Design Manual, minimum parkway width configuration shall be 10 feet. Currently, Dolphin Place Right-of-Way is only 5 feet. Revise the Site Plan to show and call out the applicant shall dedicate and improve an additional 5.0 feet adjacent to the site on Dolphin Place, satisfactory to the City Engineer. Please note: Any private improvements within public right-of-way need to be approved by City Engineer through Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement (EMRA). (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Project is within the PIOZ-COASTAL-IMPACT and PIOZ-BEACH-IMPACT. Per the SDMC, Table 142-05M, the max driveway's width within parking impact area shall be 12 feet . Revise the plan to call out 12 feet max driveway on Dolphin Place. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	The east existing driveway on Bird Rock Avenue is not ADA-compliant and not to current City Standard. Revise the Site Plan, to show and call out the removal and replacement of the existing driveway, per current City Standard. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	On the proposed Site Plan, show the Water and Sewer Mains, including laterals that serve the project. Call out the City Improvement Plan numbers. A search of City Records by your office may be required. If the existing water service and sewer lateral will be used, call out on the plans the existing services will remain. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Please provide a detail written response to all comments whether you agree or not and in case of disagreement, express your reasoning. (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Please address all the outstanding issues. (From Cycle 7)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Please provide a detail written response to all comments whether you agree or not and in case of disagreement, express your reasoning. (From Cycle 7)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Please contact my office at KHuynh@sandiego.gov or (619)446-5299 if you have questions. (From Cycle 7)

3rd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Revise the Site Plan, call out curb to property line dimension for Dolphin Pl (5 feet per 2231-L) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Revise the Site Plan, call out the 5 feet IOD on Dolphin Pl. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Revise the Site Plan, call out the existing driveway, adjacent to the site on Dolphin Place to be reconstructed per SDG-162. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Revise the Site Plan, change the words " (N) curb rebuild per City Standard" to " Closure of non-utilized driveway, install new standard curb, gutter and sidewalk" on Bird Rock Avenue. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	The driveway on Bird Rock Avenue near the corner can be remain, due to the site condition. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Khanh Huynh at (619) 446-5299. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 8





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"/>	26	Please provide a detail written response to all comments whether you agree or not and in case of disagreement, express your reasoning. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 07/28/2020	Deemed Complete on 07/28/2020
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 07/28/2020	
Reviewer: Del Valle, Xavier (619) 557-7941 XDelValle@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 09/16/2020	
	Started: 09/16/2020	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Review Due: 08/18/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 09/16/2020	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 09/16/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/21/2020 from 08/21/2020 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 Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (3 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 61 reviews, 44.3% were on-time, and 37.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

First Review Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Chair for the La Jolla Community Planning Association at 858.456.7900 or info@lajollacpa.org to schedule your project presentation. This Community Planning Group is officially recognized by the City as a representative of the community, and an advisor to the City in actions that would affect the community. The Development Services Department has provided the group a copy of the project plans and documents. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The proposed project is located within the La Jolla Community Planning Area. The La Jolla Community Planning Association is the officially recognized community group for the area to provide recommendations to the City. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	If you have not already done so, please contact Diane Kane, Chair 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, please submit a copy of the recommendation and/or minutes from the meeting, which includes the vote count to the Development Project Manager. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Development Services Department (DSD) Information Bulletin #620, "Coordination of Project Management with Community Planning Committees" (available at https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services), provides additional information about the advisory role of the Community Planning Groups. Council Policy 600-24 provides guidance to the Community Planning Groups and is available at https://docs.sandiego.gov/councilpolicies/cpd_600-24.pdf (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 07/28/2020	Deemed Complete on 07/28/2020
Reviewing Discipline: Coastal Commission	Cycle Distributed: 07/28/2020	
Reviewer: Del Valle, Xavier (619) 557-7941 XDelValle@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 09/16/2020	
	Started: 09/16/2020	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 08/18/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 09/16/2020	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 09/16/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/21/2020 from 08/21/2020 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 Coastal Commission on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with Coastal Commission (4 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Coastal Commission performed 5 reviews, 40.0% were on-time, and 25.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Contact Coastal Commission

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Commission staff has provided comments to the proposed project, via email, dated October 29, 2018. This email was forwarded to the point of contact on October 31, 2018.
--------------------------	---	--

For additional information, please contact Coastal staff noted below:

Alexander Llerandi
Coastal Program Analyst II
California Coastal Commission
San Diego District
7575 Metropolitan Drive #103
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 767-2370

<input type="checkbox"/>	2	email: Alexander.Llerandi@coastal.ca.gov (From Cycle 2) Coastal Commission staff has provided comments by email to the updated set of plans. The email dated December 5, 2019 was forwarded to the applicant. For additional information, please contact Alexander Llerandi with the Coastal Commission at (619) 767-2370 or by email at Alexander.Llerandi@coastal.ca.gov. (From Cycle 7)
--------------------------	---	---

