



# CITY OF RIDGECREST

100 West California Avenue  
Ridgecrest, CA 93555

## MINUTES

### MEETING OF THE CITY OF RIDGECREST PLANNING COMMISSION

City Council Chambers

Tuesday, January 27, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.

**Commissioners:** Chairman Nellavan Jeglum, Vice Chairman Lois Beres, Commissioners: Eric Kauffman, Jason Patin, and Craig Porter

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chairman Jeglum, Vice-Chairman Beres, Commissioners Kauffman, Patin and Porter  
Staff Present: Public Services Director Jim McRea, City Planner Matthew Alexander, Code Enforcement Officer Bob Smith, Administrative Secretary Danielle Valentine

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

A motion was moved by EK and seconded by LB to approve the Agenda as written. The Agenda was unanimously approved.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was moved by LB and seconded by CP to approve the Minutes of January 13 January, 2009. The Minutes of January 13, 2009 were unanimously approved.

**6. PUBLIC COMMENTS OF ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None.

**7. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**7.a Pre-Abatement Hearing – Nuisance Abatement – CANCELLED (PROPERTY ABATED)**

*Property located at 228 N. Warner Street; APN: 067-103-06-005*

Property was abated and case closed prior to hearing but after the Public Notice.

**7.b Pre-Abatement Hearing – Nuisance Abatement – CANCELLED (PROPERTY ABATED)**

*Property located at 237 S. Lilac St.; APN: 343-221-07-002*

Property was abated and case closed prior to hearing but after the Public Notice.

**7.c Pre-Abatement Hearing – Nuisance Abatement**

*Property located at 112 Barbara Ave; APN: 509-161-03-001*

A hearing to determine whether property constitutes a public nuisance, fire hazard and or harbors the infestation of vermin or rodents, insects, which endangers the life, limb, health, property, safety or welfare of the public or the occupants thereof.

Staff is seeking an order of abatement within 30-days of the hearing

Code Enforcement Officer Bob Smith addressed the Commission. Mr. Smith advised that this case was first called in during August of 2008 by the Kern County Fire Department regarding overgrown foliage. He said he had contacted the owner at that time and that an extension was granted due to a medical condition. Mr. Smith said he received a further letter in September of 2008 making further complaint regarding the property – saying it was

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Department of the City of Ridgecrest at 100 W. California Ave, Ridgecrest, during normal business hours.*

a risk to public safety. Mr. Smith said he believed that the overgrowth could harbor rodents etc and that minimal clean up had been conducted since the case was first opened. He asked that an order of abatement be approved and outlined the conditions of that proposed order.

Mr. Smith provided a slide presentation with graphics of the property – including timelines from the time the case opened. He noted that some recent trimmings to a tree had been observed. Mr. Smith included photos taken on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> January. In particular he mentioned the leaves in the front yard which the owner had indicated were left in order to mulch and photos showing foliage growing through the fence into the neighbor's property.

He then went on to provide the Codes that he believed were in violation.

Chairman Jeglum questioned the quotation of code relating to doorways and Mr. Smith explained he had to provide the entire code and explained his interpretation saying that a door was covered with foliage which hindered an exit of the building. Mr. Smith provided several codes which he believed this building was in violation of including an explanation of his interpretation of these codes as they applied to this address.

Mr. Smith said he had received a further report from the family filing the complaint saying that they had had scorpions in their yard. He said the owner had reported treating for rodents.

Mr. Smith went on to say that the owner had reported clearing the doorway mentioned earlier but he still felt it important to bring this case before the Commission due to the other violations he had listed in his report.

Commissioner Kauffman questioned the listing of leaves. Mr. Smith said that dry leaves were a combustible product. Commissioner Kauffman said he didn't believe the Commission needed to address the leaves at this time.

Commissioner Porter said he had driven by the property and did not believe that the front yard was "terrible" although it did need some trimming.

Commissioner Beres said she did not believe the property owner should do anything to impinge on their neighbor but she said cleaning leaves was difficult as someone could clean up the leaves one day and they would be back the next.

Chairman Jeglum said she too had driven by and seen that the front yard had been recently mowed. She said she spoke with a neighbor who had reported living in the neighborhood for 8 years and that the yard had been recently cleaned up but that in general the appearance of the property had not changed much during that 8 years.

