

To the Planning and Zoning Commission:

First, the proposed ordinance as outlined in the news tramples property rights. The tenants in a park will move out whenever it suits them, with little or no notice to the property owner. Current law provides for significant notice and relocation assistance already.

Second, the State of Arizona has law in regard to closure. We do not believe it is constitutional for a lower jurisdiction to override an issue that has law passed at the state level. In California, similar efforts have failed universally, but those failures have cost the city involved and the landowners millions of dollars. This exact scenario played out in Costa Mesa, CA.

Third, the proposed ordinance is a taking.

Fourth, this concept has emotional appeal, but there will be unintended consequences. The residents of Flagstaff and the City want parks and land use planning to have the flexibility to upgrade as the city progresses. Locking in a project like Arrowhead locks in the existence of substandard housing.

Fifth, the requirements for 100% agreement in order to allow a closure to proceed with less review empowers the few, or one resident, to obstruct a otherwise orderly plan. This is a raw transfer of rights and value away from the property owner.

We own two parks in Flagstaff. As far as I know, we had no, zero, inquiries from any tenants involved in the proposed closure for Landmark. We have spaces open in both parks. Granted, some would have had a difficult time because some of the houses were old, but we have open spaces and would have liked to see qualified new residents come in to fill those spaces. It appeared to us that while some residents were unhappy with the closure, others (with attorneys) were seeking to be enriched - trailers that were worth \$2,000 to \$5,000 were seeking \$30,000 payments to move. The tenants have not invested sums in their homes that merit those kinds of payments.

Lastly, it is distressing that no outreach has been made to park owners for input into this process. Since we own two parks and a total of 469 mobile home and RV spaces it would seem logical to create a true workshop environment for any changes that may occur.

The City would be well advised to stand back and look at the big picture present: what kind of housing does the City want to lock in, how much does the City respect owner's rights, and how willing is the City to sow and fertilize the seeds of constitutional taking lawsuits that do not change the outcome for the re-use planning of a given parcel?

Sincerely,

Chris Welsh
LLC Manager
Westglen MHP LLC KC RV Park LLC
parkowner@gmail.com

10/22/2014