

From: [Peter](#)
To: [Hippely, Hannah](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Kanemoto Estates Conservation Easement Termination
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:09:21 PM

Hi Hannah Hippely,

hopefully, this is the proper forum for us to object to the Termination of the Kanemoto Estates Conservation Easement. While we would have liked to be available for the zoom meeting and object, virtually, to the planned termination of this Easement, neither my wife nor I will be able to attend in person or virtually. However, we do want to go on record that we strongly object to this termination.

The Conservation Easement under consideration is pretty much the only remaining property in this area that has not already been developed. Therefore, it should continue to remain open space. The possible addition of about 400 housing units to this property is just way too large an addition. The potential traffic that will be added, once completed, will create major congestion on Airport Road, Clover Basin and the Diagonal. Further, it will totally destroy the current rather peaceful and natural setting that exists.

Please note that the city of Longmont already has approved a small development that is basically on the opposite site of the Kanemoto Estate on Airport Road. That development will only add about 20 housing units and that will, of course, also impact the traffic density in this area. If we now add the 400 Kanemoto Estate housing units to this area, the overall picture of a fairly tranquil and peaceful neighborhood will be totally destroyed. Therefore, Boulder County must not permit the Termination of the Kanemoto Estates Conservation Easement.

Sincerely,

Bonnie and Peter Zurfluh
1423 Venice Lane
Longmont, CO 80503

From: [Gene Smerchek](#)
To: [LU Land Use Planner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Kanemoto Estates
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 11:09:54 AM

Does Boulder County have no shame? Such hypocrisy. First, the attempt on the Rainbow Farm's conservation easement.. And now, Kanemoto Estates? Isn't it somewhat hypocritical that Boulder County recently spent millions to purchase open space along the Peak to Peak highway in order to remove three lots that could have been developed. Come on Boulder County! You made the rules, now live by them.

Gene Smerchek, Allenspark

From: [Maryanne Himmelsbach](#)
To: [Hippely, Hannah](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Kanemoto Estates
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 8:19:41 PM

Dear Hannah

I listened to the Neighborhood Meeting on January 26th regarding removing a conservation easement on the Kanemoto Estates for development of a mixed housing community. My impressions are:

1. This is a very high density development, over 400 dwellings on a relatively small parcel of land.
2. All traffic to and from this development will be handled by one street, Airport Road.

The fact that one road will contain all traffic to and from this development sounds like a traffic nightmare and log jam for all neighborhoods off Airport Road. The high density of this development suggests that noise and privacy will be a concern for future residents.

This does not seem beneficial to the community,
Maryanne Himmelsbach

From: [Mo Fauvel](#)
To: [Hippely, Hannah](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Kanemoto development
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:08:42 AM

Mo Fauvel <drfauvel@gmail.com>

Mar 13, 2023, 8:07 AM (21 hours ago)



to Susan, sbarberphd, tsmithxxl, linneas



I, too, have deep reservations on developments like this. My biggest concerns are, again, it is mostly a rental development. I feel the ratio should be reversed so that units would be 80% attainable and 20% rental for purposes of future Longmont development. Second, concern is the density: 400 units on 40 acres really does not seem a plus to me- no personal space yards, where does everyone park? Thirdly, between the huge rental development underway behind Home Depot and this development, that's over a thousand units! Does Longmont truly have the kind of job prospects to afford all this? Please share this with other planning members and city council and keep me in the loop on future city meetings regarding this. Thank you.

Materials to accompany public comments from Randall Weiner, Weiner & Cording, on behalf of KARES (3/15/1923).

Boulder County Comprehensive Plan (“BCCP”) Elements Which are Relevant to the Proposed Kanemoto Estates Conservation Easement Termination

<https://assets.bouldercounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/bccp-boulder-county-comprehensive-plan.pdf>

Both the original 1978 version and the current updated version of the BCCP were designed to limit urban growth to restricted areas and preserve and conserve Agricultural Lands.

