

**ADDITIONAL
CITIZEN TESTIMONY
SUBMITTED FOR
MARCH 13, 2024
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

(Received as of 12 p.m. on 03/12/2024)

This page intentionally left blank

-----Original Message-----

From: Teresa Larsen <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 5:48 PM

To: City Hall <cityhall@corb.us>

Subject: STR caps

Hello,

I support the cap on short term rentals. I would suggest a percentage cap so it can fluctuate with growth.

Thank you!

Teresa Larsen

Larsen Properties, LLC
[REDACTED]

From: Gary Elbow <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 5:28 PM

To: City Hall <cityhall@corb.us>

Subject: Short term rental limits

My home has been licensed for many years, so adding a limit, presumably, would not affect me directly. However, thinking more about the general impact, it seems to me that whatever benefit might accrue to the city would be quite small compared to the loss of potential income for property owners who hope to offer their home as a vacation rental.

Gary Elbow

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

From: Daniel Howlett <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 11:13 AM
To: Mary McGinnis; Charles McNeilly; Kristine Hayes; Alesia Franken; Penny Cheek; Tom Martine; Luke Shepard; Melissa Thompson
Subject: Public Testimony for the March council meeting

Please add this to the public testimony for the Wednesday council meeting:

STR Considerations Not Considered

While I was happy to hear that the council was taking action to regulate the STR market, it seems like the current ordinance is short sighted, unfair to locals, and has sparked a proliferation of STR license applications. When the STR cap conversation began in January 2024, there were 455 STR licenses representing 21.6% of the housing stock. As of March 10th, 2024 there are 508 licenses or 24.1%, with more in the pipeline.

The STR cap could have been evaluated by zone, allowing different rules for different neighborhoods. For example, a higher concentration of STRs could have been allowed west of Hwy 101 while protecting other more residential neighborhoods inland. None of this was considered.

The amendment that allows existing license holders unlimited transferability of their licenses will prove to be detrimental for locals. A more fair approach would have been to allow a one time only transferability of the STR license. Under the proposed system, existing residents who may have wanted to rent out their homes as STRs in the future will most likely be waiting for years on the waiting list. The natural attrition of license turnover after sales would have at least allowed locals the chance to move up on the waitlist to eventually get licensed. Without any changes to the existing proposal, real estate values for STR licensed homes will eclipse those of non licensed homes, creating inequity in the community for decades. Some homeowners might procure the STR license simply to protect their resale value. It's no wonder there has been a run on STR licenses.

Sadly, an ordinance originally conceived to protect the community from the proliferation of STRs has created even more STRs, and granted them forever licenses. Current STR homeowners will be reluctant to ever let go of their licenses while locals will be stuck on the sidelines losing out on future short term rental income as their property values decline. When they go to sell one day, non STR licensed homes will take longer to sell and sell for less. Perhaps it would have been better to leave the STR market unregulated.

Daniel Howlett