



Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: **266825**

Title: COPLEY - PRICE FAMILY YMCA

Project Mgr: Black, Laura

(619) 236-6327

Lblack@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: PUD-Water & Sewer Dev	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Keshavarzi, Mahmood (619) 533-4692	Assigned: 03/26/2012	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Started: 04/03/2012	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
	Completed: 04/05/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for PUD-Water & Sewer Dev on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 8 outstanding review issues with PUD-Water & Sewer Dev (6 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month PUD-Water & Sewer Dev performed 70 reviews, 92.9% were on-time, and 76.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The existing sewer main within the alley right-of-way shall be relocated to the 43rd Street or Fairmount Avenue right-of-way. A sewer study is required to determine the size and location of the sewer main. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Revise sheet 3 of 17 to either relocate the proposed water and sewer services within Meade Avenue or revise location of the proposed driveway. Water and sewer service must be located outside of any driveway or vehicular use area. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Show and call out the existing water service (domestic, fire, irrigation) and sewer lateral, and identify to remain or abandon. If remain please call out future use. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Delete the existing 6" water main within El Cajon Boulevard. The existing 6" water main was abandoned per drawing 19136-D. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Revise location of the proposed water service within El Cajon Boulevard. Please provide 5' minimum separation between the proposed water service and the existing 24" storm drain. (From Cycle 6)

2nd Review Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	The existing utilities are not legible on sheet DD1.2 (New Issue)

Draft Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, the design and construction of any new water and sewer service(s) outside of any driveway, and the disconnection at the water main of the existing unused water service adjacent to the project site, in a manner satisfactory to the Director of Public Utilities and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall apply for a plumbing permit for the installation of appropriate private back flow prevention device(s), on each water service (domestic, fire and irrigation), in a manner satisfactory to the Director of Public Utilities and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	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)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy, all public water and sewer facilities shall be complete and operational in a manner satisfactory to the Director of Public Utilities and the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	The Owner/Permittee shall design and construct all proposed public water and sewer facilities in accordance with established criteria in the current edition of the City of San Diego Water Facility Design Guidelines and City regulations, standards and practices. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Abalos, Raynard (619) 446-5377	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
	Started: 04/02/2012	
Hours of Review: 1.50	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Completed: 04/02/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (7 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 128 reviews, 59.4% were on-time, and 40.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Expedite Rev Jan 2012

Project Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within the CUPD-CU-2-4 zone of the Central Urbanized Planned District, the City Heights Redevelopment Project Area, the Transit Area Overlay Zone, and the Kensington-Talmadge neighborhood of the Mid-City Communities Plan area. [Info Only - No Response Required] (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	This Sustainable Buildings Project proposes a privately operated, outdoor recreation facility and child care center, consisting of an approximately 53,100 sf recreation building with roof deck, a 7,300 sf enclosed pool building, a three-level parking garage, an outdoor soccer arena, an outdoor pool and other outdoor recreation areas on a 3.71 acre site with an existing 3-level parking garage. [Info Only - No Response Required] (From Cycle 6)

Permits

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The project requires the following discretionary permits: - Process Four Conditional Use Permit (CDP) for a Privately Operated, Outdoor Recreation Facility over 40,000 square feet in size. The project is subject to the separately regulated use requirements in SDMC 141.0618 and SDMC 141.0606(c) (see additional comments below). - Process Four Planned Development Permit (PDP) for proposed deviations (see additional comments below) (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	The applications for all discretionary actions and permits shall be consolidated for processing and shall be reviewed by a single decision maker. This project shall be decided in accordance with Process Four with the Planning Commission as the decision maker. The City Council may approve the project only if all required findings are made. The findings required for approval of each permit shall be considered individually, consistent with SDMC 126.0105. The decision can be appealed to the City Council in accordance with SDMC 112.0508. [Info Only - No Response Required] (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Provide draft findings for the SDP with the next submittal. The required findings are as follows: PDP - SDMC 126.0604(a) CUP - SDMC 126.0305 (From Cycle 6)

Deviations

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Provide a completed request for deviations form listing all requested deviations along with justification for why each deviation is necessary, and how the findings can be met. The approved form is available from the Development Project Manager. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Quantify all proposed deviations on Sheet DD1 (e.g. 10-foot or less street side setback along 25 percent of the street frontage where SDMC 151.0242 requires a maximum 10-foot setback along at least 70 percent of the street frontage). (From Cycle 6)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Raynard Abalos at (619) 446-5377. Project Nbr: 266825 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	The project proposes the following deviations through application of a PDP: - Deviation from the maximum allowable street side setback of 10 feet in SDMC 151.0242 - Deviation from the locational requirements for refuse and recyclable materials enclosures in SDMC 142.0810 - Deviation from the transparency requirement in SDMC 131.0552 - Deviation from the drive aisle width requirement in SDMC 142.0560 - Deviation from the landscape street yard planting points requirement (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	The intent of the Planned Development Permit regulations is to accommodate, to the greatest extent possible, an equitable balance of development types, intensities, styles, site constraints, project amenities, public improvements, community and City benefits and to provide flexibility in the application of development regulations for projects where strict application of the base zone development regulations would restrict design options and result in a less desirable project. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Deviations from the applicable base zone development regulations may be requested in order to provide flexibility in achieving a zone-equivalent project design that will be consistent with the intent of the base zone. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	The intent of the CUPD-CU-2-4 zone is to accommodate development with pedestrian orientation. The proposed deviation to the transparency requirement is not consistent with the intent of the zone. The deviation may be appropriate, but the project should offset the lack of transparency by adding additional features along the key intersections of El Cajon Blvd and 43rd St and El Cajon Blvd and Fairmount Ave. Areas reserved for pedestrian and public use on these corners would meet the intent of the zone. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	The supplemental PDP requirements (see below) also provide additional review criteria that support the above recommendation. In order to meet the supplemental PDP requirements, the intent of the zone and in order to make the required PDP findings, LDR-Planning recommends revising the project to satisfy Long-Range Planning's comments. (From Cycle 6)

