



L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Project Information

Project Nbr: 203654 **Title:** Calif. Proton Treatment Center
Project Mgr: Peterson, Jeff (619) 446-5237 japeterson@sandiego.gov



Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Abalos, Raynard (619) 446-5377 | Assigned: 02/09/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 4.00 | Started: 02/22/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/26/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 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: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 15 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 109 reviews, 48.6% were on-time, and 69.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Rev Feb 2010

Project Information

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The project site is located within the IL-2-1 Zone, the Airport Environs Overlay (65 CNEL), the Airport Influence Area (MCAS Miramar), the FAA Part 77 Notification Area, the MCAS Miramar Overflight Zone and Safety Zone areas, the Mira Mesa Facilities Benefit Assessment District, and the Mira Mesa Community Plan Area. The project site is governed by SDP/PDP/VTM No. 98-1199 for the Carroll Canyon Technology Center. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | The project proposes approximately 100,000 sf building for a medical office use on a 9.36 acre site. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | See Plan-Airport's review for FAA and Airport Authority requirements. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue) |

Discretionary Actions

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | In accordance with the approved SDP/PDP No. 98-1199, the project requires approval of a Process Two Substantial Conformance Review, with staff as the decision maker. Staff may approve the project if it is determined that the project substantially conforms to the approved SDP/PDP/VTM No. 98-1199. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | LDR-Planning has determined that the project will substantially conform to SDP/PDP/VTM No. 98-1199 with the following recommendations and corrections. (New Issue) |

SDP/PDP Stds

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | The project is subject to all conditions of the SDP and PDP, including the approved Design Guidelines, which are a part of the Exhibit "A" for the SDP/PDP. The following are comments based on the Design Guidelines Requirements. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | The intensity of development is regulated by the SDP/PDP, which allows a maximum of 13,200 ADT's for the entire twenty-two lots within the Carroll Canyon Technology Center. LDR-Planning defers to LDR-Transportation to determine the allowable ADT's for the project site. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | The Design Guidelines allow any use permitted in the IL-2-1 zone. The proposed use is categorized as "Medical Office" and is an allowable use within the IL-2-1 zone. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | The Design Guidelines provide architectural guidelines related to building massing, siting, orientation and architecture, including color and material. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | The east elevation of the proposed structure consists of blank walls with the 2nd story stepped back from the 1st. The architectural guidelines address the treatment of blank walls through articulation, glazing, and a variation of building material, textures and colors. The guidelines also state that the predominant exterior materials and textures should be glass, concrete (either smooth finish or light sandblast) and field stone. (New Issue) |

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Raynard Abalos at (619) 446-5377. Project Nbr: 203654 / Cycle: 1





L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 | Although the proposed accent trees help screen the east elevation, LDR-Planning recommends changing the surface treatment by using different materials or color on the articulated portions of this elevation. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 | In addition, the elevations indicate a stucco finish as the predominant material. As stated in the architectural guidelines, the walls should be primarily glass, concrete (either smooth finish or light sandblast) or field stone. Consider replacing the stucco finish to comply with the architectural guidelines. (New Issue) |

IL-2-1 Stds

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 | Where not otherwise specified in the Design Guidelines, the IL-2-1 zoning regulations apply to this project. LDR-Planning has determined that the project complies with all requirements of the IL-2-1 zone. [Information Only - No Response Required] (New Issue) |

Corrections

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14 | Under the Development Summary section on Sheet 1, the proposed "Density" is indicated as 68,421 sf. Please revise this to read "GFA" or "Gross Floor Area" and ensure this number is consistent with the proposed GFA shown on Sheet 8. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15 | Signs - Please include a note on Sheet 1 that states "All signs shall comply with the criteria established in the Fenton-Carroll Canyon Technology Center Design Guidelines and shall conform to the sign regulations set forth in Land Development Code Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 12." (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Shearer-Nguyen, Liz (619) 446-5369 | Assigned: 02/05/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 4.00 | Started: 02/26/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/26/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 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: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 65 reviews, 46.2% were on-time, and 54.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

