05SV088

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

From: Kim Solomon-Gavach [mailto:kiso@rushmore.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 11:37 PM

To: planning.commission@rcgov.org

Subject: Variance to Parkhill Subdivision regulations

To members of the planning commission,

In regards to the variance filed by Bruce Kulpaca to change the Parkhill Subdivision regulations as they pertain to his property, my husband and I would like to state our objections to this change. Our property lies south of Mr. Kulpaca's, and we are already apprehensive about the amount of traffic that drives--often at high speeds--through our quiet neighborhood. The addition of yet another road in such a small neighborhood (especially in its proposed location) will almost certainly compromise the safety of our streets, as well as the safety of those who drive, walk or play in and around them.

We are also concerned with the growing population density in our area, especially since Canyon Development (which is co-owned by Mr. Kulpaca's nephew) assured us repeatedly at the time we purchased our house three years ago that the property behind us would sustain <u>no more</u> than a couple of homes at most. While we are aware that Mr. Kulpaca himself did not make this claim, it contributes to our feelings that our subdivision regulations should remain as they are and be applied *as is* to all landowners equally.

Please feel free to contact me at work (718-6155) or at home after 6 p.m. (716-7176) if you have any questions regarding our position on this matter. I would be happy to discuss it with you.

Sincerely,

Kim Solomon-Gavach 1116 East Oakland St. Rapid City -----Original Message-----

From: Kevin Tiede [mailto:krtiede@rushmore.com] Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2006 9:06 PM

To: planning.commission@rcgov.org; councilgroup@rcgov.org

Subject: File Number 05SV088 - CETEC Engineering for Bruce Kulpaca

Dear Planning Commission & Council Group,

I wish to express my opposition to the Petition by Cetec Engineering for Bruce Kulpaca regarding the variance request to the Subdivision Regulations to allow a lot twice as long as it is wide as per Chapter 16.16 of the Rapid City Municipal Code.

I currently live in the affected area, 2617 Merlot Drive. The requested variance I believe is not beneficial to the surrounding residential area. We are very concerned on how the requested change will impact the adjacent properties, to include the density use and particularly the safety and placement of additional streets.

We are at present seeing a heavy use of our city streets due to changes allowed in the past. This traffic has not only increased over time, but the vehicle speeds is also a problem as the vehicles gain speed coming down the steep hill on Merlot. This new petition not only would add to this traffic, but the current proposal of the street would junction with our current street (Merlot) right at the bottom of the this hill, adding additional high moving traffic from two streets now instead of one. The design is poorly planned and flawed for a residential area.

Also, when we first purchased a home in this area, we were told it would be a development of residential homes. A person only has to drive up the streets of Smith and Merlot and they would see the property development has changed from residential to duplex or townhouse type construction. My concern is that this type of development will continue in the area, further decreasing the value of our residential homes and continuing a higher density population to include traffic.

I sincerely hope that the Planning Commission and Council will not allow the passage of this variance request.

Sincerely,

Kevin & Ronda Tiede 2617 Merlot Drive 718-3843 The undersigned residents of Park Hill Subdivision are opposed to the granting of the petition for a variance to Tract B in Park Hill Subdivision, Section 7, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, allowing for a lot twice as long as it is wide as per Chapter 16.16 of the Rapid City Municipal Code. We believe this would add too much density to an already dense neighborhood and compromise the safety of our streets for our families.

The undersigned residents of Park Hill Subdivision are opposed to the granting of the petition for a variance to Tract B in Park Hill Subdivision, Section 7, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, allowing for a lot twice as long as it is wide as per Chapter 16.16 of the Rapid City Municipal Code. We believe this would add too much density to an already dense neighborhood and compromise the safety of our streets for our families.

1. Kathleen Burr	2554 Smith Ave.
2. Hichael - Ills	2618 Merlot
3. Mienetee Gibbs	2418 Merlot Dr.
4. FRANSIS TATE	1110 NAMLES CR
5. DeanKertin	1120 Noples Ct.
6. Verne Ra Ehresman	1122 Naples Ct
7. Juling of Engy	III Nanley Ct
8. Del Mildelema	1022 East Oakland
9. Kuki Thoman	1012 F Oakland
10. July Manna	1012 E Ockland
11. I la frest Win Ess	1102 E Bakland
12. James Von Colle	1102 F. Oakland
13. Tan Boedler	1029 E Oakland
14. Jallin Backler	1029 E. Oakland
15. H	1023 B. Oakfand St.
16. Alwayer	1017 E. OAKLAND ST.
	10 - 10

The undersigned residents of Park Hill Subdivision are opposed to the granting of the petition for a variance to Tract B in Park Hill Subdivision, Section 7, T1N, R8E, BHM, Rapid City, Pennington County, South Dakota, allowing for a lot twice as long as it is wide as per Chapter 16.16 of the Rapid City Municipal Code. We believe this would add too much density to an already dense neighborhood and compromise the safety of our streets for our families.

	Name	Address	<u>Phone</u>	Signature	(6)
1.	Grate	Schleunting	1011 Gast DAKE	nd 721-44	135En
2. 3.	Lorri .	Schleuning Swavel	1011 E. Oakland 2629 Smith ave	281-2340	Lorsi
<i>3</i> . 4.	Gara	11	26235m: +hAu	342-8543	Car
5.	Pat	tie Unite En	meth alpry 5 M.	ALST, 430.08	soy fat
6. 7.		/el			
8.					
9.					
10. 11.			2		
12.					
13.	-				-
14. 15.				: ·	
16.					
17.	_				
18. 19.					
20.			g	1	
21.					
22. 23.					
23. 24.					
25.					