

Public Input

Row 7

Name	Robin Hochtritt
Email	robin.hochtritt@gmail.com
Form Date Field	06/23/21
Topic	Agenda Item
Comments	<p>How many short-term vacation rentals (STRs) operate in Lincoln County? Too many. According to Lincoln County, there are 2,155 short-term vacation rentals (STRs or (VRDs) licensed in the cities and unincorporated County. Lincoln County Housing Strategy Plan Report (June 21, 2019). I attached the page from this Report. Assuming an average of 6 people maximum occupancy for a three-bedroom STR (which is less than the current licensed occupancy of 11 in unincorporated Lincoln County), the 50,000 Permanent Residents of Lincoln County accommodate 12,930 overnight renters daily, almost a quarter of our total population. That's a lot of extra people during fire season. Local print and online media have published letters about fire danger, precisely due to fireworks. In addition, all recent letter writers have reported watching vacation renters set them off. In a recent letter, Bayshore HOA neighbors reported occupants coming in and out of an STR, setting off fireworks in the beach grass. The Sheriff doesn't respond because it is not within his jurisdiction. Bayshore is in unincorporated Lincoln County, and short-term renters cause the fireworks. Whose jurisdiction is it? Commissioners, please tell them. On June 18, the NewsTimes reported on the first of seven wildfire prevention public meetings held by the County's Emergency Management, the County's Fire Defense Board, the local fire district Chiefs, and the Oregon Department of Forestry held the first of seven wildfire prevention public meetings. The objective: "To strengthen the [Permanent Residents'] knowledge of local wildfire risks and to educate them on their role in wildfire preparedness, response, and recovery." Question 1: Who educates the short-term vacation renters about their role in "wildfire preparedness, response, and recovery"? These officials continued, reminding [Permanent Residents] to "have an evacuation plan in place." Question 2: Are the 2,155 STRs provided with an evacuation plan? Or told to plan for potential evacuation? "It really becomes a life-safety hazard if we have to go around and spend more time dealing with evacuations than we are with firefighting ... we're really looking for cooperation from the public [or Permanent Residents?]." Question 3: Why doesn't the STR Industry tell us how much extra it contributes to the Fire Districts to fight fires and safely evacuate their clients? [Rhetorical] Question 4: Do the out-of-town Owner/Investors and the Property Managers expect the [Permanent Residents] to evacuate their unwitting clients? In my neighborhoods, my priorities are ensuring that my family and friends will not overburden the Districts' resources. My neighbors and I, most of whom are disabled or elderly retirees, wish we could be of more help, but the County should not count on us. See attached file for complete Comment and Attachment.</p>
Meeting Date	06/28/21

Subject Drought, fire, and STR planning

How many short-term vacation rentals (STRs) operate in Lincoln County?

Too many.

According to Lincoln County, there are 2,155 short-term vacation rentals (STRs or (VRDs) licensed in the cities and unincorporated County. *Lincoln County Housing Strategy Plan Report* (June 21, 2019). I attached the page from this Report.

Assuming an average of 6 people maximum occupancy for a three-bedroom STR (which is less than the current licensed occupancy of 11 in unincorporated Lincoln County), the 50,000 Permanent Residents of Lincoln County accommodate 12,930 overnight renters daily, almost a quarter of our total population.

That's a lot of extra people during fire season.

Local print and online media have published letters about fire danger, precisely due to fireworks. In addition, all recent letter writers have reported watching vacation renters set them off.

In a recent letter, Bayshore HOA neighbors reported occupants coming in and out of a STR, setting off fireworks in the beach grass. The Sheriff doesn't respond because it is not within his jurisdiction. Bayshore is in unincorporated Lincoln County, and short-term renters cause the fireworks. Whose jurisdiction is it? **Commissioners, please tell them.**

On June 18, the NewsTimes reported on the first of seven wildfire prevention public meetings held by the County's Emergency Management, the County's Fire Defense Board, the local fire district Chiefs, and the Oregon Department of Forestry held the first of seven wildfire prevention public meetings. The objective: "To strengthen the [Permanent Residents'] knowledge of local wildfire risks and to educate them on their role in wildfire preparedness, response, and recovery."

Question 1: Who educates the short-term vacation renters about their role in "wildfire preparedness, response, and recovery"?

These officials continued, reminding [Permanent Residents] to "have an evacuation plan in place."

Question 2: Are the 2,155 STRs provided with an evacuation plan? Or told to plan for potential evacuation?