There are 27 separate chapters/sections, 4 appendices and 17 maps. Most chapter/sections are referred to as Elements. As many as 15 of those Elements reinforce the fact that preservation of Boulder County Agricultural Lands, and specifically conservation easements in the Plains Planning Area, is consistent with the BCCP.

I Introduction Page IN-1

The Boulder County Comprehensive Plan (BCCP) reflects Boulder County’s tradition of serving as a leader in environmental and land stewardship... The BCCP was developed to respond to the....principle that the county will make decisions affecting the future of the county’s lands..... Since its initial adoption in 1978.....*the Plan has changed very little*; the county’s vision is to channel growth to municipalities, to **protect agricultural lands**, and to **prioritize preservation** of our environmental and natural resources in making land use....decisions.

II Guiding Principles pg GP-1

5) Maintain the rural character and function of the unincorporated area of Boulder County by protecting environmental resources, *agricultural uses*, open spaces, vistas, and the distinction between urban and rural areas of the county.

III Countywide Goals pg CG-1 & 3 & AG-4

1. Cluster Development. Future urban development should be located within or adjacent to existing urban areas in order to **eliminate sprawl and strip development**, to assure....urban services, to **preserve agriculture**, forestry and open space land uses,....

pg CG -2

2. Appropriate Rate of Growth. Existing communities should grow at whatever rate they consider desirable, **within the limits of what is acceptable to the citizens of areas potentially affected by that growth**,.....

pgCG-3

2. Foster a Diverse Agricultural Economy. Agricultural enterprises and activities are an important sector of the Boulder County economy and the county shall foster and promote a diverse and sustainable agricultural economy as an integral part of its activities **to conserve and preserve agricultural lands in the county.**

3. Conserve & Preserve Land. Productive **agricultural land is a limited resource** of both environmental and economic value and **should be conserved and preserved.**

pg CG-5

2. Open Space. Conserve. Boulder County **conserves the rural character of the unincorporated county** by protecting and acquiring lands and waters embodying significant open space values and functions.

I Agricultural Element. Covers 6 pages of the BCCP

pg AG -1

A. Introduction Agricultural Land is a non-renewable resource. Once public and private decisions are made that result in the conversion of agricultural land and/or water to non-agricultural uses, this vital resource is almost always irretrievably lost.

pg AG-2

....in the 1978 Comprehensive Plan, the county adopted a non-urban planned unit development process (**NUPUD**)....offered landowners a **development density of two dwellings** per 35 acres....In return, at least **75% of the total acreage had to be deeded to the county in the**

form of a conservation easement which restricted activity on the easement to agriculturally related or other rural land uses....in 1994 through the adoption of the Plains Planning Area Element....That Element refocused the county’s policies and intentions for managing unincorporated Plains lands by emphasizing that land uses “...should **continue to be related to agricultural activities...and other activities consistent with the rural character of the county.**”

pg AG-3

B. Agricultural Objectives **The objective of the subsequent policies is the preservation of the agricultural lands** in the county, and their related uses, **by whatever means are available** to the county and effective in achieving this end...

It remains the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and attendant land use codes to promote and assist in the **preservation of agricultural lands** for agricultural and other rural purposes....They include the recognition of agricultural lands as an **important nonrenewable resource....**the belief that **compact urban development is the most efficient and appropriate way to retain agricultural lands** and rural character....

pg AG-4

Goal 2. Foster a Diverse Agricultural Economy.... promote a diverse and sustainable agricultural economy as an integral part of its activities to **conserve and preserve agricultural lands** in the county.

Goal 3. Conserve & Preserve Land. Productive agricultural land is a limited resource of both environmental and economic value and should be conserved and preserved.

POLICIES AG 1.01 Agricultural Land Preservation. It is the policy of Boulder County to promote and support the preservation of agricultural lands and activities within the unincorporated areas of the county, and to make that position known to all citizens currently living in or intending to move into this area.

