

# CENTERLINE

## MEMORANDUM

---

P.O. BOX 7597 ♦ RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA 57709-7597

DATE: June 18, 2002

731 ST. JOSEPH STREET ♦ SUITE 120

RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA 57701

PH: 605.341.3193 FX: 605.341.3358

centrline@aol.com

TO: Rapid City Planning Commission

FROM: Lawrence M. Kostaneski, PE for Lazy P-6 Land Co., Inc.

RE: 0066 Lazy P-6 Land Co., Inc

**02PL052 Layout Plat**

### MESSAGE:

Lazy P-6 Land Co., Inc. has the following response to the staff report dated June 20, 2002.

- On June 4, 2002 Lazy P-6 submitted a waiver request for the Master Plan requirement. The request should have been delivered to Commissioners for their consideration at the 6/06 meeting: it was not. Lazy P-6 repeats its request and responsibilities outlined in that request memo.
- Lazy P-6 is not in violation of 16.12.050 regarding half streets. 66 feet of ROW exists along this section line, as clearly shown on the plan submitted. They are also proposing to dedicate the additional ROW needed for future 5<sup>th</sup> St. on their side of the section line at Final Plat. This is identical to all other plat requests within the City's jurisdiction. Moreover, Lazy P-6 is willing to build a Collector class street to Catron Blvd., as they are required to do. They would like nothing better than to have the ultimate 5<sup>th</sup> St. section in place, but there does not seem to be the determination to make this happen. Consequently, until such time as the City is ready to build future 5<sup>th</sup> St., Lazy P-6 will build the section necessary for their development.
- Lazy P-6 wants to keep the "right in - right out only" intersection at the "southern access road" as shown. Staff routinely demands emergency response circulation, and this serves that purpose for a collection of buildings with substantial value. It is considered appropriate for this application.
- The curve design at the "northern access road" (we assume staff means the mandatory rearage road) is taken right from the 5<sup>th</sup> St. 95% plans. If they mean the curb return fillet, that's acknowledged. Lazy P-6 plans to challenge this obsession with non-access easements. They believe it is another encumbrance on the land and consider it arbitrary regulation of land considering the City's long standing approach - intersection spacing criteria.
- The rearage road (is this the same as the "northern access road"? There are only 2 roads.) is located as desired by Lazy P-6. Is there a design upon which they can rely, other than their own? There is no adjacent property Layout Plat information included with staff comments.
- Lazy P-6 plans to use lane widths that will accommodate intersection locations. Moreover, the City routinely uses lanes less than 12 ft. wide on high speed, high volume roads and Lazy P-6 intends to do the same. Turn lanes will be needed at 5<sup>th</sup> St. and the rearage road, at a minimum.
- Standard curb and gutter with no on-street parking is provided in an area where no children are playing. There is historically much less pedestrian activity in these areas than in residential settings. Landscape themes are also more attractive without the annoying "dead zones" adjacent to curbs. Combined with the City's concerns with lawn watering seeping in behind the curbs, curbside sidewalk is considered a viable design solution for this application.
- Lazy P-6 is not aware that the 5<sup>th</sup> St. construction plans are approved. In addition, any water main looping (from the west?) is a matter for the City's system managers. Lazy P-6 will accommodate any

reasonable system connections, and has done so by relying on the utility strategy shown in the 95% draft 5<sup>th</sup> St plans. If there are other system requirements, the City should make them known.

- Lazy P-6 intends to comply with all competent wastewater disposal regulations.
- Lazy P-6 has learned that the City plans to use only existing, natural drainage channels as the conveyance strategy for the South Truck Route Drainage Basin Plan. If true, this is a "secret" decision. On 6/04/01 and again on 10/24/01, Lazy P-6 advised City staff in writing of its acceptance of several major components of the current DRAFT plan, including the recognition that additional metering dams may need to be placed on their property. Do the alleged "approved" 5<sup>th</sup> St. plans reflect this strategy change? Currently they show a channel along the south side of Catron Blvd., which Lazy P-6 also recognized, reserving 50 ft. of private ground for this purpose. Lazy P-6 has also identified areas for future metering in anticipation of this strategy. The current DRAFT Basin Plan is a technically reliable document that only needs an update to account for the land use changes. While there may be a need for more or somewhat larger metering elements, there is no chance that the current facilities will disappear. Therefore Lazy P-6 plans to use the current draft plan as direction, recognizing that any construction plans submitted subsequent to Layout Plat will require detailed storm water management strategies, both short and long term. It continues its objection, however, to having drainage channels artificially routed onto its property without its concurrence. (Why would Lazy P-6 or anyone else worry about "Master Plans" in the face of this kind of activity?)
- Considering the amount of tax dollars spent on City contour mapping, it is ludicrous to prohibit their use. Supplemented with field data obtained at critical locations or in critical areas, they are a perfectly acceptable design tool. Only in heavily wooded or radical terrain areas does the mapping become less reliable than might be desired. Lazy P-6 plans to use this existing data, supplemented as noted.
- City staff is apparently oblivious to the massive grading projects undertaken in conjunction with recent land development. Thorough geo-technical analysis is admittedly a must, but once this is obtained there is rarely any geologic obstacles that cannot be overcome by adhering to the geo-technical recommendations. Lazy P-6 intends to follow this strategy as well.
- Fire hydrants are located at the intersections of paved, public roads with hydrant spacing as required. Is there some special "fire apparatus access" requirement not anticipated by current criteria?

Thank you for your consideration

Lawrence M. Kostaneski, PE  
For Lazy P-6 Land Co., Inc.