

Adam Zack

From: Kate Kimball <katekimball@peak.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 1:26 PM
To: Vacation Rental Comments
Subject: Re-sending comments re vacation rentals

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.

[I sent these yesterday but don't see them listed so am re-sending.]

Dear Planning Commissioners and Council Members:

Thank you for taking the time to consider this comment. It is important to me as there is a quite active vacation rental in my neighborhood and I feel the impacts daily. (This is no criticism of the individuals but of their impacts.)

1. Compliance Required

I do not understand why permit holders who are out of compliance are continued to allowed to operate their vacation rental — or why such a permit would be counted in the inventory. To do so creates an incentive to ignore requirements and fails to acknowledge that such permits are a business licenses that, like all such licenses, are foregone when the license holders no longer meets the requirements. A cap on vacation rental permits should be based only on those permits that are active and in compliance. To do otherwise rewards noncompliance of vacation rental permit holders while imposing the costs of that noncompliance on the neighborhood.

2. Vacation Rental Permits Do Not Transfer with Sale of Property

Vacation rental permits are a temporary business license that the landowner must apply to receive. There is no reason for them to transfer upon sale because the property doesn't hold the license, the landowner does. Vacation rental permits require action by the landowner. It makes little sense to assume a purchaser's compliance or action. If I buy a building that housed a restaurant, there is rightly no assumption that I have complied with all applicable requirements when I open my restaurant in that building. The same principle should apply to vacation rental permits.

3. Vacation Rentals Only for Owners on Site

Salt Spring Island in British Columbia, which faces challenges similar to ours, allows vacation rentals ("seasonal cottages" only as part of a home-based business. Under their rules, a remote landowner could not operate a seasonal cottage (equivalent to our vacation rental). This has the benefit of limiting adverse impacts from vacation rentals because the landowner is on-site and also experiencing those impacts. (https://islandstrust.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2001/06/SS-BL-355_LUB_2021-05_update.pdf and a page with some overview information and links presented by one individual, necessarily with his/her own point of view: <http://ssi-stvr-facts.com>)

I appreciate the time you are taking on this issue. The future of our islands depends on the work you do. With all the uncertainty around us, now is the time to help us protect what makes the islands in this county so special.

Thank you.

Kate Kimball
Olga, WA
360-376-8828