

**From:** [Carrie McClinton](#)  
**To:** [Chace Pedersen](#)  
**Cc:** [Paul McClinton](#)  
**Subject:** CU-23-00002 The Outpost  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 29, 2023 5:00:52 PM

---

**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.

Hello Chace,

This letter is in response to hearing very recently about the proposed Outpost development ([CU-23-00002 Application](#)) near our home on Sandelin Lane. The first we knew of the development was when the public sign was posted.

We purchased our home in 2014, with two young children in tow, so we could have a place for our family to enjoy nature. We purposely did not buy in a developed community (Roslyn Ridge, Suncadia, or many of the newly built neighborhoods along Salmon la Sac) because we were looking for a more authentic and non-uniform neighborhood to enjoy. We watch herds of elk feed and migrate through our neighboring properties and we have bears, flocks of wild turkeys and deer frequently walking by our house. It is peaceful and quiet....so they come around.

I've seen developments go in and trees come down far faster than we'll ever be able to recover. The storage units off of Salmon la Sac by The Last Resort are truly an example of thoughtless development with no consideration of the surrounding beauty.

While The Outpost states they are developing a place for people to enjoy nature, they are literally having the exact opposite effect for those around them who live here, many for decades longer than we have.

We have community and history, and we know our neighbors. This campground is built with the intention of high volume. It will be a swinging-door recreational site, where people are not connected to what happens before they arrive, or after they leave. I believe in the general nature of people being respectful. That said, when you are visiting for a short period of time in a camping setting amongst 30+ structures (2-4 people per site) of other campers, you are not quietly enjoying nature. You are in a campground. Campgrounds are loud.

When people camp, they are having fun, partying, and recreating. I'm not the fun-police. I love camping and have been many times, which is why I know that in this environment there is no sign that can be posted, or rule stated, that will change the noisy nature of a campground.

Recreation in our area of course brings noise. However, this density (which would never be allowed under current Rural Recreational and R5 zoning laws if this developer was building houses) and constant occupancy, will permanently change the ambient noise in this entire neighborhood. The goal for this campground is 100% occupancy year-round - *even WishPoosh is seasonal*.

There are two considerations for a conditional permit in a rural recreational area that are very much being violated by this development. The first is:

12. In considering proposals for location of campgrounds, the Board shall consider at a minimum the following criteria:
- a) Campgrounds should be located at sufficient distance from existing rural residential/residential development so as to avoid possible conflicts and disturbances;

The Outpost campground is quite literally butting up against residential homes. It would be very difficult to argue this is a "sufficient distance" from residential development and will naturally cause conflicts and disturbances by the sheer volume and proximity of people coming/going and camping/recreating nearby.

The second consideration is from the project narrative document.

**F. The proposed use is consistent with the intent and character of the zoning district in which it is located.**

The Outpost is absolutely not consistent with the intent and character of the applied zoning, hence the need for a Special Use

Permit. This campground is amongst neighborhoods with part-time and full time residents. There are no other campgrounds in this area...for a reason, this isn't appropriate zoning for a campground.

Additional concerns:

- **This development creates economic injury to our property value.** Literature suggests parks that are primarily passive recreation tend to have a positive impact on nearby property values, while parks that are primarily active recreation tend to introduce disturbance and therefore negatively affect adjacent properties.
- **Wildlife will be displaced.** We watch herds of elk walk by our home through neighboring properties and they bed down in this proposed development area. With the area significantly cleared and graded, this wildlife will not be around. If the property were developed as currently platted (4 lots) this would still allow wildlife to flow freely through the area.
- **Insurance premiums and coverage is more difficult next to a recreational campground.** It is already VERY difficult to insure property in this area due to wildfire risk. Many neighbors have been dropped and had to find new coverage. We already pay a significant amount over a usual policy so our insurance company has not yet dropped us. Getting insurance for this campground will be a challenge and will impact neighboring communities insurance. Also, Fire Insurance companies have come up with their own ideas for campgrounds, embracing the "Firewise USA Program". This promotes the clearing of brush around structures and the installation of fire suppression systems, which sounds nice until you realize that many insurers are "suggesting" park owners *remove ALL trees within 200 feet of any buildings*. What's worse than a campground next to your house? A tree-less campground.
- **Increased FIRE RISK.** This area is currently served by volunteer firefighters, The Outpost adds a significant amount of additional structures which increases the risk of both loss and bottleneck in a wildfire emergency.

**I have a list of concerns much longer than this letter will detail because, put simply, legally this campground does not belong here and I think that should be enough to stop the development.**

Finally, while this will likely have no bearing on the outcome, I want Michael Jackson, the property owner and developer, as well as the public hearing commissioner to read this.

I saw Michael, with his wife Rachel and their 4 kids, drive down Sandelin Lane in December, 2020. I stopped to say hello. There had been some lawyer communication between our community and Michael about road usage and HOA history. It is in my nature to bridge the gap and talk to people directly vs. lawyer up. I let him know that I'd love to work with him and our board to come to an agreement on the road. I told him people had lived here a long time and enjoyed the quiet nature of the area. They were concerned he would develop the property and we would see increased foot and vehicle traffic on Sandelin Lane. He looked directly at me - and I quote - said, "We have no plans to develop this property. We've made trails for the kids to use snowmobiles and we enjoy it with our family and friends." It is unfortunate I took him on his word. I reached out multiple times after that to sit down and discuss a solution, but he did not respond. I was attempting to create community and help with the road issue. I think his dishonesty speaks directly to the fact that community is not something he cares about.

I appreciate your consideration of how this development negatively impacts our community. I ask that you do NOT allow this Conditional Use Permit and hold this developer to the same standards as others building in the area.

Thank you,  
Paul & Carrie McClinton  
200 Sandelin Lane

