

Allison Kennedy

From: Mandy Pomeroy
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 11:48 AM
To: pzcouter
Subject: FW: Deny Request for Mediation, Quigley Ranch and Mountain Overlay change

FYI

Mandy Pomeroy, SHRM-SCP

County Administrator

Blaine County

Blaine County Old Courthouse

206 S. 1st Avenue, Suite 305

Hailey, Idaho 83333

(208) 871-9422

mpomeroy@co.blaine.id.us

From: Ken & Ginna Lagergren <lagergren@cs.com>

Sent: Sunday, April 2, 2023 5:50 PM

To: Angenie McCleary <amccleary@co.blaine.id.us>; Muffy Davis <mdavis@co.blaine.id.us>; Allison Kennedy <akennedy@co.blaine.id.us>; Tim Graves <tgraves@co.blaine.id.us>; Allison Kennedy <akennedy@co.blaine.id.us>; Jeff Loomis <jloomis@co.blaine.id.us>; Kristine Hilt <khilt@co.blaine.id.us>; Mandy Pomeroy <mpomeroy@co.blaine.id.us>; Steve Thompson <sthompson@co.blaine.id.us>; Tom Bergin <tbergin@co.blaine.id.us>; Secretary <secretary@co.blaine.id.us>

Subject: Deny Request for Mediation, Quigley Ranch and Mountain Overlay change

TO: amccleary@co.blaine.id.us, mdavis@co.blaine.id.us, akennedy@co.blaine.id.us, tgraves@co.blaine.id.us, amarks@co.blaine.id.us, jloomis@co.blaine.id.us, khilt@co.blaine.id.us, mpomeroy@co.blaine.id.us, sthompson@co.blaine.id.us, tbergin@co.blaine.id.us, secretary@co.blaine.id.us,

Dear Commissioners Muffy and Angenie,

We are so sorry that you, - as our elected officials, have been put in a position to being, essentially *threatened by a Developer*.

This is horrible for you to have to stand up to fight and prevent the ruination of Quigley Canyon beyond Quigley Farms - but that is exactly what most of the public of Blaine County hope you can do!!

Ken and I have written several common sense letters to you regarding this project with suggestions. These suggestions we made, apparently, are NOT intended to be met by these developers, lawyers, and business people. - We gave suggestions how to AVOID paving Quigley Rd, and still have their 24 lots - WITHOUT changing the Mountain Overlay boundaries, and how to make the exit thru Quigley Farms. But...

SO, there is no other option, we need you to find a way - to stand up with your votes - to deny Quigley Ranch and deny changing the Mountain Overlay and stop this entirely!!!

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO GO TO MEDIATION.

You have a back up, because the P & Z - DENIED approval of the project!

We hope that the seriousness of all the wording in points 1-6, described below, should be reviewed and echoed in your responses for denial.

Please find a way to DENY,

Sincerely, Ginna and Ken Lagergren, PE

215 E Myrtle St, Hailey, ID



-
1. "concern that as designed with access off of Quigley Road rather than through Quigley Farm Subdivision **that 24 lots will incur more traffic with deliveries etc. reducing safety for recreators,**" Those safety concerns "stem from the conflict of the amount of recreators and the proposed future nine access points (6 driveways from lots 1-6 and 3 spur roads from the 3 development "pods") onto Quigley Road and the associated traffic."
 2. "The Commission found that the Cul-de-sacs are proposed as permanent and therefore do not comply with standards."
 3. **"The Planning and Zoning Commission advocated for one larger contiguous open space to minimize wildlife/residential conflict** and provide for a larger tract of unencumbered habitat instead of spaces between building envelopes and avalanche areas."
 4. **The application did not meet Desired Outcome B-3 from the County's Comprehensive Master Plan**, which is to "Facilitate the development of smaller houses, dwelling units, and lots through zoning and other tools." The Commission found this comprehensive plan goal was not met since a design can provide for smaller lots.
 5. **The application did not meet Desired Outcome A-4 from the County's Comprehensive Master Plan**, which is to "Continue to protect hillside, avalanche-prone, riparian and other sensitive or hazard areas from housing development. Implementation of firewise practices should be augmented in existing lots near wildfire-prone areas and defensible spaces should be established in new subdivisions. The Commission found that this comprehensive plan standard was not met due to the impacts on wildlife and existing hillside with lots 1-6.
 6. **The application did not meet the design standard of preserving natural features:** "The commission found that proposed lots 1-6 were not found to be practicable and appropriate."