

Unapproved Minutes
Vermillion Planning Commission
Tuesday, October 11, 2016 Regular Meeting

The regular meeting of the Vermillion Planning Commission was called to order by Vice Chairman Forseth in the Large Conference Room at City Hall on October 11, 2016 at 5:34 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Present: Fairholm, Forseth, Gruhn, Muenster, and Wilson.
Absent: Iverson, Tuve, Manning and Oehler.

Staff present: Jose Dominguez, City Engineer and John Prescott, City Manager

2. Minutes

a. September 26, 2016 Regular Meeting.

Moved by Muenster to approve the September 26, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes, seconded by Wilson. Motion carried 5-0.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Fairholm to adopt the agenda, seconded by Muenster. Motion carried 5-0.

4. Visitors to be Heard

5. Public Hearing

a. A proposal to rezone Heikes Tract 2 SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Exc. Heikes Addition, 7-92-51, 5th P.M., Clay County, South Dakota and Lot 1, Block 1, Heikes Addition, City of Vermillion, Clay County

Vice Chairman Forseth opened the public hearing. No public comment received. Moved by Muenster to grant the proposal to rezone Heikes Tract 2 SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Exc. Heikes Addition, 7-92-51, 5th P.M., Clay County, South Dakota and Lot 1, Block 1, Heikes Addition, City of Vermillion, Clay County, seconded by Wilson. Motion carried 5-0.

b. Petition to rezone Lot G-2, except the West 110.9 feet of the South 198.914 feet, thereof, and except Lot 1 of Lot G-2, all in the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$) and the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$), Section Eighteen (18), Township Ninety-Two (92) North, Range Fifty-One (51) West of the 5th P.M., City of Vermillion, Clay County, South Dakota from R-2 Residential District to the Spady Planned Development District.

Vice Chairman Forseth opened the public hearing.

Jose Dominguez, City Engineer, read the staff memo aloud to the Planning Commission and visitors present.

Kim McLaury, McLaury engineering, hired by Adam Spady/APS to prepare the plans, explained they put together a preliminary layout for three phases. Phase 1: development of the existing structure reconstructed into duplexes and build two-stall garages for each residence. Phase 2: installation of sanitary sewer, water lines, street lights, and streets. Phase 3: Construction of new duplexes, two to four a year.

Vice Chairman Forseth asked how big the duplexes will be. McLaury said he thinks they're about 1386 sq feet, two and three bedroom homes and that they will be exactly like the duplex units near the fairgrounds off Cherry Street across from the Ford dealership with the two-car garages.

Adam Spady explained that the plan is to renovate the current existing structure and turn it into two three-plexes with garages going down both sides. During the course of the next few years he will develop the back four acres of vacant land.

John Lynch has a lot to the east of the property line that is vacant right now and voiced concerns about water run-off and tree removal. Discussion followed.

Brad James of 1441 E Cherry also voiced concerns about water drainage.

Kim McLaury said they are not looking at using the Cherry street pipe that runs to the north out to Hwy 50 and on the north side of Hwy 50. The storm sewer capacity along Norbeck Street has not been analyzed yet which will dictate how big the detention area should be and how big the pipe needs to be.

Andy Martinez of 1517 E. Cherry voiced concerns regarding the detention area and sitting water. Discussion followed.

Jose Dominguez explained McLaury's intent is to have the detention area and drainage to the north. The outlet off Cherry Street that was in question is owned by the DOT and even if they allowed access they can restrict how much water goes into it. This is why draining to the north is more than likely what will happen.

Randy Crum 1433 E Cherry voiced concern about the maintenance of detention areas and flooding issues due to the grade of the new development. Discussion followed.

Janice Emmick of 822 N. Crawford Road voiced concern as well to the grade of the new development and standing water that can't drain. Discussion followed.

Holly Annis of 810 N. Crawford Road asked if there was another property he had built that she could see. Adam Spady referenced 716 Madison Street.

Emily Johnson of 723 N. Norbeck owns property just to the south of the proposed area and asked if they were going to put up a fence because in the past she had trouble with people cutting across the lawn. Discussion followed.

Elizabeth Bartling of 714 Brooks Drive voiced concern about rentals and noise factor. Adam Spady explained that was one of the reasons they did not look for an access off Cherry Street so people weren't driving through houses back to the development. Discussion followed.

The question was asked how many duplexes there will be.

Jose Dominguez said there will be 34 duplexes (individual units) which equals 17 buildings. The City parking requirement allows for a garage and two parking stalls in front of the garage.

Discussion followed.

Jose Dominguez explained that once the City Council approves the Ordinance the applicant will have to submit a final development plan. The final development plan submitted must be consistent with the initial development plan. If it is not what they proposed, then they would have to apply for an amendment. Depending on the amendment the Planning Commission may hold another public hearing and adjacent property owners would be notified.

Moved by Fairholm to recommend approval of the petition to rezone Lot G-2, except the West 110.9 feet of the South 198.914 feet, thereof, and except Lot 1 of Lot G-2, all in the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$) and the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$), Section Eighteen (18), Township Ninety-Two (92) North, Range Fifty-One (51) West of the 5th P.M., City of Vermillion, Clay County, South Dakota from R-2 Residential District to the Spady Planned Development District, Muenster seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

6. Old Business

7. New Business

- a. Preliminary Plat of Lot 1, 2, and 3, Block 1, Spady Addition to the City of Vermillion, South Dakota.

Moved by Fairholm to approve the Preliminary Plat of Lot 1, 2, and 3, Block 1, Spady Addition to the City of Vermillion, South Dakota, Gruhn seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

8. Adjourn

Moved by Muenster to adjourn, seconded by Wilson. Motion carried 5-0. Forseth declared the meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.