



Remaining Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A-2

Project Information

Project Nbr: 585583 **Title:** MPF 7830 Trade St
Project Mgr: Fisher, John (619) 446-5231 jsfisher@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/18/2018	Deemed Complete on 05/18/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 05/18/2018	
Reviewer: Goossens, Kyle (619) 446-5475 Kgoossens@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/18/2018	
	Started: 05/23/2018	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 06/04/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/31/2018	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 06/13/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/07/2018 from 06/07/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 4th 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 15 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (2 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 110 reviews, 89.1% were on-time, and 41.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

First Review

Project Info

No outstanding Issues

Permits

No outstanding Issues

Community Plan/ General Plan

No outstanding Issues

Airport

No outstanding Issues

Separation Requirements

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Major Issue: San Diego United Sports Center at 7698 Miramar Road appears to be a minor oriented facility/ sensitive use. Please revise your map/spread sheet to reflect this business. Is this a minor-oriented facility? If it is not, then what is your rationale for it not being a minor-oriented facility or sensitive use? If City staff determines that minor oriented facilities or sensitive use exist denial of the application will be recommended. (From Cycle 2)

Corrections

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Per submittal guideline requirements please provide all setbacks. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	Additional comments may follow once new information is provided (From Cycle 5)

Draft Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Please keep in mind additional draft conditions may arise throughout the process (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	All operations shall be conducted indoors within a secured structure. All equipment and storage shall be also located within a secure structure. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	Lighting shall be provided to illuminate the immediate surrounding area of the facility, including parking lots and adjoining sidewalks. Lighting shall be hooded or oriented so as to deflect light away from adjacent properties. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	Security shall include operable cameras, alarms, and a security guard. The security guard shall be licensed by the State of California and be present on the premises during business hours. The security guard shall only be engaged in activities related to providing security for the facility, except on an incidental basis. (From Cycle 2)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Kyle Goossens at (619) 446-5475. Project Nbr: 585583 / Cycle: 7





<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	The name and emergency contact phone number of an operator or manager shall be posted outside the marijuana production facility in a location visible to the public from the public right-of-way in character size at least two inches in height. The permittee shall provide this contact information to the San Diego Police Department. The operator or manager shall also be available 24 hours a day to address public nuisance complaints and interact with local, state, and federal law enforcement authorities. Other than the contact information, a marijuana production facility shall limit signage on the (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	A permit shall be obtained as required pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 2, Division 15. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	41	A Conditional Use Permit for a marijuana production facility shall expire no later than five (5) years from the date of issuance. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	The sale of marijuana and marijuana products shall only be conducted by a marijuana outlet in accordance with Section 141.0504. A marijuana production facility is prohibited from providing marijuana and marijuana products to any person other than another marijuana production facility, a testing lab, or a marijuana outlet. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	The marijuana production facility, adjacent public sidewalks, and areas under the control of the marijuana production facility shall be maintained free of litter and graffiti at all times. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	44	The marijuana production facility shall provide daily removal of trash, litter, and debris. Graffiti shall be removed from the premises within 24 hours. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	Prior to the commencement of operations granted by this Permit, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain a change of use/occupancy building permit consistent with all California Codes and Regulations in effect at the time of building permit, satisfactory to the Building Official (New Issue)

Second Review

Planning Review

No outstanding Issues

Community Plan Rec's

No outstanding Issues

Seperation Requirements

No outstanding Issues

Third Review

Seperation Requirements

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	54	Staff review of minor-oriented facilities show no significant barrier between San Diego United Sports Center at 7698 Miramar Rd and proposed MPF. Unless this use is not the primary use on the premises, staff must recommend denial as it does not meet the seperation requirements. (New Issue)





Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/18/2018	Deemed Complete on 05/18/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 05/18/2018	
Reviewer: Mc Pherson, Anna (619) 446-5276 amcpherson@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/18/2018	
	Started: 06/08/2018	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 06/07/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 06/08/2018	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 06/13/2018	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (None of which are new)
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 124 reviews, 76.6% were on-time, and 32.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

