

**LA JOLLA SHORES PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA
LA JOLLA COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**

Tuesday, June 28 @ 4:00 p.m.

La Jolla Recreation Center, 615 Prospect St., La Jolla, CA

1. **4:00pm Welcome and Call to Order:** Tony Crisafi, Chair
2. **Adopt the Agenda**
3. **Adopt May Minutes**
4. **Non-Agenda Public Comment:** 2 minutes each for items not on the agenda
5. **Non-Agenda Committee Member Comments**
6. **4:05pm Chair Comments**
 - a. Document/Plan Review Requests
7. **Selection of New Secretary**
8. **Project Review:**
 - a. **4:10-4:30pm JONES RESIDENCE– 4TH REVIEW**
 - Project #: 432689
 - Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
 - Location: 2315 Rue De Anne
 - Applicant’s Rep: Brian Will 619-204-3739
 - Project Manager: Edith Gutierrez 619-446-5147 EGutierrez@sandiego.gov
 - **Project Description:** LA JOLLA (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing single family residence and construct a new 4,975 sq ft. 2-story single family residence with attached garage and pool at 2315 Rue De Anne. The 0.351 acre site is in the single family (SF) zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal (Non-Appealable) overlay zone within the La Jolla Community Plan Area. Council District 1.

MAY ACTION: Motion by Gordon, second by Emerson, that findings can be made on a preliminary basis for the split level house design dated 5/21/2016, and that applicant shall return with city cycle issues for final review.

April Meeting: Motion by Ducharme, second by Gordon: that the project return to the LJSPRC with:
1. Street massing diagram in elevation form and 2. Include adjacent neighbor structure setbacks on east/west site section. Motion passes 6-0-0.

MARCH MEETING: *Motion by Crisafi, second by Donovan to be continued to future meeting.*

Request the appliance respond to the following issues:

1. *Proposed massing, bulk and scale, step back second floor on East side.*
 2. *Refer to first 2 bullet points and images on page 5, La Jolla Shores Design Manual for guidance.*
 3. *Provide photo survey/ massing study of proposed design in context with existing homes on the South side of Rue de Anne*
 4. *Provide Shading Study along East property line.*
 5. *Consider utilizing existing North yard grade rather than raising 18”*
- The motion passed 5-0-0.***

b. 4:30-5:50pm 2702 COSTBELLE SDP – 1ST REVIEW

- Project #: 460884
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence

- Location: 2702 Costebelle Drive
- Applicant's Rep: Ali Fakhimi 619-309-9831 salami27@gmail.com
- Project Manager: Edith Gutierrez 619-446-5147 EGutierrez@sandiego.gov
- **Project Description:** LA JOLLA (Process 3) Site Development Permit for a remodel and a 10,254 sq ft, 2-story over basement addition to an existing residence, new pool and site improvements at 2702 Costebelle Dr. The 0.459 acre site is in the SF zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan area. Council District 1.

c. 4:50-5:10pm CARDENAS RESIDENCE – 1ST REVIEW

- Project #: 445629
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 8466 El Paseo Grande
- Applicant's Rep: Bill Hayer / 858-792-2800
- Project Manager: Glenn Gargas / 619-446-5142 / ggargas@sandiego.gov
- Project Description: La Jolla (Process 3) Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit to demolish an existing single family residence and construct a new 6,875 (now 6,780) sq.ft. single family residence with attached garage at 8466 El Paseo Grande. The 0.27 acre site is in the LJSPD-SF zone of the appealable coastal zone and the La Jolla Shores Plan District Community Plan.

d. 5:10-5:30pm 7734 ESTEREL DRIVE – 1ST REVIEW

- Project #: 480979
- Type of Structure: Single Family Residence
- Location: 7734 Esterel Drive
- Applicant's Rep: Michael Kinoshita 858-268-8176 michaelk@mkainc.com
- Project Manager: Morris Dye 619-446-5245 MDye@sandiego.gov
- **Project Description:** LA JOLLA (Process 3) Site Development Permit for the demolition of existing single dwelling unit and construction of a single dwelling unit with a companion unit with total area of 6,129 square feet. The 0.53 acre site is at 7734 Esterel Drive in LJSPD-SF zone of the La Jolla community plan area within Council District 1.

9. Adjourn to next PRC meeting Tuesday, April 26, 2016 @ 4:00 p.m.

MEETING PROTOCOLS FOR PROJECT REVIEW:

- The meeting will proceed in three parts:
 1. Presentation by the Applicant:
 - a. The applicant presents the proposal and Members of the Committee may request information or clarification. No public comment is heard in this part.
 2. Public Comment:
 - a. Members of the public may address the Committee about the proposal.
 3. Deliberation by the Committee:
 - a. The members of the Committee discuss the proposal. Note that the members of the Committee may initiate questions of the Applicant and the Members of the Public during this part. The deliberation may lead to requests for additional information or to a resolution and voting.
- The Committee may elect to impose time limits on presentations by the Applicant, comments by Members of the Public, and other participants as judged by the Committee to manage available time.

