



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

northparkplanning.org

URBAN DESIGN-PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA: Monday, July 7, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.

North Park Recreation Center / Adult Center, 2719 Howard Avenue

I. Parliamentary Items (6:00 pm)

- A. Call to Order*
- B. Modifications & Adoption of the Agenda
- C. Approval of Previous Minutes: June 2, 2014
- D. Announcements

II. Non Agenda Public Comment (2 minutes each).

III. Action/Discussion

A. 3132 Herman Ave. – Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP)

Neighborhood Development Permit for a 342-square-foot first floor addition to an existing 1,603-square-foot, one story, single-dwelling residence with a 516-square-foot detached garage. In addition, an existing 584-square-foot, one-story, single-dwelling residence would remain on the project site.

B. 4106-4114 Louisiana St. – Vesting Tentative Map

Conversion of recently constructed 5 unit building from apartments to condominiums.

C. North Park Community Plan Update – Urban Design Element:

Continuing discussion of the North Park Community Plan Update, as time permits.

IV. Information

None

V. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items

None

VI. Adjournment (8:00 pm)

Next Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee meeting date: Monday, August , 2014

For information about the Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee please visit northparkplanning.org or contact the Chair, Peter Hill, at urbanadesign@northparkplanning.org or (619) 846-2689.

** Subcommittee Membership & Quorum: When all 15 elected NPPC Board Member seats are filled, the maximum total of seated (voting) UD-PR Subcommittee members is 13 (up to 7 elected NPPC Board Members and up to 6 seated North Park community members). To constitute a quorum, a majority of the seated UD-PR Subcommittee members must be elected NPPC Board Members.*

*** Community Voting Members: North Park residents and business owners may gain UD-PR Subcommittee voting rights by becoming a General Member of the NPPC and by attending three UD-PR Subcommittee meetings. Please sign-in on the meeting attendance list and notify the Chair or Vice-Chair if you are attending to gain Subcommittee voting rights.*

North Park Planning Committee meetings are held on the second floor of the North Park Christian Fellowship (2901 North Park Way, 2nd Floor), on the third Tuesday of each month, at 6:30 pm. The next scheduled NPPC meeting is on April 15, 2014.

For additional information about the North Park Planning Committee, please like our Facebook page and follow our Twitter feed:



[NorthParkPlanning](#)



[@NPPlanning](#)



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

northparkplanning.org

URBAN DESIGN-PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES: Monday, June 2, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.

North Park Recreation Center / Adult Center, 2719 Howard Avenue

I. Parliamentary Items

a. Call to Order & Attendance (6:03 PM)

Seated NPPC Board Members: Peter Hill, Rachel Levin, Vicki Granowitz (left at 6:25), Lucky Morrison, Daniel Gebreselassie, Steve Codraro, Dionne Carlson, Rick Pyles (arrived 6:30)

Seated General Members: Ernie Bonn, Robb Steppke, Kitty Callen

Nonvoting Board Members in Audience: None

Audience / Public Sign in Sheet: 11 members of the public attending [Brandon Price, Deborah Hill, Paul Spears, Michael Edwards, Eva Mille, Justin Tjalma, Elizabeth Lucas, Ken Moto?, Antoinette Goodbody, Terry Goodbody, Howard Blackson]

b. Modifications & Adoption of the Agenda:

- Modifications: None

- Motion to adopt June 2, 2014 agenda Bonn/Steppke, 10-0-0

c. Approval of May 5, 2014 Minutes: Motion to approve Dionne/Daniel , 10-0-0

d. Announcements:

- Kitty: careabouthnorthpark.com - St. Luke's Episcopal Church, 3725 30th St. is having a rummage sale Saturday, June 21st, 7am-2pm. Funds raised in this sale will help cover legal costs in the ongoing lawsuit against the City and Jack in the Box.

- Ernie: Trolley Barn Concert Series Fridays, July 5-August 2 6pm-8pm

- Dionne: SOHO Historic homes tours June 6th,7th,& 8th

II. Non Agenda Public Comment (2 minutes each):

Paul Spears: Wanting to clarify from last meeting (general NPPC), the commercial strip on Wightman, a 2004 report stated that 39 out of 44 properties on Wightman were considered of contributing character.

Deborah Hill: Thanking Lucky about noticing the public regarding the meeting today. Hoping that Wightman St gets looked at for the future

Elizabeth Lucas: Just learned about the Wightman St issue, understand that its been going on for a long time. Understand that there is a put for residential to convert commercial on north side of Wightman – it would be unfortunate to compromise the character of that street. How is the public noticed for these meetings? Posted on NorthParkPlanning.org, email lists. The next agenda says neighborhood designation, what does that mean?

