

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
Rapid City, South Dakota
March 28, 2005

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a special meeting of the City Council of the City of Rapid City was held at the City/School Administration Center in Rapid City, South Dakota on Monday, March 28, 2005 at 5:25 P.M.

The following members were present: Mayor Jim Shaw and the following Alderpersons: Malcom Chapman, Jean French, Ron Kroeger, Tom Johnson, Karen Olson, Bob Hurlbut and Bill Waugh. The following Alderperson arrived during the course of the meeting: Ray Hadley, Tom Murphy, and Sam Kooiker; and the following were absent: None.

Staff members present included City Finance Officer Jim Preston, City Attorney Jason Green, Public Works Director Dirk Jablonski, Growth Management Director Marcia Elkins and Administrative Assistant Jackie Gerry.

The Mayor presented No. 04CA032, a request by the City of Rapid City for an **Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan adopting the U.S. Highway 16 Neighborhood Area Future Land Use Plan** on property located north of Cathedral Drive, south along U.S. Highway 16 approximately one mile either side of U.S. Highway 16 to south of Reptile Gardens.

Alderman Kroeger reported the South Dakota Department of Transportation made a presentation at the Council's Information Meeting. He pointed out there is a concern with a proposed traffic signal on Hwy 16 at Moon Meadows and Sammis Trail. With the aid of an overhead, Growth Management Community Service Coordinator Horton outlined the interchange alignment and grade issues and explained the South Dakota Department of Transportation is still in the design process. Responding to a concern from Alderman Olson, Horton explained an overpass could be constructed at Catron Blvd., fifteen years into the future or when traffic volumes dictate the need. Also responding to a question from Alderman Kooiker, Horton explained the South Dakota Department of Transportation expects to reconstruct Catron Blvd. between Hwy 79 and Hwy 16, in 2009. Alderman Johnson reviewed the distances that it takes a vehicle to stop at a given rate of speed, and pointed out that a vehicle would need to begin stopping at the bottom of the crest of the hill.

Alderman French expressed concern about different zoning districts adjacent to one another and suggested perceived problems are little or none when a barrier exists between the different zoning districts. She suggested mapping north/south roads would lend itself to the depth of the different zoning districts; and also suggested that where there is limited access to Hwy 16 would be better suited for an office commercial designation.

Responding to questions from the Council on preliminary procedures, City Attorney Green advised the Council that there be a general motion to approve the item before the Council and make substitute motions to deal with the discreet parts of the plan that the Council wishes to talk about individually.

Kroeger, in response to a request from Mayor Shaw, pointed out the issues regarding future land use verses specific proposals that have been talked about; and explained the Council needs to look at the future land use plan. He believed it appropriate that the Council needed to remember that this is the vision for the area in the future, and indicated he understood what was

being proposed for development in this area. He suggested that when Wal-Mart comes forward with their development, the Council can then look at the traffic, street network, sewer infrastructure and all the other things that will be addressed as they come through the planning phases.

Responding to a question from Mayor Shaw, Growth Management Director Elkins explained that the future land use plan is one element of the City's comprehensive plan; and the other elements are such things as sewer and water master plans. She indicated there is a future land use plan dating to the 1970s, updated in 1980s, and this is a neighborhood update. Responding to a request from Kroeger, Elkins explained that a PRD (Planned Residential Development) requires an applicant to rezone and file an Initial and final development plan that lays out the street network, shows elevations, landscaping, details drainage, etc. This phase requires a public hearing and notification to adjacent property owners within a specified distance. This hearing process is before the Planning Commission and objections can be appealed to the Council. Responding to a question from Alderman Kooiker about the Forest Service land and a planned development, Elkins explained this area is identified in the plan as Public, and because it is federally owned the local zoning regulations do not apply; they have a federal preemption.

Alderman Olson believed it important to observe that a proposed five hundred foot landscape buffer continue north along Hwy 16 and suggested the buffer could include such things as trees of considerable substance.

Johnson pointed out the section line highway explaining that for the short term this is an at-grade intersection accessing Hwy 16, but long term the South Dakota Department of Transportation will eliminate that intersection and possibly make the section line highway as a bridge over Hwy 16 with no access to Hwy 16. He pointed out the existing businesses along Hwy 16 will lose their direct access to Hwy 16 and indicated his greatest concern was the area east of Hwy 16, with the greatest commercial development, that will have only two points of access - Sammis Trail to the south and Catron Blvd. to the north.

