

MINUTES
PENNINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
January 13, 2014 @ 9:00 a.m.

County Commissioners' Meeting Room - Pennington County Courthouse

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sig Zvejnieks, Karen Hall, Jim Coleman, Lori Litzen, Bill McCollam, Barbara Landers, and Ken Davis.

STAFF PRESENT: Dan Jennissen, Lysann Zeller, Jeri Ervin, PJ Conover, and Patrick Grode (SAO).

ROLL CALL

1. APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 9, 2013, MINUTES
Moved by Hall and seconded by McCollman to approve the December 9, 2013, Planning Commission minutes. Vote: unanimous (6 to 0).

Commissioner Litzen appeared at 9:01 a.m.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Moved by Litzen and seconded by Hall to approve the January 13, 2014, Planning Commission Agenda. Vote: unanimous (7 to 0).

CONSENT CALENDAR

The following items have been placed on the Consent Calendar for action to be taken on all items in accordance with staff's recommendation by a single vote. Any item may be removed from the Consent Calendar, by any Planning Commissioner, staff member, or audience member for separate consideration. The findings of this Planning Commission are recommendations to the Pennington County Board of Commissioners who will make the final decision.

3. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REVIEW / CU 07-47:** Exergy Development Group; John E. Link Revocable Trust. To review a wind measurement tower, not to exceed 200 feet in height, in a General Agriculture District in accordance with Sections 205 and 510 of the Pennington County Zoning Ordinance.

Government Lot 4; SE1/4SW1/4; S1/2SE1/4, Section 30, T4N, R16E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

(Continued from the November 25, 2013, Planning Commission meeting.)

To revoke Conditional Use Permit / CU 07-47.

Vote: unanimous (7 to 0).

4. **MINOR PLAT / PL 13-27 AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS VARIANCE / SV 13-13:** Tracey Mowery / George and Robin Pendo. To reconfigure lot lines to create Lot 1R and Lot 2 of Slater Subdivision and to waive platting requirements in accordance with Sections 400.3 and 700.1 of the Pennington County Subdivision Regulations.

EXISTING LEGAL: NE1/4 less Tightline Lake Estates; E1/2NW1/4 less Slater Subdivision; SW1/4NW1/4 less Slater Subdivision, less I-90 right-of-way and less County Road right-of-way; and Lot 1 of Slater Subdivision; all in Section 26, T2N, R10E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

PROPOSED LEGAL: Lot 1R and Lot 2 of Slater Subdivision, Section 26, T2N, R10E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

(Continued from the December 9, 2013, Planning Commission meeting.)

To recommend to deny without prejudice Subdivision Regulations Variance / SV 13-13 and Minor Plat 13-27, per the applicants' request.

Vote: unanimous (7 to 0).

5. **REZONE / RZ 13-20:** Phyllis Gilbert Trust and Charles Halverson; Lorraine Smith - Agent. To rezone 42.1 acres from General Agriculture District to Limited Agriculture District in accordance with Sections 206 and 508 of the Pennington County Zoning Ordinance.

Located on the S3/4NE1/4SW1/4; SE1/4SW1/4 less part lying south of highway; and, that part of the SW1/4SW1/4 and vacated Section Line lying East of County Road #C2337; Section 24, T1S, R6E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

To recommend approval of Rezone / RZ 13-20.

Vote: unanimous (7 to 0).

6. **LAYOUT PLAT / PL 13-30 AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS VARIANCE / SV 13-14:** John Donahue; Fisk Land Surveying. To reconfigure lots lines to create Tract A Revised of Blocks 7 and 8 and Tract B of Block 7 in Silver City and to waive platting requirements in accordance with Section 400.1 of the Pennington County Subdivision Regulations.