Dionne: Chairs the facilities committee, regarding the bike lanes going in along the Wightman – please contact her for your input.

Lucky: Thank you for coming in, get on the email distribution list to become better informed

Justin Tjalma: Informing us of a new ministerial project (not required for public review) at 4110 Louisiana – which will include five row homes and side by side parking.

Steve Codraro: Asking for clarification regarding the proposal on Wightman. We will need to discuss with the city planner.

III. Action Items:

a. Community Plan Update Discussion: Urban Design Element

Design standards for proposed Albertson's and Von's specific sites

Discussion shown below in addendum

b. Public outreach efforts - discussion

Elizabeth: Flyers at grocery stores and checkout

Uptown news, north park news

Howard: Being consistent is the best thing, don't be afraid to use the board.

Public comment: Business that would like to give more advertising could they help subsidize the noticing costs? (No – conflict of interest)

Daniel: Topics bring people – tell what is being discussed. Nextdoor.com is a good place to notice.

Dionne: Met with the Nextdoor rep – requested that all the neighborhoods be together in North Park.

Steve: Development services sends email regarding new development projects, you can get on the list.

Elizabeth: Publicly notice at events

Antoinette: Online what will be discussed and what was discussed previously is helpful

Rob: Regarding advertising – we have to avoid this due to potential conflicts of interest in the future.

IV. Information Items: None

V. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items: None

VI. Adjournment: Motion to Adjourn Steve/Dionne(7:54PM), 10-0-0

Next Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee meeting date: Monday, July 7, 2014

For information about the Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee please visit northparkplanning.org or contact the Chair, Peter Hill, at urbandesign@northparkplanning.org or (619) 846-2689.

** **Subcommittee Membership & Quorum:** When all 15 elected NPPC Board Member seats are filled, the maximum total of seated (voting) UD-PR Subcommittee members is 13 (up to 7 elected NPPC Board Members and up to 6 seated North Park community members). To constitute a quorum, a majority of the seated UD-PR Subcommittee members must be elected NPPC Board Members.*

*** **Community Voting Members:** North Park residents and business owners may gain UD-PR Subcommittee voting rights by becoming a General Member of the NPPC and by attending three UD-PR Subcommittee meetings. Please sign-in on the meeting attendance list and notify the Chair or Vice-Chair if you are attending to gain Subcommittee voting rights.*

North Park Planning Committee meetings are held on the second floor of the North Park Christian Fellowship (2901 North Park Way, 2nd Floor), on the third Tuesday of each month, at 6:30 pm. The next scheduled NPPC meeting is on April 15, 2014.

For additional information about the North Park Planning Committee, please like our Facebook page and follow our Twitter feed: NPPlanning

Addendum:Item III.a.

Community Plan Update Discussion: Urban Design Element

Design standards for proposed Albertson's and Von's (30th and Howard) specific sites

From Peter Hill: What do we want these spaces to look like 20+ years out? Looking for input for the possible future development. How do these spaces integrate? Spark neighborhood revitalization? Peter walked through the handout which shows the Vons and Albertsons sites, gives examples of urban design language with visual explanations, so that we can all be on the same page regarding technical terms moving forward.

Ernie: Meade up to El Cajon Blvd – we had a gradual step up in place (1986 plan)

Regarding Albertson's site:

Comments from the public – Paul: would have a problem regarding similar design of the uptown district shopping center because it turns its back on the neighborhood. Elizabeth: regarding site design, is the city's parking design required to be inside? What comes to mind (Balboa and Genesee shopping center) and the feeling of being boxed in – would be preferable to have parking external, not internal. Also taller buildings in center of lot vs. on the outer edge. Deborah Hill: mixed use seems more appropriate, step down effect to decrease the monolithic look. The parking issue is a problem in particular to this area. Are many going underground for parking? Maybe mixed use complicates this?

Antoinette: What is the existing zoning? (CL2 – commercial or residential – height possible is 65 ft.) Make a square, with green space for gardens in the center. Houses on the outside, parking on the ground floor or underground.

Lucky: Regarding CiPOZ – if height limit is 65ft on university, what can we realistically ask for?

Kitty: Builders don't like to put in underground parking because it's too expensive.

Ken Growth: living across the street from the Albertson's, hearing talk about this site, is there a plan for changing this site? No, we are just thinking about what we would like to see for potential future development (be prepared in the community plan update).

Terry Goodbody: Parking will be an issue, liked KFC for supplying parking off street. Grocery stores need to provide parking. Many people in the neighborhood are getting frustrated about the parking issue, especially with all the new bars going in and no one uses the parking structure on 30th and University.