<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Alex Llerandi with the Coastal Commission provided the following comments in an email dated August 6, 2020:
--------------------------	---	---

1) As communicated in past comments from Commission staff, because the proposed addition will physically connect the existing main residence and the currently detached garage, it will result in the creation of a new, unified structure - per the definition of "structure" in Chapter 11 of the Land Development Code - where previously there were two structures. This means that the size (i.e. square footage) of the new structure will be more than 50% greater of at least one of the (New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	4	previously detached structures (in this case, greater than 50% of both detached structures). Pursuant to the La Jolla Community Plan, when a previously conforming structure on a bluff top parcel increases in size by more than 50%, it is considered redevelopment, the entire structure must be brought up to current code. It is irrelevant whether or not there are internal connections between the various parts of a structure (example, a duplex has two units; those units are not internally connected; the duplex is still one structure). The proposed structure in the offline review plans, despite (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	---

<input type="checkbox"/>	5	representing an increase in size by more than 50% for the existing structures, will not bring those structures up to current code, but rather retain the previously conforming aspects (e.g. the portion of the main residence closer than 40 feet to the bluff, the portion of the garage closer than 15 feet to the street, and the portion of both structures closer than 5 feet 7 inches to the southern property line.
--------------------------	---	---

2) The proposed addition proposes to exacerbate the non-conformity by extending closer than 5 feet 7 inches to the southern property line, in line with the non-conformities found on (New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	6	on the main residence and the garage. (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	---





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 07/28/2020	Deemed Complete on 07/28/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 07/28/2020	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296 pathomas@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 07/28/2020	
	Started: 08/14/2020	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 08/18/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 08/19/2020	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 09/16/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/21/2020 from 08/21/2020 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-Geology on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 4 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (4 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 63 reviews, 58.7% were on-time, and 68.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

611654-2 (11/26/2018)

Comments

<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Issue</u>	
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	The referenced geotechnical report is over three years old and was prepared by a geotechnical firm that is no longer in business. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	An update geotechnical investigation report that addresses the geologic conditions at the site and the issues that follow must be submitted for review. The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports." https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/development-services/pdf/industry/geoguidelines.pdf (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Edge of Bluff: Provide a current determination of the bluff edge in accordance with the methods described in the Coastal Bluffs and Beaches Guidelines. https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/development-services/pdf/industry/landdevmanual/lmcoastal.pdf (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Provide an accurate and precise topographic map of the ground surface at the property and beyond to aid in establishing the location of the coastal beach, coastal bluff face, and coastal bluff edge as defined in the City's Coastal Bluffs and Beaches Guidelines. Consideration should be given to providing elevation contours with an interval no greater than 2-feet. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Indicate the bluff edge on the topographic map, the site plan and site sections. The geotechnical consultant must provide three geologic cross sections through the lot, including the bluff edge. The cross-sections must match the site plan and include all geologic information. Show the existing gunite faced bluff, rock revetment, 25 foot and 40 foot coastal bluff edge setbacks and 1.5 factor of safety line on the site plan and sections. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Geologic units including fill soils and proposed lot improvements must be shown and labeled. Fill distribution and thickness should be based on subsurface investigation by the geotechnical consultant. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Bluff Recession: Please provide an average bluff recession rate in feet per year and the resulting feet of bluff recession in 75 years. Please provide photographic copies or high density scans of historic photographs used in the analysis (.jpg or .tif format) as well as copies of any other documents used. Please indicate the points measured as part of the analysis. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	A site-specific rate must be determined for the site by using historical data, such as historic aerial photographs. If the rate exceeds 25 feet in 75 years, please provide a bluff edge setback suitable to preclude erosion of the bluff affecting the lot improvements for the specified period of time (75 years). (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Please provide an analysis of the potential effects on bluff stability of rising sea levels and of the potential effects of past and projected El Nino events on bluff stability, using latest scientific information. The report must also provide an analysis of whether this section of coastline is under a process of retreat. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Please address rising sea levels with respect to "California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance, Interpretive Guidelines for Addressing Sea Level Rise in Local Coastal Programs and Coastal Development Permits," adopted August 12, 2015 (available at: https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/slr/guidance/August2015/0_Full_Adopted_Sea_Level_Rise_Policy_Guidance.pdf). (From Cycle 2)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Geology' review, please call Patrick Thomas at (619) 446-5296. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Provide slope stability analysis for each geologic cross section. The consultant must demonstrate and conclude that the site will have factors of safety of 1.5 or greater with respect to gross and surficial bluff stability at the completion of the project. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Construction Impacts: The geotechnical consultant must comment whether or not the proposed scope of work as recommended will measurably destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Submit original quality prints and digital copies (on CD/DVD/or USB data storage device) of the referenced and requested geotechnical reports for our review and for our records. (From Cycle 2)

