

Draft

MINUTES OF THE
RAPID CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
October 25, 2001

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sam Kooiker, Mel Prairie Chicken, Jeff Hoffmann, Robert Scull, Jeff Stone, Paul Swedlund, Bob Wall, and Stuart Wevik. Ron Kroeger, Council Liaison was also present.

STAFF PRESENT: Marcia Elkins, Vicki Fisher, Lisa Seaman, Karen Bulman, Bill Lass, Bill Knight, Dave Johnson, Randy Nelson, Dave Johnson, Dave LaFrance and Risë Ficken

Chairperson Wevik called the meeting to order at 7:02 a.m.

Wevik 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 8 be removed from the Non-Hearing Consent Agenda for separate consideration. Swedlund requested that Items 10 and 11 be removed from the Non-Hearing Consent Agenda for separate consideration. Dan Ferber requested that Item 13 be removed from the Non-Hearing Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

Scull moved, Stone seconded and carried unanimously to recommend approval of the Non-Hearing Consent Agenda Items 1 through 14 in accordance with the staff recommendations with the exception of Items 8, 10 11 and 13. (8 to 0)

---NON HEARING ITEMS CONSENT CALENDAR---

1. Approval of the October 4, 2001 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
2. No. 01PL064 - Bies Subdivision
A request by FMG, Inc. for Robbins & Stearns to consider an application for a **Layout, Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lot 1 and Lot 2 of Bies Subdivision formerly the unplatted balance of the SE1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 18 located in the SE1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 18, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located west of S. Highway 79, north of Minnesota Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Layout, Preliminary and Final Plat be continued to the November 21, 2001 Planning Commission pending approval of a 404 permit from the Corps of Engineers.

3. No. 01PL079 - Lowe's Subdivision
A request by Ferber Engineering Company to consider an application for a **Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lot 1 and Lot 2 of Lowe's Subdivision formerly Tract CR and Tract 1 of Martley Subdivision located in the NW1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 25, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota,

more generally described as being located on the east side of Haines Avenue between Mall Drive and Disk Drive.

Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary and Final Plat be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting to allow staff additional time to review recently submitted information.

4. No. 01PL096 - Robbinsdale Addition No. 8

A request by Gary Rasmusson to consider an application for a **Final Plat** on Lots 31R through 35R, and Lots 40 through 42, of Block 11, and Lots 1R through 4R, and Lot 26 of Block 13, Robbinsdale Addition No. 8 (formerly Lots 31 through 35, and Lot 36 Rev. of Block 11, and Lots 1 through 4 of Block 13, of Robbinsdale Addition No. 8) Section 18, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the intersection of Sitka Street and Hemlock Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Final Plat be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting.

5. No. 01PL099 - Terracita Park Subdivision

A request by Doug Sperlich for Walgar Development Corp to consider an application for a **Layout, Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lot 1 of Block 1, Terracita Park Subdivision, and Minnesota Street Right-of-Way (formerly a portion of the SW1/4 of the NW1/4 of the SE1/4 of Section 13) located in the SW1/4 of the NW1/4 of the SE1/4 of Section 13, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the intersection of Fifth Street and Minnesota Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Layout, Preliminary and Final Plat be approved with the following stipulations:

Engineering Division Recommendations:

1. **Prior to Preliminary Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall submit corrections to the engineering plans for review and submittal;**
2. **Prior to Preliminary Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall identify a non-access easement along the entire frontage of 5th Street and eastern 175 feet of the Minnesota Street frontage;**
3. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall identify a twenty foot sewer easement along the Fifth Street frontage;**
4. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall dedicate an additional 3.5 feet of right-of-way along the north side of Minnesota Street;**

Urban Planning Division Recommendations:

5. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, the subdivision improvement estimate form shall be submitted for review and approval and the subdivision inspection fees shall be paid; and,**
6. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted.**

6. No. 01PL101 - Rushmore Business Park

A request by Ferber Engineering Company to consider an application for a **Layout, Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lot 3 of Block 1 Rushmore Business Park, Section 4, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located south of Homestead Street and east of Conseco Finance.

Planning Commission recommended that the Layout, Preliminary and Final Plat be approved with the following stipulation:

Engineering Division Recommendations:

1. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall identify a non-access easement along the north side of Homestead Street except for the future intersection of Turbine Street.**

7. No. 01PL102 - Morningstar Ranch

A request by Alliance of Architects for American West Communities to consider an application for a **Layout Plat** on S1/2 of the NE1/4 and the SE1/4 except Bradeen Subdivision of Section 22 and NE1/4 Section 27, T1N, R8E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the intersection of Reservoir Road and South Side Drive.

Planning Commission recommended that the Layout Plat be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting to allow staff to meet with the applicant to discuss issues relative to the plat and to allow the applicant to submit additional information.

9. No. 01PL104 - Mountain View Subdivision

A request by Paul and Sandra Thielen to consider an application for a **Layout Plat** on Lots 1 and 2 of Lot 9 of Block 10 of Mountain View Subdivision, Section 11, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 2216 Cerro Court.

Planning Commission acknowledged the applicant's request to withdraw the Layout Plat application.

12. No. 01PL107 - Village on the Green No. 2

A request by FMG, Inc. for Hart Ranch Development Co. to consider an application for a **Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lot A of Lot 29 and Lot B of Lot 29 of Village on the Green No. 2, Sections 12 and 13, T1S, R7E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the intersection of Mulligan Mile and Hacker Loop.

