



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

L64A-003A

## Project Information

**Project Nbr:** 412254      **Title:** Tivyan SDP  
**Project Mgr:** Tirandazi, Firouzeh      (619) 446-5325      ftirandazi@sandiego.gov



## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 04/10/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Plan-Facilities Financing	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 04/13/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Abeyta, Angela (619) 533-3674 aabeyta@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 04/15/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 04/21/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.50	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/11/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 04/21/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 05/18/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Facilities Financing on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Plan-Facilities Financing performed 98 reviews, 92.9% were on-time, and 99.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Impact Fees

### Discretionary & Prelim Reviews

#### DIF/FBA-Residential

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Development Impact Fees (DIF) and/or Facilities Benefit Assessments (FBA) are required at building permit issuance based on increased residential development and/or a change to existing land use. The currently adopted Rancho Encantada DIF rate for residential development is \$3,724 per single-dwelling unit. Rates provided are subject to annual change on July 1 or updates to a Community Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP). (New Issue) [Recommended]

#### RTCIP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	City RTCIP Fees on residential development are required at building permit issuance. These fees were established to ensure that new Development invests in the Region's transportation system to offset the negative impact of growth on congestion and mobility. RTCIP Fee is \$2,625 per sdu and/or \$2,100 per mdu. Rates subject to change annually July 1. This project would be subject to the RTCIP fee. (New Issue) [Recommended]

#### Current Impact Fee Schedule

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The Impact Fee Schedule outlines the fees which the Facilities Financing Section of the City collects at building permit issuance as part of the costs of land development in the City of San Diego. Fees are paid through OpenDSD at <a href="http://opensd.sandiego.gov/web/invoices/">http://opensd.sandiego.gov/web/invoices/</a> . The schedule can be accessed on the City web site at: <a href="http://www.sandiego.gov/facilitiesfinancing/pdf/feeschedule.pdf">http://www.sandiego.gov/facilitiesfinancing/pdf/feeschedule.pdf</a> (New Issue) [Recommended]





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 04/10/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Landscaping	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 04/13/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Lien, Terre	<b>Assigned:</b> 04/13/2015	
(619) 446-5327	<b>Started:</b> 05/11/2015	
tlien@sandiego.gov	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/11/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 8.00	<b>Completed:</b> 05/13/2015	<b>COMPLETED LATE</b>
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Closed:</b> 05/18/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 27 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 55 reviews, 85.5% were on-time, and 41.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	General Scope - Project includes single-dwelling unit development on an undeveloped lot in a City-wide RS-1-8 residential zone adjacent to the the Rancho Encantada Specific Planning area. Project is subject to a Site Development Permit due to the presence of Steep Hillside and Sensitive Biological Resources.

(New Issue)

