

Dave,

Public Works still requires the no access easement in the locations mentioned in the conditions of approval. It is felt that this makes for a safer environment by lowering the potential for traffic conflicts from all of the parcels on the north side near 64th Street West, and on the south side near 72nd Street West.

By having the corner parcels come out on the cul-de-sac roads only, there will be fewer interruptions to the traffic flow on the main road (Skycrest Drive). Additionally, if it is needed to back out of the driveway, it would be safer to do so where there are only 4 lots instead of many. As Mr. Saldivar correctly pointed out during the Planning Board meeting, Skycrest Drive is the only road that can be used to access the properties. Just in Phase I, there would be 9 approaches on the north side of the road, which is approximately 1000 feet of roadway. By allowing circular drives, this would add an additional 4 on the south side, bringing the total to 13 approaches in what appears to be a very small length of road.

Public Works does not feel that a controlled access strip would help alleviate the potential congestion because there would still be the possibility for adding more approaches onto what will become an already busy street.

Darin

From: Green, Dave [<mailto:greend@ci.billings.mt.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 9:45 AM
To: Tim Miller; Darin Swenson; Mike Black
Cc: Friday, Wyeth
Subject: Skycrest Subdivision

Last night at the planning board meeting Skycrest Subdivision was presented to the planning board for review. Two of the conditions of approval required the applicant to provide no access easements along Skycrest Drive, the single through street in the subdivision. This was requested in the department review meeting when everyone brought their comments and correction about the subdivision to give to the applicant. When the applicant resubmitted the subdivision to continue on with the process the 1 foot no access easements were not shown on the plat as requested. I sent an email to Darin asking if there had been a change since the department review meeting. I was told no there had not been. So conditions to final plat were written that required the applicant to show 1 foot no access easements on the plat.

Here are the conditions:

4. To improve traffic safety and reduce traffic conflicts, prior to final plat approval the applicant will place a '1 foot no access easement' on the south side of Skycrest Drive from the northwest corner of Lot 4, Block 4 to South 64 th Street West, excluding the dedicated rights-of-way for the six cul-de-sacs off of Skycrest Drive on the south. Also, an opening will be left on the park frontage for access to the park.
5. To improve traffic safety and reduce traffic conflicts, prior to final plat approval the

applicant will place a '1 foot no access easement' along the north side of Skycrest Drive from the southeast corner of Lot 34, Block 3 to the southwest corner of Lot 46, Block 3, excluding the dedicated rights-of-way for the four cul-de-sacs off of Skycrest Drive on the north.

At last night's meeting the applicant stated that he had spoken with Mike Black and was told he didn't need to do the 1 foot no access easement and asked the planning board to remove those conditions. He stated that people like a circular drive way on the corner cul-de-sac lots and he didn't think it was a safety issue since it's a residential street.

If you look at the plat, attached, there is only one through street in this proposed subdivision and a planning board members expressed concerns for the number of driveways that will already be coming out onto the street.

Here is the question, what does County Public Works want on this topic? Planning added the conditions based on information we had received from County Public Works and there seems to be conflicting information going out.

We told the planning board we would get an answer from County Public Works and bring it back to them at their meeting on the 23rd of this month. We would appreciate an answer to the question as soon as possible so we can get the staff report done and get it to the Planning Board so they also have an answer.

Thanks

dave