DATE ISSUED: January 14, 2011             REPORT NO. PC-11-012

ATTENTION: Planning Commission, Agenda of January 20, 2011

SUBJECT: WHITNEY MIXED USE - Project No.182513
Process 3


OWNER/ APPLICANT: Playa Grande L.L.C., Owner
Tim Martin, Martin Architecture, Applicant

SUMMARY

Issue(s): Should the Planning Commission reconsider their environmental determination and their decision on September 9, 2010 to approve development permits for the Whitney Mixed Use Project within the La Jolla Community Plan area?

Staff Recommendations:

1. Certify Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 182513, and Adopt Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program; and

2. Approve Coastal Development Permit No. 662551, Site Development Permit No. 662678, and Tentative Map Waiver No. 683254.

Community Planning Group Recommendation: On October 1, 2009, the La Jolla Community Planning Association voted 14-1-1 to recommend denial of the proposed project.
La Jolla Shores Advisory Board: On April 20, 2010, the Board voted 4-0 with no consensus for a recommendation on the project.

Environmental Review: A Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 182513, has been prepared for the project in accordance with State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. A Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared and will be implemented which will reduce, to a level below significance, any potential impacts identified in the environmental review process.

Fiscal Impact Statement: All costs associated with the processing of this project are paid from a deposit account maintained by the applicant.

Code Enforcement Impact: None

Housing Impact Statement: The project proposes to demolish an existing single family residence and retail store, and to construct a new mixed use development consisting of two residential and one commercial condominium unit. The proposed project is located within the La Jolla Shores Planned District area’s Commercial Center (CC) Zone of the La Jolla Community Plan which allows for community-serving commercial services, retail uses, and dwelling units with a minimum of 400 square feet. The proposed two residential units of 3,227 square feet and 2,890 square feet will meet the minimum square footage requirement and would provide a net gain of one additional unit. Also, prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, the applicant shall comply with the affordable housing requirements of the City’s Inclusionary Affordable Housing Regulations.

BACKGROUND

The Whitney Mixed Use Project is an application for a Coastal Development Permit, Site Development Permit, and Tentative Map Waiver to demolish an existing single-story residence and ground floor retail store, and to construct a new mixed use development of approximately 8,950 square feet. The proposed project includes a new three-story building, with a maximum height of 30 feet, consisting of two residential condominium units on the second and third floors, basement parking, and 2,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. The project site is located on a 0.09-acre lot at 2202 and 2206 Avenida de la Playa, on the northeast corner of El Paseo Grande and Avenida de la Playa, in the Commercial Center (CC) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-appealable Area 2), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, and the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Beach Impact Area) of the La Jolla Community Plan area.

The site is designated by the La Jolla Community Plan for commercial and mixed uses. The purpose of the CC zone is to accommodate community-serving commercial services and retail uses. The project site is specifically located along Avenida de la Playa in La Jolla Shores and the specific recommendations for the various commercial areas are regulated and detailed in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance. The CC Zone allows for 100 percent lot coverage, zero setbacks, and no Floor Area Ratio (FAR) restriction. Also, commercial services on the ground floor area of a development shall not exceed 6,000 square feet and dwelling units require a
minimum floor area of 400 square feet.

On July 28, 2010, the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego approved the development’s Coastal Development Permit, Site Development Permit, Tentative Map Waiver, removed the Variance along with the associated findings, and added conditions for additional offsets along the building’s east elevation and stipulation for compliance with La Jolla Community Plan’s Commercial Development Recommendations. Thereafter, the La Jolla Community Planning Association, Bernard Segal, and La Jolla Shores Tomorrow filed appeals of the Hearing Officer’s decision.

On September 9, 2010 the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego considered the appeal issues as identified in the Report to the Planning Commission No. PC-10-079 (Attachment I). The Planning Commission voted 5-1-1 to certify the Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 182513 and adopt the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program; and denied the appeals and upheld the Hearing Officer’s decision to approve the development permits.

On September 22, 2010, La Jolla Shores Tomorrow, care of Julie Hamilton, Esq., and on September 23, 2010, Bernard Segal filed separate appeals to City Council regarding the Planning Commission’s environmental determination for the Whitney Mixed Use Project’s Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 182513. On November 16, 2010, the City Council considered the appeal issues of the environmental determination as identified in the Report to the City Council No. 10-150. The City Council voted 5-3-0 to grant the appeal; denying certification of Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 182513; setting aside the environmental determination and remanded the matter to back to Planning Commission.

**DISCUSSION**

During the City Council hearing, the appellants and opposition parties to the project’s environmental determination provided various documents to the Councilmembers before and during the public testimony. Councilmember Lightner, during her motion to approve the appeal and remand the project back to Planning Commission, noted that City staff should evaluate the new evidence presented by the appellant in a letter prepared by Geissler Engineering (Attachment 3) and re-examine whether the aesthetics and neighborhood character had been adequately addressed in the environmental document as it relates to the bulk and scale, neighborhood compatibility, and aesthetics. The motion was further amended by Councilmember Emerald to request City staff to also review another letter from the appellant and prepared by Federhart and Associates (Attachment 4) regarding traffic safety for the project. Both the Geissler Engineering and Federhart and Associates documents were not provided to City staff or the applicant prior to the Council hearing.

City staff, in addition to evaluating the project’s compatibility with the aesthetics and neighborhood character as it relates to the bulk and scale, neighborhood compatibility, and aesthetics, has also reviewed the Geissler Engineering and Federhart and Associates documents. The applicant has also provided the City staff with a Response to the Geissler Engineering letter, prepared by Geotechnical Exploration, Inc. (Attachment 5). Based upon the City Council’s actions, the City staff provides the following evaluations and conclusions.
**Geology Analysis:**

The City's Geology staff has reviewed the letter prepared by Geissler Engineering dated November 8, 2010 regarding the Whitney Mixed-Use Project. Based on that review, Geissler Engineering has not provided substantial evidence that contradicts the evaluation of the geologic hazards, assessment of potential impacts, and recommended mitigation measures provided in the original geotechnical documents addressing the Whitney Mixed-Use Project prepared by Geotechnical Exploration, Inc.

**Traffic and Safety Analysis:**

The information in the Federhart & Associates letter provided by the appellant at the City Council hearing does not contain any new information that would change the previous analysis, determinations, or recommendations of the City staff.

**Aesthetics and Neighborhood Character Analysis:**

The project is consistent with recommendations specific to the La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan's Avenida de la Playa Community Commercial area, which promotes a focus on pedestrian-related amenities such as sidewalk surface treatments and street trees. The scale of the project is consistent with existing development in the neighborhood which allows zero-foot yard setbacks and 100 percent building coverage. The project also avoids abrupt transition in scale with adjacent residential areas. Residential projects adjacent to the La Jolla Shores commercial district are multi-family structures, many of which are taller and bulkier than the commercial development. This project is located on the corner of El Paso Grande and Avenida de la Playa which leads directly into a residential area of existing large multi-unit projects. The proposed development is smaller in scale than the multi-unit projects to the west and north.

The proposed project will be larger in scale than what exists on site today, but also aesthetically harmonious in a community that encompasses a variety of architectural styles and building sizes. Specifically, immediately east of the project site is a three-story mixed use structure; south from the site and across the street is a four-story commercial office structure; west of the site and across El Paseo Grande is a one-story commercial structure; north of the project site is a two-story apartment complex; and northwest of the project site is a four-story multi-family development. Various additional structures in the immediate project vicinity are widely mixed in style, bulk and scale, and therefore City staff determined that this project would not result in a substantial change to the community character, neighborhood aesthetics, or the land use plan.

Finally, San Diego Municipal Code section 1510.0301 establishes General Design Regulations for the La Jolla Shores Planned District. Consistent with the requirements of Section 1510.0301, "unity with variety" shall be used as a guiding principle in reviewing projects for conformance with the General Design Regulations. As required by Section 1510.0301, the project was determined to be generally consistent with the quality, form, materials, color, and relationship of other buildings in the surrounding area. Further, the General Design Regulations state that
"building materials and color are the most critical unifying elements", of which the project complies. In accordance with Section 1510.0301(c), the project was also reviewed for its potential impact on any designated public views to the ocean. In addition, Section 1510.0301 does not contain regulatory controls for bulk and scale, such as a defined maximum Floor Area Ratio.

In conclusion, the project continues to be consistent with the Commercial Center (CC) Zone designation of the La Jolla Shores Planned District (LJSPD) in the La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan (Plan) area. The development's draft permit resolution contains the required findings related to conformity to the City's General Plan and the adopted community plan and local coastal program land use plan. The development also complies with the specific recommendations for this commercial area as regulated and detailed in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance.

Environmental Analysis:

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 182513 has been prepared for the project in accordance with State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have significant environmental affects to historical resources (archaeological) and paleontological resources. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in the MND, and a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared and will be implemented which will reduce, to a level below significance, any potential impacts identified in the environmental review process.

City staff has evaluated the information submitted by the appellant during the City Council hearing and has determined that no substantial evidence has been provided that contradicts the evaluation of geologic and traffic hazards, assessment of their potential impacts, and recommended mitigation measures that have already been provided in the existing technical documents submitted by the applicant. City staff has determined that geology, transportation, and aesthetics/neighborhood character issues have been adequately addressed in the existing project's Final MND No. 182513 and errata sheet. In addition, City staff has concluded that the final MND’s response to comments contains specific information addressing geology, transportation, and bulk and scale/neighborhood compatibility/aesthetic concerns/issues raised by the appellants and other members of the Community.

Conclusion:

City staff has reviewed the proposed project and all issues identified through the review process have been resolved in conformance with adopted City Council policies and regulations of the Land Development Code. Staff has previously provided in the Report to the Planning Commission No. PC-10-079 the draft environmental resolution and Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, draft findings to support approval of the proposed development, draft conditions of approval, and draft map resolution and conditions. City staff is recommending the Planning Commissioners certify the Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 182513, and adopt Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program; and approve the development permits.
ALTERNATIVES

1. **Approve** Coastal Development Permit No. 662551, Site Development Permit No. 662678, and Tentative Map Waiver No. 683254 with modifications.

2. **Deny** Coastal Development Permit No. 662551, Site Development Permit No. 662678, and Tentative Map Waiver No. 683254 if the findings required to approve the project cannot be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Westlake  
Program Manager  
Development Services Department

Tim Daly  
Project Manager  
Development Services Department

BROUGHTON/TPD

Attachments:

1. Report to the Planning Commission No. PC-10-079
2. Report to the City Council No. 10-150
3. Geissler Engineering letter, Nov. 8, 2010
DATE ISSUED: September 2, 2010 REPORT NO. PC-10--079
ATTENTION: Planning Commission, Agenda of September 9, 2010
SUBJECT: WHITNEY MIXED USE - Project No.182513
OWNER/APPLICANT: Bob Whitney, Owner
Tim Martin, Martin Architecture, Applicant

SUMMARY

Issue(s): Should the Planning Commission approve or deny the appeals of the Hearing Officer decision to approve the demolition of an existing mixed use structure and the construction of a new mixed use condominium building within the La Jolla Community Plan area?

Staff Recommendations:

1. Certify Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 812513, and Adopt Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program; and

2. Deny the appeals and Approve Coastal Development Permit No. 662551, Site Development Permit No. 662678, and Tentative Map Waiver No. 683254.

Community Planning Group Recommendation: On October 1, 2009, the La Jolla Community Planning Association voted 14-1-1 to recommend denial of the proposed project (Attachment No. 13). See Discussion section for analysis.

La Jolla Shores Advisory Board: On April 20, 2010, the Board voted 4-0 with no consensus for a recommendation on the project (Attachment No. 14). See Discussion section for analysis.

