



This petition has collected
189 signatures
using the online tools at ipetitions.com

Printed on 2024-05-16

Say No to Pleasant Valley Ranch, a Small Lot-Large Density Development in Williamson Valley

About this petition

Brooks Land Holding, Inc., proposes the development of Pleasant Valley Ranch (PVR), a high-density subdivision with 163 small 5-acre lots along Las Vegas Ranch Road, a private road built exclusively for Las Vegas Ranch Estates (LVRE) in Williamson Valley. Each lot will require a separate well, septic tank, and leach field.

PVR is incompatible with the surrounding large cattle ranches, large parcel communities of LVRE, Long Meadow, and Crossroads Ranch, and a few nearby residential parcels, none of which are less than 10 acres.

PVR could severely impact the LVRE community, as its only access point would be via Las Vegas Ranch Road. The increased residential, construction, and truck traffic could significantly damage this road, make travel unsafe, and impose additional security risks on LVRE residents. Additionally, the development would harm the local environment, impact wildlife, contaminate water, reduce surrounding community and individual home asset values, and generally impact the quality of life.

PVR would also impact other Williamson Valley residents and communities like Crossroads Ranch, Long Meadow, Talking Rock, and Hootenanny Holler. It would increase the residential and construction traffic on the already dangerous Williamson Valley Road and place additional water usage demands on the aquifer that supplies these communities. The effluent from the numerous leach fields installed in porous soils over an aquifer as shallow as 10 feet nearby will likely contaminate the groundwater with a toxic brew of pathogens, pharmaceuticals, phosphates, etc.

We believe that PVR is a high-risk venture with a high likelihood of failure for several reasons. Firstly, PVR lots are overpriced (\$60,000/acre). The available parcels at nearby LVRE, cost between \$9,000-\$11,000/acre, and some have been on the market for almost a year. Secondly, PVR is located 45 minutes away from stores, schools, and emergency medical services. Thirdly, PVR is accessed by a narrow, unmarked, potentially unsafe road unsuitable for high-volume residential or construction traffic. Fourthly, PVR's "dry lot" approach of individual wells and sewer systems may contaminate wells and groundwater, imposing serious health and legal liability risks to PVR lot owners. Finally, PVR title and trespassing restrictions prohibit vehicular access to nearby Camp Wood Road and Prescott National Forest, negating one of the selling points for PVR.

Please click [here](#) for more information concerning PVR's impacts on LVRE and surrounding communities. We urge you to support our efforts to encourage county planners to squash this development by signing this petition. We also welcome your comments.

Signatures

1. Name: Tom Turner on 2024-03-14 21:45:06
Comments:

2. Name: Randy Joly on 2024-03-14 22:26:47
Comments:

3. Name: Heath Baker on 2024-03-14 22:27:51
Comments:

4. Name: Dan Searer on 2024-03-14 22:54:52
Comments:

5. Name: Linda Turner on 2024-03-14 22:57:55
Comments:

6. Name: Cheryl Searer on 2024-03-15 01:06:16
Comments:

7. Name: Elizabeth Merchant on 2024-03-15 02:16:36
Comments:

8. Name: Jonathan Feuer on 2024-03-15 14:02:04
Comments:

9. Name: Stacey Feuer on 2024-03-15 14:03:13
Comments:

10. Name: Cathy Kenson on 2024-03-15 14:06:12
Comments:

11. Name: Dennis DeAtley on 2024-03-15 14:13:05
Comments: No!

12. Name: Andrew Jablow on 2024-03-15 14:19:01
Comments:

13. Name: Richard Davis on 2024-03-15 14:23:53
Comments:

14. Name: Jeffrey W Morley on 2024-03-15 14:26:29

Comments: Thanks for all you've doing. I'm 100% against this development and I fear the negative impacts it would cause, especially on our water.

15. Name: Mark Watson on 2024-03-15 14:26:43
Comments: This proposed development will fail and have inadequate infrastructure.

16. Name: Diane Uczekaj on 2024-03-15 14:28:11
Comments:

17. Name: Janet Kelly on 2024-03-15 14:34:30
Comments:

18. Name: Kristen Martucci on 2024-03-15 14:38:47
Comments:

19. Name: Ken Welsh on 2024-03-15 14:53:35
Comments:

20. Name: Carlton M Glenn on 2024-03-15 15:12:53
Comments:

21. Name: Robert L Whitney on 2024-03-15 15:19:26
Comments: It is incompatible with our area.

22. Name: Catherine Wilkinson on 2024-03-15 15:31:25
Comments:

23. Name: Carolin Engelhorn on 2024-03-15 15:32:55
Comments:

24. Name: Mark Kenson on 2024-03-15 15:32:56
Comments:

25. Name: Cathie Zettler on 2024-03-15 15:35:52
Comments:

26. Name: Denise Bixler on 2024-03-15 15:42:32
Comments:

27. Name: Will Lewis on 2024-03-15 15:44:34
Comments: Too many, too busy, not what I signed up for. Keep LVRE open and natural as can be.