AG 1.02.01. & 1.03It is the policy of Boulder County to **encourage the preservation** and utilization of those lands identified in the Agricultural Element as **Agricultural Lands of National, Statewide, or Local Importance** and other agricultural lands for agricultural or rural

uses. The Boulder County Comprehensive Plan “Significant Agricultural Lands” map shall include such lands located outside of the boundaries of any municipality.....

BCCP Map 31 designates the **Kanemoto property as a Significant Agricultural Land of National Importance**. Agricultural Lands of National Importance are U.S. Department of Agriculture **Prime Farm Lands**. Boulder County Docket DC-18-0002

Link below will take you to the USDA soil maps where the Kanemoto property is designated as Prime Farmland except where the two houses have been built. You may need to zoom in on area CO643. Then click on the property sections and read Map Unit Data drop down list on the left side of page.

<https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/gmap/>

AG 1.04 Development Review. In reviewing applications for new development, Boulder County shall consider potential impacts on existing adjacent agricultural uses and shall use its regulatory authority to mitigate those impacts which would be detrimental to the continuation of existing agricultural operations and activities and the establishment of new agricultural operations and activities. **New development should be sited in such a way so as to minimize and/or prevent future conflicts.**
pg AG-5

AG 1.07 State, Federal, and Local Programs. The county shall continue to actively participate in state, federal, and local programs directed **toward the identification and preservation of agricultural land.**

Position statement from USDA Prime Farmland website.

Prime farmland is of major importance in meeting the Nation's short- and long-range needs for food and fiber. Because the supply of **high-quality farmland is limited, the U.S. Department of Agriculture recognizes that responsible levels of government**, as well as individuals, should encourage and facilitate the wise use of our Nation's prime farmland.

https://efotg.sc.egov.usda.gov/references/public/LA/Prime_and_other_Important_Farmland.html

AG 1.12 Land Unification. The county shall continue to **discourage the fragmentation of large parcels of agricultural land and to**

encourage the assemblage of smaller parcels into larger, more manageable and productive tracts.

AG 1.13 Policy and Code Management. **The county shall continue to monitor the application of these policies** and attendant Boulder County land use codes, **as to their effectiveness in preserving agricultural land and *perpetuating* agricultural uses** in Boulder County.....

AG 2.01 Utility Infrastructure. The county **shall discourage the placement of new utility infrastructure upon agricultural lands.** The county supports using existing easements or other public rights-of-way to **minimize the impacts to agriculturally productive land.**

AG 2.01.03. **Any agricultural lands and water resource systems disturbed by infrastructure construction shall be restored to their former productivity.**

IV Economic Element
pg EE-2

EC 1.03 Agriculture. **Boulder County acknowledges the importance of agriculture** and its cultural, environmental, health, economic, and resilience-related benefits to the community. **Boulder County recognizes the integral role of agricultural history in the county and supports innovation and diversification in the agricultural economy.**

IX Natural Hazards Element
pg NH-4

NH 2.01.04 (Also Policy GE 1.05) The county shall **require the evaluation of all geologic hazards and constraints where such hazards or constraints may exist in unincorporated areas of the county** as related to new intensive uses. Such evaluations shall be conducted by either a member of the American Institute of Professional Geologists, a member of the Association of Engineering Geologists.....

VII Geology Element
pg GE-2

Geologic Constraint: A geologic condition which can **cause intolerable damage to structures**, but does not present a significant threat to health, life, or limb.

Map 15. Geologic Hazards and Constraint Areas. Kanemoto Estates has a Geologic building constraint due to a **High soil and bedrock swell potential**. Has it been properly evaluated and approved by a geologist for site development?

pg GE-8

GE 4.02 Priorities for Most Effective Performance Technologies and Practices. Areas where the county has an interest in assuring that the most effective performance technologies and practices are applied include....**j) Agricultural land preservation.....o) Visual impacts and preservation of scenic views.**

pg GE-10

GE 4.11 Agricultural Land Restoration and Reclamation. **Agricultural land preservation and conservation is a core goal and value of the BCCP.** Oil and gas operations will be required to restore and reclaim all on and off-site agricultural lands impacted by any activity.....

