

MINUTES OF THE
RAPID CITY SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION
July 27, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Erik Braun, John Brewer, Eric Christianson, Julie Gregg, Doug Kinniburgh, Dennis Landguth, Linda Marchand, Dennis Popp, Kay Rippentrop and Pat Wyss. Dave Davis, Council Liaison was also present

STAFF PRESENT: Marcia Elkins, Monica Heller, Tim Behlings, James Johns, Mike Schad and Carol Campbell.

Gregg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Wyss stated that his office has provided services for the area and also stated that they are not currently active in any project in the area. Wyss added that he does not believe there is a conflict of interest for the purposes of discussion and voting.

1. 10TP017 – Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study – Draft Report

Heller presented a brief overview of the Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study. Heller added that the purpose of the study was to identify an alternative alignment for access in and out of the Chapel Valley area. Heller further noted that the purpose of the study was to identify an alternative access to provide emergency services should the primary access be blocked for any reason. She noted the need for an alternative access for the convenience of the residents as well. Heller reviewed the 40 Unit Rule as it applies to commercial and residential neighborhoods. Heller reviewed the numerous neighborhood meetings that have been conducted to gather input for the area residents. Heller reviewed the numerous alternatives evaluated through the Study. Heller noted that the Study identified Alternative G as the most feasible access alignment. Heller reviewed the history of the discussions relative to the need for a second access into Chapel Valley and further noted that this is not a new issue.

In response to Landguth's question regarding how much of Alignment "G" is in the canyon, Heller identified the portion that would lie in the canyon.

Steve Mousel, 3226 Snowmass Court expressed his opposition to the proposal for a second access into Chapel Valley. Mousel expressed his opinion that the the study was done because of a developer's request to develop property in the area. Mousel stated that the proposed second access would negatively impact to the neighborhood.

Ziggy Hladysz, 4801 Powderhorn Drive stated that he is a geotechnical engineer and commented on his concerns with possible negative impact to the safety of the Chapel Valley neighborhood with a second access as proposed. Hladysz expressed his opinion that the "no action" action would be the acceptable option. Hladysz stated that he feels that the Draft Report is incomplete. Hladysz expressed his opinion that the options would not mitigate the safety risk to the Chapel Valley neighborhood.

William (Chip) Rasmussen, 4826 Steamboat Circle expressed his appreciation to the Planning Commission for holding an evening meeting. Rasmussen expressed his opinion regarding the possible negative impact on traffic flow resulting from the construction of a proposed secondary access. Rasmussen requested that the Planning Commission reject the staff recommendation to approve the proposed Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study – Draft Report.

In response to Merilee McLaughlin's question, Elkins reviewed the annexation history of the neighborhood, the development of the property in the County that did not meet City standards and the adoption of the 40 dwelling unit rule by the City of Rapid City in the early 1990's.

Cory Haeder, area resident expressed his opposition to the proposed secondary access.

Marilee McLaughlin expressed her opposition to the original purposes that initiated the Study. McLaughlin requested that the Planning Commission reject the Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study – Draft Report.

Mike Derby, owner of Canyon Lake Resort expressed his opinion regarding the possibility of further development. Derby requested that the Planning Commission carefully consider the facts and all input regarding the Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study – Draft Report. Derby commented on his respect for the Emergency Management Services and their opinions regarding safety issues related to development in Chapel Valley.

Karen Paugh, area resident expressed her opinions regarding the piece meal planning that occurred with the development of the Valley. Paugh expressed her concerns regarding the possible negative impact of a secondary access on pedestrian/bicycle safety in the area. Paugh objected to the expenditure of tax payer funds on the construction of a secondary access.

Rob Corner, 4780 Idlehurst Lane expressed appreciation to the Planning Commission for their efforts on behalf of the community. Corner expressed his opposition to the recommendations in the Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study – Draft Report and disagreed with the need for a secondary access. Corner requested that the Planning Commission reject the Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study – Draft Report.

Rasmussen expressed his opinion regarding safety issue comments from the Fire Department regarding development previously proposed in Chapel Valley.

Derby clarified the identity of the officials from the Fire Department and the Police Department that comment on safety issues regarding the proposed development of the Canyon Lake Chophouse and Resort.

Christine Sandvik, 4810 Powderhorn Drive expressed her concern with the possible negative impact to the area from increased traffic as a result of the secondary access. Sandvik requested that consideration be given to the

construction of an emergency only access.