Chairman Jeglum opened the floor for public comment at 7:22 p.m.

Anne Wirtz – property owner – addressed the Commission. She said that she did not know which neighbor Chairman Jeglum had spoken with but she agreed that foliage grew constantly but for the most part she happened to like a lot of plants and liked the overgrown look. She said in the past she had neighbors query if the overgrowth was a fire hazard and she had been told by the Fire Department that the overgrowth was not a fire hazard as she kept it well watered. She said that any plants that did not appear green were dormant during the winter. She spoke about her watering schedule and admitted that last fall she had not pulled weeds during her recent illness. She noted that her father had been attempting to mitigate following the actions taken by Code Enforcement and listed tasks she believed were relevant to abating the property. She said she had a lot of plants that she enjoyed growing – noting it provided privacy and a break from the winds. She then asked the

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Department of the City of Ridgecrest at 100 W. California Ave, Ridgecrest, during normal business hours.*

Commission to hear from her father – whom she had asked to speak on her behalf.

Ed Wirtz – addressed the Commission. Mr. Wirtz said he had read through the abatement notice and that it seemed to him that Mr. Smith (sic) was “stretching” it. He said as a consequence he had thought about why this might happened. He acknowledged the importance of Mr. Smith’s role but noted that perhaps the complaints from neighbors had forced Mr. Smith to take action. He said he believed this would be the only reason that Mr. Smith had “stretched” the interpretation of the ordinance. Mr. Wirtz said the home was less than 15 years old and had no doors that would not open etc. He said the ordinances quoted by Mr. Smith were in reference to the building and there were no issues with the home. He then referred to the potential of fire hazard and said that Mr. Smith had initially advised Ms. Wirtz that the Fire Department did not believe it was a fire hazard, he did. He said that he had asked the Fire Department to come out and declare that the property was not a fire hazard. Mr. Wirtz then spoke about the 6 foot backyard fence saying that Ms. Wirtz surely had the privacy to grow what she wanted to grow given that neighbors could not see into her yard without making considerable effort. He then addressed a potential rodent issue saying that his daughter had not seen any mice but admitted the property was very damp and therefore he did not believe that scorpions would therefore thrive in that environment. He said his daughter had seen no snakes. Mr. Wirtz said he had been at the property for the past weekends filling trash cans with green waste and that for the most part he had completed the front yard but had not been in the backyard. In summary Mr. Wirtz said he had been working on the property and was present at this evening’s meeting as Mr. Smith had told the owner she should be present. He asked to what extent he should continue noting that he would never complete the project to the neighbor’s contentment.

Ms. Wirtz then addressed the Commission again saying she had known that her neighbor did not like her yard from the time they moved in. She then made references to several past requests/demands from her neighbor citing examples such as police being sent to her home with a call in that she was possibly dead and having the Fire Department arriving at her home to advise her that her trees etc were not a fire hazard. Ms. Wirtz said this too was a nuisance – to her. She then offered photos of her doorways clear as well as photos of her backyard.

Chairman Jeglum then asked for comment from the public.

David Sweitzer – 116 Barbara – said he had a 6 minute DVD showing the conditions of the backyard and said it also showed decaying brush built up in the backyard. He said the biggest issue now was that he could not lay enough pesticide to prevent his home from being invaded. He said that since the birth of his son he had to greatly reduce the amount of pesticide he could lay out and had immediately seen a dramatic increase in the number of roaches, scorpions etc saying his yard was well kept, trimmed and not over-watered. He said that he constantly had black-widows. He said he felt his sons were not safe in their yard and he was not happy having to lay out so much pesticide. He went on to say that his DVD showed a decaying rat in the wood pile noting he had at times smelt odors and that he had also witnessed rodent activity from fruit falling from the trees. He said that he was not as concerned about the eyesore but the property being a prime breeding ground for roaches, rodents etc. He said he had contacted the owner early on and offered to help with any work that might need to be done and that her response had been hostile. He said he had also noticed Ms. Wirtz about the scorpions and her response was a suggestion that Mr. Swietzer should spray for the insects. He said he believed that this property had been brought before the Commission in 2002/03 and that he believed there had not been a lot of maintenance and up-keep for some time.

