

MINUTES OF THE
RAPID CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 4, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandra Beshara, John Brewer, Linda Marchand, Cody Raterman, Kay Rippentrop, Steve Rolinger, Tim R. Rose and Jan Swank. John Roberts, Council Liaison was also present.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos Beatty Jr., Erik Braun, Dennis Popp and Andy Scull

STAFF PRESENT: Brett Limbaugh, Vicki Fisher, Fletcher Lacock, Robert Laroco, Kip Harrington, Patsy Horton, Katherine Palmer, Ted Johnson, Carla Cushman and Andrea Wolff.

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

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

Staff requested that Items 2 and 3 be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

A member of the audience requested that Item 6 be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

Motion by Rolinger seconded by Marchand and unanimously carried to recommend approval of the Consent Agenda Items 1 thru 9 in accordance with the staff recommendations with the exception of Items 2, 3, and 6. (8 to 0 with Beshara, Brewer, Marchand, Raterman, Rippentrop, Rolinger, Rose and Swank voting yes and none voting no)

---CONSENT CALENDAR---

1. Planning Commission approved the March 21, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

4. No. 13CA003 – Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt the Rapid City Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
Summary of Adoption Action on an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to adopt the Rapid City Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Planning Commission approved the Planning Commission the summary and authorized publication in the Rapid City Journal.

5. No. 13RZ004 - Original Town of Rapid City
A request by Kent Kennedy for Thomas A. Whillock to consider an application for a **Rezoning from High Density Residential District to Office Commercial District** for Lots 22 thru 24 of Block 123 of Original Town of Rapid City, located in Section 1, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota,

more generally described as being located at 726 South Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Rezoning from High Density Residential District to Office Commercial District be approved.

7. No. 13PL025 - Severson Subdivision

A request by Fisk Land Surveying and Consulting Engineers, Inc. for Chad Williams to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for proposed Lots 2A, 2B, 2C and 2D of Severson Subdivision, Lot 2 of Severson Subdivision, located in the SW1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 16, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, South Dakota, more generally described as being located east of Park Drive between Olympic Court and Wonderland Drive.

Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary Subdivision Plan be approved with the following stipulation:

1. **Prior to submittal of a Final Plat application, the plat document shall be revised to include a note stating that townhome lots shall have a six foot exterior maintenance easement on either side of a common lot line to provide adequate room for maintenance, repair and alterations.**

8. No. 13CA005 - Section 27, T1N, R7E

A request by City of Rapid City to consider an application for a **Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the land use designation from Residential to Commercial** for a portion of Lot A of the SE1/4SW1/4 of Section 27, T1N, R7E of the BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more particularly described as: commencing from a found 5/8" rebar with aluminum cap marked "FMG Inc. LS SD 6119" monumenting the W1/16th corner of Section 27, T1N, R7E, BHM also being the southwest corner of said lot and being the true point of beginning; thence, N02°05'38"E along the west line of said property, a distance of 270.51 feet to a found 1/2" iron pin marking the northwest corner of said lot; thence, S88°07'53"E along the north line of said lot, a distance of 524.26 feet to a point of deflection; thence, S1956'15"E, a distance of 291.45 feet to a point of deflection on the south line of said lot; thence, N887'53"W along the south line of said lot, a distance of 316.84 feet to a found 5/8" rebar with plastic cap marked "Renner LS 2652"; thence, N88°07'53"W along the south line of said lot, a distance of 316.75 feet to the true point of beginning, more generally described as being located west of South U.S. Highway 16 and south of Catron Boulevard.

Planning Commission recommended that the Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the future land use designation from Residential to Commercial be approved.

9. No. 13RZ005 - Section 27, T1N, R7E

A request by City of Rapid City to consider an application for a **Rezoning from No Use District to General Commercial District** for Lot A of the SW1/4 of the NW1/4 of Section 26 and Lot A of the SE1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 27, all located in T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located west of South U.S. Highway 16 and south

of Catron Boulevard.

