



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

August 15, 2011

Stephen Lombardi
Steven Lombardi Architect
1926 Bacon street
San Diego, CA 92107

Dear Steven:

Subject: CHATEAU BEAU SOLEIL Assessment Letter; Project No. 241828; IO No. 24001875 Pacific Beach

The Development Services Department has completed the **Initial Review** of the project referenced above, and described as a Coastal Development Permit to construct a 6,360 sq ft single family residence on a vacant 0.27 acre site at 889 Sunset Cliffs Blvd in the RS-1-7 Zone within the Peninsula Community Plan, Coastal Overlay (appealable), Coastal Ht Limit, Parking Impact, Residential Tandem Parking, FAA Part 77. Council District 2..

Enclosed is a Cycle Issues Report (Enclosure 1) which contains review comments from staff representing various disciplines, outside agencies and the community planning group. 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.

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 2 Coastal Development Permit for proposed development within the Coastal Zone non-appealable area.

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.

- **Utilities Location:** Existing Water service is located where parking spaces are proposed which may hinder public utilities maintenance of the water meter service. This utility will need to be relocated so that it is not within the driveway (See Enclosure 1, Cycle Issues Report, LDR-Engineering and PUD comments).
- **INFORMATIONAL:** Please disregard comment no. 6 from LDR-Planning requesting a biology letter survey. Subsequent to the closure of the review LDR-Environmental staff has volunteered to evaluate biology significance at the same time conducting a site survey to determine any archeological significance (See Enclosure 1, Cycle Issues Report, LDR-Planning and LDR-Environmental comments). Therefore, at this time, a biology letter survey is not required.

III. STUDIES/REPORTS REQUIRED: Documents have been identified as necessary to the project's review. Reference the attached Submittal Requirements Report (Enclosure 3). Studies required for the project include:

❖ **Water Quality Study**

IV. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS: Our current accounting system does not provide for real-time information regarding account status, however, our records show approximately \$2,000 billed to date.

V. TIMELINE:

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 14 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: When you are ready to resubmit, please telephone (619) 446-5300 and request an appointment for a "Submittal-Discretionary Resubmittal." Resubmittals may also be done on a walk-in basis, however you may experience a longer than desirable wait time. In either case, please check in on the third floor of the Development Service Center (1222 First Avenue) to be placed on the list for the submittal counter. At your appointment, 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. Cycle Issues Report response letter: 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.

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 Suhail Khalil, Chairperson of the Peninsula Community Planning Group, at (619) 224-1527 to schedule your project for a recommendation from the group. If you have already obtained a recommendation from

Page 4
Stephen Lombardi
August 15, 2011

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://clerkdoc.sannet.gov/Website/council-policy>.

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>

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)446-5201 or via e-mail at mdye@sandiego.gov.

Sincerely,



William Zounes for Morris Dye
Development Project Manager

Enclosures:

1. Cycle Issues Report
2. Required Findings
3. Submittal Requirements Report

cc: File
Suhail Khalil, Chairperson of the Peninsula Community Planning Group
Reviewing Staff (Assessment letter only)
Tony Kempton, Long Range Planning



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: **241828** Title: CHATEAU BEAU SOLEIL
Project Mgr: Zounes, Will (619) 687-5942 wzounes@sandiego.gov



Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Submitted: 06/15/2011 | Deemed Complete on 07/06/2011 |
| Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review | Cycle Distributed: 07/06/2011 | |
| Reviewer: Tripp, Bill (619) 446-5273 | Assigned: 07/06/2011 | |
| Hours of Review: 8.00 | Started: 08/02/2011 | |
| Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Review Due: 08/18/2011 | |
| | Completed: 08/11/2011 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 08/15/2011 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 08/18/2011 from 08/08/2011 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 8 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 133 reviews, 48.1% were on-time, and 74.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review 8.03.11