X Open Space Element

pg OS-1 (See Agriculture Goal 3 above. **To Conserve and Preserve Agricultural Lands**)

What's in a Word? Protect v. Preserve v. Conserve Open space lands are **“protected” from development** but protection can be carried out in different ways. **“Conserve”** suggests responsible and sustainable use of natural resources whereas **“preserve” implies maintaining the landscape in its original, or pristine, state.** In the Open Space Element policies, **“conserve”** is used for policies relating to working landscapes such as **agricultural properties** while **“preserve”** is used for policies relating to **broader protection.**

pg OS-2

Open space is defined as “lands intentionally left free from development.” Open space serves one or more of the following values or functions

Conserve and *enhance* agricultural lands, especially agricultural lands of local, statewide, and *national importance*.

Boulder County Parks & Open Space **Mission Statement** To **conserve** natural, cultural and **agricultural resources** and provide public uses that reflect sound resource management and community values.

XIII Sustainability Element
pg SU-1

Goal 6. Foster & Promote Resources of Open & Rural Lands. The **preservation** and viability of the increasingly **precious resources** of open and rural lands, whether **devoted to agriculture**, forestry, open space, or plant and wildlife habitat, as well as the sustainability of uses that provide for the **long-term preservation** of such lands, should be fostered and promoted....

pg SU-8

SU 1.09 TDR Program Criteria. In establishing this new TDR program, the county, through an open public process, will develop criteria....and should take into consideration the following attributes:

- Location as an enclave within or adjacent to BCCP-designated Environmental Conservation Areas, United States Forest Service or other publicly held lands, **or lands with a *conservation easement protecting them from further development***

I Plains Planning Area
pg PPA-1

Introduction....recommend a rational organization of land uses which will **protect and preserve** some of the county's remaining **rural land**....

pg PPA-2

It is expected that land within municipal Community Service Areas will be developed in an urban pattern, urban services will be provided by the municipalities, and the area will eventually be annexed. **Conversely, land outside CSAs and their transition areas will remain rural; urban services will not be extended there, and zoning will *prohibit urban development* and densities. Most of the land outside the CSAs will continue to be used for agricultural activities, environmental resource protection, low-density residential development and other**

activities consistent with the rural character of the county.

[NOTE: The Kanemoto property was issued a NUPUD (PPA 2.04) and Conservation Easement (PPA 2.03) in 1982 because it was NEVER intended to be within the Longmont Community Service Area. As stated above, Urban Development is Prohibited.]

In April of 1978, the Boulder County Comprehensive Plan (BCCP) was adopted. A primary component of the Plan included policies calling for the establishment of a **minimum 35 acre-lot size in most unincorporated areas outside CSAs**, consistent with Senate Bill 35. Recognizing that this was authorizing a dramatic shift in land use regulations that would have its greatest direct impact on the farming community, the Plan's policies also called for the creation of the **NonUrban Planned Unit Development, or NUPUD**. This land use option, requiring discretionary review an action by the county Commissioners, permitted density bonuses on parcels of 35 acres and larger so that the farmer would have an economic incentive, through a limited subdivision process to keep a major part of his or her land in agricultural production while conveying small land parcels to other interests. Accordingly, **land use regulations and a comprehensive rezoning were adopted to implement the Plan's policy direction.**

pg PPA-3

ISSUES Loss of Agricultural Lands & Open Space. Land valuable for agriculture, wildlife habitat, flood control and other natural resources may be jeopardized. In addition, the county has **consistently lost agricultural operations and farmland to both development pressures and annexations.**

pg PPA-4

POLICIES

PPA 1.01 Geographic Scope and Vision for Plains Planning Area. **Land located outside CSAs** and east of the Forestry zoning district, should be designated as the Plains Planning Area, and **should remain rural**. Urban services should not be extended into the Plains Planning Area, and **zoning should continue to prohibit urban development and densities**. Land uses within the Plains Planning Area should continue to

be related to **agricultural activities**, environmental resource protection, **low density residential development** and other activities consistent with the rural character of the county.