Planning Commission recommended that Rezoning from No Use District to General Commercial District be approved, in conjunction with approval of the associated Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

---END OF CONSENT CALENDAR---

---BEGINNING OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS---

Items 2 and 3 were heard concurrently

2. No. 12RZ019 - Section 18, T1N, R8E

A request by Renner and Associates, LLC for Parkview Estate LLC to consider an application for a **Rezoning from Low Density Residential District to Medium Density Residential District** for a portion of the W1/2 of the NW1/4 of the SW 1/4, Section 18, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota more fully described as follows: Commencing at south section 1/16th corner, on the west line of Section 18, T1N, R8E, BHM, common to the east line of Section 13, T1N, R7E, BHM, and the point of beginning; Thence, first course: N00°11'02"E, along the section line common to said Sections 13 and 18, a distance of 500.00 feet; Thence, second course: S89°17'02"E, a distance of 165.05 feet, to a point on the westerly boundary of Tract A, of Block 19, of Robbinsdale Addition No. 10; Thence, third course: S00°14'30"E, along the westerly boundary of said Tract A, a distance of 500 feet, to a point on the northerly boundary of Lot H1 in Lot A Revised of the N1/2 of Government Lot 4, Section 18, T1N, R8E, BHM, common to the section 1/16th line; Thence, fourth course: N89°18'01"W, along the said section 1/16th line, a distance of 168.76 feet, to the said point of beginning, more generally described as being located east of Parkview Drive and south of East Minnesota Street.

*3. No. 12PD043 - Section 18, T1N, R8E

A request by Renner and Associates, LLC for Parkview Estate LLC to consider an application for an **Initial and Final Planned Development Overlay to Allow a Townhome Development** for the unplatted balance of the W1/2 of the NW1/4 of the SW1/4 of Section 18, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located southeast of the intersection of Parkview Drive and East Minnesota Street.

Lacock presented the applications and reviewed the slides. Lacock noted that the applicant is proposing to rezone that portion of the property that is currently zoned Low Density Residential District to Medium Density Residential District to allow the entire property to be zoned Medium Density Residential District. Additionally, the applicant has submitted an Initial and Final Planned Development Overlay to Allow a Townhome Development to allow a total of 24 townhome units. Lacock noted that the townhome units are proposed to be located along Parkview Drive and that the development will have seven access points in lieu of 24 individual access points. Lacock stated that these items had been pulled from the Consent Agenda because staff had received a letter of

opposition with multiple neighboring property owner signatures. Lacock stated that staff recommends that the **Rezoning from Low Density Residential District to Medium Density Residential District** be approved in conjunction with the Initial and Final Planned Development Overlay and that the **Initial and Final Planned Development Overlay to Allow a Townhome Development** be approved with stipulations.

David Papen, Countryside Enterprises, the contractor of the townhome units, spoke in support of the development stating that the units will be higher end units with open green space and landscaping that they feel will be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

In response to a question from Brewer regarding drainage, Johnson confirmed that there is an existing drainage channel and that engineering has reviewed the plans and believe that the current drainage and the proposed on site detention will be sufficient for the additional demand. Additionally, the drainage channel will provide a buffer.

In response to a question from Rose to whether this property was affected by the revised FEMA mapping, Johnson confirmed that it was not.

Brewer addressed the petition signed by a number of neighbors expressing concern regarding the potential increase in traffic that this development could generate and requested that staff address the traffic impact. Fisher noted that plans show that there will only be seven approaches to the 24 units rather than 24 individual approaches which should help to minimize the traffic impact.

Rolinger moved, Swank seconded to recommend that the Rezoning from Low Density Residential District to Medium Density Residential District be approved in conjunction with the Final Planned Development Overlay and that the;

Initial and Final Planned Development Overlay to allow a townhome development be approved with the following stipulations:

- 1. A building permit shall be obtained prior to any construction and a Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained prior to occupancy;**
- 2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a Development Engineering Plan shall be approved;**
- 3. Prior to issuance of a building permit, access easements shall be dedicated for the townhome driveways and a copy shall be submitted to Community Planning and Development Services Department;**
- 4. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, a Final Plat shall be approved;**
- 5. Upon submittal of a building permit, plans shall be prepared and stamped by a licensed Architect or Professional Engineer as per SDCL 36-18A;**
- 6. Temporary or permanent site stabilization shall be achieved prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy;**
- 7. An Air Quality Construction Permit shall be obtained prior to any**

