



BURLEIGH GROWTH 2015
BURLEIGH COUNTY LAND USE PLAN

Comments Received

APPENDIX
four



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



BURLEIGH GROWTH 2015

BURLEIGH COUNTY LAND USE STUDY
COMMENT SHEET



www.BurleighGrowth2015.com

Tuesday September 29, 2015 – Horizon Middle School – 6:30 to 8:00 pm
Please use the space below to provide comments regarding the Burleigh County Land Use Study.

PLEASE
PRINT

Name: Raymond Parsons

Address: 8990 Palamida Dr., Bismarck

—THIS SPACE
OFFICE USE
ONLY—

- Very good presentation, good presenters
- Concerned about services keeping in pace w/development
- Discouraged at the intermingling of industrial w/ residential on the east side of Lincoln as well as the close proximity of industrial to main roadways
- Keep subdivisions in Apple Creek Township to 5 acres or more
- What is the status of managing traffic, Apple Creek Township/Lincoln to Bismarck.
- Address the possibility of 80th St. + overpass as future link for traffic to I-94

Thanks!

Please leave comments with meeting conductors or mail comments to:

Wade Kline
KLJ
4585 Coleman Street, PO Box 1157
Bismarck, ND 58502-1157
Email: wade.kline@kljeng.com
Note "NE Bismarck Subarea Study" in the e-mail subject heading



BURLEIGH GROWTH 2015
BURLEIGH COUNTY LAND USE STUDY



COMMENT SHEET

www.BurleighGrowth2015.com

Tuesday September 29, 2015 — Horizon Middle School — 6:30 to 8:00 pm

Please use the space below to provide comments regarding the Burleigh County Land Use Study.

PLEASE
PRINT

Name:

Arnold A. Rusan

Address:

238 Redstone Drive - Bis 58503

—THIS SPACE
OFFICE USE
ONLY—

If the Land use plan is adopted,
do planning Commission and ^{the} Burleigh
County Commission have to follow the
plan?

Police
Fire
medical

Has second access provisions been
considered for

- (1) Residential Subdivision
- (2) Commercial
- (3) Industrial ?

Please leave comments with meeting conductors or mail comments to:

Wade Kline
KLJ
4585 Coleman Street, PO Box 1157
Bismarck, ND 58502-1157
Email: wade.kline@kljeng.com
Note "NE Bismarck Subarea Study" in the e-mail subject heading



BURLEIGH GROWTH 2015

BURLEIGH COUNTY LAND USE STUDY

Bismarck-Mandan
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION



Please use the space below to provide comments regarding the Burleigh County Land Use Study.

PLEASE
PRINT

Name: Dwight Malske
Address: 17755 5th Street NE, Belding, ND 58524

-THIS SPACE
OFFICE USE
ONLY-

- Excellent Job with explanation of word Definitions
 - o Survey Results
 - o Mapping Definitions
 - o Number of Representation of Diff. Dept. Involved in Study.
- Suggestions for Next Meeting's:
 - o Better Sound
 - o Better way of Voting (Had to raise hands to vote)
- Excellent Job overall

Please leave comments with meeting conductors or mail comments by August 3, 2015 to:
Carron Day, AICP
4585 Coleman Street
Bismarck, ND 58503
Email: carron.day@kljeng.com
Note "Burleigh Growth 2015" in the e-mail subject heading



TO: Burleigh County and
Bismarck-Mandan Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

FROM: Larry Stockert *LS*
2903 123rd Ave. NW
Bismarck, ND 58503
258-2217

RE: Burleigh County Land Use Study
Horizon Middle School Meeting Location

Date: July 13, 2015

Thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns and opinions regarding development in Burleigh County.

I live approximately ten miles north of Bismarck on forty-acres and have seen what I would characterize as an unorganized approach to development. My comments and suggestions are intended to present sound long-rang strategic alternatives to the current situation from not just the brick and mortar perspective but through a much broader and necessary perspective.

1. Administrative.

At a recent Planning Commission meeting I became aware Burleigh County employees apparently felt restricted regarding what they could (should) recommend to the Planning Commission. Their recommendations were contrary to the established policies of Burleigh County and provided the Planning Commission the “cover” to approve a re-zoning over the objections of area residents. This has unfortunately occurred numerous times throughout the County.

If Burleigh County and the MPO are genuinely sincere about organized development they should establish a process whereby County employees will feel free to tell the Planning Commission what they need to know, not what they want to hear. Bureaucrats typically do not want to rock the boat in fear of losing their jobs.

Additionally, Burleigh County and the MPO must recognize and adopt the results of the Study and include verbiage preventing “work-a-rounds” or “waivers”. These have been previously developed by the bureaucrats, for the Commissions, against the will of the people, and have resulted in significant problems. If Burleigh County and the MPO were to make it know that the “Study” results will be consistently, uniformly, and strictly adhered to, most problems will be eliminated. The Study, in other words, must be carved in stone in order to be effective and provide the desired outcome.

2. Planning Commission.

The structure of the Planning Commission must be addressed. It has become necessary that representation must originate from all areas of the County. A process needs to be implemented whereby each Township, or a combination of two or three Townships, are responsible for the election (appointment) of their representatives. The Planning Commission should be expanded to nine members with the majority representing rural areas.

If Burleigh County and the MPO were to adopt the “Study” as presented above, the Planning Commissions function would become significantly clearer, consistent, and uniform. The Planning Commission would subsequently not become bogged down with what to do (work-a-rounds, waivers, etc.).

3. County Commissioners.

The County Commissioners must formally recognize and adopt the “Study” and its requirements. They must also recognize and understand that to deviate from it opens the proverbial Pandora box. If everyone understands the parameters it effectively eliminates expectations of the previously noted “work-a-rounds” and “waivers”.

4. Transportation.

Transportation seems to have been ignored in past zoning and re-zoning activity. This must be recognized and considered integral to any future development. Local area residents know and are keenly aware of their road situation and should have significant considerations when any potential development is being considered. Transportation concerns and requirements must be address with infrastructure and maintenance commitments in place prior to approval of any future zoning or re-zoning activity. The County must recognize and understand development necessitates additional expenses such and road maintenance.

5. Land Use.

Previously approved land use re-zoning has been conducted to the detriment of County tax payers. Case in point; in my location a landfill approval, and lack of will by the County Commissioners to address problems, has resulted in severe degradation of the areas gravel roads. Routine road maintenance is less than half what it was five years ago with area residential traffic expanding from that of two households to twelve and with the explosion of landfill haulers.

As population densities increase the County must also be aware that the co-mingling of residential, industrial, and commercial activity will be a problem unless properly controlled. Two situations come to mind. A rural residential area was developed with many homes built. After the fact a developer wants to re-zone several adjoining lots to industrial, the status of this is unknown at present but the sentiment of the Planning Commission and County Commissioners seems to be to approve. Second, cropland regularly receives aerial crop spraying with applicators flying dangerously close to and within a few feet of residential rooftops. These two situations must be addressed.

6. Law Enforcement and Fire Department.

The County has not maintained the size of the sheriff and fire departments at sufficient levels. Response time regarding law enforcement is upwards of 45-60 minutes if in fact they arrive at all. The departments are spread too thin with staff overworked. This issue must be included in and study.

Summary:

The “Study” must cut to the chase and not be wishy-washy. The study area is at a point where all parties must conduct an honest, legitimate, strategic assessment and address long-term needs.

A straight forward assessment of the needs, with the necessary safeguards included regarding performance by the commissions involved, will go a long way to dispel the perception that “big money” and self-serving interests prevail.

Thank you.