Steve C.: Developmental services will provide info on specific sites, it takes time to get, but can be done.

Dionne: Walked Wightman St and Albertsons site today – made sense to have commercial on the University side with curb cuts on University because of the bike path going in and the residential character. It's single family along Whitman with trees, green space. parking is difficult. Height should be on University side, not residential side with step up. If we want underground parking, what are we willing to give up? An extra floor?

Rob Steppke: 65ft will include parking at grade (example: Vons in Mission Hills). Agree with the concept Louisiana and Front – Louisiana – would like to see residential. El Cajon Blvd and 5th Ave are different spaces – El Cajon is a car oriented space, 5th is a different space – would recommend curb cuts on University to handle traffic.

Ernie: Roof parking. Uptown planners worked with the Vons developer and they were shocked at what they got vs. what they asked for.

Rachel: Concern for this space is getting projects like the Atlas in Hillcrest, which does not fit the neighborhood context, is bulky, etc.

Lucky: You want to think about shadowing, you want to be careful and aware of what you ask for.

Daniel: Sees mixed use along University Ave. – 30 and 45 ft, parking could go between residential and commercial. He likes the Ralphs downtown, parking underground. Likes the idea to incorporate rooftop gardens.

Kitty: Wants to remind everyone that what is important is to stick together. With the water issue, we need to think about hardscape, not landscape.

Rick: Does Albertsons own that property? Yes. They could just do a ministerial project.

Ernie: Mobility project (University Ave) putting parking on side streets.

Rob: University and Alabama – the median, limited amount of access on that street. Regarding Vons – BRT line down El Cajon Blvd and 30th.

Peter: KFC and Jack in the Box – remodeling vs. rebuilding under same permit. Regarding uptown district shopping center - feeling boxed in – understand that perspective.

Regarding Vons site:

Paul: FYI - Albertsons parent co bought Vons.

Deborah: We had a neighborhood problem regarding their recycling and asked them to move it. Vons has that issue now.

Daniel: Looking at bowling alley, 30th and El Cajon – look at designs that fit that neighborhood.

Lucky: Community plans are in place and not updated frequently – public impact is important.

Rachel: Would like to see consistency along 30th regarding commercial, height and setbacks.

Ernie: We will be faced with the developer having a choice to work with the community first.

Robb: L.A. has Pavilions grocery store – could be a tactic to draw a different shopper.

Steve: Would volunteer to collect the zoning details regarding these sites. CIPOZ could give us more control where none exists currently.

Dionne: Sees the CIPOZ as a potential tool. Southeast corner of the Vons site has residential character, how you look at massing, would like to see more articulation, less massing. 30th St seems appropriate for commercial. Howard also has more commercial as well. Liked the discussion regarding parking on the roof – seen it in Pasadena done very well, interested in that as an idea here.

Kitty: Vons did some remodeling a few years ago, they added walls to screen the carts.

Lucky: Grocery stores need access for delivery trucks.

Peter: Commercial on 30th makes sense. Keeping the setback consistent. Idea of along El Cajon Blvd – allowing residential where we might traditionally have commercial because of vacant spaces.

Terry Goodbody: residents are scared of a wall abutting the neighborhood. Bulk of the building in the center, parking around. Roof top parking is cheaper than underground. Likes the idea. Hamilton row housing is a good example of parking.

Howard Blackson: 30th and Howard is your big retail, parking on the roof would be great. Row homes on Ohio – there should be a buffer, zoning doesn't give you that option.



Cycle Issues DRAFT

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003B

Project Information

Project Nbr: 367739

Title: 3132 Herman Ave. NDP



Project Mgr: Daly, Tim

(619) 446-5356

TPDaly@sandiego.gov

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

Submitted: 05/21/2014 Deemed Complete on 05/27/2014

Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review

Cycle Distributed: 05/27/2014

Reviewer: Tripp, Bill

Assigned: 05/27/2014

(619) 446-5273

Started: 06/24/2014

wtripp@sandiego.gov

Review Due: 06/24/2014

Hours of Review: 4.00

Completed: 06/24/2014

Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

Closed:

- . The review due date was changed to 07/02/2014 from 06/27/2014 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

Review 6.24.14

Issue

Cleared?	Num	Issue Text
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Planning Review has determined that, due to project compliance with all applicable development regulations, there are no issues with the proposed reconfiguration of the existing SFR, on the site, which is previously conforming with respect to density.
		No work is being proposed for the detached dwelling unit. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/21/2014	Deemed Complete on 05/27/2014
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 05/27/2014	
Reviewer: Cooper, Scott (619) 446-5378 SJCooper@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/28/2014	
	Started: 05/28/2014	
Hours of Review: 8.50	Review Due: 06/27/2014	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 06/26/2014	
	Closed:	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