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

Urban Planning Division Recommendations:

1. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, a subdivision estimate form shall be submitted and all subdivision inspection fees paid;**

2. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted;**
 3. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, a note shall be placed on the plat stating that “a six foot exterior maintenance easement exists on either side of a common lot line to provide adequate room for maintenance, repair and alterations”;**
 4. **A Special Exception to the Street Design Criteria Manual is hereby granted to reduce the right-of-way width from 47 feet to 40 feet; and,**
 5. **A Special Exception to the Street Design Criteria Manual is hereby granted to allow an exclusive access road to serve 43 dwelling units.**
14. No. 01PL109 - Country Club Heights No. 2
A request by Doug Sperlich for Gary Rasmusson to consider an application for a **Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lots 10R and 11R of Block 2 of Country Club Heights No. 2, Section 9, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located on Hogan Court.

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

Engineering Division Recommendations:

1. **Prior to City Council approval of the Final Plat, the plat shall be revised to show a “16 foot wide utility and drainage easement” along the existing common lot line; and,**

Urban Planning Division Recommendations:

2. **Prior to City Council approval of the Final Plat, a Variance to the Subdivision Regulations shall be obtained to allow a lot length greater than twice the lot width or the plat shall be revised to comply with the length to width requirement.**

---END OF NON HEARING ITEMS CONSENT CALENDAR---

8. No. 01PL103 - Enchanted Pines Subdivision
A request by Dream Design International, Inc. to consider an application for a **Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lots 1-6, Block 1; Lots 1-5, Block 2; and Lots 1-9, Block 3 of Enchanted Pines Subdivision, Section 23, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the northern terminus of Enchanted Pines Drive.

Elkins advised that public comment concerning the proposed development was received yesterday afternoon and was distributed on the dais this morning.

Wall moved, Scull seconded and unanimously carried to recommend that the Preliminary and Final Plat be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting. (8 to 0)

Swedlund requested that Items 10 and 11 be considered concurrently.

10. No. 01PL105 - Skyline Pines Subdivision
A request by Doug Sperlich for Skyline Pines Development to consider an application for a **Final Plat** on Lots 1-7, Block 1, Skyline Pines Subdivision, Section 11, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located on Skyline Drive west of Skyview North Subdivision.
11. No. 01PL106 - Skyline Pines Subdivision
A request by Doug Sperlich for Skyline Pines Development to consider an application for a **Final Plat** on Lots 15 and 16 of Block 3 of Skyline Pines Subdivision, Section 11, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located on Pevans Parkway.

Swedlund stated that he does not feel the development of property along Skyline Drive is appropriate noting that he will not vote in favor of any development on Skyline Drive. He added that he feels that undeveloped property along Skyline Drive should be preserved as green space and as a conservation area and he noted that he feels the City of Rapid City should take the initiative to preserve the area.

Wall moved, Scull seconded and carried to recommend that the Final Plat be approved with the following stipulations:

Engineering Division Recommendations:

1. Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall identify a utility easement for water and sewer service lines for Lots 4 and 5 across the adjacent lots to access the mains; and,
2. Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall identify a twenty-foot utility easement along the northern property line of Lot 1 of Block 1;

and, to recommend that the Final Plat be approved with the following stipulations:

Engineering Division Recommendations:

1. Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall identify a twenty-foot utility easement along the northern property line of Lot 15 and a twenty-foot utility easement centered on the common property line;
2. Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, the applicant shall submit revised erosion control/stabilization plans for the subdivision for those locations where the retaining walls have been omitted for review and approval; and,

Urban Planning Division Recommendations:

3. Prior to Final Plat approval by the City council, the applicant shall identify a temporary emergency turn-around easement on the plat.
(6 to 2 with Swedlund and Prairie Chicken voting no)

13. No. 01PL108 - High Sheridan Ranch Subdivision
A request by Ferber Engineering for Raymond J. Crawford III to consider an application for a **Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lot 4R, High Sheridan Ranch

Subdivision, Section 35, T1N, R6E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 23435 Sand Lane.

Dan Ferber, agent for applicant, indicated that he has made changes to the plans and has information that will be submitted later today that will resolve all outstanding issues identified in conversations with the Engineering staff. He reviewed the applicant's plans for the property and requested that the Preliminary and Final Plat be approved with stipulations at this time.

Dave Johnson, Engineering Division, reviewed issues and discussions with the applicant over the last several days and suggested several stipulations that would be appropriate if the application is to be approved at this time.

In response to a question from Wevik, Johnson stated that there is adequate right-of-way for a temporary turn around on the subject property. He added that this information needs to be included on the site plan. He indicated that he feels these issues can be resolved prior to City Council approval.

Discussion followed concerning what conditions of approval staff feels are appropriate for this application.

Scull moved and Hoffmann seconded to consider Item 13 later in the agenda to allow staff to develop conditions of approval of the plat request.

Wall expressed concern that requiring staff to develop recommendations during the meeting is an invitation for missing items.

