Wendy Danielson

From: Angie Rutherford
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 8:22 AM
To: Wendy Danielson
Subject: FW: LDS Stake building

Angie Rutherford
Planner, Teton County, Idaho
208 354-2593

From: Kathryn W Myers
Sent: Sunday, December 04, 2011 8:10 AM
To: Angie Rutherford
Subject: LDS Stake building

As a user of Hwy 33, I think granting a CUP would be a true safety concern. Also I feel it would another visual blight on rural views. The building is too large and high. If it was an appropriate use of the property, why would a CUP be needed. That's why I urge you to not grant this.

Kathryn Myers

_____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 6691 (20111207)
_____

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com

_____ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 6691 (20111207)
_____

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com

January 6, 2012

TO:Teton County Planning Commission

Attn: Curt Moore

150 Courthouse Drive Room 107

Driggs, ID 83422

FROM: Aspen Lake Homeowner's Association

P.O. Box 227

Victor, ID 83455

SUBJECT: Conditional Use Permit – 7000S/500W

The board of directors of the Aspen Lake Homeowner's Association has discussed the proposal for an LDS church at the subject location and has no objection to the proposed use. However, as 7000S is our only method of ingress and egress to our homes we have concern about the significant increase in traffic that will result from the construction of the new church. There are already 5 existing subdivisions as well as farming activity that use 7000S as our <u>only</u> method in and out of our homes and farms.

We unanimously agree that at a minimum the following road/intersection improvements should accompany this project:

Rt. 33 - turn lanes in both north and south directions

-acceleration lane to the south of intersection

-deceleration lane to the north of intersection

7000S -deceleration/turn lane west bound between Rt. 33 and entrance to church parking lot

1000W -due to anticipated increased traffic on this gravel road, paving would be the ultimate(also expensive) improvement to hold down the dust, however, regular application of dust control agent(magnesium chloride) would be helpful.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

James W. Rein/Secretary ALHOA

Wendy Danielson

From: Angie Rutherford
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 9:40 AM
To: Curt Moore; Wendy Danielson
Subject: FW: Opposition to CUP for LDS church building

Angie Rutherford
Planner, Teton County, Idaho
208 354-2593

From: Sarah J.
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 1:20 PM
To: Angie Rutherford; Kathy Rinaldi
Subject: Opposition to CUP for LDS church building

Teton County Planning & Zoning:

RE: Opposition to proposed CUP for LDS church building on Highway 33

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed CUP for an LDS Church building at 7000 South and Highway 33. My concerns are detailed below:

1. A building of this magnitude does NOT belong in or near the scenic corridor through our county. Regardless of its intended use such a large building and parking lot have a commercial 'sprawl' look about them. *Our Scenic Corridor is one of the greatest economic assets this County has, and should be protected and preserved.* The proposed project would destroy this.
2. Furthermore, the LDS Church has demonstrated a poor sense of architecture in their many cookie cutter buildings cluttering the west. Regardless of the fact that a building of such size doesn't belong in our scenic corridor, a building of such tasteless design as most LDS churches exhibit shouldn't be allowed anywhere near the scenic byway.
3. Most LDS Church buildings I am familiar with include large parking areas with significant amounts of outdoor lighting. Our valley is renowned for its dark skies, which would undoubtedly be tainted by such a parking installation, unless strict conditions were set and met regarding quantity of lights, intensity of lighting, and hours of operation. This matter is a concern in any location throughout the valley, not just the proposed location. Again, this is a question of damaging an economic asset in our valley.

Does the church intend to decommission one of the current church buildings in the valley and replace it with this one? Or is the church projecting future growth based on the absurd number of platted lots in the valley - many of which may not be built for decades to come? What about traffic, storm runoff, sewage load? It seems there are many unanswered questions surrounding this proposed project. It seems more logical to place a church building within or closer to the residential community it will serve. To place it so near the highway requires that patrons drive their cars, rather than walking to the location. Teton County is trending toward more local services, and less sprawl type development. As proposed this project appears to typify sprawl.

