



MINUTES OF THE  
RAPID CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
September 9, 2004

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peter Anderson, Debra Hadcock, Mike Lemay, Scott Nash, Mel Prairie Chicken, Martha Rodriguez and Ethan Schmidt; Karen Olson, Council Liaison, was also present

STAFF PRESENT: Karen Bulman, Renee Catron Blair, Marcia Elkins, Vicki Fisher, Curt Huus, Dave Johnson, Bill Knight, Jason Green, Todd Tucker and Risë Ficken

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

**Nash reviewed the Non-Hearing Consent Agenda and asked if any member of the Planning Commission, staff or audience would like any item removed from the Non-Hearing Consent Agenda for individual consideration.**

**Staff requested that Item 6 be removed from the Non-Hearing Consent Agenda for separate consideration.**

**~~Prairie—Chicken~~ Rodriguez moved, ~~Brown~~ Prairie Chicken seconded and unanimously carried to recommend approval of the Non-Hearing Consent Agenda Items 1 through 8 in accordance with the staff recommendations with the exception of Item 6. (7 to 0 with Anderson, Hadcock, Lemay, Nash, Prairie Chicken, Rodriguez and Schmidt voting yes and with none voting no)**

**---NON HEARING ITEMS CONSENT CALENDAR---**

1. Approval of the August 12, 2004 and August 26, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
2. No. 04PL093 – Commerce Park Subdivision  
A request by Sperlich Consulting, Inc. for Robert Scull to consider an application for a **Preliminary Plat** on Lot 1, Lot 2 and Drainage Lot, Block 1 and dedicated streets, Commerce Park Subdivision, Section 27, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, legally described as the unplatted portion of the SW1/4 SE1/4 of Section 27, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located northeast of the intersection of Rand Road and Commerce Road.

**Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary Plat be approved with the following stipulations:**

1. **Prior to Preliminary Plat approval by the City Council, a cost estimate for the subdivision improvements shall be submitted for review and approval;**
2. **Prior to Preliminary Plat approval by the City Council, plans showing structures and driveway approach locations for the property and adjacent properties shall be submitted for review and approval;**
3. **Prior to Preliminary Plat approval by the City Council, a grading plan for Lot 1 and Lot 2 including existing and proposed grades and sediment**

The motion with the stipulations listed above carried unanimously. (7 to 0 with Anderson, Hadcock, Lemay, Nash, Prairie Chicken, Rodriguez and Schmidt voting yes and with none voting no)

Nash announced that the Public Hearings on Items 9 through 28 were opened.

Staff requested that Item 28 be removed from the Hearing Items Consent Calendar for separate consideration. Prairie Chicken requested that Item 9 be removed from the Hearing Items Consent Calendar for separate consideration.

Prairie Chicken moved, ~~Brown~~ Hadcock seconded and unanimously carried to recommend approval of the Hearing Consent Agenda Items 9 through 28 in accordance with the staff recommendations with the exception of Items 9 and 28. (7 to 0 with Anderson, Hadcock, Lemay, Nash, Prairie Chicken, Rodriguez and Schmidt voting yes and with none voting no)

The Public Hearings for Items 9 through 28 were closed.

---HEARING ITEMS CONSENT CALENDAR---

10. No. 04CA034 – Skyline Pines East Subdivision

A request by Wyss Associates for WEB Land Holdings to consider an application for an **Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan by changing the future land use designation on an approximate 1.08 acre parcel of land from Low Density Residential with a Planned Residential Development to Park Forest with a Planned Residential Development** on property described by metes and bounds commencing at the NW corner of the SE1/4 of Section 11, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota. Thence travel 553.75 feet at a bearing S00°31'58" West to a point; Thence travel 165.47 feet at a bearing S89°28'02" East to the Point of Beginning; Travel 74.15 feet at a bearing N41°05'15" West to a point; Travel 245.15 feet at a bearing N00°21'00" East to a point; Travel 106.97 feet at a bearing N34°54'43" East to a point; Travel 115.00 feet at a bearing N05°14'58" West to a point; Travel 51.63 feet at a bearing N09°59'31" East to a point; Travel 56.07 feet at a bearing S89°37'11" East to a point; Travel 464.33 feet at a bearing S00°32'53" West to a point; Travel 110.01 feet at a bearing S35°36'28" West to the point of beginning. The area described contains approximately 1.08 acres more or less, more generally described as being located west of the western terminus of Fairmont Boulevard along Tower Road.

