

Bill Martin, AICP
Director of Community Development
201 North Broadway, Escondido, CA 92025
Phone: 760-839-4647 Fax: 760-839-4313

April 5, 2020

Ninia Hammond
Integral Communities
2235 Encinitas Blvd., Ste. 216
Encinitas, CA 92024

Re: SUB 18-0011 / ENV 18-0009 / PHG 18-0049 – Request for a Specific Plan Amendment, General Plan Amendment (Circulation Element), Master and Precise Development Plan, Tentative Subdivision Map, Specific Alignment Plan and Development Agreement for Palomar Heights (555 E. Valley Parkway and adjacent properties)

Dear Ms. Hammond:

The City of Escondido has completed its fourth review of the above-referenced application, submitted on December 23, 2019. Upon completion of this review it has been determined that there are still outstanding issues that need to be addressed. Please provide the items, information, and plan revisions/modifications described below so that we can complete our review of the application.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

1. The date of revision shall be provided on all plans and reports.
2. The Planning Case numbers (SUB 18-0011, ENV 18-0009 and PHG 18-0049) shall be provided on all plans. (They are included on most plans but are still missing on the landscape plans.)
3. Ensure that all plans use the same base layers so that everything is plotted consistently.
4. Ensure that the Final EIR is revised to reflect relevant changes resulting from comments provided in this letter.

PLANNING DIVISION COMMENTS:

GENERAL PROJECT REVISIONS

The following comments will require revisions to multiple plan sets since they reflect general design issues. They may or may not be referenced in comments provided for various sections below, however they shall be addressed throughout the plan sets, as necessary. These items have been discussed with your team and various members of City staff, and drafts of various plans may have been presented to the City for review. Since those plans were not included with the December 23, 2019 submittal, the intent of these comments is to make sure that all modifications subsequently discussed with staff are addressed throughout the plans.

1. Diagonal parking is not permitted along E. Valley Parkway.
2. Conflicts between the location of the 36" water main and pressure reducing station in/near E. Valley Parkway, and proposed landscaping and decorative overhead structure at the southwest corner of Valley Boulevard and E. Valley Parkway shall be addressed, to the satisfaction of the Utilities Department and Planning Division.
3. Utilities (primarily sewer) and retaining walls along the eastern property line (N. Fig Street) shall be revised to reflect the currently proposed design, to the satisfaction of the Utilities and Engineering Service Departments and the Planning Division.
4. The alignment of Valley Boulevard shall be revised, to the satisfaction of the Engineering Services Department.

PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN

1. Identify the name of the soils engineer in the General Design Notes. (This comment was provided previously and has not been addressed.)
2. Remove or clarify General Design Note No. 11.
3. Ensure that the Proposed Valley Boulevard street section (Sheet 3) matches that shown on the Specific Alignment Plan (SAP). (Please ensure that the Engineering Services Department supports the proposed SAP design before making final revisions.)
4. The Valley Parkway Intersection Detail sheet (Sheet 12) shall be revised to conform to the proposed SAP.
5. There appears to be an existing retaining wall shown just north/east of the main project driveway on Sheet 6. Please remove it or call it out as to-remain and provide top and bottom elevations.
6. Retaining wall heights and orientation along N. Fig Street will be reviewed again after the sewer main modifications have been identified. Note that staff prefers the sewer main modifications to be made in such a way as to allow the greatest reduction in height of the retaining walls while keeping the proposed sewer main(s) as shallow as possible, subject to approval by the Utilities Department.
7. Revised Utilities plan sheets shall be included with the plans.
8. Parking and open space calculations on Sheet 1 shall be revised to incorporate any changes required on other plans.

TENTATIVE MAP

1. Remove General Note No. 6 or replace with the information provided in General Note No. 11 and remove that Note.
2. Revise the location and/or type of utility easements shown on Sheet 5 based on proposed modifications to the utility system.
3. Incorporate any additional revisions based on comments provided on the Preliminary Grading Plan above.

DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

The overall design of the project is moving in the right direction with regard to the major concerns raised previously. The following design-related issues and necessary corrections and revisions need to be taken into account when making further project modifications:

Site Planning

1. Electric vehicle (EV) charging spaces will be required at the rate identified in the California Building Code in effect at the time of building plan submittal.
2. Verify that the proposed location of the ride share spaces and bus stop is acceptable to the Engineering Services Department. They may be too close to the corner of Valley Boulevard and E. Grand Avenue. (This may have already been addressed through modifications made to the Valley Boulevard alignment since the December 23, 2019, plan sets were submitted.)
3. The primary purpose for on-site loading spaces is to accommodate short-term parking of delivery vehicles and moving trucks. The loading spaces provided on the interior of the project site (one near the southeast corner of Building 23 and one at the northwest corner of Building 24) are insufficient to serve this purpose.
 - a. More than one loading space needs to be provided on the main portion of project site (east of Valley Boulevard). The spaces should be located in areas where they provide more convenient access to elevators, front doors, etc.
 - b. The loading space shown near the southeast corner of Building 23 is too close to the driveway on E. Grand Avenue.
 - c. The loading space at the northwest corner of Building 24 is too far from the elevator. Additionally, it projects into the public right-of-way.

- d. Consider enlarging various parking spaces throughout the site to serve as loading spaces during daytime hours. This will serve the primary purpose while not reducing the overall number of spaces available for resident and guest parking after-hours.
4. Identify the location of the bike rack on the northeast corner of the Valley Boulevard/E. Grand Avenue intersection. (It is missing from the architectural site plan.)
5. Staff still does not believe that providing sidewalks/walkways on both sides of all interior private drives is necessary. Sidewalks/walkways appear to cross the interior private drives (or can be modified to do so) in a manner that would already provide the necessary accessible path of travel. Additionally, currently proposed accessible units can be relocated within the buildings or moved to other buildings. Removal of sidewalks/walkways in various locations will allow the project to provide additional green space.
6. There is no need for two adjacent walkways between Buildings 17 and 18. Please remove one of them.
7. An accessible parking space may be necessary in the vicinity of the dog park and the rec area near the east side of the project site.
8. What is the rectangular area on the northwest side of Building 1? It appears on all plans but is not called out. Please identify it or remove it.
9. Please provide a letter from Escondido Disposal, Inc., acknowledging that they will be able to provide service to the site based on the proximity of the trash truck pads to the trash rooms.
10. While staff acknowledges that some site modifications have been made to add more green space, the site is still dominated by parking and driveways. Staff continues to encourage you to look for ways to reduce the amount of pavement on the property.

Open Space and Landscaping

1. The Planning Case Numbers (SUB 18-0011 / ENV 18-0009 / PHG 18-0049) are still missing on the Landscape Plans.
2. Provide a sheet index on Sheet L-1.
3. Provide street trees along E. Valley Parkway (northeast of the primary project entrance), and west of the eastern project driveway on E. Grand Avenue (near Building 12). Street trees will also be required at the bottom of the retaining wall along N. Fig Street.
4. The 2019 California Green Building Code contains requirements for partial shading of parking areas by tree canopies within a defined period from installation. Please be aware that this may require additional trees in the parking areas. (This comment is being provided for informational purposes only and can be addressed during preparation of landscape construction drawings.)
5. Please revise the Open Space Exhibit to address the following items:
 - a. Differentiate between interior and exterior common open space.
 - b. Useable open space is defined as areas having less than ten percent slope and measuring a minimum of ten feet in all directions. (Staff believes it is a good idea to include the sloped areas on the exhibit for illustrative purposes, however they need to be omitted from the open space calculation.)
6. Staff still believes that a roof deck on the corner of Building 1 would provide a great place for residents to congregate, similar to the type of residential open space amenities previously contemplated with the building re-use scenario for the project, and encourages you to investigate the ability to provide this amenity.
7. Provide a shade structure and barbeque area by the tables in the open space area north of Building 23.
8. The callout on sheet L-02 for the enlargement of the Plaza at Valley Parkway Split is incorrect (L-05 instead of L-06).
9. Identify grass-crete on the legend on Sheet L-02. Also, expend the grass-crete area west of the pool to include the entire row of parking spaces.
10. Please revise the Fence Plan to address the following items:

- a. A 42-inch fence is not sufficient around the dog park.
- b. Ensure that the guardrail on top of the retaining walls is of adequate height. Three feet may not be sufficient.
- c. Provide more detail regarding type and material callouts for all fences and walls. For instance, are retaining walls proposed as split-face block, keystone, etc.; what type of fencing is proposed for the containment fencing around the pool?
- d. Provide typical details for fences and walls. Make sure to include details where fencing is proposed atop retaining walls. Details shall identify the maximum (combined, if appropriate) height of the various fence types.

