



Sharon Fox <sfox@co.teton.id.us>

Northern Lights Subdivision

1 message

Jen Fisher <jenfisher44@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 21, 2023 at 10:44 AM

To: pz@co.teton.id.us

To the Teton County Board of County Commissioners: Comments and Concerns regarding Northern Lights Subdivision

As residents of W 7000 N, just North and East of the proposed Northern Lights Subdivision, I have reviewed the preliminary plat and have concerns with the nature of the proposed development. Building a 17-home subdivision on a rural, agricultural hillside with complex topography in a sparsely developed area of the valley that consists of large, productive tracts and poor infrastructure despite being within miles of the City of Teton is not the responsible growth our community needs. This proposal disregards the goal of maintaining the rural character and heritage of the north end of the valley and contradicts the vision for this unique foothill area to stay sparsely populated for the sake of wildfire and wildlife. As well, the road infrastructure is barely hanging on with the increase of traffic North from Hatches Corner, west on 6500N and no infrastructure (dirt roads) from Teton to the East. The county continues to 'patch' (poorly, I might add) the pot hole situation on N 500 W.

Regarding the conformance of the Subdivision/PUD with the Comprehensive Plan, the applicants note that "Northern Lights is situated in the rural agriculture designation on the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, with the land designated as mixed agriculture / rural neighborhood." They quote that the "Desired future character and land uses for the Rural Agriculture areas include:

- Agriculture
- Ranching
- Low density residential, with provisions for clustering/conservation developments to protect natural resources or rural character
- Conservation and wildlife habitat enhancement/protection"

- **The proposed subdivision would eliminate agriculture and ranching on these 80 acres.**
- **A 17-lot subdivision is not low density and does not protect rural character.**
 - The area of the proposed subdivision is characterized by large tracts of rolling, hilly agricultural land with minimal residences - smaller (1-5 acre) lots along the rural road interspersed with larger (10+ acre) lots. The rural character and heritage would be compromised by the proposed subdivision.
- **A 17-lot subdivision does not conserve, protect or enhance wildlife habitat.**
 - Adding structures, modifying the topography and bringing upwards of 5 times the current residents to this neighborhood is hugely impactful. Putting a 17-lot subdivision in large game migration zones, close to Songbird/Raptor Breeding and Wintering Habitat and Sharp-tailed Grouse Breeding Habitat does not meet the goal of conservation and wildlife habitat enhancement/protection.

The applicants submitted the application paperwork right before the code changed. By the new LDC, that land is classified as Foothills 10. The code describes the FH-10 Zone District as "intended to ensure development is in harmony with mountainous and hilly settings that are at higher risk to wildfire and notable for wildlife values. FH-10 serves to provide limited residential development with an average density not to exceed one (1) lot per ten (10) acres in the foothills of the Western, Southern, and lower elevation Northeastern portions of the valley. The intent for development in the FH-10 is to maintain public access to state and federal lands; discourage scattered hillside development that requires remote roads and infrastructure; follow best practices to help prevent wildfires and minimize threats to life and property when wildfires do occur in the fire prone wildland interface; protect steep slopes; and preserve critical wildlife habitats such as wildlife migration linkage areas at the forest edge, and to protect native vegetation and scenic views of the foothills from the valley floor."

- *All the above characteristics of the area are true now and were true before the code changed* - approving a subdivision of this size just because the old zoning allows for it is not the forward looking, wildfire-wise, responsible development that Teton Valley needs.

Additionally, the proposed project is not compatible with the 5 goals of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, listed below.

1. Our Community Envisions a Sustainable Future for Teton County We will strive to: Establish a vibrant, diverse and stable economy.

- **The project lacks diversity.**
 - The proposed development stacks small lots of uniform size in a concentrated area rather than maintaining the agricultural and rural feel of the area by creating some smaller lots surrounded by larger lots to follow the pattern of the current development in the vicinity. With the current land costs and building prices, plus the lack of water and sewer available on the lots, these will not be affordable for middle/working class families and thus will not help stabilize local housing needs.

2. Create and maintain a well- connected, multi-modal network of transportation infrastructure to provide convenient and safe mobility for all residents, visitors and businesses.

- **The current road access is not suited to a development of this size and would not have "minimal impact" on the local dirt roads.**
 - The proposed subdivision uses W 7000 N as access, a small county road that is not plowed by the county in the winter and does not meet the Teton County, ID standard (shown in the original proposal) of being 22' wide with two 9' lanes and a 2' shoulders - it is roughly 15' wide with no shoulders. The proposal also claims the subdivision to be within 1.25 miles of Hwy 33, which is only accurate using a minimally maintained, steep, rutted section of W 7000 N west of the property that is not plowed

in the winter, not graded in the summer and like the rest of W 7000 N does not meet the county standards. The actual access would be from the east via N 1750 W, which is a dirt road that is county maintained, but currently sees little traffic in the area of the proposed subdivision due to there being only 5 residences north of W 6500 N. This development, fully built, would increase the traffic on N1750 W and the surrounding access roads (N 2000 W, W 6000 N and W 6500 N) upwards of 500% and bring heavy construction vehicles along a quiet, rural dirt road.

3. Preserve natural resources and a healthy environment, which are essential for creating viable future economic and recreational opportunities for all users.

- **The development does not align with the vision for responsible development that preserves natural resources at the north end of Teton Valley.**
 - The applicants have owned the eastern lot since 2014 and expressed the intent to build a single home on it. According to the deed, they purchased the western parcel in December of 2021 and are fast-tracking a concept plan using the outdated smaller lot zoning in full knowledge of, but total disregard for, the new zoning that will not allow such high density development to happen. There are no subdivisions in the visible vicinity, and the proposed plan and layout do not take into account the intent to maintain "limited residential development" that is "in harmony with mountainous and hilly settings that are at higher risk to wildfire and notable for wildlife values." (Quoted from the LDC Document adopted 8/3/22)
 - The subdivision site is not flat; creating sites for 17 houses will require completely changing the existing topography.

4. Contribute to our strong sense of community by providing quality facilities, services, and activities to benefit the community.

- **The subdivision will increase the number of people commuting along the main valley corridors without adding beneficial facilities or services.**
 - Though within a couple miles of Teton as the crow flies, this neighborhood is not accessible by public transportation and is not linked to the main business centers of the valley via pathways. No public open space or added recreational opportunities for nearby residents of Teton are proposed.

