

Jim Kalkofen 3/4/21
7:30pm

The Burnt Fork proposal should go back to the starting line until the track is clear of all obstacles.

For instance, the commercial re-zoning request for the corner of Logan and Middle Burnt Fork is out of place. Six months ago, the developer's representatives were denied a road easement onto Middle Burnt Fork Road for their proposed commercial area. That was denied. They have not yet met with the county road administrator to discuss this matter.

It sort of makes a person curious how the developer can assume this access will automatically be granted. No road access. No commercial. Since the re-zoning is part of this proposal, the entire proposal should be denied now.

Here's another item to raise the public's curiosity. The property does not have water rights. This is not a modern problem. It has been known for years. The result is that the current Town administration must address and correct this issue. Without water rights, the proposed 220 families would have no water.

Another issue deals with water capacity. There is not enough. Wells have been operating at capacity. Last August, the Town paid \$3,000 additional tax dollars because the pumps were running continuously. That \$3,000 was for electricity to run pumps. If running continuously now, how could 220 more homes be connected? By the way, the former Town public works

director stated the obvious: Stevi does NOT have water capacity for a new subdivision.

Another look at water capacity comes from the Town 2016 Growth Policy. In talking about the potential to add 255 Creekside and Twin Creeks water connections, the Policy states, “This many new connections would bring Stevensville’s water system to capacity, requiring expansion in order to accommodate future annexations.”

Since this policy was adopted, there have been 46 new homes and 4 new businesses added in Stevi. Also, 16 units are nearing completion by Ace. 16 lots are in the Burnt Fork proposed commercial zone. The new laundromat uses the equivalent water to 16 homes. Twin Creeks will soon be adding 40 to 50 new homes.

Burnt Fork wants to add 220 more homes.

These totals far exceed 255. That means expanded water capacity. Who will pay these exorbitant costs?

Three of the town’s water wells have NOT been approved by the Department of Environmental Quality. Why not? They must be approved in advance before even considering the proposal. There is work ahead.

Water presents many muddy issues. Who pays to upgrade the systems and rectify the problems? In a meeting with Council members Devlin and Ludington, this question was

raised. Paul Ludington said the developer would have to pay for some of these upgrades.

What is the developer's percentage? Does the developer pay all? 10 %? Half? Town taxpayers need to know. We pay a considerable amount monthly for water now and will far into the future. A new well would cost \$300 to \$500,000. A new reservoir would cost in excess of a MILLION. A booster pump will be needed. Even if this cost \$100,000 to \$200,000, who pays?

The Town should address all water issues. Only when they are resolved should this proposal be considered. Not before.

This proposal is like a can being kicked down the road. Conditions are part of the language. Really, they are assumptions that homes will be able to be hooked up to water. That there will be adequate water. That wells will be brought into compliance. That an access will be available.

With all traffic slated to enter via Logan Lane, traffic nightmares can be expected. Much of that traffic will access Logan thru three roads from the proposed subdivision onto Creekside Drive. As president of Creekside HOA, most owners vehemently object to this assault on a quiet neighborhood. 220 homes times 8 trips daily means lots more traffic.

By the way, when the Planning and Zoning board met, the members requested a road be engineered into the proposed commercial zone from the residential area. The Town website does not show this re-drawn plat. Was the P & Z effort just for looks? The board also discussed the mitigation fee for local traffic. The proposal seemed to be headed to the county for this number? Since the developer's representatives did not meet with the county, and the original figure remains in the proposal, what is the number?

Just for the record. I feel Town residents are NOT opposed to progress. They are OPPOSED to a high-density 220 home subdivision with its 10-plex, 7-plex, 4-plexes, duplexes and commercial zone. Water issues alone are enough to sidetrack consideration at this time.