As the County is progressing with its Comprehensive Plan which will guide development for the next decade, it seems foolish to advance a project of this magnitude, which doesn't seem to fit within the developing Comp Plan. I would rather see the BOCC or the planning department defer any binding decision on this project to a later date when the Comp Plan is more complete, and can provide better guidance on the issue. If such a deferral is not possible I recommend against any sort of approval in this, especially on any location within a half mile of the Scenic Corridor.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sarah Johnson,

Wendy Danielson

From: Angie Rutherford
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 9:35 AM
To: Curt Moore; Wendy Danielson
Subject: FW: I oppose the proposed CUP for LDS church building on Highway 33

Angie Rutherford
Planner, Teton County, Idaho
208 354-2593

From: HF Johnson
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 12:05 PM
To: Angie Rutherford
Cc: Kathy Rinaldi
Subject: I oppose the proposed CUP for LDS church building on Highway 33

Teton County Planning & Zoning:

RE: Opposition to proposed CUP for LDS church building on Highway 33

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed CUP for an LDS Church building at 7000 South and Highway 33. My concerns are detailed below:

1. A building of this magnitude does NOT belong in or near the scenic corridor through our county. Regardless of its intended use such a large building and parking lot have a commercial 'sprawl' look about them. *Our Scenic Corridor is one of the greatest economic assets this County has, and should be protected and preserved.* The proposed project would destroy this.
2. Furthermore, the LDS Church has demonstrated a poor sense of architecture in their many cookie cutter buildings cluttering the west. Regardless of the fact that a building of such size doesn't belong in our scenic corridor, a building of such tasteless design as most LDS churches exhibit shouldn't be allowed anywhere near the scenic byway.
3. Most LDS Church buildings I am familiar with include large parking areas with significant amounts of outdoor lighting. Our valley is renowned for its dark skies, which would undoubtedly be tainted by such a parking installation, unless strict conditions were set and met regarding quantity of lights, intensity of lighting, and hours of operation. This matter is a concern in any location throughout the valley, not just the proposed location. Again, this is a question of damaging an economic asset in our valley.

Does the church intend to decommission one of the current church buildings in the valley and replace it with this one? Or is the church projecting future growth based on the absurd number of platted lots in the valley - many of which may not be built for decades to come? What about traffic, storm runoff, sewage load? It seems there are many unanswered questions surrounding this proposed project. It seems more logical to place a church building within or closer to the residential community it will serve. To place it so near the highway requires that patrons drive their cars, rather than walking to the location. Teton County is trending toward more local services, and less sprawl type development. As proposed this project appears to typify sprawl.

As the County is progressing with its Comprehensive Plan which will guide development for the next decade, it seems foolish to advance a project of this magnitude, which doesn't seem to fit within the developing Comp Plan. I would rather see the BOCC or the planning department defer any binding decision on this project to a later date when the Comp Plan is more complete, and can provide better guidance on the issue. If such a deferral is not possible I recommend against any sort of approval in this, especially on any location within a half mile of the Scenic Corridor.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Hyrum Johnson

Valley Advocates for Responsible Development

January 31, 2012

Teton County Planning & Zoning Commission
150 Courthouse Drive
Driggs, Idaho 83422

RE: Comments on the Stake Center at 7,000 South

Dear Planning & Zoning Commissioners –

Churches, Wards, and Stakes Centers are all valuable gathering spaces that add to our quality of life in Teton Valley. By nature, they are community-oriented buildings that are central to the heart and soul and fundamental character of our valley. The question here is not whether this Stake Center is valued and needed, but rather, whether this is the appropriate location for it. Community-oriented buildings belong *in the community*, where they can be integrated into the surrounding neighborhoods and easily accessed. Here, the proposed site is on the far end of the Victor Impact Area, amidst almost two square miles of agricultural fields. There is only one house located within a square mile of this property. [1]

There is a lot of published research on the value Churches, Wards, and Temples in neighborhoods, meaning they are assets to a community and increase property values.[2] As well-maintained buildings with respectful visitors, these facilities equate with higher occupancy rates for nearby homes and increased property values. Put another way, they "anchor" neighborhoods and create a draw for housing. As stated in their narrative, someday Blackfoot Farms anticipates commercial along the highway and building housing around the Stake Center. This position is not congruent with the current Comprehensive Plan, or the goals and values outlined in the Comprehensive Plan that is in process.

Given the potential community benefits of locating the Stake Center in town rather than in an agricultural field out along the highway, *is it in the public interest to grant a CUP to allow such a fundamentally community-oriented building to be built so far away from the community that it serves?*

---

[1] Square mileage data take from the Teton County GIS program. The contiguous agricultural fields between 6000S and Cedron Road encumber over 1.7 square miles.

[2] Do, Quang, Wilbur, Robert W., Short, James, *An Empirical Examination of the Externalities of Neighborhood Churches on Housing Values,* Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics Volume 9, Page 127-136 (1994); Carroll, Thomas M., Clauretie, Terrence M., Jensen Jeff, *Living Next to Godliness: Residential Property Values and Churches,* Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics Volume 12, Page 319-330 (1996); Danderson, Steven J., *The Impact of LDS Temples on Local Property Values*, a study conducted by the Foundation for Apologetic Information & Research (2003); Schneider, Chelsea, *LDS Temples Boost Property Values: Home Values Often Rise Near LDS Sites,* The Arizona Republic (January 8, 2009); Fickess, Jim, *The Temple Effect,* Phoenix Magazine, Page 38 (November 2009).