SCR Review 2/10

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | EAS has determined that there are no substantial modifications and finds the project is substantial conformance with the previously certified Environmental Impact Report No. 40-0870, pending resolution of issues raised by other reviewing disciplines (Transportation). |

The determination may change in response to any project changes and/or new information.
(New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Tzonov, Krassimir (619) 687-5967 | Assigned: 02/08/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 6.00 | Started: 02/25/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/26/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 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: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 46 reviews, 76.1% were on-time, and 60.0% 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 | Please address the following issues prior to resubmittal. You may contact the Landscape Planner (Krassimir Tzonov) at (619) 446-5499 with any comments or questions. Further issues may be required by LDR-Landscape pending future revisions to the plans. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Brush Management: The project site is subject to the Brush Management Regulations due its proximity to a highly flammable area of native or naturalized vegetation [LDC, Section 142.0412]. The project has an approved Conceptual Landscape/ Brush Management Plan per the SDP/PDP 98-1199 and landscape drawings D-31879. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | The Brush Management Zones shall be established based on the proposed design, consistent with Exhibit A (PDP/SDP 98-1199) and LDC 142.0412. Note that no structures were indicated in VTM 98-1199 and the Brush Management Plan(Exhibit A) is too conceptual.The required Zone One shall be measured from the exterior of the proposed structure to the vegetation [142.0412(g)(1)-LDC]: VTM 98-1199 indicates 35' BMZ1 (Min) and 50' BMZ2(Min). (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Brush Management Zones - Zone One extends from the rear of the proposed structure out towards the native/naturalized vegetation. Zone Two shall extend beyond Zone One. Please delineate and dimension on the Brush Management Plan. Also please show the Zones clearly on the Landscape Plan (sheet 4). If there are varied zone widths on the project, label the plan to show the different widths at typical and critical points. Note that the Zone Two width may be decreased by 1.5 feet for each 1 foot of increase in Zone One width [142.0412(f)]. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Please callout the "Top-of Slope and identify the boundary of the native/naturalized vegetation. Note that BMZ1 shall not encroach into areas containing sensitive vegetation and/or steep hillsides. Also, Brush Management Zone One is not allowed on slopes with a gradient greater than 4:1 (4 horizontal feet to 1 vertical foot) (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Zone One (35' min) [142.0412(g)]:This area shall be least flammable, and shall consist of pavement and permanently irrigated drought-tolerant fire retardant landscaping. [142.0412(b)(1)]. Also see the Brush management notes from Exhibit A-e.g.: "Brush management Zone One occurs on the building pads." It appears that portions of BMZ1 contain coastal sage scrub planting. Why portions of the pad are replanted with coastal sage scrub?Please remove the coastal sage scrub from BMZ1. For BMZ1, please use drought-tolerant transitional plants(permanently irrigated) consistent with the Exhibit A. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | Limit-of-Work - Please clearly identify and label the limit-of-work on the Landscape Plan. Include reference call-outs (ie. D-sht dwg series (e.g.-31879-D), Plan File No...etc) for areas already permitted so that staff can evaluate the interface between various "phases" of the development. Also identify the existing vegetation adjacent to the project/beyond the limits of work (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | Vehicular Use Area (VUA) Requirements: [142.0406; Table 142-04D; 142.0407]. Please show any 'potential future' parking spaces on the Landscape Plan (sheet 4). Please demonstrate that the VUA requirement of one 24" box size tree within 30 feet of each parking space for the 'potential future' parking areas will be met. Show any 'potential future' trees on the plan. Finger islands or other means of providing 40s.f permeable area for root zones of required trees shall be shown on the plan. The required trees shall be provided within the VUA. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | In addition provide the following note on the Landscape Plan: All canopy trees shall be provided with 40 sq. feet root zone and planted in an air and water permeable landscape area. The minimum dimension (width) of this area shall be 5 feet. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | Please provide the following note: "Long-term Maintenance Responsibility: All Landscaping / Brush Management as shown on these plans shall be the responsibility of _____ [please Specify, e.g. Owner, H.O.A.]". (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Bui, Thomas (619) 446-5458 | Assigned: 02/05/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 4.00 | Started: 02/26/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Conditions | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/26/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 14 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 59 reviews, 89.8% were on-time, and 50.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Engineering Review has no comment. (New Issue) |

