

MINUTES OF THE
RAPID CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 21, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT: Doug Andrews, Gary Brown, Debra Hadcock, Mike LeMay, Scott Nash, Mel Prairie Chicken and Ethan Schmidt. Karen Olson, Council Liaison was also present

STAFF PRESENT: Marcia Elkins, Vicki Fisher, Todd Tucker, Renee Catron-Blair, Rod Johnson, Karen Bulman, Michelle Horkey, Bob Dominicak, Dave Johnson, Tim Behlings, Joel Landeen, Risë Ficken and Carol Bjornstad.

Nash called the meeting to order at 7:00 a.m.

---BEGINNING OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS---

Elkins advised that the applicant has requested Item 41 be considered after Items 42 and 43.

Bulman requested that Items 42 and 43 be considered concurrently.

X 42. No. 05TI001 - Section 5, T1N, R8E

A request by Jim Letner to consider an application for a Resolution Creating Tax Increment District No. 52 on Tract 1, Shamrock Subdivision, Section 5, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; and, Tract C, Section 5, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Lot B of Lot 3 of Tract D, Section 5, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; and, The 60 foot East St. Charles Street right-of-way located between Cambell Street and Creek Drive, and the 66 foot Creek Drive right-of-way located between E. St. Patrick Street on the south and Rapid Creek on the north, all located in Section 5, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located north of East Saint Patrick Street, East of Cambell Street and west of Creek Drive.

43. No. 05TI002 - Section 5, T1N, R8E

A request by Jim Letner to consider an application for a Tax Increment District No. 52 Project Plan on Tract 1, Shamrock Subdivision, Section 5, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; and, Tract C, Section 5, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Lot B of Lot 3 of Tract D, Section 5, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; and, The 60 foot East St. Charles Street right-of-way located between Cambell Street and Creek Drive, and the 66 foot Creek Drive right-of-way located between E. St. Patrick Street on the south and Rapid Creek on the north, all located in Section 5, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located north of East Saint Patrick Street, East of Cambell Street and west of Creek Drive.

Buhlman presented the request and reviewed the slides of the subject property and staff's recommendation.

Discussion followed concerning proposed reclamation project, specific concerns were voiced by panel regarding the snow removal dump-site and future use and alternatives for utilizing the reclamation site.

Elkins responded to a question from Olson clarifying that the relocation of the snow removal site is under discussion at Committee. Elkins advised that if the project plan is approved there would be a five year period in which the improvements could be made to the site. Elkins stated that by approving this project plan, the Planning Commission is not making a commitment in terms of what will happen with the snow storage site.

Mr. Sperlich, petitioner's representative responded to questions and concerns regarding the proposed reclamation project. Sperlich stated the applicant's intended goals for reclamation of the site with the proposed improvements. Sperlich also advised that the improvements would minimize vandalism and improve the commercial potential of the site. Sperlich stated that use of TIF District funds would assist in making improvements to the proposed reclamation project that would be of mutual benefit to the City and the applicant. Sperlich clarified that the north half of the construction of East Saint Charles Street would be funded by the TIF District and the applicant will pay for the south half of the improvements.

Discussion continued regarding the City's intended use of the snow removal site after reclamation.

In response to a question from Nash, Sperlich indicated that the property to the north of the proposed extension of East Saint Charles Street is already developed. Sperlich stated that he did not feel it is appropriate to require the owner of the property to the north to participate in an assessment project.

Discussion followed regarding the other area property owners responsibility to address drainage from their property, new development and access issues.

Nash expressed concern with regard to the use of TIF District funds for this project and the potential for other developers to request similar funding. Nash requested clarification concerning the criteria considered by the Tax Increment Financing Committee to evaluate this request.

Discussion continued regarding the proposed project and existing drainage issues. Sperlich stated that the applicant would pay for the drainage improvements associated with their development and funds from the TIF District would be used to construct improvements to convey storm water from surrounding properties.

Discussion followed concerning the use of TIF District funds for reclamation of the snow removal site.

Letner stated that using TIF District funds would be an inexpensive solution to construct the proposed improvements and would increase area property values.

Discussion followed regarding the potential to require the surrounding property owners to address issues related to drainage from their property.

Andrews moved to approve the Resolution Creating Tax Increment District No. 52 and the Tax Increment District No. 52 Project Plan. The motion died due to the lack of a second.

Schmidt left meeting @ 8:42

Discussion followed concerning the Tax Increment Financing Committee's review of the proposed District.

Nash expressed concern that the reclamation project for the snow removal site would not be successful if the City continued to use the site to dump snow. Nash stated that the cost for the proposed improvements should be the developer's responsibility.

Jim Letner clarified that the additional improvements not related to his development will not occur without the TIF funding.

Sperlich stated that TIF District is not necessary for the applicant to develop his property. Sperlich noted that the proposed TIF District provides an opportunity to improve the neighborhood.

Discussion followed concerning the criteria used to evaluate TIF Districts and the pending discussions before the Public Works Committee concerning the City's snow removal site.

Elkins noted that the Planning Commission could add a stipulation of approval to the Project Plan recommending that no TIF District funds would be expended for improvements to the snow removal site until such time as an alternative snow removal site has been identified.

Nash restated concerns regarding use of taxpayer monies to subsidize private development.

Rod Johnson clarified that a determination has not been made as to the ultimate use of the snow removal site. Johnson indicated that the site may possibly be used for storage or other light industrial uses.

Discussion followed concerning a portion of the snow removal site that is zoned Flood Hazard.

Andrews suggested that these items be continued to the May 5, 2005 Planning Commission meeting.

Sperlich requested that the Planning Commission deny the requests at this time and they would address their concerns to City Council.

In response to a question from Brown, Elkins explained that State statute requires that all TIF funds must be expended within five years. Elkins noted that the five year period would give the City time to work through the issues related to the snow removal site.

In response to a question from Brown, Sperlich stated that the delay of improvements to the City's snow removal site would not have a negative impact on the proposed development project.

Brown moved, Hadcock seconded and unanimously carried to recommend approval of the resolution creating Tax Increment District #52 and to recommend approval of the Tax Increment District #52 Project Plan with the stipulation that the improvements to the snow removal area not occur until such time as a determination has been made as to the future use of that area. (4 to 2 with Andrews, Brown, Hadcock and Prairie Chicken voting yes and with LeMay and Nash voting no)