"It really becomes a life-safety hazard if we have to go around and spend more time dealing with evacuations than we are with firefighting ... we're really looking for cooperation from the public [or Permanent Residents?]."

Question 3: Why doesn't the STR Industry tell us how much extra it contributes to the Fire Districts to fight fires and safely evacuate their clients?

[Rhetorical] Question 4: Do the out-of-town Owner/Investors and the Property Managers expect the [Permanent Residents] to evacuate their unwitting clients? In my neighborhoods, my priorities are ensuring that my family and friends will not overburden the Districts' resources. My neighbors and I, most of whom are disabled or elderly retirees, wish we could be of more help, but the County should not count on us.

The County's apparent ignorance about the impacts of STRs and its expectations of mostly small rural communities are among the reasons I gratefully signed the 15neighborhoods Petition.

What I don't understand is this: The Industry's focus is entirely on economic impacts which can be refuted, if the County chose to do so. For instance,

1. **Local Economic impacts:** Low paying hospitality jobs v. decent, available, and affordable housing with the potential for better paying jobs),

2. **Local Wealth Accumulation impacts:** Middle class wealth resides in our homes. The competition over 1% available housing stock has prevented us from acquiring wealth (from our home equity) because we can't afford it. This fuels Speculators and Corporate Investors buying as much coastal property as they can, which they are.

There are many realtors who are permanent residents and who worry about STRs.

1. Emerald Realty agent(s) referred to unincorporated County as the wild west.

2. Coldwell Banker agent(s) report that their clients' instructions are to buy certain investment properties (view, frontage, lots) at any price. One example I remember is that the client instructed the agent to "pay any price" to acquire several investment properties.

3. Some realtors and property managers have criticized the County for not taking action as soon as it realized there was a problem ... or would be a problem once the cities began imposing caps.

4. All I have spoken to, every single one, reported that more Investors or Investors' Agents contact them for investment property than people just looking to purchase a primary or a vacation home.

Why don't the Commissioners just (1) stop issuing STR licenses in Residential Zones (or residential subdivisions, if you prefer) and (2) adopt a phase-out of STRs from said areas?

Why does the Board of Commissioners expect the County's permanent residents to spend hundreds, if not thousands, of hours and spend thousands, if not tens of thousands of dollars in personal funds to, in essence, do the Commissioners' work?

Commissioners, if you have even the teeniest doubt whether short-term vacation rentals adversely affect your constituents and our progeny, please ask yourselves: "In either the near or long term, will Lincoln County residents benefit more from (1) decent housing that working

people can afford or (2) neighborhoods turned into resorts that are owned by out-of-town Investors lining every one of our rivers and the entire 54 mile coastline?”

The County has a responsibility to permanent residents, registered voters or not. Restricting STRs is a legitimate governmental interest. In 1995, the Oregon Supreme Court in *Cope v Canon Beach* upheld Canon Beach’s decision to restrict STRs because in so doing the government was “securing affordable housing for permanent residents” and “preserving the character and integrity of residential neighborhoods,” finding both to be legitimate governmental interests.

There is no property right to rent short-term. Because the owners have real property to sell or rent long-term, the owners retain the economically viable use of their properties. That’s all the law and common sense requires.

Public Input

Row 6

Name	Bernadette Williams
Email	bwnj2or@peak.org
Form Date Field	06/24/21
Topic	Non-Agenda Item
Comments	<p>Dear Commissioners, Thousands of people will be flocking to the coast to escape the heat this weekend as well as during the July 4th holiday weekend. The HOA board of directors for Bayshore, where I live, have decided to ban ALL fireworks in Bayshore (including sparklers, spinners, etc.). We are in agreement with the city of Waldport regarding this matter. I doubt that vacationers will abide by the rule and just hope we don't experience any fires along the beach or within communities. Given the current drought conditions in the state, is it reasonable for the Commissioners to consider restricting occupancy of STRs (e.g. temporary ban) if or when Lincoln county is under severe water restriction? Wouldn't a temporary ban on rentals be advisable to help ease the burden on our already stressed water supply? Please consider this option to better serve Lincoln county residents, businesses and services, especially the fire departments. Thank you, Bernadette Williams</p>
Meeting Date	06/28/21
Subject	Water restrictions and STRs