611654-7 (12/17/2019)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Geologic Evaluation-Coastal Bluff, Property at 205-205-1/2 Bird Rock Avenue, La Jolla, California, prepared by Woodward-Clyde Consultants, dated March 17, 1989 (their project no. 8951020D-COS1). Coastal Development Plans for: Mark Tuszynski, 5692 Dolphin Place, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by Austin & Associates, dated September 28, 2018, revised August 22, 2019. (From Cycle 7)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	The previous PTS Cycle 2 Geology review issues 4 through 16 remain unaddressed and uncleared. (From Cycle 7)

611654-8 (8/19/2020)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Update Geotechnical Evaluation, Proposed Residential Addition, 5692 Dolphin Place, La Jolla, California 92037, APN 357-421-01-00, prepared by GeoSoils, Inc., dated July 3, 2020 (their project no. W.O. 7882-A-SC). Response to City Review, closed December 12, 2018, Project No: 611654/Cycle 2, for, 5692 Dolphin Place, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by GeoSoils, Inc., dated July 7, 2020 (their project no. W.O. 7882-A-SC). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Geologic Evaluation-Coastal Bluff, Property at 205-205-1/2 Bird Rock Avenue, La Jolla, California, prepared by Woodward-Clyde Consultants, dated March 17, 1989 (their project no. 8951020D-COS1). Coastal Development Plans for: Mark Tuszynski, 5692 Dolphin Place, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by Austin & Associates, dated February 4, 2020, revised July 21, 2020. (New Issue)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Revise the Plot Plan (Figure P) of the referenced Coastal Development Plans to accurately reflect the bluff edge and 40-foot setback line as depicted on the Geotechnical Map (Plate 1) in the referenced Update Geotechnical Evaluation dated July 3, 2020. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Submit digital copies (on CD/DVD/or USB data storage device) of the referenced geotechnical reports 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

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 07/28/2020	Deemed Complete on 07/28/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 07/28/2020	
Reviewer: Kohakura, Vanessa (619) 446-5120 Vkohakura@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 07/29/2020	
	Started: 08/18/2020	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 08/18/2020	COMPLETED ON TIME
Next Review Method: Conditions	Completed: 08/18/2020	
	Closed: 09/16/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/21/2020 from 08/21/2020 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (3 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 60 reviews, 73.3% were on-time, and 40.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Street Trees - Project is located in Residential Tree District 1 as set forth in the La Jolla Community Plan. Street tree(s) are to be provided in or adjacent to the right-of-way at a rate of one 24-in box canopy tree for every 30 linear feet of street frontage, excluding required curb cuts. However, due to site constraints, including non-standard right-of-way and existing utilities, it does not appear feasible to provide street trees along Dolphin Place, and only one tree can be provided along the Bird Rock frontage, approximately ten feet west of the existing electric transformer. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	[cont. from above] Please provide, selecting species options from Residential Street Tree District 1 (see attached excerpt for your reference/use.) (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review (Cycle 7) 12/20/19

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Landscape staff did not receive a response to comments. Please include a response to comments with the next submittal. (From Cycle 7)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Street Trees: Project is located in Residential Tree District 1 as set forth in the La Jolla Community Plan. Street tree(s) are to be provided in or adjacent to the right-of-way at a rate of one 24-in box canopy tree for every 30 linear feet of street frontage, excluding required curb cuts. However, due to site constraints, including non-standard right-of-way and existing utilities, only one tree can be provided along the Bird Rock frontage, approximately ten feet west of the existing electric transformer. (continued below...) (From Cycle 7)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Please show and identify street tree on the plans. Select a species listed under Residential Street Tree District 1 from the Community Plan. Identify species by both botanical and common name. Include the container box size on the plans. (From Cycle 7)

Draft Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Plant material used on or adjacent to coastal bluffs shall be native/naturalized or other drought-tolerant plant species to minimize the need for irrigation. Permanent irrigation is not permitted on coastal bluffs. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	A distance of five feet from the coastal bluff edge may be granted for at-grade landscape features to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Landscaping' review, please call Vanessa Kohakura at (619) 446-5120. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 8





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"/>	10	Landscaping within the view corridor may be installed provided such improvements do not significantly obstruct public views to the ocean. Landscaping shall be maintained such that during growing stage and at maturity, it will not encroach into the view corridor or obstruct public views to the ocean.

