

RESOLUTION NO. PC2022-21

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF COACHELLA PLANNING COMMISSION DENYING ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW NO. 22-06 AND VARIANCE NO. 22-03 FOR THE PROPOSED INSTALLATION OF A FREESTANDING IDENTIFICATION SIGN AT 21 FEET HIGH AND A 96 SQUARE FOOT SIGN FACE FOR AN EXISTING AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENT RENTAL BUSINESS LOCATED ON A 3.86 ACRE SITE AT 86100 AVENUE 54 IN THE M-H (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL) ZONE. EBERHARD EQUIPMENT NO. 2, APPLICANT.

WHEREAS Joe Rodriguez, on behalf of Eberhard Equipment No. 2 filed an application for Architectural Review No. 22-06 and Variance No. 22-03 to freestanding identification sign at 21 feet high and 96 sq. ft. sign face area for an existing agricultural equipment rental business located on a 3.86 acre site at 86100 Avenue 54 (Assessor's Parcel No. 763-141-009 and 763-141-007); and,

WHEREAS on October 7, 2001 the Planning Commission approved Architectural Review No. 01-14 to allow the construction of a 10,000 sq. ft. industrial building with offices, warehouse, and outdoor storage space with a corner monument sign located at 86100 Avenue 54 for California Pools; and,

WHEREAS on September 11, 2022, the Planning Commission of the City of Coachella published a public hearing notice and conducted a duly noticed public hearing on Architectural Review No. 22-06 and Variance No. 22-03 and considered the application as presented by the applicant, findings, conditions and staff recommendations; and

WHEREAS the Applicant and members of the public were present and were afforded an opportunity to testify regarding the Project; and,

WHEREAS the proposal to allow the proposed freestanding sign would be inconsistent with the City of Coachella Zoning Ordinance with respect to total sign area as the proposed sign proposes a sign area of 96 sq. ft. which exceeds the 75 sq. ft. maximum size permitted in the Zoning Ordinance and the findings to support granting of the variance cannot be made; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of Coachella, California hereby resolve as follows:

Section 1. Incorporation of Recitals

The Planning Commission hereby finds that all of the facts in the Recitals are true and correct and are incorporated and adopted as findings of the Planning Commission as fully set forth in this resolution.

Section 2. CEQA Findings

Based upon its review of the entire record, including the Staff Report, any public comments or testimony presented to the Planning Commission, and the facts outlined below, the Planning Commission hereby finds and determines that the proposed project is categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Class 11) "Accessory Structures" as the applicant proposes an on-premise sign which is consistent with the Class 11 exemption for construction, or placement of minor structures accessory to existing industrial facilities.

Section 3. Variance Findings

With respect to Variance No. 22-02, the Planning Commission finds as follows for the proposed variance request:

1. That the strict application of the provisions of this chapter would not result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the chapter the Coachella Municipal Code as the subject site is located in the Heavy Industrial Zone that permits monument signs or freestanding signs consistent with the Coachella Zoning Ordinance. The subject site has direct street frontage on Avenue 54 and Tyler Street and a sign constructed for consistency with the City's Sign ordinance would be visible to customers and would not pose a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship.
2. That there are no special circumstances applicable to the subject property such as size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, that do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity. The Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.56 allows for a sign face size based on ten (10) square feet of sign per acre to a maximum area of seventy-five (75) square feet per face for businesses with one more than two and one-half acres of land. The subject site is more than two and on-half acres and allows for the largest sign face of 75 square feet available to businesses citywide.
3. That such variance is unnecessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right or use generally possessed by other property in the same zone and vicinity as the previous business on the subject site utilized a monument sign on-site less than 6 feet in height. The applicant is able to propose a sign of up to 25' in height with a 75 sq. ft. sign face area which is much larger than the originally approved sign for the subject site.
4. That the granting of such variance would be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in the same zone or vicinity in which the property is located as it would establish a precedence for larger signs in the area when no practical difficulties or unique circumstances exist for this subject site.
5. That the granting of the variance will not adversely effect any element of the general plan. Though the general plan does not preclude a larger sign at this location, the Zoning Ordinance does not support such signs at the sign face size proposed.

Section 4. Architectural Review Findings

With respect to Architectural Review No. 22-06, the Planning Commission finds as follows for the proposed freestanding sign request:

1. Compatibility with neighboring property. The proposed sign would not be compatible with signage for industrial properties in the vicinity and can be constructed to be compatible with the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The Zoning Ordinance development standards allows for a maximum sign area of 75 square feet considered suitable of industrial sites larger than 2 ½ acres and architectural review by the Planning Commission to determine suitability of the sign for the site. A variance for allow for the larger sign would result in a precedence where other industrial signs could be proposed at a similar size or larger beyond the size permitted in the Zoning Ordinance which would result in a negative aesthetic impact within the vicinity.
3. Though the proposed sign would not impact traffic congestion, the proposed sign would have an adverse effect on neighboring property as the proposed sign would have an appearance too large for the subject site and result in the potential increase in light glare.
4. That approval of the Architectural Review No. 22-06 will not adversely effect any element of the general plan. Though the general plan does not preclude a larger sign at this location, the Zoning Ordinance does not support such signs at the sign face size proposed.

Section 5. Planning Commission Denial

Based on the foregoing recitals and findings above, and the written and oral comments, facts and evidence presented, the City of Coachella Planning Commission denies Architectural Review No. 22-06 and Variance No. 22-03 for the Eberhard Equipment No. 2 freestanding sign project.

PASSED APPROVED and ADOPTED this 21th day of September 2022.

Stephanie Virgen, Chairperson
Coachella Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Gabriel Perez
Planning Commission Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Carlos Campos
City Attorney

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. PC2022-21, was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Coachella, California, held on the 21th day of September 2022, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Gabriel Perez
Planning Commission Secretary