

Hello my name is Lowell Cary.

I reside at 14777 Hayhook Road and have lived in the canyon since 1993. I am a BCPOA board member and I have served in that capacity for 8 years.

I want to thank you for being loyal to the democratic process, which can be exasperating at times.

As noted on page 37 of the staff Report and in the Bridger canyon zoning regulation, 13.5, in approving the area for a planned unit development the commission must determine if at least one of the four general Standards for Development exists. Because BCP provided a CUP application for Phase 1 only, the Planning Dept, the commission and public have only been privy to the details of that part of the Bridger Mountain Village development. My comments here refer to the conditions of the area planned for Phase 1.

The "Standards for Development", section (13.5) of the Bridger Canyon zoning Regulation, list four general criteria for evaluations of the appropriateness of an area for a planned unit development. I believe that the Crosscut Ranch meadow and other Phase 1 areas do not meet any of the conditions listed. I will explain my reasoning point by point after referencing the condition.

1) The parcel is situated such that the planned unit development will allow flexibility of design for the protection of scenic vistas or will lessen the visual impact of development.

Phase 1 of the Bridger Mountain Village development is situated in a meadow fully visible from Bridger Canyon Road (even with the proposed modifications). The relatively high-density development is proposed for a location considered a scenic vista from Bridger Canyon Road. Rather than lessening visual impact, BCP's location site actually highlights the presence of development.

2) The planned unit development will result in the preservation of agricultural land and/or open space.

BCP's initial phase will not preserve the open space and agricultural land present in the Crosscut Ranch area; rather it consumes it. In evaluating the proposed development in light of the alternatives to a PUD, namely 1) underlying zoning of one house per forty acres or 2) an individual PUD on tract 2 Crosscut Ranch, I find either alternative to offer a higher quality of open space with greater benefit to residents of and visitors to Bridger Canyon than the proposed developers Phase 1.

In the alternative scenarios the number of overnight accommodations and residences possible in the Crosscut Ranch tract would be significantly reduced and would likely provide greater opportunity for the developer to preserve and protect the open meadow, streams, wildlife habitat, and wetlands so valued in our planning documents. The General Plan and Development Guide, the Base Area Plan and the Zoning Regulations provide for protection of open meadows from residential construction. (Specifically the General plan states on page 26 that "residential areas be developed in such a way as not interfere with the open meadows, and well away from the wetland areas along the stream beds.")

In looking at the Development Right allocation in the Bridger Canyon zoning regulation, 13.10.4, the Cross Cut ranch parcel of 61 acres only has 4

recreational housing units, 5 overnight development rights, and 6 reserved overnight, which is far less than what the developers have proposed in this same area. Again I refer to the zoning regulation, 13.10 which states, "to require the most dense development near the ski base facilities."

3) The parcel contains natural assets, which will be preserved though the use of the planned unit development. Such natural assets include vegetation, stands of large trees, land which serves as a natural habitat for wildlife, and streams.

As proposed, Bridger Mountain Village Phase 1 fails to preserve important natural assets. Phase 1 construction would eliminate stands of aspen trees, surround wetland areas with paved roads and residences, and there by barring wildlife from wetlands. The General Plan sees wetlands as natural assets, stating, "residential areas be developed... well away from the wetland areas along the streambeds" (p26).

4) The parcel contains topography that is suitable for minimizing the visual impact of development. The planned unit development shall prevent erosion and result in development more suitable to the nature of the terrain.

The topography of the proposed sight is adjacent to, lower than, and sloping toward the highway. From your car the entire length of the meadow can be viewed by everyone driving by through the canyon. Rather than minimizing the visual impact of development, BCP is maximizing the impact.

Because an erosion control plan had not been submitted with the CUP application, who can determine whether erosion can be prevented in such a sensitive area? I can speculate, however, that the constraints imposed by this parcel, wetlands and watercourses feeding an impaired stream, have presented considerable problems for BCP in their efforts to meet this condition.

In fact, Dick Prugh stated as much last Tuesday during his own presentation. He said,

" there is just not enough room on this property to do a real quality job without building higher. By the time you ... take out the wetlands, stream corridors, steep slopes (and) aspen groves,,, there is very little land left"

He concluded for all of us with " We think we've done as good a job essentially, well I wouldn't say as good a job as you can do: we tried to do our best in locating development out of these sensitive areas."

When the developer's team admits publicly that they could do better, let's send them back to the drawing board and ask them to do just that!