



CITY OF RIDGECREST
100 West California Avenue
Ridgecrest, CA 93555
MINUTES

MEETING OF THE CITY OF RIDGECREST PLANNING COMMISSION
City Council Chambers
Tuesday, August 24, 2010 at 6:00 PM

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

Next Resolution # 10-7

1. **CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 p.m.**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ROLL CALL: All Commissioners Present**
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA; Approved**
5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - July 27, 2010 (Planning Commission portion of Minutes) Approved
 - August 10, 2010 Approved
6. **PUBLIC COMMENTS OF ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA None**

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Site Plan Review SPR-10-04 405 E. Ridgecrest Blvd Jansen Animal Hospital

A request to build a 2,400 s.f. metal building as an animal hospital to replace existing modular buildings in Service Commercial (SC) Zone District, APN 080-152-01,02,& 03

- Mathew Alexander reviewed Staff Report and gave slide presentation. He noted the whole project is on three parcels consisting of the old building and two lots for new building. He gave a history of the Jansen Animal Hospital which consisted of the fire that destroyed the building, the modular buildings that were temporarily approved, code enforcement abatement and subsequent expired site plan reviews to remove the temporary modular and replace with a permanent structure. On the last site plan review, the applicant could not come to terms with the cost of the new building as was designed by his engineer.
- Matthew Alexander reviewed the current Site Plan to install a new 2,400 sf metal building and remove the existing modulares which will cover only two parcels with a condition that the old buildings be removed from the third parcel. He noted that a lot merger is required as part of this site plan review.
- He noted that conditions state the modular buildings will be removed 21 days after occupancy.
- Commission Jeglum asked if we should bond this item as it has been going on for 5 years.
- Commissioner discussion: How real do we think this project is? Are they serious?
- Dr. Hanna, resident Vet responded. He has been trying to find a solution and believes that Dr. Jansen might complete the project. He believes his interest in the project is sketchy. He thought the last Site Plan Review might have become a reality, but it did not.
- Dr. Hanna said he has been working with the Contractor, James Bell, to get this project ready. He commented that Dr. Jansen thinks this building should not cost more than \$200K. He is locked back in time. Dr. Jansen has not talked to Mr. Bell, Dr. Hanna has done all the leg work and negotiations.
- Commissioner discussion: Swing a big hammer. We need to the owner involved. Site Plan fees have been paid. We need to set a time limit.
- Dr. Hanna feels Dr. Jansen should have meet with Mr. Bell.
- James Bell stepped forward to confirmed he has been getting paid. He said the investment will be put to the test.

- James Bell was asked to lay out a time line. He got involved because he believes Dr. Hanna is a great Vet and wants him to stay in town. He believes Dr. Jansen will go forward once this Site Plan was approved.
- Commissioner discussion: Because of the history, the commissioners believe this project is shaky.
- Bell plans to get the floor plans ready as soon as approved. He was not happy with some of the Public Works conditions, mainly the alley paving requirement. He wants to make this project work, has reduced the scope. He laid out the plan that the parcels on each side would be available to sell once the project is done. He assures the trailers will be removed at Certificate of Occupancy.
- Bell will be asking for substantial money from Dr. Jansen to go forward. If the money does not come, Bell will come back to the Commission and report. It will take about 45 days for interior plans then into plan check.
- Commissioner Discussion: Do you (Bell) have a drop dead date.? Just want to have something in place to move forward so we won't be where we are today. Enough is enough. Is September 15th an acceptable date to receive confirmation that the check has been received?.
- Bell commented that he would be glad to give a progress report. Bell is committed to keep Dr. Hanna here as a vet.
- Bell noted the condition for the Alley is of concern.
- Alexander stated this condition still exist. Bell does not feel the full width should be a requirement and noted that this tough economic times.
- Bell commented on the requirement for a topo map. This is an existing lot and we will not be doing much site grading. We will be using the existing pavement for parking. No slab currently where the new building will sit. Does not feel a condition for a topo map is a reasonable request.
- Alexander requested the opportunity to complete the presentation then would ask the City Engineer, Loren Culp to comment.
- Alexander stated he and Craig Porter met with Dr. Hanna and discussed the metal building with alternate front improvements. See proposed Condition 24 and 25 and 26. Building treatments and landscaping. He also stated that the existing pole sign should be removed and replaced.
- Loren Culp, City Engineer commented on Condition 11a, Alley: During a field survey, it was found that site had full improvements out front but not the alley way. He stated that infill development was required by our code to make the improvements as stated in the conditions. The alley would be required to be improved the full width to Desert Candles. It could be improved instead to the East to meet up with Gun's for Us improvements in the alley. It would make more sense.
- Commissioner discussion: It was already paved once. Is it that bad of shape? If they pave half, is that acceptable. We do not want make this conditional a deal breaker.
- Discussion: It is not paved behind the vacant lot (between the project and Guns for Us) but is paved behind the three project lots. The Alley is owned by the City but it is up to the property owner to pave in front of their property. This is not an infill but a replacement of a destroyed building.
- Discussion: We are dealing with a stubborn person, do we want to lose the project or bend to let it happen. It may not meet City standards but this alley has been improved before. Do we want to delete this item – 11a?
- Discussion on Grading plan: Culp explained the requirement for a Topo grading plan is for a drainage plan per our Master Drainage Plan. To be in compliance with the Master Drainage Plan, we need to plan for onsite retention.
- Discussion: This is site that already exist, would this condition really apply to this site?
- Bell said onsite retention has not been implemented anywhere in town except on residential tracts. He said the retention has always been sent to the street on Commercial buildings. Stated the Master Drainage Plan is out-of-date. Again, this is an existing construction on this lot.
- Discussion: Can you show that the lot drains to Ridgecrest Blvd? Yes. Bell stated he could show this. He thinks some of the parcel might drain to the alley around the dog walk. There is a block wall along part of the rear.
- Loren Culp stated the Municipal Code does not differentiate between old and new construction, just a building permit. The drainage is to be evaluated by project. He looks at cumulative effects.
- Commissioner Jeglum asked if the Municipal Code said "may or shall"? This community was designed for the streets to carry the water. If you can show on the topo that the water can drain, that should be sufficient.
- Bell noted that the parking lot was to be reused used in the project. It would be a deal breaker if this parking lot has to be removed. Bell suggested that we do not require onsite retention throughout the city. Other projects I have worked on used was natural drainage to the street. Nowhere to push the water. Money would be a factor. Bell said he could not do a detailed topo map of the site. Said the building was there during the big flood of 1984.
- Commissioner questions: Condition #24 Does this plan intent to stucco the whole building all the way around. Bell said yes.