28. Name: Ben Richter on 2024-03-15 15:52:37
Comments:

29. Name: Gail Davis on 2024-03-15 15:55:28
Comments:

30. Name: Diana Watson on 2024-03-15 16:19:24
Comments:

31. Name: Jerome Staab on 2024-03-15 16:22:36
Comments:

32. Name: Kelsey Baker on 2024-03-15 16:31:39
Comments: No! So many negatives!

33. Name: Jeff Derby on 2024-03-15 17:05:35
Comments: Las Vegas Ranch Rd would not be safe with the amount of additional traffic from the proposed development. I have major concern about sewage/water situation, also. I don't think scale and density of the project fits this area or landscape at all.

34. Name: Ruth Jablow on 2024-03-15 17:06:10
Comments:

35. Name: Darrell Bryant on 2024-03-15 17:10:20
Comments:

36. Name: Dan Beck on 2024-03-15 17:41:57
Comments:

37. Name: Bruce Thompson on 2024-03-15 18:20:31
Comments:

38. Name: Glenn L Sperbeck on 2024-03-15 18:23:01
Comments:

39. Name: Daryl Auster Miller on 2024-03-15 18:35:00
Comments:

40. Name: Dan Robinson on 2024-03-15 18:49:49
Comments:

41. Name: Christine Kuzdal on 2024-03-15 19:26:12

Comments:

42. Name: Sharon Morley on 2024-03-15 19:35:13

Comments:

43. Name: kim abbott on 2024-03-15 19:47:34

Comments:

44. Name: Michelle Thomas on 2024-03-15 19:48:01

Comments:

45. Name: Kerby Lanford on 2024-03-15 19:48:01

Comments:

46. Name: James Berzon on 2024-03-15 19:48:05

Comments:

47. Name: Steven Calabrese on 2024-03-15 20:04:18

Comments:

48. Name: Deborah Calabrese on 2024-03-15 20:14:35

Comments:

49. Name: Martin Ament on 2024-03-15 20:20:41

Comments:

50. Name: Denise Smith on 2024-03-15 20:28:03

Comments:

51. Name: Brian Peterson on 2024-03-15 20:35:53

Comments:

52. Name: Bill Taber on 2024-03-15 20:37:59

Comments:

53. Name: Maltbie James W on 2024-03-15 20:38:12

Comments:

54. Name: Ping Y Maltbie on 2024-03-15 20:39:39

Comments:

55. Name: James D Maltbie on 2024-03-15 20:40:48
Comments:
-
56. Name: Susan Kviz on 2024-03-15 20:41:39
Comments:
-
57. Name: Marjorie Istwan on 2024-03-15 21:05:12
Comments: Please let me know what I can do to help...
-
58. Name: Kristy Miller on 2024-03-15 21:18:54
Comments:
-
59. Name: John Uczekaj on 2024-03-15 21:19:48
Comments:
-
60. Name: Lauren Barra-Berzon on 2024-03-15 21:29:53
Comments:
-
61. Name: Paul E English on 2024-03-15 21:55:19
Comments: I am absolutely opposed to this high density development. I will be impacted the most as 11-12 lots will abut my property. This will disturb the deer and elk migration patterns and harm the environment here with the significant infrastructure that needs to be put in to support 5 acre lots.
-
62. Name: John Kuzdal on 2024-03-15 23:01:20
Comments:
-
63. Name: Lani beach on 2024-03-16 01:32:33
Comments: No
-
64. Name: Gwendolyn Sperbeck on 2024-03-16 03:15:37
Comments:
-
65. Name: Pamela Carricaburu on 2024-03-16 04:21:06
Comments:
-
66. Name: Rose Miller on 2024-03-16 04:43:16
Comments:
-
67. Name: Hal M Miller on 2024-03-16 04:48:59
Comments:
-

68. Name: Laurel Bailey on 2024-03-16 13:28:58
Comments:

69. Name: Donna Ray on 2024-03-16 13:56:11
Comments:

70. Name: Andie Hill on 2024-03-16 13:56:46
Comments:

71. Name: Randy J Clifford on 2024-03-16 14:07:29
Comments: This proposed development belongs somewhere else!!!

72. Name: Michael Hubbard on 2024-03-16 14:25:36
Comments:

73. Name: Dawn Van Doren on 2024-03-16 14:31:17
Comments: Please do not do this! This is something that is completely not needed.