EXISTING LEGAL: Tract A of Blocks 7 and 8 and all of Lots 25 and 26 in Block 7 of Silver City, Section 31, T2N, R5E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

PROPOSED LEGAL: Tract A Revised of Blocks 7 and 8 and Tract B of Block 7 in Silver City, Section 31, T2N, R5E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

To recommend approval of Subdivision Regulations Variance / SV 13-14 to waive all road improvements for all roads, including Nugget Street, Saint Joseph Street, the adjacent alley and easements; waive topography information at a five (5) foot contour interval (allow topography at a 40 foot contour interval instead); waive submittal of percolation tests and soil profile information; and, to waive dedication of the eight (8) foot utility and drainage easements in the location of the existing house (cabin) along the side (west) property line and proposed Tract B (dedicate these easements in all other locations) and approval of Layout Plat 13-30 with the following fifteen (15) conditions:

- 1. That at the time of Minor Plat submittal, engineered road construction plans be submitted for St. Joseph Street, the platted 20 foot private access easement which allows access to lots in Block 8 and Block 1, and the platted 20 foot alley, or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;**
- 2. That the following roads: St. Joseph Street, the platted 20 foot private access easement which allows access to lots in Block 8 and Block 1, and the platted 20 foot alley be improved, per Table 1 of the Subdivision Regulations, or approval of a Subdivision Regulation Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;**
- 3. That at the time of the Minor Plat submittal, the applicant submits percolation tests and soil profile information for both lots to be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Planner or obtain approval of a Subdivision Regulations Variance waiving this requirement;**
- 4. That at the time of submittal of the Minor Plat, the applicant submits topography at five foot intervals or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;**
- 5. That at the time of submittal of the Minor Plat, the measurement be labeled for the shared lot line between Tract A Revised and Tract B;**
- 6. That at the time of submittal of the Minor Plat, a letter from Black Hills Power indicating the vacation of the platted 15 feet (each side) power line easement over Tract A be submitted to the Pennington County Planning Department or said easement and power line be added to the plat with accompanying easements;**
- 7. That at the time of submittal of the Minor Plat, the street name Nugget Street (indicated on the submitted plat and site plan), be corrected and the correct street name: Fairview Street, per plats: January 5, 1893 (Silver City) and 1999 Plat 29-99 be used;**

8. That at the time of submittal of the Minor Plat, the pair of dashed-lines denoting the vacated portion of Fairview Street (see 1999 Plat 29-99) be removed from the plat;
9. That prior to County Board approval of the Minor Plat, a Lot Size Variance be obtained for Tract B;
10. That prior to County Board approval of the Minor Plat, a Lot Size Variance be obtained for Tract A Revised, if a well and septic system are to be located on the property;
11. That the width of the alley and the 20 foot private drive easement need to be 66-feet-wide or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;
12. That prior to filing the Minor Plat with the Register of Deeds, the outhouse located on Tract A Revised be removed;
13. That a note needs to be added to the plat indicating that the 8-foot-wide Utility and Minor Drainage Easement not be located in the area of existing structures;
14. That proposed Tract A Revised of Blocks 7 and 8, become known, as Tract A Revised of Block 7; and,
15. That the approval of this Layout Plat does not constitute approval of any further applications to be submitted for the above-described properties.

Vote: unanimous (7 to 0).

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

7. LAYOUT PLAT / PL 13-29: John and Jenny Boland. To create Lot 1 of Boland Subdivision in accordance with Section 400.1 of the Pennington County Subdivision Regulations.

EXISTING LEGAL: Government Lots 10-11, Section 31, T1S, R6E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

PROPOSED LEGAL: Lot 1 of Boland Subdivision and unplatted balance of Government Lot 11, Section 31, T1S, R6E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

Jennissen reviewed the Staff Report indicating the applicant has applied for a Layout Plat to create Lot 1 of Boland Subdivision, which will create a separate lot for a studio/residence, and the rest will be left as an unplatted balance.

Jennissen further explained that, in 2011, an Ordinance Amendment was adopted which allows one Guest House per parcel, in addition to the main residence, with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Prior to the adoption of the Guest House Ordinance, studios were allowed as long as they were not to be used as a second living quarters. Mr. Boland indicated that the studio/Guest House has a stove and complete living quarters, and he thought that it would be grandfathered-in when the Guest House Ordinance was adopted. Since the studio is now a Guest House, the property is in violation and in order to bring the property into compliance, a separate lot needs to be created for the second home on the property. Mr. Boland does not have the option of applying for a CUP as the Guest House is larger than 1,000 square feet and a Guest House cannot be larger than 1,000 square feet. By creating a separate lot for the guest house, it will bring the property into compliance.