Information

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Please be advised that the followings must be accomplished during the ministerial permit issuance on this project: The applicant must complete and submit the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist in order to determine the project's storm water Best Management Practices (BMPs) requirements during construction and post construction. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | The subject development is a priority project which requires the applicant to submit a Water Quality Technical Report in accordance with the Appendix D of the City's Storm Water Standards. The report shall include, but not be limited to how Low Impact Development (LID) and Source Control BMPs have been incorporated to the project, selection and calculations regarding the numeric sizing treatment standards, BMP maintenance schedules and maintenance costs and the responsible party for future maintenance and associated costs. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | In addition, include the selection of Treatment BMPs and calculations regarding the numeric sizing treatment standards, BMP maintenance schedules and maintenance costs and the responsible party for future maintenance and associated costs. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | The report will also need to address water quality, by describing the type of pollutants which will be generated during post construction, the pollutants to be captured and treated by the proposed BMPs and the quality of the resultant discharge. The Storm Water Standards are available online at: http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/stormwater.shtml (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain a Holding the City Harmless Agreement for the proposed work located on the adjacent property. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | 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"/> | 8 | 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 Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, 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, consistent with the Water Quality Technical Report. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | The drainage system for this project shall be private and will be subject to approval by the City Engineer. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 | Prior to the issuance of any 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"/> | 12 | Development of this project shall comply with all requirements of State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order No. 99 08 and the Municipal Storm Water Permit, Order No. 2001-01 (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000002 and CA S0108758), 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) |

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Thomas Bui at (619) 446-5458. Project Nbr: 203654 / Cycle: 1





L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 | 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. 99 08 DWQ, and any subsequent amendments thereto, shall comply with special provisions as set forth in Section C.7 of SWRCB Order No. 99 08 DWQ. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14 | This Substantial Conformance Review shall comply with all conditions in the Site Development/Planned Development Permit No.98-1199. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Transportation Dev | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Huffman, Victoria (619) 446-5396 | Assigned: 02/04/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 9.50 | Started: 02/17/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/25/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 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-Transportation Dev on this project as: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 40 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Transportation Dev performed 36 reviews, 69.4% were on-time, and 30.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

