September 14, 2006

RECEIVED

St 2 1 5 7006

Growth Management Department 300 6<sup>th</sup> Street Rapid City, SD 57701

Rat'l City Growth Management Department

Re: Notice of Hearing for a Variance to the Subdivision Regulations

Enclosed is a copy of the Notice for Variance we received. Relative to this variance, we wish to raise some concerns prior to any approval of such variance:

- 1. We would approve this variance only on the condition that the road being built is to service ONLY 1 or 2 homes in this area. We trust that the road requirements will include a sufficient gravel coat and a sufficient road width. However, if more homes are planned for the future, then we feel that the road should have a have a sufficient width and chip seal coating placed on the surface, similar to Sun Ridge Road. Also, this property should have a secondary access. In the early 1990's, Ponderosa Ridge Road District was formed because many of the homeowners at that time were concerned with the dust problem and wanted a paved surface on the roads. The current chip seal coating was done at the expense of all the landowners in our development. This Road District remained in effect until the District had met all of the Pennington County requirements of a properly installed chip seal coating and any necessary repairs to such coating prior to returning full control of these roads back to Pennington County. We already have a problem with the current road into the property requesting this variance. The vehicles traveling in and out of this property track a significant amount of mud/dirt onto Sun Ridge Road and often do not obey the speed limits posted for Sun Ridge Road. Also, these vehicles cause more wear and tear on our roads, having the benefit of using our roads without having paid for the improvements to these roads. As long as these concerns are adequately addressed prior to the approval of this variance, then we have no problem with approving it.
- 2. We and many of the homeowners in Ponderosa Ridge Estates have discussed at great length our concerns for any future development of the property in question. Our major concern has always been that this property have a second assess rather than be limited by access via Sun Ridge Road. Our concern has always been that such secondary access is necessary for fire control (whether for forest fire or residential fire) as well as easing the traffic flow on Sun Ridge Road. The issues of mud/dirt and speed have also been raised at our homeowners meetings. If this property is to be used for more than the current residence and possibly one more, then we request that a secondary access be installed to this property and a chip seal coat be installed as well.

Again, if the proposed road involved is only to service 1 or 2 homes on this parcel, then we are fine with waiving the curb, gutter, street light conduit, water, and sewer. However, we would strongly urge you to consider a chip seal coat and a secondary access either way. If this variance would open up the possibility to any further residential development of the property, then we and all of the homeowners within Ponderosa Ridge Estates would wish to have a say in any proposed changes.

We will try to attend the meeting; however, if we are unable to attend, we are sending this letter so that our concerns can be addressed. If you have any questions, we can be reached at 342-0118 during regular business hours or at 342-2122 in the evenings.

Sincerely,

Dave + See anne England

Dave & Lee Anne England

6747 Sun Ridge Road Rapid City, SD 57702

## GUNDERSON, PALMER, GOODSELL & NELSON, LLP

## ATTORNEYS AT LAW

J. CRISMAN PALMER G. VERNE GODDSELL JAMES S. NELSON DANIEL E. ASHMORE TERENCE R. QUINN DONALD P. KNUDSEN PATRICK G. GOETZINGER TALBOT J. WIECZOREK MARK J. CONNOT JENNIFER K. TRUCANO DAVID E. LUST ASSURANT BUILDING
440 MT. RUSHMORE ROAD
POST OFFICE BOX 8045
RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA 57709-8045

TELEPHONE (605) 342-1078 - FAX (605) 342-0480

www.gundersonpalmer.com ATTORNEYS LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN EDAKOTA, NORTH DAKOTA, IOWA, NEBRASKA

ATTORNEYS LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN SOUTH DAKOTA, NORTH DAKOTA, IOWA, NEBRASKA COLORADO, MONTANA, WYOMING & MINNESOTA THOMAS E. SIMMONS TERRI LEE WILLIAMS PAMELA SNYDER-VARNS SARA FRANKENSTEIN AMY K. KOENIG JASON M. SMILEY SHANE C. PENFIELD JONATHAN M. OOSTRA

WYNN A. GUNDERSON Of Counsel

Writer's Email Address: jnelson@gpgnlaw.com

September 18, 2006

## BY FAX-ORIGINAL TO FOLLOW BY MAIL

Ms. Janelle L. Finck
President
Fisk Land Surveying & Consulting Engineers, Inc.
P.O. Box 8154
Rapid City, SD 57709-8154

Re: Brent Pushing Property

Dear Janelle:

I represent James and Delana Nelson of 13555 Bittersweet Road, Rapid City, who own 40 acres adjacent to and west of the 40 acres that Brent Pushing is seeking to develop.

James and Delana received a notice of a public hearing concerning rezoning, variance to lot sizes, and road improvement variances sought by Brent Pushing to develop his 40 acres, and I am writing this letter to you on behalf of James and Delana to advise that they support Mr. Pushing's request for rezoning, variances to lot sizes, and road improvement variances.