The motion carried unanimously to consider Item 13 later in the agenda to allow staff to develop conditions of approval of the plat request. (8 to 0)

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

Wall requested that Items 21-23 and 30-31 be removed from the Hearing Consent Agenda for separate consideration. Kooiker requested that Items 19 and 35-37 be removed from the Hearing Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

Scull moved, Stone seconded and carried unanimously to recommend approval of the Hearing Consent Agenda Items 15 through 37 in accordance with the staff recommendations with the exception of Items 19, 21-23, 30, 31 and 35-37. (8 to 0)

---HEARING ITEMS CONSENT CALENDAR---

15. No. 01CA031 - Section 32, T2N, R8E

A request by Theresa Bennington to consider an application for an **Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan revising the Elk Vale Neighborhood Area Future Land Use Plan to change the future land use designation on a 37.20 acre parcel from General Commercial to Heavy Industrial** on NW1/4 SE1/4 SW1/4 Section 32, T2N, R8E; east 613 feet of the north 511 feet of the SW1/4 SW1/4 Section 32, T2N, R8E; E1/2 SE1/4 SW1/4 Section 32, T2N, R8E all located in BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the western terminus of East Philadelphia Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan revising the Elk Vale Neighborhood Area Future Land Use Plan to change the future land use designation on a 37.20 acre parcel from General Commercial to Heavy Industrial Land Use with alternate designation of General Commercial Land Use be approved for the 17.20 acres legally described as the NW1/4 SE1/4 SW1/4 Section 32, T2N, R8E and east 613 feet of the north 511 feet of the SW1/4 SW1/4 Section 32, T2N, R8E and to deny without prejudice the request to change the future land use designation from General Commercial Land Use to Heavy Industrial Land Use on the 20 acre parcel legally described as E1/2 SE1/4 SW1/4 Section 32, T2N, R8E.

16. No. 01CA032 - Skyline Pines East

A request by Wyss Associates for W.E.B. Partners to consider an application for an **Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the future land use designation on a 3.202 acre parcel from Office Commercial to General Commercial** on property described by metes and bounds beginning from a point 1795.13 feet at a bearing S89d39'0"E from the SW corner of the NW1/4 of the SE1/4 of Section 11, T1N, R7E, BHM, travel 431.35 feet at a bearing N22°2'42"W, Then travel 310.56 feet along a 230' LHF curve with a chord bearing N16°38'12" E, Then travel 161.93 feet at a bearing N55°19'17"E, Then travel 227.59 feet at a bearing S34°35'20"E, Then travel 300.07 feet at a bearing S45°W, Then travel 305.00 feet at a bearing S34°36'5"E, Then travel 165.44 feet at a bearing S45°W, Then travel 26.8 feet at a bearing N89°39'0"W, to the point of start, more generally described as being located west of the western terminus of Fairmont Boulevard and north of Tower Road.

Planning Commission recommended that the Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the future land use designation on a 3.202 acre parcel from Office Commercial to General Commercial be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting.

17. No. 01OA019 - Ordinance Amendment

A request by City of Rapid City to consider an application for an Ordinance Amending Chapter 17.50 by adding Section 17.50.335; amending Section 12.20.30 of Chapter 12.20; amending Section 15.40.080 of Chapter 15.40; amending Sections 17.50,230, 17.50.250 (f) (2), 17.50.280 and 17.50.300 of Chapter 17.50 of the Rapid City Municipal Code pertaining to sight triangles.

Planning Commission recommended that the Ordinance Amendment be approved.

18. No. 01OA020 - Ordinance Amendment

A request by City of Rapid City to consider an application for an Ordinance amending Section 17.22.030 of Chapter 17.22 of the Rapid City Municipal Code by adding a new Subsection 17.22.030 (K) allowing wind energy conversion systems in uses permitted on review.

Planning Commission recommended that the Ordinance Amendment be approved.

20. No. 01PD050 - Lowe's Subdivision

A request by Ozark Civil Engineering for Lowe's Companies Inc. to consider an application for a **Planned Commercial Development - Initial and Final Development Plan** on Lots 1 and 2 of Lowe's Subdivision, Section 25, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the intersection of Haines Avenue and Mall Drive.

Planning Commission recommended that the Planned Commercial Development - Initial and Final Development Plan request be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting to allow staff additional time to review the recently submitted information.

24. No. 01PD053 - South Boulevard Addition

A request by Rosenbaum's Signs to consider an application for a **Major Amendment to a Planned Commercial Development** on Lots 12 through 18 of Block 17 of South Boulevard Addition, Section 12, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the intersection of Flormann Street and 7th Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Major Amendment to a Planned Commercial Development be approved with the following stipulations:

Urban Planning Division Recommendations:

1. All previous conditions of approval for the Final Commercial Development Plan #00PD069 shall be continually met with the exception of stipulation #13 regarding the previously approved sign package; and,
2. The sign package shall be revised to allow three 2 foot 10 inch X 48 foot 11 inch non-illuminated pole mounted directional signs to be located in the northwest corner and southwest corner of the subject property and adjacent to the northeast corner of the proposed structure, respectively. In addition, a 5 foot 2 inch X 7 foot internally lit ground shall be allowed at the entrance of the property along Flormann Street. Two non-illuminated wall mounted signs measuring 12 inch X 30 foot 6 inch and a 12 inch X 3 foot, respectively, shall also be allowed along the north side of the proposed structure. In addition,

three 8 inch X 18 inch "open/closed lane" signs and one 8 inch X 48 inch "clearance sign" shall be allowed in the three drive thru lanes.

25. No. 01RZ054 - Skyline Pines East

A request by Wyss Associates for W.E.B. Partners to consider an application for a **Rezoning from Office Commercial District to General Commercial District** beginning from a point 1795.13 feet at a bearing S89°39'0"E from the SW corner of the NW1/4 of the SE1/4 of Section 11, T1N, R7E, BHM, travel 431.35 feet at a bearing N22°2'42"W, Then travel 310.56 feet along a 230' LHF curve with a chord bearing N16°38'12" E, Then travel 161.93 feet at a bearing N55°19'17"E, Then travel 227.59 feet at a bearing S34°35'20"E, Then travel 300.07 feet at a bearing S45°W, Then travel 305.00 feet at a bearing S34°36'5"E, Then travel 165.44 feet at a bearing S45°W, Then travel 26.8 feet at a bearing N89°39'0"W, to the point of start, more generally described as being located west of the western terminus of Fairmont Boulevard and north of Tower Road.