In response to Landguth's question regarding development plans with other routes that would possibly mitigate any additional traffic to Red Rock Canyon Road, Heller identified existing and proposed road alignments on the adopted Major Street Plan. Heller reviewed current and possible development patterns of the Rapid City area.

In response to Landguth's question regarding potential routes diverting traffic from the Red Rock Canyon area, Heller reviewed possible alternative connectivity.

In response to Braun's questions regarding road alignments proposed at the time of development, Elkins stated that the recommendation contained in the study is to place the future road alignment on the Major Street Plan. Elkins added that there is no short term plan to construct the road nor is there any development proposed at this time. Elkins commented that staff is trying to identify possible connections for long range planning.

In response to Braun's question regarding reasoning to preserve the connectivity now rather than in the future, Elkins stated that placing it on the Major Street Plan preserve the corridors to protect the taxpayers in the future and would precludes building within those proposed connections. Elkins added that the Major Street Plan is a long term plan to protect the corridors to the benefit of the taxpayers.

In response to Kinniburgh's question regarding the 40 unit rule criteria, Elkins stated that previous Planning Commissions have denied requests that would increase the density of a neighborhood. Discussion followed.

Wyss expressed his opinion in support of the 40 Unit Rule standards. Wyss expressed his support for consideration of the opinions of the Emergency staff. Wyss added that he believes there is a need for a secondary access. Wyss requested further assessment of the Study with regard to ranking relating to developer cost. Wyss stated that the original purpose of the Report is to create a second access and not a collector street.

Marchand expressed her concern that the recommended alignment proposal is still flood prone.

Landguth expressed his concern with the safety of the neighborhood and the opposition from the area residents to provide a second access. Landguth expressed his support for the need to provide an emergency access and evacuation plan.

Scott Grote, 4914 Steamboat Circle expressed his concern with the possible negative impact on the neighborhood resulting from increased traffic associated with the proposed secondary access. Grote expressed his opinion regarding safety issues, possible development and the creation for an emergency egress point.

Braun expressed his support for second access route. Braun further stated that the proposed secondary access should be provided through development. Braun expressed his opinion that further review is needed for the Draft Report.

In response to Landguth's question regarding reclassification of the proposed alignment to a lower level or an emergency access, Elkins reviewed an option that the Planning Commission could instruct staff to send the information back to consultant to focus on issue of emergency and safety access and bring back to the Planning Commission with proposed revisions. Discussion followed.

In response to Landguth's question regarding short-term mitigation in the area of risk management, Hladysz expressed his opinion that, temporarily, no action is better than action. Discussion followed.

Brewer expressed his support for an alternative access.

Brewer moved and Wyss seconded to direct staff to send the Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study – Draft Report back to the Consultant with a focus to provide a safe exit.

Braun suggested a friendly amendment to the motion to request that the Police and Fire Emergency Services staff be included in the discussion. Elkins stated that staff would take that direction and include the Emergency Management staff in the discussion. Discussion followed.

Tim Behlings commented on short term safety issues and on the actions that can be taken by the neighborhood to mitigate effects from Fire Hazard. Behlings requested that the neighborhood continue to work with the Fire Department to create and implement a plan to mitigate any fire hazard. Behlings elaborated on options to mitigate the fire hazard issues in the neighborhood.

In response to Landguth's question regarding the study of the safety issues relative to road alignments, Elkins stated that she understood the Planning Commission's direction to include brainstorming the issues in a broader perspective with the emergency management.

Elkins requested clarification as to whether the Planning Commission's direction to staff included presenting the updated draft for review by property owners prior to the next review by the Planning Commission. Discussion followed.

Christianson expressed his support for additional neighborhood involvement.

Corner thanked the Planning Commission for pursuing the option that has been presented. Corner expressed his support for reconstruction of the bridge.

Brewer moved, Wyss seconded and unanimously carried to direct staff to send the Chapel Valley Access and Route Alignment Study – Draft Report back to the Consultant with a focus to provide a safe exit and to have an additional neighborhood meeting before reporting back to the Planning Commission. (10 to 0 with Braun, Brewer, Christianson, Gregg, Kinniburgh,

Landguth, Marchand, Popp, Rippentrop and Wyss voting yes and none voting no)

There being no further business, Landguth moved, Christian seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 a.m. (10 to 0 with Braun, Brewer, Christianson, Gregg, Kinniburgh, Landguth, Marchand, Popp, Rippentrop, and Wyss voting yes and none voting no)