Separately Regulated Use Reqs

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Privately Operated Outdoor Rec Facility The privately operated outdoor recreation facility is subject to the separately regulated use requirements in SDMC 141.0618. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	SDMC 141.0618(e) states that hours of operation may be limited so that neighboring development is not disturbed by noise and lights. Provide a written response (separate document) indicating the proposed hours of operation, especially for the soccer field and swimming pool, and discuss the how the hours of operation will not result in impacts related to noise and light with the adjacent uses. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	SDMC 141.0618(d) requires off-street parking at a level sufficient to serve the facility without impacting adjacent or nearby property. See Transportation's review for issues related to this requirement. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Child Care Center A child care center is allowed as a limited use in the zone, subject to the separately regulated use requirements in SDMC 141.0606(c). Provide a written response (separate document) indicating how the project conforms to all applicable requirements in SDMC 141.0606(c). (From Cycle 6)

Supplemental PDP Reqs

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	The project is subject to the supplemental PDP regulations in SDMC Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 4. Please revise per the following. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	SDMC 143.0460(d) states that fences and walls that are generally parallel to the public right-of-way and exceed 150 feet in length shall be articulated with vertical elements spaced at no more than 50 feet on center. These vertical elements shall be a minimum of 12 inches wide. Revise the planter wall along Fairmount Ave, adjacent to the outdoor and indoor pools, to comply with this requirement. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	SDMC 143.0460(e)(2) states that commercial developments should include public open areas or plazas that are accessible to the general public. Revise the project per Issues #11 above and per Long-Range Planning's comments. (From Cycle 6)

Corrections

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Provide a diagram that shows how each façade complies with the building articulation requirement in SDMC 131.0554. Use hatching or similar illustrations to indicate the different offsetting planes and provide a table showing how the planes comply with the offset requirements and area requirements. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	On Sheet DD1, revise the "Zoning Designation" to read "CUPD-CU-2-4" instead of "CU-2-4." (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	On Sheet DD1, show the lot coverage as a percentage. (From Cycle 6)





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

23 Provide a correct legal description on Sheet DD1. (From Cycle 6)

2nd Expedite Rev April 2012

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

24 The plans have been revised and requested documents have been submitted per LDR-Planning's previous review. (New Issue)

25 LDR-Planning has no additional issues and recommends approval with the following conditions. No response is required for the following unless the applicant proposes revisions to the conditions. (New Issue)

Draft Conditions

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 26 Outdoor lighting for the soccer arena and outdoor pool shall be turned off and shall not be used between the hours of 10:00 pm and 5:00 am. (New Issue)
- 27 The project shall comply with the refuse and recyclable materials storage area requirements in SDMC Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 8 except where a deviation has been approved as part of this permit. (New Issue)
- 28 Owner/Permittee shall maintain a minimum of xxx off-street parking spaces on the property at all times in the approximate locations shown on the approved Exhibit "A." Parking spaces shall comply at all times with the SDMC and shall not be converted for any other use unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate City decision maker in accordance with the SDMC. (New Issue)
- 29 All private outdoor lighting shall be shaded and adjusted to fall on the same premises where such lights are located and in accordance with the applicable regulations in the SDMC. (New Issue)
- 30 New Issue (6284257) (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Benally, Rhonda (619) 446-5468	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
Hours of Review: 0.00	Started: 04/02/2012	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
	Completed: 04/06/2012	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental 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-Environmental (23 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 96 reviews, 59.4% were on-time, and 48.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review 1/20/2012

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Scope of Work (INFORMATIONAL ONLY, NO ACTION REQUIRED) The site was formerly an auto dealership, and is a vacant site except for an existing parking structure. The project proposes a new two-story, 59,700-square-foot Recreation Facility, 7,300-square-foot enclosed pool and parking structure. The project will require deviations for setbacks, drive aisle width, transparency, and landscaping. The recreation facility would provide general membership to the local community and offer two pools, exercise/workout rooms, a computer lab, and an outdoor youth arena soccer. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	(Continued) The project is located at 4300 El Cajon Boulevard between 43rd and Fairmont Streets, in the CU-2-4 zone of the Central Urbanized Planned District Ordinance in the Kensington-Talmadge community of the Mid-City Communities Planning area, and Transit Area Overlay Zone. (From Cycle 6)

Project Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) is not able to make a determination at this time pending the submittal of additional information and resolution of the other reviewing disciplines' (LDR-Planning, LDR-Engineering, LDR-Transportation, Plan-Long Range Planning LDR-Geology, Park and Recreation) issues. (From Cycle 6)

Paleontology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	According to the "Preliminary Geologic Reconnaissance and Geotechnical Evaluation City Heights Property at Fairmont Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard, San Diego, California (January 20, 2009)," prepared by Terracosta Consulting Group, Inc, the subject property is underlain by the San Diego and Lindavista Formations. San Diego Formation has been assigned as high resource potential, and Lindavista Formation has been assigned as a moderate resource potential for paleontological resources. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	(Continued) The Earthwork quantities on the Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan (Sheet 3 of 17) states approximately 3,373 cubic yards of cut, however the maximum depth of cut proposed for the project including the pools was not provided. In addition, LDR-Engineering indicated the grading plan submitted needs to be revised, therefore please provide this information as requested by LDR-Engineering in the next submittal. Until this information is provided EAS is not able to determine if monitoring for paleontological resources is required. (From Cycle 6)

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

<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	EAS received "Greenhouse Gas Assessment Copley Family YMCA, San Diego, CA, City Project No. 242653," prepared by LDN Consulting, Inc., December 18, 2011. The report requires revisions, and will be given to the City's project manager to be forwarded to the applicant's consultant. Please make the necessary revisions as "redlined" in the report. Until EAS receives the revised report this issue will remain uncleared. (From Cycle 6)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	EAS received "Preliminary Geologic Reconnaissance and Geotechnical Evaluation City Heights Property at Fairmont Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard, San Diego, California," prepared by TerraCosta Consulting Group, Inc., January 20, 2009. LDR-Geology requires an addendum in the next submittal. Please refer to LDR-Geology for additional information. Please provide a copy of the addendum to EAS in the next submittal. (From Cycle 6)

