



CITY OF OCEANSIDE

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT / PLANNING DIVISION

June 21, 2022

Mr. Reza Shera
PO Box 9890
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

Subject: Application Review Committee (ARC), T21-00002, D21-00005, and DB21-00003, Vista Way Senior Housing (Assessor Parcel Number: 165-493-47)

Dear Mr. Shera,

VIA E-MAIL: rezashera@gmail.com

The City of Oceanside Application Review Committee (ARC), with project management coordinated by the City's Planning Division, has conducted an initial review of the project, which consists of the following applications which your office has submitted and represents:

**Tentative Tract Map T21-00002, Development Plan D21-00005, and
Density Bonus DB21-00003**

The ARC is a standing, working committee comprised of representatives from the various City departments with responsibility for assuring that proposed projects comply with applicable provisions of State and local law. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65943, City staff has evaluated the above applications to determine whether additional information is needed to determine compliance with the City's General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and other applicable regulations and guidelines. At this time, the Committee finds that the submitted application package is **incomplete**, and thus, a formal resubmittal of the project application will be necessary to move the proposed project forward through the City's application review process. The following comments from the City's various, responsible Departments and/or Divisions must be addressed before further processing of the application can proceed. At such time that the revised application materials are ready for re-submittal, please contact me to schedule that submission so that we can review the materials together to confirm that all outstanding information has been included in the resubmittal package.

The project site is zoned Medium-Density Residential-A (RMA) and has a General Plan Land Use Designation of Medium-Density A- Residential (MDA-R) with a density range of 6 – 9.9 du/acre).

PLANNING:

The Planning Division's comments are contained in Attachment 1. Please contact me directly should you have any questions regarding any of the comments provided.

ENGINEERING:

The Engineering Division's comments are included as in Attachment 2. Should you have any questions regarding their comments, please contact Edwin Medina, Assistant Engineer, at 760-435-5086 or at emedina@oceansideca.org.

ENGINEERING (LAND SURVEY):

The Land Survey Section of the Engineering Division's comments are included here. Should you have any questions regarding their comments, please contact Bill Tuck, Land Surveyor, at 760-435-5170 or at btuck@oceansideca.org.

1. Title report and easement data on TM is incorrect, see redlined TM.

ENGINEERING (STORM WATER):

The storm water review comments are included as Attachment 3. Should you have any questions regarding the comments, please contact Paul Pham, City Land Development Engineer, at 760-435-5030 or at ppham@oceansideca.org

FIRE:

The Fire Department has conditionally approved the project and their draft conditions of approval were included in the 2nd ARC letter. Should you have any questions regarding their draft conditions, please contact Tim Rise, Landscape Architect, at 760-435-4308 or at trise@oceansideca.org.

TRANSPORTATION:

Please see the Transportation Engineering Section's comments are provided below. Should you have any questions regarding their comments, please contact Tam Tran, Associate Engineer, at 760-435-5115 or at ttran@oceansideca.org.

1. Painted median Buena Hills Dr. to North yellow striping.
2. Vehicle will only be permitted to turn right when exiting the community. Project to install a right turn pork chop (Right turn slip lane) for Driveway Exit. Please take pedestrian and ADA into consideration when designing this.

WATER UTILITIES:

No additional comments are required from the Water Utilities Department's. Should you have any questions for this department, please contact Bryan Kallenbaugh, Associate Engineer, at 760-435-5857 or at BKallenbaugh@oceansideca.org

WATER UTILITIES (SOLID WASTE):

Solid Waste Section comments will be provided under separate cover. When received, should you have any questions regarding their comments, please contact Annika Andersen, Environmental Specialist II, at 760-435-5818 or at aandersen@oceansideca.org.

SUMMARY:

Please respond to all comments and resubmit the application package with appropriate changes which address departmental review comments. Should you have any additional questions, feel free to contact me at (760) 435-3529.

Please be advised that you may direct any questions regarding these review comments to the City staff person who provided them, with the understanding that any written correspondence or e-mail related to this project application needs to be copied to the Planning Division's project manager who is responsible for overall project management. As a general rule, please include the City's project planner in any meetings and/or discussions with other City staff regarding the proposed project. If the City's project manager is not available to attend meetings or participate in such discussions at any time, please provide the project manager with a written meeting summary including any specific staff direction and/or recommendations which resulted from such meetings or discussions.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review

Staff has conducted a preliminary review of the proposed project pursuant to Section 15061 of the CEQA Guidelines and has determined that the project may qualify for a categorical exemption. While revisions to the project plans resulting from the ARC review process are not likely to affect or change this CEQA determination, nevertheless, staff will review the CEQA determination issue following re-submission of the application.

Please don't hesitate to contact me at 760-435-3529 or panders@oceansideca.org with any questions regarding the processing of this application. I look forward to working with you and your project team to assure that your project proposal both meets your objectives

as well as those of the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinances, and to keep the proposal moving forward through the discretionary review process.