March 23, 2016

Mr. Greg Friesen
Hayer Architecture
445 Marine View Avenue, Suite 280
Del Mar, CA 92014

Subject: Cardenas Residence CDP / SDP, Assessment Letter; Project No. 445629;
Internal Order No. 24006206; La Jolla Community Planning area.

Dear Mr Friesen:

The Development Services Department has completed the initial review of the project referenced above, and described as:

Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit to demolish an existing one story residence and construct a two story residence with attached two car garage totaling 6,875 square feet. The 0.27-acre site is located within the appealable coastal zone at 8466 El Paseo Grande in the LJSPD-SF zone of the La Jolla Shore Plan District Community Plan.

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

If any additional requirements should arise during the subsequent review of your project, we will identify the issue and the reason for the additional requirement. To resolve any outstanding issues, please provide the information that is requested in the Cycle Issues Report. If you choose not to provide the requested additional information or make the requested revisions, processing may continue. However, the project may be recommended for denial if the remaining issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved and the appropriate findings for approval cannot be made.

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

As your Development Project Manager, I will coordinate all correspondence, emails, phone calls, and meetings directly with the applicants assigned "Point of Contact." The addressee on this letter has been designated as the Point of Contact for your project. Please notify me if you should decide to change your Point of Contact while I am managing this project.

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

▪ **Required approvals:**

○ Process 3 - A Coastal Development Permit & Site Development Permit (CDP Process Three, Hearing Officer as decision-maker, appealable to Planning Commission) in accordance with SDMC Sections 126.0707 and 1510.0201.

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

▪ **Required Findings:** In order to recommend approval of your project, certain findings must be substantiated in the record. Enclosure 2 contains the required findings.

II. SIGNIFICANT PROJECT ISSUES: The significant project issues are summarized below. Resolution of these issues could affect your project. Additional explanation is provided in the Cycle Issues Report.

Key Issues:

Cultural Resources (Archeology) – Environmental staff recommends a Mitigation Measure be incorporated to address this issue with monitoring to be provided during construction-related activities.

Water Quality Technical Report – Report must be prepared and submitted for review.

Revised Drainage Study – Study must be revised as requested by LDR-Engineering and submitted for review.

Addendum Geotechnical Report – Report must be revised as requested by LDR-Geology and submitted for review.

Public View – Please revise all plans as requested by LDR-Planning to address public view issue along El Paseo Grande.

Structure Height – Height needs to be clarified as requested by LDR-Planning.

- III. Studies/Reports Required:** A number of documents have been identified as necessary to the project's review. Reference the attached Submittal Requirements Report (Enclosure 3). As mentioned above, please submit the Water Quality Technical Report, revised Drainage Study and an Addendum Geotechnical Report.
- IV. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS:** Our current accounting system does not provide for real-time information regarding account status, however, our records show approximately \$5,614.38 billed to date. Based on the processing point, unresolved issues, and level of controversy of your project, no additional funds are required at this time.

During the processing of your project, you will continue to receive statements with the break-down of staff charges to your account. Should you have questions about those charges, please feel free to contact me directly.

V. TIMELINE

A formal resubmittal is required. From a timeline stand point, the submittal and review of the requested items from LDR-Planning, LDR-Engineering, LDR-Geology and LDR-Environmental are key. Until the requested Water Quality Technical Report, Revised Drainage Study and Addendum Geotechnical Report information has been provided, Environmental Analysis Section cannot make an environmental determination. The City also recommends that you receive a recommendation from the La Jolla Community Planning Association prior to scheduling Hearing Officer public hearing for approval.

Upon your review of the attached Cycle Issues Report, you may wish to schedule a meeting with staff and your consultants prior to resubmitting the project. Please telephone me if you wish to schedule a meeting with staff. During the meeting, we will also focus on key milestones that must be met in order to facilitate the review of your proposal and to project a potential timeline for a hearing date. Your next review cycle should take approximately 30 days to complete.

Municipal Code Section 126.0114 requires that a development permit application be closed if the applicant fails to submit or resubmit requested materials, information, fees, or deposits within 90 calendar days. Once closed, the application, plans and other data submitted for review may be returned to the applicant or destroyed. To reapply, the applicant shall be required to submit a new development permit application with required submittal materials, and shall be subject to all applicable fees and regulations in effect on the date the new application is deemed complete.

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

VI. RESUBMITTALS/NEXT STEPS: Resubmittals are done on a walk-in basis. Please check in on the third floor of the Development Service Center (1222 First Avenue). Please be prepared to provide the following:

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

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

C. Deposit Account: Our most recent records show that there is a balance of \$10,385.62 in the deposit account for your project. However, please be advised that the cost of this review has not been posted to your account, and it may take four to six weeks to post these charges to the account. Statements are mailed to the Financially Responsible Party for this project on a monthly basis.