Health and Safety

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	Hazardous Material Questionnaire: EAS received the Development Services Department (DSD) Form DS-527, "Child Care Center Hazardous Materials Questionnaire." However this form has not been reviewed and stamped by the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health-Hazardous Materials Division (HMD). Please have this form reviewed and stamped by the County HMD, and provide a copy to EAS in your next submittal. For additional information please contact Ms. Joan Swanson, County HMD at (858) 505-6791. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	(Continued) Until EAS receives this form that has been reviewed and stamped by the County HMD this issue cannot be cleared. (From Cycle 6)

Noise

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	(Continued) EAS received "Noise Study Copley Family YMCA San Diego, CA, City Project No. 242653," prepared by LDN Consulting, Inc., December 16, 2011. Table 3-2 only illustrates the evening hours of 7PM to 10 PM, however the hours of operation range from 6 AM to 10PM. Therefore please clarify in Table 3-2 the sound level limits and arithmetic mean for each time of day including 10PM to 7AM for potential noise impacts to surrounding neighborhood. Please clarify if mitigation is or is not required. Please revise report to address these comments. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	(Continued) The report indicates the arena soccer field, and outdoor pool activities would occur between the hours of 5PM to 10 PM during the week, and from 10AM to 10PM on weekends. The site is surrounded by existing residential to the north, west and east. Please provide noise contours on Figure 5-1 clarifying the decibel levels from the subject site to the adjacent residential development. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	(Continued) Based on review of Table 4-1, it appears the ambient noise level of Monitoring location 3 (M3) exceeds the acceptable noise level for this type of project. Please refer to the land use compatibility table in the City's General Plan. It appears that mitigation may be required along Fairmont Avenue. Please clarify what, if any mitigation is required. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	(Continued) In addition, the report concludes that the unmitigated outdoor noise levels for future traffic related noise levels as shown in Table 6-1 are below the 65 dBA CNEL. Please provide additional discussion to document how the future ambient noise level (with increased traffic trips) actually decreases. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	(Continued) Page 8, Land Use Compatibility Noise Chart: Please remove this table and replace this table utilizing the Table NE-3 of the City's General Plan. Please ensure the appropriate land use compatibility in the acoustical analysis. Revise report if necessary. (From Cycle 6)

Transportation/Circulation/Par

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Rhonda Benally at (619) 446-5468. Project Nbr: 266825 / Cycle: 8





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

4/9/12 10:52 am

Page 7 of 24

L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 18 EAS received "Traffic Impact Analysis Copley YMCA, San Diego, California," prepared by Linscott Law and Greenspan, December 9, 2011. LDR-Transportation is currently in review of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) please refer to LDR-Transportation for additional information. Please provide a copy of approved TIA to EAS. (From Cycle 6)

Water Quality/Drainage Study

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 19 EAS received "Water Quality Technical Report for 4300 El Cajon Blvd, San Diego, CA (December 16, 2011)," and "Drainage Study for Copley Family YMCA," prepared by REC Consulting. LDR-Engineering has indicated the Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR) and Drainage Study require revisions. Please provide a copy of approved WQTR and Drainage Study to EAS. Until this information is received this issue cannot be cleared. (From Cycle 6)

Long Range Planning

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 20 The project has been reviewed by the City's Long Range Planning staff. Please refer to Long Range Planning for additional information, and consistency with the Mid-City Communities Plan. (From Cycle 6)

New Issue Group (1490382)

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 21 Please note additional environmental issues may arise as the review progresses. (From Cycle 6)

Review 4/5/2012

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 22 EAS is not able to make a determination at this time pending the submittal of additional information and resolution of the other reviewing disciplines' (LDR-Engineering, LDR-Transportation, Park and Recreation, and Environmental Services Department (ESD)) issues. ESD will be added to the next review cycle. (New Issue)

Light Study

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 23 EAS reviewed the light and photometric plans provided in this submittal, however EAS needs a narrative analysis (in the form of a separate letter from the consultant who prepared the photometric) on how the photometric plans comply with the municipal code (City of San Diego's Outdoor Lighting Regulations, Municipal Code Regulations 142.0740). In addition, this analysis also needs to include the proposed lighting as shown on the plans. (New Issue)
- 24 (Continued)

EAS will forward a sample copy of a narrative analysis via the City's Project Manager for the applicant. Until EAS receives this information this issue cannot be cleared. (New Issue)

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 25 EAS received "Greenhouse Gas Assessment Copley Family YMCA, San Diego, CA, City Project No. 242653," prepared by LDN Consulting, Inc., December 18, 2011. The report requires the following revisions below. Until EAS reviews and accepts this report this issue will remain unclear. (New Issue)
- 26 EAS inadvertently missed informing the consultant to include a discussion of how the project complies with the applicable policies listed in the Conservation Element of the City's General Plan (GP) (March 2008). Please provide a discussion of how the project complies with the applicable policies of the GP in the report. Revise report accordingly. (New Issue)
- 27 Based upon advice from the Office of the City Attorney, projects cannot include reductions attributed to the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) because the state has not yet begun implementation of this measure due to litigation. Please revise report accordingly. (New Issue)

Noise

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 28 EAS received "Noise Study Copley Family YMCA San Diego CA, City Project No. 242653," prepared by LDN Consulting, March 7, 2012. EAS accepts this report. (New Issue)

Transportation/Circulation/Par

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Rhonda Benally at (619) 446-5468. Project Nbr: 266825 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 29 EAS received "Traffic Impact Analysis Copley YMCA, San Diego, California," prepared by Linscott Law and Greenspan, March 20, 2012. LDR-Transportation is currently in review of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) please refer to LDR-Transportation for additional information. Until EAS receives an approved TIA this issue cannot be cleared. (New Issue)

Water Quality/Drainage Study

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 30 EAS received "Water Quality Technical Report for Copley Family YMCA, 4300 El Cajon Blvd, San Diego, CA (March 21, 2012)," and "Drainage Study for Copley Family YMCA," prepared by REC Consulting. LDR-Engineering has indicated the Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR) and Drainage Study (DS) require revisions. Until EAS receives a WQTR and DS that has been reviewed and accepted by LDR-Engineering this issue cannot be cleared. (New Issue)