355 North Main, PO Box 1164, Driggs, Idaho 83422
208.354.1707 ph ✦ 208.354.1709 fax ✦ www.tetonvalleyadvocates.org

This facility will create urban impacts that must be mitigated.

If this Stake Center is ultimately approved on this site, there will certainly be a host of urban impacts that must be mitigated so as to not change the rural character of the area.

I. Compliance with dark skies ordinances

Dark skies are a strong community value that we all share. In fact, the Teton County dark skies ordinances were just revamped last year to offer greater protections. I offer the following comments regarding the dark skies compliance issues:

- **Twenty-Six lamp posts is simply too bright.** This proposal includes 26 lamp posts throughout the parking lot that are 18 feet tall. For a comparison as to how bright this can be, the 2.5-acre parking lot in front of Broulim's Grocery (which is located in downtown Driggs) has only 11 lamp posts. The Driggs Stake Center (which is also located in the heart of Driggs) has 8 lamp posts. The kind of urban lighting that is proposed here is incongruent with the rural character of the area.

- **Are there any other lights?** It is not clear in the current application if other landscape, walkway, or building lighting is also being proposed here.

- **What hours are lights needed?** Because this will be an intensively used building located in a rural area, the specific hours of lighting are very important.

II. Medium Impact Screening is a necessity

This building will be oriented to run parallel to Highway 33. As an almost 30,000 square foot building with a 30-31 foot roofline that is 200 feet long, the size and bulk of this building will be quite visible from all directions - particularly from the scenic corridor. Because the surrounding area is in agricultural production, there are almost no trees to help buffer the appearance of this building on the landscape.

Both state and county code expressly authorize conditioning uses to minimize adverse impacts on the surrounding area, including using more restrictive standards than those generally required.[3] In this situation, the Teton County screening standards should be applied to this permit application. The current landscaping plan proposes eight trees and shrubs to run along the east and west side of the building. This does not appear to even meet Teton County's criteria for low-impact screening.[4] Given the large size, scale, and bulk of this building coupled with its high visibility to the surrounding area, this particular

[3] Teton County Zoning Ordinance 8-6-1-B8. *See also,* I.C. § 67-6512.

[4] Teton County Zoning Ordinance 8-12-1.

CUP calls for Medium Impact Screening as outlined in T.C.C. 8-12-1-C. In addition, this screening would also help buffer the light pollution impacts.

III. Stormwater runoff

With over 3.1 acres of paved surfaces proposed, stormwater runoff is a real concern here. The applicant's stormwater plan concludes that no special draining plan is needed. This position needs to be carefully reviewed by Teton County. Would additional parking lot landscaping (similar to Broulim's parking lot landscaping) help mitigate some of these stormwater impacts and also provide additional screening?

IV. Make a plan for multimodal connectivity

The applicant's narrative has raised objections to including a pathway connection to the Victor/Driggs rail trail, based on many arguments including that the location of this project is simply not walk-able or bike-able. Really, that is precisely the point: *this community oriented building is being proposed on a site that is nowhere near the community.* From a long-term planning perspective, one of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan is to promote multi-modal transportation. As a Stake Center that would serve as a meeting house for two Wards, this will be a heavily used building that is accessed by many people, in many different ways, several days of the week, for years to come. Multi-use connectivity is a community planning necessity for this type of large, community-oriented building.

V. Traffic impacts

Traffic impacts are particularly important in light of the applicant's narrative that pathways are not needed because attendees would use only vehicles to reach this facility. An initial traffic study concluded that 7000S would need to be widened and brought up to county standards, and a turning lane is needed at 500W, and turning lane is also needed on Highway 33. All of these recommendations should be included in any permit approval.

VI. Criteria for a height variance

Looking at the statutory criteria for a variance, (I.C. § 67-6516) the characteristics of this site (an agricultural field) simply do not lend themselves to creating the need for a 70-foot height variance.

I recognize that these types of land use issues are definitely not easy to grapple with. So once again, thank you for all of your hard work and careful consideration in the service of our community.

Sincerely,

Anna Trentadue
VARD Program Director / Staff Attorney

355 North Main, PO Box 1164, Driggs, Idaho 83422
208.354.1707 ph ✦ 208.354.1709 fax ✦ www.tetonvalleyadvocates.org