Project Scope

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The 12,000 sq. ft. project site (0.27-acre) is addressed as 889 Sunset Cliffs Blvd., and located on the easterly side of Sunset Cliffs Bl., south of Monaco, north of Bandini and west of Cordova Streets, within the RS-1-7 Zone (Single-Family Residential), and Peninsula Community Plan Area. The site is also mapped as containing sensitive and potentially sensitive biological resources which are regulated as Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL); within the FAA Part 77 Noticing Area (Lindbergh and NAS North Island); |
| | | continued ... (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Coastal Height Limitation and Coastal (City-Appealable), Parking Impact (Coastal and Beach), and Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zones. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | The project proposes construct a three-story, 6,353 sq. ft. single-dwelling unit with a 3-car basement (3,526 sq. ft.) parking garage, and 3 surface parking spaces off the existing alley, on an existing 12,000 sq. ft. undeveloped legal lot, |
| | | Development of the site is subject to the development regulations in Land Development Code (LDC) Sections 131.0401 through 131.0466, and 143.0101 through 143.0160 (ESL) as applicable. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Resubmit the plans for plan check. You may contact the Planning Reviewer at (619) 446-5273 if you have any questions. (New Issue) |

Permits Required

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | A Coastal Development Permit (CDP), decision Process 3, is required for development within the Coastal Overlay Zone. Process 3 decisions are made by a Hearing Officer whose decision may be appealed to the Planning Commission. |
| | | Refer to LDC Sections 126.0701 through 126.0724. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | A Neighborhood Development Permit (NDP), decision Process 2, may be required for development on land containing sensitive biological resources (ESL). Please submit a biology letter survey report prepared in accordance with the City's biological review guidelines. The report shall contain a determination whether sensitive biological resources existing on-site and, if so, the type, location, and quantity. |
| | | Refer to LDC Sections 126.0402(b) and 143.0141. |
| | | If a NDP is required, it will be processed concurrently with the CDP under decision Process 3. (New Issue) |

CDP Findings

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



L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Section 126.0708 1. The proposed coastal development will not encroach upon any existing physical access way 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; and 2. The proposed coastal development will not adversely affect environmentally sensitive lands; and (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 8 | 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; and 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. (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 9 | Supplemental Findings--Environmentally Sensitive Lands Within the Coastal Overlay Zone 1. Based on the economic information provided by the applicant, as well as any other relevant evidence, each use provided for in the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations would not provide any economically viable use of the applicant's property; and 2. Application of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations would interfere with the applicant's reasonable investment-backed expectations; and (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 10 | 3. The use proposed by the applicant is consistent with the applicable zoning; and 4. The use and project design, siting, and size are the minimum necessary to provide the applicant with an economically viable use of the premises; and 5. The project is the least environmentally damaging alternative and is consistent with all provisions of the certified Local Coastal Program with the exception of the provision for which the deviation is requested. (New Issue) |

NDP Findings

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 11 | Section 126.0404 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. (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 12 | Supplemental Findings--Environmentally Sensitive Lands 1. The site is physically suitable for the design and siting of the proposed development and the development will result in minimum disturbance to environmentally sensitive lands; 2. The proposed development will minimize the alteration of natural land forms and will not result in undue risk from geologic and erosional forces, flood hazards, or fire hazards; (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 13 | 3. The proposed development will be sited and designed to prevent adverse impacts on any adjacent environmentally sensitive lands; and 4. The proposed development will be consistent with the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan. (New Issue) |

Development Regulations

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





L64A-003A

| Cleared? | Issue Num | Issue Text |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 14 | Maximum density - one dwelling unit, one unit proposed |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 15 | project complies (New Issue) Minimum lot area - 5,000 s.q ft. 12,000 sq. ft. existing, project complies (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 16 | Minimum lot dimensions - frontage - 50 ft., 75-ft existing, complies width - 50 ft., 75-ft existing, complies width (corner) - 55 ft., not applicable depth - 95 ft., 160-ft., complies (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 17 | Minimum setbacks - front - 15 ft., 15-ft provided, complies side (interior) - 0.08 x lot width (75) = 6-ft, 6-ft provided, complies side (street) - 0.10 x lot width - not applicable rear - 13 ft., 7'-6" provided, complies with Section 131.0443(a)(2) which allows one-half of the alley width (10-ft) to be included - complies (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 18 | Setbacks for resubdivided corner lots - not applicable (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 19 | Maximum structure height - 30-ft 30'-0" proposed project complies (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 20 | Lot coverage for sloping lots - 131.0445(a) - does not apply |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 21 | (New Issue) Maximum floor area ratio - 12,000 sq. ft. x 0.53 - 6,360 sq. ft. 6,353 sq. ft. indicated project complies (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 22 | Maximum paving/hardscape, refer to LDC Section 131.0447 demonstrate compliance on plans (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 23 | Accessory uses and structures - refer to LDC Section 131.0448 (a and b) - none proposed project complies (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 24 | Garage regulations - refer to LDC Section 131.0449(a) - does not apply (New Issue) |