January 2017 Review

Land use

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Land Development Review has identified potential issues related to compliance with the Marijuana Production Facility Ordinance. EAS will coordinate with the permit planner to determine if the project has the potential to result in a land use inconsistency, and therefore, result in a recommendation of denial. (From Cycle 2)

Air Quality and Odor

No outstanding Issues

Energy

No outstanding Issues

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

No outstanding Issues

Transportation

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Transportation is requesting additional information/clarification; refer to their comments for further direction. Please provide EAS with any additional documentation/information requested by Transportation. EAS will coordinate with Transportation to determine what, if any, impacts would result with project implementation. (From Cycle 2)

General Comment

No outstanding Issues

Determination

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Until all requested information is submitted and it can be determined that there will be no changes (or further changes as requested by other disciplines) EAS will not be able to make a final environmental determination. 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. The appropriate environmental determination will be made based upon all submitted and reviewed information and when all issues are cleared. (From Cycle 2)

March 2018

Special Note

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Previous comments were inadvertently dated January 2107; they were completed in January 2018. (From Cycle 5)

Land Use

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





Remaining Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A-2

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	An issue related to locational criteria is outstanding. EAS will coordinate with Planning Review to determine if this would impact the analysis and determination. (From Cycle 5)

Air Quality and Odor

No outstanding Issues

Health and Safety

No outstanding Issues

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

No outstanding Issues





Remaining Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A-2

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/18/2018	Deemed Complete on 05/18/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 05/18/2018	
Reviewer: Adams, Tamara (619) 446-5417 TAADAMS@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/23/2018	
	Started: 05/29/2018	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 06/04/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/29/2018	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 06/13/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/07/2018 from 06/07/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 4th 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 4 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (3 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 112 reviews, 88.4% were on-time, and 31.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

3rd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	The recently submitted plans are not consistent with the plans that were submitted and reviewed during the first review cycle, therefore, new comments are added below. Please note the following comments are not exclusive and additional comments may be recommended pending further review of any redesign of this project. Should you have any questions, please contact me at taadams@sandiego.gov. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	The plans recently submitted show patio and patio fence that is encroaching into the right of way, is this a sidewalk cafe? Is there a permit associated with this patio enclosure? Please submit supporting documentation with your response. Further comments will follow. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	The driveway leading to the loading dock shall be 3 ft away from the edge of the patio fence and any obstruction, please revise accordingly. Refer to comment 14. (New Issue)

2nd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	All driveways and curb openings shall be a minimum of 3' from any property lines, easements, structures, and any obstruction, i.e., poles, hydrants, etc. Please update the plans accordingly. (From Cycle 5)





Remaining Cycle Issues

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

L64A-003A-2

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/18/2018	Deemed Complete on 05/18/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Transportation Dev	Cycle Distributed: 05/18/2018	
Reviewer: Santos, Mary Rose (619) 446-5367 MCSantos@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/18/2018	
	Started: 06/04/2018	
Hours of Review: 3.00	Review Due: 06/04/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 06/04/2018	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 06/13/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/07/2018 from 06/07/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Transportation Dev on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 9 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (7 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Transportation Dev performed 73 reviews, 68.5% were on-time, and 27.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review, 12/20/2017

Production Facility Info:

No outstanding Issues

General Comments:

No outstanding Issues

Access:

No outstanding Issues

Public Improvements:

No outstanding Issues

Parking:

No outstanding Issues

Carpool/Zero Emissions Vehicle

No outstanding Issues

Shared Parking:

No outstanding Issues

Mutual Access:

No outstanding Issues

Loading Space:

No outstanding Issues

Additional Comments (informati

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Pending a redesign and/or comments from other reviewing disciplines, LDR-Transportation staff reserves the right to provide additional comments on subsequent review cycles. (From Cycle 2)