Development Plans

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Development Summary, Brush Management (sht. 1) - Once Brush Management zones have been finalized, please update listed acreage designated as Brush Management Zone Two and Open Space. See below for further discussion.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Consistency of Plans, Grading and Brush Management (sht. 2 thru 5, 8, 9, 11) - Slope configurations and depictions of brush management zones are inconsistent between the Civil sheets and Landscape sheets. Please resolve, incorporating adjustments per below.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Brush Management Zones (sht. 2 thru 5, 8, 9, 11) - Brush Management is to be measured perpendicular from the face of the structure extending out towards the native/naturalized vegetation. Zone Two reduction measures should be implemented where appropriate to minimize biological impacts, maximize on-site mitigation opportunities, and reduce on-going maintenance responsibilities. Staff strongly recommends that all manufactured slopes draining down to the pad be permanently irrigated and included in Zone One. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	[cont. from above] Slopes draining away from the pad should be treated as an expanded Zone One or at least provide the minimum 35-ft Zone One with a balance of Zone Two towards the tow of slope. See attached mark-ups for your reference/use based upon slope configurations shown on the Civil sheets.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Covenant of Easement, Open Space (sht. 2, ) - Once Brush Management zones have been finalized, please adjust Open Space depictions to include both the Zone Two Brush Management (non-mitigation) acreage and designated Open Space (mitigation) acreage.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Off-site Brush Management vs. Alternative Compliance (sht. 2 thru 5, 8, 9, 11) - Property to the west of the subject parcel is identified on the Landscape plan as "Developed." However, Google Maps, Bing Maps, and the submitted Bio Report indicate that the property is undeveloped. Either provide evidence that the adjacent property is, in fact, developed or provide for brush management to the west of the proposed residential structure. Since the full defensible space cannot be provided to the west, (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	[cont. from above] ...an off-site easement with the adjacent property owner would be required to provide the balance of brush management on the adjacent property . (See attached City template, DS-50, for establishing a Brush Management Easement.) Alternative to this would be to provide additional fire-rating of the residential structure over and above standard CBC 7A requirements to include the following upgraded opening protection: Dual-glazed, dual-tempered panes... (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	[cont. from above] ...along southwest and northwest faces, inclusive of a 10-ft perpendicular return along adjacent wall faces, as shown on the attached mark-ups.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Alternative Compliance, Opening Protection (sht. 6, 8) - If pursuing the Alternative Compliance option described above, please identify windows/doors to receive the upgraded protection and include the following note: "Alternative Compliance for Brush Management: Identified openings to be upgraded to dual-glazed, dual-tempered panes in lieu of full brush management zones, typ." Include a brief discussion of the Alternative Compliance measures in the Landscape Design Statement.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Landscape Plans, Title Sheet (sht. 8) - Remove extraneous information that is irrelevant to the project at hand, including references to the Ridgecrest Subdivision and HOA maintenance over Parcel 1 of PM 17619. Under Re-vegetation Program Note 5, replace the words "the restoration" with "coverage," since restoration has a specific connotation related to mitigation for impacts. Omit the "Additional Notes" 1 thru 7, which are irrelevant to the project or redundant to notes provided elsewhere on the plans. Update sheet listing per below. Retitle sheet to "Cover Sheet / Revegetation Notes."  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Irrigation (sht. 9, 10) - At the entitlement stage, irrigation should be addressed with a conceptual note only to establish the type(s) of systems to be provided. This has been adequately addressed under Re-vegetation Program Note 2 on the Cover sheet. Omit the Irrigation Plan and Construction Details.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Site Context (sht. 11) - On the Planting Plan / Brush Management Plan, please identify the "Native Undisturbed Plant Material" as "Southern Mixed Chaparral" consistent with the Bio Report. Identify the MHPA south of the subject parcel.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Slope Hydroseed Mix (sht. 11) - Retitle "Slope Restoration Hydroseed Mix" to read "Zone One Slope Revegetation Hydroseed Mix," since restoration has a specific connotation related to mitigation for impacts. Note that revegetation within Zone Two must be an exclusively native palette per section 142.0412(h)(5). Provide a Zone Two mix accordingly or provide permanent irrigation to all manufactured slope areas and incorporate Zone Two reduction as appropriate.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Zone One Treatment (sht. 8, 11) - Design Statement on Landscape Cover sheet states: "The Landscape Design intent was carefully generated as a result of design sensitivities for a contextual/aesthetically pleasing environment." However, the Planting Plan merely reflects a sodded lawn for pad areas and above mentioned hydroseed mix. Plans should conceptually anticipate how the owner may wish to use the Zone One areas adjacent to the residential structure. Plan should anticipate location for trees to both "...create an environment suitable and inviting for residents... (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	[cont. from above] ...and "...resemble contextually the surrounding neighborhood and the nearby natural environment." Demonstrate that trees located in Zone One shall meet clearance requirements set forth under 142.0412(g)(4), which calls for trees to be located away from structures to a minimum distance of 10 feet as measured from the structures to the drip line of the tree at maturity. By way of example, a tree with a 30-ft mature canopy spread would need to be located a minimum of 25 feet from the structure.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Planting Notes (sht. 12) - Planting notes provided on sheet 12 are relevant to construction, not entitlement. Please omit from the development plan package.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Brush Management Notes (sht. 13, 14) - Omit Code sections 142.0412(k) through (o), which are irrelevant to the project at hand. Reference Policy No. FPB B-08-1 as the source for notes on sheet 14. Omit sections VI. D and all of section VII. (Section VIIA is obsolete and addressed in discussion of Alternative Compliance above. Section VIIB is irrelevant.)  (New Issue)

**Bio Report**

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Landscaping' review, please call Terre Lien at (619) 446-5327. Project Nbr: 412254 / Cycle: 5





