



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

Attendance

Commissioners Present: Chair Gene Touchet; Vice Chair Doug Diekmann, Bill Feist and Sonja Marchand

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Stan Barnes (Excused)

A Motion was made by Feist, seconded by Marchand and approved 4-0 to excuse Barnes since he was ill.

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

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

Touchet stated that since the applicant, Mr. Hemstreet (ZOA No. 05-001) was present and the other applicant Mr. Gordon (DR No. 05-002) was not, that if there were no objections, the agenda items would be addressed in reverse order. There were no objections to the request.

Approval of Minutes from March 16, 2005

A Motion was made by Feist, seconded by Diekmann to approve the March 16, 2005 minutes. The motion was approved by a 3-0 vote. Marchand abstained since she was not present at the March 16, 2005 Planning Commission meeting, and Barnes did not vote since he was absent.

Public Hearing Items

Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 05-001, Associate Planner Rich Malacoff

Malacoff presented the staff report and stated the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment was to ease the restrictions on residential development in the DRN District. This would entail amending Municipal Code Section 9.08 and 9.25 that regulates residential land uses within the Downtown Residential Neighborhood District (DRN) which



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

is the outer ring of the downtown area. Currently, applicants with a parcel under 21,000 square feet are prohibited from doing any type of multiple family development; and new single family development is prohibited. The changes included in this proposal are:

1. To allow multiple family development in the DRN with a Conditional Use Permit for lots between 10,000 square feet and 20,999 square feet.
2. Change the overall density requirements to be equivalent (2,200 square feet per dwelling unit) to the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) District.
3. Establish the ability to develop Live/Work Units in the DRN District and modify the parking requirements to reflect this.
4. Clean up typographical errors and procedural errors to be consistent with the remainder of the Municipal Code.

This project is exempt from CEQA under Section 15061 (b) (3) the General Rule which allows an exemption if there is a certainty that there are no significant environmental impacts. Each project proposed under this new ordinance would be required to have its own environmental review and therefore the ordinance modification will not have a significant impact.

Malacoff stated there are currently 15 vacant parcels between 10,000 – 20,999 square feet, 9 owned by the City and 6 owned by private developers. If the project is approved the owners will be able to either consolidate properties and take advantage of the bonus incentive plan or have the option of building a single-family residence within the 10,000 – 20,999 square feel parcel.

There was extensive discussion between staff and Commission in determining sufficient parking space for the units.

Signage was also discussed.

Touchet opened the public comment portion of the public hearing

Applicant Eric Hemstreet complimented Mr. Malacoff on presenting the project well and thanked him for all the hard work and effort that went into putting the project together. Hemstreet also thanked the Commission for considering the project. He stated that he felt it was important for the downtown area and that the project accomplished the City's and property owners' common goals. He also felt the key to the Live/Work situation was the Live/Work permit that gives the property owner broad power over use on a case-by-case basis.

Hemstreet expressed his concern with having sufficient parking spaces.



Touchet closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Commissioners Comments

Diekmann stated in order to develop the DRN, there was a need for something like this proposal, to move away from urban blight, and change the development district in a more favorable direction. He stated that it would be a major accomplishment for the City and property owners.

Diekmann had an issue with the parking. He stated that consideration should be given for adequate parking in the future.

Marchand agreed with Diekmann that it was necessary to plan for the future.

Feist stated he liked the progressive, units per lot size bonus incentive plan. He also expressed that signage needed to be addressed.

In summary, the Planning Commission directed staff to replace the verbiage relative to the parking and signage as written to:

Multiple-family projects shall provide guest parking at a rate of twenty-five percent of the total required parking for the residential portion of the project and provide an additional space for Live/Work units a rate of one parking space per unit.

The signage can be approved with a Sign Permit that has a maximum of 3 square feet and is not illuminated.

A Motion was made by Marchand seconded by Feist and approved by a 4-0 vote, with Barnes not voting since he was absent.

Design Review No. 05-002, Associate Planner Rich Malacoff

The applicant, Richard Gordon was unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting due to a family health crisis, however a signed letter from the applicant was presented by Malacoff and read by Chairman Touchet.

Feist suggested postponing the presentation since the applicant was not in attendance.

Malacoff however stated that the applicant, in his letter, was hoping that the Planning Commission would take action and review the project although he would not be in attendance.

Commission and staff decided that there would be no harm in proceeding with the project review since the applicant can appeal to the City Council in the event he is not in



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

agreement with existing conditions or additional changes that may be incorporated. It was pointed out that there were four options. The project could be: 1) approved with suggested ARC changes; 2) approved as requested by the applicant; 3) approved per Planning Commission recommendations, or, 4) the proposal could be denied. Whatever course of action was taken, the applicant still had the option to appeal it to the City Council. Therefore, there was no reason not to proceed with reviewing the proposal.