Hazardous Material Questionnai

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 31 EAS received a copy of the Development Services Department (DSD) Form DS-527, "Child Care Center Hazardous Materials Substance Approval Form," that has been reviewed and stamped by the County of San Diego Hazardous Materials Division. EAS has no further issue. (New Issue)

Paleontology

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 32 Based on the information provided and the geotechnical report submitted, the project does not meet the thresholds for paleontological resources. No mitigation is required. (New Issue)

Geology

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 34 EAS received "Preliminary Geologic Reconnaissance and Geotechnical Evaluation City Heights Property at Fairmont Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard, San Diego, California," prepared by TerraCosta Consulting Group, Inc., January 20, 2009. (New Issue)

Waste Management Plan

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 35 Waste Management Plan

The project meets the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (January 2011) for Waste Management, therefore a Waste Management Plan will be required. (New Issue)
- 36 [CONTINUED]

The California Integrated Solid Waste Management Act (also known as Assembly Bill 939 (AB 939)) requires each city in the state to divert at least 50% percent of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, composting, and transformation. The City has enacted codes and policies aimed at helping the City to achieve this diversion level, including the Refuse and Recyclable Materials Storage Regulations (LDC Chapter 14, Article 2 Division 8), Recycling Ordinance (O-19678), and the Construction and Demolition (C & D) Debris Deposit (New Issue)
- 37 [CONTINUED]

Ordinance (O-19420 & O-19694). (New Issue)
- 38 [CONTINUED]

Projections indicate that diversion rates achieved by these regulations and ordinances alone will not be sufficient to achieve the 50% diversion level. To compound the problem, the City's Miramar Landfill is projected to close before 2016, making efforts that preserve landfill space especially important. (New Issue)
- 39 [CONTINUED]

The following solid waste thresholds discuss the level at which compliance with regulations/ordinances is not sufficient, and therefore the inclusion of solid waste considerations in the review and preparation of environmental documents is necessary to address project construction, demolition and ongoing waste generation. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Rhonda Benally at (619) 446-5468. Project Nbr: 266825 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	40	[CONTINUED]
--------------------------	----	-------------

A Waste Management Plan (WMP) is required to be prepared by the applicant and conceptually approved by the Environmental Services Department (ESD). The WMP must be implemented by the applicant and address the demolition, construction, and occupancy phases of the project as applicable to include the following:

- a. Tons of waste anticipated to be generated
- b. Material type of waste to be generated
- c. Source separation techniques for waste generated
- d. How materials will be reused on-site

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	41	[CONTINUED]
--------------------------	----	-------------

e. Name and location of recycling, reuse, and landfill facilities where recyclables and waste will be taken if not reused on-site

- f. A "buy recycled" program for green construction products, including mulch and compost
- g. How the project will aim to reduce the generation of construction/ demolition debris
- h. A plan of how waste reduction and recycling goals will be communicated to subcontractors
- i. A timeline for each of the three main phases of the project as stated above
- j. How the recycling space allocation ordinance will be incorporated into construction design (New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	42	[CONTINUED]
--------------------------	----	-------------

of the building's waste area.

k. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), International Standard (ISO), or other certification, if any.

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	43	Leed certification means that there has been a commitment for green construction.
--------------------------	----	---

ISO certification means there has been a commitment to reduce ongoing waste.

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	44	Please note, if the project can demonstrate that it would generate less than 30 tons of waste in the construction phase and generate less than 60 tons of waste per year, a WMP would not be required (e.g. LEED projects, etc.). ESD will be required to determine if the project meets this exemption. (New Issue)
--------------------------	----	--

<input type="checkbox"/>	45	Please contact Lisa Wood (ESD) at (858) 573-1236 or via e-mail at LFWood@sandiego.gov for more information regarding preparation of the WMP. To streamline the review process for the WMP, EAS suggests the applicant provide ESD with the draft WMP for edits/modifications prior to submitting it to EAS for review. (New Issue)
--------------------------	----	--





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Spindell, Glenn (619) 446-5353	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 04/03/2012	
Next Review Method: LDR-Landscaping(Appmt.)	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
	Completed: 04/04/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: LDR-Landscaping(Appmt.).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 7 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (7 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 49 reviews, 79.6% were on-time, and 47.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review 011812

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project is subject to the City-wide Landscape Requirements for Commercial Development. Deviations are requested for Street Tree and Street Yard requirements. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Landscaping proximal to the Bus Stop on El Cajon Blvd. shall comply with Metropolitan Transit Development Board [MTDB] design standards. Provide notes and details accordingly. Additionally, Long-Range Planning review has recommended additional trees for this vicinity. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Please revise the landscape development plan to include a separate legend entry for street trees (within and outside of the right-of-way). (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Per Table 142-04C, 25 per cent of the street yard is required as landscape. Applicant proposes 40 per cent. Please clarify whether this percentage includes turf within active-use recreational areas e.g. the soccer field. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	The required plant points are to be achieved by trees only. Please revise street yard calculations accordingly, using Form DS-4. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Applicant proposes 20 per cent of the required points provided by trees. Staff recommends that the container size of the street yard trees be increased where feasible (Ref. Table 142-04B: Plant Point Schedule). Additionally, the street trees may be counted toward the street yard tree requirement. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Conversely, where site conditions preclude the amount of required street trees, street yard trees within 10 feet of the property line may count toward the street tree requirement. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Deviations from the Landscape Regulations may be requested through this Development Permit process. If deemed necessary, they must be clearly articulated within the design statement in order to provide findings for a hearing body to consider. Such items to consider are: whether existing conditions and/or requirements of other review disciplines preclude strict application of the regulations; whether available planting areas are maximized; if the intent of the Landscape Regulations is being met. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Provide a design statement articulating how the proposed plan substantially conforms to the intent of the Mid-Cities Community Plan, particularly recommendations pertaining to such Urban Design Elements as the International Promenade (43rd St. and Fairmount Ave.); Community Gateway (Fairmount Ave. at Meade Ave.); Pedestrian Element (security, visibility). (From Cycle 6)

2nd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Palm trees may only be used to satisfy the street tree requirement where identified as an acceptable street tree species in an adopted land use plan (142.0409[a][3]). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	(Minor Revision) Revise the streetscape palette to omit palms, as the Mid-City Communities Plan does not recommend the use of Palms for streetscape. (New Issue)