5. Maintain, nurture, and enhance the rural character and heritage of Teton Valley.

- **A 24-lot subdivision of mostly small lots is not keeping with the character of this part of Teton Valley.**
 - Asking the applicants to downsize the number of lots and intersperse smaller lots with larger tracts (10+ acres) would better fit the character and rural agricultural heritage of this area. It would limit the impact to the surrounding hillsides, roads and residences while still allowing for development.

We believe we can develop this area responsibly, so as to allow for limited growth that preserves access for wildlife, maintain the area's natural character and agricultural vibrancy and minimize the impact to the landscape and existing inhabitants.

Kurt Borich & Jen Fisher
607 Peaked Lane
Teton, ID 83452

August 18, 2023

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of the Cody Hill household, we do not believe that the proposed Northern Lights subdivision should come to pass for a multitude of reasons. One of our main concerns is the condition of the road. This gravel road is not equipped to have so much traffic on it, the potholes typically get disastrous with the current traffic. Not to mention you can barely pass someone on the road in some spots. It would be dangerous for everyone involved if that many people drove on this county road. Just last winter we had to pull at least seven people out of the ditch with our tractor. The Northern Lights Traffic Impact Study claims that 7000 N. road would be the road that was primarily used but as someone who has lived here for 52 years I can tell you that people who live in that area use the 6000 N. road as well as the 2000 N. road. Besides, the 7000 N. road is in terrible condition because it washes out easily. It also is closed in the winter so all of that traffic would go on these other routes.

Turning off the highway onto these routes can be dangerous. The only road that actually has a turn lane is the road that leads to the 7000 N. road which is quite frankly the worst road out of the three. There have been many times that we have almost been hit trying to turn onto the 6000 N. road. People do not pay attention and they do not slow down and sometimes they even try to pass you as you are turning. I'm sure the same could be said for the 2000 N. road. The more people who take these roads the more dangerous it is going to get.

Another of our concerns about passing the proposed subdivision is how the wildlife would be affected. We get many animals that migrate through that field and use the field as a source of food as well as breeding. Some of these animals include elk, whitetail deer, moose, mule deer and sharp-tailed grouse. Insects would also be negatively impacted. For instance, bees

are currently endangered and one of the biggest factors for this is loss of habitat. When you tear out these fields it is only aiding in the decline of these extremely important insects. Honey bees make up 80 percent of the world's pollination and with the population declining pollination rates go down majorly. Teton Valley should do its part in keeping the ecosystem stable.

Thank you,

The Cody Hill family



Sharon Fox <sfox@co.teton.id.us>

Northern Lights Subdivision

1 message

Jeanne Perry <mjbperry@msn.com>
To: "pz@co.teton.id.us" <pz@co.teton.id.us>

Thu, Aug 17, 2023 at 5:18 PM

August 17, 2023

Dear Planning and Zoning Staff and County Commissioners,

Numerous letters have been sent and speeches have been given stating concerns about the proposed Northern Lights Subdivision. Though there are numerous concerns, we will only focus on one. We haven't heard any sort of plan or resolution to this concern which has been brought up time and time again. This concern is the amount of traffic that will be using 1750 West. The pea hill road, which is the one that was offered as an alternative road, is even less adequate than 1750 West. We traveled up this road a week or two ago and found a deep ravine. What will it be like in the winter? Currently, there is way more traffic along 1750 West than is safe for this road. It is not wide enough and the borrow pits are too steep/deep. We have had many gravel trucks that use this road constantly. We have witnessed vehicles that have gone off the steep embankments throughout different seasons. One even losing his precious life. It is dangerous as is and will be even more dangerous with increased traffic. What commitments have been made to ensure the safety of those who use this road? Who will pay for improvements to widen the road, fill in the steep embankments, and control the dust? Please address this concern.

Thank you,

Jeanne and Blair Perry

435-279-6783 or 435-279-6045

Sent from [Outlook](#)

August 16, 2023

Dear Teton County Board of County Commissioners:

This letter and the information contained herein is presented in opposition of the proposed Northern Lights Subdivision of Tony and Anne Campbell (known also as Alpengrow Development, LLC), advanced by Civilize, PLLC Management and Engineering, to be located in Tetonia, Idaho.

The process used by The Teton County Planning & Zoning Commission to recommend approval of this subdivision has been at best a pathetic joke, a disgraceful unfair sham of public hearings. The public was properly notified of the hearings – August 9, 2022 Concept Hearing, and June 13, 2023 Preliminary Plat application hearing, and given the opportunity to give written comments prior to the hearings. But, what good are written public comments, no matter how well researched or how accurate the information given is, if the Planning & Zoning Commissioners don't read the written public input? This is lamentably a true fact of what has taken place. The P&Z commissioners rely on a staff member to give an opinion for approval or not. A staff member, a young woman, by the name of Claire was assigned to give recommendation for the Northern Lights Subdivision hearing. She recommended approval. The Commission voted to approve. Because the P&Z Commissioners seemed clueless regarding the issues many of us raised in our written comments, as well as unread & uneducated regarding Civilize, PLLC's ponderous traffic study, I had concerns following the hearing that I wanted to address. The day after the June 13 hearing, I personally went to the clerk's window just down the hall from the Commissioners' Chamber and spoke with two staff members, the clerk who took minutes at the hearing, and Claire, the staff member who recommended approval to the P&Z Commissioners. I asked them point blank if the P&Z commissioners received copies of the public input. The clerks answered yes. I asked if the P&Z Commissioners read the public input ahead of the actual hearing. I also asked if the Commissioners received and read the traffic study presented by Civilize, PLLC. I was told that ahead of the hearing on June 13, which included seven agenda items, the P&Z Commission received over 1,000 pages of material, and that there was no way for them to have time to read it all. I then asked Claire directly, since she had been assigned the Northern Lights Subdivision, if she had read all of the public input. Claire told me that she "looked" at the input. I asked her to clarify "looked at"- did that mean read? She told me that there was too much material to read all of it, so NO she had not read it all, only "looked" at it. Looked, skimmed, glanced, is a far cry from read, studied, examined, researched.

How is it in the public's best interest for the P&Z Commission to vote to recommend a subdivision for which they have not honestly done their due diligence to understand the impact it will have on the valley, the ecosystem where it is proposed, and the people that will be adversely affected? How can you call a public hearing FAIR if the Commission, either unwilling

or unable, has not read the public input prior to the hearing, or closely examined the information presented by Civilize, PLLC and the Campbells? This is a bad case of the blind leading the blind, with a staff member who has not closely examined both sides, giving guidance to a poorly prepared Commission. Worse yet, the public was limited to only 3 minutes to voice opposition directly to the Commission, while Civilize, PLLC and the Campbells had no time limit to sell their proposal. That is hardly enough time to educate and inform the Commissioners on what they failed to read for themselves. Three minutes is grossly inadequate to present an argument regarding the multiple issues at hand, some of which I will address later in this letter. Can you imagine a court hearing where either the prosecution or the defense is limited to 3 minutes while the other has unlimited time to argue their side of a case, or where evidence is ignored?

Of deep concern are some of the comments made by the commission that illustrate their lack of preparation and failure to analyze information sent to them ahead of time. I will paraphrase three of those.

- 1) "I don't understand most of the traffic impact study. It's too complicated."
- 2) "Well, it checks all the boxes." (referring to completed & submitted studies without understanding them)
- 3) "We voted to allow a dangerous narrow road on Fox Creek, so we should allow this one."

This entire hearing process has been incredibly frustrating to watch an ill-informed P&Z Commission rubber stamp this proposed Northern Lights Subdivision while largely dismissing any voice of opposition, and failing to verify facts or do their own research.

The fact that this proposed subdivision passed the first concept hearing, on August 9, 2022, is almost beyond reason, with Commissioner Tremblay being the only commissioner present to vote "NAY". Albeit, this was only a concept hearing, as pointed out by Commissioner Tremblay, the very idea of spoiling one of Teton Valley's last remaining unspoiled farming and wildlife spaces with a subdivision flies in the face of common sense, and strays far from the Valley's long term planning and preservation of its rural flavor. Driggs and Victor have already suffered sprawling development and growth with one subdivision after another. To my understanding from a conversation with Rob Marin, GIS, Community Projects Coordinator, there are currently somewhere around 6,000 existing approved building lots. None of these seem to be contributing to "affordable housing" or any other long term planning goal of the valley. How many more building lots does Teton County currently need?

Teton County has finally recognized the growing problem of sprawling subdivisions and the financial burden of providing service to these scattered residential clusters and has taken action to protect our valley through the NEW LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE. The good news is that there is still a chance to preserve the northern half of the valley for future generations to experience

the dark night skies filled with bright star constellations unobscured by man-made lighting, to observe wildlife in a natural habitat not dissected by additional roads and subdivisions, to sit or go for a walk or a bike ride and enjoy the quiet surrounding serenity uninterrupted by cars whizzing by or residential noise. Once these things are gone, they are pretty much gone forever.

Commissioner Penfold lamented in the concept hearing that the area surrounding the land that his family has farmed for years is looking down the barrel of some 300 proposed lots, due to the earlier zoning. The current zoning for the proposed parcels of the Northern Lights subdivision falls under *FH-10 Foothills* for the west parcel and *RA-35 Rural Agriculture* for the east parcel. The unfortunate growth in the southern portion of our valley does not justify doing the same to the north end. Mistakes and oversights of the past do not validate further mistakes. Experience should lead to greater wisdom and better decisions. Teton Valley is a rare ecological treasure and deserves to be treated with conservative precaution.

It is true that Alpenglow Development, LLC (Tony and Anne Campbell) made it under the wire with application for their development ahead of The New Land Development Code (in effect August 3, 2022), but this is now 2023. Neither the code of 2012, nor the current code of 2023 guarantees the Campbells approval to put in their development. Even if the new LDC did not exist, the County has the authority to deny the creation of this subdivision. The County is not precluded from denying the Campbells approval to put in a subdivision that is detrimental to the area and its current residents. Among its declarations, the new LDC defines jurisdictions and densities. The Campbells' proposed subdivision does not fit within the new code. Furthermore, the New LDC states, only "**EXISTING** lots that don't comply with new density assignments will be allowed to be developed per their original entitlements." The Campbells' Northern Lights subdivision is proposed. No subdivision exists. No lots exist. Northern Lights is a proposal, a bad proposal. The LDC further reads, "With any new Land Development Code that gets adopted, it applies only to new construction projects and new developments. What is **ALREADY BUILT, SUBDIVIDED AND EXISTING NOW** is not affected by the new density requirements". Northern Lights subdivision is only a concept, a proposal; no lots actually **EXIST**. The Campbells and their engineering firm, which stands to make a great deal of money, would like for you to believe that they are far enough along in this project that you would be doing a great disservice, an act of unconstitutionality to cut them off now. The argument of "too far down the pipeline" just keeps growing. This argument, however, does not validate the damage that will be done by such an ill-advised development to an environmentally sensitive area.

Civilize Management and Engineering are expert at pushing projects through; it's what they are paid to do. Their skills go beyond their engineering and design expertise. They know how to present information with a clear desired outcome – one which culminates in a large profit for

themselves as well as for their employing client, the Campbells. They know the right phrases to shame objectors and how to push emotional buttons. When the Civilize, PLLC engineering representative of the Campbells, Bent Crowther, spoke at the August 9, 2022 hearing, he did not just speak as an engineer, he morphed into a professor of constitutional history. He quoted The Declaration Of Independence, noting that in its creation there was a consideration of wording “.....life, liberty, and the pursuit of property”, however he glossed over the fact that our founding fathers opted NOT to use the phrase “the pursuit of land”. Rather, the authors of the Declaration chose “We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS.” The signers of The Declaration chose the term “Happiness”, a concept that goes far beyond the acquisition of land and the use thereof. However, Brent Crowther wanted the commissioners to somehow feel unpatriotic if they did not yield to the idea of unrestricted property ownership rights. Property rights are restricted by all levels of government for the good of the people. The Tenth Amendment of the Constitution reserves power to the States to govern. The State, in turn, prescribes and reserves power to local government. Local government includes departments, boards, and commissions charged to carry out duties for the well-being of the communities and lands that they serve and govern. The constitution of the State of Idaho begins with this, “We the people of the State of Idaho, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, to secure its blessings and promote our **COMMON WELFARE** do establish this constitution. Article 1, Declaration of Rights, in the Idaho State Constitution, Section 14 - Right of eminent domain - states as an objective “the preservation of the health of its inhabitants”. I am not suggesting here that eminent domain be applied, rather, I point out the serious obligation of local government to protect the common good of the inhabitants of the land, and that includes at times limiting personal property rights. Commissions already do this, without apology, in many forms. This Planning and Zoning Commission failed, but the Board of County Commissioners has the power to preserve this sensitive area for the general welfare of this valley, county, community, its inhabits - human and nature’s creatures. The Campbells can still have their right to quiet enjoyment of their land. There is a delicate balance between individual rights and the good of a community as a whole. Even our most sacred personal rights, enumerated in the First Amendment of our National Constitution come with limitations when balanced with the good of all.

Brent Crowther, in his presentation, shared the anecdote of how in his own home community a piece of land with a pond, where the youth of many generations caught tadpoles, was developed. This narrative had as a purpose to justify the despoiling of our own pristine environment, in our community of Teton Valley, because it happened to him and his boyhood community. Whether or not any circumstances, consequences, or long-term impacts bore any similarities is irrelevant. The intent of the anecdote was to shame us all into accepting a similar fate.

Crowther also attempted to shame us all for wanting to be “the last home built”, and then close the door to others. He further illustrated our “hypocrisy” with his historical recount of early American expansion with homesteading and land grants in large sectors. Because the land has been divided multiple times into smaller parcels, by Mr. Crowther’s judgement, we are all guilty of hypocrisy, and how dare we deprive his clients the right to place in jeopardy this environmentally delicate area for their own gain. During the very early years of Teton Valley, when the population was minimal, the inhabitants were largely able to do as they wished, even things that we would not even consider now, with very little impact on each other. However, there comes a time in the growth of a community when we must make decisions and restrictions, previously unnecessary, to preserve the health and nature of our valley. Saying, “NO” to this intrusive development is the right thing to do.

The DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT of Northern Lights Subdivision comes with many concerns.

- Allowing a development in 2023 based on a badly outdated code (2012) is wrong.
- What happens when the developer does not maintain public improvements, such as roads?(section 4). This becomes the burden of the county.
- The developer is allowed unlimited extensions of time due to factors beyond the developers control. (section 7)
- The county runs the risk of being in the development business. (sections 21,22,23)
- Because county officials are indemnified, and the developer is an LLC, the reality is that no individual can be held liable or responsible. (section 29) Campbells are hidden safely behind a legal tool.
- The developer will make ZERO DOLLARS donation for road improvement. (section 40 Mitigation of Teton County Road Improvements) During the August 9, 2022 hearing, Mr. Campbell stated that the roads could use some improvement, but he did not believe he should bear all of the costs. (or apparently any).
- Title 9, provides the developer a mechanism to recoup a portion of certain costs associate with the improvements made by the developer. (section 42) What are these costs? What will this cost the tax payers of Teton County?

The proposed CC&Rs come with concerns.

- Livestock and household animals. (article 8 section N) How do you propose to house up to 2 horses or llamas pastured, up to six horses penned, 2 pigs penned, 15 chickens, without allowing additional buildings beyond one living space (minimum 2,000 sq ft.) and one accessory structure?
- Short term rentals (article 11 section C). Seriously? Who is going to regulate this in any kind of meaningful or vigilant way? The County Commissioners?

- (Article 12 section D) These covenants may be amended at any time by the Declaration prior to the sale of 75% of the lots in the subdivision. Can you say “carte blanche”?

The concerns about the Development Agreement and CC&Rs are small when compared to the long term environmental concerns.

The proposed development falls within the past & present wildlife overlay maps. It is in the corridor of a large game migration area. A subdivision will negatively impact sensitive bird and fish habitat. Teton Valley’s natural resources are its real treasures, not more subdivisions.

The proposed number of lots pose a threat to Spring Creek and the aquifer that provides the drinking water (wells) of the existing homes down-stream. How many wells can pull water from the same aquifer? This subdivision poses a risk of depleting the aquifer that our established wells rely on, particularly in drought years. The Northern Lights subdivision also poses a risk of contaminating our wells and the flowing water of Spring Creek.

A drainfield is a shallow, covered trench made in the soil of a home’s yard. Partially treated wastewater from the septic tank flows out through the drainfield, filters down through the soil, and enters the groundwater. Fractured bedrock is a problem because it allows effluent to pass quickly to the ground water with no treatment. Impermeable bedrock prevents water movement and can cause systems to fail to the surface.

The following is from EPA.gov:

Filtering wastewater through the soil removes most bacteria and viruses (also known as pathogens) and some nutrients. While soil can treat many contaminants, it cannot remove all of them (e.g., medicines, some cleaning products, other potentially harmful chemicals). If untreated wastewater surfaces in the yard, wastewater may contaminate your drinking water through an unsecured well cap or cracks in the well casing. It’s important to avoid flushing medication and chemicals into your wastewater since it could contaminate your drinking water.

The contamination risk to your well is HIGHER:

- if the well is at a shallow depth and in permeable soil;
- if the well is down gradient of the septic system (i.e., if the groundwater flows from the septic system towards the well);
- if there are many homes on septic systems near the well; or,
- if there is poor construction or maintenance of the well and/or septic system (i.e., contaminants can enter a cracked drinking well casing from ground or surface water).

EPA.gov

Three of the five test holes at the site of this proposed development found bedrock, one of them as shallow as 30 inches.

Bedrock is also found on the surface on portions of the proposed sites.

Clustering homes also presents contamination risk.

Shallow soils over fractured bedrock allow water and contaminants to travel rapidly.

Allowing development beyond current LDC density codes is not only irresponsible, it is insane. Certain common chemical contaminants do NOT leech out in septic systems and drain fields, no matter how good the drain fields are. They ultimately make their way into the ground water. This is the reason why large populated areas on municipal water systems use chlorine and other chemical treatments to treat their water. We are currently blessed to be able to drink pure untreated well water on this north end of the valley. Approval of the Northern Lights subdivision, or any other high density community in this area, will spell the end of this clean water privilege. Once contamination of the ground water in the Spring Creek area is present, it will be difficult to mitigate. The expense of mitigation will be borne by the County, and not the Campbells.

The cumbersome TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY provided by Civilize, PLLC strongly supports the concept that if you blow enough smoke up a person's skirt, they won't know what the hell you are talking about or how to refute your didactic ramblings. This study seems in appearance to take the same strategy of a congressional omnibus bill, to make it long enough and cumbersome enough that no one can contend with it. In actuality page 1, The Traffic Impact Study **DISCLAIMER** sums up nicely what the Commission should understand:

- All the information/advice in the document is an opinion of Civilize, PLLC, a party that stands to substantially benefit financially from this project if approved.
- Some of the information and data that Civilize has used to form its opinion is **provided by the project owner**. This is hardly objective information! The amount and nature of this information from the *developer* and how it was collected, and what information was withheld is not disclosed. It is filled with deceptive half-truths
- The age of some of the data is not disclosed. Civilize, PLLC states that they have no control over new information. In other words, much of their data can be obsolete and selectively included or excluded.
- Civilize, PLLC does not guarantee that actual conditions will not vary from the information they have presented in their report. In other words, you cannot really rely on the information in this study as accurate. Civilize, PLLC openly acknowledges this.
- Many references were made to visual traffic counts. WHO conducted these visual traffic counts? The Campbells? Someone they hired to sit at the corner of a street? There is one date referenced for the visual traffic count – November 4, 2022 (see pages 22&23 of their study). Where exactly was this visual traffic count done? How was it done? For how long was it done? In how many locations was it done? A single day visual count supplies enough information to base a decision that impacts the quality of Teton Valley for the distant future?
- Civilize, PLLC states that their site master plan represents the best information regarding anticipated future development for land use and is the bases for their traffic projections. It is of interest that the bulk of their 104 page puzzler is devoted to graphs and statistics on hwy 33, as far as Newdale, yet where the most significant impact will be is on 1750 West from the highway, past the cemetery, and on north to 7000 N. The road, 1750 West.

- The one hundred and four pages of Civilize, PLLC’s traffic study is a deliberate quagmire of jargon, abbreviations, acronyms, graphs, and dizzying speculative mathematical projections. The P&Z Commissioners admittedly did not understand it. I am not sure if the County Commissioners have had the time to read and analyze this entire study. The real truth of this study is found on page 1: the disclaimer. **It states that the information they present is their opinion and may not be correct.** In their study Civilize states that there have only been 6 crashes, with no fatalities, in the “influence area” of their study, a very small section along Hwy 33, yet they cite traffic flow information from Newdale to Driggs with the large bulk of their ponderous report focused on Hwy 33. However, even in this limited area, Civilize’s report is inaccurate. For their information source, they cite **The Local Highway Technical Assistance Council**. They did not bother to use Teton County’s public records. They could have used these readily available public records from our local Sheriff’s office, but did not.

I did read through the entire study and will point out some major flaws that if you actually study it, you too will discover. Here is the real picture:

In the past 5 years there have been 259 reported traffic accidents from the West boundary of Teton County to the North boundary line of Driggs. 26 of those have been in this year, 2023 as of June. There have been 202 additional “slide offs”, vehicles running off the road. Civilize claims there have been NO fatalities. On law enforcement reports *fatalities* are reported as such when there is a victim pronounced dead at the scene of the accident. That does not include victims transported to medical facilities where it is there that they are pronounced as deceased. However, Civilize fails to include in their report 4 fatalities in the proximity of their stated “influence area”.

There have been 4 fatalities between June 2019 – January 2023, all in nearby area:

One at 5000 West Hwy 35

One at 4000 West Hwy 33

One at 3000 West Hwy 33

One at 3840 North Hwy 33

In addition there have been slide-offs & accidents, including fatal results along 1750 West, the most notable of these is the death of an 11 year old boy, Tripp Black, in May of 2020. And I apologize to my neighbors and friends for bringing up this horrific memory and using Tripps sacred name & life in this conversation. There are other lost lives not reflected in this study as well.

- Civilize, PLLC claims that traffic, with the addition of a couple of turning lanes, will be at an acceptable level with no additional real road improvements, in 2027 and even 2047, that traffic will still be at “an acceptable level”. Acceptable to whom? If any of you commissioners have been here for more than ten years, you know what traffic has done in the last ten years. But, remember this is just Civilize’s unbiased opinion.
- Civilize, PLLC claims that 7000 North (Pee Hill) will be used to access the proposed subdivision, school buses, emergency vehicles, and regular traffic. This is ridiculous. In the winter only snow machines can make it over that road. In the warmer months, you need a four wheel drive if it is wet. Even under the best of weather conditions, that road is a steep one lane dirt road.

- Civilize, PLLC *assumes* that 10% of the newly generated traffic will use 7000 N to access Hwy 33 to the West, and that 90% of the newly generated traffic will travel along narrow 1750 West. (see page 12 of their study)
- Does Teton County seriously NOT have any specific requirements for access management? (see page 20 of their study) According to the publication Civilize has relied on, that is the case.

Let us *assume* that the assumptions of Civilize, PLLC are correct. The traffic of 17-24 proposed homes, home owners, renters, and guests will now travel along 1750 West, a narrow gravel road, currently enjoyed by walkers, bikers, artists, and dogs. The safety and quiet peaceful enjoyment of the existing home owners along this route will be sacrificed to financially benefit the Campbells. This road, 1750 West, has a steep drop off on both sides and is narrow, just wide enough for two regular vehicles to cautiously pass each other. Putting a bunch of construction vehicles, dump trucks, concrete trucks, etc. on this road, as will be the case if this subdivision is allowed, will create unsafe conditions for all who travel 1750 West. Expensive road improvement along this route will inevitably be required, with the financial burden again to be shouldered by the County & tax payers in order to accommodate the Campbells. Has the County done any financial projections to estimate what the cost will be?

I do not believe that a single P&Z Commissioner or Claire, the staff member, did any due diligence to verify the information presented in Civilize, PLLC's so-called traffic impact study. To my knowledge, they did not check Teton County's public accident records. They did not speak with the County Sheriff's Department. They relied on information provided by the developer rather than doing their own research and analysis of information provided at itd.gov/road-data. They did not call the Idaho State Department of Transportation. They didn't speak with Jeff Sneddon, project manager, out of Rigby for District 6, or Trent Maupin, short term traffic counts, out of St. Anthony, or Raymond Wong, research analysis over traffic counts, out of Boise. Had they done any of these things to educate themselves, they would know that a one day visual traffic count by an interested party is not a valid traffic count, or that the information in Civilize, PLLC's traffic impact study is a total snow-job.

On June 12th, the Teton County Board of Commissioners, working with the Teton County Wildlife Advisory Committee, unanimously passed a wildlife habitat analysis policy, not only to conserve & protect Teton County's wildlife resources, but also to create consistency in studies through qualified objective consultants vetted by the county. This new policy will establish proper sequencing regarding wildlife overlay maps for up-front analysis before projects get too far down the pipeline, saving time, money, and emotion for all parties involved. The same kind of thing needs to happen for *traffic studies* to avoid the kind of traffic study presented by Civilize, PLLC that has one objective only: to get Northern Lights Subdivision approved. A partial truth, when intentionally presented as the whole truth, is an untruth. Truth can also be used to convey a lie, especially when it is used to create a false impression. Yes, Civilize, PLLC did present a traffic impact study to "check that particular box" for the P&Z Commissioners, but their omissions of truth outweigh any validity their study might have. If Civilize, PLLC's template generated traffic report could be converted into fertilizer, Teton Valley would have one of its greenest years ever.

Would-be-Professor Crowther and Civilize, PLLC are opportunistic professional bull-shitters, skilled in the art of misdirection, manipulation, and half truths.

I encourage, ask, plead, beg the Teton County Board of Commissioners to protect, for the greater good of the community and for future generations, this area of clean water, wildlife habitat & migration, and dark night-skies from those that would sacrifice all this for their own personal gain.

Let the Cambells make a new application to use their land in a way that conforms to the New Land Development Code, in a way that does not harm the sensitive natural environment or the area, in a way that does not create a huge financial burden to the county, and in a way that does not have such adverse effects on the current residents of the area.

Respectfully,
Robert Stewart
(435)881-0102
6263 North 1750 West
Tetonia, Idaho 83452

Email: pz@co.teton.id.us

To the Teton County Board of County Commissioners: Comments and Concerns regarding Northern Lights Subdivision

As one of few residents in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Northern Lights Subdivision, I have reviewed the preliminary plat and have concerns with the nature of the proposed development. Building a 17-home subdivision on a rural, agricultural hillside with complex topography in a sparsely developed area of the valley that consists of large, productive tracts and poor infrastructure despite being within miles of the City of Teton is not the responsible growth our community needs. This proposal disregards the goal of maintaining the rural character and heritage of the north end of the valley and contradicts the vision for this unique foothill area to stay sparsely populated for the sake of wildfire and wildlife.

Regarding the conformance of the Subdivision/PUD with the Comprehensive Plan, the applicants note that "Northern Lights is situated in the rural agriculture designation on the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, with the land designated as mixed agriculture / rural neighborhood." They quote that the "Desired future character and land uses for the Rural Agriculture areas include:

- Agriculture
- Ranching
- Low density residential, with provisions for clustering/conservation developments to protect natural resources or rural character
- Conservation and wildlife habitat enhancement/protection"

- **The proposed subdivision would eliminate agriculture and ranching on these 80 acres.**
- **A 17-lot subdivision is not low density and does not protect rural character.**
 - The area of the proposed subdivision is characterized by large tracts of rolling, hilly agricultural land with minimal residences - smaller (1-5 acre) lots along the rural road interspersed with larger (10+ acre) lots. The rural character and heritage would be compromised by the proposed subdivision.
- **A 17-lot subdivision does not conserve, protect or enhance wildlife habitat.**
 - Adding structures, modifying the topography and bringing upwards of 5 times the current residents to this neighborhood is hugely impactful. Putting a 17-lot subdivision in large game migration zones, close to Songbird/Raptor Breeding and Wintering Habitat and Sharp-tailed Grouse Breeding Habitat does not meet the goal of conservation and wildlife habitat enhancement/protection.

The applicants submitted the application paperwork right before the code changed. By the new LDC, that land is classified as Foothills 10. The code describes the FH-10 Zone District as "intended to ensure development is in harmony with mountainous and hilly settings that are at higher risk to wildfire and notable for wildlife values. FH-10 serves to provide limited residential development with an average density not to exceed one (1) lot per ten (10) acres in the foothills of the Western, Southern, and lower elevation Northeastern portions of the valley. The intent for development in the FH-10 is to maintain public access to state and federal lands; discourage

scattered hillside development that requires remote roads and infrastructure; follow best practices to help prevent wildfires and minimize threats to life and property when wildfires do occur in the fire prone wildland interface; protect steep slopes; and preserve critical wildlife habitats such as wildlife migration linkage areas at the forest edge, and to protect native vegetation and scenic views of the foothills from the valley floor.”

- *All the above characteristics of the area are true now and were true before the code changed* - approving a subdivision of this size just because the old zoning allows for it is not the forward looking, wildfire-wise, responsible development that Teton Valley needs.

Additionally, the proposed project is not compatible with the 5 goals of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, listed below.

1. Our Community Envisions a Sustainable Future for Teton County We will strive to: Establish a vibrant, diverse and stable economy.

- **The project lacks diversity.**
 - The proposed development stacks small lots of uniform size in a concentrated area rather than maintaining the agricultural and rural feel of the area by creating some smaller lots surrounded by larger lots to follow the pattern of the current development in the vicinity. With the current land costs and building prices, plus the lack of water and sewer available on the lots, these will not be affordable for middle/working class families and thus will not help stabilize local housing needs.

2. Create and maintain a well- connected, multi-modal network of transportation infrastructure to provide convenient and safe mobility for all residents, visitors and businesses.

- **The current road access is not suited to a development of this size and would not have “minimal impact” on the local dirt roads.**
 - The proposed subdivision uses W 7000 N as access, a small county road that is not plowed by the county in the winter and does not meet the Teton County, ID standard (shown in the original proposal) of being 22' wide with two 9' lanes and a 2' shoulders - it is roughly 15' wide with no shoulders. The proposal also claims the subdivision to be within 1.25 miles of Hwy 33, which is only accurate using a minimally maintained, steep, rutted section of W 7000 N west of the property that is not plowed in the winter, not graded in the summer and like the rest of W 7000 N does not meet the county standards. The actual access would be from the east via N 1750 W, which is a dirt road that is county maintained, but currently sees little traffic in the area of the proposed subdivision due to there being only 5 residences north of W 6500 N. This development, fully built, would increase the traffic on N1750 W and the surrounding access roads (N 2000 W, W 6000 N and W 6500 N) upwards of 500% and bring heavy construction vehicles along a quiet, rural dirt road.

3. Preserve natural resources and a healthy environment, which are essential for creating viable future economic and recreational opportunities for all users.

- **The development does not align with the vision for responsible development that preserves natural resources at the north end of Teton Valley.**
 - The applicants have owned the eastern lot since 2014 and expressed the intent to build a single home on it. According to the deed, they purchased the western parcel in December of 2021 and are fast-tracking a concept plan using the outdated smaller lot zoning in full knowledge of, but total disregard for, the new zoning that will not allow such high density development to happen. There are no subdivisions in the visible vicinity, and the proposed plan and layout do not take into account the intent to maintain “limited residential development” that is “in harmony with mountainous and hilly settings that are at higher risk to wildfire and notable for wildlife values.” (Quoted from the LDC Document adopted 8/3/22)
 - The subdivision site is not flat; creating sites for 17 houses will require completely changing the existing topography.

4. Contribute to our strong sense of community by providing quality facilities, services, and activities to benefit the community.

- **The subdivision will increase the number of people commuting along the main valley corridors without adding beneficial facilities or services.**
 - Though within a couple miles of Teton as the crow flies, this neighborhood is not accessible by public transportation and is not linked to the main business centers of the valley via pathways. No public open space or added recreational opportunities for nearby residents of Teton are proposed.

5. Maintain, nurture, and enhance the rural character and heritage of Teton Valley.

- **A 24-lot subdivision of mostly small lots is not keeping with the character of this part of Teton Valley.**
 - Asking the applicants to downsize the number of lots and intersperse smaller lots with larger tracts (10+ acres) would better fit the character and rural agricultural heritage of this area. It would limit the impact to the surrounding hillsides, roads and residences while still allowing for development.

I believe we can develop this area responsibly, so as to allow for limited growth that preserves access for wildlife, maintain the area’s natural character and agricultural vibrancy and minimize the impact to the landscape and existing inhabitants.

Rebecca Parkinson
7002 Coyote Ridge Rd
Tetonia, ID 83452



Sharon Fox <sfox@co.teton.id.us>

Comments and Concerns regarding Northern Lights Subdivision

1 message

Mike Ford <mercurybg@hotmail.com>
To: "pz@co.teton.id.us" <pz@co.teton.id.us>

Wed, May 31, 2023 at 7:17 PM

As a property owner in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Northern Lights Subdivision, I have reviewed the concept plan and have concerns with the proposed development. Building a 17 home subdivision on an existing rural, agricultural hillside with complex topography in a sparsely developed area of the valley that consists of large, productive tracts and poor infrastructure despite being within miles of the City of Teton is not the growth our community needs. This proposal disregards the goal of maintaining the rural character and heritage of the north end of the valley, this proposal also contradicts the forward looking vision for the unique area for sparsely populated for the benefit of wildlife. There are indicator species whose presence is a sign of the overall health of its ecosystem. They also have significant biological, ecological, economic, educational, and aesthetic values. The following are considered indicator species observed on the property, Columbian Sharp-Tailed grouse, Bald Eagles, Rocky Mountain Elk, Mule Deer, Moose, and Greater Sandhill Crane.

The Comprehensive Plan, Subdivision/PUD conformance, the Northern Lights is situated in the rural agriculture designation on the 2012 plan, with the land designated as mixed agriculture / rural neighborhood. The desired future character and land uses for the rural agriculture areas include: Agriculture, Ranching, Low density residential, with provisions for clustering/conservation developments to protect natural resources or rural character and Conservation and wildlife habitat enhancement/protection.

The proposed subdivision would eliminate agriculture and ranching on these 80 acres.

A 17 lot subdivision of predominantly 2.5 acre lots is not low density and does not protect rural character. The rural character and heritage would be compromised by the proposed subdivision.

A 17 lot subdivision does not conserve, protect or enhance wildlife habitat. By adding structures, modifying the topography and bringing five times the current residents to this part of Valley is hugely impactful. Putting a 17 lot subdivision in large game migrating zones, close to songbird/raptor breeding and wintering habitat and Sharptailed grouse breeding habitat does not meet the goal of conservation and wildlife habitat enhancement protection.

The proposed subdivision has a road proposed to connect with a private road N 2250 W with out a right of way.

The proposed project is not compatible with the five goals of the 2012 comprehensive plan listed below:

1. Our community invasions of sustainable future for Teton County we will strive to: Establish a vibrant diverse and stable economy.

This project lacks diversity as the proposed development stacks small lots of uniform size in a concentrated area rather than maintaining the agricultural and rural feel of the area, which is surrounded by larger lots of the current development in this vicinity. This project reduces agriculture and ranching acreage. This project does not contribute to low density residential areas. This project doesn't protect natural resources, conserve, enhance or protect multiple wildlife indicator species habitats. With the current land costs and building prices, plus the lack of water and sewer available on the lots, these will not be affordable for middle/working class families and thus will not help diversify or stabilize local housing needs.

2. Create and maintain a well-connected multi modular network of transportation infrastructure to provide convenient and safe mobility for all residence visitors and businesses.

The current road access is not suited to support the proposed project and will have maximum impact on the local roads. The proposed subdivision uses W 7000 N as access which is a small county road that is not maintained by the county as it lacks a good base of gravel, sand and fines, a failed drainage with 0% slope crown and/or drainage to carry water away from the road surface, it currently has 2 foot deep ruts and trenches. This makes it impassable for school buses, waste, construction, and Life Saving Service vehicles especially during short and long term weather events. The road conditions are even worse coming from W 3000 N up and over the hill to W 1750 N.

The main access to Hwy 33 via 2000N is above capacity CURRENTLY to need a turning lane (according to their [traffic study](#)). This would be the actual access for this project and would add addition traffic via N 1750 W, N 2000 W, W 6000 N, and W 6500 N which are roads that the county maintains, but currently sees little traffic in the area of the proposed subdivision. This development fully built would increase the traffic on N 1750 W, N 2000 W, W 6000 N, and W 6500 N which will exerting maximum impact on the existing transportation system, while bring heavy construction vehicles along quiet rural dirt road for a number of years. These are all dirt roads that the county does not do any sort of dust abatement on, which has been challenging with the current new construction and heavy truck traffic.

3. Preserve natural resources and a healthy environment, which are essential for creating viable future economic and recreational opportunities for all users.

The development does not align with the vision for responsible development that preserves natural resources at the north end of Teton Valley. The applicants and are fast-tracking a concept plan using the outdated smaller lot zoning in full knowledge of, but total disregard for, the new zoning that will not allow such high density development to happen. There are no subdivisions in the visible vicinity, and the proposed plan and layout do not take into account the intent to maintain "limited residential development" that is "in harmony with mountainous and hilly settings that are at higher risk to wildfire and notable for wildlife values." (Quoted from the LDC Document adopted 8/3/22). The subdivision site is not flat; creating sites for 17 houses will require completely changing the existing topography.

4. Contribute to our strong sense of community by providing quality facilities, services, and activities to benefit the community.

The subdivision will increase the number of people commuting along the main valley Corridor's without adding beneficial facilities or services. Though within a couple of miles of Teton, this neighborhood is not accessible by public transportation and it's not linked to the main business centers of the valley via pathways. No public open space or added recreational opportunities for nearby residence of Teton are proposed.

5. Maintain, nurture, and enhance the rule character and heritage of Teton Valley.

A 17 lot subdivision of mostly small lots is not keeping within the character of this part of the Teton Valley. Asking the applicants to create a plan tracks of 10+ acres would better fit the character in rural agricultural heritage of this area. It would limit the impact to the surrounding hillsides, roads and residences while still allowing for development. This would support the District as intended to ensure development is in harmony with mountainous and hilly settings that are at higher risk to wildfire and notable for wildlife values. There are indicator species whose presence is a sign of the overall health of its ecosystem. They also have significant biological, ecological, economic, educational, and aesthetic values. The following are considered indicator species observed on the property, Columbian Sharp-Tailed grouse, Bald Eagles, Rocky Mountain Elk, Mule Deer, Moose, and Greater Sandhill Crane.

I do not understand why the P&Z Commission would approve a development that does not align with the new code, which indicates the Foothills to be an area meant to have "limited residential development" regardless of when application was submitted.

I believe we can develop this area responsibly, so as to allow access for wildlife, maintain the areas natural character and agricultural vibrancy and minimize the impact to the landscape and existing inhabitants.

Michael Ford

[2355 W 7000 N](#)

[Tetonia, ID](#)



Sharon Fox <sfox@co.teton.id.us>

Northern Lights Subdivision - Neighbor Input

1 message

GARH <galeenster@yahoo.com>

Sat, Jun 10, 2023 at 8:44 PM

To: "pz@co.teton.id.us" <pz@co.teton.id.us>

To whom it may concern,

This is my first letter regarding the proposed Northern Lights Subdivision.

As a property owner who is adjacent to this proposed subdivision, I did not hear about this until I happened to finally stop and read the random notice that was placed on a fence late last summer/fall. I never received an official notice and because of this I missed the first meeting. I still have not received anything other than emails from some of the neighbors.

I am the only full-time resident homeowner on this section of W 7000 N and my property is catty-corner from the proposed subdivision off the northwest corner.

As of now, the county has no interest in improving or providing snow removal services for the stretch of W 7000 N between N 1750 W and N 3000 W. I was responsible for clearing the road this past winter and numerous neighbors have paid to improve the road at our own expense. With more improvements planned as soon as the weather cooperates.

The road is impassable at times in adverse weather and is a connector road for many local residents, delivery trucks, and lost tourists.

We have no road base. It is a dirt road with too much traffic already. The hill is washed out with deep ruts. Now, from what I understand, part of the approval process will require the developers to improve the road from W 1750 N to the entrance of the subdivision. This only addresses the flat section on the east side which is the best part of the road. However, with a subdivision, traffic will increase on the whole road. Who is going to pay for the continued upkeep?

How is the county going to handle issues on P-Hill (the steep part of W 7000 N that is on my property) with the increased traffic?

This neighborhood is not an ideal location for any sort of dense housing development. There are currently 11 residents in the surrounding area that will be heavily impacted by the approval of the Northern Lights Subdivision. This includes the homes directly on N 1750 W and the adjacent homes on W 7000 N.

The developers are counting on the subdivision traffic to use N 1750 W to N 2000 W when accessing HWY 33. That corner is going to need some sort of improvement to accommodate the increased traffic. There are no turning lanes, and it is on a corner that creates a hazard. It is hard to see traffic coming from the right when you are turning left. And this intersection is already over capacity according to their own traffic study.

Not to mention N 1750 W is not designed to accommodate much more traffic. Between width and blind spots on the series dips between W 6500 N and W 7000 N, there is an increased chance of mishaps.

I would also like to add that these parcels, under the Current Development Code, are zoned differently than what is being proposed. And since this has not been approved that it should follow the current code at the time of approval.

As of August 2022, the parcels are zoned FH-10 (Foothills 10) and RA-35 (Rural Agricultural 35), which would limit the density of development to 1 home/10 acres on the west parcel and 1 home/35 acres on the east parcel.

Now, let us touch on the need to improve the transportation corridor through the valley. Before the county approves many more subdivisions scattered around rural areas of the county, please consider the overall need to address and improve the HWY 33 corridor. How many fatal accidents were there last year alone? How many accidents? How many close calls? Driggs is the county hub and all the residents from this end must travel HWY 33 for most services.

The county Road and Bridge department is already understaffed and spread thin with the current workload and snow removal. Approving more pocket subdivisions around the county just stresses the existing crew.

They cannot keep up with the needed maintenance.

Overall, the proposed subdivision does not comply with the current development code, does not align with the surrounding neighborhood, and puts unnecessary stress on the existing roadways.

Please consider further reducing the number of proposed lots if you approve this subdivision.

Thank you,

Gaylan Hellyer – Hellcat Haven, LLC

[2410 W 7000 N](#), PO Box 427, Tetonia, Idaho 83452

Jeanne Perry
6359 North 1750 West
Tetonia, Idaho

Dear Planning and Zoning committee,

I appreciate you taking the time to read about my concerns. First, to the Campbells, thank you for decreasing the density of your proposed subdivision. It is my hope that you will consider decreasing it even more due to these concerns:

- The increase of traffic along 1750 West. The increase of traffic will greatly affect the lifestyle and safety of those who walk their dogs, ride their bikes, jog, artists who love to set up their paint stands, etc.
- The narrowness of the 1750 West would make it difficult for 2 cars to safely pass, especially in winter conditions. The taxpayers would be left to foot the bill if road widening becomes necessary and with the addition of that many cars, it would be.
- The traffic study is laborious and difficult to read. Is one day in November – a visual report-a true representation?
- There is a discrepancy between the proposed development and the zoning. The current zoning for the west 40-acre parcel is F-10. The east parcel is RA-40. Although Cambell's got their proposal in under the old zoning, it was only a proposal and no homes had been built.
- Although the 20 acres is set aside for farming presently, are there plans to develop it in the future?
- The migration of Elk and other animals that use that as their home is a great concern.
- Septic and drainage that could contaminate the water on the homes beneath the hill.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Jeanne Perry

(P.S. to the Cambells, I want to be your friend so please don't think that because of these concerns that I would be rude because I won't be)