Environmental Review: A Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 182513, has been prepared for the project in accordance with State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. A Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared.
and will be implemented which will reduce, to a level below significance, any potential impacts identified in the environmental review process.

**Fiscal Impact Statement:** All costs associated with the processing of this project are paid from a deposit account maintained by the applicant.

**Code Enforcement Impact:** None

**Housing Impact Statement:** The project proposes to demolish the existing one single-story residence and one ground floor retail store, and construct a new mixed use development with two residential and one commercial condominium unit on the site. The proposed project is located within the La Jolla Shores Planned District area’s Commercial Center (CC) Zone of the La Jolla Community Plan and the CC zone allows for community-serving commercial services, retail uses, and dwelling units with a minimum of 400 square feet. The proposed two residential units of 3,227 square feet and 2,890 square feet will meet the minimum square footage requirement and would provide a net gain of one additional unit. Also, prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, the applicant shall comply with the affordable housing requirements of the City’s Inclusionary Affordable Housing Regulations.

**BACKGROUND**

The project site is located on a 0.09-acre lot at 2202 and 2206 Avenida de la Playa, on the northeast corner of El Paseo Grande and Avenida de la Playa intersection (Attachment No. 1), in the Commercial Center (CC) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-appealable Area 2), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, and the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Beach Impact Area) of the La Jolla Community Plan area. The project site is currently developed with a one-story, single family residence and a retail store of approximately 1,538 square feet (Attachment No. 2).

The site is designated by the La Jolla Community Plan for commercial and mixed uses (Attachment No. 3). The purpose of the CC zone is to accommodate community-serving commercial services and retail uses. The project site is specifically located along Avenida de la Playa in La Jolla Shores and the specific recommendations for the various commercial areas are regulated and detailed in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance. The CC Zone allows for 100 percent lot coverage, zero setbacks, and no Floor Area Ratio (FAR) restriction. Also, commercial services on the ground floor area of a development shall not exceed 6,000 square feet and dwelling units require a minimum floor area of 400 square feet.

The proposed coastal development project will include the demolition of the existing structures on the 0.09-acre site, and the construction of a new three-story, mixed use building with residential and commercial condominiums (Attachment No. 4). The demolition and new construction in the Coastal Zone requires a Coastal Development Permit from the City. The project is also located in the La Jolla Shores Planned District area and requires a Site Development Permit for compliance with codified regulations of the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance. Finally, the project requires a Tentative Map Waiver (Attachment No.5) for
the subdivision of a 0.091-acre site into one lot for two residential and one commercial condominium units, and to waive the requirement to underground existing offsite overhead utility facilities.

On July 28, 2010, the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego considered the project’s Coastal Development Permit, Site Development Permit, Variance, and Tentative Map Waiver. A Variance (Attachment No. 7) was requested for San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Division 2, Rules for Calculation and Measurement, sections 113.0273(a) and 113.0273(c), Measuring Visibility Area (Attachment No. 8), and applying these SDMC sections to project’s development along Calle Clara, a public right of way street. However, after public testimony and open discussion with City staff, the Hearing Officer decided that a Variance is not required for the project because the specific SDMC sections in the Division are intended to provide the rules for calculating, determining, establishing, and measuring those aspects that are regulated by the City’s Street Design Manual for engineering requirements in the public right-of-way and not an applicable development regulation of the Land Development Code. In addition, the City’s Transportation and Engineering staff have allowed existing development along Calle Clara with modified curbs, gutters, driveways, and support the project as currently designed. Therefore, the Hearing Officer approved the development’s Coastal Development Permit, Site Development Permit, Tentative Map Waiver, and removed the Variance along with the findings (Attachment 9).

On August 10, 2010, the La Jolla Community Planning Association filed an appeal of the Hearing Officer’s decision and on August 11, 2010, appeals were also filed by Bernard Segal and La Jolla Shores Tomorrow (Attachment 12).

DISCUSSION

Project Description:

The project site is located on a 0.09-acre lot at 2202 and 2206 Avenida de la Playa, on the northeast corner of El Paseo Grande and Avenida de la Playa and proposes the demolition of the existing one single-story residence and one ground floor retail store, and the construction of a new mixed use development on site. The new development would be a new three-story building, with a maximum height of 30 feet, consisting of two residential condominium units on the second and third floors, basement parking, and 2,000 square feet of commercial condominium unit space on the ground floor (Attachment No. 6). The development’s gross floor area will be approximately 8,950 square feet. Proposed work in the public right-of-way would also include new accessible ramps installed at two intersections at Avenida de la Playa and El Paseo Grande, and Calle Clara and El Paseo Grande.

The 2,000 square-foot commercial unit requires two off-street parking spaces and will be located in the rear of the property on Calle Clara. Access to the basement parking garage with the required residential five parking spaces would be from a ramp at the rear of the site, on the north side of the development along Calle Clara. The project would feature hardscape/permeable surface similar to the current development. Drought tolerant landscaping is also proposed. Roof drains and sheet flow from the site would be directed to proposed landscaped areas and to
existing non-contiguous sidewalk landscape areas for natural filtration prior to discharge into existing street storm drains surrounding the site. The topography of the site ranges from approximately 11 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) at the southwest portion of the site and 14 feet AMSL at the northeast corner.

Grading on the 0.091 acre site would cover the entire site with a total excavation of 1,700 cubic yards to a depth of 14 feet. All cut soils would be exported off-site and no fill soils would be required. Retaining walls would be in the basement only with a maximum height of 10 feet (below the current grade) and total length of 270 linear feet. The finished basement will be of a tight-seal construction to avoid any groundwater intrusion. During construction, any groundwater encountered will not be discharged to the municipal storm drain system, but disposed of in accordance with all applicable regulations.

Community Plan Analysis:

The project site is within the Commercial Center (CC) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District in the adopted La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (LJ Plan) area. The LJ Plan identifies the site for commercial and mixed use. The La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, as codified in the San Diego Municipal Code, establishes the zoning regulations to implement the policies of the General Plan and the LJ Plan. The purpose of the CC zone is to accommodate community-serving commercial services, and retail uses. The project site is specifically located along Avenida de la Playa in La Jolla Shores and the specific recommendations for the various commercial areas are regulated and detailed in the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance.

The LJ Plan’s Commercial Land Use Element provides goals to maintain a diversified, yet balanced land use pattern which includes providing adequate levels of commercial retail services, residential development and cultural opportunities within existing commercial areas, while limiting additional office use within commercially designated districts. The Element also visualizes the revitalization commercial retail areas to strengthen, reinforce and unify existing retail districts within La Jolla. Also, promote pedestrian-oriented features to improve pedestrian safety, access and ease of movement through all the commercial areas and finally, to promote mixed-use residential and commercial development along transit corridors and encourage affordable housing opportunities. Consistent with the aforementioned goals, the Element also includes overall Commercial Development Recommendations (pages 102 and 103) and specific Area Recommendations to implement to Element’s goals. The project site is located in the specific recommendation area of Avenida de la Playa – Community Commercial (page 107).

Consistent with the LJ Plan’s Element and Recommendations, the project incorporates the following shortened list of commercial goals and recommendations by: avoiding abrupt transition in scale with adjacent residential areas; providing building design articulation on the ground floor and step-backs on the upper floors to minimize bulk through the use of site; extending the existing brick paving pattern from the east in the parkway to the front of the project site and planting a new mature Jacaranda tree to match the existing street trees that would provide common pedestrian space already defined by existing improvements and development to the east; locating off-street parking to the rear of the development; storage areas and mechanical
equipment screened from public view; and utilizing energy efficient technology to promote green and clean use for the duration of the development. Also, the development retains retail and visitor oriented commercial areas in proximity to the beach and coastline parks in order to maintain a high degree of pedestrian activity and access to coastal resources. Finally, the project would adhere to policies and objectives established by the LJ Plan in that the design of the proposed structure does not affect any existing physical access way that is legally used by the public or any proposed public accessway identified in a Local Coastal Program land use plan.

Environmental Analysis:

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 182513 has been prepared for the project in accordance with State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental affects to historical resources (archaeological) and paleontological resources. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in the MND and a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared and will be implemented which will reduce, to a level below significance, any potential impacts identified in the environmental review process. The project, as revised, now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

Project-Related Issues:

Approvals

As noted previously, the proposed development requires a Coastal Development Permit, a Site Development Permit, and a Tentative Map Waiver. City staff recommended a Variance to SDMC sections 113.0273(a) and 113.0273(c), Measuring Visibility Area (Attachment No. 15), and applying these SDMC sections to their development along Calle Clara.

Calle Clara’s public right of way, on the north side and rear of the project site, was established along with the original block’s Subdivision Map No. 1913, La Jolla Shores Unit No. 1, June 1, 1926 (Attachment No10), with the dedication of 10 feet for an unnamed public right of way (approximately 1/2 width of an alley) between Paseo del Ocasco and El Paseo Grande. Typical of an alley, the project site’s entire block is currently developed as such with zero lot line development along the alley. Later, Subdivision Map No. 2061, La Jolla Shores Unit No. 3, Sept. 26, 1927 (Attachment No. 11), was recorded for the proposed subdivision on the north side of this unnamed alley. This subdivision map required the additional dedication of 20 feet of public right of way (approximately 1/2 width of a street) and identified the total 30 feet of public right of way as “Calle Clara.” This subsequent subdivision’s development produced street side features such as curb and gutter along portions of the north side of Calle Clara. The combination of these subdivision requirements has created a unique situation in which the existing Calle Clara has dual street and alley features and Calle Clara does not meet the City’s Street Design Standards. However, pursuant to the definition of an “alley” in the SDMC section 113.0103, an alley is a maximum of 25 feet wide.
Considering the unique situation and the existing development all along the southern side of Calle Clara observing a zero-foot setback as allowed in the LJSPDO, the City has reviewed the project as proposed with zero-setback and considered Calle Clara functioning as an alley rather than a street. Therefore, applying SDMC section 113.0273(a) would not be applicable to the project. Considering development along Calle Clara as an “alley,” the visibility areas at the intersection of a street and alley (El Paseo Grande and Calle Clara) would be provided as a 10 feet by 10 feet visibility triangle area pursuant to section 113.0273(b) instead of 15 feet by 15 feet for two streets. Also, a visibility area at the intersection of an alley and driveway is not required instead of a driveway and street of which requires 10 feet by 10 feet visibility triangle areas on each side of a driveway pursuant to section 113.0273(c).

Community Planning Group Recommendation

The La Jolla Community Planning Association voted to deny the project for two reasons. The following reasons are provided below along with the City staff’s analysis:

1. **Under the LJSPDO Section 1510.0301 and under Progress Guide and General Plan for the City of San Diego, the La Jolla Community Plan, and the La Jolla Shores Precise Plan: The form and relationship of the project would disrupt the character and architectural unity of the streetscape.**

   The project site is located at 2202 and 2206 Avenida de la Playa, and proposes a mixed use development in the Commercial Center (CC) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District (LJSPD) in the La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan (Plan) area. The development’s draft permit resolution contains the required findings related to conformity to the City’s General Plan and the adopted community plan and local coastal program land use plan. Specifically, the project is consistent with recommendations specific to the Avenida de la Playa Community Commercial area which promote a focus on pedestrian-related amenities such as sidewalk surface treatments and street trees, both of which will be consistent with existing patterns of development. The scale of the project is consistent with existing development which allows zero-foot yard setbacks and 100 percent building coverage. The project also avoids abrupt transition in scale with adjacent residential areas. Residential projects adjacent to the La Jolla Shores commercial district are multi-family structures, many of which are taller and bulkier than the commercial development. This project is located on the corner of El Paso Grande and Avenida de la Playa which leads directly into a residential area of existing large multi-unit projects. The proposed development is smaller in scale than the multi-unit projects to the west and north. Therefore, as reviewed by City staff and as detailed in the development’s draft permit findings, the proposed uses and design of the development are consistent with the adopted land use plans, zoning regulations, and the proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan.