L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 25 | Building spacing - refer to LDC Section 131.0450 - not applicable (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 26 | Maximum third story dimension - refer to LDC Section 131.0460 - project complies (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 27 | Architectural projections and encroachments - refer to LDC Section 131.0461(a) - none proposed (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 28 | Supplemental requirements - refer to LDC Section 131.0464(a) - not applicable (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 29 | Bedroom regulations - does not apply (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 30 | Refuse and recyclable material storage - refer to LDC Section 142.0805 does not apply (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 31 | Based on submitted plans, the proposed project complies with the Proposition 'D' Height Limit. (New Issue) |

CONDITIONS

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 32 | Prior to framing inspection, a pad elevation certificate shall be performed by a licensed civil engineer indicating the pad elevation. A copy of this certificate shall be provided to LDR - Planning Review, and a copy to the field inspector. |

The purpose of this condition is to ensure the conceptual development as proposed, is constructed and completed to observe the maximum 30'-0" height limit. (New Issue)



L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Submitted: 06/15/2011 | Deemed Complete on 07/06/2011 |
| Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental | Cycle Distributed: 07/06/2011 | |
| Reviewer: Szymanski, Jeffrey (619) 446-5324 | Assigned: 07/07/2011 | |
| Hours of Review: 3.00 | Started: 08/15/2011 | |
| Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Review Due: 08/08/2011 | |
| | Completed: 08/15/2011 | COMPLETED LATE |
| | Closed: 08/15/2011 | |

- 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 3 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- Last month LDR-Environmental performed 86 reviews, 51.2% were on-time, and 67.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Extended Initial Study

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Entitlements Division has reviewed the referenced project and has determined that additional information is required for Paleontological Resources and Historical Resources (Archaeology). Until the above issues have been addressed, the CEQA determination can not be made and the environmental processing time line will be held in abeyance. (New Issue) |

Paleontological Resources

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | The project site is overlain by Very Old Paralic Deposits and Point Loma Formation. Point Loma Formation is consider to be a sensitive paleontological formation. In accordance with the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds projects that would require grading in excess of 1,000 cubic yards of soil removal to a depth greater than 10 feet could significantly impact this resource. Therefore, please provide the grading qualities for the entire site and the depth of the excavation. This information will be employed to determine if mitigation would be required. (New Issue) |

Historical Resources-Archaeolo

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | The project is currently vacant and is located just south of a recorded archaeological site. Qualified City staff will conduct a site survey in order to determine in any further archaeological evaluations would be required. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Submitted: 06/15/2011 | Deemed Complete on 07/06/2011 |
| Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review | Cycle Distributed: 07/06/2011 | |
| Reviewer: Canning, Jack (619) 446-5425 | Assigned: 07/06/2011 | |
| | Started: 07/29/2011 | |
| Hours of Review: 6.00 | Review Due: 08/03/2011 | |
| Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Completed: 08/03/2011 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 08/15/2011 | |