74. Name: Bryce Schaefer on 2024-03-16 15:03:43
Comments:

75. Name: Laurie Baynes on 2024-03-16 15:06:54
Comments:

76. Name: Angelia Vanderhye on 2024-03-16 15:07:17
Comments: I live in TRR and we already have water issues!

77. Name: Frank W Villars on 2024-03-16 16:23:10
Comments:

78. Name: Lisa Monahan on 2024-03-16 17:02:09
Comments: There are a lot of cons and no pros!

79. Name: Victoria Y Potratz on 2024-03-16 17:57:55
Comments:

80. Name: Susan Houser on 2024-03-16 20:44:53
Comments:

81. Name: William Culler on 2024-03-16 20:47:08
Comments:

82. Name: Jon Lovie on 2024-03-16 21:06:04
Comments:
-
83. Name: michael chambers on 2024-03-16 21:51:51
Comments:
-
84. Name: Diane McKelvey on 2024-03-17 01:20:44
Comments: Definitely No!
-
85. Name: Kristin Baumgartner on 2024-03-17 02:28:17
Comments:
-
86. Name: Stephen Gwinn on 2024-03-17 02:44:22
Comments:
-
87. Name: Joseph Dalmas on 2024-03-17 03:58:03
Comments:
-
88. Name: Linda Dalmas on 2024-03-17 04:00:59
Comments:
-
89. Name: Laurie Hubbard on 2024-03-17 04:34:58
Comments:
-
90. Name: Steve Hunyar on 2024-03-17 13:12:54
Comments:
-
91. Name: Patrick Pearson on 2024-03-17 13:21:35
Comments: "High Density" housing is considered 5 acre lots? Building out in the middle of ranches where there is no infrastructure or services? Construction equipment travelling on unmaintained roads that are not rated for them? Sounds like it's time to start visiting some planning and zoning meetings and talk to the county supervisor about this.
-
92. Name: Laurie Owens on 2024-03-17 13:54:36
Comments: We live in Talking Rock and don't approve this
-
93. Name: Dana Armstrong on 2024-03-17 14:31:23
Comments:
-
94. Name: Susan Barz on 2024-03-17 14:51:33
Comments:
-

95. Name: Rick Barz on 2024-03-17 15:08:57
Comments:
-
96. Name: Patrick Giammarise on 2024-03-17 15:37:05
Comments: This development appears to pose serious risks to the area's water quality because it is septic system only.
-
97. Name: Julie on 2024-03-17 15:56:38
Comments:
-
98. Name: Linda Hunyar on 2024-03-17 16:01:18
Comments:
-
99. Name: Paul Kemmeter on 2024-03-17 16:52:18
Comments:
-
100. Name: Kurt Wilkinson on 2024-03-17 17:05:04
Comments:
-
101. Name: Sharon Kelley on 2024-03-17 17:55:15
Comments: No. No, No!
-
102. Name: Jeff Schaffer on 2024-03-17 19:28:06
Comments:
-
103. Name: Elizabeth Bourne on 2024-03-17 20:30:52
Comments:
-
104. Name: Ursula R Tobler on 2024-03-17 20:52:35
Comments: We need to think about the wildlife and flora as well as the water, septic, contamination, traffic as well as our quality of life. Stop the greed.
-
105. Name: Mark Martucci on 2024-03-17 21:06:48
Comments:
-
106. Name: Jeffrey McLeod on 2024-03-17 23:03:09
Comments:
-
107. Name: Louis Van Tonder on 2024-03-17 23:07:34
Comments: NO! We don't have the water for this developers greed!!!
-
108. Name: Krista Marcum on 2024-03-18 01:23:07

Comments:

109. Name: Eric English on 2024-03-18 16:27:10
Comments: English Land and Livestock is opposed to this development for all the reasons stated in this petition. Additionally, the bald eagle and raptor nesting along Williamson Valley Wash will be disturbed forever if they proceed. Seasonal elk and deer migration will be disrupted as well.
-
110. Name: Katie English on 2024-03-18 16:36:28
Comments:
-
111. Name: Everett Freeman on 2024-03-18 16:54:57
Comments:
-
112. Name: Sharon Swope on 2024-03-19 04:16:18
Comments:
-
113. Name: Rebecca M Ramme on 2024-03-19 14:12:57
Comments:
-
114. Name: Inga Brchan on 2024-03-19 18:03:18
Comments:
-
115. Name: Kimberli Lee on 2024-03-19 18:38:48
Comments:
-
116. Name: Jody jacobs on 2024-03-19 22:16:55
Comments:
-
117. Name: Sara Clouse on 2024-03-19 23:29:27
Comments:
-
118. Name: Catherine Wolfe on 2024-03-20 01:04:18
Comments: Great concerns about water issues and increased traffic on Williamson Valley Road.
-
119. Name: Kathryn Benage on 2024-03-20 12:55:44
Comments:
-
120. Name: Brad Boardman on 2024-03-20 15:18:05
Comments: Too many red flags, no.
-

121. Name: Donna Boardman on 2024-03-20 15:24:26
Comments:
-
122. Name: Chris White on 2024-03-20 16:08:18
Comments:
-
123. Name: Michelle Lewis on 2024-03-20 16:28:23
Comments:
-
124. Name: Mike Dement on 2024-03-20 16:44:48
Comments: No on the new development.
-
125. Name: Laura Dement on 2024-03-20 16:45:41
Comments: No on proposed development
-
126. Name: George Price on 2024-03-20 17:32:46
Comments: I think 2 acre lots with individual septic systems would be a mistake and would damage the aquifer.
-
127. Name: bill wade on 2024-03-20 18:22:44
Comments:
-
128. Name: MaryHelen Costanza on 2024-03-20 18:26:17
Comments: Saying no to Pleasant Valley Ranch development
-
129. Name: Marbella Lanford on 2024-03-20 18:29:25
Comments:
-
130. Name: Nelda Beck on 2024-03-20 18:51:01
Comments:
-
131. Name: Terri Bryant on 2024-03-20 19:51:33
Comments:
-
132. Name: John Carricaburu on 2024-03-20 20:48:22
Comments:
-
133. Name: Travis Hess on 2024-03-21 13:46:22
Comments:
-
134. Name: Emily Pringle on 2024-03-21 16:02:11
Comments:

-
135. Name: Robin J White on 2024-03-21 16:29:56
Comments: no more density, we don't have enough water!!!!!!!!!! infrastructure can't support this!!!!!!
-
136. Name: Suzi Bailey on 2024-03-21 20:37:31
Comments: This Pleasant Valley Ranch development is absolutely going to conflict with the highest & best use of current land agricultural zoning, ingress/egress, resources for both human , livestock and wildlife corridors. Yavapai County must control growth, and be mindful of the limited natural resources available .Our family has been in Williamson Valley area for 32 years and being in the real estate profession for 22 of those years I'm keenly aware of the devastating effect of random zoning changes like this. Highly opposed
-
137. Name: Patricia E McNay on 2024-03-22 01:39:14
Comments: We live at the 17 mile marker on WVR. We do not want Williamson Valley to turn into Prescott Valley!
-
138. Name: Kristina Sperbeck on 2024-03-22 01:58:43
Comments:
-
139. Name: Thomas Kelly on 2024-03-22 13:13:35
Comments:
-
140. Name: Jane Krieser on 2024-03-23 15:24:16
Comments: Also read elsewhere Brooks dev does not have good reputation
-
141. Name: Teddi Baggins on 2024-03-23 18:57:34
Comments: We do not want to see Williamson Valley road become a four lane highway. We must be more protective of our water resources.
-
142. Name: The Varner family on 2024-03-23 19:04:13
Comments: Sincerely hope this does not get approved
-
143. Name: Jill Escalante on 2024-03-23 19:07:09
Comments:
-
144. Name: Julia Sullivan on 2024-03-23 21:29:22
Comments:
-
145. Name: Sarah Agnew on 2024-03-23 22:28:39

Comments: No! No on Pleasant Valley Ranch project! NO!

146. Name: Jeff Morse on 2024-03-24 00:18:21
Comments:

147. Name: Patricia Kloch on 2024-03-24 15:21:25
Comments: The aquifer is already stressed and this proposed development would only make things worse. No on Pleasant Valley Ranch Project!