**Planning Commission recommended that the Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan by changing the future land use designation on an approximate 1.08 acre parcel of land from Low Density Residential with a Planned Residential Development to Park Forest with a Planned Residential Development be approved.**

11. No. 04CA035 – Skyline Pines East Subdivision

A request by Wyss Associates for WEB Land Holdings to consider an application for an **Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the future land**

worked on this project since spring. Finck added that the Future Land Use Committee and City staff have indicated that the proposed development appears to be a good transitional use between the existing residential and commercial developments. Finck clarified that under a Low Density Residential zoning district as many as 154 single family residences could be developed on the subject property. Finck commented that the number of units to be located on the property has been limited, noting that additional landscaping will be provided, and the main structure will be located approximately 100 feet from the property line. Finck emphasized that the proposed development would be a quiet retirement community noting that traffic from the proposed development would be significantly less than traffic seen from single family residences. Finck stated that approximately 50% of the residents at the Echo Ridge facility drive a vehicle. Finck described additional benefits of developing the property as proposed, noting the property will be well constructed and well maintained. Finck indicated that the requested Subdivision Variance is requested for the existing road located outside of the development noting that all improvements inside the development will be fully provided. Finck added that this development will be served by City sewer noting that single family dwellings could develop using individual septic systems.

Karen Olsen requested clarification concerning why the main facility was located on the east side of the property near the existing residential development. Finck explained that the topography on the west side of the site is much more severe than the topography on the ~~west~~ east side and would prohibit the mechanical access on the rear of the main structure. Finck stated that locating the main structure on the west side of the property would significantly reduce the number of units that could be constructed on the property. Olsen requested clarification concerning the requested Subdivision Variance. Finck stated that all improvements within the development would be constructed to City standards. Finck explained that the pavement on Enchantment Road is already in place noting that staff has generally supported similar requested variances when the construction of the improvement would result in discontinuous sections of curb, gutter and sidewalk. Finck added that the property owner is willing to sign a waiver of right to protect future assessments for the improvements.

Schmidt asked if Finck had used a scientific method to determine that 50% of the residents of the proposed development would have vehicles. Finck responded that the residents will be similar to the residents of the Echo Ridge facility and a shuttle service will be provided for the use of the residents. Discussion followed concerning the number of staff at the facility, transportation options for residents of the facility, the number of residents likely to drive vehicles, the description of a twin home, street lighting within the proposed facility, and the proposed internal sidewalk system.

Prairie Chicken asked if a landscaping buffer would be provided. Finck identified some of the proposed landscaping on the preliminary landscaping plan for the associated Planned Residential Development.

Nash advised that he lives close to the existing Echo Ridge facility and stated that the residents and property management have proved to be good neighbors

33. No. 04CA041 – MJK Subdivision

A request by Dream Design International, Inc. to consider an application for an **Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the designation of a Collector Street to a Sub-Collector Street on the Major Street Plan** on Tract A of Tract B of Parcel C, MJK Subdivision, SE1/4 SW1/4 of Section 18, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, legally described as a portion of Tract B of Parcel C, MJK Subdivision residing within the S1/2 SW1/4 Section 18, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the northeast corner of Elm Avenue and Enchanted Pines Drive.

Fisher presented the request and reviewed the associated slides. Fisher noted that a Layout Plat in this area was approved earlier this year. Fisher explained the proposal for road improvements, reviewed the staff report and noted staff's recommendation for denial of the requested amendment.

Hani Shafai, applicant, advised that the engineering plans were designed with the street as a subcollector based on meetings with City staff. Shafai referred to a letter dated December 2, ~~2004~~ 2002 noting that the property owner is requesting that the road be designated as a subcollector. Shafai related information from a 2002 meeting and discussed future interconnectivity between S.D. Highway 79 and 5<sup>th</sup> Street. Shafai explained that most houses in the proposed development will be single family residences. Shafai stated his opinion that two collector streets within 1000 feet of each other are excessive.

Schmidt noted that the Major Street Plan identifies the proposed road as a collector street and requested clarification concerning the basis for designing the road as a subcollector street. Shafai stated that during discussions two years ago City staff had indicated that consideration would be given to changing the road to a subcollector. Shafai commented that it was his understanding at that time that staff would support the proposed Major Street Plan Amendment.

Shafai reviewed a number of existing areas in South Robbinsdale where collector streets were not required. Shafai expressed concern that designing the street as a collector additional traffic would be encouraged through the proposed residential development.

Discussion followed concerning likely growth in the area and traffic issues in existing residential neighborhoods that were constructed without collector streets.

Fisher clarified that staff has given consideration to the proposed designation of the street as a subcollector and determined that it is appropriate to continue the design of the street as a collector.

Shafai reviewed the anticipated traffic connections in the developing area and stated his opinion that there would be sufficient collector streets within the area.

In response to a question from Schmidt, Shafai stated that the property owner is not concerned with the costs associated with developing a collector status street,