

STAFF REPORT  
July 27, 2006

---

**No. 06SV042 - Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot twice as long as it is wide as per Chapter 16 of the Rapid City Municipal Code**

---

**ITEM 49**

GENERAL INFORMATION:

PETITIONER	CETEC Engineering, Inc. for Park Hill Development, Inc.
REQUEST	<b>No. 06SV042 - Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot twice as long as it is wide as per Chapter 16 of the Rapid City Municipal Code</b>
EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTION	The unplatted balance of the SW1/4 NE1/4, SE1/4 NE1/4, less the Right-of-Way, Section 7, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota
PROPOSED LEGAL DESCRIPTION	Lots 18 thru 35, Block 2; and Lots 14 thru 25, Block 5; and the dedicated public Right-of-Way, Park Meadow Subdivision, located in the SW1/4 NE1/4, SE1/4 NE1/4, less the Right-of-Way, Section 7, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota
PARCEL ACREAGE	Approximately 11.97 acres
LOCATION	At the northern terminus of Smith Avenue
EXISTING ZONING	Medium Density Residential District - Low Density Residential District
SURROUNDING ZONING	
North:	Medium Density Residential District - Low Density Residential District
South:	Medium Density Residential District - Low Density Residential District
East:	Light Industrial District - Heavy Industrial District
West:	Low Density Residential District
PUBLIC UTILITIES	City sewer and water
DATE OF APPLICATION	6/30/2006
REVIEWED BY	Vicki L. Fisher / Mary Bosworth

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot twice as long as it is wide as per Chapter 16 of the Rapid City Municipal Code be approved.

STAFF REPORT  
July 27, 2006

---

**No. 06SV042 - Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot twice as long as it is wide as per Chapter 16 of the Rapid City Municipal Code**

---

**ITEM 49**

GENERAL COMMENTS:

The applicant has submitted a Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot twice as long as it is wide. In addition, the applicant has submitted a Preliminary Plat to subdivide the subject property into 30 residential lots. (See companion item #06PL103.)

On February 6, 2006, the City Council approved a Layout Plat to subdivide the subject property into 30 lots as shown on this Preliminary Plat. The proposed subdivision is to be known as Phase Four of the Park Meadows Subdivision.

On April 28, 2006, the applicant submitted a Preliminary Plat to subdivide the subject property into 30 residential lots and a Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot twice as long as it is wide. On June 19, 2006, the City Council denied both applications without prejudice at the applicant's request. The applicant has subsequently revised a few of the common lot lines on the plat document and has significantly changed the grade of the street section(s). As such, this Preliminary Plat has been submitted for review and approval.

The property is located at the northern terminus of Smith Avenue and is currently void of any structural development.

STAFF REVIEW:

Staff has reviewed the Variance to the Subdivision Regulations and has noted the following considerations:

Lot Configuration: The Subdivision Regulations states that "...for lots in residential districts having a width of not more than one hundred fifty feet, the lot length shall not be greater than twice the lot width". The proposed Layout Plat identifies that ten of the lots will have a length twice the distance of the width.

The lots are located along the terminus of the cul-de-sac streets. Due to the design of cul-de-sac streets, there is limited lot frontage along the roadway. The subdivision design as shown on this plat is reasonable for the site. In addition, the lot configuration does not create any significant difficulties for use or maintenance. As such, staff is recommending that the Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot twice as long as it is wide be approved.

Legal Notification Requirement: The receipts from the certified mailings have not been returned. Staff will notify the Planning Commission at the July 27, 2006 Planning Commission meeting if this requirement is not met. Staff has not received any calls or inquires regarding this proposal.