Sincerely,

Patty Anders

Patty Anders
Contract Planner

Attachments:

1. Planning Division Comments
2. Engineering Division Comments
3. Storm Water Comments



Application Review Committee Division Comments- Planning

Development Services Department
300 N. Coast Hwy, Oceanside, CA 92054 | (760) 435-4373

To be filled out by Project Planner

Project/property address and/or APN: 3710 Vista Way (APN: 165-493-47)

Project description: Tentative Map, Development Plan, and Conditional Use Permit for proposed 18-unit detached senior housing project on a vacant 1.97 acre site

To be filled out by ARC Division Reviewer

☐ 1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th **Review**

Staff member: Patty Anders, Contract Planner

Phone number: 760-435-3529

E-mail: panders@oceansideca.org

☐ **Approved w/Conditions**

☐ **Returned for Corrections – 15 Days**

☒ **Returned for Corrections – 30 Days**

(include attachments/forms on TRAKiT, if applicable):

1. Density is not correct: $18 \div 1.97 = 10.9$ or 11%. Global comment: update on all plans including Density Bonus Report.
2. See redline comments on site plan and tentative track map; the proposed General Plan Land Use is not listed correctly and the proposed zoning is incorrect and needs to be deleted.
3. On site plan (sheet 1), the site landscaping is listed at 100%. This is not correct; please revise to vacant and see several other redline comments.
4. Add the required lot coverage maximum (50%) and the proposed.
5. Add the interior dimensions of the one car garages.
6. The response to this comment indicated a profile of the proposed retaining wall is not required due to the request of a waiver; however, staff still needs the profile of the proposed retaining wall with the maximum

Division:

☐ 1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th **Review**

height called out and proposed fences. Due to the extensive use of retaining walls and the significant height of the walls, a separate wall and fence plan is requested as the line work is not clear and hard to read where all walls and fences are located and the maximum height of each. The wall and fence plan needs to call out the maximum height of all retaining walls and the combined height of the retaining wall and fence. As discussed with the engineer, consider the use color if needed to more clearly represent the wall/fence type and height of each. Is there any landscape screening of these large walls? On this new plan also provide a profile of the existing residences to the north, the downward slope to the subject property and the proposed retaining wall. How will the landscaping between the existing and proposed wall be maintained? **(Repeat Comment)**

7. The setback exhibit needs to be clearer and call out all front, rear, side and corner setbacks. Also on the setback exhibit, call out the distance to the interior fences between units, the distance to the proposed retaining wall and the units. In several locations there is a small distance from the unit to a large (e.g. possible 11' retaining wall). Can the retaining wall be setback to capture more usable yard space for the residences and reduce the "no man's land" of landscaping between the two walls? See extensive redline comments on setback exhibits. Staff would like to discuss this site condition.
8. HOA will be conditioned to maintain the open space that is between existing wall on adjacent property and project's proposed wall.
9. Pursuant to Density Bonus Report, the project is requesting waivers for the following development standards:
 - a. Section 1050(AA), a usable rear yard area with no slopes greater than 5 percent shall be provided immediately adjacent to the rear of the structure. The depth of the usable rear yard area shall equal the minimum rear yard setback requirement of the underlying zoning district, which for the RM-A Zoning District is 15'.
 - b. Pursuant to Section 1050(Q), the project must comply with the Usable Open Space requirements (both private and common). The basic requirement is 300 square feet per unit, 50% of which has to be provided in the form of usable common open space.
 - c. Pursuant to Section 1050(X) of the Zoning Ordinance, the minimum front-yard setback from the private street is 15' to the main structure and 20' to the garage.
 - d. Section 1050 Setbacks which are: Front: 20', Side 5/10, Corner: 10' and rear 15'.
 - e. Section 1050(T) with respect to front-yard and side-yard landscaping requirements. This was not included in the Density Bonus Waiver Table.
 - f. Section 1050(DD) with respect to the required 20' garage setbacks.
 - g. Section 1050(U) Fences and Walls, maximum height shall be 6' except in the front yard abutting a street shall be 42" and all walls over 4' shall be planted and irrigated. A wall and fence plan is requested to do the extensive and height of proposed retaining walls, including the retaining wall

Division:

☐ 1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th Review

visible from Vista Way. Call out heights, material, planting and irrigation of all walls on civil and wall and fence plans.

10. The project is subject to the provisions of Section 3047 of the Zoning Ordinance and will be conditioned as such.
11. The project is subject to the provisions of Section 3049 of the Zoning Ordinance. An exhibit depicting compliance with the Urban Forestry Canopy should be provided to confirm the project complies with the requirements outlined for projects of 1 acre or more. **(Repeat Comment)**
12. Provide a Community Outreach Plan as required by the City's Enhanced Notification Policy. **(Repeat Comment)**
13. The waiver exhibit should include the 300SF of useable open space and 2 car garage requirements to further support the limited developable envelope of the project when all the development standards are implemented.