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Brush Management, Acreages and Figures - Please update acreages and figures in the Bio Report once brush management zones and extents of the covenant of easement are finalized.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Project Reference (pg 1) - Please update PTS # to reflect this entitlement, i.e. PTS # 412254.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Summary, Zone Two Brush Management (pg. 1) - Zone Two Brush Management is not considered an impact. Revise 3rd sentence of second paragraph to read: "BMZ 2 would occur within an additional 0.86 acre of Southern Mixed Chaparral, but BMZ 2 is considered "impact neutral" and does not require mitigation."  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Project Description, BMZ 2 (pg. 4) - Revise second bullet under BMZ 2 description to read: "Must be thinned and pruned on a seasonal basis consistent with the Brush Management Regulations and Standards to reduce the fuel-load..."  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Direct Impacts, Vegetation (pg. 12) - Revise beginning of third sentence of paragraph to read: "BMZ 2 maintenance activities (0.86 acre) are considered impact neutral..." Omit last two sentences of the paragraph since the width of Zone One and Zone Two shall not exceed 100 feet per section 142.0412(c). (Note that fuel-load maintenance along the entry drive is permitted and required by Fire Code, but it is not considered Zone Two Brush Management, which is based on the residential structure.)  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	MHPA Adjacency Guidelines, Brush Management, Guideline (pg. 18) - Referenced text from the Subarea Plan is outdated. Please revise to read as follows:  Guideline:* "New development located adjacent to and topographically above the MHPA (e.g., along canyon edges) must be set back from slope edges to incorporate Zone One brush management areas on the pad and outside of the MHPA. Zone Two may be located in the MHPA upon granting of an easement to the City (or other acceptable agency) except where narrow wildlife corridors require it to be located outside of the MHPA. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	[cont. from above] Brush management zones will not be greater in size than is currently required by the City's regulations. Initial thinning of woody vegetation shall not exceed 50 percent coverage of the existing vegetation prior to implementation of Brush Management activities. Additional thinning and pruning shall be done consistent with City standards to obtain minimum vertical and horizontal clearances and shall avoid/minimize impacts to covered species to the maximum extent possible. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	[cont. from above] For all new development, regardless of the ownership, brush management in the Zone Two area will be the responsibility of a homeowners association or other private party. For existing and approved projects, the brush management zones, standards and locations, and clearing techniques will not change from those required under existing regulations.  *Revised to be consistent with the Land Development Code as amended by O-20261 N.S., effective 7-19-13.
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	(New Issue) MHPA Adjacency Guidelines, Brush Management, Compliance (pg. 18) - Revise first part of fourth sentence to remove references to Zone Two being greater than the minimum required.  (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

**Cycle Type:** 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)      **Submitted:** 04/10/2015      Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015  
**Reviewing Discipline:** Plan-MSCP      **Cycle Distributed:** 04/13/2015  
**Reviewer:** Smit-Kicklighter, Holly      **Assigned:** 04/15/2015  
(619) 236-6621      **Started:** 05/05/2015  
hsmit@sandiego.gov      **Review Due:** 05/20/2015  
**Hours of Review:** 8.00      **Completed:** 05/13/2015      **COMPLETED ON TIME**  
**Next Review Method:** Plan-MSCP (Submit)      **Closed:** 05/18/2015

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-MSCP on this project as: Plan-MSCP (Submit).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 9 outstanding review issues with Plan-MSCP (all of which are new).
- . Last month Plan-MSCP performed 24 reviews, 62.5% were on-time, and 45.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

MSCP 1st Review May 2015

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	MSCP has reviewed a Biology Letter Report for the Tivyan Residence (Tierra Data, February 18, 2015) and Sheets 1- 11 of the Site Plans and have the following comments:

The site is abuts the MHPA along the southern border and contains native chaparral habitat and a jurisdictional drainage. PTS/GIS maps are slightly skewed and show the MHPA slightly across the southern border but MHPA hardcopy base maps are legally binding and show it on the property line.

