



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 97484 **Title:** KING CHAVEZ ACADEMY
Project Mgr: Teasley, Sandra (619) 446-5271 steasley@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Gibbs, Antoinette (619) 446-5475	Assigned: 06/27/2006	
Hours of Review: 11.00	Started: 07/17/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 09/02/2006	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 81 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 549 reviews, 94.0% were on-time, and 72.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review Cycle 8-2006

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

- 1 The current project is going through a discretionary review process, during this time Staff has the responsibility to review the proposed project based on the current LDC, discretionary requirements, and/or PDO in effect at the time of submittal. Throughout this review process and any subsequent review processes, Staff may be asked for additional information to assist in the review process. Please keep in mind a thorough review may not have been done because more information may be needed. Additional issues and/or concerns may arise during the review process. (New Issue)
- 2 Prepare a cover letter that specifically describes how you have addressed each of the issues identified. Alternatively, the applicant can submit the Cycle Issues Report, identifying within the margins how you have addressed the issues. If the issues are addressed on one or more sheets of the plans or the reports, please reference the plan, sheet number, report or page number as appropriate. If it is not feasible to address a particular issue, please indicate the reason.

(New Issue)

Zoning, Permits, and Process

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

- 3 The proposed project is located in the MF-2500 and MF-3000 zone of the Southeastern Planned District. The project is proposing to construct charter school and amended and/or rescind several Conditional Use Permits. (New Issue)
- 4 (1 of 2)

The proposed project requires the following permits

A Conditional Use Permit (CUP, Process 3, Hearing Officer as the decision-maker) for the educational facility use per SDMC Section 126.0303;

A Southeast San Diego Development Permit (processed as a SDP, Process 3, Hearing Officer as the decision-maker) for Commercial Development and uses requiring a CUP within the SESDPD per Section 103.1703(b)(1)(C) and (E), (New Issue)
- 5 (2 of 2)

A Planned Development Permit (PDP, Process 4, Planning Commission as the decision-maker) is only required if the project proposes any deviations from the development regulations of the underlying zone per SDMC Section 126.0602(b)(1).

These will all be processed concurrently at the highest process level. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

- | <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | The following CUP's are to permit Calvary Baptist Church to use the property identify within this submittal application as parking for the Church:

14404-A, 1940 Kearney Avenue; -18 spaces;
14404-B, 1884 Julian Avenue-18 spaces(Rescind);
14404-C, 1964 Julian Avenue-18 spaces;
17341, 1918-1928 Julian Avenue-28 spaces;
11327, SW corner of C. E. Chavez Pkwy and Julian -18 spaces;
10116, 1900 blk Julian Street between C. E. Chavez Pkay and Dewey Street (Blk 188, lots 38-41, por. 42)-45 spaces; and,
10471, NW corner of Julian Avenue and Dewey Street-60 spaces (Rescind);

(New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | The applicant is proposing a shared access agreement and new development on the lots that where previously approved with a CUP. The project as proposed will not be consistent with the approved CUP, therefore, an amendment or rescision to the permit is required. (New Issue) |

Submittal Requirements

- | <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | The submittal requirements have not been met. Please submit the following in accordance with "Project Submittal Requirements, Section 4, Development Permit/Approvals," dated May 2004. See items below that not been met.
(New Issue) |

Development Summary 9.0

- | <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | (1 of 2)

Provide in table format the following information on the first sheet of the plans (Generally the Title Sheet or Site Plan)

Item No. 9.4 - Bullet point narrative that details the project's complete scope of work, including all existing and proposed improvements, any proposed development regulations deviations (if applicable).

Provide legal description AND assessor Parcel Number(s) for ALL the property that the development is proposed.

Zoning designation and/or overlay zone designations.

Gross site area, floor area and floor area ratio

Existing and proposed uses

(New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | (2 of 2)

Year constructed for all existing structures on the lot, including existing structures to be demolished.

(New Issue) |

Site Plan 10.1

- | <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 | Property Lines 10.1.2 - Show and label all property lines, including distances

(New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 | Easements 10.1.5 - Show and label existing and proposed easements - identify type. If none, please note.
(New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 | Bus Stops 10.1.6 - Show and label existing and proposed bus stops. If not, please note. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14 | Street Improvements 10.1.7 - Show and label location and width of existing/proposed streets, sidewalks, curb cuts and driveways, and curb to property line distances. Label as existing or proposed. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15 | Off-Street Parking 10.1.8 - Show all off-street parking spaces that are not within a structure. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16 | Site Section Lines 10.1.10 - Provide labeled site section lines. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17 | Building/Structures 10.1.11 - Show location & dimension of existing (to remain) and proposed buildings and structures, use of all existing (to remain) and proposed structures, including number of stories. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 18 Refuse & Recycling Areas - 10.1.14 - Show and label the location and dimensions of refuse and recycling materials storage areas as required per 142.0810. (New Issue)

Site Sections 10.3

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 19 Limit of work 10.3.1 - Show the property line, limit of work line and when proposing work the public right-of-way, show and label the public right-of-way, easements and curb-to-property line distances. (New Issue)
- 20 Grade 10.3.2 - Clearly show and label existing and proposed grades. If existing and proposed is the same, label as such. (New Issue)
- 21 Spot Elevations 10.3.3 - Show spot elevations at all high points, low points, changes in gradients, corner of structure foundations and finished floor levels, and where necessary clearly indicate the proposed grading design. (New Issue)
- 22 Structures 10.3.4 - All structures must be shown and labeled including building, retaining/crib walls, roadbeds, walls curbs and driveways.

