Hi Fletcher,

I am sharing my concern about the zoning request to change to multiple home unit 3 & 4 until town homes. When I made a decision to purchase my home in this neighborhood my understanding is that space could be standard two family dwelling town homes. My understanding maximum of 6 total family's. Now with the new request there will be up to 11 family's in that same space with all two car garage so expected 22 additional vicheles. Additional issue I see is there will be concrete connecting to Street in three different locations however with 11 double garage units that's 264ft of concrete wide by 20 ft deep is or 5280 sq of concrete that's a parking lot in my opinion. I am against the approval of this change.

I would support 3 two unit town homes.

Please confirm that you received this email and let me know what ever next steps I can take to confirm that the space remaining is utilized appropriately.

Thanks for your time

James Munger

605-431-9187
My name is Cody Schmidt residing at 6104 Nugget Gulch RD and I appose the rezoning and building structures proposed for the project.

Sent from my iPhone

________________________________________________________________________

From: Amanda Coleman [mailto:amandajo62@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2017 11:47 AM  
To: Lacock Fletcher <Fletcher.Lacock@rcgov.org>  
Subject: File #17 pd015

Nugget gulch rd

To whom it may concern:

My name is Amanda Coleman. We bought at 6036 nugget gulch rd one year ago. It has been brought to my attention that our neighboring property has been re-zoned from agricultural to residential. When we bought we were told this would not sell. We bought our house for the surrounding natural beauty. We are not pleased to know there is a chance of 11 or so units being built right next door to us. Not only for the view but for the resell value of our home and property. Also, our neighborhood will be adding that much more traffic. We purchased this house to be in a quieter place to raise our small kids. We are very OPPOSED to this new zone. Please contact us if need be

Ken and Amanda Coleman  
6036 Nugget Gulch Rd

952-484-1010  
612-751-6391

Sent from my iPhone

________________________________________________________________________

From: Stephanie Strand [mailto:strandstephanie@icloud.com]  
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2017 4:21 PM  
To: Lacock Fletcher <Fletcher.Lacock@rcgov.org>  
Cc: cdstrand@gmail.com  
Subject: File 17 pd015

Ken and Amanda Coleman
6036 Nugget Gulch Rd

952-484-1010  
612-751-6391

Sent from my iPhone
We oppose the land development on Nugget Gulch Road.

Residents
Strands
6005 Nugget Gulch Rd
Sent from my iPhone

From: Coleman, Kenneth (HHT) [mailto:ColemanK@hearthnhome.com]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2017 4:31 PM
To: Lacock Fletcher <Fletcher.Lacock@rcgov.org>
Subject: Rezoning Nugget Gulch

I am sending my response to the rezoning.

I live at 6036 Nugget Gulch Dr. I am against the rezoning to add multi family homes to the property next to my home. I am concerned the value of my property will decrease. I was told that the property was agricultural and would not be built on.

I would like be heard formally to understand the effects on my property valuation and resell disadvantages.

Thanks for your consideration,

Ken & Amanda Coleman

Sent from my iPhone
From: Nick and Sandra Spain [mailto:nickandsandraspain@ymail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 1:41 PM
To: Lacock Fletcher <Fletcher.Lacock@rcgov.org>
Subject: 17PD015

Mr. Fletcher,

As I stated in previous emails I am a homeowner in the Catron Crossing Subdivision. This email is in petition to deny approval of Stoney Creek South #2 Townhome project. My family and I live directly across from the proposed Stoney Creek South No. 2 Townhome Project (17PD015). This email is regards of my concern for the project.

First, this subdivision is considered to be of low density. Rezoning an area of 1 acre to allow 11 townhomes definitely does not fit the current format of 1 house or 2 townhomes for lots of 0.25-0.5 acres. 1 Townhome per 1/10 of an acre hardly fits this model. It to me is the developer trying to squeeze as much profit into as little space as possible without regard to current homeowners. I'm sure this would be do to the large amount of excavation that would be required as this is a hill. The excavation of this area alone concerns me as the type of equipment needed to perform this extreme of work is quite large. The equipment alone concerns the safety of my young children (4 and 7). My family and I enjoy the current landscape as a buffer to the current apartment complex.

I would truly like this area to never be developed but do realize that some sort of development will eventually happen. There is some landscape that is too difficult or costly to develop and this area appears to be that way. It does not make sense to reduce setbacks, drastically decrease lot size, and change the character of the current area in which many people have recently purchased homes because of open area and larger lot sizes.