- The review due date was changed to 08/18/2011 from 08/08/2011 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 13 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 55 reviews, 85.5% were on-time, and 58.7% 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 | Revise the Site Plan Sheet A-4. Add the finished floor elevation. Add a Grading Data Table with cut/fill and import/export quantities, plus the depths of cut and fill. Add surface drainage flow patterns and slope gradient, and the collection and discharge points for all site and roof drains. Please Note: surface drainage will not be allowed to drain directly over the existing hillside. Show how the storm water will be collected, treated and discharged onto Sunset Cliffs Boulevard or the alley. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Submit a Water Quality Study, listed in next time documents, that Identifies Pollutants from the Project Area (pg 4-3) and addresses how the 5 possible Low Impact Development (LID) BMP's and 15 possible Source Control BMP's (pgs 4-1 thru 3-7) have been incorporated into the project. (continued below) (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | If any of the 20 possible BMP's have not been used in the project design, add a discussion in the report why the omitted BMP's are not feasible or not applicable. Please Note: A Water Quality Study is required, not a Water Quality Technical Report. City's Storm Water Standards are available online at: http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Revise the Site Plan Sheet A-4. Show and call out the damaged AC alley shall be reconstructed with current City Standard G-21 full-width concrete alley. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Revise the Garage/Basement Level 3 Sheet A-2 and Site Plan Sheet A-4. Change how the vehicle access gate opens. Add a note that states: No alley access gate shall swing open into the alley Right-of-Way. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Revise the Site Plan Sheet A-4. Existing water service is located where parking spaces are proposed which will hinder Public Utilities maintenance of the water meter and service, which is unacceptable. Therefore show and call out the existing water service will be removed at the main and a new water service constructed in an area free of parking spaces or obstructions. Show and call out the location of the new water service and current City Standard SDW-137 traffic rated meter box and lid. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | Revise the Garage/Basement Level 3 Sheet A-2 and Site Plan Sheet A-4. Show and dimension the garage and surface parking spaces, so they can be verified they meet San Diego Municipal Code Table 142-05J. Add a dimension showing that garage parking space No.6 has a minimum of 24 feet clear behind the parking space, which shall be measured from the open access door into the garage. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | Revise the Site Plan Sheet A-4. Add a note that states: 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"/> | 10 | Revise the Site Plan Sheet A-4. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 | Revise the Site Plan Sheet A-4. Add a note that states: 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) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 | Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 | Additional comments may be recommended pending further review or 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) |



L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Submitted: 06/15/2011 | Deemed Complete on 07/06/2011 |
| Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group | Cycle Distributed: 07/06/2011 | |
| Reviewer: Zounes, Will (619) 687-5942 | Assigned: 08/01/2011 | |
| Hours of Review: 1.00 | Started: 08/01/2011 | |
| Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Review Due: 08/03/2011 | |
| | Completed: 08/01/2011 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 08/15/2011 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 08/18/2011 from 08/08/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 44 reviews, 47.7% were on-time, and 65.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Peninsula CPG

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Please contact the Chair for the Peninsula Community Planning Board, Suhail Khalil at (619) 224.1527 to make arrangements to present your project for review at their next available meeting. This Community Plannig 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) |





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Submitted: 06/15/2011 | Deemed Complete on 07/06/2011 |
| Reviewing Discipline: Coastal Commission | Cycle Distributed: 07/06/2011 | |
| Reviewer: Zounes, Will (619) 687-5942 | Assigned: 08/01/2011 | |
| Hours of Review: 1.00 | Started: 08/01/2011 | |
| Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Review Due: 08/03/2011 | |
| | Completed: 08/01/2011 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 08/15/2011 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 08/18/2011 from 08/08/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Coastal Commission on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Coastal Commission (all of which are new).
- . Last month Coastal Commission performed 3 reviews, .0% were on-time, and 66.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Coastal Commission Comments

| <u>Issue</u> | | |
|--------------------------|------------|--|
| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | As of August 1, 2011, comments from the California Coastal Commission have need been received by the City of San Diego. If comments are received they will be provided to the applicant. (New Issue) |



L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Submitted: 06/15/2011 | Deemed Complete on 07/06/2011 |
| Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Facilities Financing | Cycle Distributed: 07/06/2011 | |
| Reviewer: Galvez III, Oscar (619) 533-3685 | Assigned: 07/06/2011 | |
| Hours of Review: 1.00 | Started: 07/18/2011 | |
| Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Review Due: 08/03/2011 | |
| | Completed: 07/18/2011 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 08/15/2011 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 08/18/2011 from 08/08/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Facilities Financing on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with Plan-Facilities Financing (all of which are new).
- . Last month Plan-Facilities Financing performed 38 reviews, 97.4% were on-time, and 100.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Impact Fees

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | A Development Impact Fee (DIF) is required at building permit issuance based upon the determination that the project will result in an increase of dwelling unit(s) over what currently exists on the site. The currently adopted Peninsula DIF rate for residential development is \$3,102 per unit. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | In addition, a Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) fee of \$2,474 per single-family unit will be assessed. These fees were adopted by Resolution #303554 on April 14, 2008. This fee is applicable only on new residential development. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Fees are subject to change upon Council approval of an update to the Public Facilities Financing Plan and/or at the beginning of the new fiscal year (July 1), requiring developer's verification of fees prior to finalization of the building permit process Contact: Oscar Galvez III, Facilities Financing Project Manager, at (619) 533-3685. (New Issue) |





THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Submitted: 06/15/2011 | Deemed Complete on 07/06/2011 |
| Reviewing Discipline: PUD-Water & Sewer Dev | Cycle Distributed: 07/06/2011 | |
| Reviewer: Ruiz, Alejandro (619) 235-1991 | Assigned: 07/07/2011 | |
| Hours of Review: 3.50 | Started: 08/01/2011 | |
| Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) | Review Due: 08/03/2011 | |
| | Completed: 08/01/2011 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 08/15/2011 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 08/18/2011 from 08/08/2011 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 PUD-Water & Sewer Dev on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with PUD-Water & Sewer Dev (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month PUD-Water & Sewer Dev performed 62 reviews, 96.8% were on-time, and 83.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Informational Items:

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Additional sewer capacity fees will be due and collected at the issuance of building permits. These fees are determined as part of the building permits process. Questions about capacity fees should be directed to Information and Application Services (619) 446-5000. (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Water capacity charges will be due at the time of building permit issuance. Capacity charges, as well as service and meter size, are determined by the Water Meter Data Card which is completed during the building plan review process. Any questions regarding water capacity fees should be addressed to Information and Application Services (619-446-5000). (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | If it is determined that the existing water services are not of adequate size to serve the proposed project, the applicant will be required to remove (kill) any existing unused water services and install new water service(s) and meter which must be located outside of any driveway or vehicular use area. (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4 | All water services to the site, including domestic, irrigation and fire, will require private, above ground back flow prevention devices (BFPDs). BFPDs are typically located on private property, in line with the service and immediately adjacent to the right-of-way. The Water Department will not permit the required BFPDs to be located below grade or within the structure. (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5 | All proposed public water facilities, including services and meters, must be designed and constructed in accordance with established criteria in the most current edition of the City of San Diego Water Facility Design Guidelines and City regulations, standards and practices pertaining thereto. (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 6 | All proposed public sewer facilities are to be designed and constructed in accordance with established criteria in the most current City of San Diego sewer design guide. (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 7 | All proposed private water and sewer facilities located within a single lot are to be designed to meet the requirements of the California Uniform Plumbing Code and will be reviewed as part of the building permit plan check. (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 8 | No trees or shrubs exceeding three feet in height at maturity shall be installed within ten feet of any water and sewer facilities. (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 9 | Utilization of existing sewer laterals is at the sole risk and responsibility of the Owner/Permittee to ensure the laterals are functional and connected to a public sewer facility. Prior to connecting to any existing sewer lateral, the lateral shall be inspected using a closed-circuit television (CCTV) by a California Licensed Plumbing Contractor to verify the lateral is in good working condition and free of all debris. (New Issue) [Recommended] |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 10 | If you have any questions regarding the water and sewer comments, please call Assistant Engineer Alejandro Ruiz at (619)235-1991 or send e-mail to aruiz@sandiego.gov (New Issue) [Recommended] |

First Review Comments (Cycle 2)

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 | The drawing numbers for the water and sewer mains are incorrect. The numbers for the sewer main is 29476-2-D and for the water main 2636-L. Please call the Development Services Department at (619) 446-5200 to obtain this information. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 | The proposed project will be required to install a backflow preventer device (BFPD). Please show it on the plans. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 | Per informational item 3, the exiting water service shall be located outside of the parking area. Rearrange the parking area or relocate the water service. (New Issue) |



L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 2 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Submitted:** 06/15/2011 Deemed Complete on 07/06/2011
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology **Cycle Distributed:** 07/06/2011
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick **Assigned:** 07/07/2011
(619) 446-5296 **Started:** 07/18/2011
Hours of Review: 4.00 **Review Due:** 08/03/2011
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Completed:** 08/03/2011 **COMPLETED ON TIME**
Closed: 08/15/2011

- . The review due date was changed to 08/18/2011 from 08/08/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 8 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 30 reviews, 100.0% were on-time, and 56.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review/Cycle 2 Information

| Cleared? | Issue Num | Issue Text |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The project site is located within geologic hazards zones 43 and 52 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 43 is characterized by coastal bluffs, generally unstable, unfavorable jointing, local high erosion. Zone 52 is characterized by other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain with favorable geologic structure, low risk. (New Issue) |

