

**MINUTES**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD**  
**Water Purification Plant**

**February 15, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

**New Business**

**1. Subdivision Ordinance Revision Process**

Jeff Schmitt, Assistant Planning Director, introduced the topic of today's meeting saying that he would like to review the procedures for processing the subdivision ordinance. He stated that Steve Randall in the Planning office would oversee the review process and also Sam Trebilcock of their office is president of the South Dakota Planners Association so he would be able to address any of the questions or comments having to do with bureaucratic side of things. Jeff then addressed the attendees and asked for any comments and suggestions to consider in the revision process. Following is a list of suggestions made:

1. It was suggested that **Final Plans be eliminated**. Items can be moved to a different stage of plan approval. It was felt this would help **streamline the process** and shorten up the time limit.
2. **Phasing on preliminary plans** – this can be done better by a consulting engineer.
3. Include the **grading on the construction plans**.
4. **Erosion Control Plans – these need to stand alone** as a set of plans because of the changes in the plan. If there is a change then all plans have to be changed.
5. From Preliminary to Final – **more items need to be caught before the Final**. Too many costly changes are required at the Final Plan stage.

Jeff stated he would like to see a **sketch plan come in along with the annexation** or Comprehensive Plan amendment and this should show land use, along with the lots and blocks. Other issues that should be covered at this time is where utilities can be laid, **traffic issues along with right of way and types of access**. **Preliminary plans should then have set standards required**. Currently when these have amendments those are not being routed throughout all parties. This creates a discrepancy when the plat comes through. More discussion is needed on deciding where the grading permit should be included or if it can stand alone. There are times when the landowner would like to add some fill but does not know what they plan to do with the land yet so it would be beneficial to them to have this stand alone. **And lastly, the Construction Plans, could these include items from the Final or split with the Preliminary process**. Jeff also asked about the review process for amending the entire ordinance. The recommended ordinance will need **to go through Planning Commission and City Council**. It was suggested that these ideas and comments be grouped and consolidated, then brought back and a **draft will be constructed to review with this Board and then a larger group consisting of contractors and design consultants as well as developers**.

**Action Items**

City staff will work on a draft for a revision of the subdivision ordinance.

**March 1, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

## **2. Subdivision Ordinance Revision Process**

Jeff Schmitt, Assistant Planning Director, displayed charts that he and staff had drawn up as drafts to changes to the subdivision ordinance process. It was mentioned in the previous meeting to **change the names on the process**. The names proposed by staff are: concept plan, initial plan, construction plan and plat.

**Concept Plan** – this can be done by anyone, the applicant can even draw this up. It was questioned today if a size limit should be stated saying at what point it should be drawn up by a consulting engineer. The attendees would also like a stated time limit allowed for review such as 30-45 days. This step would allow Planning to review the possibility of platting in considering the access, services available and zoning among the main items.

**Initial Plan** – this step would **go to the Council for approval**. This should be more detailed with lot, block, right of way, utility layout and to scale. It would have a stated approval time line as well. It was suggested that **Final Drainage** be included in this stage to be able to determine if a BMP is needed and to foresee oversize costs earlier. It was also discussed that a **grading permit be allowed to acquire at any time** so dirt work can start even before final [Construction] plans are determined.

**Construction Plan** - This stage should show an approximate **95% completion of the plans scheduled**. The approval process for the majority of this stage is done within the Engineering Division. **It was discussed to switch the sequence of the plan with the plat to have it be after the plat.**

**Plat** – **The strongest suggestion is to move this step before the construction plan.** There was also suggestion to include language on a replat as at the present the language is very **uncertain as to what requirements there are for a plot of land to be replatted.**

Jeff stated Planning would revise this draft and return to the Board with the updates and further comments.

### **Action Items**

City staff will continue to update the draft of the subdivision ordinance.

**March 15, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

## **2. Subdivision Revision Review Process**

Jeff Schmitt distributed handouts displaying color coded comments that were received during last week's meeting that were suggestions from IRAB, staff and questions that came up during the meeting. Discussions today on the different steps were as follows:

Concept Plan – It was discussed on how much detail is needed for this step; such as if including the lot, block and manhole numbers should be required. It was felt that **Zoning should be covered** at this point in order to avoid delay at a later time.

Initial Plan – It was still agreed upon that this step **should be detailed and this would go to City Council for approval. This would be a final step [prior to Plat] as all issues of concern should be addressed in the Concept Plan.** The issue of drainage returned as it was felt this should be reported in this phase in detail as the City needs to know if there will be funding expenses.