IO 24000475 SCR 1st Review

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Project Description (information only, no action required): Transportation Development staff has completed its first review of the proposed (Process 2) SCR and lot line adjustment for the construction of a 98,723 sf proton treatment center, comprised of 46,028 sf of office space and 52,695 sf of equipment area, with 165 surface parking spaces (proposed parking ratio of 3.3. spaces/1,000 sf (ksf)) on a vacant lot at 9730 1/3 Summers Ridge (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2 | (continued): Road in the IL-2-1 Zone, on Lot 6 of the Carroll Canyon Technology Center in the Mira Mesa Community Plan. Additionally, a lot line adjustment is requested. A preliminary review was performed for this project as PTS#198578. (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | (continued): The site is currently regulated by Vesting Tentative Map (VTM)/Site Development Permit (SDP)/Planned Development Permit (PDP) No. 98-1199 and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 89-0585 Amendment, which permitted 22 office lots with a major emphasis on light industrial, manufacturing, warehousing, and business office users, and limited commercial uses to support the primary users of the Technology Center, on a 130.9 acre site at the northern terminus of (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4 | (continued): Camino Santa Fe from Miramar Road and at the southern terminus of Camino Santa Fe from Mira Mesa Boulevard. The total development allowed by SDP/PDP No. 98-1199 is not allowed to exceed 13,200 average daily trips (ADTs), with no more than 1,293 am peak-hour "in" trips, 203 am peak-hour "out" trips, 248 pm peak-hour "in" trips, and 1,282 pm peak hour "out" trips. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Substantial Conformance: In order to find the project in substantial conformance with Site Development Permit (SDP)/Planned Development Permit (PDP) No. 98-1199, Transportation Development requests the following issues be addressed: (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Vesting Tentative Map: Please provide a copy of the resolution for Vesting Tentative Map No. 98-1199. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 | MMRP: Please demonstrate how all Transportation/Circulation mitigation required in the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) of Environmental Impact Report (EIR) LDR No. 40-0870 has been fulfilled. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | ADT Table: Provide a completed Traffic Worksheet, as shown in Table 5 of the Design Guidelines for the Carroll Canyon Technology Center, which shows the existing development's ADTs as well as the proposed project's ADTs. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | Acreage Per Lot Allocation Table: Update the acreage per lot allocation in the PDP and update Exhibit C of Declaration Establishing Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions and Grants of Easements for Fenton Technology Park. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | Traffic Letter: The proposed facility is estimated to generate 1040 ADT with 27 am peak-hour trips and 27 pm peak-hour trips with the following limitations on the facility: 1. The proposed facility shall maintain no greater than 110 total employees (not full-time equivalent). 2. The patient treatment hours shall be limited to 16 hours per day, six days a week, and 50 weeks per year. 3. The number of patients receiving treatment shall be limited to 240 patients per day. Please state each of these limitations on the plans. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11 | Number of Patients: Please revise the portion of the Development Summary on the Title Sheet (Sheet 1) that states, "The center will treat 240 patients per day;" to "The center will treat a maximum of 240 patients per day;" (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12 | Number of Patients: Please revise the clause in the Scope of Work Summary on the Architectural Site Plan (Sheet 6) from "The center will treat 240 patients per day;" to "The center will treat a maximum of 240 patients per day;" (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13 | Declaration of Restrictions: From Recital D of the proposed Declaration of Restrictions document, revise the clause, "until such time as the City issues a development permit or other discretionary approval for the Property" to "until such time as the City issues a discretionary approval for the Property." (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14 | Declaration of Restrictions: Remove item 5, regarding Termination, from the Declaration portion of the proposed Declaration of Restrictions. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15 | Declaration of Restrictions: Add a severability clause to the proposed Declaration of Restrictions. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16 | Zoning: In the Development Summary portion of the Title Sheet (Sheet 1), please revise the words, "Zoning: il-2-1" to "Zoning: IL-2-1." (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17 | Automobile Parking: The Fenton-Carroll Canyon Technology Center Design Guidelines requires automobile parking to meet the minimum parking requirements shown in Land Development Code (LDC) Table 142-05F. LDC Section 142.0530 Table 142-05F requires medical office space provide parking at the minimum ratio of 4.0 spaces/ksf. However, the proposed project is proposing a parking ratio of approximately 3.58 spaces/ksf (excluding the equipment area of the proposed building). (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18 | (continued): The proposed approximate 3.58 spaces/ksf parking ratio is acceptable only if a parking study performed after the treatment center is completed and in full operation demonstrates to the satisfaction of the City Engineer that the proposed 165 parking spaces sufficient. Per the Declaration of Restrictions, the City will require up to an additional 35 parking spaces, with the caveat that all landscaping requirements must be met for either the 165 parking spaces or the potential 200 parking spaces. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19 | Automobile Parking: The stairwells on both the first and second floor plan, and the elevators shown on the second floor plan should not be counted as equipment area with respect to determining parking requirements. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 20 | Automobile Parking: Please rename the "future parking" "potential future parking" on all pertinent plan sheets. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 21 | Automobile Parking: Number the proposed and future proposed automobile parking spaces sequentially. This will help confirm the number of spaces proposed on the site and assist identifying specific spaces if necessary. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 22 | Automobile The Parking Summary table on the Title Sheet (Sheet 1) indicates 145 standard parking spaces and 20 accessible parking spaces are proposed, but the Site Plan (Sheet 1) and the Architectural Site Plan (Sheet 6) indicate 144 standard parking spaces and 21 accessible parking spaces are proposed. Please make submittal information consistent. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 23 | Accessible Parking (information only, no action required): Per Table 11b-6 of the 2007 California Building Code, if anywhere from 165 to 200 automobile parking spaces are proposed, 6 of them must be accessible parking spaces. The number of accessible parking spaces proposed (21 spaces) is sufficient. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 24 | Accessible Parking: Please show the widths, or the typical widths, of the access aisles for the proposed accessible parking spaces. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 25 | Van Accessible Parking: Please distinguish van accessible parking spaces from standard accessible parking spaces on the Site Plan (Sheet 2). Section 1129 B.3 of the 2007 California Building Code requires the access aisles for van accessible parking spaces to be provided on the passenger side of the vehicle as the vehicle is facing forward into the parking space. Consequently, it appears that only two van accessible parking spaces are proposed. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 26 | Van Accessible Parking: Since one, and not less than one, in every eight accessible parking spaces must be van accessible, if 21 accessible parking spaces are proposed, three of them must be van accessible. Please provide at least 3 van accessible parking spaces. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 27 | Van Accessible Parking: The Architectural Site Plan (Sheet 6) shows only two van accessible parking spaces proposed whereas the Parking Summary table on the Title Sheet (Sheet 1) indicates four van accessible parking spaces are proposed. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 28 | Van Accessible Parking: One of the two accessible parking spaces marked as "van" accessible parking spaces on the Architectural Site Plan (Sheet 6) is not a van accessible parking space since its access aisle is on the wrong side. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 29 | Van Accessible Parking: Revise the Parking Summary table accordingly to show the correct number of van accessible parking spaces proposed. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 30 | <p>Bicycle Parking:</p> <p>The Fenton-Carroll Canyon Technology Center Design Guidelines requires bicycle parking to be provided as in LDC Section 142.0530 (e). Therefore, the proposed project is required to provide a minimum of 2 bicycle parking spaces, based on the following calculation:</p> <p>50 ksf x 0.03 bicycle parking spaces with rack(s) = 1.5 = 2 bicycle parking spaces with rack(s) (after rounding up as required by LDC Section 142.0560 (a) (1))</p> <p>Please indicate on the Site Plan (Sheet 2) the number of bicycles the proposed bike rack can accommodate. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 31 | <p>Bicycle Lockers with Shower:</p> <p>The Fenton-Carroll Canyon Technology Center Design Guidelines requires bicycle lockers with shower(s) be provided at the minimum rate of 0.03 + 0.03 bike lockers with shower per 1,000 sf of building floor area. Therefore, the proposed project is required to provide a minimum of 2 bicycle lockers with shower(s), based on the following calculation:</p> <p>(New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 32 | <p>(continued):</p> <p>50 ksf x 0.03 bike lockers with shower = 1.5 bike lockers with shower = 2 bike lockers with shower (after rounding up as required by LDC Section 142.0560 (a) (1))</p> <p>Please provide, show, and call out these required bicycle lockers and the location of the showers on the Site Plan (Sheet 2). (New Issue)</p> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 33 | <p>Motorcycle Parking (information only, no action required):</p> <p>The Fenton-Carroll Canyon Technology Center Design Guidelines requires bicycle parking to be provided as in LDC Section 142.0530 (g), which requires motorcycle parking to be provided at the minimum rate of 2% of the minimum number of automobile parking spaces required, or two spaces, whichever is greater. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 34 | <p>(continued):</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed project is required to provide a minimum of 4 motorcycle parking spaces, based on the following calculation:</p> <p>0.02 x 200 = 4 motorcycle parking spaces</p> <p>The number of motorcycle parking spaces proposed (4 spaces) and their dimensions are sufficient. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 35 | <p>Loading Area:</p> <p>Per LDC Section 142.1010 Table 142-10B, one off-street loading space is required for the proposed project. This off-street loading space must have a minimum length of 35 feet, a minimum width of 12 feet, and a minimum vertical clearance of 14 feet including entrances and exits. Please provide, show, and dimension this loading space on the site plans. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 36 | <p>Landscaping:</p> <p>If there is any other landscaping required if the "potential future" parking spaces are paved, it should be shown on the landscaping plan as "potential future" landscaping. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 37 | <p>Driveway:</p> <p>Adjust the lot line between Lot 5 and Lot 6 so that the new property line is aligned with the center line of the private driveway. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 38 | <p>Driveway:</p> <p>Please demonstrate on the plans that there is adequate site distance for the project access point on Summers Ridge Road. (New Issue)</p> |