(New Issue)





Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 07/28/2020	Deemed Complete on 07/28/2020
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Historic	Cycle Distributed: 07/28/2020	
Reviewer: Haggerty, Emma (619) 236-7173 EHaggerty@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 07/29/2020	
	Started: 08/12/2020	
Hours of Review: 3.00	Review Due: 08/18/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 08/14/2020	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/16/2020	

- . The review due date was changed to 08/21/2020 from 08/21/2020 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for Plan-Historic on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Plan-Historic performed 320 reviews, 85.6% were on-time, and 86.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

11.27.18

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Staff cannot make a determination with the information provided. Please provide the following documents: (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Please include a Notice of Completion. It is typically provided as part of a chain of title search. It can also be found at the County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 103, San Diego CA 92101. If a Notice of Completion cannot be located, add the following note on the Building Record: "Notice of Completion cannot be located." (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	A Chain of Title was not included. It is available through title search companies or by conducting research at the County Administration Center. The Chain of Title must list the property's conveyance from seller to buyer (with date) since construction through the present day. Please note that deed copies do not satisfy this requirement. (From Cycle 2)

1.28.2020

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	The provide documentation does not include the Notice of Completion or a complete Chain of Title. (From Cycle 7)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	If the Notice of Completion cannot be located, please provide in writing "Notic of Completion cannot be located". (From Cycle 7)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Like the provided List of Occupants, the Chain of Title must also be in a tabular format and must list the property's conveyance from seller to buyer (with date) since construction through the present day. (From Cycle 7)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Please resubmit the required documentation to the Development Services Department for routing and review. Should you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact the "Reviewer" listed in bold at the top of this cycle issues report. (From Cycle 7)

8.12.2020

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Staff has reviewed the photos; Assessor's Building Record; water and sewer records; written description of the property and alterations; the newly provided chain of title; and listing of occupants; as well as any available historic photographs; Sanborn maps; and Notices of Completion. In addition, staff has considered any input received through applicable public noticing and outreach and have made the following determination: (New Issue)





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"/>	18	The property does not meet local designation criteria as an individually significant resource under any adopted Historical Resources Board Criteria. Therefore, no historical research report required at this time. This determination is good for 5 years from this date unless new information is provided that speaks to the building's eligibility for designation. Any applications made after 5 years will be subject to review for potential historic resources, consistent with Municipal Code requirements. (Info Only, No Response Required) (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Because the property is not eligible for designation, the plans have not been stamped by Plan-Historic staff. No Plan-Historic stamps are required for permit issuance. Should you have any questions regarding this review, please contact the "Reviewer" listed at the top of this cycle issues report. (Info Only, No Response Required) (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Project Information

Project Nbr: 611654 Title: Tuszynski Residence CDP/SDP
Project Mgr: Del Valle, Xavier (619) 557-7941 XDelValle@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Submitted: 12/03/2020 Deemed Complete on 12/03/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review Cycle Distributed: 12/03/2020
Reviewer: Messina, Ana Assigned: 12/07/2020
(619) 446-5131 Started: 12/15/2020
Amessina@sandiego.gov Review Due: 12/24/2020
Hours of Review: 4.00 Completed: 01/11/2021
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Closed:

- The review due date was changed to 01/06/2021 from 01/06/2021 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.
The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
Your project still has 12 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (14 of which are new issues).

11/20/2018

CDP

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Num, Issue Text. Row 1: [X] 7 Please provide a demolition wall matrix for proposed demolition to current development on site. Please provide this on a separate demolition sheet. (From Cycle 2)

Issues

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Num, Issue Text. Rows 1-3: [X] 17 Per the La Jolla Community Plan (p. 40) On coastal bluff property, when redevelopment of an existing previously conforming structure includes the demolition or removal of 50% or more of the exterior walls, require the entire structure to be brought into conformance with all policies and standards of the Local Coastal Program, including, but not limited to, bluff edge setback. Additions that increase the size of the structure by 50% or more, shall not be authorized unless the structure is brought into conformance with the policies and standards of the Local Coastal Program. (From Cycle 2)
[X] 19 Previously conforming regulations (SDMC 127.0106) outline:
(c) For structures located on a premises that contains or abuts a coastal beach or a coastal bluff edge, new additions or improvements to existing structures may be permitted subject to a Coastal Development Permit, in accordance with Section 126.0707, provided that all such new additions or improvements themselves do not increase the degree of non-conformity and comply with all of the following:
[CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)
[X] 23 [CONTINUED]
(7) The applicant agrees to execute and record a waiver of future shoreline protection, and the execution and recordation shall occur prior to the issuance of the first building permit.
(d) In the Coastal Overlay Zone, the previously conforming status for a structure located on a premises that contains or abuts a coastal beach or a coastal bluff edge shall terminate upon:
[CONTINUED] (From Cycle 2)