Draft Permit Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Prior to issuance of any engineering permits for right-of-way improvements, complete landscape construction documents for right-of-way improvements shall be submitted to the Development Services Department for approval. Improvement plans shall provide a minimum root zone of 40 square feet in area unencumbered by utilities and hardscape for all trees. Driveways, utilities, drains, water and sewer laterals shall be designed so as not to prohibit the placement of street trees. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Prior to issuance of any construction permits for structures (including shell), complete landscape and irrigation construction documents consistent with the Landscape Standards shall be submitted to the Development Services Department for approval. The construction documents shall be in substantial conformance with Exhibit 'A,' Landscape Development Plan, on file in the Office of the Development Services Department. Construction plans shall provide a minimum root zone of 40 square feet in area unencumbered by utilities and hardscape for all trees pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code section 14 (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy, it shall be the responsibility of the Owner/Permittee to install all required landscape and obtain all required landscape inspections. A "No Fee" Street Tree Permit shall be obtained for the installation, establishment, and on-going maintenance of all street trees. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	The Owner/Permittee shall be responsible for the maintenance of all landscape improvements shown on the approved plans, including in the right-of-way, consistent with the Landscape Standards unless long-term maintenance of said landscaping will be the responsibility of a Landscape Maintenance District or other approved entity. Severe pruning or "topping" of trees is not permitted. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	If any required landscape (including existing or new plantings, hardscape, landscape features, etc.) indicated on the approved construction document plans is damaged or removed during demolition or construction, it shall be repaired and/or replaced in kind and equivalent size per the approved documents to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department within 30 days of damage or Certificate of Occupancy. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Ocen, Julius (619) 446-5295	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
Hours of Review: 10.00	Started: 03/28/2012	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
	Completed: 04/03/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 17 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (11 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 74 reviews, 87.8% were on-time, and 40.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The preliminary drainage study is referencing the County of San Diego's Hydrology manual and method. Please note that the City no longer accepts the County's manual and values. Please revise all technical reports and studies to comply with the City of San Diego drainage design manual dated April 1984. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The grading plan submitted needs to be revised as follows: Submit a conceptual grading plan showing the existing and proposed grading contours, grading data table with cut/fill import/export quantities, slope gradient, drainage patterns, and the collection/discharge points for all site/roof drains. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The plans shows the bio filter planter at 4 feet high. Please provide details and cross sections including discharge points of these proposed proposed bio filters. The maximum allowable height of these walls within the public right of way is 3 feet. Additionally remove all walls higher than 3 feet from all visibility triangle areas of street corner and driveway corners. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Please provide cross-sections of all adjacent streets with curb to property line distances. Additionally show all utility boxes within the right of way on the plans.

Please provide cross-sections of all adjacent streets with curb to property line distances. Additionally show all utility boxes within the right of way on the plans.

- (From Cycle 6)
- 5 Easement data notes indicates that easements will be vacated. Please note that these easements will be Quit Claimed to each respective agency. (From Cycle 6)
- 6 Note number 3 sheet DD1.2 indicates that the storm drain easement will be vacated. Please note that this is a public storm drain that requires an easement over it. If this easement is Quit Claimed, then the storm drain facility must be private and privately maintained. Please revise plans accordingly. (From Cycle 6)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Julius Ocen at (619) 446-5295. Project Nbr: 266825 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

2nd Review Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	The bioretention narrative on page 13 of the storm water standards indicates infiltration. Please note that compliance with restrictions on the use of infiltration treatment BMPs is required per Storm Water Standards 4.4.2. Revise the WQTR accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	In order to confirm the existing dimensions at all adjacent streets, please provide cross-sections of the adjacent streets with dimensions including curb to property line distances. (New Issue)

Draft Engineering Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain a bonded grading permit for the grading proposed for this project. All grading shall conform to requirements in accordance with the City of San Diego Municipal Code in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	This project proposes to export 336 cubic yards of material from the project site. All export material shall be discharged into a legal disposal site. The approval of this project does not allow the onsite processing and sale of the export material unless the underlying zone allows a construction and demolition debris recycling facility with an approved Neighborhood Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit per LDC Section 141.0620(i). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, 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"/>	11	Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, 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, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall incorporate and show the type and location of all post-construction Best Management Practices (BMP's) on the final construction drawings, in accordance with the approved Water Quality Technical Report, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Development of this project shall comply with all requirements of State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order No. 2009-009 DWQ and the Municipal Storm Water Permit, Order No. 2009-009(NPDES General Permit No. CAS000002 and CAS0108758), Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated With Construction Activity. In accordance with said permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Monitoring Program Plan shall be implemented concurrently with the commencement of grading activities, and a Notice of Intent (NOI) shall be filed with the SWRCB.... (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14 A copy of the acknowledgment from the SWRCB that an NOI has been received for this project shall be filed with the City of San Diego when received; further, a copy of the completed NOI from the SWRCB showing the permit number for this project shall be filed with the City of San Diego when received. In addition, the owner(s) and subsequent owner(s) of any portion of the property covered by this grading permit and by SWRCB Order No. 2009-009 DWQ, and any subsequent amendments thereto, shall comply with special provisions as set forth in SWRCB Order No. 2009-009 DWQ. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	All driveways and curb openings shall comply with City Standard Drawings G-14A, G-16 and SDG-100 and satisfactory to the city engineer. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure by permit and bond replacement of all damaged sidewalk, maintaining the existing sidewalk scoring pattern adjacent to the site on, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Transportation Dev	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: French, Tanner (619) 446-5493	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
Hours of Review: 12.00	Started: 04/06/2012	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
	Completed: 04/06/2012	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Transportation Dev on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 19 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (19 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Transportation Dev performed 34 reviews, 79.4% were on-time, and 44.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