- surface disturbance of one acre or more;
8. All provisions of the underlying zoning must be met unless otherwise specifically authorized as a stipulation of this Initial and Final Planned Development Overlay or a subsequent Major Amendment;
 9. All applicable provisions of the adopted International Fire Code shall continually be met; and,
 10. The Initial and Final Planned Development shall allow for a townhome development with a “common lot”. Any change in use that is a permitted use in the underlying zoning district shall require the review and approval of a Minimal Amendment. Any change in use that is a Conditional Use in the underlying zoning district shall require the review and approval of a Major Amendment to the Planned Development. (7 to 1 with Beshara, Brewer, Marchand, Raterman, Rippentrop, Rolinger and Swank voting yes and Rose voting no)

The Rapid City Planning Commission's action on this item is final unless any party appeals that decision to the Rapid City Council. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Department of Community Planning & Development Services by close of business on the seventh full calendar day following action by the Planning Commission.

6. No. 13CA004 - Sections 26 and 35, T1N, R7E

A request by Dream Design International, Inc. to consider an application for an **Amendment to Comprehensive Plan to revise the Major Street Plan** for the unplatted balance of the S1/2 of the SE1/4 of the NW1/4, the unplatted balance of the NE1/4 of the SW1/4, Lot B of the SW1/4 of the SW1/4 less the right-of-way, the SE1/4 of the SW1/4 all located in Section 26, T1N, R7E; and, the NW1/4 of the NW1/4 less Lot H1 and less right-of-way, the NE1/4 of the NW1/4, the SW1/4 of the NW1/4 less Lot H1 and less Lot H2, the SE1/4 of the NW1/4, the N1/2 of the N1/2 of the N1/2 of the N1/2 of the N1/2 of the W1/2 of the SW1/4 and the NE1/4 of the SW1/4, all located in Section 35, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located south of Catron Boulevard and west of South Highway 16, more generally described as being located south of Catron Boulevard and east of South Highway 16.

Harrington presented the application reviewing the slides and stating that the main change on the proposed principal arterial road is the realignment of Moon Meadows Road as it extends to the east in a more northern path before meeting up with Sammis Trail. Harrington noted that the proposed collector street identified in the Comprehensive Plan that runs north and south is not developed to date and that it would be shifted slightly to the west on the northern section and to the east on the southern end when it is developed.

Casey Peterson, 8583 Dreamscape Road, inquired as to the definition of a Comprehensive Plan, Fisher clarified that a Comprehensive Plan is generally defined as looking at the area as a whole and determining, based on the type of plan such as Major Street Plan, Draining Plan, Future Land Use, etc, that the needs of the neighborhood are being met while serving the needs of the

community as a whole. Fisher stated that this being the Major Street Plan, it looks at those main street sections that carry traffic east to west and north to south as best supported by the terrain. Peterson pointed out that he feels the current property owners will be adversely effected by light pollution from headlights of cars traveling on the realigned Moon Meadows Road. Fisher stated that the City has had discussions with the underlying property owners to provide some form of separation between the road and properties to the east but to date no decision has been made.

Discussion followed.

In response to Peterson's question regarding development of future roads, Harrington stated that any future roads will be required to provide access equal to or better than that of existing roads. Fisher further stated that staff will take the local road needs into consideration as development of the area moves forward.

In response to Petersons request that a stipulation precluding light pollution to existing properties be included, Fisher stated that that would be difficult to provide, Fisher further clarified that this is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and that Planning Commission either approves or denies the request; however, she offered a stipulation that physical access be maintained to existing properties throughout construction be added.

Discussion followed.