Alderman Hurlbut suggested a smarter process would have the City look at designations for timeframes to develop parcels. He expressed concern with traffic on Moon Meadows and questioned the City's cost to reconstruct this roadway. He again reiterated his concerns over costs of extending City services and blending of zoning districts. Horton outlined the parcels in the study area pointing out that several parcels are zoned commercial in the County but not in the City. Hurlbut suggested areas in the north, closer to existing development and Catron Blvd. would be more likely to support General Commercial development sooner and at less cost to the City and without the traffic problems. He also suggested Office Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial designations for other parcels with a planned development.

Johnson suggested the Council needed to talk densities and appropriateness of zoning and depth of zoning, and suggested there could be problems on Sammis Trail with the residential densities.

Kooiker questioned the procedures of handling the final vote at the next meeting, suggesting it was important to recognize on the plan as presented there are four amendments to the plan. Asking for clarification, City Attorney Green advised that there needs to be a motion on the plan as a whole and motions to amend individual components of the plan. Elkins explained that what came forward from the Planning Commission was a revised map with four changes that were

incorporated into the plan, with a recommendation for approval. The Council has two motions that approved two amendments to the plan: one being the designation of the Hart Ranch densities and the other being the water tower to the north.

Johnson suggested a Scenic Byway designation and asked staff to prepare a resolution or an ordinance for Council consideration. He suggested it include the highest degree of landscaping, setbacks, building materials, lighting, etc.; and suggested this designation be in place before adopting the future land use plan and in place before changing any more designations. Elkins asked for clarification and explained there has been discussion about requesting scenic byway designation from the State of South Dakota and ultimately from the federal government. Johnson responded that from his perspective, he was not interested in the State's scenic byway designation, suggesting the City could be more restrictive. Olson explained that this not a scenic byway, it is more broad; and indicated it should go beyond the five hundred foot landscaping buffer. She suggested this is an effort to set a high standard as to landscaping, berming, plant materials, and could include all the commercial property and wider than five hundred feet and would include light pollution issues, building heights, and architectural features of buildings.

Johnson moved, second by Waugh to direct staff to prepare a document and bring it forward for Council consideration. Motion carried.

Hurlbut asked for maps that indicate the section line highway, not being an option, as well as a map showing it as an option. Elkins indicated staff can include an identification that at such time as the overpass would be required, that there would be no direct access allowed at that location. She pointed out that it is important overall to the traffic flow in that area that this section line highway still be a collector road even if it is an overpass. That will provide some traffic networking to both sides of Hwy 16.

French pointed out there is a parcel that is contentious and is zoned agricultural, the Commerford Ranch. Responding to a concern from French, Elkins explained that if someone came forward with a rezoning request to change the General Agriculture to General Commercial, and it is within the distance that fronts the estimated five hundred feet that was shown in the 1980 plan, staff would recommend approval because it is consistent with the adopted plan. She pointed out that when the Commerford property came into the City, and based on discussions staff had with the owner and the developers, it was zoned General Ag as a holding zone; because at that point in time, the City had not identified any specific development on the property. Elkins explained that all zoning changes are brought before the Planning Commission, and the Commission's recommendations are forwarded to the Council because this is considered an ordinance amendment.

Hurlbut moved, second by French to request a map indicating the section line collector road removed, as not an option; each of the present zoning area changes that are being considered to be blocked off in a way that they are more identifiable; and have the sections that are not currently zoned identified; the density and land use designations being considered verses those were brought forward from the Land Use Committee and the Planning Commission. Discussion ensued regarding zoning designations on parcels located in the county. Motion carried.

At the request of Johnson asking to have all the areas of interest identified, Hurlbut suggested a topic breakdown, such as residential densities, proposed commercial use zonings and scenic preservation designation; and suggested several meetings to discuss these topics. Residential

densities identified by individual aldermen were: Schultz property, Hart Ranch, areas east of Hwy 16 and south of sewer service boundary and north of Spring Creek, Highland Park, and area around the Orthopedic Center; and six commercial developments were identified and outlined on an overhead; and at each meeting the scenic standards would be discussed.

Waugh moved, second by Murphy to set two special Council meetings on April 11 and April 25, 2005 at 7:00 P.M; with residential densities being discussed on April 11; and commercial on April 25. Motion carried.

As there was no further business to come before the Council at this time, the meeting adjourned at 7:50 P. M.

CITY OF RAPID CITY

ATTEST:

Mayor

Finance Officer

(SEAL)