(New Issue)
- 23 Building height 10.3.5 - Indicate building heights as defined by LDC Section 113.0270. (New Issue)

Elevation 10.5

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 24 Separate Elevations 10.5.1 - Drawings must be separated and labeled North, South, East and West elevations. All elevation plans must be accurately scaled and fully dimensioned. (New Issue)
- 25 Grades 10.5.2 - Clearly show and label existing and proposed grades. If existing and proposed are the same, label as such. (New Issue)
- 26 Building Height 10.5.4 - Indicate building heights as defined by LDC Section 113.0270 (New Issue)
- 27 Finished Floor Elevations 10.5.3 - Indicate all finished floor elevations, based on the topographic source, not an assumed datum. (New Issue)

Grading and Drainage Plans 10.

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 28 Please provide existing and proposed contours/spot elevations, grading data table with cut/fill import/export quantities, slope gradient, and the collection/discharge points for all site/roof drains. See Submittal Requirements - Item 10.8
(New Issue)

Information/Correction/Clairif

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 29 Please correct the site number shown on Sheet AS1.0, this sheet is describing Site #1 not #2 as shown on the applicants vicinity map. (New Issue)
- 30 CDP - Per Section 103.017A (Use Table) - Schools limited to primary elementary, junior high and senior high are required to apply for a Special Permit which in this case is a Conditional Use Permit. Please provide a copy of the CUP for Site 1 and 2. All educational facilities are subject to Section 141.0407.

(New Issue)
- 31 Please show all encroachments/projects on the site plan. The air conditioning unit appears to be within the setback. Please refer to Section 131.0461 for a list of allowed architectural projections and encroachments in Residential Zones. (New Issue)
- 32 The height is measured incorrectly. Please refer to SDMC Section 113.0270 "Measuring Structure Height."
(New Issue)
- 33 (New Issue)

Reqs. for Educational F

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

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

- 34 Requirements for Educational Facilities - Per SDMC 141.0407

The applicant will be required to provide a master development plan (for each school) that includes the following, per Section 141.0407 of the LDC. All this information needs to be shown and detailed on the appropriate plan.
 - (1) The student capacity of the camps;
 - (2) The size, number, and location of all proposed facilities;
 - (3) The pedestrian and traffic circulation systems proposed for the site;
 - (4) A transportation and parking development program; and
 - (5) A development phasing schedule.
 (New Issue)
- 35 The design of the structures shall incorporate architectural elements that help to diminish building bulk (New Issue)
- 36 Larger structures, areas with high levels of activity, and parking areas shall be located on the site away from surrounding development that is smaller in scale or less intense. (New Issue)
- 37 Off-street parking requirements for kindergarten through grade 12 are provided in Table 142-05F. Please refer to LDR-Transportation for parking requirement. (New Issue)

Dev. Reqs. for sites 1-3

Project Site #1 (NE corner C)

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

- 38 Applicant has indicated that this site located on the Northeast corner of Cesar E. Chavez Parkway and Kearney Avenue currently operates as a primary campus for Grades K-3, known as the King/Chavez Academy. Staff was unable to locate any building records on discretionary permits for the existing structures/current use that is shown on the site plan (Sheet AS1.0-Site #1). Please provide a copy of the building records/discretionary permit for all structures on the site.

(New Issue)
- 39 If the structure(s) were constructed without a building permit the site and structures would be subject to the current development regulations. If the project is not able to meet the development regulations, the applicant will be required to apply for the appropriate development permit. (New Issue)
- 40 Front Yard Setback - Per SDMC Section 103.1706(f)(3) - The proposed development is showing a 7'-6" front yard setback where a 10' setback is required. As indicated above, please provide the building records. (New Issue)
- 41 Interior Side Yard Setback - Per SDMC Section 103.1706(f)(3) - The proposed development is showing a 4' interior side yard setback where a 5' setback is required. As indicated above, please provide the building records. (New Issue)
- 42 Side Yard Setback - Per SDMC Section 103.1706(f)(3) - The proposed development is showing a 0' side yard setback where a 8' setback is required. As indicated above, please provide the building records. (New Issue)
- 43 Min. area of front yard - SDMC 103.1706(f)(1) - A front yard shall be provided at a minimum area calculated by multiplying the linear feet of frontage by 20 feet. At this time, Staff is unable to confirm. Please provide the property line dimensions.

