# **K-2**

Hydraulic Modeling, San Dieguito Water District's Potable Water System This page intentionally left blank.

#### **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM**

То:	Christina Olson, San Dieguito Water District
From:	Elizabeth Caliva, Dudek; Justin Scheidel, Dudek; Jenny Li, Dudek
Subject:	As-Needed Development Services Hydraulic Modeling (TO 8) - Torrey Crest (1220-1240
	Melba Road, 1190 Island View Lane)
Date:	September 21, 2022

Torrey Pacific Corporation (Developer) is constructing thirty (30) single family residential units on approximately 6.6 acres of existing residential and vacant land. The proposed development, known as Torrey Crest, fronts Melba Rd approximately 1,000 feet east of Balour Dr. The existing site addresses are 1220, 1230, 1234, and 1240 Melba Rd and 1190 Island View Ln. **Figure 1** depicts the location of the project site. Attachment A includes preliminary site drawings for the proposed development.

The following technical memorandum evaluates the impacts of the proposed development on San Dieguito Water District's (District) existing potable water system. Both existing (2021) and future (2040) scenarios were analyzed to determine what, if any, improvements to the off-site or on-site system are required to maintain District design criteria while delivering water service to the proposed development and surrounding customers.

The memorandum is organized into the following sections:

- Section 1 Potable Water Demands Summarizes the anticipated potable water demands, including fire flow requirement, of the proposed development.
- Section 2 On-Site Improvements Summarizes the proposed on-site potable water facility improvements and tie-in to the District's existing system.
- Section 3 Existing Scenario Analysis & Results Summarizes the impact of the proposed development on the District's existing potable water system.
- Section 4 Future Scenario Analysis & Results Summarizes the impact of the proposed development on the District's future potable water system.

**Section 5 – Recommendations** – Recommends improvements to the existing off-site and/or proposed on-site potable water system based on the results of the existing and future scenario analyses.



Figure 1: Location Map

# 1 Potable Water Demands

The potable water demand of the proposed development was estimated using Table 4-1-1 from the Water Agencies' Standards Design Guidelines for Water and Sewer Facilities (Attachment B), the District's standard for estimating residential demands. **Table 1** presents the anticipated demands of the proposed development.

#### **Table 1. Potable Water Demand Projections for Torrey Crest**

Dwelling Units Gross (DUs) Area (Ac)	Dwelling Unit Density (DU/Ac)	Unit Water Demand <sup>1</sup> (gal/gross acre-day)	Average Day Water Demand (gpm)	Maximum Day Water Demand <sup>2</sup> (gpm)	Peak Hour Water Demand <sup>3</sup> (gpm)
30 6.646	4.5	2100	9.7	14.5	26.6

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Assumed a dwelling unit density of 4 DU/Ac.

<sup>2</sup> Potable water MDD is equal to 1.5 x ADD per Table 3-5 from the District's 2022 Water System Master Plan.

<sup>3</sup> Peak hour demand is equal to 1.83 x MDD per pattern "MDD" in the District's latest potable water model.

According to the District's 2022 Water Master Plan, the fire flow requirement of the proposed development is 1,500 gpm for 2 hours as summarized in **Table 2**.

#### **Table 2. Fire Flow Requirement for Torrey Crest**

Land Use Category	Fire Flow Requirement (gpm) <sup>1</sup>	Duration (hours)
Single Family Residential	1,500	2
Nataa		

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Fire flow requirement per Table 4-2 from the District's 2022 Water System Master Plan.

# 2 On-Site Improvements

Per the preliminary site drawings in Attachment A and as shown in **Figure 2**, the developer proposes to install an on-site 8-inch PVC waterline beginning from a point of connection to the existing 6-inch waterline in Melba Rd and terminating in a cul-de-sac at the northeast corner of the project site. The proposed on-site waterline is designated as public and therefore will be maintained by the District.



Figure 2: Proposed On-Site Water Improvements

The proposed 8-inch waterline was added to the District's existing InfoWater<sup>™</sup> model, created and calibrated by IEC in 2021. A Hazen-Williams coefficient ("C") of 130 was assumed for the new PVC waterline. On-site junction elevations were approximated from contour lines depicted on the preliminary grading plans. The proposed development resides within the District's 520 pressure zone.



# 3 Existing Scenario Analysis & Results

Analysis of the existing conditions included two (2) extended period simulation (EPS) scenarios—maximum day demand (MDD), which includes peak hour, and MDD plus fire flow. The following sections detail each analysis and results.

## 3.1 Existing Maximum Day and Peak Hour Analysis

Scenario "2021\_MDD\_FF" in the existing potable water model was used to evaluate the impacts of the proposed development on the existing system and verify the on-site waterline is adequately sized for immediate service. The MDD of 14.5 gpm calculated in Table 1 was allocated evenly between the six (6) on-site model junctions. A twenty-four (24) hour EPS was performed under MDD conditions.

The model results were compared to District design criteria listed in Table 4-1 from the 2022 Water System Master Plan, which call for a minimum service pressure of 40 psi and maximum pipeline velocity of 7 fps under peak flow conditions.

The results shown in **Figure 3** indicate pipeline velocities surrounding and within the proposed development are not expected to exceed 7 fps. Furthermore, junction pressures are not projected to fall below 40 psi. The low-pressure nodes surrounding the Balour Tank northwest of the proposed development are existing low-pressure nodes with zero demands and therefore not applicable to the analysis. Therefore, the proposed on-site 8-inch waterline can meet peak demand while maintaining District design criteria in the existing system.



Figure 3: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Existing MDD Analysis

## 3.2 Existing Maximum Day Plus Fire Flow Analysis

An additional 24-hour EPS was performed under existing MDD plus fire flow conditions to verify the proposed onsite waterline can deliver the required fire flow while maintaining District design criteria. The District allows a minimum service pressure of 20 psi and maximum pipeline velocity of 15 fps under MDD plus fire flow conditions.

A worst-case fire event was simulated by applying the required fire flow of 1,500 gpm to the dead-end node at the northeast corner of the project site.

The results shown in **Figure 4** indicate pipeline velocities surrounding and within the proposed development are not expected to exceed 15 fps. However, pressures will fall below 20 psi on-site due to the fire flow demand. Off-site pressures will remain above 20 psi. The low-pressure nodes surrounding the Balour Tank northwest of the proposed development are existing low-pressure nodes with zero demands and therefore not applicable to the analysis.





Figure 4: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Existing Fire Flow Analysis

Two options to minimize headloss through the distribution system and therefore improve low pressures under fire flow conditions are presented below, including:

- 1. Upsizing a portion of the proposed on-site 8-inch waterline to 12-inch
- 2. Upsizing a portion of the existing off-site 6-inch waterline in Melba Rd to 8-inch

#### 3.2.1 Option 1: Upsize On-Site Waterline

Under Option 1, a portion of the proposed on-site waterline is upsized to reduce headloss and convey existing maximum day plus fire flow demands without violating District pressure design criteria. **Figure 5** presents the results of an MDD plus fire flow analysis with approximately 320 feet of proposed on-site 8-inch waterline upsized to 12-inch. On-site and off-site pressures remain above 20 psi and pipeline velocities do not exceed 15 fps. Therefore, Option 1 requires a minimum of 320 feet of the proposed on-site 8-inch waterline north of Melba Rd to be upsized to 12-inch to accommodate maximum day plus fire flow demands while maintaining District design criteria under existing demand conditions.

