

-----Original Message-----

From: Centrline@aol.com [mailto:Centrline@aol.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 03, 2007 3:45 PM

To: marcia.elkins@rcgov.org; bob.dominicak@rcgov.org; vicki.fisher@rcgov.org

Cc: Centrline@aol.com

Subject: PC Item 16 & 35)

Hi:

Please formally attach these concerns and comments to the referenced Planning Commission items so they may be forwarded to the City Council.

The following comments address the staff report dated July 5, 2007 (Item 16 07PL081)

Traffic Analysis: Comments provided later.

Access Easements.

In a June 7, 2007 meeting w/ GM staff, the proposed width was discussed. A consensus was reached, which resulted in the June 8, 2007 submittal of a design memorandum and conceptual plan identifying a 48 ft wide access and utility corridor w/ no parking or backing into the corridor. The corridor identified the necessary space allocation for both public and private utilities. The development footprint size is ~ 34 ac.

There is a companion variance addressing this issue. Item 35 07SV024

Baken Park is ~15 ac; Kmart is ~16 ac; Rushmore Mall w/ outlet store pads is ~70 ac. In each case the perimeter roads are public. Once in the footprint, however, the corridors are primarily parking aisles. At Rushmore Mall sidewalks are in front of the businesses; curb and gutter is used only to define parking areas, there are few if any turn lanes and easements mark the water and sewer mains. Parking lot inlets collect rainfall and direct it to an offsite metering pond. These 3 examples seem to have little difficulty functioning successfully.

Staff has not made a recommendation on the proposed 48 ft corridor as discussed with them, proposed and described. And construction plans are pointless until the width and status issues are resolved.

Action Development is asking for the Planning Commission to approve the request for a 48 ft access and utility easement without curb and gutter (except at Anamosa and E North) or sidewalk.

Master Utility Plan:

At the June 7 meeting w/ GM staff insisted seeing the water and sewer routing proposed for the access corridors, even though the typical section showed the locations. This was submitted along with the computer modeling for these two systems.

Now the staff wants a signed, on site plan for private utilities. Private utilities are confined to a joint trench up to 24" wide. (3 phase power and gas in the same trench.) These corridors were clearly shown on the typical section. Moreover, private utilities size their primary lines based on the building type and demand. All they ever need initially is a corridor. They cannot provide details until they know the specific use.

The plans for Anamosa Street will show the conduit crossings requested by the private utilities. But they won't even run wire/pipe until a building is identified.

Action Development requests the Planning Commission remove the portion of the stipulation requiring private utility sign off.

Drainage:

The June 8, 2007 Design Memorandum and Anamosa Street Plans contained the following: the specific description of contributing area size and location relative to the roadway; inlet and pipe size and locations; a rating curve identifying intercepted inlet flow vs. total flow, a cross section showing water spread at maximum flow; detailed modeling of pipe performance under maximum flow.

The staff also wants storm sewer extended to the west of Century Rd. This will bring an unknown amount of drainage from one basin into another, which is a bad thing since the proposed metering pond is already sized for this development. All of the data provided to date addresses the Perrine (West) Drainage Basin Plan.

Action Development requests the Planning Commission delete this requirement in its entirety, or require staff to quickly provide a more coherent set of instructions. They might provide a recent example of what information they're seeking.

Water:

3 years ago the city purchased ROW from the developer based on an 8 lane (equivalent) road with curb side bike trail one side, 5 ft walk on the other. At no time was the developer told about the 10 ft water main restriction. If the city desires to purchase additional ROW, the developer will consider it.

Action Development requests the Planning Commission approve the location of the two city required water mains, or purchase additional ROW to accommodate them.

Sewer:

Staff referenced previous Layout Plat submittals. Not until this submittal has the city requested evaluation of an existing sewer system 2 miles south with almost 200 acres of undeveloped land in between. Moreover, in 2006 the city approved the extension of

sewer main and casing pipe under E North St., spending \$175,000 of TID funds in the process. There was no downstream analysis requirement.

A very conceptual analysis was provided with the June 8, 2007 submittal. Naturally the city has virtually no information about the design or construction of the downstream system. What sewer plans does the staff want revised?

Action Development requests the Planning Commission eliminate this requirement in its entirety. If the city has this many deficient systems, it should issue a warning to all potential developers: or, upgrade the systems well in advance of development. The staff might also be required to quote the specific source for the $\frac{3}{4}$ full analysis requirement.

Cost Estimate/Surety:

The staff referenced oversize costs, so obviously they have the cost information. But at this point estimates are not much help since the staff has not reviewed the plans.

Action Development requests the Planning Commission eliminate this requirement in its entirety, or make it a requirement of final plat

approval (which it already is).

Thank you for your consideration of these requests. Development is difficult and costly enough without the added burden of confusing or conflicting requirements.

For Action Development:

CENTERLINE
Lawrence M. Kostaneski, PE
520 Kansas City Street Suite 307
Rapid City, South Dakota 57701
Ph: 605.341.3193 Fx: 605.341.3358
centrline@aol.com