Planning Commission recommended that the Rezoning from Office Commercial District to General Commercial District be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting.

26. No. 01RZ056 - Minnesota Ridge Subdivision

A request by 3 T's Land Development to consider an application for a **Rezoning from Office Commercial District and Low Density Residential District to Low Density Residential II District** on Tract B of Minnesota Ridge Subdivision located in the NW1/4 SE1/4 Section 13, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located west of 5th Street north of Minnesota Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Rezoning from Low Density Residential District to Low Density Residential II District be approved with the condition that prior to City Council approval the applicant shall provide a metes and bounds description of that portion of Tract B that is currently zoned Low Density Residential.

27. No. 01SV027 - Village on the Green No. 2

A request by FMG, Inc. for Hart Ranch Development Co. to consider an application for a **Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow sidewalks on one side of the street** on Lot A of Lot 29 and Lot B of Lot 29 of Village on the Green No. 2, Sections 12 and 13, T1S, R7E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the intersection of Mulligan Mile and Hacker Loop.

Planning Commission recommended that the Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow sidewalks on one side of the street be approved.

28. No. 01SV028 - High Sheridan Ranch Subdivision

A request by Ferber Engineering for Raymond J. Crawford III to consider an application for a **Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to waive the requirement for pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks, lighting conduit, and dry sewer** on Lot 4R, High Sheridan Ranch Subdivision, Section 35, T1N, R6E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 23435 Sand Lane.

Planning Commission recommended that the Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to waive the requirement for pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks, lighting conduit, and dry sewer be approved.

29. No. 01SV029 - Country Club Heights No. 2

A request by Doug Sperlich for Gary Rasmusson to consider an application for a **Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot more than twice as long as it is wide** on Lots 10R and 11R of Block 2 of Country Club Heights No. 2, Section 9, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at Hogan Court.

Planning Commission recommended that the Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot more than twice as long as it is wide be approved.

32. No. 01TI006 - Rushmore Business Park

A request by Rapid City Economic Development Partnership and Fenske Media to consider an application for a **Resolution Creating Tax Increment District No. 33** on Lot 3 of Block 1 Rushmore Business Park, Section 4, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located south of Homestead Street and east of Conseco Finance.

Planning Commission recommended that the Resolution Creating Tax Increment District No. 33 be continued until the December 6, 2001 Planning Commission meeting, to allow platting of the property to be completed.

33. No. 01TI007 - Rushmore Business Park

A request by Rapid City Economic Development Partnership and Fenske Media to consider an application for **Tax Increment District No. 33 Project Plan** on Lot 3 of Block 1 Rushmore Business Park, Section 4, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located south of Homestead Street and east of Conseco Finance.

Planning Commission recommended that the Tax Increment District No. 33 Project Plan be continued until the December 6, 2001 Planning Commission, to allow platting of the property to be completed.

34. No. 01UR037 - Nicholl's Subdivision

A request by Anne Devlin to consider an application for a **Use On Review for a Child Care Center** on Lot 2 less W250', Nicholl's Subdivision, Section 7, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 1241 E. St. Joseph Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Use On Review for a Child Care Center be continued to the November 21, 2001 Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant time to submit additional required information.

---END OF HEARING CONSENT CALENDAR---

---BEGINNING OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS---

19. No. 01PD049 - Fairelm Subdivision
A request by Thurston Design Group for Regional Senior Care to consider an application for a **Major Amendment to a Planned Residential Development to increase the density and allow a nursing home** on Lot B of Fairelm Subdivision, Section 7, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 417 East Fairlane Drive.

Kooiker concurred with staff's concerns with the locking system on the facility and stated his desire that the applicant come into compliance with existing regulations.

Elkins indicated that staff's recommendation to continue the request will allow the applicant to work with the building official in an effort to address these concerns.

Kooiker moved, Wall seconded and unanimously carried to recommend that the Major Amendment to a Planned Residential Development to increase the density and allow a nursing home be continued to the November 21, 2001 Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant time to review the occupancy classification of the building. (8 to 0)

Wall requested that Items 21-23 be considered concurrently.

21. No. 01PD052 - Enchanted Pines Subdivision
A request by Dream Design International, Inc. to consider an application for a **Planned Residential Development - Initial and Final Development Plan** on Lots 1-6, Block 1; Lots 1-5, Block 2; and Lots 1-9, Block 3 of Enchanted Pines Subdivision, Section 23, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the northern terminus of Enchanted Pines Drive.
22. No. 01RZ057 - Enchanted Pines Subdivision
A request by Dream Design International, Inc. to consider an application for a **Rezoning from General Agriculture District to Low Density Residential District** on Lots 1-6, Block 1; Lots 1-5, Block 2; and Lots 1-9, Block 3 of Enchanted Pines Subdivision, Section 23, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the northern terminus of Enchanted Pines Drive.

23. No. 01SV026 - Enchanted Pines Subdivision

A request by Dream Design International, Inc. to consider an application for a **Variance to the Subdivision Regulations to waive the requirement for water, sewer, paving, curb, gutter, sidewalks, and street light conduit and to allow lots more than twice as long as they are wide** on Lots 1-6, Block 1; Lots 1-5, Block 2; and Lots 1-9, Block 3 of Enchanted Pines Subdivision, Section 23, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at the northern terminus of Enchanted Pines Drive.

In response to a question from Wall, Bill Knight, Rapid City Fire Department, clarified that a temporary turn around will be required at the end of the cul-de-sac as part of the conditions of plat approval.

