

From: Natasha Abner <nabner@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2021 9:59 PM

To: CityCouncil <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>; Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

Subject: Housing is for PEOPLE

Hello members of the Planning Commission and City Council,

Last year, City Council **passed one of the strongest short term rental ordinances in our nation**. I was proud to be a resident of Ann Arbor, and proud that members of city government and staff would have the courage to confront profiteers and say that we will **not** have our housing stock snatched off the market and used to make a quick buck instead of provide a secure home.

I was dismayed earlier this year when council passed a resolution to weaken that ordinance - when new council members made it loud and clear that they do **not** have that same courage.

And tonight I find myself dismayed yet again as I see that the [Planning Commission](#) - presumably with the support of council - is now pursuing amendments that would even further weaken the ordinance.

And in addition to my disappointment at how profoundly city officials have lost their courage in these last few months, I am also horrified by the anti-democratic ways that city government is pursuing to change legislation that recently **passed our democratically elected City Council** because **it had the support of the people**.

As a home owner and voter in Ann Arbor, I demand that you **cease immediately** all amendments to the short-term rental ordinance and let us return to that fleeting moment when we were all residents of a city whose officials had the courage to proclaim that housing is for our people, not for profits.

Thank you,
Natasha Abner, PhD

From: Beth Collins <rdhbeth@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2021 9:39 AM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>; Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; DiLeo, Alexis <ADiLeo@a2gov.org>

Cc: Nelson, Elizabeth <ENelson@a2gov.org>

Subject: STR grandfathering taking housing stock and increasing the value of such homes

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing about the Public Hearing on 3/2/2021.

I am very concerned about the non owner occupied STR's being grandfathered as "non conforming" in residential zoned districts. When this was brought back to CPC for evaluation and grandfathering from City Council, it was stated that these homes would be turned back into housing stock when they sold, however at the last meeting it was stated that **the non conformity stays with the home, which will be an investors dream..... being able to "sell" the non conformity (business/ hotel) with the home, increasing the sales price and making Ann Arbor even less affordable.**

I request that you tell us at the meeting exactly how many of these homes (and bedrooms) in residential neighborhoods are registered March 1st. Is it 200? Is it 400? The public should know and know that these are coming off the housing market for home buyers and long term rentals in our city.

Can we make the non conformity attached to the owner and not the dwelling?? So that when it sells, it has to be turned back into a residential home?

Ironic that this discussion and PH is in the same meeting as we are trying to add housing options, like ADU's and TSD. Please, tell us straight out, we are losing this many homes in town.....200-400 (?) for mini hotels, not helping the 80,000 who want to live here now as neighbors.

Thank you,

Beth Collins

3404 Porter Rd

From: Caroline Elliott <clelliott444@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2021 11:50 AM
To: CityCouncil <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>; Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Subject: Rental ordinances

Hello members of the Planning Commission and City Council,

Last year, City Council passed one of the strongest short term rental ordinances in our nation. I was proud to be a resident of Ann Arbor, and proud that members of city government and staff would have the courage to confront profiteers and say that we will not have our housing stock snatched off the market and used to make a quick buck instead of provide a secure home. I was dismayed earlier this year when council passed a resolution to weaken that ordinance - when new council members made it loud and clear that they do not have that same courage.

And tonight I find myself dismayed yet again as I see that the Planning Commission - presumably with the support of council - is now pursuing amendments that would even further weaken the ordinance.

And in addition to my disappointment at how profoundly city officials have lost their courage in these last few months, I am also horrified by the anti-democratic ways that city government is pursuing to change legislation that recently passed our democratically elected City Council because it had the support of the people.

As a resident and voter in Ann Arbor, I demand that you cease immediately all amendments to the short-term rental ordinance and let us return to that fleeting moment when we were all residents of a city whose officials had the courage to proclaim that housing is for our people, not for profits.