If an invoice is attached to this letter, you will need to pay the invoice prior to resubmitting your project. Additional deposits can be made online through Open DSD by entering your project number in the Project ID field: <http://opensds.sandiego.gov/web/approvals/>. Invoices can be paid online by searching for the invoice number: <http://opensds.sandiego.gov/web/invoices/> or in person at the Cashier, located on the 3rd Floor of the Development Services Center.

San Diego County Clerk Fee: The San Diego County Clerk now requires \$50.00 to post the required public notice informing the public that a draft environmental document has been prepared. A check made out to the San Diego County Clerk for this amount will be required prior to the distribution of the draft environmental document for public review.

D. CEQA Filing Fees: A California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Notice of Determination (NOD) must be filed within five working days after the project's approval and all appeal periods have been exhausted. Filing the NOD would start a 30-day statute of limitations on legal court challenges to the approval under CEQA. The NOD must be accompanied by a California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fee (CDFG) filing fee or a CDFW "No Effect" form, and a San Diego County document handling fee.

If the applicant believes or has evidence (e.g. aerial images, photographs, etc.) to verify that the project will have no effect on fish and wildlife, please consult the process for "No Effect Determination" on the California Department of Fish and Wildlife web site:

<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/CEQA/NED>. San Diego is in South Coast Region 5 and forms may be submitted via email to: R5NoEffect@dfg.ca.gov

Prior to scheduling your project for a decision, the following must be forwarded to me to be filed with the CEQA NOD:

- The **original** approved CDFW "No Effect" Form and a check for \$50 (handling fee) made payable to the "San Diego County Clerk". -or-
- A check, payable to the "San Diego County Clerk" in the amount of \$2,260.25 (\$2,210.25 CDFW fee + \$50 handling fee) if a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for your project; **or** \$3,120.00 (\$3,070.00 CDFW Fee + \$50 handling fee) if an Environmental Impact Report was prepared for your project. Please include your project number on the check.

A receipt for the fee and a copy of the CDFW "No Effect" Form or NOD will be forwarded to you after the 30-day posting requirement by the County Clerk.

E. Records Fee: Prior to scheduling your project for a decision you must pay the Records Fee to cover the cost of imaging and archiving your complete project record electronically (see Information Bulletin 503). I will contact you regarding this fee in the future, closer to the public hearing date.

- VII. COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP:** Staff provides the decision maker with the recommendation from your locally recognized community planning group. If you have not already done so, please contact Cindy Greatrex, Chairperson of the La Jolla Community Planning Association, at (858) 456-7900 to schedule your project for a recommendation from the group. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the community planning group, in your resubmittal, if applicable, please indicate how your project incorporates any input suggested to you by the community planning group.

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

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

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

Page 6
Mr. Greg Friesen
March 23, 2016

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

For modifications to the project scope, submittal requirements or questions regarding any of the above, please contact me prior to resubmittal. I may be reached by telephone at (619) 446-5142 or via e-mail at ggargas@sandiego.gov.

Sincerely,



Glenn R. Gargas, AICP
Development Project Manager

Enclosures:

1. Cycle No. 4 Issues Report
2. Required Findings
3. Submittal Requirements Report

cc: File
Cindy Greatrex, La Jolla Community Planning Association
Reviewing Staff (Assessment letter only)

Revised 2-29-16 pjf

Cycle Issues



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

3/22/16 9:32 am

Page 1 of 15

L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 445629 **Title:** Cardenas Residence - CDP/SDP
Project Mgr: Gargas, Glenn (619) 446-5142 ggargas@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/20/2015	Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Coastal Commission	Cycle Distributed: 10/20/2015	
Reviewer: Gargas, Glenn	Assigned: 10/22/2015	
(619) 446-5142	Started: 10/22/2015	
ggargas@sandiego.gov	Review Due: 11/18/2015	
Hours of Review: 0.30	Completed: 11/20/2015	COMPLETED LATE
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Closed: 03/22/2016	

- . The review due date was changed to 02/11/2016 from 11/23/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Coastal Commission on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Coastal Commission performed 5 reviews, 40.0% were on-time, and 60.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Nov. 2015

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	No review comments were received from the California Coastal Commission during this review cycle. (New Issue)



Cycle Issues



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

3/22/16 9:32 am

Page 2 of 15

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/20/2015	Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Park & Rec	Cycle Distributed: 10/20/2015	
Reviewer: Harkness, Jeff	Assigned: 10/21/2015	
(619) 533-6595	Started: 10/21/2015	
Jharkness@sandiego.gov	Review Due: 11/18/2015	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Completed: 10/21/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Closed: 03/22/2016	

- . The review due date was changed to 02/11/2016 from 11/23/2015 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 32 reviews, 71.9% were on-time, and 77.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review 11-23-15

Issue

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	There are no population-based park, adjacent open space, or Maintenance Assessment District (MAD) issues associated with the demolition of a single story residence and construction of a new two story residence. (New Issue)
-------------------------------------	---	--