PPA 1.03 Guidelines for Land Use Proposals...

b) **Preservation** and utilization of **agricultural lands**, or when applicable, the preservation of other environmental resources

d) **Minimizing** potential **negative impacts** on surrounding lands, **including agricultural land**, attendant agricultural uses, and established neighborhoods and other adjoining or nearby development and land uses.

pg PPA-5

PPA 2.03 Conservation Easements. **Conservation easements** pursuant to CRS 38-30.5-101 through 110, as amended, or other legally accepted methods between the county and landowners, should continue to be **the acceptable development control, for the purpose of preventing additional parcel division or development of lands committed for agricultural activities**, environmental and historic resource protection, and other activities consistent with the rural character of the county.

PPA 2.04 **NUPUD** and NCNUPUD Proposals. NUPUD & NCNUPUD proposals should only be supported in the Plains Planning area as a **means of preserving and conserving large tracts of land identified in the Boulder County Comprehensive Plan as possessing significant environment features, including but not limited to significant agricultural land and sensitive or important ecosystems.**

PPA 3.04 **Location Limits** for Proposals. Except as provided for in PPA 3.05, land use proposals requesting additional density as receiving sites through the **density transfer process should not be located on Nationally significant agricultural land**, sensitive areas, critical wildlife habitats or corridors, designated open space, or other lands and locations as from time to time identified.

IV Longmont, Lyons Subregion Specific to the Longmont Community Service Area.

pg LO-2

LO 1.02 Designation and **Protection of Agricultural Land Uses**. It is the policy of Boulder County to designate the character and form of land

uses within the Subregion (**outside of the adopted Community Service Areas**) as being agricultural in nature and to **project continual agricultural usage** throughout the planning period. Future land use decisions that occur outside of designated Community Service Areas shall be consistent and harmonious with the agricultural character of the land and with the provisions of the Agricultural Policies of the Plan, including those **specifying non-urban residential density**

LO 1.03 Resolving Conflicts Between Existing Zoning and Future Land Use. Many land use and zoning decisions have been made in the past 12 years without the use of a comprehensive plan to guide in the formulation of such decisions. With the development of the goals and policies of the Boulder County Comprehensive Plan, it is clear that many past decisions now conflict with the underlying plan **objective of channeling urban growth into Community Service Areas while preserving the surrounding agricultural land**. To rectify these obvious conflicts between existing zoning and future land use, it is the policy in this subregion to modify the existing zoning pattern to **reflect the present and future use of the county's agricultural lands**.

7) View Protection Corridor from BCCP

Map 33. About one mile of Airport Road from Pike Rd south to Rt. 119 was designated as a **View protection Corridor**. An approximately one half mile section from Pike Road south has been severely compromised. Both the Kamemoto property and the West View Acres property are along this corridor.

pg PH-3

1992: Establishment of view protection overlay district

1994: Established Natural Resources View Protection Overlay District
pg OS-2

Conserve rural character of the unincorporated county, **scenic corridors**, and community buffers to ensure community identity and **prevent urban sprawl**

pg OS-5

OS 1.02.01. To the extent possible, the county shall **avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on views from view protection corridors**

including, but not limited to, those shown in mapping that accompanies this element.

Pg TR-4

TR 6.01 Manage Rural Roads to Preserve Rural Character.