Public Input

Row 5

Name	Heidi
Email	Heidirholmes@yahoo.com
Form Date Field	06/26/21
Topic	Agenda Item
Comments	<p>STR's- The very few situations that occur each year only need to be handled with law enforcement. Add more officers as that is the ONLY thing needed for Lincoln County. OPEN Licensing Back up as this is beyond ridiculous. Commissioners: You are hurting your own County!</p> <p>NANTUCKET, Mass. (AP) — Nantucket voters on Saturday rejected a proposal to limit short term rentals on the famous vacation island, opponents of the measure said. The Alliance to Protect Nantucket's Economy said the measure was defeated on a vote of 625 to 297 at Nantucket's annual town meeting, held outside the island's elementary school. ACK NOW, the group that proposed the limits, didn't respond to an email seeking comment. The group sought to prevent property owners that don't live on the island year-round from renting their homes for more than 45 nights a year, The Boston Globe reports. The proposal would have also made the minimum stay for a short-term rental on the island at least 7 consecutive days and limited the rentals to two people per bedroom and only one car, according to WBZ ACK NOW argued that the proliferation of short-term rentals limits the amount of affordable housing available on the tiny island off Cape Cod favored by wealthy vacationers. Opponents, including property owners, business owners and real estate professionals, touted a UMass study suggesting limits on short-term rentals would lead to more than 100,000 fewer visitors a year and millions of dollars in lost wages and tax revenue for the island of some 11,000 year-round residents Another city with the same situation... David and Peg Schroeder, who filed a lawsuit against Wilmington's ordinance imposing a 2% overall cap on vacation rental properties and requiring a 400-foot separation between vacation rentals. INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE NOAH JOHNSON WILMINGTON STARNEWS 2:27 pm EDT September 16, 2020 North Carolina Superior Court Judge Richard K. Harrel has ruled that Wilmington's vacation rental law is illegal. While state law says no local government may adopt or enforce a law requiring rental property owners to register property with the local government, Wilmington adopted a new city code on Feb. 5 2019 that requires property owners to register each establishment annually with the city, according to a court ruling. As part of the registration process, the city also required property owners to enter into a lottery that raffled off the owner's right to rent, according to a press release from Institute for Justice, a nonprofit public interest law firm. The lottery was based on a cap on how many properties were allowed to be vacation rentals in the city in addition to a requirement of a 400-foot separation between vacation rentals. Those who lost the lottery would have one year to continue operating, but at the end of that time, they'd have to relinquish their renting rights. "Today's decision marks an important victory for property owners and property rights in North Carolina," said Ari Bargil, an attorney at the Institute for Justice (IJ), who represented the defendants in the case. "The decision</p>

makes it crystal clear that North Carolina cities cannot impose unnecessary permitting or registration requirements on vacation rentals.” In August, IJ took on the case of David and Peg Schroeder, lifetime Wilmington residents, who filed a lawsuit after losing the city's lottery. Before the lottery, the Schroeder's bought a townhome in Wilmington they planned to offer as a vacation rental, spending about \$75,000 on renovation costs. The decision means they will be able to keep the property they purchased. “What a relief,” David Schroeder is quoted as saying in the release. “We bought our home with the intent of occasionally renting it. When we lost the lottery, our only remaining options were to sell our home or file a lawsuit. We sued because we knew that Wilmington’s law was clearly illegal.”

Meeting Date 06/28/21

Subject STR’s- Open things back up!

Public Input

Row 4

Name	Heidi
Email	Heidirholmes@yahoo.com
Form Date Field	06/26/21
Topic	Agenda Item
Comments	<p>STR's- The very few situations that occur each year only need to be handled with law enforcement. Add more officers as that is the ONLY thing needed for Lincoln County. OPEN Licensing Back up as this is beyond ridiculous. Commissioners: You are hurting your own County!</p> <p>NANTUCKET, Mass. (AP) — Nantucket voters on Saturday rejected a proposal to limit short term rentals on the famous vacation island, opponents of the measure said. The Alliance to Protect Nantucket's Economy said the measure was defeated on a vote of 625 to 297 at Nantucket's annual town meeting, held outside the island's elementary school. ACK NOW, the group that proposed the limits, didn't respond to an email seeking comment. The group sought to prevent property owners that don't live on the island year-round from renting their homes for more than 45 nights a year, The Boston Globe reports. The proposal would have also made the minimum stay for a short-term rental on the island at least 7 consecutive days and limited the rentals to two people per bedroom and only one car, according to WBZ ACK NOW argued that the proliferation of short-term rentals limits the amount of affordable housing available on the tiny island off Cape Cod favored by wealthy vacationers. Opponents, including property owners, business owners and real estate professionals, touted a UMass study suggesting limits on short-term rentals would lead to more than 100,000 fewer visitors a year and millions of dollars in lost wages and tax revenue for the island of some 11,000 year-round residents Another city with the same situation... David and Peg Schroeder, who filed a lawsuit against Wilmington's ordinance imposing a 2% overall cap on vacation rental properties and requiring a 400-foot separation between vacation rentals. INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE NOAH JOHNSON WILMINGTON STARNEWS 2:27 pm EDT September 16, 2020 North Carolina Superior Court Judge Richard K. Harrel has ruled that Wilmington's vacation rental law is illegal. While state law says no local government may adopt or enforce a law requiring rental property owners to register property with the local government, Wilmington adopted a new city code on Feb. 5 2019 that requires property owners to register each establishment annually with the city, according to a court ruling. As part of the registration process, the city also required property owners to enter into a lottery that raffled off the owner's right to rent, according to a press release from Institute for Justice, a nonprofit public interest law firm. The lottery was based on a cap on how many properties were allowed to be vacation rentals in the city in addition to a requirement of a 400-foot separation between vacation rentals. Those who lost the lottery would have one year to continue operating, but at the end of that time, they'd have to relinquish their renting rights. "Today's decision marks an important victory for property owners and property rights in North Carolina," said Ari Bargil, an attorney at the Institute for Justice (IJ), who represented the defendants in the case. "The decision</p>

