



# Centerline

## Clarification Memorandum via email

731 Saint Joseph Street ♦ Suite 120  
Rapid City, South Dakota 57701  
Ph: 605.341.3193 Fx: 605.341.3358  
centrline@aol.com

TO: City Planning, Engineering; County  
FROM: Lawrence M. Kostaneski, PE  
DATE: January 5, 2004

Item # 03SV049

### **RE: Darlington Estates Subdivision:** 03PL122 and 03SV049 Staff Reports

Message: Ref. Submitted plan sheet, applications and concept memorandum.

#### **03PL122 Applicant comments are as follows:**

1. The statement ,” The Layout Plat process is an informal preliminary review...”creates contextual confusion by using layout and preliminary in the same statement. The goal of Layout Plats is to more precisely identify important issues. It is in fact a “formal review of a conceptual plan” designed to obtain input on issues based on the level of detail provided. The number and specificity of the comments received on both applications is proof of this assertion. Hopefully the comments are not informal, but rather competent guidance and direction.
2. The applicant requests the specific citation that requires individual water well characteristics. When exactly is this information required, if it is?
3. The applicant requests clarification of the Master Plan requirement for preliminary plat: identify what “two properties” are contemplated.
4. The non-access easement requirement is sweeping and lacks any specific direction relating to Lamb Road, but they agree that preliminary plat is the time to define its scope.

#### **03SV049 Applicant comments are as follows:**

1. Why does the applicant have to submit construction plan, execute WORPs and vacations prior to council approval of the variance? Is this more appropriate prior to preliminary plat approval?
2. Paving Old Folsom Road conflicts with the WORP approval of other roadway elements. If at some time in the future this road is upgraded to an urban section, much damage will be done to the pavement when curb & gutter, utility or drainage crossings and similar features are installed. Moreover, requiring one lot to pave the entire road segment is not particularly economical, not to mention unfair. Since only one lot is actually accessing this road segment, the applicant believes that the paving requirement should be included in the WORP, and hereby makes that request
3. Paving the private access road and the 52’ ROW constitutes a hazard to equestrians – the target market - who will undoubtedly be using these roads to exercise horses or just take short rides throughout the property. Since this development cannot be considered “dense” under any definition, and the future extension of the road itself simply accesses similarly large lots, the applicant persists in the request to waive the paving requirement, or at least have it included in the WORP. The owners of the property can decide in the future if they want the road paved.
4. A variance to the internal section line improvements is obvious due to the circumstances explained in the Concept Memorandum submitted. Alternate suggestions are either amazingly cumbersome or do little to secure corridors, which already exist in any case. Perhaps a WORP attachment would be the solution. Applicant persists in the request to grant this variance.
5. A planting screen easement is unnecessary in an area with 10 acre lots and grazing land.

Please call with questions. Thanks.

END