

Item #29 05RZ037

Item #28 05CA025

May 24, 2005

To whom it may concern:

We are writing in regards to the rezoning and subsequent development of property west of Bendt Dr. and North of Catron Blvd. shown on maps 05RZ037 and 05CA025.

We would like to express some concerns from the perspective of residents across the street facing the north side of this property, 5261 Winterset Dr. We purchased this property a little over two years ago and have invested in the landscaping and overall appearance of our home. We look at this home as a great place to raise our family, and eventually retire. We feel our property value is in the high 280's to 300,000 dollar range.

Realtors stated to us when we first looked at this property that the "covenants" of the property to the south would require single dwelling family homes, or low density residential property. We have held on to the hope that eventually this property would become a complement to our wonderful neighborhood.

Now it's our understanding that the owner/developer would place 36 unit town homes on this property. Outside the prospect of opening our front door to a triplex building with 3 double garages each morning, we have questions regarding how this will effect the entire neighborhood.

First and foremost is the traffic. There are already times in the day when families are going to work and school that the traffic is steady on the corner of Sheridan Lake Dr and Catron Blvd. Traffic can only egress on Bendt to Catron or Summerset to Sheridan Lake, both becoming a near grid lock. With another 60-80 cars added, I hate to imagine the delay and risks, especially to the children in the area. Access to other routes seem unlikely due to the extensive drainage to the west and east of the property. Basically, there is no through access. Is this safe?

The plan on file for development shows 2,3, and 4 plex units across from \$250,000-\$330,000 homes. We fear for the effect they will have on our property values. We don't doubt the developer wants to maximize his income from the property, but if it comes directly from the pocket of surrounding landowners, is that fair?

Further concerns of appearance, landscaping, drainage, ect., lie down the road. We question if low density dwelling on, at least, lots 1, 2 and 3 would be a reasonable compromise to alleviate some of the pending negative outcomes. We feel 36 units is a very large number for this neighborhood. The adjoining properties are zoned low density residential, this should be too!

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.  
August and Nancy Bakeberg  
5261 Winterset Dr,  
Rapid City SD  
57702

RECEIVED

MAY 25 2005

Rapid City Growth  
Management Department

RECEIVED

MAY 25 2005

Rapid City Growth  
Management Department

05-24-2005

City Of Rapid City  
Growth Management Department  
300 Sixth Street  
Rapid City, SD 57701-2724

To Whom This May Concern,

My name is David Kalil, and my wife Candy, and I live at 5218 Stoney Creek Drive. I am writing this letter as I am unable to be at the Hearing concerning Lots 1A and 1B, Block 5, Stoney Creek Subdivision, which is for the rezoning of that property from General Commercial to Medium Density Residential.

I have several concerns about the plan I would like to talk about. The first issue and I think the most important is that all actions to date concerning this property have not been in the best interest of the neighborhood. This particular piece of land has not been taken care of at all in the last three years. Erosion from the property has been a constant problem that even though we have had numerous city officials out looking at the issues we have still had no answers to the movement of the soil from this property each time it rains. During the last three years the property has been mowed one time and a large part of this property has nothing but weeds growing on it. There has been at least two instances of a stop work order being put on the property during the last two years which does not seem to have had any affect on the amount of dirt being dumped on the south end of the site. It concerns me a great deal that the owner of the property does not seem to have to follow any rules in regards to maintaining the property in a condition that is not detrimental to the neighborhood.

The second thing I would like to bring to the attention of planning and zoning board is that the drainage or elevation plan for this property should be monitored very carefully. This property drains to the west and north and it will be critical to protecting not only my yard and property but the neighbors on each side of me as the future use of this land could lead to changing the drainage so that it all flows towards our properties. The proposed structure on Lot 4 of this property would sit in what is now the lowest portion of the whole site. This part of the property is the natural drain area for a large portion of the north end of the acreage. If the fill dirt at the south and east end of the is property is any indication all I can envision is the same type of drainage and flooding problem that has occurred just up the street from us to east where flooding from a neighboring property caused a large amount of damage to the house located at east end of Winterset Drive. The drainage plan for that entire area which is just east of this property was then modified by installing drainage ditches to the north and to the west through each of the lots in that block. All of that work was done after the yards and sprinkler systems were installed so it became an issue after the fact, which is what I am trying to avoid here.

The third issue I would like to bring to the attention of the board is that the structure proposed for lot 1 of the plan will not fit in with the current neighborhood. Locating the proposed three-plex in lot 1 is not in the best interest of the houses that border that particular lot or the overall neighborhood. Having that structure sit on that corner creates traffic issues that the neighborhood should not have to put up with. Currently many of the neighbors stop there now to pick up mail at the post office drop box. The streets in this area are short, narrow and congested now and adding this structure with the associated parking and traffic will really cause this corner to become a headache for many years to come. During hearings for the land, which my house is located on, several years ago the Princeton street intersection with Bendt drive was noted to have a no left turn on it, which would keep the traffic flowing towards Catron and not through the neighborhood. I would ask the hearing board to deny medium density residential zoning for that part of the plan, which would allow multiple density for lot 1. That lot should be a single density residential area, which would be safer and fit in with the properties, which are adjacent to it.

To summarize I would tell you if I was able to be here in person that I agree with a great deal of this proposed plan. My concerns are that the owner has not followed any rules for the upkeep and erosion control of this property during the three years I have lived at my house. That has led me to believe we could wake up sometime this fall and the drainage for the whole area could flow towards my property. By allowing a structure to be built on lot 4 of the proposed plan you will create drainage problems for the entire NW corner of the acreage which will affect my property as well as the neighbors. This area has turned into a very nice single-family neighborhood and by allowing a multiple density structure on the corner which is labeled lot 1, you will allow traffic and congestion problems which will affect the entire neighborhood. I would hope that if you send this plan to the City Commission with an approval recommendation that you would have several stipulations in place to protect the neighborhood from any detrimental issues that have been addressed here.

Thank You

*David Kalil* *Candy Kalil*

David and Candy Kalil

**RECEIVED**

**MAY 25 2005**

**Rapid City Growth  
Management Department**