PTS 266825 // 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	<p>Parking - Size of Proposed Project:</p> <p>On Sheet DD1 of the site plan under the heading "Square Footages" the total square footage of the recreational buildings is 59,700 (36,700+16,400+6,600). However under the "Parking Calculations" heading the square footage is assumed as 55,000. Please either explain or fix this discrepancy.</p> <p>(From Cycle 6)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	<p>Parking - Rate:</p> <p>As previously stated in the Preliminary Review (PTS 242653) for the project, the minimum parking requirement for the entire facility should be based on the health club rate of 5.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet (instead of 2.1 as shown on Sheet DD1 of the site plan) from Table 142-05F of the Land Development Code (LDC). Also, for the ancillary soccer arena use please include more information as to the use of the indoor soccer field. Will YMCA members be the only ones using the field? Will the field be rented to private organizations for use?</p> <p>(From Cycle 6)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	<p>Parking - Transit Area Overlay Zone:</p> <p>The proposed project is within the Transit Area Overlay Zone; as such, a 15% reduction should be used when calculating the minimum parking requirement. Please include this on Sheet DD1.</p> <p>(From Cycle 6)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	<p>Parking:</p> <p>As previously stated in the Preliminary Review (PTS 242653) for the project, parking tables for the proposed project should include the required and proposed number accessible, motorcycle and bicycle spaces. Please include this information on Sheet DD1 of the site plan.</p> <p>(From Cycle 6)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	<p>Parking - Numbering Spaces:</p> <p>Please number each automobile parking space sequentially, or at least number every ten parking spaces sequentially. This will help confirm the number of spaces proposed on the site and assist identifying specific spaces if necessary.</p> <p>(From Cycle 6)</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	<p>Project Frontage:</p> <p>As previously stated in the Preliminary Review (PTS 242653) for the project, plans should show and dimension all existing and proposed curb to curb, property line to property line, property line to center line, and property line to curb line distances on all fronting streets. Plans should also show all existing and proposed curb, gutter, sidewalk, driveways, and striping with all lane width dimensioned on the fronting streets.</p> <p>(From Cycle 6)</p>

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Transportation Dev' review, please call Tanner French at (619) 446-5493. Project Nbr: 266825 / Cycle: 8





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Project Frontage (continued):
-------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

The entire intersection at all 4 corners of the site should also be shown with all lane width and striping details. Additional frontage improvements and right-of-way dedications may be required pending provision of this information.

(From Cycle 6)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Driveways:
-------------------------------------	---	------------

As previously stated in the Preliminary Review (PTS 242653) for the project, the minimum and maximum one-way driveway width for a non-residential project should be 14 and 20 foot respectively, and the minimum and maximum two-way driveway width for a non-residential project should be 24 and 30 foot respectively from Table 142-05L of the LDC. Width of project driveways should be adjusted to be within the above range. Accordingly, the one-way southerly project driveway on 43rd Street should be narrowed to a maximum width of 20 feet (or 16 to 18 preferably).

(From Cycle 6)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Driveways - One Way Driveways:
-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------------

Please include proper signage for the one-way exit driveway shown on 43rd Street on Sheet DD1, and make a note on the same sheet that the directional arrows shown for both the one-way exit and entrance driveways will be added as part of the project. (This refers only to the arrows at the driveways, not the multitude of other arrows showing travel direction)

(From Cycle 6)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	Deviation - Drive Aisle Width:
-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------------

Transportation Development can accept the drive aisle deviation shown on Sheet DD9 for the 23 foot 3 inch drive aisles. However, the 16 foot 6 inch drive aisle on Sheet DD8 may not be acceptable. Please make a note on the sheet the angle of the diagonal parking stalls. Please note that for 60 degree angled parking spaces the minimum one-way drive aisle from Table 142-05K of the LDC is 18 feet wide. It appears that restriping could be performed to fix this deficient drive aisle width.

(From Cycle 6)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Sidewalk Pop-out:
-------------------------------------	----	-------------------

Please show dimensions of the sidewalk pop-out shown on Sheet DD1 on the corner of El Cajon Boulevard/43rd Street. It would also help to show the dimensions of the adjacent lanes at the intersection, as was mentioned in a previous comment.

(From Cycle 6)

2nd Review // 04.05.2012

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Previous Comments (Information only, no action required):
--------------------------	----	---

Although all previous comments have been cleared, some have not been fully addressed. Accordingly they have been repeated or reiterated below.

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Size of Proposed Project:
--------------------------	----	---------------------------

On Sheet DD1 of the site plan under the heading "Square Footages" the total square footage of the recreational buildings is 60,224 sf (36,700+16,400+6,949+175). However under the "Proposed Development Regulation Deviations" heading the square footage is assumed as 59,750 sf. Consistency within the site plan and between the site plan and traffic study, specifically the trip generation section, is necessary. The most recent version of the traffic study assumes a development of 55,000 square feet.

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Size of Proposed Project:
--------------------------	----	---------------------------

On Sheet DD1 please also show square footages of all specific facilities included in the proposed project including the Day Care Center and the Teen Center.

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

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

18 Required Parking:

The minimum parking requirement for this facility is:

Health Club: 43,284 sf at 5.0 spaces/ksf =216 spaces
Day Care: 15 staff at 1.0 spaces/staff =15 spaces
Teen Center: 2 staff at 1.0 spaces/staff =2 spaces
Soccer Arena: 1 arena at 38 spaces/arena =38 spaces

Given a 15% reduction (total 41 spaces) for the project's location within the Transit Area Overlay Zone, a minimum of 230 automobile spaces, including 6 standard accessible spaces, 1 van accessible space, 5 motorcycle spaces, and 5 bicycle spaces with rack(s) are required by the Land Development Code (LDC). (New Issue)

19 Provided Parking:

The current version of the site plan shows that the project is providing 272 automobile spaces, including 4 standard accessible spaces, 2 van accessible spaces, 12 motorcycle spaces, and 12 bicycle spaces with rack(s). One additional accessible parking space is required.

(New Issue)

20 Parking Table:

Please update the information under the "Parking Calculation" heading to reflect the minimum requirements and provisions listed above.

(New Issue)

21 Accessible Parking:

Please dimension all accessible parking spaces and their access aisles. Per the California Building Code Section 1129B, standard accessible parking spaces should be a minimum of 9 feet wide with 5 foot wide access aisles, and van accessible parking spaces should be a minimum of 9 feet wide with 8 foot wide access aisles on the passenger side of the vehicle as the vehicle is facing forward into the space. Please also label all accessible parking spaces and van accessible parking spaces.

