

Eileen Rossow & Warren Meyer
23451 Peregrine Pt. Pl.
Rapid City, South Dakota 57702
605-388-8378

April 7, 2004

Growth Management Department
300 6th Street
Rapid City, SD 57701

Re: Section 36.0, Lot 1R, Parcel I.D. 3636400004, TWP 1.0 N, RNG 6.0 E
23451 Peregrine Pt. Pl., Rapid City, SD 57702

This property is currently being used as a single family residence and a five room bed and breakfast.

Gentlemen,

This letter is in response to the Notice of Hearing for a Variance to the Subdivision Regulations for the property located at 9425 Sheridan Lake Road. Our property is adjacent to the southern portion of the property in question. We have several concerns with the variance request that we would like to make the Planning Commission aware of.

1. Our water supply is from a well that is approximately 850 feet deep. The production from the well is approximately 3 gallons per minute. We maintain a 5,000 gallon cistern in order to have adequate water for ourselves, our bed and breakfast and for emergencies. We have two concerns about the water supply.
 - A. Where will the 25 lots get their water supply and will it affect our current water supply?
 - B. What affect will 25 septic systems in the acreage above our property have on the quality of our water supply?
2. Our property is basically below the property in question. We are concerned about construction run-off, roadway run-off and the fact that no sewer system or holding pond is going to be required for run-off. Further, with construction, the existing ecosystem will be damaged which will lessen the amount of moisture retention and cause more run-off onto our property. We would request that some type of requirements be made to lessen this possibility.
3. We question the validity of the waiver, based on the requirements for a five house development directly across Sheridan Lake Road from the property. We believe that that development was required to have water, paving, sidewalks, curb, and electricity. We question why that much smaller development was required to have those items, and this new development, which is much bigger, and will have a greater impact on the area, is not?
4. We believe that the requirement to have paving on both the development road and Peregrine Pt. Pl. is proper. We would suggest that possibly a road maintenance district should be required of the residents in order to maintain a good road system without the county or the city having to be involved.
5. We would like to see a development in the area that is going to enhance the value of the properties around it rather than decrease the values. When one lives in the county, one feels that any development is a detriment. However, we would hope that the planners would require enough of the developer in order to establish a valuable and quality development, thus increasing the tax base for the entire area. We are concerned that this is not the case, based on the request for the waiving of all the requirements which would create a quality development.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,


Eileen Rossow & Warren Meyer

RECEIVED

APR 07 2004

**City Growth
Department**