Figure 5: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Existing Fire Flow Analysis with Upsizing On-Site



### 3.2.2 Option 2: Upsize Off-Site Waterline

Under Option 2, a portion of the existing off-site waterline in Melba Rd is upsized to reduce headloss and convey existing maximum day plus fire flow demands without violating District pressure design criteria. **Figure 6** presents the results of an MDD plus fire flow analysis with approximately 350 feet of existing off-site 6-inch waterline in Melba Rd between Oceanic Dr and Wotan Dr upsized to 8-inch. On-site and off-site pressures remain above 20 psi and pipeline velocities do not exceed 15 fps. Therefore, Option 2 requires a minimum of 350 feet of existing off-site 6-inch waterline in Melba Rd to be upsized to 8-inch to accommodate maximum day plus fire flow demands while maintaining District design criteria under existing demand conditions.

Figure 6: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Existing Fire Flow Analysis with Upsizing Off-Site



# 4 Future Scenario Analysis & Results

Analysis of the future conditions included two (2) EPS scenarios—MDD, which includes peak hour, and MDD plus fire flow. The following sections detail each analysis and results.

## 4.1 Future Maximum Day and Peak Hour Analysis

In addition to the existing "2021\_MDD\_FF" scenario, Dudek created a future "2040\_MDD\_FF" scenario to evaluate the impacts of the proposed development on the future system and verify the on-site waterline is adequately sized for the ultimate condition. Future average daily demands were calculated using the growth factors outlined in the District's 2022 Water Master Plan. As in the existing scenario analysis, a 24-hour EPS was performed under MDD conditions and model results compared to District design criteria.

The future scenario analysis was evaluated under upsizing Options 1 and 2 from Section 3.2 above, as required to meet design criteria under existing MDD plus fire flow conditions.

The results shown in **Figures 7** and **8** indicate that under future peak demand conditions, pipeline velocities surrounding and within the proposed development are not expected to exceed 7 fps under either upsizing Options 1 or 2. Furthermore, junction pressures are not projected to fall below 40 psi. Therefore, both upsizing options are anticipated to be able to meet peak hour demand while maintaining District design criteria in the future system.



Figure 7: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Future MDD Analysis (Option 1)



Figure 8: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Future MDD Analysis (Option 2)

## 4.2 Future Maximum Day Plus Fire Flow Analysis

As in the existing demand analysis, an additional 24-hour EPS was performed under future MDD plus fire flow conditions to verify the on-site waterline can deliver the required fire flow while maintaining District design criteria. This condition was evaluated under both upsizing Options 1 and 2. Once again, a worst-case fire event was simulated by applying the required fire flow of 1,500 gpm to the dead-end node at the northeast corner of the project site.

### 4.2.1 Option 1: Upsize On-Site Waterline

Under upsizing Option 1, with 320 LF of on-site waterline sized at 12-inch diameter, the results shown in **Figure 9** indicate pipeline velocities surrounding and within the proposed development are not expected to exceed 15 fps. However, the pressure at the dead-end node on site falls just below 20 psi due to the fire flow demand. Off-site pressures will remain above 20 psi. The low-pressure nodes surrounding the Balour Tank northwest of the proposed development are existing low-pressure nodes with zero demands and therefore not applicable to the analysis.

An additional segment of the proposed on-site waterline must be upsized to convey future maximum day plus fire flow demands without violating District low pressure design criteria. **Figure 10** presents the results of an MDD plus fire flow analysis with approximately 40 feet of proposed on-site 8-inch waterline upsized to 12-inch, in addition to the 320 feet of waterline upsized in the existing system analysis. On-site and off-site pressures remain above 20 psi and pipeline velocities do not exceed 15 fps. Therefore, approximately 360 feet of the proposed on-site 8-inch waterline north of Melba Rd must be upsized to 12-inch to maintain District design criteria under future MDD plus fire flow conditions.

Figure 9: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Future Fire Flow Analysis Under Option 1 (320 LF On-Site Waterline Sized at 12-inch)





#### Figure 10: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Future Fire Flow Analysis Under Option 1 with Additional Upsizing On-Site

### 4.2.2 Option 2: Upsize Off-Site Waterline

Under upsizing Option 2, with 350 LF of existing off-site 6-inch waterline in Melba Road upsized to 8-inch diameter, the results shown in **Figure 11** indicate pipeline velocities surrounding and within the proposed development are not expected to exceed 15 fps. Additionally, off-site and on-site pressures remain at or above the District's minimum requirement of 20 psi. Therefore, no additional off-site waterline upsizing in Melba Rd beyond the 350 LF previously determined as required for the existing system is necessary to maintain District design criteria under future MDD plus fire flow conditions.

Figure 11: Minimum Junction Pressures and Maximum Pipeline Velocities – Future Fire Flow Analysis Under Option 2 (350 LF Off-Site Waterline Sized at 8-inch)



# 5 Recommendations

Based on the results of the existing and future analyses presented in the preceding sections, the proposed development cannot proceed as proposed in the preliminary site drawings. Either on-site or off-site waterline upsizing will be necessary to convey the required fire flow to the project site while maintaining District design criteria. Since the project is served by a dead-end line, the District will not allow a portion of the on-site proposed waterline to be upsized to 12-inch due to on-going water quality considerations (i.e., the need for regular flushing of the line). Therefore, it is recommended that 350 LF of existing off-site 6-inch waterline in Melba Ave between Oceanic Dr and Wotan Dr be upsized to 8-inch to ensure sufficient fire flow to the project site under maximum day demand conditions within District design criteria.

