

I represent Millwood citizens who lodged the appeal you have before you.

I assume you have read the material submitted with the Magnolia Village application and Environmental Checklist. If so, you will know that throughout the application it is clear that the proposal is for 20 units.

The site development plans back this up.

The Staff Report and Decision itself describes the proposal as, "20 unit manufactured home park..."

The Planner chose to approve the application with conditions. Condition 3 limits the number of units to seventeen. This is not a condition; it is a material modification to the application itself. It in effect revises the application. It is based on the "City of Millwood Bulk Density Standards identified in the City Comprehensive Plan." These standards specify a **Maximum** density of "2 units per 10,000 sq. ft." **By her own calculation, the Planner confirms that a 20 unit development on this site exceeds the maximum standard she cited. On that basis alone the application should have been summarily denied and returned to the applicant.**

However, in apparent eagerness to get the application over this hurdle, the Planner elected to use some creative math. She decided to adjust the application, reducing the number of units to 17, which by her calculation meets the minimum standard she relied on. We asked her to explain how she arrived at the number 17? She e-mailed her calculations showing a maximum number of 16.64 units. Then she bizarrely rounded that number UP to 17. The rules of rounding are clear. She could have, based on her calculations rounded the number down to 16.6. Why didn't she? She knows you cannot have partial dwelling units. So, her choice was either 16 or 17, nothing in between. Did she communicate with the applicant as to arrive at an acceptable number of units or did she act unilaterally? We know she did not contact any of the neighbors to determine what might be acceptable to them. What authority does she have to change land use applications to make them acceptable? The application is obviously for a 20 unit development, not 17 or even 16. In any event by choosing to round **up** to 17 she has exceeded the Maximum number of units allowed based on the bulk density standard which she herself cited as the basis for her "condition." By the way, you cannot round up a maximum number

The Millwood Code under which this application was filed allowed Manufactured/mobile home parks "...where reasonably compatible with existing and potential development of the properties in the vicinity." The site in the UR-1 zone, defined as, "Low Density Residential," intended to provide for "primarily single-family homes on large lots." The Planner chose to emphasize the word "primarily" in this sentence. If she had paid attention to the purpose of the UR-1 zone, she would have read, "...preserving its existing semi-rural nature." She could have emphasized the word "preserve;" preserve is defined as, to protect, keep safe from injury or harm, to keep intact and free from decay, to maintain and keep free from decomposition.

This congested, unmanaged proposal is not consistent with the preservation requirement. It would in fact decay and injure the essential character of properties in the area.

A number of the conditions imposed by the Planner are ineffective of meaningless.

You have I trust read them but let me highlight a few.

Covenants, Conditions, & Restrictions are to be established without City input into their content or adequacy.

Non-defined "enforcement provisions" are called for. The developer stated he would drive through the development every two weeks or so to check on its condition. This same person previously called "humans" invasive species and as a part of this application called Millwood residents "ignoramus." No one can expect someone who displays arrogant contempt for Millwood citizens, including you at this table, to care about serious enforcement.

Use of recreational vehicles as the primary dwelling unit is to be prohibited. Nothing however disallows RVs from being parked on site and used as long term temporary living quarters, a sure recipe for deterioration into an unsightly slum.

A 6 foot privacy fence is required but with no specifications as to style or construction.

Condition 16 states that, "...the design of the manufactured home will be reviewed for consistency with the "cottage style" manufactured homes identified in the typical design examples..." "Cottage Style" home is not defined, and the shiny pictures submitted are nowhere referenced in the application itself. An internet search of "cottage style homes" yields a wide range of options, virtually none of which appear like the pictures. This imprecise requirement is meaningless.

The applicant is encouraged to make certain modifications to the parking arrangements. Encouragement is not a condition; encouragement cannot be enforced.

In addition to their deficiencies there is no mention of how the provisions will be enforced. The City has at best a spotty code enforcement record. Why should we expect anything different?

Project Review Incomplete

The Decision Document says that, "All comments received from agencies and the public have been reviewed and considered prior to the decision..." If this is true there is no documentation.

I won't detail the long-standing traffic problems on East Empire. You've been hearing them for years.

Concerns about lack of traffic control and associated risks to people and property are dismissed in the decision document; "Traffic counts taken by the City on Wednesday, May 3, 2017. Not much development has occurred since the traffic counts were taken..." The traffic studies cited are out of date and have not even been provided to us. This statement ignores the extensive apartments that have been constructed in Coyote Rock, a development that feeds directly onto Empire. It is apparently the opinion of individuals and organizations that do not live along Empire, most of whom have never visited the site or monitored the traffic, that traffic associated with this proposal is not important. Residents with first-hand, daily knowledge disagree.

The concern over increased crime has been totally ignored. Personal communication with law enforcement personnel confirms what we all intuitively know. Congested, low income housing, which this will be, is synonymous with increased crime. This crime will spill over into family neighborhoods.

Rose Haven Trailer Park was advertised at its inception as having a “Gold Star Rating,” It deteriorated into a crime ridden eye-sore. According to a Spokesman-Review article Rose Haven, law enforcement was required to respond to vehicle thefts, drug-related crimes and identity thefts. Mobile homes were raided. People were arrested on drug charges.

“When you have an absentee landlord, they don’t see the day-to-day decline, and they’re either unwilling or don’t care to address it,” stated a Spokane Valley Police official.

This is the future of Magnolia Village. Why officials are unwilling to even acknowledge the community concern about increased crime resulting from this proposal is baffling.

This proposal will negatively affect nearby property values. A real estate agent with nearly 15 years experience in Spokane County stated (personal communication) that a proposal such as this typically drives down nearby property values by 10-25%. The reason for this is clear: Aesthetics. It will become a collection of poorly maintained structures, surrounded by the detritus of those with no pride of ownership. How would you feel if this proposal was located next to your home? How would it impact the value of your property? We know the land owner, Mr. Anderson, would not want it near his house; he made that statement at the neighborhood meeting. If you won’t listen to Millwood residents, maybe you will listen to him.

The applicant was asked whether there were any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old eligible for listing in local preservations registers.

His attested as true and complete that there were such structures within 500 feet of the property.” He knows this is not true. We are inclined to believe Annie Oakes, a member of the Millwood Historic Commission who has provided five examples of homes that would potentially qualify for historic designation.

The Planner simply accepted this false statement, despite her obligation to check the Applicant’s submission for accuracy.

Maybe the City Planner, an unelected, non-resident, does not think it her responsibility to consider the impact of this development on Millwood citizens. But as elected representatives of Millwood citizens you do have that responsibility; to advance the quality of life, and unite the City of Millwood, not to somehow incorporate us into the standards of Spokane or Spokane County. We are a unique feature of this area and we want to stay that way. This proposal erodes that objective. This appeal presents you with a decision. You can listen to the citizens you were elected to represent and help alleviate crime and protect individual. Alternatively you can approve a proposal that diminishes values and in so doing side with the applicant who has pure contempt for the citizens you represent. ? Please honor the Millwood Code objective of preserving "...the existing semi-rural nature of the area." Don't further divide Millwood into regional enclaves?

Please reverse the decision of the City Planner and deny this proposal.