2nd Review, 03/14/2018

Previous Comments:

No outstanding Issues

Parking Requirements:

No outstanding Issues

Driveways:

No outstanding Issues

Additional Comments (informati

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





Remaining Cycle Issues

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	42	Pending a redesign and/or comments from other reviewing disciplines, LDR-Transportation staff reserves the right to provide additional comments on subsequent review cycles. (From Cycle 5)
--------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3rd Review, 06/04/2018

Trip Generation:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	43	Please provide a completed trip generation worksheet on the next submittal. Contact Mary Rose Santos at mcsantos@sandiego.gov for a copy of the trip generation worksheet. (New Issue)
--------------------------	----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Parking Table:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	44	Please also include the minimum parking ratios required per code, the minimum number of parking spaces required per code, and the parking provided for: loading spaces. Per SDMC 142-01B, for 10,000-50,000 GFA of structure, a minimum of 1 loading space is required. (New Issue)
--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Compact Parking:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	45	Per SDMC Section 142.0560(e) for pre-existing parking facilities, required off-street parking spaces approved before January 1, 2000 need not be restriped to comply with this section when enlargement or a change in use is undertaken if the spaces required for both the existing use and enlargement comply with the following standards:
--------------------------	----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(1) The parking stall dimensions for 90-degree parking are 8 feet, 6 inches wide by 20 feet long with 21-foot aisles; or

(2) A maximum of 60 percent of the total number of spaces may be 7 feet, 6 inches wide by 15 feet long with 18-foot aisles.

<input type="checkbox"/>	46	Continued from comment #45:
--------------------------	----	-----------------------------

Parking spaces 1-5 and 7-12 appear to be compact parking spaces. Please provide verifiable documentation demonstrating that these spaces were approved before January 1, 2000 and complies with SDMC Section 142.0560(e); otherwise, parking stall dimensions shall comply with SDMC Section 142.0560, Table 142-0K. Refer to previous comment #6. (New Issue)

Parking Requirements:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	47	Parking for applications proposing to utilize existing developed properties will be based on one of the following:
--------------------------	----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- a. The number of employees identified by the applicant needed to operate the MPF; or
- b. 2.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

The project is proposing to provide parking at a rate of one parking space per employee. Per the parking table, it appears that a maximum of 18 employees at one time is being proposed. A minimum of 18 parking spaces is required and the project is proposing to provide 26 parking spaces.

<input type="checkbox"/>	48	(New Issue) Continued from comment #47:
--------------------------	----	--------------------------------------------

Please be advised that parking based on the number of employees will be expressed in the CUP as a condition, which limits the maximum number of employees on-site at any given time. (New Issue)

Driveways:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	49	Per Land Development Code Section 142.0560 (j) Table 142-05M, the current minimum required and maximum allowed, two-way driveway widths for the proposed nonresidential development are 24 and 30 feet respectively. Please dimension the driveway width leading to the loading dock. (New Issue)
--------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------





Remaining Cycle Issues

6/13/18 11:14 am

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

L64A-003A-2

Page 8 of 8

Review Information

Cycle Type: 7 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 05/18/2018	Deemed Complete on 05/18/2018
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 05/18/2018	
Reviewer: Fisher, John (619) 446-5231 jsfisher@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 06/12/2018	
	Started: 06/12/2018	
Hours of Review: 0.25	Review Due: 06/04/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 06/12/2018	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 06/13/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 06/07/2018 from 06/07/2018 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 4th complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (None of which are new)
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 74 reviews, 60.8% were on-time, and 37.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

2nd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Plans were sent to the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group for their information. Community Planning Group recommendations are integral components of the project review process. You may contact Jeffrey L. Stevens, Chair of the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group, Chair at mmcpvg.chair@gmail.com to inquire about the community planning group meeting dates, times, and location for community review of this project. (From Cycle 5)