Chairman Jeglum said that unfortunately the Commission could not review the DVD as any presentations had to be submitted to the MIS Department prior to presentation and given the date of the DVD.

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Department of the City of Ridgecrest at 100 W. California Ave, Ridgecrest, during normal business hours.*

Mr. Swietzer said he did not believe that the single trash can method being employed by Mr. Wirtz would enable the abatement of the property and he acknowledged that Ms. Wirtz did have an aversion to pay anyone to clean up the property.

Steve Bissell – 124 Barbara Ave – said he had lived in the neighborhood since June of 2002 and that he too had two children. He said upon moving in he had noticed that this property was inconsistent with other home in the neighborhood – due to the overgrowth. He said the previous owner had confirmed that this problem had been ongoing before he purchased his home. He acknowledged the work of Mr. Wirtz and said that the front yard had been improved. Mr. Bissell said that he had experienced enquiries from people who had believed the home was vacant – and that this perhaps evidenced the appearance of the property. He then offered any help Ms. Wirtz might want to help her with the yard.

Chairman Jeglum then closed the Public Hearing at 7:44 p.m.

Commissioner Patin asked when Ms. Wirtz took the photos she provided and Ms. Wirtz said they had been taken this morning.

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Sweitzer if any of the shrubs were over-hanging into his property. Mr. Sweitzer said there was but that was not his main concern – rather, the concern was for the insect and rodent problems.

Commissioner Beres said she lived between two homes and she too experienced roaches etc. and she said that both her neighbors were very tidy and therefore she could not understand why the blame sat with Ms. Wirtz but she did believe that Ms. Wirtz should keep her foliage out of Mr. Sweitzer's yard and not have piles of leaves etc.

Re-opened Public Hearing 7:49 p.m.

Mr. Sweitzer responded saying that none of the other neighbors he had spoken with had the vermin he had. He said the death rate he experienced when he lay pesticide evidenced where the problem was originating.

Commissioner Kauffman said that he did not understand why the City was paying somebody to go and look into somebody's backyard. He said he had seen nothing except for a blocked doorway and some overgrowth that needed addressing. He referred to a previous Code Enforcement case where there was he believed a definite danger to children.

Chairman closed Public Hearing at 7:52 p.m.

Chairman Jeglum said she partially agreed with Commissioner Kauffman and that if Ms. Wirtz was not pushing the fence over with overgrowth she did not believe there was a problem. She said she had witnessed the property that afternoon and listed her observations saying she did not believe it was appropriate to tell anybody what they could do in their backyard. She then asked if Mr. Smith had a statement from the Fire Department. Mr. Smith said he did not require the Department to issue a written statement rather he took their word that there was a problem. He then responded to a further comment from the Chairman saying it was a "he said" "she said" situation and that he had done his job and had been told that the property was a fire hazard. Chairman Jeglum then asked Mr. Sweitzer if he had evidence of the property being before the Commission on the past occasions he had mentioned and Mr. Sweitzer said his knowledge of this had come about via a comment from Mr. Smith's supervisor.

Commissioner Kauffman raised a motion to drop proceedings against this property – this was seconded by Commissioner Porter. All in favor.

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Department of the City of Ridgecrest at 100 W. California Ave, Ridgecrest, during normal business hours.*

**7.d Pre-Abatement Hearing – Nuisance Abatement**

*Property located at 1417 W. St. George St.; APN: 081-331-07-005*

A hearing to determine whether property constitutes a public nuisance, fire hazard and or harbors the infestation of vermin or rodents, insects, which endangers the life, limb, health, property, safety or welfare of the public or the occupants thereof.

Staff is seeking an order of abatement within 30-days of the hearing.

Mr. Smith briefed the Commission on the property saying the case was opened following a complaint from the Kern County Fire Department. He noted difficulties contacting the owner saying that all letters had been returned undeliverable. He said that due to the failure to contact the owner, the exhaustive efforts to do so and the state of the property it was now before the Commission. Mr. Smith went on to provide a slide presentation of the property showing broken out windows, junk, debris etc. He provided the ordinance he believed were being violated. He said he believed that the building should probably be removed from the site. He said he had been on the property previously to check for trespassers and he witnessed that the inside of the house was in disarray and that a shed in the backyard was full of similar items.