Zoning Review

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Num, Issue Text. Row 1: [X] 40 Please provide the plumb height limit of 30 feet running parallel to grade on all elevations/sections. Please see SDMC 113.0270(a)(2)(A) for how to measure plumb height. (From Cycle 2)
Row 2: [X] 45 Please add property lines and setbacks for the full height of the structure on all elevations and section. (From Cycle 2)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Ana Messina at (619) 446-5131. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 10





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	48	Per SDMC 132.0403(b), a visual corridor of not less than the yard setbacks or more than 10 feet in width, and running the full depth of the premises, shall be preserved as a deed restriction as a condition of Coastal Development Permit approval whenever the proposed development is located on premises that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway. Please call out and outline the view easements in hatching on the site plan. (From Cycle 2)

Community Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	This project shall be presented to the La Jolla Community Planning Association to receive a formal recommendation. Planning will review Community Planning Group comments prior to sign off. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	53	Proposed project is located within an intermittent or partial vista per La Jolla Community Plan visual resource map (Figure 9, p.36). Site is located within a visual corridor or public vantage point as outlined in the La Jolla Community Plan (Figure 9, p. 35-36). The Community Plan also states that public views to the ocean from the first public roadway adjacent to the ocean shall be preserved and enhanced, including visual access across private coastal properties at yards and setbacks. View easements over the side setbacks will be a requirement per this Community Plan policy. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	55	Community Plan recommendation for visual resources also states that where new development is proposed on property that lies between the shoreline and the first public roadway, preserve, enhance or restore existing or potential view corridors within the yards and setbacks by adhering to setback regulations that cumulatively form functional view corridors and prevent an appearance of the public right-of way being walled off from the ocean. View corridor easements as a condition of this permit must conform to this recommendation. (From Cycle 2)

Recheck Comments 08/14/2020

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	62	From issue 6. Applicant did not provide any written findings, so staff will defer to DPM once Draft Findings are prepared. (info only) (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	63	From issue 7. Please revise the Wall Demo Matrix shown on Sheet A-0.1 to indicate a 20'-0" wall length & 14% equivalent on Main Home structure. Demolition for Coastal Zones includes those portions of existing exterior wall that will be covered by new proposed development, like proposed bedroom #3, even if they are not physically removed they are no longer exterior walls. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	65	From Issue 17 & 19. Staff agrees that development is not proposing to remove more than 50% of the existing exterior walls, but proposal would increase the SF of the existing main house (which encroaches into Coastal Bluff setback) by more than 50% as follows: Existing SF = 1114, 50% = 557 SF Proposed addition of new 494 SF + existing detached garage of 294 SF = 788 SF, > 50% Therefore, based on Community Plan and SDMC sections noted before, the entire structure would need (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	66	(cont.) to be brought up to compliance with current regulations, which would mean compliance with the Coastal bluff setback of 40'-0" at rear and the Front Yard 15'-0" setback. In order for staff to be able to make findings for approval while keeping the existing structures as is, applicant needs to propose an addition to the Main SDU that does not exceed 557 SF and does not attach to the existing non conforming garage that encroaches in Front Yard. Sec. 131.0450 requires a min. 3'-0" separation between habitable and non-habitable structures for RS-1-7 zone. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	67	From issue 23. Applicant has stated that there is an existing permit for Shoreline protection, so please provide staff with more information as to what type of protections already exist and the type of permit it refers to. Regardless of the existing conditions, a requirement to Record a Waiver of Future Shoreline Protection needs to be executed prior to Issuance of a new building permit, as noted per Sec. 127.0106, so this will be included as a Condition of approval for the CDP. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	68	From issue 29 & 30. Setbacks noted per Table on sheet T are correct but please revise the Street Side setback dimension noted on the Site Plan sheet P and all other Floor plans to match the 7'-0" requirement. Plans now show an 8'-0" dimension. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	70	New development needs to comply with current SDMC regulations, therefore proposed bedroom walls along the S side Interior Yard need to meet required Interior Side setback of 5'-7-1/2", please revise wall location currently shown in line with the non conforming existing structure, sheet A-1. (From Cycle 8)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	71	From issue 40. Please provide a Section view for the proposed addition. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	73	From issue 45. Please revise sheet A-2 to correctly show edge of existing structure walls that are not at required Side Setback. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	75	From Issue 48 & 53. Requirement to provide a Visual Corridor is triggered by the location of this site as noted per Sec. 132.0403(b)(1), it is not dependent on whether the site has existing Easements or not. Please show compliance as requested by marking the Interior Side Yard as "Visual Corridor" on plans and make sure that any Landscaping or fencing (i.e gates shown) provide an "open" view from Street, see Sec. 132.0403(e). (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	77	From Issue 51. Applicant response list indicates "Comment as noted", but staff needs to know if the project has been presented to the Community Planning Group and what their comments and decision (if any) were. Please clarify. (From Cycle 8)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	79	Before approval of any development permit, the applicant shall execute and record in favor of the City a hold harmless and/or indemnification agreement for the approved development, as necessary and appropriate. This may be a Condition on the CDP once need is verified with Geology & Environmental staff. (Info only) (From Cycle 8)

