

From: [Sharon Marble](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Citizen Communication - Short-term rentals
Date: Monday, April 10, 2023 10:40:52 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

You don't often get email from sharonmarble@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Comments for the April 11, Public Hearing from Sharon & Robert Marble – 721 NE Pinebrook Avenue
360-448-1991, sharonmarble@comcast.net

Living in a unique wooded 52-acre residential HOA, we find it very unsettling that we have three Airbnbs in our midst. They do not fit the cohesiveness of our neighborhood. The visitors do not know the boundaries/rules of the HOA. They are strangers in our midst.

There is added traffic and noise at odd hours, searching for the Airbnbs, with guests moving in and out with their luggage, slamming car doors etc. Some of the visitors seem to be oblivious to the fact that they are in a residential neighborhood and that quiet hours are 10:00 pm to 8 am.

Summer appears to be the worst for large noisy gatherings and unruly visitors. Parking is at a premium on the narrow streets and at times a hinderance to emergency vehicles. We have an aged community and firetrucks and ambulances need access.

We are glad to see that it appears the City is finally going to have Regulations and fees regarding Short-Term Rentals. Thank you. Not everyone is going to be happy with the end results.

We feel short-term rentals devalue the neighboring homes. Residential neighborhoods zoned as such should remain residential.

From: [Wes](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Planning Commission 4/11/23 Public Hearing: Short Term Rental Comments
Date: Tuesday, April 11, 2023 9:51:20 AM

You don't often get email from cartwrightwes@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello and thank you for your time,

While I have attended past hearings to make comments in person related to Short Term Rentals in Vancouver, I am unable to attend today due to work conflicts. I would greatly appreciate your attention to the concerns below that my wife and I have, thank you:

My name is Wes, my wife and son and I have lived in Vancouver and owned a home since 2009. We had never complained to the city in our lives, nor commented in a public forum, until a short-term rental opened up next door. Our experience with and concern over STR's have prompted us to put together comments for this forum, and for each STR planning meeting in this process.

Our only home, that we have been working decades to pay for, is in a residentially zoned neighborhood where families and children live and play. Recently, the home next door to us began operating as an illegal short-term rental. We have had to file a complaint to the city about guest behavior. Our home is now worth less if we choose to sell, as no-one wants to live next to an STR, not even STR owners.

Another has begun operating up the street, prompting further complaints to the city from other neighbors, one has indeed moved away. There are now 2 STRs in a ten house stretch on our street, and that's while STR's are still illegal under the current code.

Reading this commission's materials and current status, it seems the majority of communication and input through this process has been focused on STR owners/operators themselves - **those who stand to profit** - or a survey of the general public, the vast majority of whom do not live near an STR. This commission should focus on input from those who are directly experiencing the negative impacts that STR's have on a neighborhood. These insights can and should serve as a warning.

Existing code requiring an on-site owner was created for valid reasons. It has always ensured that homes and homeowners, and the qualities that make Vancouver's neighborhoods great, are protected. It has also helped ensure that Vancouver's neighborhoods have available home supply that families can rent or buy if they choose to reside here. **THOSE REASONS STILL EXIST.**

Given the nightly rates STR's can charge, and the lack of leases & resident protections, they are **much** more lucrative and profitable than renting long-term to families, or even selling a home.

Our major concern is that if current existing code requiring owner/operators to reside on-site is not fully enforced, or, even worse done away with, then commercialized chain STR businesses will grow exponentially in Vancouver's great residential neighborhoods.

This will lead to a decrease in the quality of life in our neighborhoods, it has already done so in ours. Families and children will live and play next to rotating groups of strange visitors with no vested interest in the community.

Available housing supply will drop as existing STR owners open the max number allowed, and new STR owners begin their own new commercialized chain businesses. Affordability of remaining homes on the market will suffer. Sky-high rents will increase further as supply drops. Local hospitality businesses and their employees will be undercut by STR's that employ no-one and do not contribute the proper taxes that help support the communities they are exploiting.

The commission's survey and study numbers and data regarding existing STR's only captures the present status, those operating while still illegal under code. But today is only the tip of the iceberg. Please make plans and draft regulations accordingly. Please keep the requirement of owner-operators on-site in these new regulations, for the exact same reasons that requirement was already on the books. Do not let large tech corporations and illegal businesses convince you that their profit is more important than our community. Do not change a code that is meant to protect Vancouver's neighborhoods and homeowners. Thank you.

Wes & Meladie Cartwright



Chair, Marjorie Ledell, Chair
Commissioner, Steve Schulte
Commissioner, Larry Blaufus
Commissioner, Zachary Pyle, Vice Chair
Commissioner, Nena Cavel
Commissioner, Patrick Adigweme
Commissioner, Melissa von Borstel

Concerning Short Term Rental Policy in the City of Vancouver:

Dear, Chair Ledell & Fellow Commissioners

The City of Vancouver stands to benefit from the current direction staff and the commission has taken in the draft code and regulations in front of you. Short term rentals provide a unique and, in some cases, necessary option, for those choosing to stay in the City of Vancouver. Guests with groups, families, travel nurses, contract workers both blue and white collar, prospective residents, and a multitude of other reasons constitute why people choose to lodge in short term rentals. Short term rentals benefit the local economy and tourism, providing lodging options in various parts of the city. 91% of short-term rental operators in the city operate 1-2 properties. This alludes to the fact that many of these operators are residents, some of which staff and others have already heard from. These operators inevitably invest back into our community. Also, keep in mind that 87% of short-term rental listings in the City of Vancouver lease the entire home. Consumers desire the privacy and comfort level of short-term rentals, something that some other lodging options cannot provide.