Staff recommended approval of Layout Plat 13-29 with the following ten (10) conditions:

1. That at the time of Minor Plat submittal, engineered road construction plans be submitted for the 66-foot-wide access easement and the Section Line ROW or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;
2. That at the time of Minor Plat submittal, the applicant submits percolation tests and soil profile information for all three lots to be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Planner or obtain approval of a Subdivision Regulations Variance waiving this requirement;
3. That at the time of submittal of the Minor Plat, the Section Line ROW and 66-foot-wide easement be improved to Ordinance 14 Standards or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;
4. That at the time of Minor Plat submittal, the applicants submit topography at a five foot contour interval or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;
5. That the private access easement be named and labeled on the plat, and the properties be appropriately addressed from the private access easement in accordance with Ordinance 20;
6. That prior to filing the plat with Register of Deeds, an Operating Permit be obtained for proposed Lot 1;
7. That proposed Lot 1 be rezoned from General Agriculture District to Low Density Residential District or approval of a Lot Size Variance be obtained to allow a 3.384 acre lot in a General Agriculture District;

8. That the scale of the plat be not more than 1" = 100', or obtain approval of a Subdivision Regulations Variance waiving this requirement;
9. That a site plan be submitted showing the locations of all the existing structures to assure a minimum of 25 feet is maintained for the existing studio/residence prior to approval of the Minor Plat; and,
10. That approval of this Layout Plat does not constitute approval of any further applications to be submitted for the above-described property.

Mr. John Boland, applicant, appeared and stated he is not opposed to the conditions recommended for the Layout Plat.

Moved by Davis and seconded by Coleman to approve of Layout Plat 13-29 with the following ten (10) conditions:

- 1. That at the time of Minor Plat submittal, engineered road construction plans be submitted for the 66-foot-wide access easement and the Section Line ROW or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;**
- 2. That at the time of Minor Plat submittal, the applicant submits percolation tests and soil profile information for all three lots to be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Planner or obtain approval of a Subdivision Regulations Variance waiving this requirement;**
- 3. That at the time of submittal of the Minor Plat, the Section Line ROW and 66-foot-wide easement be improved to Ordinance 14 Standards or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;**
- 4. That at the time of Minor Plat submittal, the applicants submit topography at a five foot contour interval or a Subdivision Regulations Variance be obtained waiving this requirement;**
- 5. That the private access easement be named and labeled on the plat, and the properties be appropriately addressed from the private access easement in accordance with Ordinance 20;**
- 6. That prior to filing the plat with Register of Deeds, an Operating Permit be obtained for proposed Lot 1;**
- 7. That proposed Lot 1 be rezoned from General Agriculture District to Low Density Residential District or approval of a Lot Size Variance be obtained to allow a 3.384 acre lot in a General Agriculture District;**

8. **That the scale of the plat be not more than 1" = 100', or obtain approval of a Subdivision Regulations Variance waiving this requirement;**
9. **That a site plan be submitted showing the locations of all the existing structures to assure a minimum of 25 feet is maintained for the existing studio/residence prior to approval of the Minor Plat; and,**
10. **That approval of this Layout Plat does not constitute approval of any further applications to be submitted for the above-described property.**

All voting aye, the Motion carried 7 to 0.

8. REZONE / RZ 13-21 AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT / CA 13-13: Rushmore Cave, LLC (Tom Hagen and Bobby Sundby). To rezone 56.13 acres from General Agriculture District and Low Density Residential District to Highway Service District and to amend the Comprehensive Plan to change the Future Land Use from Limited Agriculture District to Highway Service District in accordance with Sections 210 and 508 of the Pennington County Zoning Ordinance.

Lot 1R of Rushmore Cave Subdivision, Section 18, T2S, R7E, BHM, Pennington County, South Dakota.

Zeller reviewed the Staff Report indicating the applicant has applied to rezone 56.13 acres from General Agriculture District and Low Density Residential District to Highway Service District and to amend the Comprehensive Plan to change the Future Land Use from Limited Agriculture District to Highway Service District.

Zeller explained the subject property is home to the Rushmore Cave and contains a visitor's center/gift shop, zip line ride, interactive dark theatre, parking area, shop, barn, bunkhouse, and single-family residence. All of these uses, with the exception of the single-family residence, are allowed through the approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Recreational Resort in a General Agriculture District. The purpose of the original Conditional Use Permit for the Recreational Resort was to bring the cave operation into compliance and allow for the expansion of a zip line ride (CU #11-03). This Conditional Use Permit was later amended to also allow for an interactive dark theatre (CU #12-02) and approved by Planning Commission on March 12, 2012, with 15 conditions. This latter Conditional Use Permit was most recently reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on August 12, 2013, with 11 conditions.

Zeller stated that, although the applicant has not provided any specific information for their future intentions of the use of the subject property, it is staffs understanding that the applicant intends, at a minimum, to continue operating the cave and other attractions on the property. However, rezoning the subject property to Highway Service District will also allow for any of the Permitted Uses listed in Section 210 of the Zoning Ordinance to be developed on the property, including, but not limited to: hotels and motels, eating and drinking establishments, service stations and garages, souvenir and gift shops, retail

businesses, commercial recreation and amusement structures and uses, public services structures, outdoor advertising and community signs, and Vacation Home Rentals. If the subject property is rezoned to Highway Service District, these commercial uses could be established on the property through issuance of a Building Permit from the Planning Department and would not require additional approval by the Planning Commission or Board of Commissioners. Currently, the Conditional Use Permit the cave and other attractions are operating under is required to be amended before additional uses are established on the property. This Conditional Use Permit would no longer be valid if the property is rezoned.

Zeller further indicated that the surrounding area is zoned a mix of Low Density Residential, General Agriculture District, Limited Agriculture District and Highway Service District. A majority of lots in the area contain single-family residences or are used for agricultural purposes. The nearest Highway Service District zoning is located directly west of the property, across Highway 40, and was previously used as a campground and cabins, but does not appear to contain an established commercial use at this time. This property was rezoned to Highway Service District in 1992 “to bring zoning into compliance with present use of property.” The next nearest commercial zoning (Highway Service District) is located approximately 1.5 miles further west along Highway 40 and also does not appear to contain an established commercial use at this time. This property was rezoned to Highway Service District in 1983 to allow for a gift shop.

Staff recommended approval of Rezone 13-21 and Comprehensive Plan Amendment 13-13 in consideration of the following: 1.) Rushmore Cave has been operated commercially on the property for over 60 years; 2.) The size of the subject property is apparently sufficient to accommodate the uses allowed in a Highway Service District; 3.) The proximity of other Highway Service District zoning across the highway; and, 4) The established use of the subject property is seemingly more consistent with Commercial Land Use than Agricultural Land Use as defined in the Pennington County Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Coleman wanted to know if the proposed rezone request to Highway Service is in anticipation for possible future additions to the cave by the applicant.

Zeller stated the applicant is at the meeting and could address this, but noted that this was likely since the applicant has applied to rezone the property. She also noted other tourism sites that are zoned Highway Service District: Bear Country, Cosmos, etc.

Commissioner Coleman asked where the nearest Highway Service Zoning District is in relation to the subject property and also how far the cave is located from Keystone.

Zeller said that the nearest Highway Service property is located directly west of the subject property, across Highway 40, and was previously used as a campground and cabins, but does not appear to contain an established commercial use at this time. Zeller also indicated that the cave is about five miles from the city of Keystone.

Commissioner Litzen asked if the current Conditional Use Permit is reviewed on an annual basis.

Zeller explained that, based on the conditions, it will be reviewed in one year, but could be changed in the future to be reviewed more or less frequently.

Mr. Tom Hagen, applicant, appeared and spoke in support of the proposed application. He also reviewed a letter he submitted addressing why he feels the property should be rezoned to Highway Service District.

Mr. Tom Pitlick, new landowner in Forty Oaks Subdivision (Lots 3 and 5), appeared and spoke of the quietness and peacefulness of the area in which he wanted to live. He asked that the request be denied.

Ms. Rita Wagner, area landowner, appeared and also spoke in opposition to the proposed request.

Mr. Dan Schweitzer, area landowner, appeared and spoke in opposition to the proposed request. He stated that additional uses on the subject property will lower his property values.

Mr. John Preston, realtor and owner of Battle Creek Agency, appeared and stated that he feels the property values near the area of the cave have been reduced because of the additional attractions added to the subject property.

Mr. Bobby Sundby, owner of Rushmore Cave and realtor, appeared and stated their intent is not to lower neighboring property values and feels the values have not been reduced.

Commissioner Zvejnieks spoke of his concern if the property is rezoned to Highway Service District and is sold in the future.

Mr. Sundby discussed tourism in the Black Hills and tourism being blended in with residential areas all over the Black Hills. He spoke of Bear Country and Reptile Gardens as examples with residential areas surrounding them.

Commissioner Coleman commented that he believes the neighbors are concerned, since there is nothing preventing the applicants from installing a roller coaster once the property is rezoned.

Mr. Hagen addressed this and noted that Prairie Berry, Bear Country, and Reptile Gardens could also build roller coasters on each of their properties, as they are zoned for that type of use. Mr. Hagen further added that he does not want to build an amusement park on the property and would like to see his kids continuing to operate it in the future.

Commissioner Landers spoke of the cave being a unique business as it is located underground and this is what the neighbors expected. The use is now being changed from an underground use to other uses being added.

Mr. Hagen said the neighbors' perception is that the cave will add different types of amusements park-type rides and this is not what they want to do. He stated they are asking for it to be rezoned to Highway Service as other commercially operated businesses are in the Black Hills. They fit the criteria to be zoned Highway Service.

Commissioner Litzen spoke of allowed uses in a Highway Service District and uses in that zoning district which need a Conditional Use Permit to operate, such as a roller coaster. She noted that the applicants would still need to appear before the Planning Commission to obtain approval.

Commissioner Davis asked Mr. Hagen if they have a business plan in place and wanted to know why they feel the property needs to be rezoned.

Mr. Hagen responded and said there is a business plan and further spoke of the operation of Jewel Cave and Wind Cave, which are federally funded caves, and Rushmore Cave is not. As business owner, in order to make Rushmore Cave competitive and profitable, they look for different ways to add family-type ventures to their operation and having it rezoned would not hinder the process. Having the Conditional Use Permit does, since the process takes time and they have to appear every time in front of the Planning Commission to obtain approval.

Commissioner Litzen asked Mr. Hagen what they are proposing in the next five years.

Mr. Hagen said they have looked at adding a pumpkin patch, apple orchard, laser tag, climbing walls, alpine slide, hiking trails and nature areas, etc. He also added that they want the property to fit in with the area and they are not intending to add mechanical rides.

Commissioner Litzen commented and stated that all of those ideas are very complimenting and consistent with the area.

Mr. Lance Rombough, landowner, appeared and spoke in opposition and said the area has the potential for lowered property values. He also spoke of the residential quality of life and he would like to keep it that way.

Mr. Sundby offered to any properties owners present at the meeting, which border their property, the depreciation difference if any of those property owners feel their values will be affected for assessed values for 2013.

Discussion followed.

Moved by Landers and seconded by Zvejnieks to deny Rezone 13-21 and Comprehensive Plan Amendment 13-13.

Commissioner McCollman asked if there is anything in the Zoning Ordinance which would preclude the application from not being approved.

Jennissen stated the Comprehensive Plan indicates the Future Land Use of the property to be Limited Agriculture and this could be one argument to not rezone the property, but the property has operated as a commercial use for over 50 years,

Mr. Hagen informed the Planning Commission that in the 1950s, the area was known as the township of Hayward. The town contained a lot of residences during those years, and, later on, the town moved to by Hermosa.

Jennissen also stated that the development of Rushmore Ranch Estates, which is located close to the subject property, initially intended to have commercial activities along Highway 40, such as a golf course.

Commissioner Davis called the Question. Motion to call the Question. All voting aye, the Motion carried 7 to 0.

Vote on Original Motion to Deny: Commissioners Davis, Landers, Coleman, Hall, and Zvejnieks voted yes. Commissioners Litzen and McCollam voted no. Motion to Deny carried 5 to 2.

Jennissen then stated the applicant just requested that the application be denied without prejudice, which will allow the applicant one year's time to refile if they would like.

Reconsideration of Motion to Deny: Moved by Hall and seconded by Coleman to reconsider the Motion to Deny. Motion to Reconsider carried 7 to 0.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Moved by Hall and seconded by Landers to deny without prejudice Rezone 13-21 and Comprehensive Plan Amendment 13-13, per the applicant's request.