- Condition #6 Trash Bins: Question regarding access to trash bins. Most likely in the rear by the alley with two bins. Location to be determined.
- Pam Hill stated that the City staff will now be sending all site plans to Benz for their comments on the location of bins.
- Craig Porter commented on his discussion with Dr. Hanna regarding the 21 days removal of the modulars. He said the leasing company from Bakersfield would be contacted to pick them up.
- Nellavan Jeglum: Do you have to have an occupancy permit before you move in?
- Bell said he could move in after the final from Building, He said they will move out trailers and apply for the Certificate of Occupancy. At least 21 days would be needed to move animals into a finished building. The trailers are leased and there would be no reason for Dr. Jansen not to move the trailers and pay the extra leases.
- Commissioner comment: Can we put another condition that the abatement process will start if the process is not completed. Can we get a letter? Six months, why do we have to have 6 months?
- Bell stated he will send an update once a month to Planning. Bell will bring a check to prove that he is pressing forward.
- Commissioner comment: If we do not get something by the September 14, then the abate process will begin.
- **Public Hearing Opened:** at 7:20 p.m. Jerry Taylor commented: Site Plan is before you, not the abatement process. You can start the abatement hearing on lot 1 and leave 2 and 3 alone if you do not get action. He commented that the building being stuccoed, will be an asst. He thanked the City Engineer for his diligence but we will not be doing onsite retention. This is an existing lot.
- **Public Hearing Closed** at 7:23 p.m.
- Commissioner comments on Resolution amendments: It was suggested that conditions 11a,13,14,15 be illuminated, a drainage plan be provided showing drainage to East Ridgcrest Blvd., #6 Trash bins – note that the location to be determined and include additional conditions 24, 25, 26 as presented.
- It was moved and seconded that Resolution PC-10-07 be amended as suggested. Approved by all.

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.a Study Session regarding carports

Matthew Alexander gave a staff report and slide presentation on carports. Many citizens have asked if they could install a carport in the front yard setback. This is currently not allowed per our code.

Matt noted that the current Municipal Code does not have any restrictions regarding enclosing garages as long as there is two onsite parking spaces.

Commissioner questions: Is this for a code enforcement action? Alexander stated no.

Commissioner Patin stated that carports in front yards are acceptable.

Commissioner Beres stated if it works with structure (architecturally), maybe ok.

Alexander agreed if it works with the house. You could allow if you want.

Public Comment – James Bell stated anything over 120 s.f. needs a permit. You have leverage to enforce, but you do not. The building permit should have a site plan first. Site distance comes into play at driveway. This is a Code Enforcement issue. We would to see City to enforce.

Craig Porter commented that this item is covered in the code as a variance, could be applied for.

Commissioner Discussion: Hard to say no when they are all over the city. Enforcement issues are not being met. Setbacks should be enforced. No further action suggested.

9. COMMISSIONER ITEMS

9.a Commissioner Update from City Council Committees

- **Lois Beres, Infrastructure Committee:** City property and driveways discussed. It was the property owners problem. PMS discussion on a consultant, new PMS study.
- **Jason Patin, Park and Rec - Quality of Life:** Received a Park from Cal-Trans (Denny's corner) They wanted to name it for a person and it started a discussion. A sub-committee was created to have a process on naming a park. The developer does not get to name his park.
- **City Org Meeting** – Transportation, Budgeting
- **Community Development** - did not have a meeting -

9.b Commissioner Contacts:

- Craig Porter met with Dr. Hanna.

- Jason Patin met with John Landry regarding parks and recs item. Deferred answer.
9.c Additional Commissioner Items - none

10. STAFF ITEMS - none

11. ADJOURN 7:50 p.m.

FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS

- **September 14, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting**
 - a. **Site Plan Review/Conditional Use Permit SPR/CUP-10-06 T-Mobile Cell Tower at 709 W. Inyokern Rd.** A request to build a 150' cell tower facility consisting of 240 sf equipment shelter located at 709 W Inyokern Blvd just West of Sierra View St.
 - b. **Continued Discussion of New Draft Sign Ordinance**
- **September 21, 2010 Special Planning Commission / OTAP Committee Meeting**
- **September 28, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting**