

Statement regarding proposed multi-family 2 story apartment development on Stafford and Silver Sage Submitted to the Planning Commission 2-17-23

Submitted by Catherine Borde, on behalf of residents living on Heaton Way, 2-17-23

These objections are raised by the residents who will be directly affected by the requested special use permit.

1. The surrounding zoning is: East - single family
West - offices
North - single family
South - single family

There are no multi-family units within at least 1 mile of this proposed building site. Apartments would be 2-story. There are no 2-story buildings in the immediate area. There could be at least 26 renters, and 28 parking spaces This would all be on less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre. The residential population of Heaton Way, east and west, north to south, is 34.

2. Violates CCMC 18.02.080

- a. Section 5b: Use, Peaceful Enjoyment, Economic Value and Compatibility
- b. Section 5c: Traffic/Pedestrian
- c. Section 5f: Public Health, Safety, Convenience and Welfare

3. Violates Building Department regulations

- a. Not consistent with Master Plans for the area.
- b. Detrimental to use, allows objectionable noises and increased physical activities in immediate area.
- c. Car traffic and pedestrian traffic will considerably effect immediate surrounding area. Vehicles exiting onto Stafford can only turn right. Heaton Way, a private street, would be used by renters as a short-cut to make a left turn onto Silver Sage.
- d. Detrimental to public health, safety, convenience and welfare of immediate area.
- e. Will result in prejudice to other properties in the vicinity.

4. Per CCDS 1.18

- a. There is no maximum renter density. Would allow for many, many residents

5. Special Use Permit:

- a. Is not be consistent with master plan elements.
- b. Will be detrimental to use, peaceful enjoyment and economic value of established residences.
- c. Will cause objectionable noise, fumes, odors and physical activity.
- d. Will have detrimental effect on vehicular and pedestrian traffic,
- e. Density will be 16.6 units on less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre,
- f. Required parking will be 2 spaces per unit and 1 extra parking space for every 2 units. Results in at least 28 required spaces on less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre,
- g. Each apartment will have 2-3 bedrooms, increasing the renter population. No maximum density has been stated,
- h. Downstairs units will have private yards. Result will be increased noise, odors and disturbance of quiet residential area.

6. FALSE statements by developer:

- a. "Project will be in keeping with the residential nature of surrounding area."
 1. Wrote conflicting statement in proposal: "Building and architectural elements will be distinctive." It will not be in keeping with architectural nature of surrounding area.
- b. "Community will benefit from additional residential square footage." As statistics have proven, property values of established residences will decline dramatically.
- c. "Approval of the project will only help complete the neighborhood and add to its' aesthetic and community value." No other apartments or 2 story buildings are in the immediate area. As statistics have proven, apartments built in an established community of single family residences causes the value of those residences to decline. Residents will suffer economic losses.

7. The Panning Commission letter states it was sent to "90 residents" within 300 feet of the proposed building. There are not 90 people within this 300 foot range. In addition, several of those within this 300 foot range did not receive a letter regarding the proposal and the meeting date.

8. In conclusion, there are 2 questions which each Commission members must answer for themselves:

- a. Would you approve a multi-family apartment building in your well-established neighborhood? Would you approve this if it was across the street from your home?
- b. Is profit and income generating more important than the peaceful existence of current property owners? In the name of more money, are these residents to be subjected to increased traffic, noise, noxious odors, nuisances and inconveniences? None of these conditions currently exist in this neighborhood.
 1. If the answer to the first question is "no", why is it being approved for an established neighborhood of single family residences?
 2. If the answer to the second question is "yes", it is obvious that greed and money are more important than maintaining the integrity of the surrounding community. You are to be pitied for your stance on this.