(New Issue)
- 44 Min. area of street side yard - SDMC 103.1706(f)(2) - A side yard shall be provided at a minimum area calculated by multiplying the linear feet of frontage by 10 feet. At this time, Staff is unable to confirm. Please provide the property line dimensions. Please identify this area on the site plan by shading the area. (New Issue)
- 45 Structures - Based on a site visit and photographs it appears that Site #1 has two other structures on site. Some type of storage unit, an equipment enclosure, and a flagpole. Please show all structures on site. (New Issue)
- 46 If the site did apply for the appropriate permits please provide a full submittal for the site (floor and elevation plans). Please note Coverage and Height have not been confirmed. (New Issue)
- 47 Facade Design.Orientation - Per Section 103.1706(4) - The particular facade side or elevation of the building, which faces the front and street side yards, shall have window and entry door orientation parallel to the street. Please demonstrate compliance. (New Issue)
- 48 Please show trash enclosure per SDMC Section 142.0830 on the site plan. (New Issue)
- 49 Offsetting Planes Requirement

Per Section 103.1706(3)(A) and (B) - For structures in multiple-family residential zones each building wall elevation shall have building offset variations in a minimum of two vertical or horizontal separate planes. Please review this section and show compliance.

(New Issue)
- 50 New Issue (2547157) (New Issue)

Site #2 NW corner of C.E. Ch





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	Applicant has indicated that this site located on the Northwest corner of C. E. Chavez Parkway and Julian Avenue currently operates as a middle school for Grades 7-8. Staff was unable to locate any building records or discretionary permits for the existing structures/current use that is shown on the site plan (Sheet A2.0-Site #2). Please provide a copy of the building records/discretionary permit for all existing structures on the site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	52	If the structure(s) were constructed without a building permit the site and structures would be subject to the current development regulations. If the project is not able to meet the development regulations, the applicant will be required to apply for the appropriate development permit. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	Side Yard Setback - Per SDMC Section 103.1706(f)(3) - The proposed development is showing a 7'-3" side yard setback where a 8' setback is required. As indicated above, please provide the building records. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	54	Rear Yard Setback - Per SDMC Section 103.1706(f)(3) - The proposed development is showing a 3'-8" rear yard setback where a 5' setback is required. As indicated above, please provide the building records. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	Min. area of front yard - SDMC 103.1706(f)(1) - A front yard shall be provided at a minimum area calculated by multiplying the linear feet of frontage by 20 feet. At this time, Staff is unable to confirm. Please provide the property line dimensions. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	Min. area of street side yard - SDMC 103.1706(f)(2) - A side yard shall be provided at a minimum area calculated by multiplying the linear feet of frontage by 10 feet. At this time, Staff is unable to confirm. Please provide the property line dimensions. Please identify this area on the site plan by shading the area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	57	If the project does not have building permits records, please provide a floor and elevation plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	58	Facade Design.Orientation - Per Section 103.1706(4) - The particular facade side or elevation of the building, which faces the front and street side yards, shall have window and entry door orientation parallel to the street. Please demonstrate compliance. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	59	Please show trash enclosure per SDMC Section 142.0830 on site plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	60	Offsetting Planes Requirement Per Section 103.1706(3)(A) and (B) - For structures in multiple-family residential zones each building wall elevation shall have building offset variations in a minimum of two vertical or horizontal separate planes. Please review this section and show compliance. (New Issue)

Site #3 NW corner of Julian

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	61	Scope - The site is currently vacant with an existing CUP. Applicant has indicated that the site proposes to operate as an intermediate campus for Grades 4-6. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	62	Min. area of front yard - SDMC 103.1706(f)(1) - A front yard shall be provided at a minimum area calculated by multiplying the linear feet of frontage by 20 feet. In addition to shading this area, please provide the numerical calculations. Please refer to Section 103.1505(c)(5), this section will explain how to determine/calculate the street yard. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	63	Min. area of street side yard - SDMC 103.1706(f)(2) - A side yard shall be provided at a minimum area calculated by multiplying the linear feet of frontage by 10 feet. Please refer to Section 103.1505(c)(5), this section will explain how to determine/calculate the street yard. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	64	Please show all calculations. (New Issue) Please provide the dimensions of the trash enclosure shown on Sheet AS3.1, the enclosure must meet or exceed the requirements of SDMC Section 142.0830. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	65	Facade Design.Orientation - Per Section 103.1706(4) - The particular facade side or elevation of the building, which faces the front and street side yards, shall have window and entry door orientation parallel to the street. Please demonstrate compliance. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	66	Offsetting Planes Requirement Per Section 103.1706(3)(A) and (B) - For structures in multiple-family residential zones each building wall elevation shall have building offset variations in a minimum of two vertical or horizontal separate planes. Please review this section and show compliance. (New Issue)

Reqs. for PDP

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Antoinette Gibbs at (619) 446-5475. Project Nbr: 97484 / Cycle: 4





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	67	If the project is proposing any deviations from the development regulations of the MF-2500 or MF-3000 zone the applicant will need to apply for a Planned Development Permit. The project must comply with the PDP regulations of SDMC Section 143.0401. The PDP requirement is dependent on whether the other sites (1 and 2) have permits for the use/structures on site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	68	Parking and Access Circulation - Per Section 143.0410(d) - Parking areas and access drives should be located to avoid conflicts with internal pedestrian circulations, street systems, and adjacent properties. Please provide a circulation plan. Criteria for Development Design Please see Section 143.0410(j) of the LDC and indicate to staff per line item how the proposed development is meeting the design criteria. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	69	Criteria for Development Design Please see Section 143.0410(j) of the LDC and indicate to staff per line item how the proposed development is meeting the design criteria. (New Issue)