Finally, 11 townhomes in 1 acre is no where close to the current character of the neighborhood. Most houses are appraised between $320,000 and $450,000. I doubt these townhomes would be in accordance with current homes. I feel this would greatly decrease the value of my house being directly across from the proposed project. That very much concerns me. The current terrain is steep and difficult and provides a great buffer against the adjacent apartment complexes. The safety of equipment required for this project greatly worries me for my families safety. The increase in traffic would be another safety concern for my family. Overall my family and I are very much against this current proposition. This would very much affect our safety and financial status as a home is a families greatest investment. The only way I would agree with development is if current demographics were stringently adhered to.

Sincerely,

Nick Spain and Family
Michael Golliher  
2915 Sourdough Road  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
May 8, 2017  

Vicki Fisher  
Planning Manager  
City of Rapid City  
300 6th Street  
Rapid City, SD 57701

Dear Ms. Fisher:

As a homeowner in the Catron Crossing Subdivision, adjacent to the proposed Stoney Creek South No. 2 Townhome Project (17PD015), I write this letter to express my concerns in regards to this project.

I understand the decision is being considered to allow the developer to increase the allowable limit of two townhomes per lot in a Low Density Residential area to 11 townhomes on 3, approximately 1/3 acre lots. This equates to one townhome per 0.09 acres when adjacent homes are on lots that range from 0.25 to 0.5 acres. This proposed density clearly does not fit into the character of this neighborhood.

The location of the proposal is a hill which is devoid of any development and already provides a buffer between the current homes in LDR-1 and the nearby apartment complex. I would also ask the Planning Commission to look closely at the hill where the proposed townhomes would be built. Topography in this area is steep and would require mass excavation to make the sites suitable for homes. It seems as though the developer is trying to get as many homes as they can into a small area to offset the large cost of development.

If this act of rezoning and the subsequent subdivision is truly meant to be “low density”, why are we forcing a relatively high density of homes into this area?

I appreciate the attempt by the developer to reduce urban sprawl but some areas are meant to, and should be, left open. Infill does have its place but should not be taken so far that you must reduce setbacks, severely downsize lots and dramatically change the character of an area where people recently purchased homes because of the open area and larger lot sizes.
Therefore I challenge the developer’s goals:

- 11 townhomes constructed within 1 acre does not fit into the character of a neighborhood where homes are assessed between $320,000 and $445,000.
- A buffer already exists between the current neighborhood and the apartment complex.
- The existing topography does not easily lend itself to providing high quality homes.

Some would say the last goal of taking advantage of existing utilities and limiting urban sprawl is met but others, namely homeowners in this area, would say it does not and the area should be left open or the build out should conform to the guidelines established for Low Density Residential.

Homeowners in this area that agree to what I have stated are listed below.

Sincerely,

Michael Golliher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Address, Contact Information</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave &amp; Mary Ann Fredrickson</td>
<td>2909 Sourdough Rd, Rapid City, SD 57702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210-846-9937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick &amp; Brenda Berg</td>
<td>6408 Nugget Gutch Rd, Rapid City, SD 57702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>605-660-9630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin &amp; Kaylee Thrift</td>
<td>2908 Sourdough Rd, Rapid City, SD 57702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>605-680-5930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kend &amp; Amanda Coleman</td>
<td>6036 Nugget Gutch Rd, Rapid City, SD 57702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>605-489-1810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>605-431-987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>605-431-878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James &amp; Colleen Munger</td>
<td>2921 Sourdough Rd, Rapid City, SD 57702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>605-489-1810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Roberts-Titze</td>
<td>2924 Sourdough Rd, Rapid City, SD 57702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>605-431-987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg &amp; Jena McNair</td>
<td>6408 Nugget Gutch Rd, Rapid City, SD 57702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>605-934-6295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Petition to Deny Approval

**Stoney Creek South #2 - Townhome Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Address, Contact Information</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim Hinzman</td>
<td>2922 Motherlode Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Arneson</td>
<td>2912 Motherlode Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Esser</td>
<td>5603 Bald St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Frickelein</td>
<td>2909 South Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wentz</td>
<td>2923 Motherlode Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody Schmidt</td>
<td>6104 Nugget Gulch Rd</td>
<td>315-4870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Strand</td>
<td>6005 Nugget Gulch Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel S. Fullerton</td>
<td>2911 Motherlode Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Fullerton</td>
<td>2911 Motherlode Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaryAnn Kretschman</td>
<td>2917 Motherlode Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Kretschman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Wentz</td>
<td>2923 Motherlode Dr. RC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tornai</td>
<td>2928 Motherlode DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Zueger</td>
<td>2921 Slovakica Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cather</td>
<td>2974 Motherlode DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>