1st Review (June '14)

Project Scope

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED - Neighborhood Development Permit for a 342-square-foot first floor addition to an existing 1,603-square-foot, one story, single-dwelling residence with a 516-square-foot detached garage. In addition, an existing 584-square-foot, one-story, single-dwelling residence would remain on the project site. The project is located at 3132 Herman Avenue. The land use designation for the project site is Low Density Residential per the community plan. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Furthermore, the project is located within the RS-1-7 zone and the Federal Aviation Administration Part 77 (SDIA-Lindbergh Field) within the Greater North Park Community Plan area. (New Issue)

Biological Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED - The project site is an existing developed site within an urbanized residential area. Review of aerial and street level photography appears to show that onsite landscaping in non-native and the project site does not contain any sensitive biological resources on site. The project site does not contain any sensitive riparian habitat or other identified habitat community. Furthermore, the project site does not contain nor is it adjacent to MHPA designated lands. No further comment is required. (New Issue)

Geologic Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED - The proposed development is located within Geological Hazard Category 52 defined as "Other Terrain" with level or sloping terrain, unfavorable geologic structure with low to moderate risk. The project is located on an existing developed site in which previous grading operations have taken place. Per the City of San Diego Significance Determination Thresholds, a Geotechnical Report is not required with a Coastal Development Permit (Process III). No further comment is required. (New Issue)

Historical Resources (Built En)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	- INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED - Historical Resources staff determined that the property / structures are not individually designated resources and are not located within a designated historic district. Furthermore, the property does not meet designation criteria as a significant resource under any criteria. EAS has no further comments on this issue. All pertinent information will be included within the appropriate environmental document. (New Issue)

Historical Resources (Archv)

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

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Scott Cooper at (619) 446-5378. Project Nbr: 367739 / Cycle: 3





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	- -INFORMATIONAL ONLY NO RESPONSE NEEDED- -

The project site is not located within a high sensitivity area on the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Sensitivity map. There is no potential to impact any unique or non-unique historical resources and no further work is required. EAS has no further comments on this issue.
 (New Issue)

Paleontological Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	The proposed project site is underlain by the Lindavista Formation which is assigned a moderate potential for fossil resources. Paleontological monitoring during grading activities may be required if it is determined that the project's earth movement quantity exceeds the Paleontological threshold (if greater than 12,000 cubic yards and 10 feet deep for formations with a high sensitivity). In addition, monitoring may be required for shallow grading (less than ten feet) when a site has been previously graded and/or unweathered formations are present at the surface. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	In order for EAS to determine if a potential impact would result to paleontological resources, please provide the total amount of grading and/or disturbance (import/export, amount of fill, and depth of cut) proposed for the project on the project plans. (New Issue)

Water Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Engineering Review is requesting that a Water Quality Study be submitted. Please refer to comments provided by Engineering Review for further direction. Additionally, please provide EAS with a copy of the technical report. (New Issue)

Other (Grading)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Please provide a Grading Data Table with cut/fill and import/export quantities, plus the depths of cut and fill. (New Issue)

Environmental Determination

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Until the requested information has been provided, staff is not able to complete the environmental review for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. Additionally, the new information may lead to the requirement of new and/or additional technical studies. A determination as to the appropriate environmental document will be made based on all reviewed and submitted information. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/21/2014	Deemed Complete on 05/27/2014
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 05/27/2014	
Reviewer: Huynh, Khanh (619) 446-5299 KHuynh@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/27/2014	
	Started: 06/23/2014	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 06/24/2014	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 06/23/2014	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/02/2014 from 06/27/2014 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 16 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