# ATTACHMENT A PRELIMINARY SITE DRAWINGS

DUDEK

ROPERTY LINE (PL	L)				
DJACENT PROPER	RTY LINE / RIGHT-OF-V	VAY (ROV	V)		
ENTERLINE OF RO	DAD	v	· 		C
XISTING ASSESSC	DR'S PARCEL LIMITS				J
XISTING EASEMEN	NTS				
DJACENT LOT LIN	ES				
EXISTING	G EASEMEN	T IN	FORMATION	PROPOSED EASEMENT INFORMATION	V
REFER TO SHEET :	3 FOR PLOTTING OF E	XISTING	EASEMENTS	REFER TO SHEET 2 FOR PLOTTING OF PROPOSED EASEMENTS	- 122
PRELIMINARY TITL NATIONAL TITLE D NUMBER 00171756	E REPORT PREPAREL ATED FEBRUARY 25, 2 996-SD1-RT4	0 BY FIDE 2022 AS (	ELITY ORDER		
DENSITY	CALCULATI	ONS			
DENSITY (	CALCULATI	ONS	6.646 ACRES (289,	503 SF)	
DENSITY ( ROSS ACREAGE -OPE (%)	CALCULATI AREA (AC)	ONS	6.646 ACRES (289,8 DENSITY (DU)	503 SF)	
DENSITY ( ROSS ACREAGE <u>LOPE (%)</u> 7 - 25 5 - 40	CALCULATI AREA (AC) 6.557 0.059	ONS	6.646 ACRES (289,5 <u>DENSITY (DU)</u> 3.0 3.0 / 2	503 SF)	
DENSITY ( ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) ) - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT	AREA (AC) 6.557 0.059 0.030 AL = 6.646	ONS	6.646 ACRES (289,5 DENSITY (DU) 3.0 3.0 / 2 0	503 SF)	
DENSITY ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) D - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLO	AREA (AC)         6.557         0.059         0.030         AL         = 6.646	<u>ONS</u>	6.646 ACRES (289,5 DENSITY (DU) 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU	503 SF) I/AC = 19.94	
DENSITY ( ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) D - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLO BASE DENSITY PE	CALCULATI  AREA (AC)  6.557  0.059  0.030  AL  = 6.646  WED  R	<u>-</u>	6.646 ACRES (289,5 <u>DENSITY (DU)</u> 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU	503 SF) 1/AC = 19.94 N 01°26'31" E 15.00'	
DENSITY ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) D - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLON BASE DENSITY PE DENSITY BONUS R	$\frac{AREA (AC)}{6.557}$ $\frac{6.557}{0.059}$ $\frac{0.030}{0.030}$ $AL = 6.646$ WED R ROUND UP	<u>=</u>	6.646 ACRES (289,5 <u>DENSITY (DU)</u> 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU 20.0	503 SF) 1/AC = 19.94 N 01°26'31" E 15.00'	
DENSITY ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) D - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLON BASE DENSITY PEN DENSITY BONUS R 3 / 20 UNITS AS AF	$\begin{array}{c} AREA (AC) \\ \hline 6.557 \\ 0.059 \\ 0.030 \\ \hline AL = 6.646 \\ \hline WED \\ R \\ ROUND UP \\ FORDABLE \\ \hline Her \\ $	<u>ONS</u> = = =	6.646 ACRES (289, <u>DENSITY (DU)</u> 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU 20.0 15.0% AFFORDABLE	503 SF) I/AC = 19.94 N 01°26'31" E 15.00'	
DENSITY ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) D - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLON BASE DENSITY PEN DENSITY BONUS R 3 / 20 UNITS AS AF 50.0% DENSITY BC GOVT. CODE 65911 15% "VERY LOW" A	AREA (AC) 6.557 0.059 0.030 AL = 6.646 WED R ROUND UP FORDABLE DNUS PER 5 FOR AFFORDABLE UNITS	<u>ONS</u> = = = =	6.646 ACRES (289,3 <u>DENSITY (DU)</u> 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU 20.0 15.0% AFFORDABLE 30.0	503 SF) <i>I/AC</i> = 19.94 <i>N</i> 01°26'31" E 15.00' <i>PROPOSED MARKET RATE UNITS</i> = 27.0 <i>PROPOSED "VERY LOW" AFFORDABLE UNITS</i> = 3.0 TOTAL PROPOSED UNITS = 30.0	
DENSITY ( ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) 7 - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLON BASE DENSITY PE DENSITY BONUS R 3 / 20 UNITS AS AF 50.0% DENSITY BC GOVT. CODE 65915 15% "VERY LOW" A PER DENSITY BON	AREA (AC) 6.557 0.059 0.030 AL = 6.646 WED R ROUND UP FORDABLE DNUS PER 5 FOR AFFORDABLE UNITS US ROUND UP	<u>ONS</u> = = = =	6.646 ACRES (289,5 <u>DENSITY (DU)</u> 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU 20.0 15.0% AFFORDABLE 30.0 30.0 UNITS	503 SF) 1/AC = 19.94 N 01°26'31" E 15.00' PROPOSED MARKET RATE UNITS = 27.0 PROPOSED "VERY LOW" AFFORDABLE UNITS = 3.0 TOTAL PROPOSED UNITS = 30.0	
DENSITY ( ROSS ACREAGE -OPE (%) 0 - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLON BASE DENSITY PE DENSITY BONUS R 3 / 20 UNITS AS AF 50.0% DENSITY BO GOVT. CODE 65913 15% "VERY LOW" A PER DENSITY BON	AREA (AC) 6.557 0.059 0.030 AL = 6.646 WED R ROUND UP FORDABLE DNUS PER 5 FOR AFFORDABLE UNITS IUS ROUND UP NET ACREAG	<u>ONS</u> = = = = =	6.646 ACRES (289, DENSITY (DU) 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU 20.0 15.0% AFFORDABLE 30.0 30.0 UNITS CULATIONS	503 SF) 1/AC = 19.94 PROPOSED MARKET RATE UNITS = 27.0 PROPOSED "VERY LOW" AFFORDABLE UNITS = 3.0 TOTAL PROPOSED UNITS = 30.0	
DENSITY ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) D - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLON BASE DENSITY PEN DENSITY BONUS R 3 / 20 UNITS AS AF 50.0% DENSITY BONUS R 3 / 20 UNITS AS AF 50.0% DENSITY BONUS R GOVT. CODE 65912 15% "VERY LOW" A PER DENSITY BON ACREAGE 6.646 AC (0.09 AC) (0.03 AC)	AREA (AC) 6.557 0.059 0.030 AL = 6.646 WED R ROUND UP FORDABLE DNUS PER 5 FOR AFFORDABLE UNITS IUS ROUND UP NET ACREAG GROSS ACRES LESS: EXISTING I LESS: PROPOSE		6.646 ACRES (289,3 <u>DENSITY (DU)</u> 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU 20.0 15.0% AFFORDABLE 30.0 30.0 UNITS <u>CULATIONS</u> ROAD EASEMENT ROAD DEDICATION DUBLIC UTULITY EASEMENT	503 SF) $V/AC = 19.94$ $N01^{\circ}26'31'' E = 15.00'$ PROPOSED MARKET RATE UNITS = 27.0 PROPOSED 'VERY LOW' AFFORDABLE UNITS = 3.0 TOTAL PROPOSED UNITS = 30.0 $SLOPE ADJUSTED = 5.52 AC + 0.06 AC * 50\% + 0.03 AC * 0$ $RET ACREAGE = 5.55 AC$	
DENSITY ROSS ACREAGE LOPE (%) D - 25 5 - 40 40 + TOT BASE UNITS ALLOU BASE DENSITY PE DENSITY BONUS R 3 / 20 UNITS AS AF 50.0% DENSITY BON GOVT. CODE 65915 15% "VERY LOW" A PER DENSITY BON PER DENSITY BON ACREAGE 6.646 AC (0.09 AC) (0.24 AC) (0.68 AC)	AREA (AC) 6.557 0.059 0.030 AL = 6.646 WED R ROUND UP FORDABLE DNUS PER 5 FOR AFFORDABLE UNITS IUS ROUND UP <b>NET ACREAG</b> <u>GROSS ACRES</u> LESS: EXISTING I LESS: PROPOSE	ONS = = = = E CAL	6.646 ACRES (289,3 DENSITY (DU) 3.0 3.0 / 2 0 6.646 GROSS AC * 3.0 DU 20.0 15.0% AFFORDABLE 30.0 30.0 UNITS CULATIONS ROAD EASEMENT ROAD DEDICATION PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT TE ROAD LOT (LOT A)	503 SF) 1/AC = 19.94 PROPOSED MARKET RATE UNITS = 27.0 PROPOSED "VERY LOW" AFFORDABLE UNITS = 3.0 TOTAL PROPOSED UNITS = 30.0 SLOPE ADJUSTED = 5.52 AC + 0.06 AC * 50% + 0.03 AC * 0 NET ACREAGE = 5.55 AC	