Commissioner Kauffman asked how long the property had been abandoned and Mr. Smith responded stating that in March of 2005 a report had been made by the Fire Department to the City that there was a problem and he believed that the home had not been occupied at any time since.

Chairman Jeglum said she had driven by the property and witnessed several problems. She asked if it was possible to proceed towards removing the building as she believed that would cost as much as attempting to clean up the property.

Commissioner Porter said the property was close to Faller School and that it and another property close by should both be removed and he believed this property was a nuisance for kids and a fire hazard.

Commissioner Patin said his concerns were in line with Commission Porter's and he too believed the mobile home needed to be removed.

Vice-Chairman said she too believed it should be removed and asked for clarification of the process to do such and this was provided by Mr. Smith including that City Manager would make the decision to remove the building.

Commissioner Kauffman said he believed that this property was what Mr. Smith's job was about and that he hoped Mr. Smith did not think Commission Kauffman was 'writing off' his position.

Chairman Jeglum opened the floor for public comment at 8:03 p.m.

No comments.

Chairman Jeglum asked if demolition could be included in the resolution and Mr. Smith clarified that demolition would be a decision by City Manager.

Vice-chairman moved a motion to approve Resolution 09-03 to abate property at 1417 W. George St. with the recommendation that the building be demolished and that the 30 days be reduced to 21 days. JP second. All in favor.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ITEM**

- 7.e General Plan Amendment and Zone Change GPA/ZC-08-04 & Tentative Tract Map TTM 6691 and Code Text Amendment for E-1.5 (20,000 sf min.)**  
Wild Pointe Project - 161 Ac at the NW corner of Mahan St and W. Ridgecrest Blvd (PAM RC Venture) APN 455-100-06,08, 09  
(This item was continued from the November 18, 2008 and January 13, 2009 Planning Commission meetings).

City Planner Alexander addressed the Commission briefing the Commission stating that this project had been before the Commission on previous occasions. He noted the project first came before the Commission on 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2008 citing a revised map brought before the Commission on 13<sup>th</sup> January. He provided graphics of the project site. He listed amendments from the original park sump to the one now being proposed as detailed in the 13<sup>th</sup> January meeting. He also referred to the re-zoning to Neighborhood Commercial which the applicant had agreed to (as opposed to General Commercial) and said this was the recommendation of the staff. Mr. Alexander then discussed the breakdown of zoning within the proposed project including 14 acres of unincorporated land and said the applicant had agreed to annex this portion into the City and noted this would require an application to the City prior to the submission of the final map. He said Condition No. 57 was consistent with the new Draft General Plan. Mr. Alexander said that the developer had a desire to provide something different to the usual block wall and in staff's opinion would be more desirable.

Mr. Alexander said issues to be considered were (1) three conditions being recommended by the Naval Air Weapons Station – those being Conditions 52. through 54. as the project lay within the M.I.A. (2) existence of the desert tortoise – Condition 60. and (3) existence of Mojave Ground Squirrel – Condition 57 And (4) Capacity of Sewer Trunk Lines which had been reviewed by Helt Engineering (Jerry Helt present for questions) – Condition No. 36. Proposed by Helt Engineering and alternative Condition recommended by Whitten of Cornerstone Engineering also included with packet (5) Neighborhood Compatibility. Mr. Alexander advised that Superintendent Rummer was present to answer questions in regards to the School District. Mr. Alexander then provided a summary of project history from September 5<sup>th</sup> 2008 through current date saying that staff recommended that the Commission take action on this item this evening and noting that two draft Resolutions were brought before the Commission this evening – one to deny and one to approve the mitigated negative declaration along with approval of the Tentative Tract Map.

Chairman Jeglum asked for Commissioner questions of staff. Commissioner Porter asked if the Public Works Director was present and Mr. Alexander said Mr. Helt, contract City Engineer, was available for questions.

Jerry Helt – Helt Engineering responded to questions in regard to the location of the trunk line. Mr. Helt said that the sewer feasibility study had been completed showing the trunk line and also capacity of the line. He said it went along Las Flores and into an existing system and listed its path. He said the sewer study took into consideration the project before the Commission including additional load on the trunk line and that this study concluded that capacity had been reached at this time – without the added load of this project. Further he said that he therefore believed that a further study would be needed to establish what was required for not only this project but others that might come at a later date.

Commissioner Porter asked for clarification as to who was responsible for cost and this was provided by Mr. Helt. He said that the approval of the TTM included approval of conditions and that next step would be for the developer to provide plans to address those sewer needs as identified by further studies saying those would include the need identified not only by this project but by other projects. He said that he had included wording to address one

mechanism to address the sewer trunk system and thereafter a reimbursement agreement once the lines had reached capacity.

Planner Alexander then provided further that John O’Gara representing NAWS was present this evening and reiterated NAWS recommendation that zoning remain rather than be changed.

Chairman Jeglum then asked the applicant to make a presentation.

Derrill Whitten – Cornerstone Engineering – made a presentation to the Commission saying he represented the applicant and noting that the owner – Dave Michael was present as was Mr. Tom Fallgatter representing the applicant who might like to address the Commission also. Mr. Whitten said that Mr. Alexander had done a fine job to this point but that there were various persons who had either interest or intent for this property who were all trying to have their wishes for the project be brought to fruition. Mr. Whitten said that upon comment from the Commission at last meeting he had returned trying to accommodate those concerns regarding zoning. He said he was back before the Commission asking for approval but that he had been unable to make an accommodation in this regard for the following reasons. Firstly, the cost of developing the project – Mr. Whitten compared costs of developing 10,000 square foot lots versus 20,000 square foot lots and compared those costs to development costs associated with 40,000 square foot lots including improvements to Brady and the area to be annexed. Chairman Jeglum asked for clarification on costs associated with Department of Fish and Game and this was provided by Mr. Whitten. Mr. Whitten noted that particular impacts were major streets on all four sides costing approximately \$700,000 per half square mile totaling a little less than \$3m for the perimeter roads noting that the low density project did not allow for spreading out of this cost. He said further that the trail that the City was asking for would also be a substantial cost as would be the 9 acres of parkland. Mr. Whitten spoke then about the tax base of the project saying that the City would get a portion of the 1% of the property tax on the land noting potential future funding for the City and noted that fiscal impact to the City would mean that revenues would be halved if the project was zoned as was being recommended by staff. Mr. Whitten then referred to the map provided with the staff report saying that approximately 127 acres would comprise approximately 141 dwellings saying this proposal was moving towards what the Navy was looking for and at the same time being realistic as to what the developer believed could be built. Mr. Whitten said that he had heard the Navy’s concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility and he felt the developer had balanced their concern with moving forward with the development.

Mr. Whitten then summarized the history of the project addressing the amendments that had been made to the original map. He asked the Commission to consider his zone change and general amendment and approve as proposed.

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Whitten if the unincorporated portion was part of the map and Mr. Whitten said it was not, rather than an application to annex was being made as a condition of approval of the map. Commissioner Porter said he, like Mr. Whitten has spoken with the “West Brady Bunch” and that a concern was that lots would face east and not Brady. Mr. Whitten said that was true and that was to avoid having driveways opening onto a major street and also to enhance the trail system.

Chairman Jeglum clarified that lots were being referred to as 1 acre lots rather correctly they were 40,000 square foot lots.

Mr. Alexander then suggested Commissioners hear from Jody Rummer and John O’Gara.

Jody Rummer – Superintendent of SSUSD – said the District was pleased to see development coming forward and did not want to impeded development in any way. She said the District was under the impressions that companies coming to the City would be

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Department of the City of Ridgecrest at 100 W. California Ave, Ridgecrest, during normal business hours.*

willing to work with the District to mitigate the impact for students coming to the district as a result of the development. She then referred to the history of discussions with PAM and said she recognized that things had changed since initial discussions with PAM including significant changes to the economy and the district was only entitled to the developer fees associated with the project but were still open to any further assistance the developer might be willing to offer to assist with the impact this project would have on the district.

John O’Gara – NAWS – said that he had recently met with Mr. Alexander to discuss the current proposal and had responded via letter on October 2008 under the signature of Captain Gary Peterson. He said that whilst he appreciated the efforts of the developer they did not unfortunately revise concerns regards this project and therefore he reiterated that the reduction in density of this area was of concern in this particular location given it was within the Military Influence Area. He said further studies coming forward approximately 4<sup>th</sup> February would further evidence that this project lay within a rather noisy zone.

