

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE
RAPID CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 10, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kelly Arguello, Erik Braun, Karen Bulman, Racheal Caesar, Mike Gollhofer, Eirik Heikes, Mike Quasney and Vince Vidal. Bill Evans, Council Liaison was also present.

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Herr, Eric Ottenbacher and Haven Stuck

STAFF PRESENT: Vicki Fisher, Karl Bauer, Kip Harrington, Sarah Hanzel, Tim Behlings, Todd Peckosh, Wade Nyberg and Andrea Wolff.

Braun called the meeting to order at 7:05 a.m.

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

Bulman requested that Item 6 be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

Motion by Vidal seconded by Gollhofer and unanimously carried to recommend approval of the Consent Agenda Items 1 thru 6 in accordance with the staff recommendations with the exception of Item 6. (8 to 0 with Arguello, Braun, Bulman, Caesar, Gollhofer, Heikes, Quasney and Vidal voting yes and none voting no)

---CONSENT CALENDAR---

1. Approval of the May 27, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
2. No. 21PL046 - Golden Eagle Subdivision
A request by Baseline Surveying for T & A Properties, LLC to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for proposed Lot 1A and Lot 1B of Lot C of Golden Eagle Subdivision, legally described as Lot 1 of Lot C less Lot H1 of Golden Eagle Subdivision, located in Section 20, T2N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 2450 Seger Drive.

Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary Subdivision Plan be approved with the following stipulations

1. **Prior to submittal of a Final Plat application, the applicant shall confirm that a minimum of 100-feet of right-of-way is being provided along Seger Drive or the plat document shall be revised accordingly;**
2. **Prior to submittal of a Final Plat application, a Variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment shall be obtained to reduce the side yard setback from 25 feet to 23.73 feet for the existing storage building located on proposed lot 1A or the plat document shall be revised to provide the minimum required setback; and**
3. **Prior to submittal of a Final Plat application, a Variance from the**

Zoning Board of Adjustment shall be obtained to reduce the front yard setback from 25 feet to 23.17 feet for the existing storage, shop, and office building as a result of dedicating the additional right-of-way along Seger Drive.

3. No. 21PL050 - Elks Country Estates

A request by Longbranch Civil Engineering, Inc for ZCO Incorporated to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for Lot 39 thru Lot 46 of Block 10; Lot 22 through Lot 31 of Block 11; Lot 2 thru Lot 15 of Block 12; Lot 5 thru Lot 9 of Block 14; Lot 5 and Lot 10 thru Lot 12 of Block 15; Lot 12 thru Lot 37 of Block 16; Lot 1 thru Lot 9 of Block 17; and Lot 1 thru Lot 15 of Block 18 of Elks Country Estates, legally described as a portion of Tract 1 of the E1/2 of Section 16, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located southeast of the intersection of Augusta Drive and Willowbend Road.

Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary Subdivision Plan be approved with the following stipulations:

1. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for E. Minnesota Street, a minor arterial street, shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located in a minimum 100-foot wide right-of-way and constructed pursuant to Figure 2-1 of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or shall meet criteria for obtaining an Exception. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;**
2. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Jolly Lane, a collector street, shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located in a minimum 68-foot wide right-of-way and constructed pursuant to Figure 2-1 of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or shall meet criteria for obtaining an Exception. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;**
3. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Titleist Drive, Augusta Drive, Callaway Drive and Taylor Made Drive, local streets, shall be submitted for review and approval showing the streets located within a minimum 52-foot wide right-of-way and constructed pursuant to Figure 2-1 of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or shall meet criteria for obtaining an Exception. An additional 10 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated along the first 200 feet of Augusta Drive and Jolly Lane and along Callaway Drive as it abuts Lot 1, Block 18 and the Drainage Lot as they extend north from E. Minnesota Street. If Exception(s) are obtained, a copy of the approved document(s) shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;**
4. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Ping Drive, a local cul-de-sac street, shall be submitted for review and approval showing the street located within a minimum 52-foot wide right-of-way and constructed pursuant to Figure 2-1 of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or shall meet criteria for**