Architecture

1. Provide actual color and materials boards. Maximum size shall be 9" x 12".
2. The following items shall be addressed on the plans for the apartments:
 - a. Additional building articulation is still necessary on the sides of Buildings 1 and 23 that face the main project driveway, and on the east side of Building 18.
 - b. Provide inset/pop-out measurements for all building elevations, not just those facing the public street.
 - c. Building 18 has 39 covered parking spaces and 40 units. Is it your intent that one unit will not have a covered parking space? If so, this will have to be addressed as part of the Planned Development Permit since parking standards require one covered space per unit.
 - d. When counting Plan 1 units in Building 1, the total appears to be only 34, however 35 are identified in the table on Sheets A-4.1 and A-4.2. Please verify the total and adjust if necessary.
 - e. There are a few units in Building 1 that do not have the plan type identified on the building composite (second floor on Sheet A-4.1).
 - f. When counting Plan 1 units in Building 23, the total appears to be only 72, however 74 are identified in the table on Sheet A-6.1. Please verify the total and adjust if necessary.
3. The following items need to be addressed on the plans for the senior apartments:
 - a. Provide pedestrian access into the building from the covered parking area.
 - b. The entrance to the building lobby is still not substantial and needs more definition.
 - c. Provide greater variation of roof heights.
 - d. There appears to be a doorway missing between the garage and the building lobby.
4. Roof heights for Style 1 of the Villas and Rowhomes needs more variation.
5. There appears to be a person walking on water on the rendering for the rec area.

FIRE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Clarify construction type and square footage of each building so that staff can verify/provide minimum fire flow and hydrant spacing.
2. Show all FDC/PIV locations. Note that each building will require its own FDC/PIV; larger buildings may require more than one.
3. FDCs shall be within 40 feet of a hydrant.
4. Show the minimum inside turning radii on every corner and provide fire turnarounds on access roadways over 150 feet in length. Additionally, per the Fire Marshal, an additional person gate should be provided on E. Grand Avenue at the terminus of Alley "R."
5. The following items will be required as part of the building and/or grading plan submittals for the project:
 - a. All mid-rise buildings shall comply with Section 320, mid-rise ordinance. NFPA 13 & 72 shall be followed. (Provide emergency voice alarm signaling, fire command center, annunciation ID, etc.)
 - b. All buildings shall comply with Section 510, emergency responder radio coverage
 - c. Provide an adequate water supply and an approved all-weather access roadway prior to any combustible materials being brought to the site.

April 5, 2020

- d. Minimum roadway width is 24 feet, and shall paved in an approved all-weather surface able to hold the weight of the fire apparatus (75,000 pounds).
- e. Underground fire lines, fire sprinklers, standpipes, and fire alarm plans, shall all be deferred submittals.

ENGINEERING COMMENTS

Comments from the Engineering Services Department, including those provided on the Storm Water Quality Management Plan, are attached as separate documents. Note that some of the items contained therein may have been addressed through various revisions/iterations to the plans since they were submitted on December 23, 2019.

UTILITIES COMMENTS

Comments from the Utilities Department are attached as a separate document. Many of the comments have been addressed through various revisions/iterations to the plans since they were submitted on December 23, 2019. Continue to work with the Utilities Department to identify an appropriate plan for provision of sewer service that keeps sewer mains at an acceptable depth.

CONCLUSION

Please revised the project plans and technical documents in order to address the items and information identified above so that staff can complete its review of your application. Note additional comments may be identified based on review of more-detailed and complete project plans and other submittal materials.

Please provide ten full-size copies (folded) and one reduced copy (8 ½" x 11") of the revised plans, along with an electronic copy (preferably through an FTP site) incorporating responses to the items described above. For architectural plans, only five sets are necessary. *A copy of this letter with notes identifying where the requested information can be found shall accompany your resubmittal. Please also provide a response to the comments provided by the Traffic Engineering Division.*

If you have any questions regarding this information contained in this letter, please feel free to contact me at (760) 839-6203, or via email at afinestone@escondido.org.

Sincerely,

Adam Finestone

Adam Finestone, AICP
Principal Planner

Enclosures

cc: Bill Martin, Director of Community Development
Mike Strong, Assistant Planning Director
Owen Tunnell, Assistant City Engineer
Stephanie Roman Phillips, Utilities Department