

05VE006

----- Original Message -----

From: "Sue Podoll" <dsue@rushmore.com>

To: <CouncilGroup@rcgov.org>

Sent: Monday, June 20, 2005 7:44 PM

Subject: No. 05VE006 Vacation of Minor Drainage Easement

> Dear Council Members,

>

> I am requesting that the Council deny the petition of Britton
> Engineering on behalf of Bobby and Genae Sundby for the 'Vacation of
> Minor Drainage Easement.' (No. 05VE006) This is item #84 on the agenda
> for the June 20th, 2005 meeting, which has been postponed until
> Wednesday, June 22, 2005.

>

> Residents of the area have opposed development of this parcel of land
> since the initial application by the Sundby's of the "Planned
> Residential Development" (No. 05PD004) on January 28th, 2005. We have
> called, emailed, written letters, and attended every Planning
> Commission meeting in February, March, April, May, and June, in order
> to have our concerns heard and addressed (see Planning Commission
> Minutes dated February 24, March 24, April 7, and June 2). Even the
> staff assigned within the department have indicated concerns
> regarding the proposal (see staff reports dated Feb. 24, Mar. 24, and
> Apr. 7). Issues raised involve traffic congestion, emergency service
> access (fire vehicles, ambulance, hydrants) density/overcrowding,
> drainage, water table, set backs, and the overall safety of children
> and pedestrians in the area as Harmony Lane does not have sidewalks
> and is only 20 foot wide. On June 2, 2005, the Planning Commission
> denied the Sundby's PDR (No.05PD004) (See Planning Commission meeting
> minutes June 2, 2005)

>

> While we were focused on the PRD that included 12 townhouses and an

8-

> plex during this time, the Sundby's applied for a building permit
> that was radically different from the proposal that was before the
> Planning Commission. The building plans that were submitted on March
> 29th indicated that two 16 unit apartment buildings would be built on
> the property. Many of us feel this was an "end around" and done so in
> order to circumvent having to comply with the proposed Canyon Lake
> Overlay Zoning District. We are not opposed to development in the
> area, however, that development must include improvements to the
> infrastructure of roads and utilities.

>

> It seems to me that the growth of new development to the north,
> south, east and west of Rapid City would encourage the Council to
> take the time to carefully review the development that is occurring
> in the older established neighborhoods of our city. What is the
> impact of the large multifamily dwellings on the single family home
> owners? When did the developer's interests take precedence over the
> individual citizen? How can we best improve the older neighborhoods
> so that the character and community of these neighborhoods can be
> preserved? How can I keep my neighborhood just that, a neighborhood?
> I believe the Canyon Lake Overlay Project is an excellent start to
> help address some of the these challenges. And I would ask that you

> support the Overlay Zoning District and deny the "Vacation of Minor
> Drainage Easement" (No. 05VE006)
>
> Thank you for your time and consideration.
>
> Denise Podoll
> 3310 Harmony Lane
> Rapid City, SD 57702
> 721-3309
>
>