All voting, the Motion carried 5 to 2. Commissioners Davis, Landers, Coleman, Hall, and Zvejnieks voted yes. Commissioners Litzen and McCollam voted no.

9. DISCUSSION OF COMMERCIAL BUILDING PERMIT FEES.

Jennissen reviewed a Memo discussing Commercial Building Permit Fees and other counties' requirements for Commercial Building Permits, including building inspection programs and licensing of contractors.

Commissioner Litzen asked if all contractors would be required to be licensed in Pennington County, if an inspection program is adopted.

Jennissen said yes.

Commissioner McCollam asked if there is a licensing fee for contractors performing work inside the city limits.

Jennissen stated yes, but he did not know what the fee is at this time.

Commissioner Davis commented that the only item to be discussed is Commercial Building Permit Fees and not an inspection program. He feels that the fee going to Planning & Zoning, from a Commercial Building Permit, should be more than what is given to the Drainage Program at the County Highway Department. Commissioner Davis wanted to know the maximum fee and where the money goes for other counties and felt the information was not presented.

Jennissen responded and stated that it is difficult determining an estimated cost for a Building Permit because of staff's time spent on acquiring all the correct information needed before the permit is finalized and other agencies that staff may have to work with. Jennissen also noted that he did speak to other counties about their fees.

Commissioner Davis stated that what he is looking for is how much the cost is in different counties and cities for a Commercial Building Permit, do they have a maximum, and where is the money distributed.

Commissioner McCollam questioned where the Commercial Building Permit Fees for Pennington County are distributed.

Jennissen stated \$60.00 is applied to P&Z Permit Fees and the rest of the amount is designated to the Drainage Fee Account for use by the County Highway Department.

Commissioner Davis commented that he feels there should be a cap on Commercial Building Permit Fees and also that P&Z should retain more than \$60 from the fees collected.

Commissioner Hall further reviewed the Tiered Tables presented in the packet and stated Table 3D best represents a cap for Commercial Building Permit Fees. She also explained that when she met with staff, this is when the inspection program was discussed.

Commissioner Davis left the meeting at 11:02 a.m.

Discussion followed.

Moved by McCollam and seconded by Litzen to adopt Table 3D, for Commercial Building Permits, which is a \$100 Base Fee and a cap at \$10,000, and all the fees collected are designated to the General Fund for P&Z and no funds will be designated to

the Drainage Fee Account and also to recommend that the Board of Commissioners not have the ability to waive fees.

Ervin clarified with the Planning Commission that the first \$60 collected from Building Permits is designated to P&Z Permit Fees Account and the rest of the fees are designated to the Drainage Fee Account and not to the General Fund.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Moved by McCollam and seconded by Litzen to adopt Table 3D, for Commercial Building Permits, which is a \$100 Base Fee and a cap at \$10,000, and all Building Permit fees collected are designated to the P&Z Permit Fee Account and no funds will be designated to the Drainage Fee Fund and to also recommend that the Board of Commissioners not have the ability to waive fees.

All voting aye, the Motion carried 6 to 0.

Discussion further followed on adopting a Building Permit Inspection Program.

Moved by Litzen and seconded by Hall to have the Planning Director place this item on the Board of Commissioners Agenda to discuss adopting a Building Permit Inspection Program.

10. COUNTY BOARD REPORT

The Board of Commissioners concurred with the Planning Commission's recommendations from the December 9, 2013, Planning Commission meeting.

11. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no items from the public.

12. ITEMS FROM THE STAFF

A. Building Permit Report. Jennissen reviewed the Building Permit Report for December 2013.

B. Rapid City Comprehensive Plan. Jennissen informed the Planning Commission that there is a meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 14th at 9:00 a.m., in the Pennington County Commissioner's Meeting Room, to review a presentation by the Clarion Group for the Rapid City Comprehensive Plan.

13. ITEMS FROM THE MEMBERSHIP

Commissioner Zvejnieks spoke of the March 2013 Memo listing items the Planning Commission would like staff to start working on during 2014.

Commissioners Litzen, Hall, and McCollam said they are unavailable for the March 10th meeting.

14. DISCUSSION ITEMS

There were no discussion items.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Hall and seconded by Coleman to adjourn.

All voting aye, the Motion carried 6 to 0.

The meeting adjourned at **11:40 a.m.**

Chairperson, Sig Zvejnieks