WAIVER OF "DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS" AS IDENTIFIED IN SECTION 30.16.010 IN THE CITY OF ENCINITAS MUNICIPAL CODE, INCLUDING NET LOT AREA, LOT WIDTH, LOT DEPTH, BUILDING HEIGHT, PRIVATE STREETS (ROAD WIDTH AND CUL-DE-SAC RADIUS), AND SIDE, FRONT, AND REAR YARD SETBACKS, CONNECTIVITY OF ADJACENT LAND USES (30.16.010H AND 24.12.090), SUBDIVISION DESIGN STANDARDS (24.12.030), AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (30.28.010). REFER TO SEPARATE LETTER FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

AND 2. FOR BUILDING HEIGHT. REFER TO SEPARATE LETTER FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

## SHEET INDEX

- SHEET 1 TENTATIVE MAP TITLE SHEET AND NOTES SHEET 2 - PROJECT KEY MAP AND PROPOSED LOT LAYOUT
- SHEET 3 EXISTING EASEMENTS EXHIBIT
- SHEET 4 PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN (LOTS 1-6, 24-30)
- SHEET 5 PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN (LOTS 5-14, 20-25)
- SHEET 6 PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN (LOTS 13-23)
- SHEET 7 PRELIMINARY UTILITY PLAN
- SHEET 8 SECTIONS AND DETAILS
- SHEET 9 SECTIONS AND DETAILS
- SHEET 10 SLOPE ANALYSIS
- SHEET 11 CURB UTILIZATION EXHIBIT



# DISTURBED AREA CALCULATIONS

TOTAL EXIST. GROSS SITE AREA: 289,503 SF (6.646 AC) AREA DISTURBED BY PROJECT: 275,108 SF (6.316 AC)

SITE ADDRESS 1220 MELBA ROAD ENCINITAS, CA 92024 APN: 259-180-16-00

1230 MELBA ROAD ENCINITAS, CA 92024 APN: 259-180-33-00

1234 MELBA ROAD ENCINITAS, CA 92024 APNS: 259-180-10-00

1240 MELBA ROAD ENCINITAS, CA 92024 APNS: 259-180-09-00 259-180-10-00 UNASSIGNED ADDRESS ENCINITAS, CA 92024 APN: 259-181-02-00

1190 ISLAND VIEW LANE ENCINITAS, CA 92024

APN: 259-181-03-00 UNASSIGNED ADDRESS

ENCINITAS, CA 92024 APN: 259-181-04-00

# SCOPE OF WORK

THE PROJECT SEEKS APPROVAL TO DEMOLISH ALL EXISTING ONSITE STRUCTURES AND CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. THE DENSITY BONUS PROJECT PROPOSES TO SUBDIVIDE THE PROPERTY TO CREATE 30 NEW SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS WITH 27 MARKET-RATE UNITS AND 3 VERY-LOW AFFORDABLE UNITS, INCLUDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW PRIVATE ROAD, AND ASSOCIATED UTILITY, DRAINAGE, AND STORM WATER TREATMENT IMPROVEMENTS. THE PROJECT SEEKS APPROVAL OF A DENSITY BONUS TENTATIVE MAP. DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT. AND COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, AND REQUESTS MULTIPLE WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AS WELLAS TWO (2) INCENTIVES / CONCESSIONS ALLOTTED UNDER STATE DENSITY BONUS LAW BY PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING. THE PROJECT PROPOSES FILL IN EXCESS OF 4 FEET.

J:\ACTIVE JOBS\3086 STAVER-MELBA\CIVIL\DRAWING\DISCRETIONARY PLANS\3086-CV-TMAP-01-TITLE.DWG

# 1ULTI-004309-2021 / DR-004311-2021 / JB-004310-2021 / CDPNF-004312-2021 TORREY CREST

-1240 MELBA ROAD, 1190 ISLAND VIEW LANE



# PLAN VIEW - EXISTING APN LAYOUT

SCALE: 1" = 60' HORIZONTAL

IMPERVIOUS AREA CALCULATIONS

EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA (ONSITE): PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS AREA HEREON (ONSITE): ASSUMED FUTURE LOT IMPERVIOUS AREA (ONSITE): TOTAL IMPERVIOUS AREA (ONSITE): INCREASE IN IMPERVIOUS AREA:

39,852 SF (0.915 AC) 153,575 SF (3.526 AC) 15,135 SF (0.367 AC) 168,710 SF (3.87 AC) 128,858 SF (2.958 AC)

# OWNER INFORMATION

SHEET 1 OF 13

WE HEREBY CERTIFY THAT WE ARE THE RECORDED OWNERS OF THE PROPERTY SHOWN ON THE ATTACHED TENTATIVE MAP, DESIGN REVIEW, AND COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND THAT SAID APPLICATION SHOWS THE ENTIRE CONTIGUOUS OWNERSHIP. I UNDERSTAND THAT PROPERTY IS CONSIDERED CONTIGUOUS EVEN IF IT IS SEPARATED BY ROADS, STREETS, UTILITY EASEMENTS, OR RAILROAD RIGHTS OF WAY.

OWNER:

DAN STAVER FOR: TORREY PACIFIC CORPORATION 171 SAXONY ROAD, SUITE 109 ENCINITAS, CA 92024 PH: (760) 942-3256

# SUBDIVIDER INFORMATION

THE SUBDIVIDER AGREES TO DEFEND, INDEMNIFY, AND HOLD HARMLESS THE CITY OF ENCINITAS AND ITS AGENTS. OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES FROM ANY CLAIM ACTION, OR PROCEEDING AGAINST THE CITY OF ENCINITAS OR ITS AGENTS. OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES. TO ATTACK. SET ASIDE, VOID, OR ANNUL AN APPROVAL FROM THE CITY OF ENCINITAS CONCERNING THE SUBDIVISION WHEN SUCH ACTION IS BROUGHT WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD SPECIFIED IN GOV. CODE SECTION 66499.37. THIS CERTIFICATION IS CONDITIONED UPON THE CITY OF ENCINITAS PROVIDING PROMPT NOTICE TO THE SUBDIVIDER AS PROVIDED FOR BY THE ACT (GOV. CODE 66474.9)

SUBDIVIDER:

DAN STAVER FOR: TORREY PACIFIC CORPORATION 171 SAXONY RD., SUITE 109 ENCINITAS, CA 92024 PH: (760) 942-3256

# ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION

\*\*PORTION OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 14, TOWNSHIP 13 SOUTH, RANGE 4 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, IN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