- obtaining an Exception. In addition, the cul-de-sac bulb shall be constructed pursuant to Table 2-4 of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or shall meet criteria for obtaining an Exception. If Exception(s) are obtained, a copy of the approved document(s) shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
5. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application for Phase 9 and/or 10, construction plans for the section line highway, a local street, shall be submitted for review and approval showing the streets located within a minimum 52-foot wide right-of-way and constructed pursuant to Figure 2-1 of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or shall meet criteria for obtaining an Exception or the section line highway shall be vacated. If Exception(s) are obtained, a copy of the approved document(s) shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;
 6. Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a cost estimate for the required subdivision improvements shall be submitted for review and approval;
 7. Prior to approval of the Development Engineering Plan application, a Development Agreement shall be entered into with the City for all public improvements;
 8. Prior to approval of the Development Engineering Plan application, engineering design reports (in part to include water, sewer, drainage, and pavement) required for construction approval shall be accepted and agreements required for construction approval shall be executed pursuant to Chapter 1.15 of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual. In addition, construction plans shall be accepted in accordance with the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual. All final engineering reports shall be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer and contain a Certification Statement of Conformance with City Standards, as required by the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual;
 9. Prior to approval of the Development Engineering Plan application, approval from the South Dakota Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources shall be secured;
 10. Prior to submittal of the Development Engineering Plan application, the developer shall confirm that there is adequate capacity in the downstream Jolly Lane lift station;
 11. Prior to approval of the Development Engineering Plan application, any necessary off-site easements shall be recorded;
 12. Prior to submittal of a Final Plat application, a Major Amendment to the Final Planned Development Overlay shall be submitted for review and approval;
 13. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, an agreement shall be submitted for recording securing ownership and maintenance of any propose drainage elements or non-buildable lots. In addition, Major Drainage Easements shall be dedicated for the proposed drainage improvements;
 14. Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted and the subdivision inspection fees shall be paid; and,
 15. Prior to the City's acceptance of the public improvements, a warranty surety shall be submitted for review and approval as required.

4. No. 21PL051 - Chalkstone Subdivision

A request by Fisk Land Surveying & Consulting Engineers, Inc for Saxe Development LLC to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for proposed 13A and 13B of Chalkstone Subdivision, legally described as Lot 13 of Chalkstone Subdivision, located in the SW1/4 of the NW1/4 of Section 13, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 5218 Chalkstone Court.

Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary Subdivision Plan be approved with the following stipulations

1. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for Haines Avenue, a Principal Arterial Street, shall be submitted in compliance with Figure 2-1 of the Infrastructure Design Criteria Manual or an Exception shall be obtained. If an Exception is obtained, a copy of the approved document shall be submitted with the Development Engineering Plan application;**
2. **Prior to submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a Variance to waive the requirement to construct a sidewalk along Haines Avenue shall be obtained from City Council, or upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan Application, construction plans for a sidewalk shall be submitted for review and approval.**
3. **Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted and the subdivision inspection fees shall be paid; and**
4. **Prior to the City's acceptance of the public improvements, a warranty surety shall be submitted for review and approval as required.**

5. No. 21PL052 - Hulm Subdivision

A request by Fisk Land Surveying & Consulting Engineers, Inc for Terrance and Mardonna Hulm Living Trust to consider an application for a **Preliminary Subdivision Plan** for proposed Lots 1 and 2 of Hulm Subdivision, legally described as the N1/2 of the NE1/4 of the NW1/4 and the N1/2 of the NW1/4 of the NE1/4 of Section 15, T2N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 4601 225th Street.