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Submitted:** 10/20/2015 Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review **Cycle Distributed:** 10/20/2015
Reviewer: Stanco Jr, Joseph **Assigned:** 10/21/2015
 (619) 446-5373 **Started:** 01/21/2016
 Jstanco@sandiego.gov **Review Due:** 02/10/2016
Hours of Review: 7.00 **Completed:** 03/21/2016 **COMPLETED LATE**
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Closed:** 03/22/2016

- . The review due date was changed to 02/11/2016 from 11/23/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 91 reviews, 30.8% were on-time, and 39.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1ST REVIEW - MAR 2016

Project Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The proposed project is located at 8466 El Paseo Grande, in the SF (Single Family) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Overlay Zone (Appealable Area), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Sensitive Coastal Overlay Zone, La Jolla Archaeological Study Area, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Beach Impact Area), and the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone. The proposed project is for the demolition of an existing single dwelling unit and the construction of a 6,875 sq.ft. single dwelling unit on a 11,878 sq.ft. lot. (New Issue)

Permits

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The proposed project will require a Site Development Permit (SDP), processed in accordance with Process 3 (Hearing Officer as decision-maker, appealable to Planning Commission) for development in the La Jolla Shores Planned District, per Section 1510.0201(d) and for development on a premises with Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) in the form of Coastal Beaches, per SDMC Section 143.0110. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The proposed project will require a Coastal Development Permit (CDP), processed in accordance with Process Three for development within the Coastal Overlay Zone (Appealable Area), per Section 126.0707. (New Issue)

Development Regulations

Structure Height

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Please clarify the overall structure height measurement on the elevation drawings, in accordance with Section 113.0270(a)(2)(B). (New Issue)

Lot Coverage

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Although it appears that the proposed development will comply with maximum lot coverage, please clarify the proposed lot coverage calculation. (New Issue)

Fences/Walls

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	On Sheet 7, note "H", please reference that the proposed side yard fence will have 75 percent of the vertical surface open to light, per Section 142.0310(c)(2)(C). (New Issue)



L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Please include the width of the solid CMU wall in the analysis of "open" fencing, as viewed from El Paseo Grande (i.e. East Elevation on Sheet 7). The elevation within the side yards (fence plus wall), as viewed from El Paseo Grande, must total at least 75 percent open to light. (New Issue)

Community Plan

Density

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	The project site is designated as Very Low Density Residential in the La Jolla Community Plan (Figure 1, p.5). The proposed single dwelling unit on a 11,878 square-foot premises will be consistent with the land use plan density [INFORMATIONAL ITEM]. (New Issue)

Residential Character

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Per Policy 2(a) of the Residential Land Use element of the La Jolla Community Plan, the development recommendations contained in the Plan should be applied to promote good design and visual harmony in the transitions between new and older structures. The proposed residence provides sufficient building articulation, visual interest, and off-setting planes that are in general conformance with other properties in the vicinity and are consistent with the Residential Character policies of the La Jolla Community Plan [INFORMATIONAL ITEM]. (New Issue)

Visual Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	A public view to scenic coastal resources exists along El Paseo Grande. Within the La Jolla Shores Planned District, the view corridor needs to include the entire width of the proposed side setback, but not to exceed 10 feet. Please revise all plans to show a proposed view corridor equal to the width of the proposed side setbacks. (New Issue)

Draft Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Planning staff will include a more precise view corridor easement permit condition upon re-submittal. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Open fencing and landscaping may be permitted within the side setbacks provided such improvements do not significantly obstruct public views to the ocean. Landscaping shall be planted and maintained to preserve public views. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/20/2015	Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 10/20/2015	
Reviewer: Tracy, Christopher (619) 446-5381 CRTracy@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/21/2015	Started: 11/09/2015
Hours of Review: 12.00	Review Due: 11/23/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/23/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/22/2016	

- . 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 12 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 90 reviews, 50.0% were on-time, and 34.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

EAS Review

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Land Development Review Division has reviewed the submittal of the above referenced project and has determined that the project will be placed in Extended Initial Study (XIS) status due to the following issues: (New Issue) |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|

Aesthics/Visual Quality/Neighb

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | AESTHETICS/VISUAL QUALITY/NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER - The site is located along a lateral public access corridor - La Jolla Shores Beach, and as identified on the Site Plan - Sheet 01, a four foot wide deed restricted visual corridor is identified on the northern and southern property boundaries. Please provide a copy of the grant deed, so EAS staff can further evaluate any potential impacts. Additionally, EAS staff will need to defer to Planning's review for potential impacts once Planning has completed their review. (New Issue) |
|--------------------------|---|--|

Biological Impacts

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -The site is completely developed and is adjacent to an existing sandy beach and the Pacific Ocean. No impacts to biological resources are expected on-site and the site is not in or adjacent to the MSCP/MHPA. (New Issue) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|