Rolinger moved, Swan seconded and unanimously carried to recommended that the Amendment to the adopted Comprehensive Plan to revise the Major Street Plan by realigning a proposed principal arterial street and a proposed collector street be approved with the stipulation:

- 1. That physical access be maintained during construction of the streets. (8 to 0 with Beshara, Brewer, Marchand, Raterman, Rippentrop, Rolinger, Rose and Swank voting yes and none voting no)**

*10. No. 13PD006 - Cleary Subdivision

A request by Geiger Architecture for Mary E. Buhman dba Rockin' Heart, LLC to consider an application for a **Major Amendment to a Planned Unit Development to Allow a Small Animal Hospital** for Lot A less Lot H1 of Cleary Subdivision, located in Section 26, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Catron Boulevard and Wellington Drive.

Lacock presented the application noting that the application had been continued to allow the proposed signage to be addressed under the newly revised Sign Code in Section 17 of the Rapid City Municipal Code that allows the Planning Commission to review the signage. Lacock reviewed the slides showing the revised signage. Lacock noted that the applicant has requested a larger sign than is allowed in a residential district, but is within the allowable signage for a commercial use within a residential area. Lacock stated that staff has received

public comments against the increased signage and one in favor. Lacock stated that staff recommends approval of the **Major Amendment to a Planned Unit Development to Allow a Small Animal Hospital** with stipulations.

Swank noted that he will be abstaining from this item due to a conflict of interest.

Karen Bulman, 1311 Edinborough Drive, speaking for the neighborhood, stated that the neighbors are supportive of the veterinarian clinic; however, their concern is the size and the lighting of the pole sign.

In response to a question from Rolinger regarding the commercial use signage in a residential district, Fisher stated that this is unique as it is one of the few Planned Unit Developments in the city and that the commercial use allows the signage, but the underlying residential zoning has lesser allowances for signage.

Lee Geiger, Geiger Architecture, representing the applicant stated that they had met with the neighbors and had addressed their concerns and presented handouts regarding the signs. Geiger addressed the sign placement and size showing the sign in reference to the sightline and size perspective to the building and surrounding landscaping and the adjacent development. Geiger stated that they feel the sign will be less detrimental than the current sign and that the lighting of the sign will only be during business hours and not continuously lit.

Dr. Mary Buhman, the applicant, stated that there would be continuous lighting at the entries of the building to provide security and also requested that the building signage be allowed to be continuously lit.

In response to Rolinger's question regarding lit signage on the actual building and if the sign will be lit during business hours or continuously, Geiger stated that there would be a lit sign on the north side of the building on the Catron Boulevard side facing away from the development. Rolinger asked if it was possible to compromise with the number of lit signs. Geiger stated that the post sign provides greater visibility as it is perpendicular to Catron Boulevard traffic and requested that the pole sign be lit due to its visibility to the road. Geiger stated that they are willing to meet a stipulation to the hours of lighting the signs.

Raterman moved, Rolinger seconded to approve with stipulations as revised to limit the hours that the pole sign could be lit.

Discussion followed.

Fisher clarified that the Planned Unit Development is designed to serve the residents of the Planned Unit Development and cautioned that should this item be approved by the Planning Commission with too broad of stipulations it could be appealed to Council, who could overturn the Planning Commission's decision.

Bulman stated that the general concern of the neighbors was the commercialization of the property so close to their residential properties. They are not adverse to the building sign being lit but request that the pole sign, if

allowed, not be lit continuously.

Roberts left the meeting at this time.

Raterman moved, Rolinger seconded to approve the Major Amendment to a Planned Unit Development to allow a small animal hospital with the following stipulations:

- 1. An Exception is hereby granted to allow a 15 foot high by 17 foot 6 inch wide dual pole sign with 56 square feet of sign space, a wall sign measuring 60 square feet on the west side of the building and a wall sign measuring 20 square feet on the south side of the building. No electronic reader board signs are being permitted as a part of this approval. Changes to the proposed sign package, which the Community Planning and Development Services Director determines to be consistent with the original approved sign package, shall be allowed as a Minimal Amendment. All signage not in conformance with the Sign Code or any electronic reader board signs shall require the review and approval of a Major Amendment to the Planned Unit Development. Lighting for the signs shall be designed to preclude shining on the adjacent properties and/or street(s). The pole sign shall not be lit after 9:00 p.m. A sign permit shall also be obtained for the proposed signs;**
- 2. A building permit shall be obtained prior to any construction and a Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained prior to occupancy;**
- 3. Upon submittal of a building permit, plans shall be submitted showing the location of sanitary sewer and water services to the building;**
- 4. Upon submittal of a building permit, a revised parking plan shall be submitted showing the “van accessible” aisle on the right side of the “van accessible” parking space. In addition, a minimum of 17 parking spaces shall be provided. One of the parking spaces shall be handicap “van accessible”. All provisions of the Off-Street Parking Ordinance shall be continually met;**
- 5. Upon submittal of a building permit, construction plans shall be submitted showing the re-establishment of curb and gutter along the westernmost access approach;**
- 6. Upon submittal of a building permit, plans shall be prepared and stamped by a licensed Architect or Professional Engineer as per SDCL 36-18A;**
- 7. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall execute and record a Waiver of Right to Protest for the future installation of property line sidewalk along Catron Boulevard and Wellington Drive as per Chapter 12.08.060 of the Rapid City Municipal Code. In addition, a copy of the recorded document shall be submitted with the building permit application;**
- 8. Temporary or permanent site stabilization shall be achieved prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy;**
- 9. The disposal of animal waste shall comply with the applicant’s**

- operations plan;
10. The outdoor dog walk area for hospitalized animals shall be fenced with a 6 foot high screening fence as proposed by the applicant;
 11. The area of the structure used for animals shall be sound proofed and air conditioned;
 12. A minimum of 90,198 landscaping points shall be provided. All provisions of Section 17.50.300, the Landscape Regulations of the Rapid City Municipal Code shall be continually met. All landscaping shall be continually maintained in a live vegetative state and replaced as necessary;
 13. All outdoor lighting shall be reflected within the property boundaries so as to not shine onto adjoining properties and rights-of-way and to not be a hazard to the passing motorist or constitute a nuisance of any kind;
 14. All applicable provisions of the adopted International Fire Code shall continually be met; and,
 15. The Major Amendment to the Planned Unit Development shall allow for a small animal hospital operated in compliance with the applicant's operational plan. No outdoor kenneling shall be allowed. In addition, no cremation shall be allowed. Any change in use shall require the review and approval of a Major Amendment to the Planned Unit Development. (8 to 0 to 1 with Beshara, Brewer, Marchand, Raterman, Rippentrop, Rolinger and Rose voting yes and none voting no and Swank abstaining)

The Rapid City Planning Commission's action on this item is final unless any party appeals that decision to the Rapid City Council. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Department of Community Planning & Development Services by close of business on the seventh full calendar day following action by the Planning Commission.

11. No. 13PL018 - Dunsmore Road Subdivision

A request by Dream Design International, Inc. to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for proposed Lots 1 through 4 of Dunsmore Road Subdivision, legally described as that portion of the SW1/4 of the SW1/4 and the SE1/4 of the SW1/4 lying south of Lot H2 and Lot P2, excepting there from the east 480 feet of the SE1/4 of the SW1/4 and excepting there from Moon Meadows Estates and less right-of-way, all located in Section 28, T1N, R7E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the southeast corner of the Sheridan Lake Road and Dunsmore Road intersection.

Fisher presented the application noting that staff placed it on non-consent to allow Planning Commissioner Braun to abstain due to his association with the applicant Dream Design. Fisher stated that staff recommends approval of the **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** with stipulations.

Marchand moved, Rose seconded and unanimously carried to recommend

that the Preliminary Subdivision Plan be approved with the following stipulations:

1. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Sheridan Lake Road shall be submitted for review and approval. In particular, the construction plans shall show the street constructed with a minimum 36 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, water and the dedication of ten additional feet of right-of-way or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved Exception shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
2. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Moon Meadows Drive shall be submitted for review and approval. In particular, the construction plans shall show the street constructed with a minimum 36 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, sewer, water and the dedication of 17 additional feet of right-of-way or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved Exception shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
3. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Dunsmore Road shall be submitted for review and approval. In particular, the construction plans shall show the street constructed with a minimum 36 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, sewer, water and the dedication of 17 additional feet of right-of-way or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved Exception shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
4. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a plat document shall be submitted showing a principal arterial street extending through the property in compliance with the Major Street Plan. In addition, construction plans shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located within a minimum 100 foot wide right-of-way and constructed with a minimum 36 foot wide paved surface, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, sewer and water or an Exception shall be obtained or a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Major Street Plan shall be obtained; If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved Exception shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
5. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a plat document shall be submitted identifying a non-access easement along Sheridan Lake Road and all corner lots in compliance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or an Exception shall be obtained; If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved Exception shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
6. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, water