Planning Commission recommended that the Preliminary Subdivision Plan be approved with the following stipulations:

1. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, construction plans for 225th Street as it abuts the subject property from the west lot line through the proposed cul-de-sac shall be submitted showing a minimum 24-foot wide gravel rural road section pursuant to Pennington Count requirements. In addition, the construction plans shall provide a sidewalk along this section of 225th Street or a Variance shall be obtained from City Council;**
2. **Upon submittal of a Development Engineering Plan application, a drainage report shall be submitted for review and approval for any proposed culverts and ditch sizing;**
3. **Prior to approval of the Development Engineering Plan application, a Development Agreement shall be entered into with the City for all public improvements;**

4. **Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, a Covenant Agreement shall be entered into with the City to ensure that fire suppression systems are installed in any new residential structures or expansions to the existing residence that results in the expansion of the fire flow calculation area as defined by the International Fire Code. The system design and installation shall meet the system requirements of NFPA 13, 13R and 13D, as applicable;**
5. **Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, a Covenant Agreement shall be entered into with the City to ensure that exterior building construction materials, building separations and landscaping provision are in conformance with the best practices established by the Rapid City Fire Department Survivable Space Initiative;**
6. **Upon submittal of a Final Plat application, surety for any required subdivision improvements that have not been completed shall be posted and the subdivision inspection fees shall be paid; and,**
7. **Prior to the City's acceptance of the public improvements, a warranty surety shall be submitted for review and approval as required.**

---END OF CONSENT CALENDAR---

6. No. 21VR001 - Section 21, T1N, R8E

A request by KTM Design Solutions, Inc for SSST, LLC to consider an application for a **Vacation of Section Line Highway** for Section Line right-of-way located in the N1/2 of the NW1/4 of the NW1/4 of Section 21, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakotas, more generally described as being located south of southern terminus of Pahlmeyer Drive.

Bulman asked about the actual area being recorded for vacation, stating that the exhibit showed that 33 feet of the Section Line Highway was being vacated, but also indicated that another 33 feet to the west of the Section Line Highway was being vacated concurrently for a total of 66 feet vacation. Fisher stated that staff would review the exhibit and ensure that the correct distance to be recorded is shown prior to Council review.

Bulman moved, Quasney seconded and the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Vacation of Section Line Highway. (8 to 0 with Arguello, Braun, Bulman, Caesar, Golliher, Heikes, Quasney and Vidal voting yes and none voting no)

---BEGINNING OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS---

*7. No. 21PD022 - Stoney Creek South Subdivision

A request by Buell Consulting, Inc for Verizon Wireless to consider an application for a **Major Amendment to a Planned Development Overlay to allow a cellular communication tower** for Lot 4 of Block 3 of Stoney Creek South Subdivision, located in Section 22, T1N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, more generally described as being located at 5615 Nugget Gulch Road.

Fisher presented the application and reviewed the associated slides showing the location of the proposed cellular tower and the surrounding properties. Fisher reviewed the zoning designations of the property and surrounding property noting

that cellular towers are a Conditional Use Permit allowed in limited zoning areas of which this property, being General Commercial, is an allowable zoning district. Fisher noted that there will be an associated equipment building and that the structure is proposed to be built of brick with surrounding fencing. Fisher also noted that there are four evergreen trees being planted to provide an aesthetic element between Sheridan Lake Road and the tower. Fisher noted the pole structure will be beige rather than standard metal to help reduce glare and that the lightning pole that will be on the top of the tower is to draw lighting to the pole and away from the surrounding properties. Fisher reviewed the service map stating that this area has a lack of coverage and that numerous attempts to place a tower to provide service in the area have previously failed. Fisher acknowledged that cell towers are difficult as the placement is rarely appreciated by residential property owners, but due to the void of coverage, this location is supported by staff including the Fire and Police Departments. Fisher clarified that the tower is 4-G only and not 5-G. Fisher stated that staff recommends approval with the stipulations noted in the report.

Linda Herreman, 4850 Vista Hills Drive, stated that she lives along Sheridan Lake Road and she has twice required emergency services but due to the lack of cell service in the area was unable to contact emergency services using her cell phone and had to email her son in Sioux Falls to have him contact emergency assistance. She stated that the need for coverage is vital as much of the medical processes are now handled on line and she asked that the tower be allowed to ensure needed coverage.

