

From: Ralph McKee <rmckee2258@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2021 12:42 PM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: Ramlawi, Ali <ARamlawi@a2gov.org>; Briggs, Erica <EBriggs@a2gov.org>
Subject: ADUs/STRs

The public engagement process thus far on ADUs, while showing some promise, is flawed. The proposed ADU ordinance revision would effectively eliminate SFZ city-wide and thus would seem an obvious candidate for actual notice to all affected property owners. At least 3 public comments have been made advocating that. Yet staff has steadfastly, just like in 2019, refused to seriously consider that, and that concern doesn't even appear in the staff memo for the ORC meeting which purports to consider the public input received.

Also, I have said at prior CPC meetings on this topic (and sent emails to staff) that I generally support the expansion of ADUs into more areas but would like to see an amendment moving any new structures a bit farther from the lot line. I recall another public comment to that effect by someone else at an earlier meeting. That concern does not appear in the memo either. It's obviously inappropriate to limit consideration of public input to only some of the concerns expressed.

The staff memo says the policy issues arising from the 2/9 meeting were deed restrictions and the owner occupancy requirement, and this issue was discussed in some depth at the ORC meeting. The primary justification for eliminating the owner requirement appears to be the perception that banks will not loan for construction of ADUs if that requirement is in place. But as yet no support for that perception has been provided by 1) the public commenters who took that position, 2) staff, or 3) any CPC member. In fact, it doesn't appear that anyone supporting that position has had any actual conversations with local banks or other financing sources. And absent support for that position, there is simply no basis for elimination of the owner requirement.

Tom Stulberg, who as you know is active on this topic, has discussed the bank financing issue with a local bank which makes residential real estate loans. That banker advised Tom that an owner occupancy requirement was not a problem re financing; there of course may be other financing issues, but, again, absent actual evidence that the owner requirement is problematic, there is no basis for eliminating it.

And if banks are indeed reluctant to finance "regular folks" who want to build an ADU, the only entities who will benefit from removing the owner requirement are investors with cash or loan availability based on other collateral who want to buy up modest houses, build a second house on the lot, and rent both. Given current construction costs and investor profit motive, these will not be "affordable" units. So eliminating the owner requirement will likely result in decreasing the number of modest houses in the sale market and adding only expensive rental units.

To sum up, if we want to increase the number of ADUs which will help homeowners, we should research alternative financing sources in a serious way; that work clearly hasn't been done yet.

Another issue which was raised is the juxtaposition of ADUs with STRs. That involves some technical/legal issues with various definitions; should they be in Chapter 97 and/or the UDC, etc. Those are beyond the scope of this short memo but need to be addressed. My overriding concern is that the clear intent of council was to eliminate or, at a minimum, cap the number of STRs in residential areas. To allow ADU STRs as a potential loophole would be a mistake.

Also, the STR ordinance amendment should be delayed until the data comes in from the STR owners who seek to be "grandfathered in". That will be available March 31. Knowing how many there are (is it 100?, 500?) is critical to the decision making process.

Thanks for your consideration.

From: Stuart Baggaley <sjbaggaley@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Planning <Planning@a2gov.org>
Cc: john cederquist <john_cederquist@comcast.net>; OHMHA, Board <ohmha.board@gmail.com>
Subject: Opposing Short Term Rental as it stands

Hi Mr. Lenart,

The postcards sent by the City to landlords were received on March 1. That is not much time for the March 2 Planning Commission meeting. I'll try to respond.

As a landlord in the traditional sense and a block captain with the A2PD, I strongly suggest that the short term rental clause be carefully reviewed and changed.

As a landlord, I know that rental houses are regularly inspected (every two years) by the City inspectors for the safety of the tenants. I have engaged real estate agents to check the credits of potential tenants. When new tenants move in, I inform the neighbors as to who is going to live next door to ensure everyone feels safe and comfortable about the new tenants.

If the short term rental regulations (STR) are accepted as they stand now, the security of the neighborhoods will be impacted negatively. If the STR will allow tenants to stay as short as one day, the rental houses are essentially hotels. Even hotels have better regulations. Hotels know who their guests are, where they live, and what their credit card is. When they arrive, they have to register at the hotel desk. Will STR rental houses have all these rules? The setup as it is proposed is ripe for sex trafficking and prostitution. Is that what the City is inviting?

In its effort to promote affordable housing, STR housing is not catering to low income residents. All the City is doing is to invite unknown people to come in the City to do whatever for one day and disappear. Please think carefully.

Amy Seetoo