📁 Recheck 1-6-2021

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	80	From issue 63. Wall Matrix indicates 8% of exterior wall removal only. (info only). (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	81	From Issue 65 & 66. Plans have been redesigned to propose a 444 SF addition to the main SDU while keeping it detached from the existing non-conforming Front Yard Garage with a 6'-0 separation, therefore complying with Community Plan and Sec. 127.0106. (info only). (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	82	From issue 67. No additional information for any existing permits was provided by applicant. Shoreline Protection Waiver will be added as CDP/SDP condition. (info only). (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	83	From issue 70. New addition meets Side Yard setback. (info only). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	84	From Issue 77. Original Comment 51 is still pending. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	86	Planning staff needs only to review Community Planning Group recommendations prior to completing review of this project. Please provide results at next resubmital. (Items noted below under "Conditions" are for information only so no additional action is req'd by applicant.) (New Issue)

📁 Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	85	The applicant is to execute and record a waiver of future shoreline protection, and the execution and recordation shall occur prior to the issuance of the first building permit. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	87	A visual corridor of not less than the side yard setbacks and running the full depth of the premises (E thru W), shall be preserved without permanent obstructions. Open fencing and landscaping may be permitted within the view corridors and visual accessways, provided such improvements do not significantly obstruct public views of the ocean. Landscaping shall be planted and maintained to preserve public views. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	88	Prior to the commencement of any work or activity authorized by this permit, the Owner/Permittee shall execute a Notice of Hazardous Condition-Indemnification and Hold Harmless Agreement, in a form and content acceptable to the Development Services Department Director, or designated representative which shall provide: (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	89	a. that the applicant understands that no new accessory structures and landscape features customary and incidental to residential uses shall be developed within five feet of the Bluff Top. b. that the applicant understands that the site may be subject to extraordinary hazard from coastal bluff erosion and the applicant assumes the liability from such hazards; and (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	90	c. the applicant unconditionally waives any claim of liability against the City of San Diego and agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of San Diego and its advisors relative to the City of San Diego's approval of the project and for any damage due to natural hazards. This Notice of Hazardous Conditions-Indemnification and Hold Harmless Agreement shall be recorded against title to the property and shall run with the land, binding upon all successor and assigns. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	91	All new development, including buildings and accessory structures, shall be set back at least 40 feet from the coastal bluff edge. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	92	No development shall be permitted on the coastal bluff face. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	93	At grade accessory structures and landscape features customary and incidental to residential uses shall not be closer than five feet to the coastal bluff edge, in accordance with the requirements of the Land Development Code. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/03/2020	Deemed Complete on 12/03/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 12/03/2020	
Reviewer: Szymanski, Jeffrey (619) 446-5324 jszymanski@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 12/05/2020	
	Started: 01/06/2021	
Hours of Review: 1.50	Review Due: 01/06/2021	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 01/06/2021	
	Closed:	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 7 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (2 of which are new issues).

Extended Initial Study

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) has reviewed the referenced project and has determined that additional information is required for GHG, Historical Resources (Built Environment), Visual Quality, Geology, and Water Quality. Until the above issues have been addressed, the CEQA determination can not be made and the environmental processing time line will be held in abeyance. (From Cycle 2)

GHG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	EAS has reviewed the CAP checklist and has the following comments. While the project is a remodel there are substantial additions to the existing structure. In order to be found consistent with the City Climate Action Plan (CAP) the new roof elements must meet the requirements. On the checklist please indicate that roof would comply with one of the options on page 5 of the checklist. In addition, the project must also comply with the Plumbing fixture requirements found on page 6. (From Cycle 2)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please see comments from Geology staff as the report must be updated. The CEQA determination can not be made until all issues have been addressed. (From Cycle 2)

GHG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Previous comments in regards to the CAP checklist were not addressed. Also, please note that all text boxes should be used to indicate how the question was answered. (From Cycle 7)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Geology staff has not approved the geology report. EAS can not make a determination until all issues have been addressed. (From Cycle 7)

CAP Checklist

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	As previously indicated all text boxes must provide an explanation as to how the project will respond to the question being asked. (From Cycle 8)

Planning Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Please see comments from LDR-Planning the project must provide for the view corridor. If the view corridor is not provided a CEQA visual quality impact may occur. (From Cycle 8)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Please see comments from Geology Staff, the CEQA determination can not be made until all issues have been addressed. (From Cycle 8)

EAS Review 1/6/2021

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Jeffrey Szymanski at (619) 446-5324. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 10





L64A-003B

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	17	The CAP checklist has been reviewed and approved. However, as of this date LDR-Planning has not completed their comments. In addition, Geology staff still can't approve the Geology report as it pertains to the bluff setbacks. All these issues must be addressed before the CEQA determination can be made. (New Issue)
--------------------------	----	---

CAP Checklist

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	EAS has reviewed and accepted the Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist ; based on the evaluation, the project will be consistent with the applicable CAP strategies and actions outlined in Step 2 of the CAP Consistency Checklist. To ensure project compliance of the strategies the CAP Consistency Checklist will be made part of Exhibit A and a condition of approval. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. EAS has no further comments related to this issue. (New Issue)
-------------------------------------	----	---





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Submitted: 12/03/2020 Deemed Complete on 12/03/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review Cycle Distributed: 12/03/2020
Reviewer: Huynh, Khanh Assigned: 12/07/2020
(619) 446-5299 Started: 12/18/2020
KHuynh@sandiego.gov Review Due: 12/24/2020
Hours of Review: 1.00 Completed: 12/18/2020
Next Review Method: Conditions Closed:

- The review due date was changed to 01/06/2021 from 01/06/2021 per agreement with customer.
The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (5 of which are new issues).

1st Review cycle

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Row 1: [X] 8 Revise the Site Plan, show and call out drainage directions, and provide spot elevations supporting the call out. (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Row 1: [X] 18 Please address all the outstanding issues. (From Cycle 7)

3rd Review

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Rows 1-6: [X] 21 Revise the Site Plan, call out curb to property line dimension for Dolphin Pl (5 feet per 2231-L) (From Cycle 8); [X] 22 Revise the Site Plan, call out the 5 feet IOD on Dolphin Pl. (From Cycle 8); [X] 23 Revise the Site Plan, call out the existing driveway, adjacent to the site on Dolphin Place to be reconstructed per SDG-162. (From Cycle 8); [X] 24 Revise the Site Plan, change the words "(N) curb rebuild per City Standard" to "Closure of non-utilized driveway, install new standard curb, gutter and sidewalk" on Bird Rock Avenue. (From Cycle 8); [X] 25 The driveway on Bird Rock Avenue near the corner can be remain, due to the site condition. (From Cycle 8); [X] 26 Please provide a detail written response to all comments whether you agree or not and in case of disagreement, express your reasoning. (From Cycle 8)

4th Review

Conditions

Table with 3 columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Rows 1-5: [] 27 Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall grant to the City a 5 foot wide Irrevocable Offer of Dedication adjacent to the site, on Dolphin Place, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue); [] 28 Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement for the brick paver, landscape and irrigation located within the City's right-of-way, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue); [] 29 Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall assure by permit and bond the closure of non-utilized driveway, on Bird Rock Avenue, with City standard curb, gutter and sidewalk, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue); [] 30 Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall assure by permit and bond the reconstruction of the existing driveway, with City standard driveway, adjacent to the site on Dolphin Place, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue); [] 31 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. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Khanh Huynh at (619) 446-5299. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 10





Cycle Issues DRAFT

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

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 12/03/2020	Deemed Complete on 12/03/2020
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 12/03/2020	
Reviewer: Del Valle, Xavier (619) 557-7941 XDelValle@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/06/2021	
	Started: 01/06/2021	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Review Due: 12/24/2020	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed:	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/06/2021 from 01/06/2021 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (None of which are new)

First Review Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The proposed project is located within the La Jolla Community Planning Area. The La Jolla Community Planning Association is the officially recognized community group for the area to provide recommendations to the City. (From Cycle 8)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	If you have not already done so, please contact Diane Kane, Chair 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, please submit a copy of the recommendation and/or minutes from the meeting, which includes the vote count to the Development Project Manager. (From Cycle 8)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Development Services Department (DSD) Information Bulletin #620, "Coordination of Project Management with Community Planning Committees" (available at https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services), provides additional information about the advisory role of the Community Planning Groups. Council Policy 600-24 provides guidance to the Community Planning Groups and is available at https://docs.sandiego.gov/councilpolicies/cpd_600-24.pdf (From Cycle 8)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Submitted: 12/03/2020 Deemed Complete on 12/03/2020
Reviewing Discipline: Coastal Commission Cycle Distributed: 12/03/2020
Reviewer: Del Valle, Xavier Assigned: 01/06/2021
(619) 557-7941 Started: 01/06/2021
XDelValle@sandiego.gov Review Due: 12/24/2020
Hours of Review: 0.50 Completed:
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Closed:

- The review due date was changed to 01/06/2021 from 01/06/2021 per agreement with customer.
The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with Coastal Commission (3 of which are new issues).