Chris Teeslink, 2828 Harvard Avenue, stated he works at Carpenter Dental and lives approximately two blocks away and he is against the project stating that it will dominate the landscape and will not be in harmony with the neighborhood. Teeslink noted that the tower is closer to their building than it is to the Loftus building due to the placement on the lot. He stated that his customers will be concerned for the safety of their health with the tower being so close. Teeslink stated that coverage in the area has improved and doesn't think the tower is needed in this area.

Kala French, 8435 Mittenwald Court, said she was representing Dakota Dental for Kids which is located at 5509 Bendt Drive and spoke to her concerns to the health safety of their customers, reduced property values and aesthetic concerns. French also stated that she does not have coverage issues either at work or coming or going to work.

Doug Foley, 5735 Harper Court, spoke to his concerns noting that the tower will be in direct line of sight from the back decks of many of the residences located along Harper Court. Foley noted that none of the photos in the presentation showed shots from any of the surrounding residence showing the impact the tower will have on their view. Foley said that their coverage is not a problem and suggested placing the tower closer to where the service is needed. He spoke to concerns with the lighting rod that is located on the tower stating that the residences are higher than the tower.

Corky Foley, 5735 Harper Court, asked if there were other locations to place the tower stating that she does not feel placing it so close to a residential area is good placement and that other neighborhoods have rejected these requests and they are

no different. Foley mentioned the issue of reduced property value, the loss of their view and that she is disheartened.

Doug Foley stepped back to the microphone and spoke to other locations including Corral Drive Elementary School saying he feels that is a viable alternative.

Mark Abrams, 5717 Harper Court, spoke to the effect on his view noting that he had moved to his current location specifically to have this view, noting he had even purchased the neighboring lot to avoid losing his view. Abrams questioned the placement on the lot, asking if it could be closer to the Loftus building rather than at the far end of the lot. Abrams said that he believes the drainage area in the southeast corner of the lot would be a more suitable location as it would not block the view. Abrams reviewed photos showing the effect the pole would have on views from his property.

Sarah Abrams, 5717 Harper Court, said that coverage had been an issue but has not been an issue recently. Abrams said she is not opposed to a tower but just not in her backyard. She commented that the area is mostly residential and thinks there are better places to place the tower. Abrams said she appreciates Planning's attempt at screening, but you cannot screen the height of the pole. Abrams further noted her concern regarding the danger of lightning strikes and interference with the expensive medical equipment they have for their son and requests the tower be rejected.

Brook Kelly, 5729 Harper Court, stated that she was frustrated by the short notice and the number of people who were notified. Kelly stated she did not receive her notice letter until six days before the meeting leaving only three business days to prepare their argument and defense. Kelly read from her information stating that the notification requirements were not met and that the 250 feet notification area listed in the notification letter should actually be 500 feet per the Zoning Ordinance and asked if there was a change that allowed this difference. Kelly stated that they do not need a cellular tower in their neighborhood that their service is fine and although it may be needed for others she would like it elsewhere not in their backyard. Kelly further stated that she feels the applicant did not meet the requirement of providing photos of the impact of the proposed tower on the residential properties as required by the Zoning Ordinance as well as the requirement for specific distance, aesthetic design and placement and wondered if these were met and if not why. Kelly also addressed her concerns regarding the damage to property values providing copies of letters she received from a number of realtors. She addressed her health concerns about the RF waves which they will be exposed to.

Kara Wiese, 5723 Harper Court, stated that they had just recently purchased and built their home in this location specifically for the view with the intent to resell for a profit and that they were not informed that this cellular tower was in the works when they purchased their property. Wiese also spoke to the misrepresentative nature of the photos provided by the applicant stating that they did not show the true aspect of the tower's impact on the view and showed photos of how the tower will look from inside her home. Wiese spoke to the potential use of units that are attached to light towers, which would be safer and less disruptive. Wiese also stated that her coverage is personally not an issue.

Dallas Biers, Piedmont, noted he does not live in the area, but he has family that live on Harbor Court and discussed his concern regarding view and health concerns the tower will create. Biers said he was not aware of service issues in this neighborhood and feels that there must be better locations.

Travis Brink, 22767 Partridge Lane, Box Elder, stated he does not live in the area but owns Code Ninjas which is located across the street from the tower and felt as a non-resident he was able to call out the misleading nature of the presentation as he does not have to work with the City.