Draft Findings

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	70	SDP Draft Findings - Please provide documentation that supports the SDP Findings per Section 126.0504(a). Please address how the proposed project is meeting EACH of the findings. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	71	CUP Draft Findings - Please provide documentation that supports the CUP Findings per Section 126.0305 of the LDC. Please address how the proposed project is meeting EACH of the findings. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	72	PDP Draft Findings - Please provide documentation that supports the PDP Findings per Section 126.0604(a) of the LDC. Please address how the proposed project is meeting EACH of the findings. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Torres, Sean (619) 446-5305	Assigned: 06/20/2006	
Hours of Review: 10.00	Started: 07/10/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 08/31/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 18 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 153 reviews, 92.2% were on-time, and 32.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Per the DPM, comments will be forwarded in the next review cycle to allow management review of the scope of work. (New Issue)

Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Per the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, item 10 of Part A, Site #3 is a significant redevelopment over 5,000 SF and qualifies as a Priority Project. The priority project requirements are as follows: (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	(1of 2) Site #3 is subject to Priority Permanent Storm Water BMP requirements. Therefore, the applicant shall submit a Water Quality Technical Report consistent with the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards Appendix D. The report shall include, but not be limited to how source control and site design have been incorporated to the project, selection and calculations regarding the numeric sizing treatment standards, BMP maintenance schedules and maintenance costs and the responsible party for future maintenance and associated costs. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	(2 of 2) The report will also need to address water quality, by describing the type of pollutants which will be generated post construction, the pollutants to be captured and treated by the proposed BMPs and the quality of the resultant discharge. If substantial impacts are anticipated, what measures must be taken to mitigate such impacts. The Storm Water Standards are available online at http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Per drawing #9561-3-D, the curb to property line distance on Julian Avenue is 14'. There will be a requirement to remove all private structures from the Julian Avenue right-of-way. Please revise all plans to reflect this requirement. (New Issue)

Public Improvements

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	All Sites (1, 2, and 3) and Lots (A, B, C, & D) shall be subject to repair/replacement/upgrade of the adjacent public improvements. The required improvements are as follows: There will be a requirement to replace all cracked and/or uplifted portions of sidewalk, maintaining the existing sidewalk scoring pattern and preserving any contractor's stamp, adjacent to the all Sites and parking lots on Kearney Avenue, Cesar E. Chavez Parkway, Julian Avenue, and Dewey Street. Please revise the plans to reflect this requirement. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	There will be a requirement to replace all cracked and substandard curb, in which runoff can not be conveyed in an acceptable manner, with City Standard curb and gutter adjacent to all Sites and parking lots on Kearney Avenue, Cesar E. Chavez Parkway, Julian Avenue, and Dewey Street. Please revise the plans to reflect this requirement. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	There will be a requirement to close all existing non-utilized driveways with full height curb, gutter, and sidewalk, and reconstruct all existing utilized driveways to provide sidewalk across the driveway span, adjacent to all Sites and parking lots on Kearney Avenue, Cesar E. Chavez Parkway, Julian Avenue, and Dewey Street. Please revise the plans to reflect this requirement. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Sean Torres at (619) 446-5305. Project Nbr: 97484 / Cycle: 4





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	There will be a requirement to provide City Standard curb ramps at all street and alley intersections, adjacent to all Sites and parking lots. Curb ramps at alley intersections shall require 2 curb ramps (one on each side of the alley) and a concrete alley apron, where the alley apron is damaged or does not exist. (New Issue)

Comments/Corrections

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Revise the Site Plans for Sites 1, 2, and 3 as follows: ADD NOTE TO PLANS for Site #3 - Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the applicant shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent BMP maintenance. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	ADD NOTE TO PLANS for Site #3 - Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the applicant shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	ADD NOTE TO PLANS for Site #3 - Prior to the issuance of any construction permit the applicant shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix E of the City's Storm Water Standards. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Please provide existing and proposed contours/spot elevations, grading data table with cut/fill import/export quantities, slope gradient, and the collection/discharge points for all site/roof drains. Using arrows, indicate the drainage pattern for the entire site. Drainage is not allowed to flow to adjacent properties. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	State the finish floor elevation for all existing and proposed buildings. Show the curb to property line, curb to centerline, and property line to centerline dimensions for the abutting streets and alleys. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Show the length and bearings for the property line. Please state the source, date, and datum used for the topography. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	On the plan view, show the Legal Description for the subject sites and the abutting properties. The owner and engineer must sign the plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Show any existing/proposed laterals for the subject site and show the existing utilities as follows: In Cesar E Chavez Parkway adjacent to Site #1, 6" AC Water Main, reference drawing #9916-16-D. In Kearney Avenue adjacent to Site #1, 8" AC Water Main, reference drawing #14332-2-D. In the alley adjacent to Site #1, 6" VC Sewer Main, reference drawing #13726-L. In Julian Avenue adjacent to Site #2, 8" AC Water Main, reference drawing #9561-5-D. In the alley adjacent to Site #2, 6" VC Sewer Main, reference drawing #4484-L. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Cont'd from above In Dewey Street adjacent to Site #3, 8" AC Water Main, reference drawing #13373-4-D. In Julian Avenue adjacent to Site #3, 8" AC Water Main, reference drawing #9561-3-D. In the alley adjacent to Site #3, 6" VC Sewer Main, reference drawing #13726-L. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	On sheet AS.0, please call out the 17 space parking lot on Julian Avenue as Lot 'C'. On sheet AS1.0, revise the sheet title to call out Site #1 consistent with sheet AS.0. On sheet AS3.1, the doors to the trash enclosure must not swing into the public right-of-way. (New Issue)



