

North West Property Owners Alliance Statement on the Comprehensive Plan Proposal.

The North West Property Owners Alliance is a 501 C4 Corporation made up of thousands of local citizens working together to protect their right to property. We have been integral for example in stopping Tribe and Federal Government control of our regional water and stopping a foreign entity from buying our power company.

We are taking this opportunity to comment on this draft because although we appreciate that it was written in house and it simplifies the original version , we see some issues that will negatively affect the rights of local citizens, after all in the introduction you wrote *The policies only provide directions for writing regulations in the future. Only ?*

You have asked at previous hearings for testimony to address specific parts of this proposal, even though many are agreeable to us some are not, so here goes;

Objective 1 number 1, *Determine public outlooks on property rights, public health and safety and general welfare.* We agree that Property Rights is predominant here, thank you, but who determines public outlooks, public health and safety and general welfare? What weight is given to property rights, 25% ?

Objective 1 number 2, *Tailor land use regulations to reasonably and narrowly address nuisances...* again, who decides a nuisance, what is the punishment or mitigation ?

Objective 1 number 3, *.....and minimizing conditional and prohibited land uses.* Is the goal here to circumvent the CUP process?

Proposed Objective 2 *Ensure that zoning balances property rights with the responsibility to protect public health, safety and general welfare.* Is this statement used to diminish property rights? Zoning in itself restricts property rights and again who decides public health, safety and general welfare? By the way, the goals of public health, safety and general welfare are an anchor to UN Agenda 21, Agenda 2030 protocols for International Zoning Rules.

Element C Schools; Proposed Policy number 2, *Develop regulations which require applicants for large-scale (50 or more residences) residential developments to consult with local public school district officials at the pre-application stage.* Does this mean school administrators will have the power to Veto a new subdivision ? A frightening proposition to consider.

Element D sounds fine other than the possible imposition of restrictive rules on home-based businesses and cottage industries in the county. Small business is good business.

Element E Land Use, the Proposed Objectives 1A and 1B are fine as long as goals are “Encouraged” and not required, especially in areas where “Open Space” are mentioned. In Proposed Objective 2 Areas Of City Impact (ACIs) NWPOA is concerned about forced annexation. HB25 was passed in the Idaho Legislature this year requiring signatures from agricultural property owners in order to annex. Proposed Objective 3 number 1, *Establish where warranted, various rural residential zones after reviewing existing zoning, parcel sizes, development history, density, access, hazardous areas, infrastructure and the need for regulations.* This line should be removed, it will open a can of worms similar to the ULUC that was so divisive. A Change of zoning is essentially a taking and will not be acceptable to property owners. Proposed Land Use Objective 4, This whole Objective should be removed, the *regulation of Open Spaces, Wildlife Corridors, Viewsheds and Conservation Subdivisions* must have no part of our County Codes or Zoning. These terms are all part of the UN Agenda to control the lands of our country and especially the West. Two thirds of Idaho is a wildlife corridor, they can be expensive and are not even used when manmade. Viewsheds would open the county up to many lawsuits like in San Antonio, Jamestown and in Virginia. These would all be subjective regulations and again determined by whom ?

In Elements F through K and M and N; we believe there are State, Federal and Local laws that would address most of these, or they are not even needed.

Element L Housing should be eliminated, it is not part of the duty of our County to decide what kind of housing a property owner should have outside of today’s existing zoning. This Element is not required by State or Federal law.

In summary, the NWPOA concludes that this document is an example of standing in favor of the Collective over the Individual and that whatever goodwill the current commission might portray, the inevitable outcome will be further restrictions on Kootenai County citizen’s freedom of choice about what they can and cannot do with their land and the homes they wish to build upon it. Regulations ultimately add to cost resulting in unaffordability, financial duress then ultimately homelessness. Our Founders created a Constitutional Republic in order to safeguard the people from excessive government and our elected officials swear an oath to the Constitution which emphasizes Limited Government. We at North West Property Owners Alliance hope you consider these comments and we thank you for your time in serving our county and it’s citizens.

Board Of NWPOA

Jeff Tyler Chairman