148. Name: Margie English on 2024-03-25 17:05:44
Comments:

149. Name: David Reardon on 2024-03-25 19:10:35
Comments:

150. Name: Tamra Kelly on 2024-03-26 02:12:31
Comments:

151. Name: Linda Hoerling-Glenn on 2024-03-28 14:16:19
Comments:

152. Name: Catholic Life on 2024-03-29 05:00:57
Comments:

153. Name: ROBERT McDonald on 2024-03-30 21:32:11
Comments:

154. Name: Richard and Kathleen Gustin on 2024-04-07 01:47:58
Comments:

155. Name: Robert and Bonnie Davis on 2024-04-08 19:02:11
Comments:

156. Name: Lisa Duntley on 2024-04-08 19:39:58
Comments: Definitely don't need that much more traffic out here.

157. Name: Tim Mason on 2024-04-08 19:41:37
Comments:

158. Name: King and Jeanine Davis on 2024-04-08 21:15:42
Comments: Absolutely no. It will destroy the ranching history of this area and replace it with cars and people.

-
159. Name: Mark Olejnik on 2024-04-09 02:38:06
Comments: Please prevent the project from moving ahead.
-
160. Name: Mark Jones on 2024-04-09 06:08:19
Comments:
-
161. Name: Jessica Olejnik on 2024-04-09 15:33:14
Comments:
-
162. Name: Michelle Theroux on 2024-04-09 20:28:18
Comments:
-
163. Name: Megan Silveira on 2024-04-10 00:22:41
Comments:
-
164. Name: Cathy J Crawford on 2024-04-10 17:47:24
Comments: This proposed development is incompatible with existing development in Williamson Valley. This must be stopped!
-
165. Name: Sylvia Hill on 2024-04-10 17:47:35
Comments: Very concerned about impact to water, road traffic and disruption of area. NO.
-
166. Name: Barbara Sheehan on 2024-04-10 17:49:17
Comments: High density developments do NOT belong in our area, this would be inappropriate due to wells and sewage issues .
-
167. Name: Lynn Giddens on 2024-04-10 17:50:58
Comments: I have concern about insufficient fire support and septic/water
-
168. Name: Vera Leonard on 2024-04-10 17:53:26
Comments: Too dense for rural development
-
169. Name: Beth Conley on 2024-04-10 17:55:51
Comments: I am very concerned about the water as related to fires. Additionally septic systems polluting water supplies
-
170. Name: Katharine Kohles on 2024-04-10 19:03:32
Comments:
-
171. Name: James Sheehan on 2024-04-10 21:04:36

Comments: This development is not compatible with the existing character of the area. PVR would further stress our ground water resources, roads and fire protection.

172. Name: Russell Saffer on 2024-04-10 21:25:06
Comments: Not compatible with the density or quality of life of this area.
Could create higher density pressures on existing low density properties. "If they can do it why can't I" for example

173. Name: Danielle Paskowitz on 2024-04-11 13:15:11
Comments:

174. Name: Kevin Hill on 2024-04-11 13:43:19
Comments: This small lot ranch is a horrible idea! It will effect the water, a lot more traffic, impact life and change the quiet dynamics of area. There is zero benefits. NO to Pleasant Valley Ranch

175. Name: ann walters on 2024-04-23 16:12:40
Comments:

176. Name: Jacqueline Decker on 2024-04-23 19:10:08
Comments: Too much development

177. Name: Christine M Ryback on 2024-04-23 19:22:23
Comments:

178. Name: Gail Holthausen on 2024-04-23 19:24:19
Comments:

179. Name: Wanda Blake on 2024-04-24 01:06:54
Comments:

180. Name: Jeannie Fornara on 2024-04-26 20:07:45
Comments: No petition

181. Name: Valerie Darcy on 2024-05-04 21:27:00
Comments:

182. Name: Jim Rose on 2024-05-04 21:45:44
Comments: I say no to the Pleasant Valley Ranch development.

183. Name: Debbie Marcus on 2024-05-05 06:33:49
Comments:

184. Name: Tim Hole on 2024-05-05 17:40:07
Comments: Too much traffic on Williamson Valley Road, strain on ground water resources. NO to PVR.

185. Name: jerry lynn casebolt on 2024-05-05 21:55:18
Comments: At least be responsible to have a minimum of 10 acres

186. Name: Jeanine Davis on 2024-05-06 17:10:50
Comments: No no no to PVR

187. Name: grr aumann on 2024-05-12 21:23:21
Comments:

188. Name: Gay Lynn Hodges on 2024-05-14 04:36:04
Comments:

189. Name: Alfred Hodges on 2024-05-14 04:43:17
Comments:
