



MINUTES OF THE
RAPID CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
May 25, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT: Peter Anderson, Doug Andrews, Ida Fast Wolf, Debra Hadcock, Scott Nash, Mel Prairie Chicken and Ethan Schmidt.

STAFF PRESENT: Marcia Elkins, Karen Bulman, and Risë Ficken

Nash called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

Canyon Lake Overlay Proposed Ordinance

Elkins advised that the Ordinance Amendment was not advertised for consideration at this Special Planning Commission meeting although notice was properly given for the Special meeting. Elkins indicated that the Planning Commission would take public comment on the proposed Canyon Lake Overlay Ordinance at this time. Elkins clarified that the formal public hearing for the proposed Ordinance Amendment will occur at the Planning Commission meeting on June 23, 2005 at 7:00 a.m. in Council Chambers.

Bulman explained that the proposed Ordinance Amendment to create the Canyon Lake Overlay District was drafted in response to concerns expressed by neighborhood residents regarding the continued development of multi-family and apartment facilities in the area. Bulman reviewed the key elements of the proposed Canyon Lake Overlay District noting that the proposed regulations would apply to multi-family development consisting of three or more units.

Hadcock entered the meeting at this time.

Bulman advised that she has received several telephone calls from elderly residents, who couldn't attend the meeting, offering support for the proposed Ordinance Amendment. Bulman reviewed the letter from Kent Kennedy, Kennedy Design Group, that had been distributed to the Planning Commission requesting removal of the provision requiring developers of three or more units to submit a Planned Development application.

In response to a question from Schmidt concerning setback requirements, Bulman advised that staff reviewed the setback requirements currently adopted by several communities in the region. Bulman noted that side yard setbacks in these communities range from eight to thirty feet, with 15 feet most commonly used.

Anderson expressed concern that because many of the streets in the neighborhood are substandard the requirements specified in proposed Section 17.58.100 are not practical.

Elkins indicated that it is the intent of the proposed Overlay District to restrict the construction of multi-family dwellings consisting of three or more units on streets that do not meet City standards based on the comments received from area residents. Elkins added that variances to the requirements can be requested noting that there would be an opportunity for the community to comment on those requests. Elkins stated that the Planned Development process also includes provisions for the Planning Commission and ultimately the City Council to grant exceptions.

In response to a question from Prairie Chicken concerning the outdoor lighting



requirements, Elkins advised that this provision requires the use of outdoor lighting designed to direct lighting downward and/or the use of lighting shields to prevent light from flooding onto adjacent property. Schmidt requested clarification concerning whether lighted house numbers would be permitted in the district. Elkins stated that the intent of the requirement is to prohibit the use of residential signage with internal lighting that would glow into the neighborhood. Elkins suggested that the Planning commission might want to consider revisions to the sign standards to make provisions for lighted house numbers.

Schmidt expressed concern that the requirement for compliance with the Street Design Criteria Manual limits the development of multi-family structures in the neighborhood. Elkins responded that the neighborhood residents indicated that they do not feel it is appropriate to introduce the additional traffic that results from typical multi-family development along substandard streets.

Schmidt noted that some property owners purchased Medium Density Residential zoned property in this area for future multi-family development. In response to a question from Schmidt, Elkins advised that all property owners within the neighborhood boundaries were notified of the meeting.

Andrews expressed concern that because most of the roads in this neighborhood are substandard it will create a situation where no one can develop multi-family properties. Elkins stated that applications for development would be reviewed through the Planned Development process on a case by case basis noting that there may be some streets in the neighborhood that meet City standards.

Schmidt stated that he is very sensitive to the concerns of the neighborhood residents.

Anderson expressed concern that the requirements of the Overlay District will add costs to development projects and make it difficult to comply with the regulations. Elkins clarified that the proposed regulations do not apply to single family or duplex development. Elkins noted that many projects would trigger the need to request a variance or an exception to the requirements. Elkins added that through the Planned Development process the Planning Commission may approve, disapprove, or change elements of a particular proposal.

Discussion followed concerning the possibility for the neighborhood to decline in value from a lack of interest from the development community, other neighborhoods in Rapid City that have expressed interest in the creation of additional Overlay Districts, and methods used by other communities to address similar issues.

Doug Thrash, 2109 Monte Vista Drive, expressed support for the proposed Overlay District. D. Thrash described parking issues associated with an apartment development on the property adjacent to his home. D. Thrash indicated that he feels the Overlay District will help prevent similar problems and protect the neighborhood.

Abby Thrash, 2109 Monte Vista Drive, expressed concern regarding the construction of a new ten unit multi-family development on Elmhurst Drive. A. Thrash stated that she loves the location of her home, the mature trees, the proximity to parks and the historical value of the neighborhood. A. Thrash spoke in support of the proposed Overlay District as a method to keep the neighborhood a desirable place to live.



Edna Steinberg, 2030 Elmhurst Drive, advised that there will be parking problems as a result of the ten unit apartment complex under construction on her street. Steinberg described existing traffic problems along the narrow street and expressed concern that children from the apartments will not have a place to play. Steinberg stated she likes the family character of the neighborhood.

Discussion followed concerning the potential to rezone property in the area from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential.

Steve Brendan, area property owner, stated that the streets in the neighborhood are inadequate. Brendan advised that a new ten unit apartment complex is under construction on Elmhurst Drive, noting that the street is 17 feet wide. Brendan encouraged the Planning Commission to adopt the proposed Overlay District. Brendan indicated that until such time as the streets are reconstructed and sidewalks installed, multi-family development in this neighborhood is not realistic. Brendan questioned the need for additional apartments in Rapid City. Brendan stated that he feels the Overlay District will contribute to public safety in the neighborhood.

Discussion followed concerning the notices that were mailed to neighborhood property owners, existing zoning designations within the boundaries of the proposed Overlay District, the maintenance and repair of City streets, assessment projects, easements and condemnation processes.

Mary Alice Noble, 2023 Twin Elms Drive, stated that she purchased her home as a place to raise her family and retire. Noble indicated that there is currently a proposal for a four unit apartment complex adjacent to her property. Noble expressed concern regarding problems at existing apartments in the area. Noble reviewed the results of her research identifying 26 vacant apartment units within a four block radius of her home. Noble stated that she does not want additional apartment complexes in the neighborhood.

Harold Safgren, area property owner, requested clarification concerning the origination of the Overlay District. Nash indicated that a number of apartment complexes have been constructed in the neighborhood in the last several years causing serious concerns among area residents. Safgren expressed concern that the proposed Overlay District will make it difficult to construct a house on a small, empty lot he owns on Elmhurst Drive. Elkins clarified that the proposed changes do not affect the regulations for single family residences and duplexes. Elkins reviewed the existing setback requirements.

Discussion followed concerning the variances that were obtained by the developer of the ten unit apartment complex currently under construction on Elmhurst Drive. Safgren expressed concern regarding the limitations that the Overlay District would place on the ability to develop his property in a similar manner.

In response to a question from Schmidt, Elkins advised that staff drafted the proposed Ordinance Amendment at the direction of the Planning Commission. Elkins reviewed the history of the related issues in the neighborhood, the tour of the area by the Planning Commission, and subsequent public meetings to discuss the proposed Overlay District. Elkins added that there have been discussions concerning this issue at the City Council level as well. Elkins emphasized that the intent of the Ordinance is to protect this



neighborhood from re-development impacts. Discussion followed concerning methods to improve properties in the area that have fallen into disrepair.

Discussion followed concerning the process to rezone properties in the neighborhood to Low Density Residential District.

Andrews stated that some property owners may feel that their property has been devalued as a result of the Overlay District. Andrews noted that there are some large lots in the area and the Overlay District will make it difficult for people to develop a three or four unit complex.

Dr. David Schwietert, advised that he owns a commercially zoned property on Jackson Boulevard. Schwietert discussed the upcoming changes to this area resulting from the reconstruction of Jackson Boulevard and requested clarification concerning how the proposed Overlay District would affect the potential for rezoning of residential properties along Jackson Boulevard to commercial in the future. Elkins stated that the proposed Ordinance Amendment does not affect the rezoning process. Elkins indicated that the Future Land Use Plan for this neighborhood would address future zoning issues noting there are a variety of opinions in the neighborhood concerning whether the land uses in that area should change.

In response to a question from Schmidt, Elkins discussed elements of the Street Design Criteria Manual noting that the neighborhood area residents do not feel it is appropriate to construct multi-family structures on substandard streets. Elkins added that this is a significant issue for the neighborhood and this Ordinance is an attempt to address the resident's concerns regarding access and traffic issues on streets that are too narrow.

Steve Brendan, stated that the requirement for street improvements will ensure that a private developer constructs a meaningful project. Brendan added that he feels there is the potential for development to occur from the perimeter of the neighborhood boundaries. Brendan added that he feels the street requirements are appropriate and will encourage orderly as opposed to haphazard development in the area.

Elkins reminded the audience that the formal public hearing for the proposed Ordinance Amendment will be considered at the June 23, 2005 Planning Commission meeting at 7:00 a.m. in Council Chambers. Elkins encouraged the members of the audience to attend the meeting and provide written comments.

There being no further business, Schmidt moved, Andrews seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m. (6 to 0 with Anderson, Andrews, Fast Wolf, Hadcock, Nash, Prairie Chicken and Schmidt voting yes and with none voting no)