\*\*FOR FULL LEGAL DESCRIPTION, REFER TO PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT PREPARED BY FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE DATED FEBRUARY 25, 2022 AS ORDER NUMBER 00171756-996-SD1-RT4

ELEVATIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED ON A WELL

MONUMENT AT THE CENTER OF CUL DE SAC. EAST END

OF ORANGE VIEW DRIVE, PER ROS 18416, AS PT. NO. 1035

BENCHMARK

ELEVATION = 243.238

DATUM = NAVD 88

## TOPOGRAPHY

TOPOGRAPHY OBTAINED BY: FIELD SURVEY TOPOGRAPHY OBTAINED ON: SEPTEMBER 25, 2019 PREPARED BY: PASCO, LARET, SUITER & ASSOCIATES

# UTILITIES

WATER FIRE SEWER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HIGH SCHOOL

SAN DIEGUITO WATER DISTRICT ENCINITAS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT CARDIFF SANITARY DIVISION ENCINITAS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

# ZONING INFORMATION

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: PRESENT ZONING REQUIREMENTS: BUILDING HEIGHT:

PRESENT USE: R-3 R-3 PROPOSED USE \*PER CODE 30.16.010 B7

RESIDENTIAL 30 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCES 30 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS 1 PRIVATE ROAD LOT 1 NON-BUILDABLE PANHANDLE LOT 27 MARKET-RATE UNITS **3 VERY-LOW AFFORDABLE UNITS** 

SMALLEST PROPOSED LOT: LARGEST PROPOSED LOT:

\*SEE NOTE REGARDING BUILDING HEIGHT ON SHEET 2 LOT 17 (4,434 SF) LOT 1 (14,456 SF)

AVERAGE PROPOSED LOT SIZE: 8,072 SF

# EARTHWORK / PROJECT GRADING

CUT: FILL: EXPORT:

22,000 CY 6,500 CY 15,500 CY REMEDIAL: ~8,000 CY MAX CUT HEIGHT: 8.0 FT MAX FILL HEIGHT: 7.5 FT

\*ESTIMATE DOES NOT INCLUDE STRIPPINGS OR UTILITY TRENCH VOLUMES, IF REQUIRED BY SITE CONDITIONS

DATE

CONTRACTOR SHALL SELF SATISFY THAT ESTIMATES ARE CORRECT PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF WORK.

EARTHWORK QUANTITIES ARE ESTIMATED FOR PERMIT PURPOSES ONLY. THESE QUANTITIES ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE BASED ON FINAL ENGINEERING DESIGN AND DETAILING

# ACCESS

MELBA ROAD, A PUBLIC ROAD

# PREPARED BY

PREPARED BY: PASCO, LARET, SUITER & ASSOCIATES 535 N. HIGHWAY 101, SUITE A SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075 PH: (858) 259-8212

# ENGINEER OF WORK





GRAPHIC SCALE 1" = 60'

120

60

TYLER LAWSON, PE #80356



San Diego I Solana Beach I Orange County Phone 858.259.8212 | www.plsaengineering.com



J:\ACTIVE JOBS\3086 STAVER-MELBA\CIVIL\DRAWING\DISCRETIONARY PLANS\3086-CV-TMAP-02-LOTLAYOUT.DWG

#### REQUEST WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARD UNDER DENSITY BONUS

25

54 53 54 54

22\* 25 25 25 25

\* = FOR A NEW TRACT, FRONT YARD SETBACKS MAY BE REDUCED UP TO 25% ON A MAXIMUM OF ONE-HALF OF THE DWELLING UNITS WITHIN A RESIDENTIAL TRACT PER E.M.C. 30.16.010 B11C; PROJECT PROPOSES 7 LOTS / 30 LOTS WITH REDUCED FYSB = 23.3%

87

65

5



\*\* = PER EMC 30.16.010, BUILDING HEIGHT IN R-3 ZONE SHALL BE 22-FT FROM ADJACENT GRADE TO TOP OF ROOF ABOVE EXTERIOR WALL, WITH AN ADDITIONAL 4-FT ALLOWED FOR ROOF PITCH. APPLICANT REQUESTS TO USE WAIVER AND INCENTIVE OF BUILDING HEIGHT AS LISTED ABOVE, NOT TO EXCEED 30-FT





San Diego I Solana Beach I Orange County Phone 858.259.8212 | www.plsaengineering.com

## APN: 259-181-01-00



LEGEND	
PROPERTY LINE	<b></b>
RIGHT-OF-WAY	
CENTERLINE OF ROAD	
EXISTING EASEMENTS	
EXISTING LOT LINES	



# SHEET 4 OF 13



LEGEND	
EXISTING SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY (PL)	
CENTERLINE OF ROAD	
RIGHT-OF-WAY	
PROPOSED SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY (AFTER DEDICATION)	
ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE	
SETBACK LINE	
EXISTING CONTOUR LINE	<i>64</i>
PROPOSED CONTOUR LINE	<u> </u>
PROPOSED FLOWLINE	· · · <b>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </b>
PROPOSED DIRECTION OF FLOW	<b>bb</b>
PROPOSED SAWCUT OF EXISTING AC PAVEMENT	
PROPOSED LIMIT OF GRADING	<u> </u>
PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB & GUTTER PER SDRSD 3-2	
PROPOSED PCC PAVEMENT	
PROPOSED AC PAVEMENT (4" AC OVER 6" CLASS II AB MIN OR PER GEOTECH RECOMMENDATION)	
PROPOSED BMP BIOFILTRATION BASIN PER DETAIL SHEET 9	**************************************
PROPOSED MASONRY RETAINING WALL	
PROPOSED 6"X16" FLUSH CURB	
EXISTING CITY INVENTORIED STREET TREE IN CURRENT PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY	0*
EXISTING TREE	
.IMIT OF TREE PROTECTION ZONE (TPZ) PER ARBORIST REPORT	
DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT (DBH) MEASURED AT 54" ABOVE NATURAL GRADE	20" DBH O
CONSTRUCTION NOTES	
1) EXISTING SURVEY MONUMENT SHALL BE PROTECTED IN PLACE. MONUMENT SHALL BE	1 SAWCUT EXISTING AC PAVEMENT; SEE DETAIL ON SHEET 7
WHO SHALL FILE A CORNER RECORD WITH THE COUNTY IF DISTURBED OR DESTROYED	(1) PROPOSED 36" X 36" BROOKS BOX OUTLET STRUCTURE
2) PROPOSED 12" X 12" AREA DRAIN	(12) PROPOSED TYPE A STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT PER SDRSD D-09
3) PROPOSED 6" TRAFFIC RATED PRIVATE STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT	(13) PROPOSED TYPE B STORM DRAIN CURB INLET PER SDRSD D-02
4) PROPOSED PCC CROSS-GUTTER PER SDRSD G-12	(14) PROPOSED WING TYPE HEADWALL WITH 4' X 4' ROCK RIP RAP ENERGY DISSIPATER; 1.1' THICK NO. 2 BACKING PER SDRSD D-34. D-40
5) PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB PER SDRSD G-1	(15) PROPOSED MASONRY RETAINING WALL
6) PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB AND GUTTER PER SDRSD G-2	<ul> <li>(16) PROPOSED TRENCH DRAIN BY NDS OR APPROVED EQUAL</li> </ul>
7) PROPOSED PCC DRIVEWAY APRON PER SDRSD G-14A	(17) PROPOSED CURB OUTLET PER SDRSD D-25
8) PROPOSED PCC DRIVEWAY APRON PER SDRSD G-14C	(18) EXISTING TREE TO BE REMOVED; SEE STREET TREE NOTE 1 BELOW AND SHEET 12 FOR
9) PROPOSED PCC SIDEWALK PER SDRSD	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
6-7	(19) PROPOSED FREE-STANDING MASONRY WALL (NON-RETAINING)
SITE NOTES	
1. ALL UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON PER BES	T AVAILABLE RECORD
INFORMATION. FOR PROPOSED PUBLIC SEE SHEET 7 FOR PRELIMINARY UTILITY	WATER AND SEWER UTILITIES, PLAN
2. ALL EXISTING ONSITE STRUCTURES TO E OTHERWISE NOTED.	3E DEMOLISHED UNLESS
3. ALL EXISTING ONSITE TREES TO BE REM NOTED.	OVED UNLESS OTHERWISE