2. **The plans and presentation do not show what dewatering will be needed by the project before and after completion and how any dewatering will be accomplished without violating LJSPDO Section 1510.0403 which prohibits discharging ground water into the storm drain on account of the need to protect the beach from such intrusion.**
The project’s permit condition No. 26 requires the applicant to comply with SDMC sec. 1510.0403 for structures below the water table. The project will not be allowed to conduct dewatering discharges to the public streets or municipal storm drain system during construction or thereafter.

La Jolla Shores Advisory Board Recommendation

On March 16, 2010, the project was presented by the applicant to the La Jolla Shores Advisory Board (Board) and after public testimony and discussion; the Board was unable to obtain a majority vote on any motion for the development. However, the Board asked the applicant to consider some design changes on the project and thereafter, the Board continued this project’s item to their next meeting. On April 20, 2010, the Board again conducted public testimony, discussed possible design changes, and was still unable to obtain a majority vote on any motion to recommend approval or denial for the project. Finally, the Board voted unanimously to not make a recommendation on the project.

Appeals

The La Jolla Community Planning Association filed an appeal on August 10, 2010. The following appeal reasons are provided below along with the City staff’s analysis:

1. The community planning group voted 14-1-1 to recommend denial of the application and voted 12-2-2 to file an appeal of the HO decision. The Community Group recommendation is discussed earlier in Recommendations section of this document and their appeal has been received.

2. Incorrect application of SDMC §1510.0301 in judging the bulk and scale of the building. SDMC Section 1510.0301 establishes General Design Regulations for the La Jolla Shores Planned District. Consistent with the requirements of Section 1510.0301, “unity with variety” shall be used as a guiding principle in reviewing projects for conformance with the General Design Regulations. As required by Section 1510.0301, the project was determined to be generally consistent with the quality, form, materials, color, and relationship of other buildings in the surrounding area. Further, the General Design Regulations state that “building materials and color are the most critical unifying elements”, of which the project complies. In accordance with Section 1510.0301(c), the project was also reviewed for its potential impact on any designated public views to the ocean. Section 1510.0301 does not contain regulatory controls for bulk and scale, such as a defined maximum Floor Area Ratio.

3. Incorrect application of SDMC §1510.0301(b) in judging disruption of the architectural unity of the area. See City staff response to appeal issue No. 2 above.

4. Incorrect application of the LDC in applying SDMC §1510.0401(j), (k) and (o). SDMC §1510.0401(j); The La Jolla Shores PDO states parking spaces shall be designed
in accordance with Land Development Code Section 142.0560, Development and Design Requirements for Parking. Pursuant to SDMC Section 142.0560, Table 142.05J, requires the minimum dimensions for a parking space to be 8 feet wide by 18 feet long. There are two commercial spaces proposed, a standard space and a van accessible space as shown on the Exhibit Plan’s Main Level plan sheet. The Exhibit Plan dimensions are 9 feet wide by 18 feet long for the standard space and 9 feet wide by 20 feet long for the accessible space, plus a 8 feet wide by 18 feet long area for an access aisle. Therefore, the proposed two spaces are in compliance.

SDMC §1510.0401(k); The La Jolla Shores PDO states access shall be in conformance with Land Development Code Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 5, Parking Regulations. The access of the parking spaces and the underground parking garage is from Calle Clara. Per LDC Section 142.0560, Table 142-05M, the minimum driveway width required to the underground parking spaces for two residential units with lot width of 50 feet or less is 12 feet. The project proposes a 13 feet 9 inches driveway width.

SDMC §1510.0401(o); The La Jolla Shores PDO states all parking areas (excluding ingress and egress, but including areas between driveways) shall be screened from public rights-of-way and adjoining properties by fences, walls, buildings, planting or a combination thereof. Outside of the project’s Line of Sight area on El Paseo Grande, the project proposes wrought iron lattice to screen the parking area.

5. Incorrect application of §1510.0107(a) and §1510.0310 in applying §113.0273 in not applying Visibility Triangles and/or ignoring the Variance request.

The Hearing Officer, after public testimony and open discussion with City staff, decided that a Variance is not required for the project because the specific SDMC sections related to Visibility Triangles in the Rules of Calculation and Measurement Division are intended to provide the rules for calculating, determining, establishing, and measuring those aspects that are regulated by the City’s Street Design Manual for engineering requirements in the public right-of-way and not an applicable “development regulation” of the Land Development Code in which a Variance may be requested. In addition, the City has allowed existing development along Calle Clara with modified curbs, gutters, driveways, and support the project as currently designed.

6. Non-compliance with §121.0308(a) in granting the Site Development and Coastal Development Permits.

Consistent with SDMC sec. 121.0308(a), No Permission to Violate Codes, the decision by the Hearing Officer and the development’s Site Development Permit and Coastal Development Permit conditions of approval will not grant any construction permit or any plan, specifications, computations, or inspection approval constituting any violation of any of the provisions of the Land Development Code, including the Building, Electrical, Plumbing, or Mechanical Regulations or any other ordinance of the City.
7. Findings can not be made for either the Variance (as originally applied by DSD), the CDP, or the SDP.

The Hearing Officer’s decision was to approve the development’s Coastal Development Permit, Site Development Permit, and Tentative Map Waiver consistent with the required findings. The Hearing Officer also decided a Variance is not required for the development and no action was taken on the specific Variance findings.

8. Incorrect analysis and erroneous recommendations made by the Environmental Review Section as contained in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration and subsequent errata.

Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 182513 has been prepared for the project in accordance with State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental affects to historical resources (archaeological) and paleontological resources. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in the MND and a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared and will be implemented which will reduce, to a level below significance, any potential impacts identified in the environmental review process.

