



Follow-Up to October 5 P&Z Meeting — Gannett Ranch Annexation

From Pamela Ridgway <pamelaridg@gmail.com>

Date Tue 10/6/2026 3:18 PM

To Chloe Sullivan <csullivan@bellevueidaho.us>

hi Chloe, there is also response here from Diane Faye with the original email and then I replied back to her, so have all this going to the records, please

Thank you, Pamela Ridgway
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Pamela Ridgway <pamelaridg@gmail.com>

Date: October 6, 2026 at 3:08:40 PM MDT

To: Diane Shay <dshay@bellevueidaho.us>

Subject: Re: Follow-Up to October 5 P&Z Meeting — Gannett Ranch Annexation

Good morning,

Rob and I attended last night's Bellevue Planning & Zoning meeting regarding the proposed Gannett Ranch development, along with approximately 30 other members of the community.

Unfortunately, the meeting was unable to proceed because the agenda had not been properly posted for the October 5 meeting. We understand that the agenda apparently appeared under an incorrect 2025 date, making it extremely difficult—or impossible—for members of the public to locate it.

A member of the audience raised the issue of Idaho's public meeting requirements and whether the meeting could legally proceed without proper public notice. Ultimately, the meeting was canceled.

While we appreciate that administrative mistakes happen, this was disappointing. Approximately 30 citizens took the time to attend because this proposal could have significant and long-lasting consequences for Bellevue and the surrounding community.

Given the cancellation, we would like to use this opportunity to submit several questions that we had intended to raise regarding the proposed annexation of Gannett Ranch. We respectfully ask that these questions be considered and addressed as the process moves forward:

1. ANNEXATION AND DENSITY

The property is currently zoned by Blaine County for approximately 38 homes. The proposed development calls for 439 homes, along with approximately 10,000 square feet of commercial space and 100,000 square feet of flex industrial space.

What is the justification for increasing the residential density from approximately 38 homes to 439 homes through annexation into Bellevue?

2. CONTIGUITY AND THE "SHOESTRING" CONNECTION

We understand questions have been raised regarding the proposed connection of the Gannett Ranch property to Bellevue and the requirements of Idaho Code §50-222.

Before proceeding further, will the City obtain a clear legal determination that the proposed annexation meets all applicable contiguity and annexation requirements?

3. WATER

The developer has stated that the project would use approximately 20% or less of the water currently used for agricultural irrigation.

What independent analysis has been completed to verify this claim?

More importantly, has an independent analysis been conducted regarding groundwater availability, aquifer impacts, and the long-term cumulative water demands of this project together with existing and already-approved development in the Bellevue area?

4. WASTEWATER AND AQUIFER RECHARGE

The developer has proposed an independent wastewater treatment system with treated water being returned to the aquifer.

Who will regulate, monitor, maintain, and ultimately be financially responsible for this system over its lifetime?

What happens if that system fails, becomes inadequate, or eventually requires connection to Bellevue's municipal wastewater system?

5. ROADS AND TRAFFIC

What traffic study has been completed to determine the effect of 439 additional residences, commercial development, and industrial development on Gannett Road, Highway 75, and surrounding roads?

Has that study considered full build-out rather than simply the first phase?

6. COST TO EXISTING BELLEVUE RESIDENTS

Has an independent fiscal-impact analysis been completed showing the short- and long-term costs to Bellevue for police, fire and emergency services, roads, administration, staffing, maintenance, and other municipal services associated with this development?

We would particularly like to know which infrastructure costs will be paid by the developer and which future maintenance and replacement costs could ultimately become the responsibility of Bellevue taxpayers.

7. PUBLIC BENEFIT

If the development intends to provide its own water and wastewater infrastructure, what is the specific public benefit to the existing residents of Bellevue from annexing this property into the City?

We believe this is an important question that deserves a clear answer before annexation discussions proceed.

8. BELLEVUE'S EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Bellevue already faces significant infrastructure, staffing, maintenance, water, and wastewater needs.

Before adding a development of this magnitude, will the City evaluate whether it currently has the financial, administrative, and infrastructure capacity to responsibly support this level of additional growth?

9. CUMULATIVE GROWTH

Finally, will the City consider temporarily slowing or pausing major annexation decisions while an independent assessment is completed of Bellevue's water supply, wastewater capacity, roads, public services, staffing, and financial ability to accommodate both existing obligations and proposed future growth?

This is not simply a question about one development. It is a question about the future size, infrastructure, financial stability, and character of Bellevue.

Last night's cancellation actually reinforces why we believe this process needs to be deliberate, transparent, properly noticed, and based upon complete and independently verified information.

We respectfully ask that these questions be entered into the record and that written responses—or the supporting studies and documentation—be made available to the public before the next substantive meeting concerning Gannett Ranch.

We would also appreciate confirmation of the date and time of the rescheduled meeting and assurance that the agenda will be properly posted within the required public-notice period.

Thank you for your time and service to our community. We look forward to receiving the information and participating constructively as this process moves forward.

I also spoke to the county clerk, Chloe on the phone today in regards to the lack of microphones in the room, and the lack of air-conditioning, not turned on prior to the meeting. I would hope in the future that your people that are speaking whether it be the mayor or anyone speaking to the public would have microphones because we could not

hear at all what the PNC folks were saying, and we asked for them to speak louder, and they mumbled, and it was just really quite unprofessional Diane.

I attend meetings at the Hailey County Courthouse and there are always microphones and I would imagine that Bellevue would have the same as it's courteous if we're invited to a meeting that we can hear what's going on.

Can you please respond back to me in regards to this issue with microphones and if someone could turn the air-conditioning conditioning on prior to would be really nice

Thank you!!

Pamela Ann & Rob Foulkes
Bellevue Farms