Cycle Issues



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

4/26/07 3:53 pm

Page 9 of 24

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Transportation Dev	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Jauregui, Rudy (619) 557-7985	Assigned: 06/27/2006	
Hours of Review: 5.00	Started: 07/17/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 08/29/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Transportation Dev on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Transportation Dev performed 70 reviews, 91.4% were on-time, and 31.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

42-6354 SDP/CUP - 1st - Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Per the DPM, comments will be forwarded in the next review cycle to allow management review of the scope of work. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: Fire-Plans Officer	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Medan, Bob (619) 236-6262	Assigned: 06/16/2006	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Started: 06/16/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 08/29/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Fire-Plans Officer on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Fire-Plans Officer performed 43 reviews, 95.3% were on-time, and 54.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Fire Dept. issues (1st review)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	All San Diego Fire-Rescue Department requirements have been met with the initial submittal. No new requirements based on this submittal. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Long Range Planning	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Pomeroy, Myles (619) 235-5219	Assigned: 06/19/2006	
Hours of Review: 3.20	Started: 07/18/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 09/07/2006	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Long Range Planning on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 8 outstanding review issues with Plan-Long Range Planning (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Plan-Long Range Planning performed 101 reviews, 61.4% were on-time, and 50.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Community Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The Southeastern San Diego Community Plan designates the subject site for Residential use with a density range of 15-17 du/ac. A school under this designation would not adversely affect the community plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Please revise the elevations to incorporate facade variation, building articulation and other architectural features to break the buildings up into smaller visual components. Long, continuous building masses should be avoided. (p. 110 of Southeastern San Diego Community Plan). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The Southeastern San Diego Community Plan encourages the use of drought-resistant plant materials (p. 119). Please incorporate them into the front yard landscaping. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Please demonstrate that lighting of the pedestrian areas is adequate and also will not produce glare into nearby buildings. (pp. 119 and 1`21 of the Community Plan). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	For the next review cycle, please provide photos of the existing buildings as they appear currently and computer enhanced photos of how they will appear after renovations. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	SECOND REQUEST - Please revise the elevations to incorporate facade variation, building articulation and other architectural features to break the buildings up into smaller visual components. Long, continuous building masses should be avoided. (p. 110 of Southeastern San Diego Community Plan). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	SECOND REQUEST - Please demonstrate that lighting of the pedestrian areas is adequate and also will not produce glare into nearby buildings. (pp. 119 and 1`21 of the Community Plan). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	SECOND REQUEST - please provide photos of the existing buildings as they appear currently and computer enhanced photos of how they will appear after renovations. (New Issue)

Community Planning Group

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Please contact Steve Veach, chair of the Southeastern San Diego Planning Committee to arrange a presentation of your project prior to any public hearing. Mr. Veach can be reached at 619-238-4537. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Teasley, Sandra (619) 446-5271	Assigned: 09/08/2006	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 09/08/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 07/17/2006	
	Completed: 09/08/2006	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 126 reviews, 50.0% were on-time, and 38.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

New Issue Group (634045)

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the chair of the community planning group to schedule the project for the agenda. Their recommendation will be forwarded to the decision maker. See Long Range Planning staff comments for information. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Warren, Herbert (619) 446-5392	Assigned: 06/22/2006	
Hours of Review: 7.50	Started: 07/12/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 09/01/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 188 reviews, 76.1% were on-time, and 67.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Environmental Review Cycle 4

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Per the DPM, comments will be forwarded in the next review cycle to allo management review of the scope of work. (New Issue)

New Issue Group (631190)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Paleontology - The site is underlain with the geologic Bay Point Formation which is assigned a high potential for containing fossil remains in this area of San Diego. Should excavation of over 1,000 cubic yards of earth material occur, at a depth of 10 feet or below during grading operations, then paleontological monitoring would be required. Please provide grading quantities (amount of cubic yards and depth of cut) to occur on-site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Archaeological Resources-Because archaeological sites (No. .2998) has been identified within 1/2 mile of the project site, an archaeological survey would be required to determine the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to determine the need for archaeological monitoring during any grading activities. The survey should be prepared in accordance with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines, adopted September 28, 1999. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Geology - The Environmental Analysis Section will be coordinating with LDR Geology staff to determine the geologic suitability of the project site for development. The site lies within Geological Hazard zone 13, which is characterized as Fault; Downtown Special Fault Zone. See LDR-Geology comments (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Traffic, Circulation and Parking - The Environmental Analysis Section will be coordinating with LDR Transportation Development to assess if a traffic study will be required and if the parking to be provided on-site will be adequate for the proposed use. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Hydrology/Water Quality-Based on the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, the project would qualify as a 'Priority ' subject to the 'Priority Project Permanent Storm Water BMP Requirements' and the 'Standard Storm Water BMP Requirements' of the Storm Water Standards Manual, Section III. Please refer to LDR Engineering comments regarding BMP submittal requirements. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: Park & Rec	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Harkness, Jeff (619) 533-6595	Assigned: 06/20/2006	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Started: 07/11/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 08/28/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Park & Rec on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Park & Rec performed 48 reviews, 75.0% were on-time, and 81.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review 7-17-06

