

Debnhads Investments L.L.C.

Debbie Hadcock
1203 Silverleaf Ave.
Rapid City SD 57701
Phone : (605) 343-1237
Fax : (605) 348-5553

To: Rapid City Planning and Zoning Committee

Regards: Dimensions III Salon
429 Quincy Ave.

Dear Committee Members,

Thank you for your time and effort regarding city requirements for the 429 Quincy property. I believe at this time we have complied and addressed all issues of concern to the city except the parking issue. However, just to clarify what has happened up to this date, I would like to summarize what we have been told by the planning and zoning staff:

On February 21st 2003, prior to me (Debnhads Investments) purchasing the property, there was a meeting with my banker, real estate agent, husband and two staff members from the city (one from planning and zoning, one from the inspection office). At this meeting several issues were discussed with regards to me using the building as a hair salon. We specifically brought up parking and how many spaces would be required, as well as all other complying issues. We were told at this time, we needed 7 on-site parking spaces based on the use of the property as a salon. Since we were satisfied that we could comply with all issues that the city required to get the building permit, we chose to purchase the property and build the salon.

After spending a lot of money and time on this project, we moved forward and applied for the building permit in late June. At that time we were then told we needed 25 parking spaces for the salon. Then it was changed to 16 and finally, we are at 14 required spaces. However, based on the lot size, it is impossible to put any more than 7 parking spaces at this location. This has all happened over the past few weeks. I have done everything possible to work with the city to resolve this issue but still have not found a solution. I don't understand why the parking is even an issue now if we discussed it at a meeting prior to me purchasing the lot.

My main concern about the parking requirement is that we met with the city covering this very issue prior to me purchasing this property (making sure we were clear on the city's expectations for the building permit). I've met the original requirement of 7 on-site parking spaces and all other city requirements.

Also, the 429 Quincy location has 3 unmetered spaces on Quincy (in front of the building) and 2 more on 5th Street (along the side of the building). Is there some reason the city should not honor what was stated at the February meeting?

In addition, I own and run two salons directly across the street, 428 and 430 Quincy, which are in the downtown business district. Together, there are 11 stylists that work these locations with no on-site parking. We utilize 5-metered parking spaces on Quincy Street and 3 unmetered parking spaces along 5th Street. We have not had any parking issues with the local businesses and neighbors in the area.

I hope this letter helps to clarify to the Planning and Zoning committee the sequence of events and the issues concerning the proposed development of the 429 Quincy property into a hair salon. If you have any further questions, please let me know and I will respond as soon as possible. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,



Debbie Hadcock

WELLS
FARGO

Wells Fargo Bank South Dakota, N.A.
1040 Main Street
P.O. Box 249
Sturgis, SD 57785
605 347-2581
605 347-5474 Fax

July 23, 2003

Rapid City Planning & Zoning
c/o Jeff Mareno
Fax (605) 348-5553


RE: Deb Hadcock
Quincy Ave. property

Dear Mr. Mareno,

I am sending this letter to hopefully clarify and confirm the commitments I believe the Planning and Zoning Office made to the Hadcock's when they purchased this property from Wells Fargo Bank. I spent a great deal of time on the phone trying to assist the Hadcock's in making the decision that this property would work for their operation. To help everyone get on the same page, a meeting was arranged so that all parties and departments involved were present to help clarify this so the Hadcock's could move forward and purchase the property or make the decision not to and look for another piece of property. Present at this meeting were the Hadcocks, Del Voth, the realtor, Jim Clark and Marcia Elkins, representing the City of Rapid City, and myself. Several issues were discussed and on more than one occasion either Jim or Marcia left the room to review building codes to answer questions that arose. It appears now that an issue has come up regarding required number of parking spaces. I clearly recall at that meeting on February 21st, 2003 that one of those issues discussed was the number of required parking spaces. It was my understanding that only 7 spaces would be required, based on the intended use of that property. Immediately following that meeting with Jim Clark and Marcia Elkins, we were allowed to use their meeting room with the Hadcock's and the realtor to discuss whether the Hadcock's wanted to move forward with the purchase of the property based on the discussion with Jim Clark and Marcia Elkins. During that meeting, I agreed to lower the selling price of the property due to some extra expense that was brought to their attention by Jim Clark and Marcia Elkins to bring the property up to code. The Hadcock's agreed on this price in good faith knowing that they had covered all the issues needed for them to pass planning and zoning. The number of parking spaces, among other things, had been addressed to their satisfaction. Now it appears, for some reason, the number of parking spaces has been changed, after they have invested a great deal of time and money into the project. It appears to me that it is awfully unfair to change the requirements at a time when the project is nearly complete. I would ask that the original requirements be honored and the Hadcock's be allowed to operate their business with the originally required 7 parking spaces.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,



Paul Bisson
President