• **minimize adverse scenic and environmental impacts,**

pg TR-5

TR 6.03 **Prohibit Improvements with Unacceptable Impacts.** After considering reasonable mitigation, transportation system facilities and access improvements may be prohibited. This may include improvements on public and/or **private lands that cause unacceptable impacts to the natural environment, including scenic views** and rural character....

pg TR-6

TR 8.03 **Preserve View Corridors. Prevent the disruption of scenic views** by transportation improvements. Promote overlooks, trails, and turnouts on recreational routes and in unique scenic areas.

pg CW-5

6. Protect Natural Landmarks. Boulder County shall continue to protect prominent natural landmarks and other **unique scenic, visual and aesthetic resources** in the county.

pg ER-3

However, the single criterion for designation shall be **its visual and scenic prominence as a landscape feature**. They provide a record of Boulder County's natural heritage.

pg ER-4

Boulder County shall continue to protect prominent natural landmarks and other **unique scenic, visual and aesthetic resources** in the county.

pg ER-5

ER 1.04 Scenic Vistas. **Scenic vistas shall be preserved as much as possible in their natural state.**

pg GE-7-8

GE 4.02 Priorities for Most Effective Performance Technologies and Practices. Areas where the county has an interest in assuring that the most effective performance technologies and practices are applied include, but may not be limited to:

o) Visual impacts and preservation of scenic views

pg SMM-4

b) Ensure that facilities or operations are planned, located, designed, and operated **to prevent and divert unacceptable** air, water, noise and **visual pollution**.

pg SU-7

Goal 10. **Protect Natural Assets**. The county's rich and varied natural features, **scenic vistas**, ecosystems, and biodiversity should be protected from further intrusion, disruption, consumption and fragmentation. SU 1.02 TDR Program Objectives. This TDR program should consider facilitating the attainment of any or all of the following objectives:

- **preserving vacant lands** identified in the Comprehensive Plan as **having significant** environmental, agricultural, **visual** or cultural **values**;
- **protecting and securing scenic corridors and vistas**;

pg SU-9

SU 1.12 **Structure Size Limitation** Analysis. An analysis should be conducted to determine whether the regulation of structure size is appropriate to meet the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan...locations within the unincorporated areas relative to existing development patterns, **established rural character, scenic/natural/resource values, visual impacts....**

pg PPA-3

From: [vic pizzo](#)
To: [LU Land Use Planner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Kanemoto Estates Conservation Easement Termination (bouldercounty.gov)
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 9:08:14 AM

To the Longmont City Council, Planning Department, and Boulder County at large:

I would like to know the origin of the idea that the City of Longmont **MUST** build new housing and even expand into County land in the process. Historically, development has occurred in response to the free market seeing a need and working with local government elements to expand housing opportunities to meet those needs. However, here we see a City housing authority (abetted by County bureaucrats) deciding in and of themselves how many units of what kind **MUST** be built to meet some plan that they themselves have devised. Where is the authority to engage in such activity? Are there some graven stone tablets somewhere that the City has obtained from a Higher Authority? Has the City Council not considered the quaint idea that many, many citizens (who they are *supposed* to represent) might not find the current plans anathema?

More simply, what are we doing, building frenetically with no real mandate to do so? Is it just the easy tax money, or some mis-begotten idea that growth itself is good? Do we need to impose a mini-Detroit on pristine open land, or an assortment of such out-of-place developments on any accessible plots of land within the City? Cannot the City planners develop integral City land in a more rational way, or are they driven by some unspeakable - and irrational - urgency? Is it all about the perception of **easy** money?

Be aware also, of the proposed, incipient desecration of virgin land that should - to any reasonable, sentient mind - remain agrarian, to sustain the enjoyment of future generations of Longmont citizens and their children. There are sizeable plots of land within the City or immediately integral to it, with much better transportation access, that could be developed by the free market - in conjunction with inspired City planning - to provide a steady, commensurate supply of new housing.

Moreover, developing any part of Longmont with such total disregard for traffic impacts is intolerable and must be vociferously opposed. In particular, the Airport/Colorado 119 intersection is a major concern. Already 119 has been identified as the most perilous route in Boulder County, yet the City plans to dump traffic associated with upwards of 400 new housing units into a known dangerous situation. Such behavior is simply unconscionable and must not be tolerated by the citizenry.