Wall requested clarification concerning improvements to the private easements extending north from the proposed development.

Elkins explained that while private streets are not maintained on the public system the requirement for improvements are the same as for public streets. She indicated that the improvements must be in place prior to platting, surety must be posted for the improvements or a subdivision variance must be obtained.

Discussion followed concerning the subdivision of individual lots within a larger subdivision, septic tank issues and public safety.

Kooiker noted comments written and submitted by the Tuckers and requested clarification concerning what subdivision improvements were required at the time they wanted to subdivide their property.

Discussion followed concerning subdivision improvements and the variance procedures available to all development applicants.

Ken Dewell, attorney representing five area property owners, stated that he feels Items 8, 21, 22 and 23 should be addressed together. He advised that his clients feel the density of the proposed development is inappropriate for a rural setting. He expressed concern that the plans submitted do not address egress and on-site septic systems. He added that the existing development's covenants specifically prohibit overhead utilities and overhead street lights and he noted that he feels the improvement to only 52 feet of the 66 foot wide private access easement constitutes a taking of his client's property. He requested that Items 21, 22 and 23 be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting to be considered concurrently with Item 8.

Discussion followed concerning the possible improvement of 52 feet of the 66 foot wide access easement and the ability of the property owners to use the remaining 14 feet of unimproved easement for access purposes.

Kooiker moved and Swedlund seconded to recommend that Items 21-23 be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting.

In response to a question from Wall, Jason Green, City Attorney's Office, stated that there is no obligation to pave the entire width of the access easement. He added that improving a portion of the easement does not reduce the width of the access easement. He noted that if the requirements of the Street Design Criteria are met with the lesser improvements, objections become a civil matter.

Swedlund stated that he supported continuance to allow the area property owner's concerns to be vocalized and mitigated to the extent possible.

Hoffmann indicated support for continuance of Items 21-23 so that they can be heard in conjunction with the associated plat request.

In response to a question from Wevik, Randy Nelson, Engineering Division, advised that percolation tests have been taken in five places and that the test results support the development.

Discussion followed concerning the information requested for the plat application.

The motion to recommend that Items 21-23 be continued to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting carried (6 to 2 with Scull and Wall voting no).

Kooiker requested that Items 30 and 31 be considered concurrently.

30. No. 01TI004 - Red Rock Estates

A request by City of Rapid City to consider an application for a **Resolution Creating Tax Increment District No. 32** on Lots 1-11, Block 1, Lots 1-19, Block 2, Lots 1-3, Block 3, Lot 1, Block 4, Lot 1, Block 5, Outlot 1, and dedicated streets, all in Red Rock Estates, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Lot 1, 2, 3A, 3B, 4A, and 4B, Block 6, Red Rock Estates Phase 1A, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Lots 4-16, Block 3, Lot 2 and Lot 3, Block 4, Lots 1-6, Block 7, Lots 1-3, Block 8, all in Red Rock Estates Phase 2, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Outlot A of Tract A, Countryside Sub, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Well Lot, and Balance of Picardi Ranch Road, and Balance of Tract 1 (Less Red Rock Estates and Less ROW), all in Red Ridge Ranch, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; and Unplatted W1/2 NW1/4 NE1/4 less Red Ridge Ranch, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Unplatted E1/2 NW1/4 NE1/4 less Red Ridge Ranch and ROW, SW1/4 NE1/4 less Red Ridge Ranch, less Red Rock Estates, less Red Rock Estate Phase 1A, and Less Row, E1/2 NW1/4 less Red Rock Estates and Less ROW, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Unplatted N1/2 NW1/4 SW1/4 less Red Rock Estates and less Countryside Sub; N1/2 NE1/4 SW1/4 less Red

Rock Estates & Less Countryside Sub; E1/2 NE1/4, and W1/2 NW1/4, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located north of the intersection of Sheridan Lake Road and Muirfield Drive.

31. No. 01TI005 - Red Rock Estates

A request by City of Rapid City to consider an application for **Tax Increment District No. 32 Project Plan** on Lots 1-11, Block 1, Lots 1-19, Block 2, Lots 1-3, Block 3, Lot 1, Block 4, Lot 1, Block 5, Outlot 1, and dedicated streets, all in Red Rock Estates, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Lot 1, 2, 3A, 3B, 4A, and 4B, Block 6, Red Rock Estates Phase 1A, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Lots 4-16, Block 3, Lot 2 and Lot 3, Block 4, Lots 1-6, Block 7, Lots 1-3, Block 8, all in Red Rock Estates Phase 2, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Outlot A of Tract A, Countryside Sub, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Well Lot, and Balance of Picardi Ranch Road, and Balance of Tract 1 (Less Red Rock Estates and Less ROW), all in Red Ridge Ranch, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; and Unplatted W1/2 NW1/4 NE1/4 less Red Ridge Ranch, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Unplatted E1/2 NW1/4 NE1/4 less Red Ridge Ranch and ROW, SW1/4 NE1/4 less Red Ridge Ranch, less Red Rock Estates, less Red Rock Estate Phase 1A, and Less Row, E1/2 NW1/4 less Red Rock Estates and Less ROW, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota; Unplatted N1/2 NW1/4 SW1/4 less Red Rock Estates and less Countryside Sub; N1/2 NE1/4 SW1/4 less Red Rock Estates & Less Countryside Sub; E1/2 NE1/4, and W1/2 NW1/4, Section 29, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located north of the intersection of Sheridan Lake Road and Muirfield Drive.

Kooiker requested clarification concerning the Tax Increment Financing Committee's recommendation to approve the proposed Tax Increment District.

