

16 July 2003

Planning Director/Marcia Elkins
Urban Planner/Vicki Fisher
Members of Planning Commission

As I prepare to depart tomorrow morning, I would like to reiterate in writing my words at the last planning meeting. The homeowners in both Edinborough and South Hill have faced a rocky road over the past four years. They were abandoned midway through the development by Mr. Baker selling off lots to speculators who did not adhere to the style standards of Edinborough. It should be pointed out, Mr. Baker required the early residents to abide by not only style and color but his floor plans as well. Homes are now being built which are two stories and split-level and do not follow the original covenants.

South Hill is a custom-home development. We were "promised" a state-of-the-art equestrian center with indoor boarding, daily removal of manure, green grass, trees, and a Kentucky-style fence. Obviously none of the promised features came to pass. Mr. Fisk ignored the city's demands to comply for over four years, and in the end, also abandoned the project. We are also faced with the industrial-style Cleary building which was to be used in conjunction with the horse barn. It also slipped through the cracks in the system. Enclosed are photographs of the way this building is maintained. Volunteer trees are the only landscaping; weeds are uncut; an industrial size dumpster, sawhorses, pallets, and tiles which have been there for almost three years mar the area.

As I mentioned on 10 July, developers do not act to save residents of neighborhoods. Motives are and will always be financial. I am a firm believer in capitalism, but also firmly committed to seeing fairness triumph. Mr. Quinn's plan to squeeze as many small residences as possible into the acreage vacated by the equestrian center is not acceptable, especially along the inner rim of Wellington Drive. If (and I use the term "if") Mr. Quinn miscalculated on the value of the property, the residents of South Hill should not suffer value loss to their property as a result. Fourteen small home (even if they meet the minimum of city rules) do not mirror the size and cost of the homes on Wellington and Regency Court; and as such, will diminish the integrity of the neighborhood and existing covenants.

Unlike the owner of Hagg Development, Mr. Quinn is not now, nor likely to be, a resident of South Hill. It is also unlikely that any of his realtors, marketers, or builders will reside in the area. My husband and I, however, used our life savings and three years of sweat equity to build our dream home. Every decision you make now will impact the outcome of that dream. These two developments have not been protected well by the system since their inception. The Planning Commission now has an opportunity to protect the integrity of our neighborhood and the value of our homes. Please break new ground and demand that the Planned Urban Development along Wellington Drive meets the size and design criteria, if not the cost of the existing homes.

Thank you for your time and effort in this matter.



PATRICIA K. HAHN
1105 Regency Court
Rapid City, South Dakota 57702

Memo

To: Planning Commission Members
From: Harley and Jean Paulson
1100 Regency Ct.
Date: July 8, 2003
Re: Development on Wellington Drive

Since we will not be here for the July 10 meeting we would like to express our support for the development of single family homes in the proposed Wellington Dr. area. We are pleased to see the development of this area, and the potential quality construction of new homes. However, the proposed multiple townhomes facing Wellington Dr. is a concern.

Perhaps a blend of townhomes and single family homes, with the townhomes being placed near the entrances from Catron Blvd. and the remainder single family homes, would be a workable plan. We are also concerned that the townhomes be of sufficient size to complement the area homes, in the range of 1400 -1600 square feet on the main level.

As you know, the residents of South Hill have met several times and we support the collective opinion of the group in our absence. Thank you for your continued care in the development of this area.

Elkins Marcia

From: Grosz, Evan [egrosz@rcrh.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2003 4:19 PM
To: 'planning.commission@rcgov.org'
Subject: 03PD024

Planning Commission,

I would like to express my concerns about the proposed planned development (03PD024) on Wellington Drive. I reside at 6620 Wellington Drive. I oppose the planned development as I have seen it. Trying to squeeze a townhouse on a .5 acre lot is crazy. My house sits on a .5 acre lot and is only 1600 sq ft. These townhomes can only be 900 sq ft per side, tops. This by no means conforms to the original South Hill development plans that I bought into. The homes were to be a minimum of 1500 sq ft per family dwelling.

Even though I've had many bad experiences with Ron Baker and the development of South Hill, I do like where I live and would like to continue calling it my home. I would ask that you be fair to the families that have already invested in the original South Hill plan.

I am not opposed to single family dwellings sitting on .5 acre lots around Wellington Drive. This would better reflect the kind of neighborhood that is currently in place.

If you have any questions for me please feel free to contact me at work or home.
Work 719-2123
Home 342-6301

Thanks
Evan Grosz
6620 Wellington Drive

***Note: The information contained in this message, including any attachments, may be privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the Sender immediately by a "reply to sender only" message and destroy all electronic or paper copies of the communication, including any attachments.