

From: [Rachael Knight](#)
To: [Jamey Ayling](#)
Subject: Public Comment in Opposition of: CU-23-00003
Date: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 9:28:24 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Kittitas County network. Do not click links, open attachments, fulfill requests, or follow guidance unless you recognize the sender and have verified the content is safe.

Dear Kittitas County Planning,

I am writing to you to express my deep concerns and opposition to CU-23-00003, Fowler Creek Guest Ranch.

Our family owns a property downhill from this proposal at the corner of Westside and Zrebiec. We purchased this property many years ago and this is intended to be the retirement home of our parents, as well as a safe place to play and explore for their grandchildren.

This proposal does not meet the definition of **17.08.270 Guest ranch or guest farm**. This proposal is not agricultural in nature and is simply a commercial resort property. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing and has the potential to change the rural landscape of this area forever. **This proposal should be rejected as it does not meet the code definition of the conditional use permit.**

Given the code incompatibility cited above, this proposal should be rejected without condition. Furthermore, this proposal falls short in many ways and leaves more questions than answers. For the reasons below, I am requesting that **this application** (*if not rejected based on the condition previously stated*) **not move any further or be given a SEPA determination until the missing information has been supplied and reviewed.**

Storm & Wastewater Concerns: The proposal does not address, anywhere that I can find, the actual amount of developed/interrupted acreage. This area has flooded in the past, a travesty attributed to the movement of surface water runoff paths. In the SEPA application, the applicants state they will use "best practices" but does not actually indicate what those are, how they will be managed, or in regards to what - as we have minimal to no information about the actual details of earthwork. In Item d of the SEPA in the discussion of Ground Water, the applicant states they will "prepare a drainage plan if required". Should this not be an integral part of the SEPA checklist required before making a determination?

I would be cautious of the applicant's self-identification of a mismarked stream on their property. Given the proximity to wetlands and the number of seasonal streams in the area, a full Ecology review of the property and proposed development area should be reviewed and assessed as part of the SEPA application.

The size of this project gives me pause in consideration of the septic tank. It's unclear to me how the applicant arrived at their total guest count (why would there only be 2 people per RV?

Or 3 persons in a 4 bedroom cabin?). I also do not see addressing the needs of staff or event waste. They claim that "1 to 4" employees could be on site. I have never seen a store, event center, Bed&Breakfast, 12 short-term rental cabins, and 30 RV sites managed by 1 person. I have spent many years working for hotels and event spaces, and it takes a significant staff count to manage even small events and overnight stays. This alone gives me pause as it relates to the thoroughness and truthfulness of this application. Additionally, given that the applicant proposes to have a sewer connection for every RV, the amount of blackwater that could accumulate far exceeds the amount that could be created on a daily basis. We need to assume there will be additional sewage treatment needs due to the ability to bring previous waste onsite and dump it. The management of this sewage is of utmost concern to public health. In this application, I do not see a plan, but rather a "plan to have a plan". Exhibit 9, Sewage Treatment Plan is not, in fact, a plan at all. **This alone should halt SEPA approval.**

Noise Concerns:

Those of us who live nearby can tell you that the noise travels extensively. Noise travels down and reverberates through the valley. A ranch, the next driveway up from Fowler Creek has an annual multi-day event. Despite the fact that our family lives more than a mile from this ranch, we can hear music and even muffled voices from our home. The amount of noise that 30 RV generators and 150+ people will make will impact the quality of life for people miles around. There are many homes near to this area - **it is zoned Rural Residential for a reason.**

The SEPA application details and associated Exhibit 11, *Noise*, do not outline what the expected noise output would be. It paints a lovely picture of noise made by 'dining, animals, recreation, human voices, landscaping, etc'. It also suggests obscene quiet hours of 12a-6a on weekends. Exhibit 11 has no formal noise analysis, performed by a professional. The applicant indicates they will plant some trees for noise blockage, but planting vegetation, except under very strict and specific conditions, is well-known not to be a strong buffer for noise. This deserves professional analysis as part of the SEPA application. Additionally, there has been no consideration made for the fact that in general, the noise floor within in the surrounding area will increase dramatically, affecting not only the people who inhabit this area, but the wildlife.

Also, the traffic impact is based off of old data and should be performed by a professional. This has the ability to negatively impact this community significantly, particularly those needing to come out of Fowler Creek.

This community already sees extensively long arrival times for public services such as police and fire. We do not have the ability to reasonably manage this number of short term guests. In case of an emergency, we will put significant strain on already overstressed public services.

Please consider my comments and **reject CU-23-0004**. It will be a detriment to the community.

Kindly,
Rachael Smith-Kipnis