1st Review comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The subject development is a standard BMPs project which requires the applicant to submit a water quality study report in accordance with the City's Storm Water Standards. The report shall include, but not be limited to how source control and site design have been incorporated to the project, selection and responsible party for future maintenance and associated costs. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The report will also need to address water quality, by describing the type of pollutants which will be generated during postconstruction, the pollutants to be captured and treated by the proposed BMPs and the quality of the resultant discharge. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The Storm Water Standards are available online at www.sandiego.gov/developmentservices/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Engineering Reviewer has the template for the Water Quality Study. If needed, please contact the reviewer for the template. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Please revise the site plan, sheet A-1.0 to remove the Owners's Certificate Standard Single Family Residential Project for Post-Construction BMPs. This certificate is no longer acceptable. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	On the site plan, sheet A-1.0 please revise the legal description to include the block number six (6). Also, please include the legal descriptions for all adjacent properties. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Please revise the site plan, sheet A-1.0 to show all the existing water services and sewer lateral serving this project site. Please include the reference drawings for their improvements. If there is any public utility easement, please show/call it out. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Please revise the site plan, sheet A-1.0 to show the existing and/or proposed grading contours, earthwork quantities, maximum height of cut/fill slope. If no grading is proposed, please add a note: "No grading is proposed". In addition, include the benchmark, source and date of the topographic information. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Revise the site plan, sheet A-1.0 to include the following: benchmark: Herman Avenue and Thorn Street, NWBP, elevation: 324.588 M.S.L. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Please revise the site plan to show the proposed drainage patterns, the collection and discharge points for all onsite drains. Please explain how the drainage from the project site will be discharge onto the public drainage system. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Please revise the site plan to include the following two notes: (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Prior to the issuance for any construction permit, the Owner/Parmittee shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). TheWPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix E of the City's Storm Water Standards. (New Issue)

Draft conditions

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Khanh Huynh at (619) 446-5299. Project Nbr: 367739 / Cycle: 3





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent BMP maintenance, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall incorporated any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the Municipal Code, into construction plans or specifications. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix E of the City's Storm Water Standards. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

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

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/21/2014	Deemed Complete on 05/27/2014
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 05/27/2014	
Reviewer: Daly, Tim	Assigned: 05/27/2014	
(619) 446-5356	Started: 05/27/2014	
TPDaly@sandiego.gov	Review Due: 06/24/2014	
Hours of Review: 0.30	Completed: 05/27/2014	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/02/2014 from 06/27/2014 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).

North Park Planning Cmte

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact VICKI GRANOWITZ, Chair for the North Park Planning Committee @ (619) 584-1203 or email, info@northparkplanning.org, 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)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Please provide a copy of the planning group's final recommendation, vote count, and any conditions. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

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

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/21/2014	Deemed Complete on 05/27/2014
Reviewing Discipline: Park & Rec	Cycle Distributed: 05/27/2014	
Reviewer: Harkness, Jeff	Assigned: 05/28/2014	
(619) 533-6595	Started: 05/28/2014	
Jharkness@sandiego.gov	Review Due: 06/24/2014	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Completed: 05/28/2014	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/02/2014 from 06/27/2014 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.

Review 6-27-14

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue 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 this proposed single family residence addition. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Submitted: 05/21/2014 Deemed Complete on 05/27/2014
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Historic Cycle Distributed: 05/27/2014
Reviewer: Stanco, Kelley Assigned: 05/29/2014
(619) 236-6545 Started: 06/23/2014
Kstanco@sandiego.gov Review Due: 06/24/2014
Hours of Review: 0.50 Completed: 06/23/2014
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) Closed:

- The review due date was changed to 07/02/2014 from 06/27/2014 per agreement with customer.
The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.

6/23/2014

Table with columns: Cleared?, Issue Num, Issue Text. Contains 9 rows of issue details regarding historical resource reviews and designations.



Cycle Issues DRAFT

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	

Because the property is not eligible for designation, the plans have not been stamped by Plan-Historic staff. No Plan-Historic stamps are required for permit issuance. Should you have any questions regarding this review, please contact the "Reviewer" listed at the top of this cycle issues report. (Info Only, No Response Required)
(New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

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

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/21/2014	Deemed Complete on 05/27/2014
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Airport	Cycle Distributed: 05/27/2014	
Reviewer: Galloway, Tait (619) 533-4550 tgalloway@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/28/2014	
	Started: 06/03/2014	
Hours of Review: 0.20	Review Due: 06/24/2014	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 06/03/2014	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/02/2014 from 06/27/2014 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.

ALUCP 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The proposed project is within the Airport Influence Area Review Area 2 for the SDIA Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project is not increasing structure height; therefore notification to the FAA is not required. The City is NOT required to submit the Airport Land Use Commission. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

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

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/21/2014	Deemed Complete on 05/27/2014
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Transportation Dev	Cycle Distributed: 05/27/2014	
Reviewer: Khaligh, Kamran (619) 446-5357 khalighK@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/28/2014	
	Started: 06/24/2014	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 06/24/2014	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 06/24/2014	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 07/02/2014 from 06/27/2014 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

New Issue Group (1942060)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Transportation Development Section no longer reviews the single family dwelling unit projects and accessory uses on a single lot. LDR-Engineering Review will address site access and LDR-Planning Review will address the on site parking. (New Issue)