Regards,

Caroline Lesemann-Elliott

--

Caroline Lesemann-Elliott

<https://carolinelesemannelliott.com/>

From: Susan Priller <susan.e.priller@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, March 01, 2021 5:20 PM

To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>

Cc: CityCouncil <CityCouncil@a2gov.org>; Taylor, Christopher (Mayor) <CTaylor@a2gov.org>

Subject: Please do not "grandfather" in existing short term rentals!

I am disturbed that the Planning Commission and City Council are meeting on Tuesday with the agenda item of grandfathering in existing short-term rentals (STRs), exempting them from the ordinance passed last summer.

That STR ordinance was one of the strongest in the country. I'm dismayed that the actions of City Council since then have been to chip away at the ordinance to satisfy the demands of landlords and STR property owners.

I've lived and/or worked in the city of Ann Arbor for 25+ years. The character of the city has changed dramatically since then -- in the wrong direction. I see increased gentrification. I see that the affordable housing market has shrunk. I see that the message the City is sending is that Ann Arbor is reserved for the owning class -- not the residents.

Frankly, the direction the City has been taking is appalling. They talk a lot about affordable housing, but appear to actually do little about it. It's been the same song and dance for years and it's making Ann Arbor more exclusionary and elitist (with the subtext of systemic racism).

Please reject grandfathering in the STRs. Ann Arbor should address the needs of the RESIDENTS, not the profiteers.

Susan E. Priller
Ward 5, Precinct 10

From: Scott Trudeau <scott.trudeau@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2021 12:25 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: Disch, Lisa <LDisch@a2gov.org>
Subject: Planning Commission ADU & STR recommendation comments

Hello Planning Commissioners!

Regarding ADU Ordinance Recommendations

I am writing to thank you for considering removing the owner-occupancy requirement for ADUs. In addition to the cities that staff has identified as not having an owner-occupancy requirement, another point of reference is the AARP's Livable Communities Model ADU ordinance.

<https://www.aarp.org/livable-communities/housing/info-2021/adu-model-state-act-and-local-ordinance.html>

The AARP recently updated this model ADU ordinance and identified a number of "poison pill" attributes of ADU ordinances that undermine their positive effects. The "poison pills" they highlight are:

- Owner occupancy requirements
- Parking requirements
- Conditional use permit review procedures and standards
- Discretionary standards related to design or "neighborhood character"

By eliminating (the already nearly moot) parking requirement and owner-occupancy requirement in our own ordinance, we would come into alignment with this recommendation. I enthusiastically support all of the other recommendations in the resolution.

Regarding STR Ordinance Recommendations

While I was not in favor of the specific current STR ordinance, I support the recommendation to allow current Non-principle Residence STR ("NPRSTR") operators in zones where NPRSTRs are banned to be granted non-conforming status. I hope this forestalls lawsuits that could be costly and risk undermining the broader STR regulation via court ruling.

My one concern, which is not spelled out in the proposed ordinance language, is the criteria the City will use to determine whether a property was operating as an NPRSTR prior to the specified date. **One criterion I strongly recommend to qualify for nonconforming status: for the period the STR was in operation, it was legally registered and inspected as a rental property.** This will filter out operators who were already operating outside our rental housing regulations while holding the door open for operators who were operating in good faith and in accordance with our pre-existing rules. This may not need to be spelled out in the ordinance language, but I do hope it is a firm policy of the City review process.

For the future: Consider allowing ADUs as STRs on owner-occupied properties

For future consideration, now that we are regulating STRs as a specific use, I hope we reconsider allowing ADUs to operate as STRs when the property is owner-occupied in residential zones. This is one case where I believe an owner-occupancy requirement makes sense because the tenants are short-term. Given that ADUs are classified and regulated as accessory uses, an ADU STR could reasonably be treated as a principal-residence STR and not an NPRSTR.

Thank you,

Scott Trudeau

Extremely non-conforming R4C homeowner Ward 1 resident