

## Hanna Veal

---

**From:** Ronald Beck <value.west.pters@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 21, 2020 8:52 AM  
**To:** planning  
**Subject:** SUBFY2020-7/AnnexFY2020-1  
**Attachments:** Perch Meadows Sub.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello:

I have attached my written opposition to the above referenced. Unfortunately, it was not mailed as I thought and I know I am late. I am hopeful my comments will still be considered even though I am submitting them today.

Thank you.

RB

**RONALD BECK- PRINCIPAL**  
2976 E. STATE ST., STE.120 #128  
EAGLE, ID 83616  
208-985-4567



This email may contain material that is confidential, privileged work product for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, disclosure, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies, including any attachments.

To: [planning@gardencityidaho.org](mailto:planning@gardencityidaho.org)  
From: [value.west.pters@gmail.com](mailto:value.west.pters@gmail.com)

Message Score: 30  
My Spam Blocking Level: High

High (60): Pass  
Medium (75): Pass  
Low (90): Pass

[Block](#) this sender  
[Block](#) gmail.com

*This message was delivered because the content filter score did not exceed your filter level.*

Ronald Beck

5965 Ulmer Lane

October 12, 2020

SUBFY2020-7/AnnexFY2020-1: Preliminary Final Plat

X No email   X Oppose the Request

I am a resident at Lakeland Village. I support real estate development and even though I will miss the open green field, the cows grazing and the geese I support the Perch Meadows subdivision. However, I do not support the Ulmer Lane connection to the new subdivision. This connection is not necessary as a result of the added Perch Meadows traffic; Arney Lane can and should absorb this added traffic. In fact, Arney Lane seems to be underutilized certainly in comparison to Ulmer Lane.

***I have researched the current traffic counts and have found that - Arney Lane is identified by ACHD as a "collector" and Ulmer Lane is a "local". A "collector" has a higher traffic classification than a "local". Currently Ulmer Lane has 1,856 ADT versus Arney Lane which has only 1,291 per ACHD. Ulmer Lane has 30% more traffic than Arney Lane and it appears that Arney Lane is being underutilized and certainly can support the additional ADTs created by the Perch Meadow Subdivision***

I understand that the lead agencies want to create vehicular and /or pedestrian access from the new Perch Subdivision onto Ulmer Lane. If it was needed as a result of the subdivision why was this not a part of the initial design - everyone new about the added traffic. Pedestrian traffic currently has a safe route and an existing connection point between Ulmer Lane and Arney Lane on the designated greenbelt. The connection of Ulmer Lane would at best have a very limited benefit to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. If this the major safety concern then a pedestrian only connection would be a reasonable compromise.

It has been mentioned that a signalized intersection is planned at Ulmer Lane & State Street why not place the signalized intersection at Arney Lane where the Perch Meadow subdivision has an existing point of access?

Finally, all of our communities north of State Street that travel on these roads are well establish and fully built out with a few minor excepts. Traffic counts should have stabilized and any increase should be minimal at best. Why at this time decide to create an Ulmer Lane connection that could alter Lakeland Village traffic patterns going forward? The traffic separation between our communities has worked well and will continue to do so. By adding the Ulmer Lane connection, you increase the traffic through our neighborhood streets especially Ulmer Lane and Heceta Head, increase the speed of the traffic and alter the environment in our communities.

Thank you.



Ron Beck