Elkins responded that the discussion by the Tax Increment Finance Committee included provisions for redundancy of power supply and the resolution of existing problems and improvement of water service for the Carriage Hills Drive area. Additionally, she indicated that the Committee felt the proposed detention facility would prove beneficial to many residents in a large area.

Kooiker requested clarification concerning whether the payment of the district could be retired in less than 20 years.

Elkins advised that because the golf course has not been included in the base valuation of the property the repayment of the project costs would likely be expedited by the additional taxes generated by the recreational facility.

Discussion followed concerning reduction of the district to a 10 year repayment schedule and possible projections for the completion of the residential portion of the development.

In response to a question from Hoffmann, Elkins reviewed the criteria used by the Tax Increment Financing Committee to support formation of the district noting that the funds are to be used only for public infrastructure improvements.

Wall moved, Stone seconded and unanimously carried to recommend approval of the resolution creating Tax Increment District No. 32; and, to recommend approval of the resolution approving Tax Increment District #32 Project Plan. (8 to 0)

35. No. 01UR053 - MDU Subdivision

A request by M & K Consulting for Western Wireless Corp. to consider an application for a **Use On Review to allow a communication tower in the Light Industrial Zoning District** on Lot 1, MDU Subdivision, Section 6, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 710 Steele Avenue.

Kooiker expressed concern that the cellular communication tower would be located in the flood plain noting that the tower could serve as a lightning rod in a area with potential flooding. He stated that he feels action on this request should be continued until the consultants have been retained and completed the cellular tower master plan.

Ron Rotel, Western Wireless, advised that they have already presented a comprehensive program of sectorization to the City and have designed all their towers with the capacity for co-location. He noted that this tower would contribute to the rectification of the substandard service within Rapid City.

Kooiker objected to the location of a cellular communication tower in the flood plain.

In response to a question from Kooiker, Rotel explained that the communication towers are well grounded.

Mark Krenn, Western Wireless, briefly described the specifications and materials used to ground the tower and protect their cellular towers from lightning strikes.

Kooiker expressed concern with the tower's proximity to Rapid Creek.

Elkins explained that the applicant's original request identified the location of the tower two feet from the property line. She indicated that the Zoning Board of Adjustment approved a reduction in setbacks to 15 feet from the property line moving the structure an additional 13 feet from Rapid Creek. Additionally, she noted that the tower would be elevated to meet the flood plain requirements.

Discussion followed concerning the net effect of elevating structures in the flood plain.

Kooiker moved to deny the Use On Review without prejudice.

The motion died due to the lack of a second.

Swedlund advised that he would abstain from voting on this request.

Scull moved, Stone seconded and carried to recommend that the Use On Review to allow a communication tower in the Light Industrial Zoning District be approved with the following stipulations:

Engineering Division Recommendations:

- 1. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, a Floodplain Development Permit shall be obtained;**

Building Inspection Division Recommendations:

- 2. A Building Permit shall be obtained prior to any construction;**
- 3. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, three sets of Architectural/Engineer stamped plans shall be provided for review and approval;**
- 4. A Certificate of Completion shall be obtained prior to any use of the tower;**

Urban Planning Division Recommendations:

- 5. The tower shall be designed to allow for the co-location of a minimum of two additional antennas (for a total of three antennae) except where the additional antennas would interfere or impact the applicant's proposed antenna(s);**
- 6. The tower shall not be illuminated by artificial means and shall not display strobe lights unless such lighting is specifically required by the Federal Aviation Administration or other federal or state authority;**
- 7. The tower shall remain unpainted allowing the galvanized steel color to show or the tower shall be painted white unless alternative colors are required by the Federal Aviation Administration or other federal or state authority;**
- 8. No commercial advertising signage shall be allowed on the tower;**
- 9. Prior to City Council approval of the Use on Review, the petitioner shall submit a parking plan complying with all requirements of the Off-Street Parking Ordinance or obtain a variance waiving the Off-Street Parking requirements;**
- 10. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Completion, the petitioner shall either complete the parking lot improvements or post financial surety in the amount necessary to cover the cost of the improvements and then complete the improvements within one paving season;**
- 11. The Use on Review shall expire if the use is not undertaken and completed within two years of the date of approval by the City Council or if the use as approved has ceased for a period of two years;**

12. **Prior to City Council approval, if necessary a parking and circulation easement shall be recorded with the Pennington County Register of Deeds; and,**
13. **Prior to City Council approval, the applicant shall provide a revised site plan identifying the distance from the southwest corner of the communications tower to the northeast corner of the MDU office and warehouse building. (6 to 1 with Kooiker voting no and with Swedlund abstaining)**

36. No. 01UR054 - Rapid City Greenway Tracts

A request by Rapid City Parks Department and the Rapid City Garden Club to consider an application for a **Use On Review to allow a sign and bench in the Flood Hazard Zoning District** on Tract 25 less Lot H1, Rapid City Greenway Tracts, Section 36, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located northwest of the intersection of Omaha Street and Pressler Junction.

Kooiker questioned staff's recommendation to allow the placement of a sign and bench in the Flood Hazard Zoning District.

Elkins briefly reviewed the history of the working relationship between the Rapid City Parks Department and the Rapid City Garden Club. She explained that the proposed wildflower demonstration area would be similar in nature to the demonstration area and benches in Canyon Lake Park.

Discussion followed concerning the current member status of the Rapid City Garden Club, the relationship of the Garden Club with the Parks Department, similar Use On Reviews to allow structures in the 500 year flood plain, the potential for the Garden Club to place the proposed sign on the back of a bench, and interpretation of the Rapid City Sign Code.