Rod Griffin, 5730 Harper Court, spoke to the impact to his view and reduced property value and he is opposed to the tower stating that he does not have cell coverage issues.

Brian Kabat, Buell Consulting, Inc., representative for Verizon, stated that he is accompanied by Rick Dobbe, RF Engineer for Verizon Wireless; Cortney Benarz, Real Estate Manager for Great Plains, Verizon Wireless and Anthony Dorland, attorney with Moss & Barnett, legal representative who will all be available to answer questions. Kabat presented slides showing reasons for the need for additional towers including that the increased usage with many households completely dependent on wireless creating draws and reducing service for large areas and the anticipated increasing draw which weakens signal. Kabat reviewed the current tower locations that provide coverage in the area including the light pole units also known as small cell or micro cell units stating that they are designed for localized coverage. Kabat spoke to the difficulty of placing the needed towers as property owners have fought placements. He explained that co-location is unfortunately not a viable option in this situation. Kabat stated they had considered the use of Southwest Middle School, which although a good location, there is no interest by the landowner. Kabat stated that they have spoken to numerous property owners but have not found any interest. He stated that the southwestern Rapid City area is such a predominantly residential area that it has presented quite a challenge and that all proposed sights have been adjacent to residential properties regardless of the zoning of the actual sight they are proposing. He stated that they have worked to reduce disruption through sight planning, reducing pole height, although taller would provide better line of sight, and by designing the antennae and radios so they are close to the pole rather than a large platform, with 12-foot faces to reduce the view shed distribution. Kabat said he understands that there is disruption and if there was a perfect location that would not affect property values and view disruption they would locate there, but there is no such location in such a populated area. Kabat spoke to the need for coverage due to the use of home working. Kabat spoke to the FCC safety requirements and that many towers are lower than the limits required by the FCC.

Heikes thanked everyone for the great information and discussion from both sides. In response to a question on the height of the street lights in the area, Peckosh stated he did not have the specific height for the lights along Catron Boulevard, but that the general height for street lights is 40 feet. In response to Heikes's question on esthetic design options, Kabat stated the mono tree design which is used to reduce visual impact of towers in forested areas would not fit the surrounding area.

In response to a question from Bill Evans, Council Liaison, on the difference between this open design versus the flag pole design, Kabat explained that the newer equipment required to be on the pole makes it difficult to use the flag pole design as the pole is too wide to be disguised as a flag pole. In response to a question from Evans on the agreement details for the use of the tower, Kabat stated those documents are confidential, but yes, there is a value to the payment for lease. Evans stated that he does not see the City Council supporting this request.

In response to a question from Caesar on the coverage from the units that are placed on light poles versus the coverage by a tower, whether it is additional coverage or just amplified power, Kabat reviewed the difference between coverage to an area with no coverage and capacity coverage to an area with existing coverage that needs increased coverage. Kabat said both devices will increase coverage but the micro or small cell units are generally amplifiers for very small areas. Caesar thanked Kabat for the overview of the other locations that have been considered.

In response to Caesar's request for other more commercial sites, Fisher agreed that this location is a challenge and reviewed zoning that allow towers stating that there are zero areas from Jackson Boulevard to Catron Boulevard until the Autumn Hills Plaza area where the zoning allows for a cell tower. Fisher explained that there have been previous attempts to spot zone to allow towers, but spot zoning is not allowed or supportable by law so options for additional cell towers to improve or even provide coverage are very limited.

In response to a question from Caesar about the location on the lot, Kabat noted that other options were considered but it was decided this was the best long range location. Caesar stated that she understands the concerns of the neighborhood but that the coverage is needed now and will only continue to increase.

In response to a question from Quasney on the location and height of the tower, Kabat reviewed why the location was selected including zoning and design and that he was informed this was the lowest viable height for the tower. Quasney spoke to the need for coverage as the city continues to grow and that he also understands both the need and the neighborhoods concerns.