Planner Alexander said City Manager had indicated late this afternoon that a joint meeting between City council and Planning Commission had been requested for February 4<sup>th</sup> at which time the Noise Study would be represented

Commissioner Patin made comment that whilst there were not a lot of questions from Commissioners this evening

Chairman Jeglum opened the Public Hearing 8:55 p.m.

Jan Holland – 229 N Brady - addressed the Commission saying she had heard about the project on-line and had not been noticed. She said she thought this development would be preferable to the motorcycle riding currently in place, that she loved the landscaping and trail along Brady as well as the Neighborhood Commercial concept. She said her concern was in regards to flooding and hoped this had been considered by the Engineers – i.e. moving the water to the sump saying she thought it would be more appropriate to locate the sump closer to where the water ended up. She also noted that a lot of streets were going to be huge wind tunnels and suggested rotation to prevent this might be appropriate. Ms. Holland noted the interesting topography of the area saying she hoped that would not be diminished by the development. Ms. Holland then asked if she could therefore be attached to City water given there would be City water across the street from her - this was addressed. Ms. Holland said she was in favor of the 1 acre lots (sic 40,000 square foot lots) saying it would be a nice transition to the 2 ½ acre lots and noted she observed the Navy’s noise concerns but had not experience overwhelming noise.

Stewart Briel (spelling not provided) – 1548 W Las Flores – thanked Commissioner Porter for speaking with him last evening saying he did not get a notice. He said he had mixed feelings about this project noting he knew Ridgecrest needed to grow but from a personal point of view he liked his privacy. He noted a lot of helicopters did fly over his home. He said he did not have a strong objection to the project but he felt the Commissioners did have a tough decision to make.

Ron Ogren– 243 Brady – said he felt this map was much improved to previous ones saying he did previously have a lot of reservations and that now he wanted to go on record in favor of this project and listed those parts of the project he particularly liked. He too thanked Commissioner Porter for his phone call and interest.

Public Hearing closed at 9:07 p.m.

Chairman Jeglum then asked for Commissioner comments.

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Department of the City of Ridgecrest at 100 W. California Ave, Ridgecrest, during normal business hours.*

Vice-Chairman Beres said that the Commission and the developer had worked very long and hard together and said that she felt it was an excellent plan however she did not like the project where it was. She said that she believed that the new administration in Washington would cut military spending and that she did not want to give the military any hint that the City might not be cooperating as she did not want the facility at China Lake to be moved. Vice-Chairman noted that the sewer system would not accommodate this development and also spoke about the costs of this development referring to the failure of other PAM projects to "take off". She said her vote at this point was still no.

Commissioner Patin said he was pretty much in line with Vice-chairman Beres' comments. He said that military influence was very important to the City and was in line with the General Plan. He too referred to the sewer issues and commented that given his own personal research he could not vote in favor – though he felt it was a beautiful project he did not believe it was right for the proposed area. Commissioner Patin asked to be on record as having a horrible struggle to come to this conclusion and thanked all involved for their efforts.

Commissioner Porter said he appreciated the developer trying to accommodate the citizens along Brady and Las Flores. He said he liked the project and listed some particular aspects he liked. He said that in spirit he believed the project met the Navy's requirements. He spoke to the sewer issues and said he appreciated the develop incorporating some of the ideas of the new Draft General Plan. He said he was in favor of the project.

Commissioner Kauffman said he liked the project and he applauded P.A.M. for their efforts. He referred to his previous conversations with Mr. Fallgatter and said that this was his hardest task to date on the Commission. He said he had continually gone back to one point – that is that he had become involved in the process via the General Plan – and that one of the first tasks undertaken in that process was to put together maps of wishes of those groups who came together via the General Plan process. He said all of those maps evidenced a wish to keep zoning in this area in place. Commissioner Kauffman said he would like the Council to understand that his feeling came from all facets of the community – for zoning to remain as is.

Chairman Jeglum then spoke about the importance of the Naval Weapons Station to the City and spoke to the zoning in place at the time of purchase of the land in question. She said the Commission had not deviated from that requirement on previous occasions and she did not believe that the Commission should deviate at this time. She then said she liked the project but that it was in the Military Influence Area and she could not ignore that. Therefore she said her vote would be to deny any change to the current zoning.