Historic Resources

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | HISTORICAL RESOURCES (Part 1 of 4) - The property at 8466 El Paseo Grande was previously reviewed for historical significance in 2010 under Project Tracking System (PTS) application number 216821 and was found not eligible for historic designation. No new information has been submitted or discovered that would alter that determination. Therefore, the prior determination of the building not historic stands. This determination is valid for 5 years from this date, absent new information that speaks to the building's eligibility for historic designation. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | (Part 2 of 4)
The site is located in an area mapped as having high potential for archaeological resources including the Spindrift site. This portion of Spindrift always requires the submittal of a records search, survey, and monitoring with a Native American monitor, with a testing program if the survey is positive. A survey of the site was conducted on October 15, 2007; entitled "Historic Resources Survey of the Lusardi Property (RECON Number 4362)" that concluded, "No historic resources were found during the survey of the Lusardi property. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | (Part 3 of 4)
However, human remains have been recovered in the expanded Spindrift Site study area to the south. Therefore, because the potential exists for archaeological deposits to be encountered during construction-related activities within the Lusardi property, RECON recommends all ground disturbing work be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American observer." (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | (Part 4 of 4)
Due to the report being over five years in age, it was reevaluated by Cultural Resource staff to determine if the report's findings were still valid. It was determined as such and based on this information, staff recommends a Mitigation Measure be incorporated to address this issue with monitoring to be provided during construction-related activities. (New Issue) |

Paleontological Resources

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Christopher Tracy at (619) 446-5381. Project Nbr: 445629 / Cycle: 4



L64A-003A

- | <u>Issue</u> | | |
|--------------------------|------------|--|
| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Part 1 of 2) - According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Jolla, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975), and the "Faulting and Bluff Geologic Evaluation Report - Proposed Lusardi Residence" (CET, Inc., February 12, 2007), the project site is primarily underlain with alluvium slopewash and the highly sensitive Bay Point Formation. As a guideline dependent on grading history, paleontological monitoring may be required if project grading meets or exceeds the City's Thresholds of 1,000 cubic yards to 10 feet in depth. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | (Part 2 of 2)
It appears the project within its current configuration is below these thresholds; therefore, paleontological resource monitoring would not be required. (New Issue) |

Hydrology/Water Quality

- | <u>Issue</u> | | |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | WATER QUALITY/HYDROLOGY - Additional Water Quality/Stormwater information has been requested by Engineering Staff. EAS will defer to Engineering to resolve associated issues. Additional issues may arise as the review progresses. Until CEQA issues are resolved, EAS is not able to complete the Initial Study for your project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. (New Issue) |

Noise

- | <u>Issue</u> | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|---|
| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 11 | NOISE (1 of 2) - Construction related noise would result, but would be temporary and is strictly regulated under San Diego Municipal Code Section 59.5.0404, "Noise Abatement and Control" which places limits on the hours of construction operations and standard decibels which cannot be exceeded. Therefore, people would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of those covered by existing noise regulations. After construction is completed, no substantial increase in noise levels that would result from this residence. (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 12 | (2 of 2)
As referenced under Table K-2 of Traffic Noise Significance Thresholds, the structure or outdoor useable area is greater than 50 feet from a roadway with an existing or future ADT greater than 7,500 ADT; therefore, there should be no substantial increase in traffic noise levels that would result from this residence. (New Issue) |

Traffic/Circulation

- | <u>Issue</u> | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|---|
| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 13 | TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION/PARKING - Since the proposed project would construct one residence in place of an existing single-family residence traffic patterns would not substantially change. The new residence would not change road patterns or congestion. In addition the project would not require the redesign of streets, traffic signals, stop signs, striping or any other changes to the existing roadways or existing public transportation routes or types are necessary. On-site parking would be required pursuant to City requirements. (New Issue) |

Geologic Conditions

- | <u>Issue</u> | | |
|--------------------------|------------|--|
| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14 | GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS - The project site is located upon the Scripps Fault Zone and lies within the Coastal Zone. It is identified in SANGIS as having slopes in excess of 25 percent As identified within the Geotechnical Report as having fill materials that are considered marginally susceptible to landsliding. In order to assess these areas further EAS staff is awaiting input from the Geology Group. EAS will defer to that group for their input as it relates to the validity/recommendations of the accompanying Prelim. Geotechnical Report. EAS is not able to complete the Initial Study. (New Issue) |

Environmental Document

- | <u>Issue</u> | | |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15 | Due to the project's anticipated monitoring that would be required to be implemented, the minimum CEQA document that is anticipated would be a Mitigated Negative Declaration. However, a final CEQA determination cannot be made and the CEQA document cannot be prepared until the remaining disciplines related to the project issues is adequately addressed. (New Issue) |

Land Use-Planning & Landscapin

- | <u>Issue</u> | | |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16 | LAND USE/PLANNING - EAS staff is awaiting input from the Planning Group and defer to that group as it relates to the Land Use/Planning. Due to this, EAS is not able to complete the Initial Study for your project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17 | LANDSCAPING - Corrections have been requested by Landscaping Staff as it relates to the submitted plans. EAS will defer to Landscaping to resolve associated issues. Additional issues may arise as the review progresses. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Air Quality/Odors/GHG