Jeff told the Board he will compile the suggestions received today into the draft and return to the next meeting with a revised draft for review.

## **Action Items**

**April 5, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

### **1. Subdivision Revision Review Process**

Tony Everson turned the meeting over to Jeff Schmitt with City Planning to continue the review of the Subdivision Ordinance revisions. Jeff distributed the revised sheets showing all final suggestions for each area of the ordinance. He stated that the proposal shows the **Concept Plan, and Preliminary Plan being initiated by Planning** and coordinating these steps with Engineering whereas **the Plat and Construction step would be coordinated by Engineering** with assistance from Planning. Jeff reviewed the eight steps outlined for the Preliminary Plan, each of these being a requirement for the preliminary plan step. It was questioned if Step #5 was too detailed but it was determined that it should be included in this step so the owner and the City know what future costs are involved.

Paul Fick entered the meeting at this time.

Jeff went through the ordinance and mentioned items that will be updated such as various terms and phrases that will be changed. It was mentioned that the current **assurance agreement process is weak** and it was asked for suggestions or ideas on how to update those requirements. This update would help give more security to the City that the plans will be carried out on a development and in making sure the developers are financially secure to have this happen and all be completed. A suggestion was to **develop a bond requirement** so the City would have something to use should a developer not complete a project.

The topic of obtaining a grading permit sooner was brought up again by the Board. It was agreed by City staff that a grading permit would be able to be obtained, early in the process, as long as an erosion control plan is submitted and approved.

Jeff stated these changes and suggestions would now be put together in a draft ordinance form and brought back to this Board for approval.

### **Action Items**

City staff will draw up a draft of the subdivision ordinance for submittal to this Board.

**May 3, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

#### **2. Subdivision Ordinance Revision Process**

Jeff Schmitt distributed a draft revision of the Subdivision Ordinance. Jeff informed the Board that from an ordinance standpoint this is a law to comply with. It is not a standard or a plan but a law that must be followed by all. Planning staff is recommending the four step process with the new titles of Concept Plan, Preliminary Plan, Final Plan and Plats. In review, the Concept & Preliminary Plans will be led by Planning and assisted by Public Works/Engineering feedback. The Final Plan and Plats will be led by Public Work/Engineering assisted by Planning feedback. Jeff continued to review changes throughout the draft. Due to time he had to stop within the document to continue at the next meeting.

**May 17, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

#### **2. Subdivision Ordinance Revision Process**

Jeff Schmitt continued reviewing where the Board left off in the draft revision of the Subdivision Ordinance. He had new sheets but only to add the date and page numbers for easy reference. Jeff reviewed some more terms with the Board. He stated that the Concept Plan was for staff to review and give comments. This step is to help the preliminary plan go through correctly on the first submittal. It was asked if a timeline could be shown to understand the time frame of the entire process. The Concept Plan should also include all modifications such as ROW widths and be solid plans so both the private parties and the City will have an indication of costs involved. It was asked if the process could also be expedited that only the areas that had comments would review resubmittals for a shorter turnaround time.

### **Action Items**

1. City staff to contact individuals and form a subcommittee to review the DSCR reimbursements.
2. City staff to illustrate a **flow chart of the full process** of the Subdivision Ordinance Revision process.

**June 21, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

### **1. Subdivision Ordinance Revision Process**

Jeff Schmitt distributed a **display of the timeline process** on the subdivision ordinance under the current process and under the new revised process. He stated that under the **current system there is really no stated timelines for the time of review**. Under the proposed process there would be timelines stated so guidelines could be followed on approval levels. Jeff also distributed a draft check list sheet to follow the steps through the submittal process of a concept plan and a plat. Jeff distributed a copy of the revisions on the subdivision ordinance dated 5/18/06 with some minor changes to the previous copies. He continued reviewing the changes on Page 12 Chapter A.03 Preliminary Plan. Consultants stated they would like to meet with the City **concerning the electronic submittal process along with the GIS Division as the consultants would like to minimize the steps in submittals**.

Mike Cooper left the meeting at this time.