Commissioner Kauffman made a motion and Vice-Chairman Beres seconded a motion to approve Resolution 09-04 denying request for zone change an amendment to General Plan, and TTM 6691.

AYES: Patin, Beres, Kauffman, Jeglum

NAYES: Porter

Absent: None

## 8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

### 8.a Proposed Zone Change for Mini Storage “Storage Depot” at the SE corner of W. Upjohn Ave and S. Norma St.

Planner Alexander addressed the Commission saying that he had been approached by Rod Rosenstein. He said Mr. Rosenstein was interested in a piece of property located at the corner of Norma and Upjohn which was for sale. He said the staff’s concern for this property was the multiple driveways for this size lot. He then referred to a concern regarding lighting but noted that Mr. Rosenstein had enlightened him that lighting was now more sophisticated and would not generate the sort of light pollution he was envisaging. He asked Mr. Rosenstein to address the Commission saying this was simply an opportunity for Mr. Rosenstein to seek some feedback from Commissioners.

Mr. Rosenstein – Chatsworth California – introduced Mr. from Northridge California. Mr. Karsai then addressed lighting saying it that infra-red cameras eliminated the need for extensive lighting and that hours of the facility would be limited and therefore quiet and unobtrusive operations.

Chairman Jeglum asked how many units were planned and Mr. Karsai said he hoped to put in approximately 100,000 square feet of storage. Chairman Jeglum then asked if an on-site Manager would be in place as well as secure access – this was confirmed and noted this would not be on Norma. Chairman Jeglum then asked for planning regarding ingress/egress and this was provided in preliminary form by Mr. Karsai

Vice-Chairman Beres asked if the storage facility would appear similar to that graphic provided in the slide and this was confirmed. She asked if the planned opening hours would be sufficient saying she felt these hours would make it easier to place into a residential area.

Mr. Alexander then addressed process for this type of application saying that a Conditional Use Permit could include opening hour restrictions. Chairman Jeglum then asked for clarification that a zone change would be required – this was confirmed by Mr. Alexander.

Chairman Jeglum said she had concerns given the site was surrounded by residential and without the representations from the Community she could not indicate either way if she would be in favor – given that she represented the Community.

Commissioner Patin agreed with this comment but said he thought it looked “great”.

Commissioner Porter said he had driven past the site that day. He said it was a tough part of town given that a lot of the residential on Upjohn and part of Norma and he felt it was a potential that this project might enhance the area. He said he was not opposed to it at this time but he had no insight as to what citizens of the surrounding areas might think. He did not that the site was at a busy intersection. Mr. Karsai addressed this concern noted his observations of a similar project in Chatsworth. He then addressed the financial aspect of the project and said he hoped to identify if the staff could accommodate a 90 day timeline – this was confirmed by Mr. Alexander.

Commissioner Kauffman said he agreed with Commissioner Porter’s comments in regards to neighborhood enhancement but noted he too would like to hear comments of neighbors.

### 8.b City Planning 101 – Introduction - A History of City Planning

This is the first in a series of Planning Commission discussions regarding the practice of City Planning including legislative updates to State Planning Law

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Department of the City of Ridgecrest at 100 W. California Ave, Ridgecrest, during normal business hours.*

Commissioner Kauffman asked if this item would be rescheduled. Chairman Jeglum suggested the item be addressed at a noticed time and venue – separate to the regular Planning Commission meetings. This was agreed to.

**9. COMMISSIONER ITEMS**

None.

Commissioner Porter commented that he felt a productive meeting had been held – noting the public input and stating that he felt the abatement issues were fair.

Commissioner Kauffman said he was afraid to turn his cell phone back on.

Vice-Chairman congratulated Commissioner Porter on his efforts to contact citizens in regards to the projects that were being discussed.

Chairman Jeglum said she felt the meeting was productive and she felt that taking a stand was important.

**10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**10.a ZC-09-01 and TTM 6731 (120) lot E-2 project with proposed Annexation of 40 acres located north of the NE corner of S. Norma St. and Kendall Ave. APN 510-010-06,07 (Taft Corp.)  
March 10<sup>th</sup> PC meeting**

**11. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.