(New Issue)

22 Parking - Width Dimensions:

On Sheets DD7, DD8 and DD9 please dimension, or provide typical dimensions for, the width of all automobile parking spaces on the site plan (currently typical width dimensions are only provided on Sheet DD9). Per LDC Section 142.0560 Table 142-05J, the minimum automobile parking stall dimensions are 8 feet wide for spaces unobstructed, 9 feet wide for spaces with one side abutting an obstacle, and 9.5 feet wide for spaces with two sides abutting an obstacle.

(New Issue)

23 Parking - Width Dimensions:

Given the information from the comment above, parking spaces B53-B58, shown as 8'-3", on Sheet DD8 are too narrow. Spaces B53, B54, B57 and B58 should be 9 feet wide, while spaces B55 and B56 should be 9.5 feet wide.

(New Issue)

24 Project Frontage:

On Sheets DD1 and DD1.3 the striping and all lane width dimensions should be shown for each of the four fronting streets. Also, the entire intersection at all 4 corners of the site should be shown with all lane width and striping details. Additional frontage improvements and right-of-way dedications may be required pending provision of this information. Also all detailed frontage information shown on Sheet DD1.3 also should be shown on Sheet DD1.

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	<p>Project Frontage:</p> <p>El Cajon Boulevard west of Fairmount Avenue is classified as a 6-Lane Major roadway in the Mid-City Community Plan and requires a property-to-center line distance of 62 feet. Currently El Cajon Boulevard between Fairmount Avenue and 43rd Street has five lanes (2 in the westbound direction) and information on Sheet DD1.3 shows the property-to-center line distance of 61 feet. Right-of-way dedications may be required and it appears that the proposed sidewalk pop-out may conflict with the ultimate classification of the roadway.</p>
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	<p>Sidewalk Pop-out:</p> <p>On Sheet DD1.3 a note was added stating "Curb as proposed by the Metro Express SDSU to Downtown Mid-City Rapid Bus Project". We understand that the project is currently under ministerial review with Traffic Safety. Please provide the engineering design drawings with the next submittal to confirm the size and extent of this pop-out on both streets.</p>
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	<p>Sidewalk Pop-out:</p> <p>In order to consider any proposed pop-out, the applicant should demonstrate its need, function, and benefits. Pop-outs may only be considered if they primarily shadow parking lanes, do not reduce or impact the existing travel lanes, parking, or the capacity of the roadways. Pop-outs may also be considered if they are proposed at all corners of an intersection instead of only one corner, however, they should not extend out onto the major streets.</p>
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	<p>Project Frontage - Cross Sections:</p> <p>On Sheet DD1.3 please provide roadway cross sections for each of the four fronting streets including centerline to property line distance, centerline to curb line distance, travel lane configuration and lane widths, medians, on street parking. Once this information is provided, it can be determined whether dedication and improvement to these roadways is required. (Some of this information is shown in the parkway cross sections that have already been provided, but the rest of the information is still needed)</p>
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	<p>Project Frontage - Pedestrian Ramps:</p> <p>On Sheets DD1 and DD1.3 please show existing and proposed pedestrian ramps on all four corners of the project.</p>
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	<p>Project Frontage - On-Street Parking:</p> <p>Although none of the on-street parking spaces could be counted as part of the project's on site minimum parking requirement, in order to determine the net gain or loss of the on-street parking spaces on the project fronting streets, the existing and the proposed on street parking spaces with dimensions and counts should be shown on the plans. The total net gain or loss of the number of on-street parking spaces should be called out including the break down for each of the fronting streets in a table on Sheet DD1. (New Issue)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	<p>Driveways - One Way Driveways:</p> <p>Please include proper signage for the one-way exit driveway shown on 43rd Street on Sheet DD1, and make a note on the same sheet that the directional arrows shown for both the one-way exit and entrance driveways will be added as part of the project. This refers only to the arrows at the driveways, not the multitude of other arrows showing travel direction. (2nd Request)</p>
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	<p>Drop-Off Locations:</p> <p>At both the one-way drop-off location off of 43rd Street and the circular drop-off location off of Fairmount Avenue please show the estimated number of proposed drop-off spaces. It seems that both sides of the circular drop-off location off of Fairmount Avenue could be utilized, where only one side labeled as such.</p>
		(New Issue)





L64A-003A

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Drop-Off Locations:
--------------------------	----	---------------------

It appears that the proposed one-way drop-off location off of 43rd Street may not be the best solution. Please explore other options including the incorporation of two-way driveways.

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Long Range Planning	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Prinz, Michael (619) 533-5931	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Started: 04/04/2012	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
	Completed: 04/04/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for Plan-Long Range Planning on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Plan-Long Range Planning performed 18 reviews, 83.3% were on-time, and 61.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

New Issue Group (1488232)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The Community Plan recommends new developments provide plazas and public seating areas at major intersections. Please include and identify the amenities available to the public. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Long range planning recommends additional shade-producing street trees at the southeast corner of the project site to mitigate heat gain resulting from paved surfaces and provide shade for pedestrians and transit-riders. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	The Community Plan identifies Fairmount Avenue at El Cajon Boulevard, and 43rd Street at Fairmount Avenue as main street intersections, which call for treatments that focus on creating urban places designed for pedestrian use. Such treatments could include, but are not limited to, increased setbacks, street furniture, and shade-producing trees. LRP recommends inclusion of treatments at the corners to enhance pedestrian activity as discussed in the Crossroads section of the Urban Design Element of the Community Plan. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Please identify any sustainable building techniques to be used in the construction and operation of the facility consistent with the policies provided in Section A of the Conservation Element of the General Plan; specifically policies CE-A.5 and CE-A.7. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	As the proposed project advances through the permit process, the applicant should contact the Chair of the Kensington-Talmadge Community Planning Group, David Moty, at kentalpc@yahoo.com to schedule the item as a future agenda action item of the Group. (From Cycle 6)