L64A-003A

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 39 | <p>Visibility:</p> <p>Show and call out visibility triangles at each corner of the driveways and street intersections on both the site plans and the landscape plans. LDC Section 113.0273 Diagram 113-02RR illustrates how visibility areas are to be drawn. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 40 | <p>(continued):</p> <p>No fences, shrubs, or other objects greater than 36 inches in height are permitted in the visibility areas. Clearly note on the site plans and landscape plans that no objects higher than 36 inches are proposed in the visibility areas. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 41 | <p>Joint Use Driveway/Mutual Access Agreement (Shared Driveway):</p> <p>A Joint Use Driveway/Mutual Access Easement Agreement between Lot 5 and Lot 6 should be recorded. This form is used for the agreement between two property owners sharing the same driveway due to the location of the property line dividing their lots. This form (Form DS-3248) will be sent to you by your Development Project Manager (DPM). (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 42 | <p>Access Easement Agreement</p> <p>An access easement agreement should be recorded between Lot 5 and Lot 6.</p> <p>This agreement must include the legal descriptions of the properties involved, the reason for the agreement, and the conditions of the agreement. The following clauses should be provided in the agreement:</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 43 | <p>1. The provisions and conditions of this agreement shall be enforceable against successor in interest and assigns of the signing parties. (New Issue) (continued):</p> <p>2. This agreement is in perpetuity and can only be terminated if separate accesses are provided for each and every property involved. The termination of such agreement must be provided to all parties involved at least sixty days prior to the termination date.</p> <p>3. This agreement is a private and not a public issue; therefore, the City of San Diego is not responsible for any dispute that might arise in the future between the private parties involved. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 44 | <p>(continued):</p> <p>In addition, the easement/agreement area shall be delineated by bearings and distances on the exhibit or the associated D-sheet drawing for the development. The agreement must be recorded at the Office of the County Recorder on the titles of those properties referenced in the agreement. (New Issue)</p> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 45 | <p>Additional Comments and Conditions (information only):</p> <p>Additional comments and conditions may be provided pending further review or redesign of this project. Please feel free to contact Victoria Huffman for any Transportation related issues.</p> <p>Phone: 619.446.5396 Email: vhuffman@sandiego.gov</p> <p>(New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 46 | <p>Declaration of Restrictions:</p> <p>Under the Declaration portion of the document, rename item 1. "Parking" to "Automobile Parking." (New Issue)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 47 | <p>Declaration of Restrictions:</p> <p>Under the Declaration portion of the document, revise the clause in item 1 from "not to exceed two hundred (200) parking spaces" to "not to exceed two hundred (200) automobile parking spaces." (New Issue)</p> |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: Fire-Plans Officer | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Carter, Ron (619) 446-5449 | Assigned: 02/04/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 1.00 | Started: 02/26/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/26/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 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 Fire-Plans Officer on this project as: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with Fire-Plans Officer (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Fire-Plans Officer performed 13 reviews, 92.3% were on-time, and 30.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Fire Dept issues (1st review)

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | Hydrant location does not cover all portions of the building within 300' radius. Additional hydrant is required. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Post indicator valves, fire department connections, and alarm bell are to be located on the address/access side of the structure. UFC 1001.4 - provide as a note on the site plan. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Provide fire access roadway signs or red curbs In accordance with FHPS Policy A-00-1 - provide as a note on the site plan. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Building is over 35 ft tall: provide aerial ladder access on one complete side of building meeting 15-25ft setback from fire access roadway to face of building. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Call Ron Carter at 619-446-5449 for an appointment to discuss these requirements. (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: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Facilities Financing | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Abeyta, Angela (619) 533-3674 | Assigned: 02/04/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 0.50 | Started: 02/05/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Conditions | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/05/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Plan-Facilities Financing on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Plan-Facilities Financing performed 29 reviews, 86.2% were on-time, and 96.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Facilities Financing

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | This project as shown would be subject to Mira Mesa Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA) Fees in the amount of \$613,978.56 based on 11.16 acres @ \$55,016 per acre. This is the acreage currently shown on our assessor's maps. In addition, a Housing Trust Fund (HTF) fee of \$72,526.26 will be collected on behalf of the Housing Commission. This fee was calculated on 68,421 sq. ft. @ \$1.06 per. Call Angela Abeyta @ 619-533-3674 with questions. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Peterson, Jeff (619) 446-5237 | Assigned: 02/17/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 0.15 | Started: 02/17/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/17/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 60 reviews, 41.7% were on-time, and 48.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

First Review Comments

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The proposed project is located within the Mira Mesa Community Planning Area and the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group is the community group for the area. This group is officially recognized by the City Council as a representative of the community, and as an advisor to the City in actions that would affect the community. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | If you have not already done so, please contact Linda Geldner, Chairperson at (858) 578-1076 to schedule your project for a presentation before the group so that they may be able to provide a recommendation. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the community planning group, please submit a copy of the recommendation and/or minutes from the meeting which includes the vote count. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Information Bulletin 620, "Coordination of Project Management with Community Planning Committees" (available at http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services), provides some valuable information about the advisory role the Community Planning Group. Council Policy 600-24 provides standard operating procedures and responsibilities of recognized Community Planning Committees and is available at http://clerkdoc.sannet.gov/Website/council-policy . (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: PUD-Water & Sewer Dev | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Rastakhiz, Mehdi (619) 533-5155 | Assigned: 02/08/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 4.00 | Started: 03/01/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 03/01/2010 | COMPLETED LATE |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Change In Project Scope.
- . We request a 2nd complete submittal for PUD-Water & Sewer Dev on this project as: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with PUD-Water & Sewer Dev (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month PUD-Water & Sewer Dev performed 13 reviews, 100.0% were on-time, and 100.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Information Item:

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | If you have any questions regarding the water and sewer review comments, please contact Mehdi Rastakhiz at (619) 533-5155. (New Issue) [Recommended] |

Comments:

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | The Water and Sewer Review Section of the Public Utilities Department has reviewed the proposed project submittal to modify the development under the previously approved SDP/PDP/VTM No. 98-1199 and finds the project is in substantial conformance with the previously approved permit provided that the following comments are addressed due to changes in use, design and/or layout of the proposed project: (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | There has been a number of Substantial Conformance Reviews (SCR's) done on this project as a whole. Please either amend the previously approved sewer study to reflect these changes or indicate that this site does not generate more flow than what the approved sewer study indicated based upon the nature of the proposed project. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | 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"/> | 5 | Revise hydrant locations per satisfaction of the Fire Marshall. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Identify all on-site sewer and water systems as "Private" on plans. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: Airport Authority | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Peterson, Jeff (619) 446-5237 | Assigned: 02/17/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 0.15 | Started: 02/17/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/17/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 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 Airport Authority on this project as: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Airport Authority (all of which are new).
- . Last month Airport Authority performed 5 reviews, 80.0% were on-time, and 100.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

