



City of Cathedral City
Planning Commission Minutes for March 16, 2005
Page 1 of 6

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Chair Gene Touchet; Vice Chair Doug Diekmann, Stan Barnes and Bill Feist

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Sonja Marchand (Excused)

A Motion was made by Diekmann, seconded by Feist and approved 4-0 to excuse Marchand since she was recovering from back surgery.

Staff Present: City Planner Joe Richards, Senior Planner Bud Kopp, Associate Planner Rich Malacoff, Planning Department Administrative Secretary Nancy Greene and Deputy City Attorney Michael J. Shirey.

Touchet opened the public comment portion of the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Touchet closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Confirmation of the Agenda

There were no comments on the Confirmation of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes from March 2, 2005

A Motion was made by Barnes, seconded by Diekmann to approve the March 2, 2005 minutes. The motion was approved by a 4-0 vote, with Marchand not voting since she was absent.

Public Hearing Items

Conditional Use Permit 04-024, Associate Planner Rich Malacoff

Malacoff presented the staff report and stated the project was found to be categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Article 19, Section 15301 (e) Class One and requested approval of the Conditional Use Permit to construct a wireless communication facility located at 32090 Rancho Vista Drive in the PCC (Planned Community Commercial) District.

Malacoff stated that all of the equipment will be housed within the structure on the roof. He also stated that the project has been reviewed by both the Developmental Services



City of Cathedral City
Planning Commission Minutes for March 16, 2005
Page 2 of 6

and Architectural Review Committees. The Architectural Review Committee had recommended the eaves located at the top of the roof structure be removed and the applicant responded quickly with a redesign. The structure has now been redesigned to have a decorative cornice around the top perimeter in lieu of the eaves. The roof will be open at the top, the four sides will have faux windows and the structure will be done in stucco which matches the building.

Malacoff complimented the applicant on the architectural style and creativity used to disguise the facility and stated that it was much better than installing a mono-palm on the site and recommended approval of the project.

Touchet opened the public comment portion of the public hearing.

The applicant, Ramon Salazar, with Tetra Tech Inc. representing Nextel was available to answer questions.

There were no questions.

Feist posed a question of Malacoff regarding possible future use of this facility for other cell phone providers. Malacoff stated that if it was feasible for a potential applicant to be collocated it would be required to be approved before the Planning Commission. There was further discussion by Diekmann that it may not be possible to collocate another provider due to limitations of space.

The Commission was very pleased with the product being proposed.

Touchet closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

A Motion was made by Diekmann, seconded by Barnes and approved by a 4-0 vote, Marchand being absent to approve the Categorical Exemption pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Section 15301 (e) (Class One) and approving Conditional Use Permit No. 04-024.

**Design Review No. 05-001 and Conditional Use Permit No. 05-003,
Senior Planner Bud Kopp**

Prior to presenting the staff report, Kopp handed out a slight modification to Condition 69 of the Resolution which he stated he would address during his presentation.

Staff also stated all off-site improvements will be completed as separate projects, with the exception of street trees and landscaping within public right-of-way on East Palm Canyon/Van Fleet/D Street, which is a part of this project.



City of Cathedral City
Planning Commission Minutes for March 16, 2005
Page 3 of 6

Kopp then presented the staff report which requested adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration, approving Design Review No. 05-001 for the construction of a 300 room resort hotel with on-site infrastructure including a restaurant, retail shop, pool, pro shop, day spa facility, administrative offices, guest registration area and conference rooms with the cart barn housed in the basement, with a total of approximately 230,000 gross square feet on 11.45 acres at the southeast corner of East Palm Canyon Drive and Allen Avenue, and Conditional Use Permit 05-003 for Joint Use Parking and to reduce the on-site parking requirements in a Mixed Use Commercial (MXC) and Downtown Residential Neighborhood (DRN) Zone.

Kopp stated the resort hotel is specifically identified in the City's 2002 General Plan Update and is consistent with the Downtown Revitalization Plan and the Redevelopment Implementation Plan.

Kopp stated that the D Street plan was modified to reduce the 120' diameter on the cul-de-sac (which cut into hotel property) to 70' diameter with no parking on the cul-de-sac. It increased the number of parking spaces on the property, which was one of the objectives. There will still be resident parking on the south side of D Street, which has not changed.

There was much discussion regarding the number of parking spaces especially during peak usage by Kopp, the Commission and Shirey.

Kopp addressed the modified Condition No. 69 in the Resolution. He stated that originally the applicant was to provide documentation to initiate a program to shuttle their employees to and from the downtown parking structure when the parking lot hit peak usage. Kopp stated it's been modified a little bit because the hotel has over 100 employees and any facility that has over 100 employees has to provide a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan. They have to reduce the number of trips through this TDM Plan by 10%. The hotel is required to provide a TDM Plan as part of this project and identify ways to implement the plan, one of which, could be the shuttle service plan for employees to remote facilities.

The Commission's main concern on this modified Condition 69 was that it made no mention of utilizing the parking structure.

Kopp stated if the Commission wished to keep Condition 69 as is, he would recommend adding TDM as Condition 70 as it is a requirement in the Zoning Ordinance.

