Dear City of Great Falls,

We sincerely appreciate your time and attention to our concerns regarding the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the proposed addition of three beds at the Parkview Assisted Living Facility, increasing the total from 14 to 17 beds.

My name is Mary Bowe, and I reside with my family at 2109 11th St. SW, situated adjacent to the assisted living facility. We live directly next to the facility, on the other side of the path leading to Meadow Lark Elementary School and Montana Park. My seven-year-old, who is entering second grade, and my five-year-old, who is entering kindergarten at Meadow Lark next school year, are a central part of our concerns. We are deeply opposed to the expansion of beds at the facility. While the city may deem this increase "rather small," a 21.4% rise from 14 to 17 beds is indeed significant.

Our opposition to the CUP stems from several serious concerns:

1. Increased Emergency Service Calls and Traffic Congestion: Since moving into our residence in July 2018, we have observed a high volume of emergency service calls to the Parkview Assisted Living Facility. City documents indicate that the number of visits is already higher than what is typically expected in a single-family zoning district. In nearly six years, we have had zero EMS calls, whereas the facility has had over 188 calls. This averages out to about one every ten days. An increase of 21.4% in EMS calls would further congest the neighborhood, causing disturbances at all hours, including increased noise, lights, anxiety, and congestion on our streets. Additionally, 11th St. SW is a busy street with access to other residential streets. Congestion is more of a concern at this location and can affect more people.

2. Safety Concerns: The facility's location is next to a school, park and a pathway which has increased vehicle, foot, bike, scooter, and stroller traffic, especially during school drop-off and pick-up times. The street that the facility is located on is extremely busy and leads to multiple residential streets. The increased presence of emergency vehicles and the higher traffic volume pose safety risks for children and residents alike. The neighborhood even recently had a child struck on a bike. Additionally, the facility's claim that there will be no increase in staffing despite housing 17 residents, including bedridden individuals, raises serious concerns about adequate care and supervision. We have witnessed firsthand the disturbances caused by the facility and feel that the well-being of all residents, including those in the assisted living facility, should be a top priority for our city officials.

3. Impact on Neighborhood Aesthetics and Infrastructure: The original residence was built as a family home and is zoned as "Single-family Medium Density." The current infrastructure, including homes, streets, and pathways, complements this residential intent. Having the garages converted to living spaces alters the original design and character of the structure. The facility's five to six garbage cans on the sidewalk, compared to the typical one or two, detracts from the neighborhood's visual appeal and usage of the sidewalk. An increase in residents would exacerbate this issue.

4. Resident Behavior and Neighborhood Impact: We have experienced several troubling incidents involving the facility's residents:

- Residents attempting to escape and approaching our property.
- A sex offender residing at the facility, which is alarming given the proximity to a school and our young children.
- Instances where residents have needed assistance beyond what the facility staff could provide, creating uncomfortable and potentially hazardous situations.

We believe that the conditional use would negatively impact the use and enjoyment as well as property value of properties in the immediate vicinity.

5. Neighborhood Council, City Planning Board and Neighbors: This request does not have the support of the Neighborhood Council and was not approved by the City Planning Board. There are also ten letters that were written by neighbors, concerned citizens and Meadow Lark School for the City Planning Board meeting earlier in the year.

It is important to note that the facility's occupancy has already increased from the city-approved 9 beds to 14 beds without the appropriate CUP, a situation that was later "grandfathered" by the city. This decision was made without proper consultation or consideration of the impact on the community. This situation highlights the importance of proper oversight to ensure that the residential neighborhood is not unduly burdened by such developments.

We urge the city to consider the negative impact that granting this CUP would have on our community and neighborhood and to prioritize the safety and well-being of all residents. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Mary Bowe and family

Upon reading the letter from the owner of Parkview and the information provided from the city, I had additional follow up questions:

- Can she clarify if the Great Falls Transport van that visits the home frequently was left out of this analysis? What days does it come? What time does it visit? How many times a day? In the letter, bullet 1, line 6 she claims that "there are not services that come and go on a routine basis between 8 am and 9 am" yet I see this van there almost daily around 8:10 am.
- Regarding the shift change in staff, the afternoon shift change is noted but not the morning shift change from 2 staff members to 1. What time is this shift change?
- ParkView Assisted Living said that they are Category A facility housing residents with limited assistance and in generally good health. However, the owner shared in the previous Planning Board meeting that she has residents that are bedridden. Wouldn't this require a Category B requirement?
- It has been stated that 17 of the 17 residents do not drive. Are residents allowed to drive and have a car if they choose to? Do you already have the three new residents lined up if the CUP is passed? How do you know that they do not drive?