9. Other issues that may be raised at hearing.

City staff will be available to discuss any additional hearing issues.

Mr. Bernard Segal filed an appeal on August 11, 2010. The following appeal reasons are provided along with the City staff’s analysis:

1. The grounds stated in the letter dated July 22, 2010 from Bernard Segal to Hearing Officer, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1-1.

   The Hearing Officer was provided the referenced letter prior to the public hearing and Mr. Segal’s issues were considered and/or discussed at the hearing prior to the Hearing Officer’s decision.

2. The response of La Jolla Community Planning Association to the Mitigated Negative Declaration filed by the applicant, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1-2.

   On April 2, 2010, the La Jolla Community Planning Association (LJCPA) submitted a comment letter on the project’s draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) No. 182513. The City’s responses to the LJCPA’s comments are included in the final MND No. 182513, which was distributed to the public on July 6, 2010.

3. The written arguments contained in the correspondence sent to the Development Services Department by Phil Merten, architect, including those arguments contending that Calle Clara in La Jolla Shores is a street and not an alley, and those arguments contending that the City is required to follow the criteria set forth in the Design Manual.

   City staff responded to Mr. Merten’s emails regarding Calle Clara. City staff determined that Calle Clara, within the existing subdivision’s block of the proposed development, would be considered a street that was altered from an alley when originally mapped. Calle Clara does not meet the SDMC’s definition of an alley by exceeding the 25-foot width. However, all existing build-out development abutting the south side of Calle Clara
functions as a public right-of-way alley. Calle Clara’s public right-of-way does not meet
the City’s Street Design Manual for engineering requirements regarding width and
improvements along the public right of way street and the City Engineer has the authority
to allow and accept modified engineering requirements.

4. The grounds set forth in the appeal of La Jolla Shores Tomorrow.
Please see the La Jolla Shores Tomorrow’s project appeal issues discussed further below
in this section of the report.

5. The Hearing conducted by Chris Larson on July 28, 2010 was unfair and violated due
process of law for the following reasons: He failed to grant a continuance of the Hearing
despite the fact that the report from the City was furnished to members of the public
requesting notice only a day or two before the Hearing. He limited statements from
members of the public to 2 minutes each, thereby making it virtually impossible to present
a complete opposition to the project. After terminating public comment, he inquired of
the City staff whether the City in the past has granted a permit where a street functioned
as an alley, and upon receiving an affirmative response, elected to treat Calle Clara as
an alley despite the fact that by definition in the Land Development Code, it is a street.
He found no need for a variance where, by Code, a variance is required. After ruling
that a variance was not necessary, he failed to re-open public comment so that inquiry
could be made by the public as to the circumstances in which the City previously treated
a street as an alley. He failed to follow the criteria in the La Jolla PDO and the La Jolla
Design Manual. He granted permit under circumstances where a variance was required,
and he failed to make the findings required for a variance.
The Hearing Officer conducted the public hearing in accordance with standard practices
for the meeting and at the discretion of the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer’s
decision was to approve the development’s Coastal Development Permit, Site
Development Permit, and Tentative Map Waiver consistent with the required findings.
The Hearing Officer also decided a Variance is not required for the development and no
action was taken on the specific Variance findings.

6. By allowing the construction of a mixed use building in La Jolla Shores with a floor area
ratio one-third larger than could be built anywhere else in the City on similarly zoned
property, the City has unconstitutionally discriminated against the residents of La Jolla
Shores.
The project site is within the Commercial Center (CC) Zone of the La Jolla Shores
Planned District in the adopted La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Program
Land Use Plan (LJ Plan) area. The LJ Plan identifies the site for commercial and mixed
use. The La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, as codified in the San Diego
Municipal Code, establishes the zoning regulations to implement the policies of the
General Plan and the LJ Plan. The purpose of the CC zone is to accommodate
community-serving commercial services, and retail uses. Specific to only the La Jolla
Shores Planned District, the CC Zone allows for 100 percent lot coverage, zero setbacks,
and no floor area ratios (FAR). Also, commercial services on the ground floor area of a
development shall not exceed 6,000 square feet and dwelling units require a minimum
floor area of 400 square feet.
7. The City is required to apply to the La Jolla Shores the maximum floor area ratios allowed elsewhere in the City in similarly zoned property, and the City did not apply those floor area ratio maximums when it granted the permit to the applicant. The project site is within the Commercial Center (CC) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District in the adopted La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (LJ Plan) area. The LJ Plan identifies the site for commercial and mixed use. The La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, as codified in the San Diego Municipal Code, establishes the zoning regulations to implement the policies of the General Plan and the LJ Plan. Specific to only the La Jolla Shores Planned District, the CC Zone allows for 100 percent lot coverage, zero setbacks, and no floor area ratios (FAR). Consistent with the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, the CC Zone regulations have been applied to this project.

8. The City granted the project a permit without applying to it the criteria prescribed in the La Jolla Shores PDO and La Jolla Shores Design Manual. The City has reviewed the project consistent with the La Jolla Shores Planned District Ordinance, the La Jolla Shores Design Manual, the policies of the City’s General Plan, and the La Jolla Community Plan.

9. From the manner in which the project was approved, it appears that the City has improperly decided not to give full effect to the La Jolla Shores Design Manual, which is an integral part of the La Jolla PDO. City staff reviewed the proposed development and considered all relevant documents for consistency with the documents, including the La Jolla Shores Design Manual (Design Manual). Consistent with the Design Manual, the project’s design or architecture of the front façade of a new building should be modified or altered and staggered so that no façade runs more than 50 feet. The combination of many small lots is discouraged in the Avenida de la Playa commercial district. The proposed project on two 25-foot lots does not exceed the Manual’s maximum façade width envisioned for the Avenida de la Playa commercial district.

