

**CITY OF RIDGECREST**  
100 West California Avenue  
Ridgecrest, CA 93555  
**PLANNING & ZONING AD HOC COMMITTEE**  
Council Conference Room  
**Wednesday, June 28, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.**

Committee: Steve Morgan, Chip Holloway, Matt Feemster, and Jim Smith

**AGENDA**

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PUBLIC COMMENT OF ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
3. BENCHMARK OPINIONS PRESENTATION
4. P&Z COMMITTEE SCOPE
5. DESIGN STANDARDS
6. COLLEGE HEIGHTS INFRASTRUCTURE
7. DRAINAGE REQUIREMENTS
8. FLIGHT CORRIDOR (Plan of Action)
9. FISH AND GAME (Plan of Action)
10. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS
11. ADJOURNMENT

**CITY OF RIDGECREST**  
100 West California Avenue  
Ridgecrest, CA 93555  
**PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE**  
Council Conference Room  
**Wednesday, May 31, 2006 at 5:00 p.m.**

Present: Committee members Steve Morgan, Chip Holloway, and Matt Feemster  
Absent: Jim Smith

Draft minutes

**12. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 p.m.

**13. PUBLIC COMMENT OF ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Mr. Bernie Connolly commented on the Planning Commission's responsibilities.

Mr. Dale Howard believes this committee is the 3<sup>rd</sup> most important city meeting and suggested meeting in the council chamber and broadcasting the meeting.

**14. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN**

The committee elected Steve Morgan as Chair and Matt Feemster as vice-chair.

**15. P&Z COMMITTEE FORMATION, ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE**

Deputy City Manager McRea commented that this committee will review projects when necessary and make recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council. Generally there are not staff reports, but there may be position papers.

The Committee voted to meet on the 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday at 6:00 p.m. and to have an ex-officio position (a member from the base).

Chair Morgan explained that the majority of this committee's scope will relate to Chapter 20 of the City's Ordinance. Need to be careful not to step on toes. Planning Commission appeal process will not change.

Member Holloway would like to establish some consistency; look at projects to make them work not how to reject. The impression is we're not willing to work with developer. Battles should be at this committee and solved at this level; Planning Commission shouldn't be surprised.

**16. BENCHMARK OPINIONS REQUESTED REZONING (50 ACRES, NE COR NORMA & SPRINGER).** Planning consultant Mathew Alexander presented an overview of the project and its status. Planning Commission took no action on this application. DCM McRea stated there were 3 issues and the 4<sup>th</sup> issue is the

urban interface. Concerns included traffic on College Heights, tract being next to livestock, and drainage. City is designed for urbanization.

Andrew Kilikauskas commented that UR can be developed as 2.5 acres.

Neil Christman commented that the County property is zoned for 2.5 acres and the city property needs transition.

Member Holloway asked if a buffer zone is required or is that something that we may want to do. Chair Morgan asked if the County was notified. Consultant Andrews replied no.

Developer representative Craig Byrne presented an overview of the project. Water will drain to depressed park. Severe storm water will go to Warner and find Dolphin then to Bowman. Option to address drainage would be a flood control wall at Norma, with a pipe to convey water to sump/park. Mentioned the block wall will have architectural design on top.

The committee discussed Warner options

Member Feemster asked if rezoning is a discretionary item, do we want to go out of our way to approve and create problems.

Chester Cornelius concerned with flooding (water will triple with development), lot size and effect sump will have on wells. Too many questions have not been answered.

Andy Kilikauskas questioned the rezoning request and commented that developer can change zoning with new map.

Dale Howard – Developer is more amenable to change. The problem was what was presented to the Planning Commission. The proposed changes will improve things. Planning Commission didn't do anything wrong. City obligated to make sure compatible with City goal and General Plan and County.

Steve Zimmer – Developer has done a good amount of due diligence; project will improve community. Need to find ways to give direction to developer and Planning Commission. Look at impact of site, not water that's been flowing 10,000 years.

Chair Morgan - Concern with Warner traffic flow. Regarding block wall on west side of Norma developer to make sure water remains on property and off sidewalk. Leaning toward recommending E2 zoning; matches and more compatible. City is not responsible to create zoning that can't be rezoned.

Member Holloway – No amount of money can fix drainage within community. Sumps are not a solution; we do because we have to. Groundwater is a significant concern. Warner Street can't be addressed unless there's

development. Suggested using developer fees to complete Warner; having Warner to Dolphin is a better solution. Zoning not an issue; E-3.

Member Feemster – Concerned with sump depth, looks like a sump not a park. Traffic is a concern, if signaled okay with. Project will channel water on Norma and Warner then dump onto private property. Would like to see Norma paved to Dolphin. Okay with zoning.

David Hoagland – Developer trying to make it better.

Chester Cornelius – First time I heard about block wall; agree with it. This is the third sump within ¼ mile of my property. Would like to see Franklin paved to Norma

Action Taken: Developer to look at Franklin (half street from Warner to Norma) and Warner (south to Dolphin), drainage on Norma to keep water, density okay, wall height on Franklin higher with architectural on top. Size of retention basin to be increased and depth lessened (work with city engineer). Chair Morgan, Vice Chair Feemster and member Holloway voted to forward to Planning Commission (1<sup>st</sup> meeting in July) with the added recommendations.

17. BENCHMARK OPINIONS REQUESTED GPA & REZONING (NE COR GEMSTONE & DOLPHIN) Developer representative Craig Byrne presented project. Density lowered; R-2 to R-1 and PO to R-4. Land use lesser all the way around; Proposed R-4 is less than R-2 use. Density was a perception. Trip comparison done, trips decreased. Mentioned a trust account for Sunland.

Issues included flood, truncated streets, traffic and density.

Member Feemster – Voted yes, liked project and would like to see Sunland paved through.

Member Holloway – Divert traffic onto Dolphin or Sunland

Chair Morgan – Refer College Heights and Bataan to Infrastructure.

Action Taken: Developer to request R-2 zoning; look at traffic on Sunland and Bataan, with Sunland going to Bowman. The Infrastructure Committee to look at intersection of College Heights and Bataan. Chair Morgan, Vice Chair Feemster and member Holloway voted to forward to Planning Commission (for meeting on June 27th) with the added recommendations.

18. TAFT CORPORATION REQUESTED GPA & REZONING (15 ACRES, NE COR SUNLAND & BOWMAN) Planning Commission recommended approval to City Council. If not upzoned could sit vacant.

Chair Morgan – this project hinged on density. Base does not have a problem. By time done with parking will have R-2 density, contributes to Bowman channel.

Dale Howard – presented history of property. If Sunland isn't put all the way through, project can gain parking.

Andrew Kilikauskas – Recommended project be zoned R-2 with PUD. This will give guarantees.

Carol Vaughn - Trouble with PUD, not used for this type of project. There's nothing wrong with R-2 or R-3.

Member Feemster – Improvement great, PUD gives guarantee. That was council's concern.

Action Taken: No changes to be made and forwarded to City Council. Chair Morgan and member Holloway voted for and Vice Chair Feemster voted against.

#### 19. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Items continued to the next meeting were College Heights Development Standards and committee guidelines

#### 20. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.