RESO	LUT	ION	NO.	

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PALM SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL NOT ALLOW OFF-SITE ADVERTISING DISPLAYS (BILLBOARDS) AND FURTHER RECOMMENDING CERTAIN CRITERIA FOR ANY AMENDMENT OF THE PALM SPRINGS ZONING CODE TO ALLOW SUCH SIGNS

WHEREAS, Sections 93.20.00 of the Palm Springs Zoning Ordinance establishes regulations for the design, placement and use of signs; and

WHEREAS, on July 20, 2011, the City Council voted to initiate a Zone Text Amendment to direct the Planning Commission to consider and adopt a recommendation regarding allowing off-site advertising displays (billboards); and

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2011, the Planning Commission conducted duly noticed public hearings on the proposed amendment, at which hearings the Commission carefully reviewed and considered all of the evidence presented in connection with the project, including but not limited to the staff report and all written and oral testimony presented.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PALM SPRINGS DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS;

<u>Section 1:</u> The Planning Commission hereby finds that adoption of the proposed Zoning Text Amendment would not benefit the community.

<u>Section 2:</u> Based upon the foregoing, the Planning Commission does hereby recommend to the City Council that the Palm Springs Zoning Code not be amended to allow off-site advertising signs (billboards) of any type.

<u>Section 3:</u> Further, should the City Council seek to allow such signs, the Planning Commission recommends that the following issues be addressed through appropriate standards and procedures:

- A. Specific locations within the City where billboards would be allowed,
- B. The type or types of allowed billboards,
- C. The maximum number of allowed billboards,
- D. The maximum size (overall height / width / sign area)
- E. Allowed media (including lighting) and materials (paper, plastic, digital sign surface)
- F. The public benefit for each sign.
- G. A review process to including the Architectural Advisory Committee, Planning Commission and City Council

Planning Commission Resolution No. Case 5.1272 – ZTA

ADOPTED this 12th day of October, 2011.

AYES:

Conrad, Munger, Roberts, Hudson and Donenfeld

NOES:

none

ABSENT:

none

ABSTAIN:

Klatchko

ATTEST:

CITY OF PALM SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA

Craig A. Ewing, AICP Director of Planning Services