Operators want to come into compliance and be treated just like other lodging options. Operators will need a valid permit tied to the property, proof of liability insurance, provide

notice to neighbors, all necessary licenses, and the city will capture the 4% Washington State lodging tax. The tax revenue collected will go back into promoting tourism within the City of Vancouver.

We commend the work both the commission and staff have contributed. Under the current proposal, the City of Vancouver will be able to benefit from the unique spaces, guests, and operators that contribute to the vibrant fabric of our community, while at the same time, providing the means for neighbors to be involved as stakeholders to identify and stop bad actors. It is important to note that this won't be the final touch point on this topic moving forward. As mentioned by staff, these policies before you are the first step, and in 24 months both this commission and council will have another opportunity to review and potentially modify policy, if deemed necessary.

Our members facilitate the dream of homeownership throughout Clark County and Southwest Washington. Homeownership is one of, if not the best, way to build generational wealth. Short term rentals represent another avenue for families and homeowners invested in our community to build generational wealth by providing unique spaces for those visiting our vibrant and thriving city!

Sincerely,

Justin Wood

Government Affairs Director
Clark County Association of Realtors®



From: aateppo@icloud.com
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Short term rentals
Date: Tuesday, April 11, 2023 3:24:33 PM

You don't often get email from aateppo@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I am in support of as I have now been operating one for 15 months.

I just listened to the April 3rd planning commission meeting and even though this is not in by the dead line I would still like to make a couple of points.

1. We are not going to solve the housing crisis on the backs of STRs. STRs are 300 or 86,000 housing units! The council has pointed out this is only 0.4% of the total market. Even if every single STR went for sale or converted to an LTR **the numbers just do not support any appreciable difference in rental affordability** in any reasonable mathematical calculation. Do the math, average rent in Vancouver is \$1,710 per month adding the STRs to the market at 0.4% at the most may result in the average coming to \$1,703 based on increased supply. If you want more affordable housing change zoning and permits and making it easier for developers to build units.

2. Mayor McEnerny-Ogle says she wants more restrictions! and that there are plenty of hotels to handle the tourists in town. She may be a bit out of touch as most families coming to town cannot afford to rent 3 or 4 hotel rooms to accommodate their needs. Families who come to visit Vancouver want a place they can all be together to sleep and eat meals and that they can afford. Almost all of the families that utilize my STR are groups of 6 to 8 and they are here to see extended family for things like weddings, graduations, baptisms, reunions, or holidays. They are not "tourists." What about the people who already live in Vancouver who like to have their friends and relatives come to town for family reunions, weddings, graduations etc? When my daughter was married I was glad that there were STRs operating because the traditional hotel simple does not offer the same type of accommodations as a nice single house STR. Livability of an area goes both ways. STRs not only allow visitors to come experience the area but also makes it conducive for families already living here to have affordable accommodations to come and visit. How about some balance for the people who already live here. STRs are not an impending blight on this community.

3. Mayor McEnerny-Ogle also said that the STRs could be LTRs. Does she forget that Rent increases were frozen during the Eviction Moratorium, effective February 29, 2020 to June 30, 2021??? When the government makes edicts like this no wonder there are housing shortages. As a mom and pop operation I couldn't have survived that if my LTR decided not to pay rent during an eviction moratorium. STRs are well taken care of. They have to be well maintained because no one will rent them. I can go through the neighborhoods and easily spot LTRs that have garbage and hoarding and pet problems.

4. Ty Stober preposed an extra tax on STRs!!! Are you kidding me? Why? Just to spite STRs? It makes no sense. STRs should pay the going occupancy taxes,,,,, but pay more??? What is he trying to fix? STRs are mostly mom and pops here who want to have some flexibility to use

their property for family and friends at times as well as to be able to pay for the expensive and always rising property taxes here.

5. Proposals made to the planning commission seem reasonable about occupancy taxes, notifying neighbors, getting a business license, being a good neighbor etc. There is no need to be heavy handed here as this only seems to be a thing of “we should be regulating this” not necessarily because it’s a problem.

6. Finally property rights. I have stated before. I have owned my second house for 15 years. My mom lived there for about 11 of those until she passed. Then some of my children have lived there off and on since. I’ve had a place for friends to come and stay. Now I STR because I still want to have it for family occasions and still be able to pay for the expenses of the property. As long as it is not creating a nuisance in the neighborhood I don’t see a problem. I don’t why the city council feels they have a right to place onerous restrictions on me forcing me to either LTR or sell. **Zero point four percent !!!! Not 10% not 15% not 20% but 0.4% is what we are talking about here.**

Thank you

Cordially

Arnie Teppo