In response to Quasney regarding the mailing and notice, Fisher reviewed Rapid City Municipal Code requirements stating that these are being met both for area and time of notice. In response to Quasney's suggestion to have certain applications require larger notice areas and earlier mailings, Fisher stated that it is important to avoid burdening specific applications with harder requirements. Fisher stated that it is important for some uses, such as this, for the applicant to hold neighborhood meetings to open up discussion and provide information prior to submitting their application. Fisher also clarified that applicants are not required to provide photo simulations but staff strongly suggest that they do.

In response to questions from Quasney on providing more time for the neighborhood, Fisher stated that it is an option for the item to be continued.

In response to Vidal questions on concerns with radio waves and use of mobile

units, Courtney Bednarz spoke to the FCC requirements and the recent studies that the emissions of new towers are lower than previous equipment. Bednarz explained that mobile towers are used to boost coverage for large events and not for standard coverage. Vidal suggested mobile units rather than a permanent tower.

Bednarz reviewed the difficulties they have experienced in trying to provide coverage to this area with the topography constraints, lack of viable locations. Bednarz noted that upon deciding on this specific location, and RF engineers worked to modify the design by reducing the height of the tower and adding the lightning rod to allow the best coverage possible.

Arguello acknowledged that the tower is not aesthetically appealing, that it will affect property value, and have an overall effect on the surrounding residences and business and it will be up to each individual to weigh those against the value and public benefits. Arguello spoke to lightning as a safety issue noting that the lightning rod which is proposed on the tower is important as it is designed to draw these dangers to it rather than other surrounding structures.

Bulman moved to continue the Planning Commission Meeting past 9:00 if needed, Quasney seconded and the Planning Commission voted unanimously. (8 to 0 with Arguello, Braun, Bulman, Caesar, Gollhofer, Heikes, Quasney and Vidal voting yes and none voting no)

Evans spoke to the gain versus negative impact and asked about potential 5-G coverage.

Rick Dobbe, RF Engineer, explained that the 5-G is a reuse of existing radio waves just in a different way, explaining that there is also the technology of expanded spectrum. Dobbe said he is not aware of that upgrade being used in the Rapid City area. Evans discussed the implementation of 5G over the 4-G with multiple point locations.

Vidal asked about line of sight due to the frequency being used by Verizon. Doby stated that the goal is a 1-mile radius and that the terrain in the area makes it difficult to do this and try to reduce the number of towers and tower height. In response to a question from Vidal about relay sights, Doby explained that they cover only a one-block area, so it would take dozens of them to cover the same 1-mile radius.

Vidal confirmed the mailing notice.

Caesar stated she would like to continue the item to the July 8, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting to allow more information to be provided for review, including photos and other locations in the area to service this area. Quasney seconded.

The Planning Commissioners identified the additional information they would like brought to the July 8, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting on this item, including additional maps and overlays showing, coverage, tower impacts, alternative sites, and information on the lightning rods. It was suggested that Verizon hold a neighborhood meeting.

Evans spoke to a City acquired property that could be an option, Fisher stated that the proposed property that is being considered, however, she expects that surrounding neighborhood would have the same concerns.

Braun spoke to previous tower applications noting that these discussion are necessary and he appreciates the open communication.

Discussion followed on what everyone would like to see at the July 8, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting.

Bulman moved, Quasney seconded and the Planning Commission continued the Major Amendment to a Planned Development Overlay to allow a cellular communication tower to the July 8, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting.

The Rapid City Planning Commission's action on this item is final unless any party appeals that decision to the Rapid City Council. All appeals must be submitted in writing to the Department of Community Development by close of business on the seventh full calendar day following action by the Planning Commission.

8. Discussion Items
None

9. Staff Items

Fisher thanked the neighborhood for all its input stating that it helps staff to review an item thoroughly.

Fisher introduced Karl Bauer who has joined our staff as a Current Planner II.

10. Planning Commission Items
None

There being no further business, Caesar moved, Vidal seconded and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 a.m. (8 to 0 with Arguello, Braun, Bulman, Caesar, Gollhofer, Heikes, Quasney and Vidal voting yes and none voting no)