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	There are no open space or population-based park issues associated with this project. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: MTDB	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Teasley, Sandra (619) 446-5271	Assigned: 09/08/2006	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 09/08/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 07/17/2006	
	Completed: 09/08/2006	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for MTDB on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month MTDB performed 6 reviews, 83.3% were on-time, and 80.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

New Issue Group (634063)

	<u>Issue</u>
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u> <u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 SANDAG has no comments on this project. (New Issue) [Recommended]





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: BDR-Structural	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Chehade, Nabil (619) 446-5076	Assigned: 06/19/2006	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Started: 06/27/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 09/01/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for BDR-Structural on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with BDR-Structural (all of which are new).
- . Last month BDR-Structural performed 870 reviews, 87.5% were on-time, and 86.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

New Issue Group (594180)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This review is for the discretionary permit only. Building permits must be obtained per City of San Diego Land Development Code Section 129.0202. Based on the preliminary information, the following are some issues the designer should analyze before submittal for a building permit. These issues may be resolved when the plans are submitted for a building permit. The plans have not been reviewed for compliance with the California Building Code. A complete review will be performed when the plans are submitted for a building permit. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Provide a State approved foundation plan for this modular building, or provide the manufactures instillation instructions and calculations to verify the design of the foundation system. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Provide a continuous unobstructed accessible route of travel connecting all accessible elements and spaces in an accessible building or facility that can be negotiated by a person with a severe disability using a wheelchair, and that is also safe for and usable by persons with other disabilities, and that also is consistent with the definition of "path of travel" in Sections 217-P and 1102B. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	You have to make sure that the state approved modulars are permitted for your specific use. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	When connecting more than one modular to for the classrooms, please make sure that the maximum number of trailers connected together are per the state approval.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	The combined floor area of the trailers has to be within the allowable floor area based on occupancy group and type of construction as specified in the Clifornia building Code table 5 in addition to the allowable increases. If more than one building in on site, you either combine the floor area or assume a property line. Building on both sides of the assumed property line need to comply with the fire rating of exterior walls and opening protection due to distance to assumed property line. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Facilities Financing	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Burgess, Victoria (619) 236-6262	Assigned: 06/16/2006	
Hours of Review: 1.50	Started: 06/20/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 08/28/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Facilities Financing on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Plan-Facilities Financing performed 67 reviews, 98.5% were on-time, and 76.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Development Impact Fees

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	A Development Impact Fee (DIF) is required for this project. A Housing Trust Fund (HTF) fee is required for this project. These fees are due at the time of building permit issuance. These fees may increase after approval of the SESD Financing Plan. Credit will be given to structures being demolished or converted. Contact: Vicki Burgess, Facilities Financing, 619-533-3684. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Hempton, Alexander (619) 446-5349	Assigned: 06/26/2006	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Started: 06/26/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 09/07/2006	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 29 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 231 reviews, 90.0% were on-time, and 65.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The Landscape Plan Review web page contains links to the following information, consolidated in one location: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landscape Regulations - Landscape Standards - Submittal Requirements - Landscape Calculation Worksheets - No Fee Street Tree Permit Application - and more... <p>http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/landscape.shtml (This information is located on the Development Services web page under Forms & Guidelines.) (New Issue)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Additional LDR-Landscape review comments may be provided after additional information is provided to be reviewed. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please note that existing parking areas and lots may be required to meet today's landscape regulations as part of this CUP. <p>In order to determine this, provide a table that includes the total existing gross floor area (do not include unpermitted buildings) and total proposed gross floor area. Calculate percent increase.</p> <p>Refer to LDC 142.0410 for Previously Conforming Landscape Requirements. Based on this calculation, existing parking lots may need to meet various aspects of the Vehicular Use Area landscape regulations. (New Issue)</p>

Existing CUP's

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	For existing lots planned to remain vacant or as parking lots, provide landscape plans for each which demonstrate that the lots are meeting the landscape requirements of the existing CUP's. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Identify the CUP for each parcel. (Provide CUP number and a copy of the CUP so that landscape requirements may be determined.) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	For the vacant lots, provide a hydroseed mix for erosion control/revegetation. Refer to LDC 142.0411 -- Revegetation and Erosion Control. (New Issue)