Contact Coastal Commission

Cleared? Issue Num Issue Text

1 Comission staff has provided comments to the proposed project, via email, dated October 29, 2018. This email was forwarded to the point of contact on October 31, 2018.

For additional information, please contact Coastal staff noted below:

Alexander Llerandi
Coastal Program Analyst II
California Coastal Commission
San Diego District
7575 Metropolitan Drive #103
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 767-2370

email: Alexander.Llerandi@coastal.ca.gov (From Cycle 2)

2 Coastal Comission staff has provided comments by email to the updated set of plans. The email dated December 5, 2019 was forwarded to the applicant. For additional information, please contact Alexander Llerandi with the Coastal Commission at (619) 767-2370 or by email at Alexander.Llerandi@coastal.ca.gov. (From Cycle 7)

3 Alex Llerandi with the Coastal Commission provided the following comments in an email dated August 6, 2020:

1) As communicated in past comments from Commission staff, because the proposed addition will physically connect the existing main residence and the currently detached garage, it will result in the creation of a new, unified structure - per the definition of "structure" in Chapter 11 of the Land Development Code - where previously there were two structures. This means that the size (i.e. square footage) of the new structure will be more than 50% greater of at least one of the (From Cycle 8)

4 previously detached structures (in this case, greater than 50% of both detached structures). Pursuant to the La Jolla Community Plan, when a previously conforming structure on a bluff top parcel increases in size by more than 50%, it is considered redevelopment, the entire structure must be brought up to current code. It is irrelevant whether or not there are internal connections between the various parts of a structure (example, a duplex has two units; those units are not internally connected; the duplex is still one structure). The proposed structure in the offline review plans, despite (From Cycle 8)

5 representing an increase in size by more than 50% for the existing structures, will not bring those structures up to current code, but rather retain the previously conforming aspects (e.g. the portion of the main residence closer than 40 feet to the bluff, the portion of the garage closer than 15 feet to the street, and the portion of both structures closer than 5 feet 7 inches to the southern property line.

2) The proposed addition proposes to exacerbate the non-conformity by extending closer than 5 feet 7 inches to the southern property line, in line with the non-conformities found on (From Cycle 8)

6 on the main residence and the garage. (From Cycle 8)

7 Alex Llerandi with the Coastal Commission provided the following comments (project plans submitted under 4th Review Cycle) in an email dated December 7, 2020:

I have reviewed the offline review plans for Project 611654, the Tuszynski Residence at 5692 Dolphin Place in La Jolla. Looking at the latest set of plans, the revisions do seem to address many of the issues identified in previous iterations. The latest plans no longer show the addition connecting the residential structure with the garage; now the two structures will remain detached. Additionally, the new addition is no longer (New Issue)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	proposed to encroach into the southern side yard setback area. Looking at the requirements and limitations for previously conforming structures contained in Section 127.0106(c), the addition is under 500 square feet in size, will not demolish more than 50% of the existing structure's exterior walls, and will not increase the gross floor area by more than 50%. I leave it to the City's geological technical staff to confirm that the proposed development conforms to 127.0106(c)(6) [does not rely on existing shoreline protection] by confirming that the addition would be safe for its (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	75-year economic life even in the absence of the existing seawall. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Submitted: 12/03/2020 Deemed Complete on 12/03/2020
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology Cycle Distributed: 12/03/2020
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick Assigned: 12/03/2020
(619) 446-5296 Started: 12/21/2020
pathomas@sandiego.gov Review Due: 12/24/2020
Hours of Review: 2.50 Completed: 12/24/2020
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Closed:

- The review due date was changed to 01/06/2021 from 01/06/2021 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.
The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
Your project still has 4 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (3 of which are new issues).

611654-8 (8/19/2020)

References

Table with columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Contains two entries for geotechnical evaluations and responses.

Comments

Table with columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Contains two entries regarding plot plan revision and digital copies.

611654-10 (12/24/2020)

References

Table with columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Contains two entries for geotechnical evaluations and responses.

Comments

Table with columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Header row for comments.

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Geology' review, please call Patrick Thomas at (619) 446-5296. Project Nbr: 611654 / Cycle: 10





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	<p>The previous PTS Cycle 8 Geology Issue Number 21 remains unaddressed and uncleared.</p> <p>PTS Cycle 8 Geology Issue Number 21: Revise the Plot Plan (Figure P) of the referenced Coastal Development Plans to accurately reflect the bluff edge and 40-foot setback line as depicted on the Geotechnical Map (Plate 1) in the referenced Update Geotechnical Evaluation dated July 3, 2020. (New Issue)</p>