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	AIR QUALITY/ODOR/GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (1 of 5) - The project does not have the bulk and scale to cause any obstruction in the implementation of the existing air quality plan or otherwise cause any adverse air movement within the area. In accordance with the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds projects that would typically result in significant air quality impacts would consist of projects that would produce 9,500 Average Daily Trips or would result in traffic Loss of Service impacts to streets, intersections and freeways. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	(2 of 5) One residence would not exceed this threshold and impacts to air quality would not occur. Construction of the project could increase the amount of pollutants entering the air basin but these emissions would be temporary and finite. Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as watering for dust abatement, would reduce construction dust emissions by 75 percent. Therefore, emissions associated with the construction of the project would not be significant. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	(3 of 5) With regards to odors, development of a single-family residence does not have the potential to release objectionable odors. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	(4 of 5) With respect to greenhouse gas emissions, the City of San Diego is utilizing the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) report "CEQA and Climate Change" (CAPCOA 2009) to determine whether a GHG analysis would be required for submitted projects. The CAPCOA report references a 900 metric ton guideline as a conservative threshold for requiring further analysis and possible mitigation. This emission level is based on the amount of vehicle trips, the typical energy and water use associated with projects, and other factors. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	(5 of 5) CAPCOA identifies project types that are estimated to emit approximately 900 metric tons of GHG's annually. This 900 metric ton threshold is roughly equivalent to 36,000 square feet of office space, 11,000 square feet of retail, 50 residential units, and 6,300 square feet of supermarkets. Since the project is a single dwelling unit, it would result in emissions well below the established 900 metric ton guideline. Therefore, impacts are not expected and mitigation for GHG is not required. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/20/2015	Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 10/20/2015	
Reviewer: Canning, Jack (619) 446-5425 jcanning@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/21/2015	
	Started: 11/09/2015	
Hours of Review: 8.00	Review Due: 11/18/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/16/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/22/2016	

- The review due date was changed to 02/11/2016 from 11/23/2015 per agreement with customer.
- The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- Your project still has 20 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 73 reviews, 84.9% were on-time, and 44.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Engineering 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<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. Upon resubmittal, we will complete our review of the Coastal Development Permit Plans. (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. (continued below) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The new Storm Water Development Regulations will become effective later this year on December 24, 2015 and this project will be subject to those regulations. Project is within the La Jolla Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) and is subject to all requirements of the Final Compliance Plan for La Jolla ASBS dated September 20, 2014. Revise the project design accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 02. Show and call out the location of the roof drains and how they are discharged into the treatment control BMPs. Show and call out the trench drain at the entrance to the garage and how it is discharged. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 02. Add a note that states: This project will not discharge any storm water run-off directly into the La Jolla ASBS. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Revise the Survey Sheet C5.0. Revise the Bench Mark per the City of San Diego Vertical Control Book. Remove the reference to NAD 83. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	The applicant did not complete the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist correctly. The correct response to Part B, Item No.7 is YES, this project is within a Water Quality Sensitive Area and therefore a Priority Development Project. Submit a revised checklist on the next submittal. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Based on the revised Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, this project is a Priority Project and requires BMPs. The applicant shall submit a Water Quality Technical Report consistent with the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards. Required elements of a WQTR are provided in Appendix F on this manual. Details supporting all decisions made in accordance with Chapter 4 requirements shall be documented in the WQTR. (continued below) (New Issue)



L64A-003A

- | <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | The design of any LID or treatment control BMP which allows for infiltration of runoff should be accompanied by a Geotechnical Investigation of the surrounding soils. A Geological Investigation Report should be attached to the Water Quality Technical Report and prepared in conformance with the City of San Diego Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports. |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | The selection of Treatment Control BMPs shall be based on Storm Water Standards Table 4-3. Since HMP Controls will be required, only those BMPs that are rated for both LID and HMP Control plus rated as High or Medium removal efficiency will be acceptable. |
| | | The revised Storm Water Standards are available online at:
http://www.sandiego.gov/development/services/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 | Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 02. Add details of the proposed catch basin and how it will gravity flow to the sidewalk underdrain in El Paseo Grande. |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 | Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 02. Show and call out the proposed Treatment Control BMP's that will be called out in the required WQTR. |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 | Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 02. Add a note that states: No access gate shall swing open into the El Paseo Grange Right-of-Way. |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14 | Revise the Grading Plan Sheet 02. Distance from sidewalk to garage door is less than the required 20 minimum per San Diego Municipal Code Diagram 142-05A. Show and call out how, per SDMC Table 142-05B Footnote, project shall provide two additional parking spaces on-street abutting the subject property and shall conform to section 142.0525(c)(4). |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15 | Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided. |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16 | Additional comments may be recommended pending further review of any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive. Should you have any questions or comments, please call Jack Canning at 619 446-5425. |
| | | (New Issue) |