Touchet opened the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Touchet commented that everyone in attendance was the project applicant or on the project applicant's team.



City of Cathedral City
Planning Commission Minutes for March 16, 2005
Page 4 of 6

The Commission commented that we needed to address two things, the parking plan and the Conference Center design which is not consistent with the Downtown Design Guidelines. Diekmann stated that there are a lot of straight lines over the Conference Center and the building needs surface relief.

Kopp stated that if it is the direction and consensus of the Commission to look into tower features on that element of the building, that an additional Condition of Approval be added to give specific direction and that the project would go back to the Architectural Committee for final review/approval and not be required to return to the Planning Commission.

The Commission inquired about the Art in Public Places fee. Kopp stated that applicant has the option of placing artwork on-site or contributing the fees. He also stated the art issue had not been discussed and it is generally decided upon at the building permit stage.

Carl Kernodle, Director of Design for Faulkner USA, Austin, Texas, expressed appreciation to Mr. Kopp on being helpful and his ability to review the project quickly.

Kernodle addressed a question brought up earlier regarding the overlap of the golf parking. He stated there is the 7:00 a.m. rush, however, the turnover is around the noon-hour, with people coming off the course and getting on the course.

Kernodle commented on the "straight-line" architectural issue. Kernodle stated they intentionally tried to change the horizontal appearance. In addition, the landscaping which also changes the horizontal look was not shown on the illustration. They are trying to work with the various elevations as well to break up the straight line appearance. In addition, there will be canopies on the building.

Diekmann commented that he would like the condition added to have no straight lines.

Jim McAuliffe, Principal with Culpepper, McAuliffe and Meaders, Inc. (CMMI), architects out of Atlanta, Georgia, stated CMMI has been working with Faulkner on the hotel as well as the Planning staff, and wanted to thank the Planning staff for all of their help. He stated that he understood the concerns and issues Cathedral City had set forth. He explained the intent of the design, to take advantage of the height of the hotel itself and concentrate the towers at the center as an emphasis. The Conference Center portion was to be lower and more of a background-type of building, not drawing attention to itself. He stated that the entry point of the Conference Center has a porte-cochere. McCulloch also stated they can work with Faulkner if necessary to modify the vertical elements on the hotel. He suggested adding a tower, or some other vertical element rather than the porte-cochere to the entrance of the Conference Center.



City of Cathedral City
Planning Commission Minutes for March 16, 2005
Page 5 of 6

Touchet inquired about the view from B Street. It was determined that the view to the Conference Center will be obstructed from Angel View Thrift Shop, which is located on B Street.

Paul Schillcock, Economic Development Director, stated that east of Angel View, the Conference Center is visible. West of Angel View there is not a view of the Conference Center.

Larry Higgins, Vice-Chairman of the Architectural Review Committee, stated there had been one redesign already made to the Conference Center by the applicant. The applicant responded very quickly, in a matter of two weeks, and incorporated the requested changes. Higgins stated the Conference Center was a lot more plain before the applicant made the changes. Towers however, were not addressed before on the Conference Center by the ARC.

There was discussion on the type and size of stones used on the project.

Touchet closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Commissioners Comments

Barnes stated that as a matter of record, when he went over to look at the three-dimensional illustration, when the applicant approached Barnes, applicant was merely pointing out some of the lines that the three-dimensional illustration showed.

Barnes suggested putting in the conditions as discussed, but continue moving forward and not stopping the project, also keeping in mind budgetary ramifications.

Kopp drafted and presented the following condition, for Commission's consideration, "The entry point to the Conference Center should be revised to include a tower or vertical architectural element to be approved by the Architectural Review Committee."

There was a consensus by the Commission in support of the draft condition and to keep the existing Condition No. 69, add new Transportation Demand Condition as Condition No. 70 and add the modification to the Conference Center "straight line" appearance as Condition No. 71.

Touchet reopened the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Applicants agreed to take the modifications back to the Architectural Review Committee for final review/approval without readdressing the Planning Commission.

Touchet closed the public comment portion of the public hearing



City of Cathedral City
Planning Commission Minutes for March 16, 2005
Page 6 of 6

With the Commission, staff and applicants agreeing to the addition of Condition Nos. 70 and 71, a Motion was made by Diekmann, seconded by Feist and approved by a 4-0 vote, Marchand being absent, to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, approve Design Review No. 05-001 and Conditional Use Permit No. 05-003.

Legislative Items

None

Discussion Items

None

City Attorney's Report

None

City Planner's Report

Richards distributed conference registration packets to applicable Commissioners.

He discussed the draft Quimby Ordinance, which under the State Subdivision Map Act, allows us to either get dedication of parkland or an equivalent payment of a fee when land is subdivided for residential purposes.

Richards stated that he will bring copies of the draft ordinance and the study to the next meeting.

Richards stated that the "language" of the document is still being reviewed by Mike Shirey.

Touchet adjourned the meeting at 7:54 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by,

Nancy Greene
Administrative Secretary
City of Cathedral City
March 16, 2005