CLEARED AS INFORMATIONAL (New Issue)

BTR Specific Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	MSCP requests that the following specific comments on the Biology Letter Report for the Tivyan Residence (Tierra Data, February 18, 2015) be addressed:
		SUMMARY - Specify the BMZ2 impacts are only neutral if only thinning of native vegetation occurs. Any grading and replanting of BMZ2 would require mitigation. Please also note, BMZ2 areas of any kind are un-usable for mitigation requirements.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	METHODS - Clarify this paragraph to indicate that the late season/fall survey limited the potential for observing spring annuals and migratory bird species. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	PAGE 7 Special Conditions for Covered Species and Page 13 -Sensitive Plants and Animals discussions: Please note that all narrow endemic plant species are also MSCP Covered Species, however additional faunal species are also MSCP covered. Appendix A of the MSCP Subarea Plan includes "Conditions of Coverage" that must be discussed for high/moderate potential species per the BTR. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	PAGE 10- City records indicate that MSCP covered Southern CA rufous crowned sparrow was previously documented on-site in 2005 by RM Beauchamp. Please note this in the report. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	IMPACT SECTION - The text on page 12 (and Figure 3) indicates correctly that BMZ1 is considered a developed impact area; and the goes on to talk about how strict application of BMZ2 is not applied and that BMZ2 would be extended to small pockets of habitat at the front of the lot; however in Table 2, area is listed as 0.67 acres of BMZ1 instead of BMZ2. Please correct Table 2- Column 9 to be BMZ2. Otherwise the mitigation numbers would be incorrect as impacts would be 1.55 ac with a required mitigation acreage of 1.55 at the required 1:1 mitigation ratio. CON'T (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	This would leave the proposed mitigation of 1.09 ac short by 0.46 ac.

MITIGATION SECTION - MSCP requests that the BTR list verbatim or reference all applicable standard City Biological Mitigation Measures to protect biological resources and adjacent MHPA pursuant to the 2012 City of San Diego "Biology Guidelines, and the MSCP Subarea Plan. The specific measures can be sent via email by either the MSCP or EAS planner.  
(New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<p>At a minimum, mitigation measures recommended should include MHPA Land Use Adjacency measures and Bio monitoring during construction (includes general nesting bird measures).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 1 - Please remove the mention that extra mitigation is provided.</p> <p>CONCLUSION - revise this section as needed per above comments (i.e. will MHPA LUAG be assured via mitigation measures or permit conditions?) (New Issue)</p>

**SITE PLAN Specific Comments**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<p>MSCP recommends the following corrections/changes be made: Sheet 1 - SDP for ESL Steep Slopes reference should include SDP for biological resources as well.</p> <p>Sheet 8 - Specify that revegetation is for BMZ1 only. Landscaping sheet list should be made consistent with actual sheet numbers (i..e Landscape Sheets 1-7 are actually Sheets 8-14 of the plan set).</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<p>(New Issue)</p> <p>Sheet 11 - This sheet references a native grass and wildlife hydroseed mix for BMZ1. Please note that Gazania splendens is a non-native African species that has been known to invade adjacent native habitat. Please substitute with a native bush daisy such as Encelia californica or Bahiopsis (Viguiera) lanciniata.</p> <p>(New Issue)</p>





L64A-003A

Review Information

**Cycle Type:** 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)      **Submitted:** 04/10/2015      Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015  
**Reviewing Discipline:** LDR-Planning Review      **Cycle Distributed:** 04/13/2015  
**Reviewer:** Majas, Polonia      **Assigned:** 04/14/2015  
(619) 446-5394      **Started:** 05/08/2015  
pmajas@sandiego.gov      **Review Due:** 05/11/2015  
**Hours of Review:** 8.00      **Completed:** 05/15/2015      **COMPLETED LATE**  
**Next Review Method:** Submitted (Multi-Discipline)      **Closed:** 05/18/2015

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 17 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 134 reviews, 44.0% were on-time, and 46.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Informational Items

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The property is located within the RS-1-8 zone, the Brush Management Zone. The property is subject to the Progress Guide and General Plan policies. The Progress Guide and General Plan Generalized Land Use map, identifies the for Residential Use. The intent is to permit development consistent with the applied zone.
--------------------------	---	---

The property contains Environmentally Sensitive Lands in the form of Steep Hillides and Sensitive Biological Resources as defined by SDMC Section 113.0103. (New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The proposed scope of work is to construct an approximately 2,879 s.f. one story single family dwelling unit and an approximately 841 s.f. two car garage and other private improvements on a 2.795 acre vacant lot. (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	--

City of San Diego General Plan

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Architecture
-------------------------------------	---	--------------

