

STAFF REPORT

June 29, 2000

PRD #00PD012 - Initial and Final Development Plan - Planned Residential Development

ITEM 8

GENERAL INFORMATION:

PETITIONER	Thurston Design Group, LLP for Doyle Estes
REQUEST	PRD #00PD012 - Initial and Final Development Plan - Planned Residential Development
LEGAL DESCRIPTION	Tract 6, Signal Heights Addition, located in S1/2 NE1/4 and N1/2 SE1/4 of Section 1, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota
PARCEL ACREAGE	Approximately 6.25 Acres
LOCATION	On East Boulevard south of the intersection of East Quincy and East Boulevard
EXISTING ZONING	Park Forest
SURROUNDING ZONING	
North:	High Density Residential
South:	General Commercial - Medium Density Residential
East:	Medium Density Residential (PRD)
West:	Park Forest
PUBLIC UTILITIES	City Water and Sewer
REPORT BY	Bill Lass

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends that the Initial and Final Development Plan for the Planned Residential Development be denied without prejudice.**

GENERAL COMMENTS: **Note: This Staff Report has been revised as of June 20, 2000.**

Revised or new text is shown in bold print. The applicant is proposing to locate the Working Against Violence Inc. facility and the Black Hills Children's Home on a 6.2 acre lot just north of Signal Hill. The Initial and Final Development Plan proposes a two story 13,000 square foot building for the Working Against Violence Incorporated facility and a 4,000 square foot one story building for the Black Hills Children's Home facility. The property is currently zoned Park Forest, however, the applicant has submitted a request to rezone the property to Medium Density Residential. Group homes are permitted as a Use On Review and through the Planned Development process in the Medium Density Residential Zoning District.

STAFF REPORT

June 29, 2000

PRD #00PD012 - Initial and Final Development Plan - Planned Residential Development

ITEM 8

The proposed site for the project presents a number of engineering challenges. The site is bounded by two very steep hills on the south and the east side, and drops off precipitously on the north side. The area has been prone to landslides in the past. The existing storm sewer to the site is already running over capacity due to street drainage and drainage from other developments in the area. The Engineering Division has numerous concerns on slope stability, storm sewer and drainage issues on the site, and has requested that the applicant submit detailed information addressing these concerns. Staff is unable to evaluate this proposal without the requested information. **The Planning Commission has continued action on this request at the past several meetings pending receipt of the required engineering information. Most recently, on May 25 the Planning Commission recommended that this request be continued one final time – to the June 29 Planning Commission meeting with the understanding that if the petitioner had not submitted the information by June 2, 2000 then the request would be Denied Without Prejudice on June 29. If the request is Denied Without Prejudice and should the petitioner wish to pursue the Planned Development again in the future, a new application would need to be submitted but no application fees would be required. The certified mailing and required signage would again be required as part of a future request.**

Staff notes that the certified mailing on the project was sent out and the sign has been posted on the property. Staff has received **seven (7)** phone calls and two office visits regarding the proposal. Two of the phone callers were opposed to locating any type of shelter in the neighborhood. **One** caller expressed his support for the project. One call was received from a neighborhood resident who expressed neither opposition nor support for the project. **Three callers expressed concern that storm water runoff from the project would adversely affect downstream properties.** Both of the neighbors who visited the office viewed the site plan and expressed some concerns regarding how the drainage would be handled. Staff explained that through the Planned Development process, adequate measures to control the drainage would be required.

Staff has noted that this development request has been continued by the Planning Commission since April 20, 2000. Due to the nature of the outstanding information and the public response to this development proposal, Staff is now recommending that this request be Denied Without Prejudice.