

Ridgecrest General Plan Update

Meeting Minutes

January 22, 2008

5:30 PM – 7:00 PM

Ridgecrest City Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:36 p.m.

Present: Jim Fallgatter, Andy Killikauskas, Chuck Roulund, Howard Laire, Lois Beres, Nellavan Jeglum, Chairman Jerry Taylor, Mike Biddlingmeier, Eric Kauffman, Vice-Chairman Jim Smith, Craig Porter

Absent: Joanna Rummer, John OGara, Sharon Paxton, Ruth Cooper

Staff Present: Public Services Director Jim McRea (arrived late), City Planner Matthew Alexander, Administrative Secretary Danielle Valentine

2. Parkways and Parks

City Planner Alexander made a slide presentation to the Committee of a Parkway Plan (generated by the Parks Sub-Committee) for their consideration indicating a need for bikeway and pathways highlighting Bowman as an existing bikeway.

He indicated that the recommendation included another trailhead – to add to the two existing.

Chairman Taylor asked for member comments. Member Beres said she was curious as to why two bikeways so close together were recommended. Planner Alexander responded stating that both would be north-south corridors and in neither case would be very wide.

Chairman Taylor asked how the City would process the plan through the County given it included County land. Planner Alexander responded that he would hope the County would be receptive to the plan.

Member Porter asked if there were specific ideas for the planned parks. Member Kilikauskas spoke about the hopeful future plans for a park near the current business park to include a gymnasium area and gave an overview of future plans for other proposed parks. He indicated that the plans were a work in progress and that the Sub-Committee is open to comment.

Member Roulund said he felt that the two parallel areas on Brady would more appropriately be cut back to one. Member Kilikauskas indicated that both had been included as they had their own issues – one within City limits was in a more densely populated area and the other outside City limits (with less influence) was less densely populated.

There was discussion in regards to the appropriateness of allowing dirt-bike road access on the trails. Whilst Member Kilikauskas indicated that the dirt-bikers had

little choice as they could not legally use the road and he felt it was a reality that those roads would be used and therefore should be addressed.

Member Roulund asked to go on record as having an understanding that trail use and bike paths did not include any motorized vehicles.

Member Jeglum commented that she felt it appropriate to look seriously at parkways, bikeways etc within the City limits. She said she did not think that some of the areas proposed would benefit the residents given their locale was outside City limits.

Chairman Taylor asked if staff could provide statistics on density in relation to the proposed park areas – i.e. align parks with population.

Planner Alexander recommended that GPAC send the map to the Parks Sub-Committee with the comments raised during the evening. Chairman Taylor said he thought it would be appropriate that the Parks Sub-Committee communicate the definition of the proposed areas – trails, bikeways etc.

There was continual discussion throughout the item on the placement of parks, trails etc given that the GPAC is building a 20 year plan.

Planner Alexander showed a slide example of an arterial road with an adjacent sidewalk and hike/bike trail. Member Roulund said he had seen towns where one side of the road would have a sidewalk and the other a bike path – both allowing two way traffic.

3. Mixed Use

Planner Alexander provided a slide presentation on Mixed Use indicating that Chairman Taylor had asked to re-ignite this discussion. Chairman Taylor said that he had a wish to bring Mixed Use to the town. Planner Alexander said that staff and the Matrix Group shouldered some blame for not bringing forward enough information on Mixed Use to the Committee.

He went on to say that land assigned for Commercial Use was abundant and that it was possible to offer those land owners the opportunity to re-zone to Mixed Use.

Member Beres commented that she liked the concept of Mixed Use saying that it allowed individuals the opportunity to work to most activities.

Member Fallgatter said he felt it added depth to an area and he liked the concept.

Member Kauffman said whilst he liked the idea he felt the issue was applying the concept to Ridgecrest – a very linear town. He said he thought it would be appropriate to see examples in cities of a similar size to Ridgecrest or the size Ridgecrest might grow to over the next 20 years.

Planner Alexander said that it was appropriate to not only consider undeveloped parcels of land but also developed parcels such as Balsam Street.

Vice-Chairman Smith said he felt it appropriate to consider the main arterials for mixed use.

Chairman Taylor said that in summary the wish was to look at areas currently zoned for commercial. Member Biddlingmeier commented this was appropriate if the infrastructure was in place to support mixed use.

Member Jeglum asked for clarification on the definition of Mixed Use – if it would be allowed as an alternative to the current designated use – in other words could an area be developed with one of the uses or would it have to include all of the uses. Planner Alexander responded that it depended upon how the zoning was written and Chairman Taylor clarified that this was the role of the GPAC.

Member Fallgatter said he felt it appropriate that Mixed Use be mandated, this was agreed to by Member Laire. Member Kauffman asked if GPAC could specify by location or if it had to be a general statement.

Member Jeglum asked if you could have a zoning designation with an overlay. Planner Alexander responded this would be possible. Member Roulund said he thought this was the general consensus at the last meeting. Member Laire agreed saying he felt flexibility was appropriate and that was the agreement at the last meeting.

Chairman Taylor summarized by saying that there seemed to be general consensus that a mandate would not be appropriate rather developers should be given the option of mixed use. Member Jeglum expanded saying that it could be provided via an overlay to eliminate the need for zone changes etc.

There was discussion as to which zones this overlay would be appropriate. It was agreed that the overlay would not be appropriate for anything currently zoned any level of residential but all other zones would be appropriate. Planner Alexander asked the Committee to clarify that the overlay would not be appropriate in the MIA. There was general agreement that this would be dependent upon the density of the proposed development.

4. Refinement of Land Use Alternatives

Planner Alexander briefed the Committee on the maps provided. He said that Map Alternative B was the direction given by the GPAC whereas Map Alternative A was proposed ideas from Matrix.

There was discussion as to the difficulty of reviewing the alternative maps given that the packet distributed did not include a Current Land Use Map.

Action Item: GPAC members to bring current Land Use Map to next GPAC meeting after spending time reviewing that map and comparing it to Alternative Maps A & B.

Member Jeglum asked if it was necessary to review the Land Use Alternatives given the impact that a Mixed Use Overlay would have on the City.

Member Laire and Member Roulund said that neither alternative presented the flexibility all members had agreed was appropriate when discussing the Mixed Use Overlay.

Planner Alexander asked members to bear in mind that developers were not generally shy in coming to the City to ask for General Plan amendments. He said the purpose of the City was to create a General Plan that made the most sense for the City. He said if there was too much land zoned commercial it would be beneficial to reduce.

Chairman Taylor summarized stating that it would be appropriate to delay this discussion to another time given that the Planning Commission was due to commence its meeting in 10 minutes.

Planner Alexander indicated that the Land Use Sub-Committee was due to meet before the next meeting and they might be the best group to spearhead such a discussion.

5. Public Comments

Tom Wiknich 417 W. Ridgecrest Blvd. said he had received 8 requests from people to see his mixed use building noting they were interested in how he had developed it. He said there was potential for mixed use.

6. GPAC Member Comments

Member Kauffman asked if there was any progress on discussion with the County and asked that staff provide any information available.

Action Item – Chairman Taylor and Planner Alexander to arrange for County representatives to come to a future GPAC meeting.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.