**July 5, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

### **1. Subdivision Ordinance Revision Process**

Jeff Schmitt had a revised version of the draft subdivision ordinance for review. He stated that he and Sam made some corrections and changed the names of the different stages to match the new terms to be used. He stated that they worked through the ordinance again looking for what is needed based upon what the subdivision ordinance's purpose should be and to try to make it as easy to use as possible. Jeff reviewed anything he and Sam had changed from the start of the document. Jeff and Sam now set titles for each step of the process which **now clarified a minor and major subdivision**. Jeff mentioned that one change **was to reference the Engineering Design Standards in lieu of stating other standards so there is no controversy between the two**. Jeff continued to review changes made throughout the document.

**August 2, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

### **2. Subdivision Ordinance Revision**

Jeff Schmitt, Assistant Director of Planning and Building Services, distributed an updated copy of the subdivision ordinance in which he and Sam Trebilcock revised

since the last review of July 5, 2006. Jeff reviewed the major changes from the beginning of the document and reminded attendees that this ordinance is set up to be the 'when' of each process and the 'how' should be found in the Engineering Design Standards. Jeff read what had been written for the Concept Plan and explained what they want it to show such as the general layout and the utility coordination. If this plan is more detailed it will save time later in the other phases of submittals. Jeff also reviewed the submittal requirements of the Preliminary Plan. He mentioned the standards required, how they will be approved and what staff will check for. Jeff stated that staff is still revising the Final Plans stage and what the requirements will be. They will continue on these and return at a later meeting.

**August 16, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

## **2. Subdivision Ordinance Revision**

Jeff Schmitt, Assistant Director of Planning, distributed a flow chart of the new four step plan. This also showed reference to the Engineering Design Standards which will be mentioned throughout the ordinance as they must be followed within the design. There was discussion on the Final Plans vs. Construction Plans and how much detail should be included. Jeff then continued review of the ordinance changes.

Mike Runge entered the meeting at this time.

Jeff stated that he is still revising the requirements for Platting & Replatting.

There is also a new section for Walkways and Pathways that was never included. Jeff stated that he would continue to revise the ordinance and return for review.

**September 6, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

## **Action Items**

1. City staff to continue to revise the subdivision ordinance.

**September 20, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

## **1. Subdivision Ordinance Revision**

Jeff Schmitt, Assistant Director of Planning, began the meeting with questioning the direction this revision is taking and if it's the right direction to go with it. He stated that the subdivision ordinance should be looking at the layout of the lot and block of each subdivision; the Engineering Design Standards shall apply to all public improvements (EDS are for construction). Jeff mentioned items in each level of

submittal to review what level of detail should be in each, referring back to points discussed in the start of this review.

Mike Runge entered the meeting at this time.

In reviewing the direction this should take Jeff came up with three options that the Board could take on this revision process. **Option 1 would keep the first proposed steps the same, Concept Plan, Preliminary Plan, Development Engineering Plan, and Plat. Option 2 would consist of a Final Lot and Block layout showing as much utilities of infrastructure in the preliminary stage.** Option 3 would give the alternative to get rid of the Concept Plan which would have the Preliminary Plan go to the Planning Commission and the Development Engineering Plan would go to City Council and these would follow the design requirements of the Engineering Design Standards. With this process the Council will be reviewing a more concrete or final plan.

**If staying with the Concept Plan this stage should include Drainage and Access issues.** Attendees voiced frustration in the review process of these two issues as they have many requests for numerous revisions in these areas.

**Consensus was to stay with the first option and require drainage and access issues to be addressed at the preliminary plan stage.** Jeff stated that agreeing to these issues prior to the public hearing may require deferrals prior to approvals.

Jeff will continue to work on details for these three options and return to the Board with a result for the revision of this ordinance.

**October 4, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

## **2. Subdivision Ordinance Revision**

Jeff Schmitt, City Planning, began review on the status of the subdivision ordinance revision. Jeff wanted to assess with the Board the path of the revision so he can continue to revise in the right manner of the Board consensus. He stated that the current order the Board wishes to go would be to include **the phases of the Concept Plan, the Preliminary Plans, the Development's Engineering Plan and then the Plat.** The Concept Plan would be routed for city staff comments with a fifteen working day deadline. The Preliminary Plan would be required to include the **preliminary drainage issues and the preliminary street / right of way access.** Jeff said they would remove specific details listed **but just refer to the Engineering Design Standards.** These two issues must be in agreement and in detail before moving on to the Plat. If a plat is for transfer of ownership only the first two steps may be an exception until development would occur. Jeff would also like to set up **an electronic system to track staff comments through the routing procedure of the Preliminary Phase.** To recap, the Concept and Preliminary Phases would go through the Planning Department and the Developments Engineering Plan and Plat would go to the Engineering Department. A **form for criteria for approval** would be constructed by

Engineering and Planning for consultants to follow as well as a section for **Conditions to the Preliminary Plan. Assurance Agreements** must also be referenced although City staff stated concern on changing the requirements involved with these as they do not hold much clout at this time if the situation arises that it needs to be enforced.

