

RESOLUTION NO. PC2020-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF COACHELLA PLANNING COMMISSION REVOKING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 312, A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A 3,250 SQUARE FOOT RETAIL CANNABIS MICROBUSINESS ON 0.29 ACRES OF LAND IN THE CG-RC (GENERAL COMMERCIAL – RETAIL CANNABIS OVERLAY) ZONE AT 84-161 AVENUE 48, AND MAKING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT THEREOF

WHEREAS, on February 27, 2019, the City of Coachella Planning Commission (“Planning Commission”) issued Conditional Use Permit No. 312 (“CUP 312”) to allow a 3,250 square foot retail cannabis microbusiness with parking and security fencing to be located on 0.29 acres of land at 84-161 Avenue 48 within a commercial center located at the southeast corner of Avenue 48 and Van Buren Street (Assessor Parcel Numbers 603-220-063 and portions of 603-220-066); and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to Condition No. 3 of CUP 312, the Development Services Director conducted a 12-month review of CUP 312 and determined that the permittee failed to comply with the Conditions of Approval of CUP 312; and,

WHEREAS, the Development Services Director determined that the interested parties failed to comply with Conditions of Approval Nos. 2(a) - (c), 5, 6, and 14 – 16; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Constitution Article XI, §7, the California Zoning and Planning Law (Government Code sections 65800–65912), Chapters 17.74 and 17.84 of the Coachella Municipal Code (“CMC”), the City of Coachella (“City”), through the Planning Commission is authorized to revoke CUP 312; and,

WHEREAS, CMC section 17.74.050 authorizes the Planning Commission to revoke a conditional use permit upon a finding that one or more conditions of the conditional use permit were not complied with; and,

WHEREAS, an application was initiated by the City for the revocation of CUP 312; and,

WHEREAS, interested parties were properly notified of a public hearing held on April 15, 2020, to determine whether the Planning Commission should revoke CUP 312; and,

WHEREAS, on April 15, 2020, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed regular public hearing in the Council Chambers, 1515 Sixth Street, Coachella, California, to consider testimony and evidence to determine whether the Planning Commission should revoke CUP 312;

WHEREAS, interested parties were afforded the opportunity to rebut the oral and written evidence that the applicant, City staff, presented in support of its position that revocation of CUP 312 was appropriate; and,

WHEREAS, members of the public were afforded an opportunity to testify regarding the revocation; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission carefully considered all information pertaining to the revocation, including the staff report and attachments, and all of the information, evidence, and testimony presented at its public hearing on April 15, 2020; and,

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred; and,

WHEREAS, revocation is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, section 15321(a).

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

SECTION 1. The recitals set forth above are true and correct and are incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 2. Based on the preponderance of the evidence presented to this Planning Commission at the above-referenced public hearing on April 15, 2020, including the staff report with attachments, and all related information presented to the Planning Commission, the following findings are made in accordance with Section 17.74.050 and Section 17.84.070 of the Coachella Municipal Code.

Finding Number 1: One or more conditions of CUP 312 was violated.

1. As set forth in the staff report and attached documents and the testimony at the revocation hearing on April 15, 2020, pursuant to Condition No. 3 of CUP 312, the Development Services Director conducted a 12-month review of CUP 312 and determined that the permittee failed to comply with the Conditions of Approval of CUP 312.
2. The permittee failed to comply with Condition No. 2(a) of CUP 312, which states: “Approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 312 is contingent upon City Council approval of the attendant Second Amendment to the Glenroy Resort Development Agreement, or a separate Development Agreement, granting an entitlement for a retail cannabis microbusiness and subject to compliance with the following performance schedule... The first phase of the Glenroy Resort Hotel shall be completed and open for business within 90 days of January 1, 2019.” As of the date of the public hearing on April 15, 2020, the first phase of the Glenroy Resort Hotel is not complete nor open for business.