Sincerely yours,

James S. Nelson

JSN:drp

c: James and Delana Nelson (By Fax-Original to Follow By Mail)

RECEIVED

SEP 2 0 2006

Rapid City Growth Management Department Dave & Lee Anne England 6747 Sun Ridge Road Rapid City, SD 57702 342-0118 Office 342-2122 Home england@enetis.net

September 28, 2006

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of the Rapid City Council,

On September 21, 2006 I attended the meeting of the Rapid City Planning Commission to voice some objections to a Variance to the Subdivision Regulations requested by Fisk Land Surveying & Consulting Engineers, Inc. for Brent Pushing (File #06SV053). After voicing my concerns, I was told that since approval had been given for this project in 2004 that the present Commission was in favor of granting approval again. However, my objection to this blank approval is that as an adjacent landowner I was never notified in 2004 of any changes that were to be made concerning the property in question. I and many landowners in the adjacent development known as Ponderosa Ridge Estates have major concerns about the approval of this variance and would have expressed these objections in 2004 if given the chance. I wish to have my concerns addressed before final approval is given. My concerns are as follows:

The property in question has asked for this variance so that a road may be built to property which is being subdivided into 4 lots. As I understand it, this new road would service these lots plus 2 other larger tracts of land on which homes could be built with the potential for further subdivision of some of these tracts. Since the current county roads known as Wide View Drive and Sun Ridge Road already service 39 lots in Ponderosa Ridge, this variance would allow 47 lots to be accessed (Jim Steele would have two five acre lots available right away by virtue of the location of the new road through his property and one larger tract that could be left as is or be subdivided in the future. Brent Pushing would have four lots and Cindy Pushing would have one 40 acre lot with a house.) with the potential of more in the future. As I understand it, the current regulation is that only 40 lots be serviced by a single road system such as ours in Ponderosa Ridge. We feel that the additional lots create a major problem should there be a forest fire in that area. Maybe if these lots were out on the prairie somewhere, it wouldn't be a problem to add a few more lots. However the property in question is heavily overgrown with trees. This objection was also raised by the fire officer in attendance that this meeting as well. The addition of these lots would severely restrict any evacuation of this area and cause a potential hazard for the current residents in Ponderosa Ridge. How many more can you "safely" add and not create a problem? Where does the limit end before you create a disaster waiting to happen? We strongly urge you to consider requiring another secondary access to this property before any further development is allowed in this area.

Our second area of concern is that the road being built be of similar quality to Wide View Drive and Sun Ridge Road, both of which have a chip and seal coating. The residents of Ponderosa Ridge went to great expense to have these roads upgraded many years ago to eliminate problems created by dust, dirt, and mud. Installing one coat upon completion of the construction of this new road will not be sufficient. Chip and seal coating requires that more coats be added in the future. Sun Ridge Road for example has 3 coats on it currently. Since chip and sealing this road will most likely require that all landowners in this property be responsible for the expense, we feel that a road district must be in place to help guarantee that this new road will be properly maintained in the future.

Again, I feel that the Planning Commission had no legal authority to approve this variance in 2004 without allowing the adjacent landowner's the opportunity to voice any objections. Had we been given the opportunity, many landowners in Ponderosa Ridge Estates would have done so at that time. Now, when we are supposed to be given the opportunity to speak, we are being denied. I strongly urge you to deny or at least postpone approval of this variance at your October 2, 2006 council meeting until all the concerns of the adjacent landowners have been addressed.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Dave England

.

## City of Rapid City Growth Management Department FILE # 06SV053

Riley White 6680 Sun Ridge Road Rapid City SD 57702

Hello Councilmembers and Commissioners,

I received a Notice from the City about a petition for a new Subdivision Regulation Variance. It is for a 40 acre building plan in my neighborhood. I can see that this Variance to the Municipal Code 16.16 will put a heavy strain on the existing water system and traffic routes we currently use. I have also discovered that there may be Porous Limestone issues underneath the Septic field areas of the new lots, bringing a possibility of contamination to our water supply. A good Environmental survey needs to be done.

Ponderosa Ridge Estates has only one way in and one way out, via Wide View Road (and it is steep). This would also have to be the access for the Construction vehicles, unless another access road to Nemo is made. If this Nemo road construction is done, it could also serve as an alternate route for fire escape later. This new access road could be used by the whole neighborhood and should be considered.

Thank you! Reley white Ocotber 2, 2006

Growth Management Department 300 6<sup>th</sup> Street Rapid City, SD 57701

Re: File No. 06SV053

As residents in the Ponderosa Ridge Estates, we wish to raise some concerns regarding the request for variance for the above-mentioned file number.

- 1. Currently the only access to Ponderosa Ridge Estates is Wide View Road. Before any more houses are allowed to be built, we would like to see a secondary road constructed to this property. This would ease the traffic flow on Sun Ridge as well as provide another exit in the event of a fire. It would also provide an alternate route for construction vehicles and new homeowners. This traffic would cause more wear and tear on our roads and give them the benefit of use without having paid for any of the improvements or helping pay for the maintenance and snow removal.
- 2. We would like to request a good environmental survey be done before any septic systems are installed. With the limestone issues underneath the septic field areas of the new properties, there could be a possibility of contamination of our water supply.
- 3. We feel that the streets to be built in this area should have to be of sufficient width and at least chip seal coating placed on the surface, similar to Sun Ridge Road. We already have a problem with the current road into that property tracking a significant amount of mud/dirt onto Sun Ridge.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

in a Mebrie Drekerson

Sincerely,

Jim and Debbie Dickerson 6251 Sun Ridge Road

341-1994

RECEIVED

OCT 0 2 2006

Rapid Common Cartment