The City must avoid any "nimby" tendencies in their planning, given most planners do not reside anywhere near the proposed monstrosity on South Airport. The voters will not soon forget the traffic impacts imposed by woefully poor planning and will hold those who are responsible for it to task - You can bet on that!

From: [Gracia, Bonnie](#)
To: [Hippely, Hannah](#); [Sheehan, Jack](#)
Subject: kanemoto ce
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 7:07:33 AM
Attachments: [EXTERNAL Boulder County Planning Commission NOT TERMINATE a Conservation Easement for Lefthand Ranch LLC Development.msg](#)

@Hippely, Hannah@Sheehan, Jack

Bonnie Gracia

On-call Planner

Boulder County Community Planning & Permitting | P.O. Box 471, Boulder, CO 80306
303-441-3930 | bgracia@bouldercounty.org

Boulder County Community Planning & Permitting office at 2045 13th St., Boulder is open to the public on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m., and on Tuesday from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Appointments are available on Tuesday but not required. Sign-up for Boulder County news at boco.org/e-news

New: Boulder County has a new website: BoulderCounty.gov! Bookmark it today. Email addresses will transition at a later date.

Milner, Anna

From: smith lakota <lakota2807@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 7:39 PM
To: LU Land Use Planner
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Boulder County Planning Commission NOT TERMINATE a Conservation Easement for Lefthand Ranch LLC, Development

March 13, 2023

I am requesting the Boulder County Planning Commission **NOT TERMINATE** a conservation easement which would open the door to annexation and development of a large neighborhood on a parcel just outside of Longmont.

The easement in question sits southwest of Longmont, on unincorporated Boulder County land, about a half mile north of the Colo. 119 and Airport Road intersection. The applicant and owner of Kanemoto Estates, Lefthand Ranch LLC, is proposing to annex the 40 acres into the city of Longmont. This development would be considered a mixed residential community that would be called Somerset Village, which as planned, includes single family and paired homes, four-plexes and flats along with community amenities. The Kanemoto Estates subdivision was approved by the county in 1982, creating two parcels of 3.9 and 5.6 acres, each with one house, and a 29-acre out-lot that was granted a conservation easement, according to county documents.

The out-lot was placed into a conservation easement, which typically designates an area to be open space in **PERPETUITY**. However, this easement included language to allow for termination should the county later decide that future development of the property would be appropriate with the comprehensive plan, according to county documents. This development is **NOT APPROPRIATE WITH THE CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**.

To proceed with the development as proposed, the conservation easement must be terminated. Lefthand Ranch wants to develop the property within Longmont's jurisdiction, so the property would have to be annexed by the city. This will not proceed if the easement is discontinued. Decisions on the annexation, zoning and redevelopment of the site would be made by the city once a decision on the conservation easement termination has been made by the county. As this zoning does not meet the current conservation easement, termination should not be approved.

Please note that neighbors are raising concern over the loss of open space and worries about the consequences of continued development in the county. Randall Weiner, an attorney representing a coalition of Longmont citizens residing near the area known as Keep Airport Road Environmental and Safe, or KARES, sent a letter to the Boulder County Planning Commission arguing against the termination. In his letter, Weiner argues that the termination would not be consistent with the Boulder County Comprehensive Plan and that ending the conservation easement would be an invitation to terminate other conservation easements in Boulder County.

"Known for its natural beauty, Boulder County should not sacrifice its scenic open spaces for commercial development," the letter said. "The clearing of vegetation, followed by the construction of a mini-city on the outskirts of Longmont with increased traffic, density and sprawl will of course create significant environmental impacts." Weiner also noted that identifying the Kanemoto Conservation Easement as a future development sight in 1996 was **ITSELF UNLAWFUL AND IN VIOLATION OF BOULDER COUNTY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**.

Thank you for your time and consideration of **NOT APPROVING** the conservation easement.

Regards,

Wayne Smith

2807 Lake Park Way

Longmont, CO 880503

(303) 776-5986

lakota2807@yahoo.com



Virus-free. www.avast.com