HARDSCAPE SHALL DRAIN AWAY FROM PROPOSED STRUCTURES AT A MINIMUM OF 2.0% FOR 10 FEET, AND LANDSCAPE FOR A MINIMUM OF 5.0% IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE SECTION 1804.4.







# SHEET 5 OF 13

# <u>(393.3 LF</u>



### LEGEND EXISTING SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY CENTERLINE OF ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY PROPOSED SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY (AFTER DEDICATION) ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE SETBACK LINE EXISTING CONTOUR LINE PROPOSED CONTOUR LINE PROPOSED FLOWLINE · \_\_\_\_\_ PROPOSED DIRECTION OF FLOW PROPOSED SAWCUT OF EXISTING AC PAVEMENT <u>v v v</u> PROPOSED LIMIT OF GRADING PROPOSED STEM WALL / PORTION OF BUILDING TO RETAIN PER SEPARATE ARCH PLAN PROPOSED DEEPENED FOOTING PER SEPARATE ARCH PLAN PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB & GUTTER PER SDRSD G-2 PROPOSED PCC PAVEMENT PROPOSED AC PAVEMENT (4" AC OVER 6" CLASS II AB MIN OR PER GEOTECH RECOMMENDATION) PROPOSED BMP BIOFILTRATION BASIN PER DETAIL SHEET 9 PROPOSED MASONRY RETAINING WALL PROPOSED 6"X16" FLUSH CURB EXISTING CITY INVENTORIED STREET TREE IN CURRENT PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY EXISTING TREE

LIMIT OF TREE PROTECTION ZONE (TPZ) PER ARBORIST REPORT

\*DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT (DBH) MEASURED AT 54" ABOVE NATURAL GRADE

## CONSTRUCTION NOTES

- (1) EXISTING SURVEY MONUMENT SHALL BE PROTECTED IN PLACE. MONUMENT SHALL BE REPLACED BY A LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR WHO SHALL FILE A CORNER RECORD WITH THE COUNTY IF DISTURBED OR DESTROYED
- 2 PROPOSED 12" X 12" AREA DRAIN BY NDS OR APPROVED EQUAL
- (3) PROPOSED 6" TRAFFIC RATED PRIVATE STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT
- (4) PROPOSED PCC CROSS-GUTTER PER SDRSD G-12
- (5) PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB PER SDRSD G-1
- (6) PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB AND GUTTER PER SDRSD G-2
- (7) PROPOSED PCC DRIVEWAY APRON PER SDRSD G-14A
- (8) PROPOSED PCC DRIVEWAY APRON PER SDRSD G-14C
- (9) PROPOSED PCC SIDEWALK PER SDRSD

(10) SAWCUT EXISTING AC PAVEMENT; SEE DETAIL ON SHEET 9

0

STRUCTURE; SEE BIOFILTRATION BMP DETAIL SHEET 9

(11) PROPOSED 36" X 36" BROOKS BOX OUTLET

- (12) PROPOSED TYPE A STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT PER SDRSD D-09
- (13) PROPOSED TYPE B STORM DRAIN CURB INLET PER SDRSD D-02
- (14) PROPOSED WING TYPE HEADWALL WITH 4' X 4' ROCK RIP RAP ENERGY DISSIPATER; 1.1' THICK, NO. 2 BACKING PER SDRSD D-34, D-40
- (15) PROPOSED MASONRY RETAINING WALL
- (16) PROPOSED TRENCH DRAIN BY NDS OR APPROVED EQUAL (17) PROPOSED CURB OUTLET PER SDRSD D-25

## SITE NOTES

GRAPHIC SCALE

20

- 1. ALL UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON PER BEST AVAILABLE RECORD INFORMATION. FOR PROPOSED PUBLIC WATER AND SEWER UTILITIES, SEE SHEET 7 FOR PRELIMINARY UTILITY PLAN
- 2. ALL EXISTING ONSITE STRUCTURES TO BE DEMOLISHED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- 3. ALL EXISTING ONSITE TREES TO BE REMOVED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- 4. HARDSCAPE SHALL DRAIN AWAY FROM PROPOSED STRUCTURES AT A MINIMUM OF 2.0% FOR 10 FEET, AND LANDSCAPE FOR A MINIMUM OF 5.0% IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE SECTION 1804.4.