3. The permittee failed to comply with Condition No. 2(b) of CUP 312, which states: “Approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 312 is contingent upon City Council approval of the attendant Second Amendment to the Glenroy Resort Development Agreement, or a separate Development Agreement, granting an entitlement for a retail cannabis microbusiness and subject to compliance with the following performance schedule... The perimeter landscaping and fencing improvements for the retail cannabis microbusiness shall be completed within 60 days of the effective date of Conditional Use Permit No. 296.” As of April 8, 2020, the perimeter landscaping and fencing improvements for the retail cannabis microbusiness have not been completed.
4. The permittee failed to comply with Condition No. 2(c) of CUP 312, which states that “Approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 312 is contingent upon City Council approval of the attendant Second Amendment to the Glenroy Resort Development Agreement, or a separate Development Agreement, granting an entitlement for a retail cannabis microbusiness and subject to compliance with the following performance schedule... The improvements required under Condition #5 of CUP 296 for additional glazing on the façade of the retail cannabis microbusiness shall be completed within 60 days of the effective date of Conditional Use Permit No. 296.” As of April 8, 2020, additional glazing on the façade of the retail cannabis microbusiness was not completed.
5. The permittee failed to comply with Condition No. 5 of CUP 312, which states that “The applicant or successor in interest shall comply with all conditions of approval imposed upon Architectural Review No. 17-07. The front façade of the business shall incorporate additional glazing on the front façade, subject to review by the Development Services Director.” As of April 8, 2020, the front façade of the business did not incorporate additional glazing.
6. The permittee failed to comply with Condition No. 6 of CUP 312, which states: “A comprehensive sign program for the Glenroy Resort project must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission prior to the issuance of any sign permits for the retail cannabis microbusiness. The front façade of the retail cannabis microbusiness may have one identification sign and one secondary “logo sign” placed on the front façade.” As of April 8, 2020, no comprehensive sign program for the Glenroy Resort project was reviewed or approved by the Planning Commission.
7. The permittee failed to comply with Condition No. 14 of CUP 312, which states: “The owner shall install a conforming trash enclosure for solid waste and recyclables within 250 feet of the proposed cannabis retail microbusiness.” As of April 8, 2020, no conforming trash enclosure for solid waste and recyclables has been installed within 250 feet of the cannabis retail microbusiness.
8. The permittee failed to comply with Condition No. 15 of CUP 312, which states: “The owner shall install a minimum of five bicycle racks in front of the retail cannabis microbusiness, or adjacent to the parking lot serving the proposed business.” As of April 8, 2020, five bicycle racks were not installed in front of the retail cannabis microbusiness or adjacent to the parking lot serving the business.

9. The permittee failed to comply with Condition No. 16 of CUP 312, which states that “The fencing along Avenue 48 may consist of a decorative wrought iron fence with a maximum height of five feet. The parking lot security gates shall consist of low barrier, non-automated gates to remain open during all hours of business operation. All entry gates must be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshal’s Office and the Building Official.” As of April 8, 2020, no perimeter fencing was installed along the Avenue 48 street frontage adjacent to the retail cannabis business and no perimeter fencing was installed adjacent to the parking area serving the retail cannabis business.
10. Based on the foregoing, the City of Coachella Planning Commission hereby finds that one or more Conditions of Approval of CUP 312 were violated, justifying the CUP 312’s revocation.

SECTION 3. Based upon the findings set forth in Sections 1 and 2 of this Resolution, the Planning Commission hereby revokes Conditional Use Permit No. 312 to allow a 3,250 square foot retail cannabis microbusiness with parking and security fencing to be located on 0.29 acres of land at 84-161 Avenue 48 within a commercial center located at the southeast corner of Avenue 48 and Van Buren Street (Assessor Parcel Numbers 603-220-063 and portions of 603-220-066).

SECTION 4. This Commission hereby finds and determines that the revocation is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended, and the Guidelines promulgated thereunder, pursuant to Section 15321 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

SECTION 5. The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which this Resolution has been based are located at the Development Services Department, Coachella Permit Center located at 53-990 Enterprise Way, Coachella, California 92236. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21081.6.

SECTION 6. This action by the Planning Commission shall be final unless appeal of the action is filed with the City Clerk’s office in writing, pursuant to Section 17.74.040 of the Coachella Municipal Code.

SECTION 7. The Secretary shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

PASSED APPROVED and ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Coachella, California, at a regular meeting held on this 15th day of April, 2020.

Javier Soliz, Chairperson
Coachella Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Yesenia Becerril
Planning Commission Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Carlos Campos
City Attorney

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution No. PC2020-03, was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Coachella, California, held on the 15th day of April, 2020, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Yesenia Becerril
Planning Commission Secretary