and sewer plans prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer showing the extension of mains and service lines shall be submitted for review and approval as per the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or an Exception shall be obtained. In addition, the property shall be served by City water and sewer as per Chapter 13.08.520 and 13.16.030 of the Rapid City Municipal Code or an Exception shall be obtained to waive the requirement that a subdivision located within 400 feet of City utilities connect to said utility. A request shall also be presented to City Council to allow a connection to City utilities for a property located outside of the City limits. If Exception(s) are obtained, a copy of the approved Exception(s) shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application. If a private water system is utilized, then an on-site water plan prepared by a Professional Engineer shall be submitted for review and approval. In addition, the water plans shall demonstrate that adequate fire and domestic flows are being provided. If individual on-site wastewater systems are utilized, then an on-site wastewater plan prepared by a Professional Engineer demonstrating that the soils are suitable for on-site wastewater systems shall be submitted for review and approval;

7. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, the design of a sanitary sewer trunk to serve the gravity sewer basin identified in the “Sheridan Lake Road Sanitary Trunk Sewer Extension Project” as it extends through the property shall be submitted for review and approval or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved Exception shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
8. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a drainage plan in compliance with the Arrowhead Drainage Basin Plan shall be submitted for review and approval. In addition, the plat document shall be revised to provide drainage easements as necessary;
9. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, geotechnical analysis and pavement design shall be submitted for review and approval;
10. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan in compliance with the adopted Stormwater Quality Manual and the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual shall be submitted for review and approval
11. Prior to Development Engineering Plan approval, engineering reports required for construction approval shall be accepted and agreements required for construction approval shall be executed. In addition, permits required for construction shall be approved and issued and construction plans shall be accepted in accordance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual. All final engineering reports shall be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer;
12. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a

cost estimate of the required subdivision improvements shall be submitted for review and approval;

13. **Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted and the subdivision inspection fees shall be paid; and,**
 14. **Prior to the City's acceptance of the public improvements, a warranty surety shall be submitted for review and approval as required. In addition, any utilities and drainage proposed outside of the dedicated right-of-way shall be secured within easement(s). (8 to 0 with Beshara, Brewer, Marchand, Raterman, Rippentrop, Rolinger, Rose and Swank voting yes and none voting no)**
12. Discussion Items
None
13. Staff Items
Fisher noted that the number of Planning Commissioners who are part of the Tax Increment Financing Committee is currently two and noted that they need to reduce that number to one. Currently John Brewer and Steve Rolinger are the Planning Commissioners on the TIF Committee.
- In response to Brewer's request for a list of who makes up the TIF Committee, Fisher said she'd have to look into that to provide an answer. Brewer stated that he feels that Tax Increment Financing applications need to be vetted carefully and worries about the reduction of Planning Commissioners on the TIF Committee.
- Rose moved, Marchand seconded and carried to have Rolinger continue on the Tax Increment Finance Committee (7 to 0 with Beshara, Brewer, Marchand, Raterman, Rippentrop, Rolinger, Rose and Swank voting yes and none voting no)**
- Fisher reviewed the Arts in the Park Policy and Placement of items in Parks Policy received from the Parks Department and requested that the Planning Commissioners review these and provide any questions or suggestions to her. In response to a question from Brewer, Fisher pointed out that these items may come forward to Planning Commission for review if a Conditional Use Permit is required.
14. Planning Commission Items
None
15. Committee Reports
None

There being no further business, Raterman moved, Rose seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 a.m. (8 to 0 with Beshara, Brewer, Marchand, Raterman, Rippentrop, Rolinger, Rose and Swank voting yes and none voting no)