First Review Comments

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) has accepted the application and will try to get the project on the March ALUC hearing. Ed Gowens Airport Land Use Commission Regional Aviation Strategic Plan San Diego County Regional Airport Authority P. O. Box 82776 San Diego, California 92138-2776 voice (619) 400-2244 fax (619) 400-2459 (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: MCAS Miramar | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Peterson, Jeff (619) 446-5237 | Assigned: 02/17/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 15.00 | Started: 02/17/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Conditions | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/17/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 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 MCAS Miramar on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with MCAS Miramar (all of which are new).

First Review Comments

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The Community Plans and Liaison for Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar provided a letter dated February 12, 2010, which states that the proposed project is consistent with the MCAS Miramar Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) safety guidelines; however, to comply with the AICUZ noise compatibility guidelines, noise mitigation must achieve a noise level reduction of 25 and be incorporated into the design and construction of the structure. Juan Lias MCAS Miramar CP&L Office (858) 577-6603 (New Issue) |

Draft Condition

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | To comply with the AICUZ noise compatibility guidelines, noise mitigation must achieve a noise level reduction of 25 and be incorporated into the design and construction of the structure. (New Issue) |





L64A-003A

Review Information

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cycle Type: 1 Substantial Conformance Review | Submitted: 02/04/2010 | Deemed Complete on 02/04/2010 |
| Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Airport | Cycle Distributed: 02/04/2010 | |
| Reviewer: Galloway, Tait (619) 533-4550 | Assigned: 02/05/2010 | |
| Hours of Review: 0.30 | Started: 02/17/2010 | |
| Next Review Method: Substantial Conformance Review | Review Due: 02/26/2010 | |
| | Completed: 02/17/2010 | COMPLETED ON TIME |
| | Closed: 03/02/2010 | |

- . The review due date was changed to 02/26/2010 from 03/05/2010 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-Airport on this project as: Substantial Conformance Review.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with Plan-Airport (all of which are new).
- . Last month Plan-Airport performed 2 reviews, 50.0% were on-time, and 50.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

ALUCP 1st Review

| <u>Cleared?</u> | <u>Issue Num</u> | <u>Issue Text</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | ALUCP: The proposed project is in the Airport Influence Area -Review Area 1 for the MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Noise: The proposed project would be located in the 65 dB to 70 dB CNEL as shown in the ALUCP for MCAS Miramar. The ALUCP requires that medical facilities uses provide noise attenuation to ensure an interior noise level of 50 dB CNEL. Please note on the plan that attenuation will be provided to ensure an interior noise level of 50 dB CNEL. (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Safety: While the southern part of the parcel is located in Transition Zone, the proposed building is not located in the Transition Zone; therefore the proposed use would not be limited by the Safety Zone restrictions. (New Issue) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 | ALUC Determination: On Sept. 7, 2006, the Airport Land Use Commission determined that office, industrial, and research and development uses would be conditionally consistent with noise attenuation. The medical facility with outpatient services would not be in conformance with the determination; therefore, the City is required to submit the proposed project to the Airport Authority, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, for a consistency determination with the adopted ALUCP for MCAS Miramar prior to final approval by the City. (New Issue) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 5 | Airspace: The FAA Part 77 notification surface (100:1) for MCAS Miramar crosses this property at 520 feet Above Mean Sea Level (AMSL). The proposed max height of the project is 417 feet AMSL. The proposed building does NOT exceed the Federal Aviation Administration Part 77 notification surface; therefore, notification to the FAA is NOT required. (New Issue) |