Wall moved, Hoffmann seconded and carried to recommend that the Use On Review to allow a sign and bench in the Flood Hazard Zoning District be approved with the following stipulations:

Engineering Division Recommendations:

1. **That the applicant shall accept responsibility for maintenance and replacement of the proposed structures in the event of damage, deterioration or removal due to the excavation for the maintenance of the sanitary sewer main;**

Building Inspection Department Recommendations:

2. **That all requirements of the Sign Code shall be continually met;**
3. **A Sign Permit shall be obtained prior to erection of a sign; and,**
4. **Prior to City Council approval, the applicant shall provide a drawing of the proposed sign. (7 to 1 with Kooiker voting no)**

37. No. 1641 - Nowlin & Wood Subdivision

A request by Dennis and Loretta Eisenbraun to consider an application for a **Renewal of Use On Review to allow a Child Care Center** on Lot 5-6, Block 10, Nowlin & Wood Subdivision, Section 31, T2N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 225 East Nowlin Street.

Kooiker requested that the applicant respond to concerns regarding traffic and dust in the alley as identified in a letter from a neighboring property owner.

Dennis Eisenbraun, applicant, advised that they had paved the alley from Milwaukee Street to the western property line as outlined in the conditions of approval for the Use On Review. He indicated that a major apartment complex and a duplex rental unit at the opposite end of the alley also generates traffic in this area.

In response to a question from Kooiker, Elkins noted that area traffic cannot be regulated to use only the paved portion of the alley.

In response to a question from Wall, Elkins noted that the staff report was written prior to the receipt of the complaint letter. She added that the issues relative to the land use have been addressed noting that the other issues set out in the letter fall have been referred to the South Dakota Department staff and Police Department staff.

Wall moved and Scull seconded to recommend that the Renewal of Use On Review to allow a Child Care Center be approved with the following stipulations:

Building Inspection Department Recommendations:

1. That all requirements of the 1994 Uniform Building Code for an E-3 occupancy shall be continually met;

Fire Department Recommendations:

2. That all requirements of the Local and State Child Care regulations shall be continually met;

Urban Planning Division Recommendations:

3. The maximum number of children permitted in the facility shall be 20;
4. That Section 17.50.150, Child Care Centers, of the Rapid City Municipal Code shall be continually met;
5. That the hours of the Day Care Center shall be 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.;
6. A maximum thirty-two square feet of sign face shall be allowed. Lighting of the signage shall be only by indirect illumination;
7. That the Use on Review be shall be subject to renewal on a complaint basis; and,
8. That the Use On Review approval shall expire if the use as approved has ceased for a period of two years.

Jeffrey Bower, area resident, stated that he feels the entire alley needs to be paved, speed bumps constructed in the alley and speed limit signs posted on the alley. He expressed concern that the applicant has not been willing to address the concerns identified in his letter.

In response to a question from Wevik, Elkins explained that approved Child Care Use on Reviews are generally reviewed at the end of one year and three years and then are subject to review on a complaint basis.

In response to a question from Wall, Eisenbraun advised that the day care staff have requested parents dropping off and picking up children use the paved portion of the alley. He indicated that his wife grew up in the house that is used as the daycare and noted that they also live in this neighborhood. He stated that he feels communications with his neighbors is very important and he presented a petition in support of his business signed by area residents.

Hoffmann called the question.

There was no objection to calling the question.

The motion unanimously carried to recommend that the Renewal of Use On Review to allow a Child Care Center be approved with the following stipulations:

Building Inspection Department Recommendations:

1. That all requirements of the 1994 Uniform Building Code for an E-3 occupancy shall be continually met;

Fire Department Recommendations:

2. That all requirements of the Local and State Child Care regulations shall be continually met;

Urban Planning Division Recommendations:

3. The maximum number of children permitted in the facility shall be 20;
4. That Section 17.50.150, Child Care Centers, of the Rapid City Municipal Code shall be continually met;
5. That the hours of the Day Care Center shall be 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.;
6. A maximum thirty-two square feet of sign face shall be allowed. Lighting of the signage shall be only by indirect illumination;
7. That the Use on Review be shall be subject to renewal on a complaint basis; and,
8. That the Use On Review approval shall expire if the use as approved has ceased for a period of two years. (8 to 0)

Wevik relinquished the chair to Wall and Wevik left the meeting at this time. Kroeger left the meeting at this time.

38. **No. 01OA021 - Ordinance Amendment**

A request by City of Rapid City to consider an application for an Ordinance amending Chapter 17.18.020 of the Rapid City Municipal Code to allow outdoor firewood storage and sales lot as a Use On Review in the General Commercial Zoning District.

Lass presented the proposed ordinance amendment noting that the application was prompted by a request to start a vocational program by the Cornerstone Rescue Mission at the October 4, 2001 Planning Commission meeting. He

explained that the proposed activity is not a specifically identified use in any zoning district. He noted staff's concerns with the potential for noise and the attempts to address these concerns through the use of a Use on Review and by prohibiting the use of mechanical power tools such as chain saws and log splitters.

Discussion followed concerning screening fences, enclosed storage areas and the processing of wood materials in industrial zoning districts.

Dan Iseland, manager of Cornerstone Rescue Mission, stated that he felt the proposed activity should be defined as an accessory use to the mission.

Elkins explained that an accessory use must be located on the same property as the primary use noting that the proposed activity is not customary to a mission use and would not be located on the same property. Additionally, Elkins indicated that the original Use On Review approval does not allow the sale and processing firewood on the site.

Discussion followed concerning interpretation of an accessory use and the Use On Review as a tool to mitigate potential impacts to surrounding properties.