Malacoff proceeded and presented the staff report and stated the project was to construct a 3,000 square foot addition to an existing auto repair business located at 68415 Perez Road. This project is exempt from CEQA per Section 15301(e) (2) (Class One), which allows additions to existing structures under 10,000 square feet

The application was submitted on January 12, 2005, was deemed incomplete and then subsequently the application was made complete. At the Developmental Services meeting, there were two issues, one regarding the 4-hour firewall and the other with the fire hydrant. Again, the applicant was able to resolve the two issues.

The applicant wants to maintain and improve the current landscaping and parking areas enclosed by the fence, wants placement of the new building aligned with the existing building with an open area in between, continue the exterior of the new building with metal and place five trees along the parking row on the east property line.

The ARC reviewed the project, wanted removal of the set-back area between the property line and the building and if the building could not be moved, they wanted the repair bay doors to be recessed. The ARC also wanted to leave the front of the existing building without the stucco, use masonry wall at the property line for the building in order to comply with the building code, and require a 4-hour firewall. ARC also wanted to make all the garage doors the same height, awnings to be put over the man doors, expand the planter in the front, move the curb to align with the drive aisle and install a slider gate. In addition the ARC wanted a total of four extra parking spaces, two in front and two at the rear of the building and provide a wall and continue the building onto the property line.

Marchand stated that they should not make it so difficult for small business owners with thriving businesses who want to expand, by placing unreasonable roadblocks in their way and imposing conditions that were cost prohibitive. She stated that if they continued on this path, that businesses would be driven out of Cathedral City.

Richards reiterated that the applicant wants to upgrade the front but does not want to change the basic configuration.

Malacoff stated that the ARC removed the requirement for the stucco on the front side of the metal building.

Richards stated that at the minimum, the applicant would paint the front of the building.



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

Diekmann stated the stucco front façade would add to the artistic value of the building. If the applicant wants to stucco the front, allow him to do so.

Malacoff added that the applicant planned to add more landscaping as well.

In summary, the following changes were requested by the Planning Commission. Marchand asked that Coachella Valley Water District be changed to Desert Water Agency in, 24.i. The Planning Commission deleted Conditions 35 a., c., f., g., and h. The Planning Commission added Condition No. 37 which states, "The applicant shall keep the 3 foot area between the building and property line clear of trash and debris". And, Condition No. 38 was also added which states, "The applicant shall provide the stucco on the front of the building as originally proposed on the plans."

Touchet opened the public comment portion of the public hearing

There were no comments.

Touchet closed the public comment portion of the public hearing

A Motion was made by Marchand, seconded by Feist and approved by a 4-0 vote, with Barnes not voting since he was absent.

Legislative Items

None

Discussion Items

None

City Attorney's Report

None

City Planner's Report

Richards stated that a joint City and Agua Caliente tribal council meeting was held. The idea was brought up about having a joint Indian and City Planning Commission meeting. They thought that a joint meeting was a good idea. A meeting will probably be scheduled the first part of June.

Richards distributed copies of the draft Quimby Ordinance and the study regarding the Park Fees.



City of Cathedral City
Planning Commission Minutes for April 6, 2005
Page 6 of 6

Shirey stated that he was informed by his office that there were issues with this ordinance. The City Attorneys office still needs to review the document and provisions may need to be changed. Shirey stated that the draft Quimby Ordinance will be reviewed and a final version will be provided.

Commissioners' Comments

Feist inquired about the Plaza de Oro project. Richards stated they are getting close to grading. Feist asked if there were any news on the restaurant coming in, potentially an In-and-Out Burger.

Marchand stated there is a closed down station which is an eyesore, located north of the Sheraton and the Plaza de Oro project. She inquired whether the City was currently doing anything about it, or if not, whether anything could be done. Richards stated that the gas station was on Indian land. Feist commented that perhaps these types of issues could be brought up at the Joint Planning Commission meetings since the Planning Commission and the City's hands are tied.

Richards suggested, in the next couple of weeks, to come up with other issues like that, to be discussed at the June Joint Planning Commission meeting.

Diekmann commented on the picture in the hallway outside the Council Chambers of Lalo Guerrero who recently passed away and what a tribute to the caliber of people that live in Cathedral City. He also noted the passing of John Paul II.

Diekmann commented on the stucco issue on the auto repair shop discussed earlier, and how changing the facade actually improves the architectural appearance of the building. He stated it adds to the commercial area overall and that it may set a precedent for owners of other metal building structures on Perez Road in the future to do the same. Diekmann also stated it may actually attract other businesses as well.

Malacoff brought up the April 20th Planning Commission meeting, that there were no items on the agenda. Although not formally cancelled, and leaving the option open in case something comes up, it was likely that the meeting would be cancelled

Touchet adjourned the meeting at 8:14 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by,

Nancy Greene
Administrative Secretary
City of Cathedral City
April 26, 2005