DENSITY BONUS REPORT (DBR) COMMENTS:

14. Report has incorrect acreage of 2.08; civil and site plan state 1.97. Please revise to be consistent with plans and all calculations in the DBR need to be revised to assess the correct gross acreage of 1.97.
15. Density is incorrect; revise to include the correct density of 11% and provide calculation ($1.97 \times 9.9 = 11\%$).
16. Project description needs to the income level of the three affordable units and indicate if the units will be rental or owner occupied.
17. See extensive redline comments and update DBR per edits. Density Bonus calculations are not correct. The site allows 20 units (9.9 un/acre allowed in the MDA-R General Plan Land Use Designation $\times 1.97 = 19.5$ or 20 units). Density Bonus allows a 27.5% increase in units due to the 15% affordable units being proposed so the maximum units available to building is 26 ($20 \times 27.5\% = 5.5$ of 6 extra Density Bonus units).
18. The report does not state which income level is being proposed nor does it mention or calculate the 15% inclusionary housing requirement as the site is subject to the surplus lands act as you know. Provide the calculation ($18 \times 15\% = 2.7$ or 3 units). The three affordable units can fulfill the inclusionary as both are required to be deed restricted for 55 years; include this in the DBR.
19. The exact setback waivers need to be listed in the waiver table, not just one "standard setback". It must include the front, rear, side, garage as applicable.
20. This is not allowed as it is not consistent with 30.32 M. Requirements for Participation which requires the affordable units to be proportional to the overall project in terms of unit mix, floor plan, square footage and exterior design, and the affordable units must be reasonably dispersed throughout the site. As proposed the units do not comply with this code requirement. To comply with this requirement one affordable unit can

Division:

☐ 1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th Review

be 2 bedroom/1.5 baths and two units must be 2 bedroom/2 bath due to the proportionality requirement as calculated below:

- 38% of the units are 2/1.5: 3 (total affordable units) x 35% = 1.14 (rounded down to 1 unit)
- 61% of the units are 2/2: 3 (total affordable units) x 61% = 1.83 (rounded to 2 units)

21. DBR states the project is eligible for two incentives but per State Law it is only one. In order to qualify for two, the project would need to provide 17% low income units.
22. Update summary per redline mark-ups and include that 15% low income affordable units as well as market rate.

Division:

☐ 1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th Review

(Parent) Project Number: T21-00002

Project Name: 3710 Vista Way

Project Planner: Sergio Madera



Application Review Committee

Division Comments- **ENGINEERING**

Development Services Department

300 N. Coast Hwy, Oceanside, CA 92054 | (760) 435-4373

Project/property address and/or APN: 3710 Vista Way (APN: 165-493-47-00)

Project description: Tentative Map for proposed 20 unit detached senior housing project

☐ 1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th **Review**

Staff member: Edwin Medina

Phone number: (760) 435-5086

E-mail: emedina@oceansideca.org

☐ **Approved w/Conditions**

☐ **Returned for Corrections – 15 Days**

☒ **Returned for Corrections – 30 Days**

Drainage Report

1. In 1.1 Introduction, remove “project should be based on previous residential single family development” and remove “City of Oceanside instructed to use C-Value”.
2. In 1.3 Project Description, remove any verbiage that states the City has instructed to do anything.
3. Page 6, remove any verbiage stating the “previous residential single family development C=0.55”.
4. Remove repeated “Page 7” information on page 8 of the PDF.

Any questions please contact me.

Division: Engineering

☐ 1st ☐ 2nd ☒ 3rd ☐ 4th **Review**



City of Oceanside Engineering Department

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 20, 2022

To: City Development Engineer
City of Oceanside
300 N. Coast Highway
Oceanside, CA 92054

From: Bryan T. Hill, PE – Tory R. Walker Engineering

Subject: SWQMP for Vista Way Senior Housing – 3rd Planning Plan Check (1st for SWQMP) for Preliminary Grading and Associated Improvements (T21-00002)

COMMENTS

- 1.1. *INFORMATION ONLY* – The SWQMP requires the Engineer of Work to submit a wet stamp, signature, and date prior to approval. At approval, please provide the following: (1) date and wet signature on the Cover Sheet; (2) date, wet stamp, and wet signature on the Certification Page; and (3) date and wet signature on the SWQA Form in Attachment 7.
- 1.2. See report redlines for additional comments.
- 1.3. The SWQMP must be updated accordingly with the City's January 2022 BMP Design Manual (BMPDM). The BMPDM is available on the [City's Development Services website](#).
- 1.4. Demonstrate that minimum site retention is provided, use the County of San Diego Automated Stormwater Pollutant Control Worksheets V2.0 to calculate retention volume. Provide a tree well or other appropriate retention BMP.
- 1.5. Provide a letter from the soils engineer indicating that the proposed permeable pavement section is appropriate for use on Type D soils, and with H-20 vehicular loading. It's critical to confirm viability of the section at this stage. If the street needs to be impervious, there will be significant implications to the project in terms of MWS and detention sizing.
- 1.6. The hydromodification calculations in Attachment 2D indicate that the entire project is tributary to UG1/ POC-2. It appears DMA-A is discharging at a separate POC, identified as POC-1. Provide hydromodification calculations and an HMP BMP for POC-1.
- 1.7. Attachment 1e - Along with the City of Oceanside BMP Design Manual Form 4 (as also summarized on County of San Diego Automated Worksheet B.2), provide an

assessment of infiltration feasibility from the soils engineer, including Worksheet C.4-1 if infiltration is feasible and proposed.

Please call if you have any questions 760-414-9212

