

Adam Zack

From: David Turnoy <davidgeri@rockisland.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 4:52 PM
To: Vacation Rental Comments; Sheila Gaquin; Lynda Guernsey
Subject: Vacation Rental comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I know that the Planning Commission will be discussing vacation rentals (VRs) this Friday, so I want to submit a comment. I testified at the county council hearing the other day in favor of extending the moratorium, and in that testimony I made a few key points that I would like to mention here.

First, I don't understand the reason that rural residential is being kept out of the moratorium. That is where much of the VR growth has been taking place, and in the two months since my rural residential development, Orcas Highlands, has been removed, we have two new VR applications. No good reason was given by the council for this, and I would like to ask the PC to advocate that the moratorium be restored to be fully countywide and covering all areas.

The second point I made is that while VR owners who live on the premises and rent out either a room or an ADU as a VR tend to have better behaved tenants, the problems arise from VRs where there is no owner or manager on the premises. These tend to be the whole houses rented out as VRs, and quite often these are owned by out-of-county interests who are using this opportunity to make money, while the consequence for locals is the destruction of neighborhoods. I would like to see out-of-county ownership of VRs no longer allowed, and if possible, I would like to see all VRs have the owner on the premises. This will help cut down the nuisance problems.

Caps per island has been the methodology that the county is studying, but this won't necessarily solve the nuisance problems as much as requiring that owners be on the premises. In addition, a minimum lot size might be considered, as greater distance between homes will mitigate some of the noise problems. My understanding is that Santa Barbara now has a minimum VR lot size of 40 acres. We could have the rule be that a 40 acre minimum (or other suitable figure) be required unless the owner or a long-term lessee is on the premises.

While designating caps can be part of the solution of controlling the rapid proliferation of VRs, minimum lot size and having the owner on the premises are perhaps even more important.

Thank you,
David Turnoy