The Design Manual also limits the ground floor retail area not to exceed 6,000 square feet. The project complies with this provision and proposes only 2,000 square feet of retail space.

In accordance with the Design Manual, only natural building materials and earth tone colors should be used. The project’s proposed stucco exterior with landscaping added for texture, is consistent with the Design Manual and surrounding commercial district.

Pursuant to the Design Manual, buildings within the Avenida de la Playa commercial district should be allowed to cover 100 percent of the lot area. The project proposes 94 percent lot coverage.
10. **The City failed to treat Calle Clara as a street, and thereby allowed driveways and curbs not permitted by Code.**

The Hearing Officer acknowledged the existing Calle Clara's public right-of-way does not meet the City's Street Design Manual for engineering requirements regarding width and improvements along the public right of way street. Also, the existing development along Calle Clara is designed with alley improvements and functions as an alley rather than a street. Finally, the City Engineer has the authority to allow and accept modified engineering requirements.

11. **In treating Calle Clara as an alley and not a street without granting a variance, the permit for the project was issued in violation of the Code and is therefore invalid.**

The Hearing Officer acknowledged the existing Calle Clara's public right-of-way does not meet the City’s Street Design Manual for engineering requirements regarding width and improvements along the public right of way street. Also, the existing development along Calle Clara is designed with alley improvements and functions as an alley rather than a street. Finally, the City Engineer has the authority to allow and accept modified engineering requirements. Therefore, the Hearing Officer’s decision to not require a variance is because the specific sections in the SDMC’s Rules for Calculation and Measurement Division are intended to provide the rules for calculating, determining, establishing, and measuring those aspects that are regulated by the City’s Street Design Manual for engineering requirements in the public right-of-way and not an applicable development regulation of the Land Development Code.

La Jolla Shores Tomorrow, c/o Julie Hamilton, Esq., filed an appeal on August 11, 2010. The following appeal reasons are provided along with the City staff’s analysis:

1. **The proposed project will adversely affect the applicable land use plan because its bulk and scale is out of character with the commercial community.**

The proposed project is consistent with the Commercial Development Recommendations of the La Jolla Community Plan and has incorporated these recommendations into the building design in order to reduce actual or apparent bulk. These recommendations include the use of building articulation on the ground floor, step-backs and offsetting planes on the upper floors, and the addition of landscaping to the exterior walls in order to soften edges and provide a sense of pedestrian scale.

2. **The proposed project will not comply to the maximum extent feasible with the Land Development Code because the project does not incorporate required visibility triangles, has not adequate information regarding the effect of the subterranean garage on pumping and subsidence, removes at least one public parking space, and does not conform in bulk and scale to the community.**

The proposed project provides the appropriate visibility areas at the intersections of El Paseo Grande and Avenida de la Playa and El Paseo Grande and Calle Clara.

A preliminary geotechnical investigation report and two addendums have been prepared for the project and have been reviewed and accepted by City staff. The report and addendums include analysis and conclusions regarding groundwater affects and
stabilization of the site. The project proposes tight seal construction methods that would avoid any periodic water pumping during the life of the development and pursuant to SDMC section 1510.0403(a), any temporary construction dewatering activities shall not be discharged to the municipal storm water system. Also, the accepted document concludes, with the implementation of proposed construction practices, the project will not destabilize or result in adverse settlement of adjacent property or the public right of way.

To comply with the City’s current Line of Sight requirements, the proposed “red,” no parking areas may be expanded and require adjustments to “on-street” parking.

Finally, regarding bulk and scale, please see City staff response to appeal issue No. 1 above.

3. There are no special circumstances to justify a variance because all properties on that block are similarly situated, the project is on a flat, rectangular, unconstrained lot with access to three streets, and the owner is not deprived of reasonable use.

The Hearing Officer’s decision was to approve the development’s Coastal Development Permit, Site Development Permit, and Tentative Map Waiver consistent with the required findings. The Hearing Officer also decided a Variance is not required for the development and no action was taken on the specific Variance findings.

4. The proposed mitigation of potential significant effects to archaeological/paleontological resources is ineffective because the language allows modification of required mitigation. City staff believes this concern is a result from the strikeout language on pages 6 and 7 of the project’s final MND. The edits to the archaeological monitoring language from the draft MND to the final MND do not change the monitoring requirements for either archaeological or paleontological resources. Specifically, the final MND’s section V. Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program, C.3, During Construction, strikeout language deleted, “The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activity” and corrected to read, “The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modifications of the PME (document typo error and should read AME).” The update allows for OSHA “modification” only as needed to ensure that the monitors are not exposed to dangerous situations such as being in a trench with an unreinforced side that could be subject to collapse. Again, the change to the MMRP protects monitors, but does not remove them from their full monitoring capacity. Prior to the release of the draft MND for Whitney, the City’s standard paleontological monitoring language had already been updated to include these OSHA requirements.

5. An EIR is required because the initial study failed to consider substantial evidence indicating significant impacts on aesthetics, community character, and inconsistency with applicable land use plan.

The appellant’s concerns were discussed during both the public review of the draft MND
and at the Hearing Officer meeting. Substantial Evidence, as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15384 means "enough relevant information and reasonable inferences from this information that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion, even though other conclusions might also be reached. Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative...or evidence of social or economic impacts which do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environments does not constitute substantial evidence." Section 15384 continues to state that "Substantial evidence shall include facts, reasonable assumptions predicated on facts, and expert opinion supported by facts."

The project has been reviewed by the City and has been determined to be in compliance with all of the applicable regulations. City staff does not believe that substantial evidence has been provided by the appellant indicating significant impacts as noted above. City staff acknowledges that the proposed project will be different and larger in scale than what exists on site today, in a community that has a variety of architectural styles and buildings sizes. Specifically, immediately east of the project site is a three-story mixed use structure; south from the site and across the street is a four-story commercial office structure; west of the site and across El Paseo Grande is a one-story commercial structure; north of the project site is a two-story apartment complex; and northwest of the project site is a four-story multi-family development. Various additional structures in the immediate project vicinity are widely mixed, and therefore staff determined that based on the varied development of the area, this project would not result in a substantial change to the community character, neighborhood aesthetics, or land use plan.