1st Review/Cycle 2 References

| Cleared? | Issue Num | Issue Text |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single-Family Residence, 889 Sunset Cliffs Boulevard, San Diego, California, prepared by Christian Wheeler Engineering, dated May 19, 2011 (their Project No. CWE 2110205.01) Site Plan, Chateau Beau Soleil, 889 Sunset Cliffs Blvd., San Diego, California 92107, prepared by Steven Lombardi Architect, Inc., dated June 14, 2011, revised July 7, 2011. (New Issue) |

1st Review/Cycle 2 Issues

| Cleared? | Issue Num | Issue Text |
|--------------------------|-----------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | The project seismic design parameters should be updated per the 2010 CBC. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Coastal Protective Devices: Please provide information whether or not coastal protective devices exist seaward of the site. If so, indicate whether or not the coastal protective device was permitted by the California Coastal Commission. If riprap, or a sea wall, or other coastal protective device was permitted and constructed to control bluff erosion or instability, the minimum setback for new construction is 40 feet per the City of San Diego Coastal Bluffs and Beaches guidelines. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Bluff Recession: Please provide an average bluff recession rate in feet per year and the resulting feet of bluff recession in 75 years. Please provide photographic copies or high density scans of historic photographs used in the analysis (.jpg or .tif format) as well as copies of any other documents used. Please indicate the points measured as part of the analysis. A site-specific rate must be determined for the site by using historical data, such as historic aerial photographs. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | If the rate exceeds 25 feet in 75 years, please provide a bluff edge setback suitable to preclude erosion of the bluff affecting the lot improvements for the specified period of time (75 years). Please provide an analysis of the potential effects on bluff stability of rising sea levels, wave run up from large storms and tsunamis, and of the potential effects of past and projected El Nino events on bluff stability, using latest scientific information. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Edge of Bluff: Please indicate the bluff edge, 40 foot setback, and proposed 15 foot encroachment on the site plan, if applicable. Please have the consultant provide three geologic cross section through the lot, including the bluff edge. The cross-sections must match the site plan and include all geologic information. Geologic units including fill soils and lot improvements must be shown and labeled. Fill distribution and thickness should be based on subsurface investigation by the consultant. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | The geotechnical consultant must provide a slope stability analysis for each of the cross-sections. The consultant must demonstrate and conclude that the project will not be subject to nor contribute to significant geologic instability throughout the anticipated life span of the structure. For purposes of the Sensitive Coastal Resource, that period is taken to be 75 years. (New Issue) |



L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | Construction Impacts: The geotechnical consultant must comment whether or not the proposed grading as recommended will measurably destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | Site Drainage: If low impact development (LID) is proposed, the geotechnical consultant must provide an addendum geotechnical report to address the feasibility of on-site storm water disposal/ infiltration systems and potential impacts regarding slope stability, fill settlement, piping of soil, and premature failure of pavement. The geotechnical consultant must comment whether or not the proposed on-site storm water disposal/ infiltration systems will have adverse impacts on adjacent properties located hydrologically downstream. (New Issue) |



Chateau Beau Soleil
Required Findings Project No. 241828

Coastal Development Permit - Section 126.0708

1. The proposed coastal development will not encroach upon any existing physical access way 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; and
2. The proposed coastal development will not adversely affect environmentally sensitive lands; and
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; and
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.

POSSIBLE NDP FINDINGS BELOW:

Neighborhood Development Permit - Section 126.0404

A.

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.**

Submittal Requirements



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

Enclosure 3 Submittal Report

8/15/11 10:25 am

Page 1 of 1

L64A-001

Project Information

Project Nbr: **241828** Title: CHATEAU BEAU SOLEIL
Project Mgr: Zounes, Will (619)687-5942 wzounes@sandiego.gov



Review Cycle Information

Review Cycle: 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

Opened: 08/15/2011 10:01 am

Submitted:

Due:

Closed:

Required Documents:

| <u>Package Type</u> | <u>Pkg Qty</u> | <u>Document Type</u> | <u>Qty Needed</u> |
|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Development Plans | 5 | Site Development Plans | 5 |
| Geotechnical Reports | 3 | Geotechnical Investigation Report | 3 |
| Water Quality Study | 3 | Water Quality Study | 3 |