Submittal Requirements

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Utilities: Show all proposed utilities located within the public right-of-way, including underground water, sewer, gas, and OVERHEAD and underground electric and telephone cables. [Submittal Requirements] (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Provide a table on each sheet for the existing landscape to remain that identifies the following information BY PLANT: a. plant species b. common name c. whether the plant is a shrub, native tree, non-native tree, broad-headed feather palm tree, feather palm tree, or fan palm tree d. spread and height for shrubs, caliper measured at 4 feet above grade for trees, or brown trunk height feet for palms e. plant points achieved (Refer to Table 142-04B, Plant Point Schedule) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Provide a graphic scale on each landscape sheet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Identify how all areas will be treated. Some parts of the plan are labeled "gravel," but it's unclear to what extent gravel will be provided. Some areas are not labeled. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Irrigation Plans, Planting Details, and Irrigations Details and Specs should be removed from plan set as they are not reviewed during the discretionary review. (Irrigation plans will be reviewed during the building permit.) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Existing Trees and Shrubs: Where trees and shrubs are existing, indicate with a dashed symbol and label each as "to be removed" or "to remain". Provide the botanical and common name, caliper size of the trees and the height and spread of the shrubs. Provide the name and condition of any groundcover to remain [LDM 9.1.8]. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	PROJECT SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS: Please revise your plans to be consistent with the Project Submittal Requirements Section 4 - Development Permits/Approvals. Refer to sections 11.0 through 11.3.5 for the minimum items required to submit a Landscape Development Package . The Project Submittal Requirements can be found on the City's website under Forms & Development Information at: http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/codes.shtml#submanual . (New Issue)

Remaining Yard

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	The remaining yard is the area between the property line and the setback line, that is not in the street yard. Provide 30% of the remaining yard as planting area. Provide 0.05 plant points per total sq. ft. of the remaining yard. Provide these calculations on the plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Please provide a 5 foot wide planting area along the entire abutting property line. This area shall be planted with trees to achieve 0.05 points per square foot in addition to the points required in the remaining yard (LDC 142.0405[c][3]). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	It appears as though some buildings are located too close to the property line for the landscape requirements to be achieved. If landscape requirements are not met, a Planned Development Permit may be required for a deviation from the code. (New Issue)

Street Yard

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Please provide twenty five percent of the total yard area as planted area (LDC 142.0404). With the exception of minimum planting areas, this 25% area may consist of hardscape (see LDC 113.0103 for a definition of hardscape) paving or unattached unit pavers. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Please provide 0.05 plant points per square foot of total street yard area. Utilize Table 142-04B to determine plant point values. Please note that the points must be achieved with trees only (LDC 142.0404). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Revise landscape calculations. Planting area required is calculated as 25% of the total Street Yard area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Identify the area being calculated as part of the Street Yard. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Provide one landscape calculation per lot. For example, on sheet 16 of 33, there are two street yard area calculations. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Note: All of the required street yard planting area located outside the vehicular use area for commercial development may consist of hardscape or unattached unit pavers. This does not include the minimum planting area required for trees and the planting area necessary to provide for healthy plant growth. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	On sheet 17 of 33, two plants identified as "existing trees" do not meet the City's definition of a tree which requires a 15' height and spread at maturity. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Sheet 18 of 33 should show the existing trees and whether they are to remain or be removed. Some of the existing trees appear diseased. This sheet does not show an existing telecommunications facility or old sign poles. These facilities need to be shown on the landscape plan as they will prevent landscaping from being planted. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Sheet 18 of 33 shows groundcover planted at the base of street trees. Site visit revealed that some of the roadside areas are currently used as loading zones. Where will the new loading zones be? Attention should be paid to providing appropriate groundcover that will also accommodate pedestrian traffic. (New Issue)

Misc.





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 30 Many of the sheets refer to gravel. This area currently consists of paving. Will the paving be removed? Provide this information as it will help determine whether this area will be permeable. (New Issue)

Street Trees

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 26 Street trees selection shall match the existing predominate species unless this specie is unacceptable to the City Manager. Provide information sufficient to note the existing (or lack of) street trees along each street. This may include photos, notes on plan, clarification in the Design Statement and dashed symbols on the plan. (New Issue)
- 27 Add "Sewer Lines - 10 ft." to the Min. Tree Sep. Distance Table. (New Issue)
- 28 In the event street trees are existing, please provide a plan indicating their type, location and caliper size. If there are no existing street trees for this project frontage, please provide a note on the plan stating as such. (New Issue)
- 29 Please note that under power lines, only certain trees are permitted. Refer to the Street Tree Selection Guide, available online via the Landscape Plan Review web page. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Submitted:** 04/21/2006 Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: Southeast Development Corporatic **Cycle Distributed:** 06/16/2006
Reviewer: Teasley, Sandra **Assigned:** 09/08/2006
(619) 446-5271 **Started:** 09/08/2006
Hours of Review: 0.50 **Review Due:** 07/17/2006
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Completed:** 09/08/2006 **COMPLETED LATE**
Closed: 09/08/2006

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Southeast Development Corporation on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Southeast Development Corporation (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Southeast Development Corporation performed 6 reviews, 33.3% were on-time, and 66.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittal

New Issue Group (634028)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	No comments received during first review. SEDC contacted 9/8/06. Comments may be forthcoming next review cycle. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Wastewater Review	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Bagheri, Hamid (619) 533-4239	Assigned: 06/19/2006	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Started: 07/14/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 09/01/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Reviewer Error/Omission.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Wastewater Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 11 outstanding review issues with LDR-Wastewater Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Wastewater Review performed 89 reviews, 91.0% were on-time, and 62.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

LDR/MWWD-Wastewater

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Public wastewater facilities are existing within the alley adjacent to the sites. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	On your next submittal, please provide Drawing numbers for the existing public sewer facilities in all the public streets within the project site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	On your next submittal show how you are planning to sewer your projects.(on your Plans) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	on-site wastewater systems are private. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	All proposed public sewer facilities are to be designed and constructed in accordance with established criteria in the most current City of San Diego sewer design guide. Proposed facilities that do not meet the current standards shall be private. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	All proposed private sewer facilities located within a single lot are to be designed to meet the requirements of the California Uniform Plumbing Code and will be reviewed as part of the building permit plan check. . (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	No trees or shrubs exceeding three feet in height at maturity shall be installed within ten feet of any public sewer facilities (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Utilization of existing sewer laterals is at the sole risk and responsibility of the developer to ensure the laterals are functional and connected to public sewer facility. Existing sewer laterals that have been unused over 5 years are considered abandoned and will need to be replaced if necessary for this development. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Additional sewer capacity fees will be due and collected at the issuance of building permits. These fees are determined as part of the building permit process. Questions about capacity fees should be directed to Information and Application Services (619-446-5000). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Contact Irina Itkins (619 533 4248) of the Wastewater Section for information on how to obtain a will serve letter and fees involved with this service. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Upon review of the next submittal, the Wastewater Section may have additional comments and will provide draft permit conditions. If you have any questions regarding the Wastewater Section comments or requirements, please call Hamid Bagheri at (619)533-4239. (New Issue)



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Water Review	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Tsang, Melvin (619) 533-4689	Assigned: 06/16/2006	
Hours of Review: 6.00	Started: 07/13/2006	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 08/31/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Water Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with LDR-Water Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Water Review performed 115 reviews, 94.8% were on-time, and 59.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Comments from Water Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Public water facilities are existing within the Cesar E. Chavez Parkway and Julian Avenue rights-of-way adjacent to the project site. However, in order to provide adequate fire protection to the proposed project, the developer will be required to replace the existing 6-inch water facilities with new 12-inch water facilities within the Cesar E. Chavez Parkway right-of-way, from Kearny Avenue to Julian Avenue. Please revise all applicable sheets accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The developer will be required to disconnect at the main (kill) any existing unused water services and install new water services where appropriate. Water services and meters must be located outside any driveway or vehicular use area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	All water services to the site, including domestic, irrigation and fire, will require private, above ground back flow prevention devices (BFPDs). BFPDs are typically located on private property, in line with the service and immediately adjacent to the right-of-way. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Additional water capacity charges will be due at the time of building permit issuance. Charges, as well as service and meter size, are determined by the Water Meter Data Card which is completed during the building plan review process. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	All proposed public water facilities, including services and meters, must be designed and constructed in accordance with established criteria in the most current edition of the City of San Diego Water Facility Design Guidelines and City regulations, standards and practices pertaining thereto. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Upon review of the revised plans addressing the above comments, the Water Review Section will provide additional comments, if any, and draft conditions. If you have any questions regarding the Water Review Section comments, please contact Melvin Tsang at (619) 533-4689. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/21/2006	Deemed Complete on 06/16/2006
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 06/16/2006	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296	Assigned: 06/16/2006	
Hours of Review: 2.50	Started: 06/19/2006	
Next Review Method: LDR-Geology(Appmt.)	Review Due: 09/01/2006	
	Completed: 08/30/2006	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 09/08/2006	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/01/2006 from 07/17/2006 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: LDR-Geology(Appmt.).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 4 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 74 reviews, 82.4% were on-time, and 73.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review/Cycle 4 Information

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within geologic hazard zone 13 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 13 is characterized by the "Downtown Special Fault Zone." Projects located within geologic hazard zone 13 require a fault hazards study to determine if "active" or "potentially active" faults traverse the site. The study must provide an explicit opinion by the geotechnical consultant of record whether or not an "active" or "potentially active" fault trace passes beneath the site. (New Issue)

1st Review/Cycle 4 Reference

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Campus Master Plan & Parking, Calvary Baptist Church, King Chavez Academy of Excellence, 735 Cesar E. Chavez Parkway, San Diego, California 92113; prepared by Rodriguez Associates Architects & Planners, Inc., dated June 16, 2006. (New Issue)

1st Review/Cycle 4 Comments

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	A fault hazard study must be submitted for review. The study must provide an explicit opinion by the geotechnical consultant of record whether or not an "active" or "potentially active" fault trace passes beneath the site. If in Downtown Special Fault Zone, the opinion must be supported by fault trenching. The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports." (New Issue)

2nd Review/Cycle 4 Comments

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	1st Review/Cycle 4 comments remain applicable. (New Issue)