Conclusion:

City staff has reviewed the proposed project and all issues identified through the review process have been resolved in conformance with adopted City Council policies and regulations of the Land Development Code. Staff has provided the draft environmental resolution and Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (Attachment No. 19), draft findings to support approval of the proposed development (Attachment No. 15), draft conditions of approval (Attachment No. 16), and draft map resolution and conditions (Attachment Nos. 17 and 18). City staff is recommending the Planning Commissioners deny all the appeals and uphold the Hearing Officer’s decision to approve the project.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Deny the appeals and Approve Coastal Development Permit No. 662551, Site Development Permit No. 662678, and Tentative Map Waiver No. 683254, with or without Variance No. 765358, with modifications.

2. Approve the appeals and Deny Coastal Development Permit No. 662551, Site Development Permit No. 662678, and Tentative Map Waiver No. 683254, with or without Variance No. 765358, if the findings required to approve the project cannot be affirmed.
Respectfully submitted,

Mike Westlake  
Program Manager  
Development Services Department

Tim Daly  
Project Manager  
Development Services Department
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Article 6: Development Permits

Division 8: Variance Procedures
(Added 12-9-1997 by O-18451 N.S.; effective 1-1-2000.)

§126.0801 Purpose of Variance Procedures

The purpose of these procedures is to provide relief for cases in which, because of special circumstances applicable to the property including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the development regulations would deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under the same land use designation and zone. 
(Added 12-9-1997 by O-18451 N.S.; effective 1-1-2000.)

§126.0802 When a Variance May Be Requested

A variance may be requested for proposed development that would not comply with an applicable development regulation of the Land Development Code, except that density shall not be increased through a variance. 
(Added 12-9-1997 by O-18451 N.S.; effective 1-1-2000.)

§126.0803 Application for a Variance

An application for a variance shall be filed in accordance with Section 112.0102. 
(Added 12-9-1997 by O-18451 N.S.; effective 1-1-2000.)

§126.0804 Decision Processes for a Variance

A decision on an application for a variance shall be made in accordance with Process Three. The decision may be appealed to the Planning Commission unless otherwise specified by the Land Development Code. 
(Added 12-9-1997 by O-18451 N.S.; effective 1-1-2000.)
(Amended 11-28-2005 by O-19444 N.S.; effective 2-9-2006.)

§126.0805 Findings for Variance Approval

The decision maker may approve or conditionally approve an application for a variance only if the decision maker makes the following findings:

(a) There are special circumstances or conditions applying to the land or premises for which the variance is sought that are peculiar to the land or premises and do not apply generally to the land or premises in the neighborhood, and these conditions have not resulted from any act of the applicant after the adoption of the applicable zone regulations;
Chapter 12: Land Development Reviews

(b) The circumstances or conditions are such that the strict application of the regulations of the Land Development Code would deprive the applicant of reasonable use of the land or premises and the variance granted by the City is the minimum variance that will permit the reasonable use of the land or premises;

(c) The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the regulations and will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare; and

(d) The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan. If the variance is being sought in conjunction with any proposed coastal development, the required finding shall specify that granting of the variance conforms with, and is adequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified land use plan.

§113.0276 Determining Yards

(a) Yards are determined in the hierarchy described below and shown in Diagram 113-02SS:

(1) Front Yard. The front yard is determined first. It is the area between the front property line and the front setback line and extends the full width of the lot.

(2) Street Side Yard. The street side yard, when applicable, is determined next. It is the area between the street side property line and the street side setback line that extends along the depth of the lot from the front setback to the rear property line. It does not include the front yard.

(3) Rear Yard. The rear yard is determined after the front and street side yards. It is the area between the rear property line and the rear setback line that extends along the width of the lot between the rear property line and the rear setback. It does not include the street side yard if one exists.

(Amended 1-9-2001 by O-18910 N.S.; effective 8-8-2001.)
(Amended 11-28-2005 by O-19444 N.S.; effective 2-9-2006.)
(Amended 3-1-2006 by O-19467 N.S.; effective 8-10-2006.)
(c) **Structure Height of Signs**

The height of a ground *sign* is measured from the lowest point of the *existing grade or proposed grade*, whichever is lower, immediately adjacent to the base of the *sign* to the highest point at the top of the *sign structure*.

*(Added 12-9-1997 by O-18451 N.S.; effective 1-1-2000.)*

*(Amended 11-28-2005 by O-19444 N.S.; effective 2-9-2006.)*

*(Amended 11-13-2008 by O-19801 N.S.; effective 12-13-2008.)*

§113.0273 **Measuring Visibility Area**

The *visibility area* is a triangular portion of a premises formed by drawing one line perpendicular to and one line parallel to the *property line* or *public right-of-way* for a specified length and one line diagonally joining the other two lines, as shown in Diagram 113-02RR. No structures may be located within a *visibility area* unless otherwise provided by the applicable zone or the regulations in Chapter 14, Article 2 (General Development Regulations).

(a) For *visibility areas* at the intersection of *streets*, two sides of the triangle extend along the intersecting *property lines* for 25 feet and the third side is a diagonal line that connects the two.

(b) For *visibility areas* at the intersection of a *street* and *alley*, two sides of the triangle extend along the intersecting *property lines* for 10 feet and the third side is a diagonal line that connects the two.

(c) For *visibility areas* at the intersection of a *street* and driveway, one side of the triangle extends from the intersection of the *street* and the driveway for 10 feet along the *property line*. The second side extends from the intersection of the *street* and driveway for 10 feet inward from the property line along the driveway edge and the third side of the triangle connects the two.

(d) Where the required front and street side yards measure less than 25 feet when combined, that measurement or 15 feet, whichever is greater, establishes the *visibility area* at the street intersection.