### **Action Items**

1. City staff to continue to revise the subdivision ordinance to include an electronic tracking system and criteria for approval.
2. City staff to check with legal council on the options for including an assurance agreement that would hold more dominance when needed to be imposed.

**November 1, 2006, at 8:30 a.m.**

### **1. Subdivision Ordinance Revision**

After being asked why we were redrafting the subdivision ordinance, Robert Ellis, Assistant City Engineer, explained to the Board that the initial purpose of redoing the Subdivision Ordinance was because the **language was in conflict with other ordinances and was in conflict with the Engineering Design Standards (EDS)**. He explained that the revision would result in the ordinance and EDS mirroring each other. Robert then explained that once the Board began making edits there was a **request to completely revisit the whole process**. Cindy Monnin asked if Robert would do an overview of the direction the Subdivision Ordinance has taken. Robert stated the steps begin with the **Concept Plan** which would give the general layout of the development and would neither be approved nor denied by the City but would rather just **initiate comments for discussion**. This would be followed by the **Preliminary Plan which would show access points and the general drainage plan along with other items as water and sewer layout, etc.** The next step would be the Developments Engineering Plan which would be very similar to the existing "Final Plan". It was asked if this could be **done in phases**. Robert stated he would have city staff check into this. The next item required would be the **plat followed by construction plans or visa-versa at the developer's choosing**. It was also asked if the Construction Plans could be combined with the Development's Engineering Plan to help expedite the process. Robert will check into that as well. It was also suggested to include **a requirement of contacting the private utilities at an early stage of future development so they can be prepared for construction**.

**The board agreed through general consent to continue with adopting the subdivision ordinance in this manner.**

### **Action Items**

1. City staff to check if the Development's Engineering Plan can be combined with the Construction Plans and also if the Development's Engineering Plan can be submitted in phases of the development.
2. Distribute remaining EDS Chapters for review.

3. Further discuss lighting alternatives.

**August 15, 2007, at 8:30 a.m.**

## **1. Subdivision Ordinance**

Jeff Schmitt and Sam Trebilcock, City Planning, updated the Board on the draft for the revised subdivision ordinance. Jeff stated that three options were presented back in October [Nov. 1] of 2006 and it was the **consensus of the Board to proceed with Option 1, which included a Concept Plan, Preliminary Plan, Developer Engineering Plan, Plat, and the Construction Plan.** Since this time, the Engineering Design Standards (EDS) have been approved and will be used as a reference guide in certain steps of the ordinance revision.

The names of some of the stages have changed. For example, the Sketch Plan has changed to the Concept Plan. The concept plan will have specific requirements, will be submitted before the Preliminary Plan, and will not be charged an application fee. The Preliminary Plan will show the lot and block layout. The Final Plan was changed to the Developer Engineering Plan. **Jeff distributed the approved Chapter 13 – Plan Submittal of the EDS for reference.** He stated that **Table 1** will be followed in the approval process and for setting up a hearing date. If criteria are not met, the applicant will be notified. It was asked **if access points could be approved** at the Preliminary stage and if some type of documentation could be developed for approving access points. Jeff stated that Engineering can approve access at any time, as long as the requirements (traffic study, etc.) have been completed. **The consensus of the group was that documentation approving access should be developed.** He stated that the Preliminary Plan has never guaranteed access. Chad stated that this will be addressed when Chapter 8 – Street Design and Pavement Thickness of the EDS is brought to the Board for approval.

## **Action Items**

1. Finalize revisions to Chapter 8 of the EDS.

**December 5, 2007 8:30 a.m.**

## **1. Engineering Design Standards – Chapter 8:**

Mark Cotter moved to approve the proposed revisions to Chapter 8 design standards as presented with the following exception: In Table 8.1 on page 8.9, sidewalk width on local streets will remain at four feet. The motion was seconded by Jeff Schmitt. Roll call: Yeses: Cotter, Schmitt, Schwanke, Fick, Vellinga 5. Noes, none.