Swedlund moved to approve the Ordinance amendment.

The motion died due to the lack of a second.

In response to a question from Scull, Alan Hanks, City Council, expressed concern that the ordinance would be amended in order to accommodate one applicant noting that any type of production line type activity in the downtown business district creates issues regarding safety, noise, and increased traffic.

Hoffmann moved and Kooiker seconded to recommend that the Ordinance Amendment be denied without prejudice.

Scull suggested that the Ordinance Amendment be forwarded to City Council without recommendation.

Iseland requested clarification concerning whether the firewood activity could be defined as an accessory use to a mission if the wood was not offered for sale.

Wall stated that Mr. Iseland was welcome to work with staff to try and identify an alternative use to accomplish their goals.

Discussion followed concerning using the Use On Review as a tool to control activities on the property and the use of mechanized equipment and other tools on the property.

Kooiker clarified that his view of the proposed activity is separate from his view of the mission as a ministry in the City.

Kooiker called the question.

The motion carried to recommend that the Ordinance Amendment be denied without prejudice. (5 to 2 with Swedlund and Scull voting no)

13. No. 01PL108 - High Sheridan Ranch Subdivision

A request by Ferber Engineering for Raymond J. Crawford III to consider an application for a **Preliminary and Final Plat** on Lot 4R, High Sheridan Ranch Subdivision, Section 35, T1N, R6E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 23435 Sand Lane.

Elkins advised that staff has prepared conditions of approval for the Preliminary and Final Plat request and thanked Lisa Seaman and the Engineering staff for working during the meeting to provide a recommendation.

Seaman distributed a copy of the conditions for approval to the Planning Commission.

A brief discussion followed.

Swedlund moved, Kooiker seconded and unanimously carried to recommend that the Preliminary and Final Plat be approved with the following stipulations:

Engineering Division Recommendations:

1. **Prior to City Council approval, the plat shall be revised to reflect a minimum right of way width of 66 feet for Sand Lane;**
2. **Prior to City Council approval, a revised site plan shall be submitted identifying the dimensions of the emergency vehicle turnaround and any improvements necessary to ensure that the turnaround complies with the requirements of the City of Rapid City Street Design Criteria Manual;**
3. **Prior to City Council approval, the applicant shall submit documentation identifying the legal entity responsible for the street maintenance within the subdivision in compliance with the Rapid City Subdivision Ordinance;**
4. **Prior to City Council approval, the applicant shall provide a revised site plan identify the size and location of the water mains providing water to the subject property and identify the operator of the system and the extent of the improvements required by the system operator;**
5. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, a subdivision estimate form shall be submitted for review and approval; and,**
6. **Prior to Final Plat approval by the City Council, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted and the subdivision inspection fee shall be paid or a subdivision variance shall be obtained. (7 to 0)**

39. Discussion Items

- A. Use On Review and Planned Development approval process – Bill Lass

Lass reviewed the proposed ordinance and requested direction concerning process and time for appeals.

Swedlund stated that he would like to maximize the time for the appeal process. Kooiker requested clarification concerning whether seven days would be adequate.

Lass clarified that based on the past year's applications, approximately 95% of all Use on Reviews and Planned Developments were approved by City Council per the Planning Commission's recommendations.

Lass noted that whether the appeal period were three days or seven days the application would skip a City Council meeting if an appeal were filed. He noted that an estimated 95% of all applications would be expedited, however, the other 5% of applications would take longer to be reviewed.

Wall indicated that the intent of the ordinance is to expedite these types of requests. He expressed concern that if the appeal period were much more than seven days the intent of the Ordinance is defeated.

Discussion followed concerning the process for notification of appeals.

Prairie Chicken left the meeting at this time.

Kooiker stated that he does not feel it is appropriate for the complainant to pay for mailings to area property owners. He added that he feels most people cannot attend morning Planning Commission meetings and suggested that Planning Commission meetings be held more frequently at a time more convenient to the public.

Discussion followed and the Planning Commission concurred that seven calendar days would be adequate for an appeal period.

Swedlund stated that he does not feel a second mailing of notice letters advising of an appeal is necessary. The other Planning Commissioners concurred.

Hoffmann moved, Stone seconded and unanimously carried to authorize staff to advertise for amendments to the Ordinance including a seven day appeal period and removing any requirements to notify area property owners of appeals. (6 to 0)

40. Planning Commission Items
 - A. Planning Commissioner appointment to the Drinking Water Protection Committee (Jeff Hoffmann)

Scull moved, Kooiker seconded and unanimously carried to appoint Jeff Hoffmann as the Planning Commission liaison to the Drinking Water Protection Committee. (6 to 0)

41. Addendum
E. Update on Roosevelt Park Construction

Rod Johnson, Public Works Department, advised that construction is currently under way on the Roosevelt Park site noting that they intend to open the facility by year end.

Swedlund requested clarification concerning future plans for the pond. Johnson discussed the relocation of the pond in the future when funding becomes available.

At Swedlund's request, Johnson reviewed the master plan and construction issues in detail.

Scull moved, Hoffmann seconded and unanimously carried to continue the balance of the agenda to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting. (6 to 0)

Discussion continued concerning the Roosevelt Park master plan.

Scull and Stone left the meeting at this time.

Swedlund stated that he feels the Planning Commission should have more involvement in the planning of large community projects.

Kooiker moved, Swedlund seconded and unanimously carried to continue the discussion of the construction of Roosevelt Park to the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission meeting. (3 to 0)

There being no further business Swedlund moved, Kooiker seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:49 a.m. (3 to 0)