



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

MEETING OF THE CITY OF RIDGECREST PLANNING COMMISSION
City Council Chambers
Tuesday, September 27, 2011 at 6:00 PM

1. **CALL TO ORDER 6:00pm**
 2. **ROLL CALL**
Present: Vice Chairman Beres, Commissioners LeCornu, Sanders & Pope
Absent: Chairman Porter
Staff Present: Matthew Alexander, Loren Culp, Karen Harker
 3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
 4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
Motion to approve Agenda as written by C. LeCornu, seconded by C. Pope
None opposed – APPROVED
 5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 23, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting**
Motion to approve August Minutes by C. LeCornu, seconded by C. Pope
None opposed – APPROVED
 6. **PUBLIC COMMENTS OF ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA - None**
 7. **PUBLIC HEARING**
Tentative Parcel Map 11999 located on 17.34 acres at the SE Corner of Radar St. and China Lake Blvd. This item was considered by the Planning Commission on June 28th and continued to July 26th and August 23rd Commission Meetings. Due to the lapsed time since June, the staff has re-noticed this Public Hearing in the newspaper and via a mail notice to property owners lying within 300 feet of the project site.

Matthew Alexander gave background information on project and staff report. Applicant withdrew his site plan and will consider a TPM only. These conditions are based on if proposed Wal-Mart goes into the site across the street. If this shopping center goes in first they will have to meet the conditions first. 6 exciting parcel are commercial general and asking to create 7 for a regional shopping center. Site to remain vacant and undeveloped until a site plan is approved. A Negative Declaration is recommended. No building can occur until the site plan review is approved by the Planning commission. This was a concern to residents in the area. Staff recommends that you approve the TPM as submitted. Does the Commission have any questions of staff:
 - o Jim Sanders - none
 - o Chris LeCornu- none
 - o Carter Pope - none
 - o Lois Beres – lots of conditions, for only a lot line adjustment. Are the conditions only needed in the Site Plan review? Will go to public comment and then come back to our City Engineer for these answers.
- PUBLIC COMMENTS:**
- o Derrill Whitten: presented another parcel map that the planning commission approved in 2006. He went through the conditions that the Public Works Department placed on the TPM. He then made reference to the TMP 11999 and

how many more conditions are made on this TPM. 95% of these development conditions are for the site plan review not for simple parcel map. Mr. Whitten explained how Bakersfield handles TMP. The Developer will come back to the Planning Commissioner with a site plan review when he is ready to develop the site. Mr. Whitten proceeded to explain his letter and what he would like deleted and have remain. Refer to his letter that he submitted to the Secretary. Asking for the Planning Commission to approve the map as a new lot configuration and approve it only as a TPM and without the site plan review submitted.

- James Sanders – Makes a lot of sense.
- Chris LeCornu- no questions
- Carter Pope – would like to know why the conditions were place on the TMP
- Loren Culp – the review of the TMP and looking at the TMP was looked at incomplete in the municipal code. The site plan was withdrawn, and applicant was asked to resubmit to a site plan and was told to use the site plan that was previous submitted. Mr. Culp explained how the site plan can be evaluated by the Planning Commission. Engineering Staff has looked at the site plan and has conditioned the parcel map to the municipal codes. This project is quite complex. Two major corridors surround this project. The General Plan that is crossed referenced by the municipal code was taken into consideration when conditioning the project. He would caution the commission to take action that is different from the municipal code. Municipal code/ordinances are set by your City Council and should be followed.
- Lois Beres - What makes this project different than the one across from the Hospital? That was on Caltrans highway.
- Loren Culp- S. China Lake Blvd is within the City of Ridgecrest and not a state highway.
- Loren Culp – you will have the opportunity to look at the site plan that is comprehensive at the tentative parcel map. You might not have this opportunity again if you view the site plan on an individual basis.
- Jim Sanders – we will not have the opportunity to oppose conditions on the project as it moves forward if we don't do it now and only at the TPM.
- Loren Culp - you, the Planning Commission, municipal code tells you what that land developer will look like for the health, safety, and welfare of the community. Site improvement
- Lois Beres – 7 pieces of property – what if we approve it like it is. Does it put the developer in a spot to sell the property?
- Loren Culp – applicant always can make an appeal to city council with a 15 day grace period.
- Jim Sanders – not complete because it doesn't have a site plan
- Chris LeCornu – Valid point and I agree with you.
- Lois Beres – sales opportunity for the Developer if we don't approve the TPM.
- Derrill Whitten – Cautions the Commission taking legal advice from the City Engineer and the Planning Commissioner should be able to approve these conditions and move forward without the approval of City Council. Referred to item 7 of the Resolution presented earlier.
- Lois Beres – can we have head shake of how the commission is feeling about moving this forward or
- Bill Brickey 1089 Cynthia Court – Parcel number three is land locked. You have not shown any public or utility right of way.
- Loren Culp – in staff review A1 item L parcel 3 does not have and some
- Mary Kawalski – bought as one site and how can we
 - Lois Beres – already in 6 and will need to make into 7
- Mary Kawalski – approval of the map is asking two things at one meeting.
- Mike Sherpa 821 S. Chesapeake – need to keep all the conditions on the TPM. With a construction background I see what the City Engineer is trying to do. I don't agree with the project on a whole but if the project is going to move forward, I want it done right.

- Carter Pope – How does it change from a marketing stand point?
- Derrill Whitten - Developer feels that when being presented to a Big Box company, he can show the site plan and it look more appealing to the investor.
- Carter Pope – Most TPM are given to us in a site plan with the TMP
- Derrill Whitten – If you would like to condition the TMP with a site plan conditions so that it can come back to the commission than that would be acceptable.

COMMITTEE COMMENT:

- Carter Pope – condition an extensive site plan
- Loren Culp – that would be acceptable. But I have Municipal Code for a Parcel Map I have a written word and the requirements from the municipal code.
- Lois Beres – there can always be an appeal
- Carter Pope – He would like to make sure if it goes to the City Council that the condition of an extensive site plan be imposed.
- Jim Sanders – withdrawn application of site plan is what I am moving towards.
- Carter Pope – Certain laws that people don't like and approve the resolution with the conditions as written.
- Chris LeCornu – approve the resolution with the conditions as written
- Jim Sanders – I would like to see this come back in a complete form and I don't see how it is right if not complete
- Lois Beres – can I see someone make a motion.
- Jim Sanders motion to disapprove the Resolution 11-13. No one seconded the motion. Motion died.

*****Motion to Approve Resolution No. 11-12 as written by Jim Sanders, seconded by Carter Pope, no opposes - PASSES

*****Motion to Approve Resolution No 11-13 as written by Carter Pope, seconded by Chris LeCornu, 3 ayes, 1 nay 1 absent - PASSES

Carter Pope – I support the project on the whole I hope that you will see to go to the City Council to appeal.

Derrill Whitten – I don't think that we will be doing that.

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Matthew Alexander attending a planning workshop in Santa Barbara, CA and at a future will share with the Commission what he learned.

9. COMMISSIONER ITEMS

a. Report from Committees

City Org – no meeting

CDC – discussed branding proposal, meeting on Thursday 9-29-11 at 4:00

QOL – August 30 & 31 – improvements of park locations, piney pool and park locations, special meeting for the presentation of pool by a consultant. Bringing forth complete package to fix pool area and parks.

Infrastructure – Wednesday October 12th.

b. Commissioner Contacts

c. OTAP Committee update – Balsam street Market, no official start date, OTAP meeting 18th of Oct

10. STAFF ITEMS

11. ADJOURN at 7:15

Next Regular Planning Commission meeting – October 11, 2011