**PASCO LARET SUITER** 

San Diego | Solana Beach | Orange County

Phone 858.259.8212 | www.plsaengineering.com

PLSA 3086-01



J:\ACTIVE JOBS\3086 STAVER-MELBA\CIVIL\DRAWING\DISCRETIONARY PLANS\3086-CV-TMAP-04-06-GRADING.DWG

# SHEET 6 OF 13



#### LOT 6 MAP 4923

20



EXISTING SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY					
CENTERLINE OF ROAD					
RIGHT-OF-WAY					
PROPOSED SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY (AFTER DEDICATION)					
ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE					
SETBACK LINE					
EXISTING CONTOUR LINE	<u> </u>				
PROPOSED CONTOUR LINE	64				
PROPOSED FLOWLINE	· · · <b>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </b>				
PROPOSED DIRECTION OF FLOW	<b></b>				
PROPOSED SAWCUT OF EXISTING AC PAVEMENT					
PROPOSED LIMIT OF GRADING	<u> </u>				
PROPOSED STEM WALL / PORTION OF BUILDING TO RETAIN PER SEPARATE ARCH PLAN					
PROPOSED DEEPENED FOOTING PER SEPARATE ARCH PLAN					
PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB & GUTTER PER SDRSD G-2					
PROPOSED PCC PAVEMENT					
PROPOSED AC PAVEMENT (4" AC OVER 6" CLASS II AB MIN OR PER GEOTECH RECOMMENDATION)					
PROPOSED BMP BIOFILTRATION BASIN PER DETAIL SHEET 9					
PROPOSED MASONRY RETAINING WALL					
PROPOSED 6"X16" FLUSH CURB					
EXISTING CITY INVENTORIED STREET TREE IN CURRENT PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY	0*				
EXISTING TREE	0				
LIMIT OF TREE PROTECTION ZONE (TPZ) PER ARBORIST REPORT					
*DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT (DBH) MEASURED AT 54" ABOVE NATURAL GRADE	20" DBH O				
CONSTRUCTION NOTES					
1) EXISTING SURVEY MONUMENT SHALL BE PROTECTED IN PLACE. MONUMENT SHALL BE REPLACED BY A LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR	10 SAWCUT EXISTING AC PAVEMENT; SEE DET ON SHEET 9				
WHO SHALL FILE A CORNER RECORD WITH THE COUNTY IF DISTURBED OR DESTROYED	(1) PROPOSED 36" X 36" BROOKS BOX OUTLET STRUCTURE				
2) PROPOSED 12" X 12" AREA DRAIN BY NDS OR APPROVED EQUAL	(12) PROPOSED TYPE A STORM DRAIN CLEANOU PER SDRSD D-09				
PROPOSED 6" TRAFFIC RATED PRIVATE STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT	(13) PROPOSED TYPE B STORM DRAIN CURB INL PER SDRSD D-02				
PROPOSED PCC CROSS-GUTTER PER     SDRSD G-12	(1) PROPOSED WING TYPE HEADWALL WITH 4')				

- (14) PROPOSED WING TYPE HEADWALL WITH 4' X 4' ROCK RIP RAP ENERGY DISSIPATER; 1.1' THICK, NO. 2 BACKING PER SDRSD D-34, D-40
- (15) PROPOSED MASONRY RETAINING WALL
- (16) PROPOSED 6" TRENCH DRAIN BY NDS OR APPROVED EQUAL
- 1. ALL UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON PER BEST AVAILABLE RECORD INFORMATION. FOR PROPOSED PUBLIC WATER AND SEWER UTILITIES, SEE SHEET 7 FOR PRELIMINARY UTILITY PLAN

5 PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB PER SDRSD G-1

6 PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB AND GUTTER

PROPOSED PCC DRIVEWAY APRON PER SDRSD G-14A

8 PROPOSED PCC DRIVEWAY APRON PER SDRSD G-14C

(9) PROPOSED PCC SIDEWALK PER SDRSD G-7

PER SDRSD G-2

SITE NOTES

GRAPHIC SCALE 1" = 20'

40

20

- 2. ALL EXISTING ONSITE STRUCTURES TO BE DEMOLISHED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- 3. ALL EXISTING ONSITE TREES TO BE REMOVED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- HARDSCAPE SHALL DRAIN AWAY FROM PROPOSED STRUCTURES AT A MINIMUM OF 2.0% FOR 10 FEET, AND LANDSCAPE FOR A MINIMUM OF 5.0% IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE SECTION 1804.4.





San Diego | Solana Beach | Orange County Phone 858.259.8212 | www.plsaengineering.com



J:\ACTIVE JOBS\3086 STAVER-MELBA\CIVIL\DRAWING\DISCRETIONARY PLANS\3086-CV-TMAP-07-UTILITY.DWG

# SHEET 7 OF 13

# LEGEND

SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY	
SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY (PROPOSED AFTER RIGHT-OF-WAY DEDICATION)	
EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY	
ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE	
CENTERLINE OF ROAD	
PROPOSED EASEMENT	
EXISTING EASEMENT	
EXISTING CONTOUR LINE	<i>64</i>
PROPOSED CONTOUR LINE	64
PROPOSED LIMIT OF GRADING	<u> </u>
EXISTING WATER MAIN (SIZE PER PLAN)	W
EXISTING SEWER MAIN (SIZE PER PLAN)	S S
PROPOSED 8" PVC WATER MAIN	— w — w —
PROPOSED 8" PVC SEWER MAIN	—— s —— s ——
PROPOSED 1" WATER SERVICE AND METER PER WAS WS-09	— w — — w — —
PROPOSED 4" SEWER LATERAL PER SDRSD SS-01	<u> </u>
PROPOSED 4" PVC STORM DRAIN	SD SD
PROPOSED 3" PVC SIDEWALK UNDERDRAIN	
PROPOSED PVC STORM DRAIN (SIZE PER PLAN)	

# UTILITY CONSTRUCTION NOTES

- 1 PROPOSED PUBLIC 8" PVC WATER MAIN
- (2) PROPOSED PUBLIC 8" PVC SEWER MAIN
- (3) PROPOSED 1" DUAL DOMESTIC / FIRE WATER SERVICE PER WAS WS-09
- (4) PROPOSED 4" PVC SEWER LATERAL PER SDRSD SS-01 WITH C.O. AT PL
- 5 PROPOSED 1" IRRIGATION SERVICE, METER, AND BACKFLOW PER WAS WS-01, WR-01
- 6 PROPOSED 60" SEWER MANHOLE WITH EPOXY LINER PER SDRSD SM-02
- 7 PROPOSED FIRE HYDRANT PER WAS WF-01
- 8 PROPOSED WM END CAP, THRUST BLOCK, AND 2" B.O. ASSEMBLY
- (9) PROPOSED 12" X 12" AREA DRAIN BY NDS OR APPROVED EQUAL
- (1) PROPOSED 36" X 36" BROOKS BOX OUTLET STRUCTURE WITH ORIFICE PLATE DRILLED TO INSIDE OF BOX AND LOW-FLOW ORIFICE; SEE BIOFILTRATION BMP DETAIL SHEET 9

- (1) PROPOSED TYPE A-4 STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT PER SDRSD D-09
- (12) PROPOSED TYPE B STORM DRAIN CURB INLET PER SDRSD D-02
- (13) PROPOSED MODIFIED CURB OUTLET PER SDRSD D-25
- PROPOSED WING TYPE HEADWALL FOR 18" PIPE CONCRETE ENERGY DISSIPATER; 2.7' THICK, NO. 2 BACKING PER SDRSD D-34, D-40
- (15) PROPOSED MAXWELL IV DEEP INFILTRATION DRYWELL BY TORRENT RESOURCES OR APPROVED EQUAL
- (16) PROPOSED 4,500 SF X 5.0 FT DEEP PERMAVOID DETENTION SYSTEM; SEE BIOFILTRATION BMP DETAIL SHEET 9
- (17) BEGIN NEW PUBLIC WATER MAIN; CONNECT TO EXISTING 8" ACP WATER MAIN WITH 8" X 8" X 8" TEE AND GATE VALVES
- (18) PROPOSED 36" X 36" BROOKS BOX EMERGENCY OVERFLOW STRUCTURE
- (19) PROPOSED CLEANOUT WITH ORIFICE PLATE DRILLED TO INSIDE OF BOX AND LOW-FLOW ORIFICE; CONNECT DETENTION STORAGE VAULT TO CLEANOUT, SEE BIOFILTRATION BMP DETAIL SHEET 9



# PRELIMINARY UTILITY EXHIBIT

PASCO LARET SUITER & ASSOCIATES San Diego | Solana Beach | Orange County Phone 858.259.8212 | www.plsaengineering.com



![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

EXISTING SLOPES	0 - 25%	6.557 AC	(98.6% OF PROJECT SITE)
EXISTING SLOPES	25 - 40%	0.059 AC	(0.89% OF PROJECT SITE)
EXISTING SLOPES	40% +	0.030 AC	(0.45% OF PROJECT SITE)
EXISTING SLOPES	25% +	0.089 AC	(1.34% OF PROJECT SITE)

J:\ACTIVE JOBS\3086 STAVER-MELBA\CIVIL\DRAWING\DISCRETIONARY PLANS\3086-CV-TMAP-10-SLOPE.DWG

![](_page_30_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_11.jpeg)

PARKING REQUIREMENTS	R-3	LOT 1	LOT 2	LOT 3	LOT 4	LOT 5	LOT 6	LOT 7	LOT 8	LOT 9	LOT 10	LOT 11	LOT 12	LOT 13	LOT
PLAN TYPE	-	PLAN 1	PLAN 7	PLAN 5	PLAN 7	PLAN 6	PLAN 3	PLAN 6	PLAN 3	PLAN 6	PLAN 7	PLAN 7	PLAN 5	PLAN 4A	PLAN
BUILDING FLOOR AREA SF	-	1,610	4,193	3,532	4,193	3,902	2,894	3,902	2,894	3,902	4,193	4,193	3,532	3,258	3,53
GARAGE AREA SF	-	461	760	713	760	675	552	675	552	675	760	760	713	654	713
*OFFSTREET PARKING REQ'D	*2/3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
OFFSTREET PARKING PROP	-	3	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	5
ONSTREET PARKING PROP	15 STALLS	TOTAL												<u>.                                    </u>	

PARKING REQUIREMENTS	R-3	LOT 16	LOT 17	LOT 18	LOT 19	LOT 20	LOT 21	LOT 22	LOT 23	LOT 24	LOT 25	LOT 26	LOT 27	LOT 28	LOT
PLAN TYPE	-	PLAN 4A	PLAN 1	PLAN 7	PLAN 7	PLAN 5	PLAN 4	PLAN 6	PLAN 3	PLAN 6	PLAN 3	PLAN 6	PLAN 4A	PLAN 2	PLAN
BUILDING FLOOR AREA SF	-	3,258	1,610	4,193	4,193	3,532	3,204	3,902	2,894	3,902	2,894	3,902	3,258	2,518	3,532
GARAGE AREA SF		654	461	760	760	713	654	675	552	675	552	675	654	486	713
OFFSTREET PARKING REQ'D	*2/3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
OFFSTREET PARKING PROP	-	3	2	5	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	5
ONSTREET PARKING PROP	15 STALLS	TOTAL													

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

# SHEET 12 OF 13

LEGEND	
EXISTING SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY (PL)	
CENTERLINE OF ROAD	<u> </u>
RIGHT-OF-WAY (ROW)	
PROPOSED SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY (AFTER DEDICATION)	
ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE	
EXISTING CONTOUR LINE	64
PROPOSED CONTOUR LINE	
PROPOSED SAWCUT OF EXISTING AC PAVEMENT	
PROPOSED LIMIT OF GRADING	<u> </u>
PROPOSED 6" PCC CURB & GUTTER PER SDRSD G-2	
PROPOSED PCC PAVEMENT / SIDEWALK	
PROPOSED AC PAVEMENT / SIDEWALK	
PROPOSED MASONRY RETAINING WALL	
PROPOSED 6"X16" FLUSH CURB	
LIMIT OF TREE PROTECTION ZONE (TPZ) PER ARBORIST REPORT	
*DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT (DBH) MEASURED AT 54" ABOVE NATURAL GRADE	20" DBH O

# PROPOSED EASEMENTS / DEDICATIONS

1 PROPOSED DEDICATION TO THE CITY OF ENCINITAS

# EXISTING EASEMENT INFORMATION

- 7THE RIGHT TO EXTEND AND MAINTAIN DRAINAGE STRUCTURES<br/>AND EXCAVATION AND EMBANKMENT SLOPES BEYOND THE<br/>LIMITS GRANTED ON OCTOBER 29, 1953 IN BOOK 5030, PAGE 290<br/>OF OFFICIAL RECORDS IN FAVOR OF THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.
- (11) AN EASEMENT FOR ROAD PURPOSES AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, RECORDED AUGUST 11, 1938 IN BOOK 808, PAGE 216 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS IN FAVOR OF ANTON VAN AMERSFOOT.
- (16) AN EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAY AND INCIDENTAL PURPOSES, RECORDED OCTOBER 29, 1953 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 146900 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. IN FAVOR OF THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO.

# NOTES

- 1. CITY STREET TREES AND PRIVATE TREES ALONG MELBA ROAD PROPERTY FRONTAGE TO BE REMOVED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. REFER TO SEPARATE ARBORIST REPORT FOR REMOVAL AND TREE PROTECTION ZONE (TPZ) RECOMMENDATIONS.
- REFER TO SEPARATE ARBORIST REPORT FOR RECOMMENDATIONS WITHIN THE TREE PROTECTION ZONE (TPZ) FOR THE EXISTING TREES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY AND ALONG PROPERTY BOUNDARY TO BE PROTECTED IN PLACE
- 3. DBH AS IT RELATES TO THE EXISTING TREES SURVEYED REFERS TO DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT MEASURED AT 54" ABOVE THE NATURAL GRADE

![](_page_31_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_16.jpeg)

20

San Diego | Solana Beach | Orange County Phone 858.259.8212 | www.plsaengineering.com

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_2.jpeg)

PLSA 3086-02

Phone 858.259.8212 | www.plsaengineering.com

# ATTACHMENT B WAS DESIGN STANDARDS TABLE 4-1-1

From Water Agencies' Standards Design Guidelines for Water and Sewer Facilities, Section 4.1, Water Planning, Revised 07/28/2014.

#### 4.1.5 DWELLING UNIT DENSITY AND RESIDENTIAL UNIT WATER DEMAND

The Engineer of Work shall estimate the residential population in the service area based on existing and ultimate allowable land use. Unless otherwise provided by the AGENCY, unit water demands shall be estimated based on dwelling unit density in Table 4-1-1.

Dwelling Unit Density	Unit Density (persons/dwelling	Population Density (persons/gross	Unit Water Demand (gallons/gross acre-day)
(dwelling	unit)	acre)	
units/gross acre)			
0.1	6.0	0.6	90
0.2	6.0	1.2	180
1	6.0	6.0	900
2	3.5	7.0	1050
3	3.5	10.5	1575
4	3.5	14	2100
8	3.5	28	4200
9	3.5	32	4800
14	3.2	45	6750
29	3.0	87	13050
43	2.6	112	16800
73	2.2	161	24150
109	1.8	196	29400
218	1.5	327	49050

Table 4-1-1 Dwelling Unit Density and Unit Water Demands