WQTR

- | <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17 | Project is a Priority Development Project and requires a WQTR. Applicant submitted a Water Quality Study which is not sufficient to address the MS4 Storm Water Requirements for this project located within a Water Quality Sensitive Area. |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18 | Add a discussion how this project adheres to the La Jolla Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) which requires low-flow diversions to eliminate non-storm water discharges to the ASBS during dry weather. |
| | | (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19 | Add a discussion how the project adheres to the new NPDES MS4 Permit requirements including controlling storm water discharge, preventing and reducing pollutants in runoff by implementing best management practices, and required increased inspection of construction activities in an ASBS. |
| | | (New Issue) |

Drainage Study

- | <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 20 | Project is a Priority Development Project and requires a WQTR. Study states the project is not a PDP and therefore was not prepared to support the required WQTR. Revise the Drainage Study to support the WQTR and the required revisions that are stated above. |
| | | (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/20/2015	Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 10/20/2015	
Reviewer: Gargas, Glenn (619) 446-5142 ggargas@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/22/2015	
	Started: 10/22/2015	
Hours of Review: 0.30	Review Due: 11/18/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 10/22/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/22/2016	

- . The review due date was changed to 02/11/2016 from 11/23/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 59 reviews, 39.0% were on-time, and 47.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

La Jolla November 2015

<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, (as identified in the assessment letter) to make arrangements to present your project for review at their next available meeting. 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 notified the group of your request and has sent them a copy of your project plans and documents. (New Issue) [Recommended]
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Projects within the La Jolla Shores Planned District require a recommendation from the La Jolla Shores Planned District Advisory Board, in addition to the La Jolla Community Planning Association (LDC Section 1510.0105(b)). Contact the Development Project Manager when you are ready to schedule your project before the Advisory Board, which meets the third Tuesday of the month. Provide adequate time to schedule your project on the docket. Presentation materials should include elevations, photographs of surrounding properties, samples of colors, finishes, and special treatments. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/20/2015	Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Historic	Cycle Distributed: 10/20/2015	
Reviewer: Stanco, Kelley (619) 236-6545 Kstanco@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/23/2015	
	Started: 11/16/2015	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Review Due: 11/18/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/16/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/22/2016	

- . The review due date was changed to 02/11/2016 from 11/23/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd 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 262 reviews, 92.4% were on-time, and 95.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

11/16/2015

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	

The property at 8466 El Paseo Grande was previously reviewed for historical significance in 2010 under PTS application number 216821 and was found not eligible for historic designation. No new information has been submitted or discovered that would alter that determination. Therefore, the prior determination of not historic stands. This determination is good for 5 years from this date, absent new information that speaks to the building's eligibility for historic designation. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/20/2015	Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 10/20/2015	
Reviewer: Quinn, Jim (619) 446-5334 jpquinn@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/22/2015	
	Started: 10/22/2015	
Hours of Review: 2.50	Review Due: 11/18/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 11/25/2015	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 03/22/2016	

- . The review due date was changed to 02/11/2016 from 11/23/2015 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 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Geology 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-Geology (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 77 reviews, 87.0% were on-time, and 77.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

445629-4 (11/25/2015)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Addendum 02 Update Geotechnical Report, Proposed Cardenas Residence, 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by Construction Testing & Engineering, Inc., dated September 11, 2015 (their project no. 10-12702G)
		Addendum 01 to Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Recommendations, Cardenas Residence (formally Lusardi Residence), 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by Construction Testing & Engineering, Inc., dated December 16, 2009 (their project no. 10-10144G)
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Faulting and Bluff Geologic Evaluation, Proposed Lusardi Residence, 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla, California, prepared by Construction Testing & Engineering, Inc., dated February 12, 2015 (their project no. 10-8264G)
		Proposed Site Plan, Cardenas Residence, 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla, CA 92037, prepared by Hayer Architecture, dated October 15, 2015
		(New Issue)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Submit the following document: Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Recommendations, Cardenas Residence (formally Lusardi Residence), 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by Construction Testing & Engineering, Inc., dated November 2, 2009 (their project no. 10-10144G)
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Submit the following document: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Lusardi Residence, 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla, California, prepared by Construction Testing & Engineering, Inc., dated March 24, 2006 (their project no. 10-8264G)
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Submit an addendum geotechnical report or update letter that addresses the proposed development for the purposes of environmental review and the following:
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Provide a geologic/ geotechnical map that shows the distribution of fill and surficial deposits and the proposed development.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Provide geologic/ geotechnical cross sections updated to show the proposed development.
		(New Issue)



L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	The project's geotechnical consultant should consider updating their description of site geology with respect to current regional geologic mapping by Kennedy and Tan (2008). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	The project's geotechnical consultant should reference the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, La Jolla Quadrangle, prepared by the California Emergency Management Agency, dated June 1, 2009 and indicate if there is a potential tsunami hazard for the site. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Provide an updated conclusion regarding geologic hazards of the site and summarize any geologic hazards potentially impacting the proposed development. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Provide an updated conclusion regarding the suitability of the site for the proposed development. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 4 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 10/20/2015	Deemed Complete on 10/20/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 10/20/2015	
Reviewer: Kohakura, Vanessa (619) 446-5120 Vkohakura@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 10/22/2015	
	Started: 11/18/2015	
Hours of Review: 2.50	Review Due: 02/11/2016	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 02/04/2016	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/22/2016	