New Issue Group (1520387)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Per issues 3, 4, and 5; the added amenities, including additional shade-producing street trees, public seating areas, and increased setbacks, meet the intent of the policies of the Community Plan. (New Issue) [Recommended]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	If the proposal is resubmitted, please revise the Perspective Drawings (sheet DD6) to identify the elements included in sheet L-3. (New Issue) [Recommended]





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Started: 03/22/2012	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
	Completed: 04/05/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (4 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 56 reviews, 82.1% were on-time, and 73.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review/Cycle 6 Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within geologic hazard zone 52 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 52 is characterized by other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain with favorable geologic structure, low risk. (From Cycle 6)

1st Review/Cycle 6 References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Preliminary Geologic Reconnaissance and Geotechnical Evaluation, City Heights Property at Fairmount Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard, San Diego, California; prepared by TerraCosta Consulting Group, Inc., dated January 20, 2009 (their project no. 2638). Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, New Recreation Facility, Copley-Price Family YMCA, City Heights, PTS 242653, San Diego, California, prepared by REC Consultants, Inc., dated December 15, 2011. (From Cycle 6)

1st Review/Cycle 6 Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The seismic design criteria should be updated per the 2010 CBC. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Indicate if the proposed bio retention areas are designed to dispose of storm water by infiltration or percolation. Provide a cross section design detail on the referenced plans. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	If storm water infiltration or percolation and lateral migration may occur, the geotechnical consultant must address 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 bio retention design will have adverse impacts on adjacent properties. (From Cycle 6)

2nd Review/Cycle 8 Reference

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan, New Recreation Facility, Copley-Price Family YMCA, City Heights, PTS 242653, San Diego, California, prepared by REC Consultants, Inc., dated December 15, 2011. (New Issue)

2nd Review/Cycle 8 Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	The referenced geotechnical documents have been reviewed. Based on that review, the geotechnical consultant has adequately addressed the soil and geologic conditions potentially affecting the proposed project for the purposes of environmental review. (New Issue)

Conditions

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





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<p>GEOLOGY REQUIREMENTS:</p> <p>The Owner/Permittee shall submit a geotechnical investigation report or update letter that specifically addresses the proposed construction plans. The geotechnical investigation report or update letter shall be reviewed for adequacy by the Geology Section of the Development Services Department prior to issuance of any construction permits.</p> <p>(New Issue)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<p>The Owner/Permittee shall submit an as-graded geotechnical report prepared in accordance with the City's "Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports" following completion of the grading. The as-graded geotechnical report shall be reviewed for adequacy by the Geology Section of the Development Services Department prior to exoneration of the bond and grading permit close-out. (New Issue)</p>





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: Park & Rec	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Harkness, Jeff (619) 533-6595	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Started: 04/04/2012	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/05/2012	
	Completed: 04/04/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for Park & Rec on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Park & Rec (None of which are new)
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Park & Rec performed 23 reviews, 60.9% were on-time, and 42.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review 1-18-12

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	General - The property is within the El Cajon Blvd Maintenance Assessment District (MAD). As such the property owner is assessed MAD fees for maintenance of landscape within the public right of way. The landscape and irrigation improvements within the project public rights of way are to be maintained by the property owner as stated on the landscape plans. Please understand the property will still be assessed MAD fees even if the property owner maintains this area. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	con't. - If the property owner wishes to have the MAD maintain this area upon completion of this project, or any time in the future, all landscape and irrigation construction must be installed per San Diego Regional Standard Drawings. All irrigation equipment must be to City standards, and a separate meter install for MAD maintained areas only. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Please either revise the plans to address maintenance by the MAD, or acknowledge, by a response in the next review cycle, that the property owner understands that the property will be assessed MAD fees even if the public right of way is to be privately maintained. (From Cycle 6)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Black, Laura (619) 236-6327	Assigned: 03/23/2012	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Started: 03/29/2012	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/04/2012	
	Completed: 03/29/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for 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 (1 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 68 reviews, 58.8% were on-time, and 64.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Kensington-Talmadge Community

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Chair for the Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group, David Moty, 619.255.2882 or email kentapc@yahoo.com, 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. (From Cycle 6)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Please forward the recommendation from the Kensington-Talmadge community planning group to the project manager. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 8 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/22/2012	Deemed Complete on 03/22/2012
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Map Check	Cycle Distributed: 03/22/2012	
Reviewer: Arcillas, Antonio (619) 687-5951	Assigned: 03/22/2012	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Started: 04/03/2012	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/04/2012	
	Completed: 04/04/2012	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 04/09/2012	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/05/2012 from 04/17/2012 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 LDR-Map Check 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-Map Check (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Map Check performed 76 reviews, 92.1% were on-time, and 62.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

COMMENTS/ISSUES

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Provide copy of an updated Preliminary Title Report noting all easements that are to be vacated. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Provide copies of the documents that granted all easements (to remain and be vacated) within the subject property. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	If the easements proposed for vacations were not originally granted on a final or parcel map which appears to be, according to the Review Templates Table - 2.17/Subdivision Approvals, REA-Acquisitions should also be reviewing this project. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	A legal description (Exhibit "A") and a B-Sheet drawing (Exhibit "B") might be required to be processed/filed to clearly delineate and describe the easements that are proposed to be vacated. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	This vacation is a formal vacation and subject to the provisions of Section 8320 of the Streets and Highways Code. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	A formal vacation of a public service easement or street vacation or other easement types requires a recommendation by the Planning Commission per the Streets and Highways Code Section 8313 (b) and Sections 125.0940 (b) and 125.1030 (b) of the City of San Diego Municipal Code. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Streets and Highways Code Section 8334.5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, a street, highway, or public service easement may not be summarily vacated if there are in-place public utility facilities that are in use and would be affected by the vacation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	This project will need to conform to the requirements set forth in Section 125.1001 of the San Diego Municipal Code. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Provide a letter of intent that describes in detail the reasons and circumstances as to why you are requesting this vacation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	On sheet DD1.2 under Easement Data, verify or confirm whether item 3 is proposed to be vacated, as well, as the Grading & Drainage Plan indicates otherwise. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	The project requires Council Approval with reference to the easements vacations, therefore the process will be in accordance with Process 5. (New Issue)

