

RECEIVED

JUN - 3 2005

KITTITAS COUNTY  
CDS

To: Jan Sharar  
From: Dan Fennerty  
Re: Application for a 27-Lot Cluster Plat south of Game Farm Road

This letter is written to address some concerns I have that were not addressed in the SEPA environmental checklist submitted on March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2005 by the agent for the developer, Laurin Mellergaard.

The map shows that the proposed development is located on the top half of the land adjacent to Game Farm Road and that the bottom half of the land will be left alone for ten years according to the county prohibition for further subdivision (17.65.040 (C)). The development proposal should be for the **bottom** half of the property for the following reasons:

1. Regarding Section IX. SEPA Environmental Checklist under (B) Environmental Elements (c), (d), (e), (f) involving soil issues: the top half of the property contains the "best" growing soil and the bottom half contains more rocky soil that is less conducive to agricultural use. County code 17.65.020 (B) under Conservation of Cluster Subdivision states that "Conservation" means "wise management of productive agricultural lands." In this case, that means building on the least productive land- the bottom half. The bottom half is less susceptible to erosion.
2. Regarding water and septic issues, the bottom half clearly makes more sense, since the distance from existing properties would be increased and less impact would occur on their resources.
3. Regarding animals, the current proposal is incorrect. It states no animals exist on the current property. Pheasant, eagles, deer and many other species have clearly been observed on multiple occasions on the property.
4. Under **Environmental Health**, the issue of noise would also be minimized for the existing properties if the development was in the bottom half of the property. Twenty seven houses right across the road from two houses currently there will have a major impact on the noise level.
5. Under **Aesthetics** the current proposal says there will be no altered or obstructed views with the current plan. This is clearly not true. My house at 2851 Game Farm Road and our neighbors Bob and Molly Pieters currently have an unobstructed view of the Manastash Ridge (which is quite spectacular). Twenty seven houses built on the top half of the property will completely remove our views of the Ridge. Building in the back of the property would minimize the impact on our spectacular view.

6. Regarding **Light and Glare**, twenty seven houses directly across the street from our houses will have a major increase in the amount of light and glare at our homes.
7. Under **Recreation**, Game Farm Road is currently used by many people for bike riding, running and walking. The small amount of traffic is conducive for these activities. Twenty seven houses directly on the road will create a huge safety issue for many people. If the back half of the property was developed, a longer "line of sight" would be available and would allow people to see traffic coming from further away.

In summary, numerous inaccuracies are in the current proposal. I am requesting that if the "cluster" is approved that the development be located in the back part of the property to meet the intent of the county rules and to minimize the impact on the current residences.

Sincerely, 

Dan Fennerty  
2851 Game Farm Road