- . The review due date was changed to 02/11/2016 from 11/23/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 12 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 53 reviews, 71.7% were on-time, and 32.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review (Cycle 4) 11/23/15

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Scope: Project proposes to demolish an existing one story residence and construct a two story residence with a two car garage located within the La Jolla Shores Planned District - (Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Site Plan (Sheet 01): Please be consistent with the information provided on the Site plan - certain areas are called out as "Planters" versus "PA" - Please revise to LA to refer to all Landscape Areas. Please be sure that text size and font are consistent (currently landscape areas are presented in different texts). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Lawn (Sheets 01 and 05): There is a discrepancy between the information presented on the plans on Sheet 01 and Sheet 05. Sheet 01 states "Existing to Remain" under the Lawn area on the west side of the site; however, Sheet 05 indicates "Existing Planter to Remain" within the same area. Please clarify whether there is an existing planter, and if so, indicate the location of the planter on the plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Planters (Sheets 01 and 05): There is a discrepancy between the two sheets. Sheet 05 is not indicating the locations of all planters (as shown on Sheet 01). Please be consistent with the information presented by labeling all existing to remain and proposed planters on site (planter in the front yard setback is not shown on Sheet 05). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Courtyard Tree (Sheets 01, 02, 05): It appears a tree is proposed within the courtyard (also shown on Sheets 02 and 05) but not on the Landscape plan (Sheet 04). Please clarify what the symbol represents. If it is a tree, please include this tree in the Plant Legend. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Planter (Sheets 01, 04 and 05): Staff has concerns with the current dimension (<2 ft) proposed for the planter. Per SDMC 1510.0304, all landscape and irrigation shall be developed in conformance with the Landscape Guidelines of the Land Development Manual. In order for the planter to count towards the total landscaped area required, planter shall be a minimum of 30 sf with no dimension less than 3 ft (per SDMC 142.0403). Please adjust planter width in order to provide sufficient space for healthy plant growth and so that planter may count towards the total landscaped area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Street Tree (Sheet 04): Landscape staff acknowledges street trees were chosen from the approved list under the La Jolla Community Plan. However, Washingtonia robustas have been found to be invasive, please replace proposed tree species with another noninvasive species under the Community Plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Concept Notes (Sheet 04): Please revise title from "Concept Notes" to "Landscape Notes". (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Design Statement (Sheet 04): Provide a design statement that verbally describes the theme and or design intent of the project, covering such items as planting themes, etc. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Landscape Notes (Sheet 04): Please provide the following note: "All landscaping shall be completed within 6 months of occupancy or within one year of the notice of completion of a residence." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	(Information) Landscaped Area (Sheet 04): Landscape calculations were provided demonstrating the minimum 30% of landscaped area was being met; the pedestrian beach access easement was included in these calculations. The La Jolla PDO allows the beach access easement to be a part of the required 30% landscaped area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Additional comments may be recommended pending further review of any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive. (New Issue)



REQUIRED PERMIT FINDINGS

Coastal Development Permit - Section 126.0708

- 1. The proposed coastal development will not encroach upon any existing physical accessway that is legally used by the public or any proposed public accessway identified in a Local Coastal Program land use plan; and the proposed coastal development will enhance and protect public views to and along the ocean and other scenic coastal areas as specified in the Local Coastal Program land use plan.**
- 2. The proposed coastal development will not adversely affect environmentally sensitive lands.**
- 3. The proposed coastal development is in conformity with the certified Local Coastal Program land use plan and complies with all regulations of the certified Implementation Program.**
- 4. For every Coastal Development Permit issued for any coastal development between the nearest public road and the sea or the shoreline of any body of water located within the Coastal Overlay Zone the coastal development is in conformity with the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act.**

Site Development Permit - Section 126.0504

- 1. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan;**
- 2. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare; and**
- 3. The proposed development will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code, including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code.**

Submittal Requirements



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

3/23/16 7:14 pm

Page 1 of 1

L64A-001

Project Information

Project Nbr: **445629** Title: Cardenas Residence - CDP/SDP
Project Mgr: Gargas, Glenn (619)446-5142 ggargas@sandiego.gov



Review Cycle Information

Review Cycle: 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Opened: 03/22/2016 9:31 am Submitted:
Due: Closed:

Required Documents:

<u>Package Type</u>	<u>Pkg Qty</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Qty Needed</u>
Development Plans	8	Site Development Plans	8
Drainage/Hydrology Study	3	Drainage Study	3
Storm Water	3	Storm Water Req. Applicability Checklist (DS-560)	3
Geotechnical Reports	3	Geotechnical Investigation Report Addendum	3
Water Quality Technical Report	3	Water Quality Technical Report	3