

**From:** [Dana Ogan](#)  
**To:** [Chace Pedersen](#)  
**Subject:** Conditional Land Use Application ACU 23-00003 (Atlas)  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 22, 2023 4:22:30 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.

Chace Pedersen,

This email is in opposition to Conditional Land Use Application ACU 23-00003 (Atlas). I have read all of the other letters opposing this application and agree with all of their sentiments. While these communication towers are something of the future, they do not belong in our rural neighborhoods and farm land.

While reading the application and project narrative, I see that several of the criteria are clearly not met. Let me pick this apart further...

“A) The proposed use **is essential or desirable** to the public convenience and **not detrimental or injurious** to the public health, peace or safety or to the **character of the surrounding neighborhood.**”

- This proposal is obviously not essential, OR DESIRABLE. It appears that the land owner is approaching this as a financial gain, not in consideration of his community.
- We can argue that there is not enough credible data to prove that tower emissions are not harmful to humans/animals. We could get into this debate, but the bottom line is that we don't know. So why risk it?
- This proposal IS DETRIMENTAL to the character of the surrounding neighborhood. PERIOD. You cannot argue against this.
- This is just the first of the 7 criteria and it's CLEARLY not met.

“B) The proposed use at the proposed location **will not be unreasonably detrimental to the economic** welfare of the county...”

- As homeowners close to the site have complained, this would obstruct their view, in turn reducing the value of their property.

For Items “C-E,” I'm going to trust Kittitas County Community Development Services does their due diligence in making ABSOLUTELY sure that this proposal meets ALL county codes, development standards, environmental impact, and public health standards.

For items “F, G”, plopping a tower in the middle of a beautiful agricultural/rural area is clearly not in the “Character” of the district it is being proposed. In fact, the “Rural Character”, as defined by The Growth Management Act defines is as follows per the Washington State

RCW:

"Rural character" refers to the patterns of land use and development established by a county in the rural element of its comprehensive plan: (a) In which **open space, the natural landscape, and vegetation predominate over the built environment**; (b) That **foster traditional rural lifestyles**, rural-based economies, and opportunities to both live and work in rural areas; (c) That **provide visual landscapes that are traditionally found in rural areas** and communities; (d) That are compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat; (e) That reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development; (f) That generally do not require the extension of urban governmental services; and (g) That are consistent with the protection of natural surface water flows and groundwater and surface water recharge and discharge areas.

Items a, b and c in the definition of "rural character" are obviously not met with this proposal and therefore this proposal clearly does not preserve the "Rural Character" of the area it is being proposed in. Items d-g could be argued as well, but I won't get into those, since the first three are clearly not met.

As someone who is pretty naive to land development, it's very easy for me to see that this proposal cannot possibly be supported by our county or residents.

Thank you for your time,  
Dana Ogan  
710 Barnes Road  
Ellensburg, WA