

CITY OF RIDGECREST
100 West California Avenue
Ridgecrest, CA 93555
MEETING OF THE CITY OF RIDGECREST PLANNING COMMISSION
City Council Chambers
Tuesday, June 14, 2005 at 7:00 p.m.

First Resolution 05-16

1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m.
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
The agenda was approved
3. ROLL CALL
Present Chair Roulund, Commissioners Laire and Feemster
Absent Commissioners Biddlingmeier and Smith
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES, March 15, March 22, and April 26, 2005
The minutes were approved.
5. DISCUSSION ITEMS
C Containers (discussion deferred for processing clarification) – staff is researching. Planner Landrum is gathering other jurisdiction information regarding C Containers. This item was continued to the next meeting.

Cell towers and dishes (discussion deferred for processing clarification) – staff is researching a number towers and their appropriateness. Staff will talk to base regarding flight areas. Staff will bring back to Planning Commission.

Modular Home Ordinance – staff and consultant. Planner Landrum reported that she contacted Mr. Scott Morgan with State Housing and the League of California Cities among other jurisdictions. Planner Landrum reported:

- Modular Homes was addressed statewide in the late 90's. State was concerned with low income housing and has created a series of laws to address manufactured homes, group homes, assisted housing.
- The legal aspect is to eliminate the barrier of treating manufactured homes separately.
- Looked at Ridgecrest, Kern County, Bakersfield, Victorville, Cal City and Palmdale manufactured home policies. All identical with the exception of size. Palmdale, however, has design criteria for all Single Family Residences across the board.
- Commented that state imposed regulations. Housing element was recently certified by state and Ridgecrest now qualifies for housing grants, etc. Don't want to put City in position of not being satisfied with state.

Chair Roulund commented Manufactured Homes seem to fit in our growth plan and meet laws. Not a great deal of flexibility. Don't want architecture review. This has gone back and forth between Council and Planning Commission. Law sets standards.

Commissioner Laire stated the current ordinance is fine.

Commissioner Feemster current ordinance is not okay, not enough. Palmdale ordinance is lengthy but has good stuff. Not a developer but would like an informal workshop with citizens. I'm in favor of looking at architectural review.

Public Comment on this issue was opened at 7:35 p.m.

Don Stanley, Corona – Silvercrest representative displayed a PowerPoint presentation showing today's manufactured homes. Manufactured Homes (MH) are made to meet UCB Code. Carry a line to fit affordable housing. Foundation can be raised or dug into ground, building can be stucco, roof can be tile; these homes come with several options and can meet the same architectural requirements of a stick built home.

Connie Anderson, Burns – Concerned because we're seeing MH that look like cracker box. Request the Planning Commission look at this issue; amazed that two Commissioners are satisfied. Don't understand state code, believes you can impose condition on MH. If these homes were nice looking nobody would object. Everyone is upset.

City Attorney Keith Lemieux (via phone) explained the state and federal law are very clear. The City has limited authority and can't create special rules; there must be uniform for all. Architectural requirements must be on all houses, more rigid requirements for all houses. That's the only way to go about it. Have to allow housing according to HUD, foundation meets state standards.

Commissioner Feemster commented that the law is worded strange and contradictory in one area.

Karen Davis, Burns – House built in 1974. Expected value to go up, putting MH next door devalues property. No one appreciates a MH, need to protect value of homes. Fair game for any developer is not right. Second home is a MH and there is a difference; insurance won't insure, only Foremost. Mahan, Downs, and China Lake designated to be stick homes, above Mahan allows MH, observed for 20 years. People throughout the community would be outraged if MH next to them. Want architectural review to protect what we've built. Three homes on Downs look terrible, cheap, and incompatible.

Commissioner Feemster asked if there could be architectural zoning distinction. City Attorney Lemieux responded you can't do that.

Commissioner Laire asked how far along the MH on Downs and Coral is? Developer, Jacobs, responded it is expected to be completed within the next 30 days. Garage, front porch and landscaping are not done.

Ernest Loscar, Upjohn – Saw grading for MH, was zoned for apartments, ran out of limitation. Has worked on a lot of housing, from what I've heard a MH is built like a house. Suggest picture of finished product be put on site to let people know what home is going to look like.

Clint ?, Ginger – Concerned with property on Gordon it's 4 feet below grade, questioned water drainage and privacy. CED replied property drains to Upjohn.

Jim Morford, Thorne – Thanked Commission and Dan. Asked if Ridgecrest has comprehensive plan? Planner Landrum responded yes, the General Plan. City should have ordinance that ensures strict integrity without getting in way of states goal. Implement tougher regulations with architectural standards. Concerned as group not just structure, neighbor aesthetics; all would like neighborhood to look good. Concerned what Downs will turn into. MH on Downs looks like it is close to street. Would love to see house with architectural rendering, but don't want to hinder the process.

Don Stanley commented there is throw away housing, but today there is better housing available.

CED Parsons commented that architectural review is subjective to who's making the decision. Should all houses be required to have stucco, tile roof, etc.?

Connie Anderson, Burns - Not asking for that specific, general quality standard.

Jake Bowen, Baylor – Asked if developer moves into area, four lots or less, can protective covenants or restrictive covenants be used.

CED Parsons replied covenants are identified at time of development and they set criteria. There is no City involvement. A MH can go in if it meets standards of the covenants.

Public Comment was closed at 8:40 p.m.

Chair Roulund – Not interested in architectural standards. MH can meet standards, square feet limits may not be wise. Leave as is, affordable housing important. MH looks nicer than some homes; drove through Ripley Estate some nice homes and some not so nice.

Commissioner Feemster – MH should be visually compatible with average of surrounding housing. Would like informal meeting. Can minimum square footage be based on neighborhood? City Attorney Lemieux indicated he would have to look into.

Commissioner Laire – opposed to informal meeting, current ordinance okay.

A minute motion was made by Commissioner Laire and seconded by Commissioner Feemster to recommend to council that the current ordinance is satisfactory for Manufactured Homes and architectural review is not needed for new construction.

Ayes:	Chair Roulund and Commissioner Laire
Noes:	Commissioner Feemster
Absent:	Commissioners Biddlingmeier and Smith

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

7. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.