The Urban Design Element of the City of San Diego's General Plan encourages design of buildings that contribute to a positive neighborhood character and relate to neighborhood and community context. Architectural features that establish and define a building's appeal and enhance the neighborhood character is encouraged. The design is a one story structure designed with off setting planes along the building wall viewed from the public right of way. The design conforms with the urban design policies of the general plan. (New Issue)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	The Urban Design Element of the City of San Diego's General Plan contains language regarding the preservation and protection of natural landforms. The project site will incorporated an open space easement containing Environmentally Sensitive Lands which is consistent with the natural features and open space linkages discussed in the General Plan. (New Issue)
-------------------------------------	---	--

Site Development Permit

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The property contains Steep Hillides and Sensitive Biological Resources. Development of a site containing Environmentally Sensitive Lands requires a Site Development Permit [SDMC Section 143.0110(b), Table 143-01A]. (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	---

<input type="checkbox"/>	6	A Site Development Permit shall be processed in accordance with Process Three (Hearing Officer as the Decision Maker appealable to Planning Commission) [SDMC Section 126.0502(a)(2)]. (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	--

<input type="checkbox"/>	7	A Site Development Permit may be approved or conditionally approved only if the decision maker makes all of the applicable findings as specified in SDMC Section 126.0504(a) and (i). (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	---

Open Space Easement Area

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	8	The Brush Management Zone 2 (BMZ2) may be considered impact neutral if included within the open space conservation easement. Provide plans identifying the total acres for the Brush Management Zone 2 and a separate calculations for the open space conservation easement. Revise plans to include the delineation of the BMZ within the open space easement. (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	---







L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	continued

If the BMZ2 is not include within the open space easement the development would need to be relocate outside of any steep hillside areas.

(New Issue)

**Steep Hillides**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	In accordance with SDMC Section 143.0140 (a), environmentally sensitive lands that are outside of the allowable development area on a premises shall be left in a natural state and used only for those passive activities allowed as a condition of permit approval. A conditions of the permit shall be incorporated into a covenant of easement that shall be recorded against title to the property, in accordance with procedures set forth in Section 143.0152.

In accordance with SDMC Section 143.0140 (a), environmentally sensitive lands that are outside of the allowable development area on a premises shall be left in a natural state and used only for those passive activities allowed as a condition of permit approval. A conditions of the permit shall be incorporated into a covenant of easement that shall be recorded against title to the property, in accordance with procedures set forth in Section 143.0152.

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	11	The allowable development area includes all portions of the premises without steep hillides. Steep hillides shall be preserved in their natural state, except that development is permitted in steep hillides if necessary to achieve a maximum development area of 25 percent of the premises (SDMC Section 143.0142(a)(2)).
--------------------------	----	---

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	12	continued
--------------------------	----	-----------

The BMZ2 area encroaching into steep hillides is required to be included within open space conservation easement. This will ensure the preservation of steep hillides and any potential impacts. Otherwise, the BMZ2 is required to be pulled back from any encroachments into steep hillides. (New Issue)

**Sensitive Biological Resources**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	In accordance with SDMC Section 143.0141(a)(1), all development occurring in sensitive biological resources is subject to a site-specific impact analysis conducted by a qualified Biologist, in accordance with the Biology Guidelines in the Land Development Manual. The impact analysis shall evaluate impacts to sensitive biological resources and CEQA sensitive species. The analysis shall determine the corresponding mitigation, where appropriate, and the requirements for protection and management. (New Issue)

In accordance with SDMC Section 143.0141(a)(1), all development occurring in sensitive biological resources is subject to a site-specific impact analysis conducted by a qualified Biologist, in accordance with the Biology Guidelines in the Land Development Manual. The impact analysis shall evaluate impacts to sensitive biological resources and CEQA sensitive species. The analysis shall determine the corresponding mitigation, where appropriate, and the requirements for protection and management. (New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	14	In accordance with SDMC Section 143.0141(a)(3), sensitive biological resources that are outside of the allowable development area on a premises, or are acquired as off-site mitigation as a condition of permit issuance, are to be left in a natural state and used only for those passive activities allowed as a condition of permit approval. (New Issue)
--------------------------	----	--

Additional comments may be generated once revised Biological Report is submitted for review. (New Issue)

**Structure Height**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Provide both the plumb line height and the over all structure height from the existing or proposed grade whichever is lower as specified in SDMC Section 113.0270.

Provide both the plumb line height and the over all structure height from the existing or proposed grade whichever is lower as specified in SDMC Section 113.0270.

Plans provide for review do illustrate the specific grade elevation that was used to demonstrate the height. (New Issue)

**General Pending Comments**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Provide a site plan drawn to scale with include the exterior dimensions of the proposed structures. Provide the front, side and rear setbacks. Include all private development such as fences, sidewalks, concrete paths and/or other landscaping features. (New Issue)

Provide a site plan drawn to scale with include the exterior dimensions of the proposed structures. Provide the front, side and rear setbacks. Include all private development such as fences, sidewalks, concrete paths and/or other landscaping features. (New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Within the development summary include a Site Development Permit for both Steep Hillides and Sensitive Biological Resources. Also, include a development table and include the applicable development regulations for the RS-1-8 zone (SDMC Section 131.0431(b), Table 131-04D). Include two columns containing the required and proposed development information.
--------------------------	----	--

Example	Required	Proposed
Side Yard Setback	10 ft.	30 ft. (New Issue)







L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Provide plans that are drawn to scale and that contains consistent information such as the exact location of the BMZ's, open space easements, driveways and location of the development. Revise plans and verify that the plans are scaled correctly. The scale and dimensions annotated on plans are inconsistent including but not limited to the BMZ's noted on Sheet 2. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Sheet 2  The exterior property line dimensions contain two different dimensions. Revise plans to include the recorded property line dimensions. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 04/10/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Environmental	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 04/13/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Dresser, Morgan (619) 446-5404 Mdresser@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 04/17/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 05/14/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 12.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/22/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 05/15/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 05/18/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 15 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 109 reviews, 39.4% were on-time, and 40.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Cycle 5 5/14/2015

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Site Development Permit to construct a 2,879 square foot single-story residence with a detached 872 square foot detached two car garage. The 2.82 acre vacant parcel is located at 11275 Beeler Canyon Road, Council District 5. The site is covered in Southern Mixed Chaparral vegetation and a drainage in the southwest corner. To the north of the site is Beeler Canyon Road, Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) is located along the southern property line off site, directly to the south and to the west and east is vacant land with Southern Mixed Chaparral. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	According to the Biology Report submitted by Tierra Data, Biology Resources Letter Report for the Tivyan Residence Design Review Project (City PTS#: 379328), San Diego, California the project site is currently vacant and supports Southern Mixed Chaparral vegetation no sensitive animals were observed. Please update the PTS # to reflect the current project PTS # 412254. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The site is described as mostly natural with few non-native plants with no sensitive plants detected. Some sensitive plant species that have been detected within one mile of the site include Del Mar Manzanita, San Diego barrel cactus, and San Diego goldenstar. This project does include impacting approximately 0.87 acres of the Southern Mixed Chaparral, which would be considered a significant impact and would require mitigation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	On page 10, paragraph 2 under sensitive plants states that "No sensitive plants were detected, though conditions were poor for detecting sensitive annuals or herbaceous species." Please explain what is meant by this. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	A small number of wildlife species were observed, however no sensitive animals were detected. Anna's hummingbird, hermit thrush, and western scrub jay were detected and American crows and an unidentified warbler flew over the site. There was small mammal use on site including active burrows, and Lepidodid and Mule deer scat. Some sensitive animals that have been detected within one mile of the site include the coastal California gnatcatcher, costal cactus wren, and the southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (the only one that has potential to appear on site). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	The site is located within the Recommended Quino Survey Area for the federally-listed as endangered quino checkerspot butterfly per the 2014 USFWS protocol. Quino checkerspot surveys in 2001 were negative, even though conditions were ideal for the species. There were no quino checkerspot butterflies observed during the site visit and the larval host, plant dot-seed plantain and nectar sources such as owl's clover were not observed as well due to the time of the year. Please explain why the survey was not conducted during the time of year this host plant would be observed. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	EAS defers to LDR Engineering Review on hydrology and/or drainage issues. Should Engineering review staff determine that a technical study is required on the project, please provide a copy of those studies to EAS with the next submittal. Staff will coordinate with LDR Engineering Review to assess potential impacts and determine what if any mitigation is necessary. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Short-term noise impacts would be associated with onsite grading and construction activities of the project. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area, but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Sensitive receptors (e.g. residential uses) may occur in the immediate area, and may be temporarily affected by construction noise. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	-- CONT... -- Construction activities, however, would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City's Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise) which are intended to reduce potential adverse effects resulting from construction noise. With compliance to the City's construction noise requirements, project construction noise levels would be reduced to less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	-- CONT... -- For the long-term, existing noise levels would not be impacted due to the nature of the proposed residential use. Typical noise levels associated with residential uses are anticipated. Therefore, no significant noise-producing traffic or operations would occur. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Jolla, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975) the project site is located on Stadium Conglomerate, which is considered to have a high sensitivity level for paleontological resources. The City Significance Determination Thresholds state that monitoring is required when a depth of 10 feet and 1,000 cubic yards of excavation would be exceeded when a project is located on a formation that has a high sensitivity rating. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	-- CONT... -- The project proposes grading approximately 375 cubic yards and to a depth of approximately 4.8 feet over approximately 28,492 square feet. Therefore, no impact is identified for this issue area. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	The City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study Maps (1995 Edition) have designated the geology at the project location as being within the City of San Diego Geologic Hazard Categories 53. Hazard Category 53 is categorized as level or sloping terrain, unfavorable geologic structure with low to moderate risk. Per the City of San Diego Information Bulletin 515 (Geotechnical Study Requirements) for a Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands, a Geotechnical Report is required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Until the requested information has been provided, staff is not able to complete the environmental review for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. Additionally, the new information may lead to the requirement of new and/or additional technical studies. A determination as to the appropriate environmental document will be made based on all reviewed and submitted information. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 04/10/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> LDR-Engineering Review	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 04/13/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Huynh, Khanh (619) 446-5299 KHuynh@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 04/13/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 05/11/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 8.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/11/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 05/11/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 05/18/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 22 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 86 reviews, 83.7% were on-time, and 38.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review issues

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

- 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 Site Development Permit Plans.  
(New Issue)
- 2 The applicant did not complete the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist correctly. The correct response to Part B, Item No.7 is YES, this project is within, directly adjacent to, or discharging directly into a Water Quality Sensitive Area. This has been determined using the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards Appendix C and PTS Stormwater Environmentally Sensitive Areas Map Layer. Submit a revised checklist on the next submittal.  
(New Issue)
- 3 This project is subject to the regulations contained in the revised City's Storm Water Standards dated January 20, 2012. To comply with the updated regulations, the project will be required to add to a WQTR, a determination if the proposed project is subject to hydromodification criteria among other requirements. If applicable, hydromodification management facilities shall be required to mitigate project-related increases to discharge rates and durations. The specific process is outlined in the Hydromodification Management Requirements Section 4.5 of the Storm Water Standards.  
(New Issue)
- 4 All drainage calculations shall be based if the Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) are required. Project must be designed so that runoff rates and durations are controlled to maintain or reduce pre-project downstream erosion conditions and protect stream habitat. (New Issue)
- 5 Based on the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, this project is a Priority Project and requires BMPs. The applicant shall submit a Water Quality Technical Report consistent with the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards. Required elements of a WQTR are provided in Appendix F on this manual. Details supporting all decisions made in accordance with Chapter 4 requirements shall be documented in the WQTR. (continued below) (New Issue)
- 6 The design of any LID or treatment control BMP which allows for infiltration of runoff should be accompanied by a Geotechnical Investigation of the surrounding soils. A Geological Investigation Report should be attached to the Water Quality Technical Report and prepared in conformance with the City of San Diego Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports.  
(New Issue)
- 7 The revised Storm Water Standards are available online at:  
  
<http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf>  
(New Issue)
- 8 Revise the Tittle Sheet, to show Legal Description and Owners' information correctly. The city's system showed the Legal Description as "Parcel 3". The plans showed as "Parcel 2". The city's system shown the owners are "Tivyan Roman and Sayavanh Nikki". The plans shown as "Roman Tivyan". Revise the plans accordingly.  
(New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Khanh Huynh at (619) 446-5299. Project Nbr: 412254 / Cycle: 5





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Revise the Site Plan. Show and call out the proposed Treatment Control BMP's and HMP controls that will be called out in the required WQTR.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	SDMC section 143.0142(f) states: Any increase in runoff resulting from the development of the site shall be directed away from any steep hillside areas and either into an existing or newly improved public storm drain system or onto a street developed with a gutter system or public right-of-way designated to carry surface drainage run-off. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Submit a Preliminary Drainage Study which addresses the existing and proposed storm water run-off and discharge locations for the project site study shall address how the storm water increase is discharge onto Beeler Canyon Road. Add a discussion regarding the required culvert in the Beeler Canyon Road's right-of-way. Discuss it shall be constructed to current City Standard, including 18 inches RCP, inlet, and outlet type. Add a discussion regarding the existing and proposed drainage on Beeler Canyon Road and the existing/proposed drainage device. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Project proposed discharge concentrated storm water on the existing hillside which is unacceptable. Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. Add a note that states: This project will not discharge any increase in storm water run-off onto the existing hillside areas or adjacent properties.  (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Revise the Site Plan. The storm drain outlets shall extend to the nearest well-defined natural drainage channel or public street which can adequately convey the discharge. Add a note that states: At the storm drain discharge location, a suitable energy dissipater is to be installed to reduce the discharge to non-erodible velocities. Add a note that states: No additional run-off is proposed for the discharge location. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. Remove/relocate the proposed energy dissipater. Plans showed the storm water will discharge into the adjacent lot which is unacceptable. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	On the Site Plan & Grading Plan, sheet 2. Plans showed the amount of maximum fill depth/cut as 4.8 feet. Is it for within building footprint or outside building footprint? If it's for within the building footprint, then revise the table to add the amount of maximum cut/fill depth for outside the building footprint. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Revise the site and grading plans to identify the source, date and MSL datum of the topography. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Provide Bench Mark information per the City of San Diego Vertical Control Book. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. 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"/>	19	Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. 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"/>	20	Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. 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"/>	21	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Additional comments may be recommended pending further review of any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive. Should you have any questions or comments, please call Khanh Huynh at 619 446-5299. (New Issue)





# Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 04/10/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Plan-Long Range Planning	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 04/13/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Galloway, Tait (619) 533-4550 tgalloway@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 04/14/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 04/14/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.00	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/11/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 04/14/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 05/18/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Long Range Planning on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Plan-Long Range Planning performed 18 reviews, 83.3% were on-time, and 33.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Long Range Planning

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Long-Range Planning does not need to review. DSD Land Development Review Planning will review for land use plan conformance. (New Issue) [Recommended]





L64A-003A

Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 04/10/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Community Planning Group	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 04/13/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Tirandazi, Firouzeh (619) 446-5325 ftirandazi@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 04/30/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 04/30/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.35	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/26/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 05/18/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 05/18/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . 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.
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 69 reviews, 49.3% were on-time, and 58.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Staff provides the decision maker with a recommendation from your locally recognized community planning group. The Rancho Encantada Precise Planning area does not have a community planning group at this time. Therefore, the adjacent communities, Miramar Ranch North and Scripps Ranch, provide an adjunct review and recommendation on applications within Rancho Encantada. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Please contact the Chair for the Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee and the Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group, (as identified in the assessment letter) to make arrangements to present your project for review at their next available meeting. The Community Plannig Groups are officially recognized by the City as representatives of these communities, and an advisor to the City in actions that would affect the communities. The Development Services Department has notified the planning groups of your request and has sent them a copy of your project plans and documents. (New Issue)

MRN Planning Committee

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	On May 6, 2015, the Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee voted 8-0-0 to approve the project with no recommendations. (New Issue)

SMR Planning Group

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	On May 12, 2015, the Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group voted unanimously to approve the project with no recommendations. (New Issue)







# Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A

## Review Information

<b>Cycle Type:</b> 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Submitted:</b> 04/10/2015	Deemed Complete on 04/13/2015
<b>Reviewing Discipline:</b> Park & Rec	<b>Cycle Distributed:</b> 04/13/2015	
<b>Reviewer:</b> Harkness, Jeff (619) 533-6595 Jharkness@sandiego.gov	<b>Assigned:</b> 04/13/2015	
	<b>Started:</b> 04/27/2015	
<b>Hours of Review:</b> 0.50	<b>Review Due:</b> 05/11/2015	
<b>Next Review Method:</b> Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	<b>Completed:</b> 05/07/2015	<b>COMPLETED ON TIME</b>
	<b>Closed:</b> 05/18/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/26/2015 from 05/14/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Park & Rec on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Park & Rec performed 43 reviews, 72.1% were on-time, and 72.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

## Review 5-14-15

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	There are no population-based park, adjacent open space, or Maintenance Assessment District (MAD) issues associated with this proposed single family residence. (New Issue)