makes it crystal clear that North Carolina cities cannot impose unnecessary permitting or registration requirements on vacation rentals.” In August, IJ took on the case of David and Peg Schroeder, lifetime Wilmington residents, who filed a lawsuit after losing the city's lottery. Before the lottery, the Schroeder's bought a townhome in Wilmington they planned to offer as a vacation rental, spending about \$75,000 on renovation costs. The decision means they will be able to keep the property they purchased. “What a relief,” David Schroeder is quoted as saying in the release. “We bought our home with the intent of occasionally renting it. When we lost the lottery, our only remaining options were to sell our home or file a lawsuit. We sued because we knew that Wilmington’s law was clearly illegal.”

Meeting Date	06/28/21
Subject	STR's- Open things back up!

Public Input

Row 2

Name	Julie Pearson
Email	jpearson1252@gmail.com
Form Date Field	06/28/21
Topic	Non-Agenda Item STR's
Comments	<p>Dear BOC, another article about rampant corporate greed in making every home a commodity instead of a home for families to live in, this one in Napa, CA' Pattie Dullea stepped out one morning last month in Napa, Calif., to have a word with the young man who pulled up in an antique sports car to tour the home across the street. "You might not want to buy there," she said she told the man, who was there to consider investing in the home. "We don't want our neighborhood to turn into a timeshare neighborhood. And we are going to do everything in our power to make that not happen." Such scenes are becoming more common in California wine-country towns where a real estate startup called Pacaso is snapping up million-dollar homes, then selling ownership shares to second-home searchers looking for weekend getaways. SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS What impact do you think real-estate startups are having on American neighborhoods? Join the conversation below. Pacaso, based in San Francisco, was co-founded by Zillow Group founder Spencer Rascoff, and it counts former Starbucks Corp. chief executive Howard Schultz among its earliest investors. The company claims to have reached unicorn status faster than any company in U.S. history, hitting a \$1 billion valuation within six months of launching last year. The Covid-19 pandemic was a boon for the business. Remote work inspired many to spend time away from cities, but rising home prices and a short supply of homes meant fewer people could afford to buy an entire second home of their own. Members of Rainier Alliance, a group of residents opposed to Pacaso, met June 10 at the home of Ms. Dullea, who wore sunglasses. The opposition to Pacaso in Napa is the latest attempt by homeowners to block real-estate companies from changing how homes in their neighborhoods are occupied or owned. Homeowners and local governments have for years fought the spread of short-term rentals made through platforms like Airbnb, and high demand during the pandemic for both vacation and primary residences has only intensified the conflicts. Real Estate From aspirational residences to major commercial deals. Austin Allison, Pacaso chief executive and a Napa resident, said the local unpleasantness was misplaced outrage about the larger shortage of affordable housing in California. The company's 14 homes in the region, which the company markets to up to eight partial owners each, are a drop in the bucket, he said. "This housing crisis is a big problem that's way bigger than Pacaso," he said. Homeowners in the Napa Valley say their quiet residential cul-de-sacs are on the brink of becoming high-traffic party zones and no longer affordable to local families. Anti-Pacaso signs dot property lines. Groups opposing its presence have organized in several towns: In Napa, there is Communities Against Timeshares (Cats); in Sonoma, Sonomans Together Opposing Pacaso (Stop) is active; and in St. Helena, Neighborhoods Opposing Pacaso Encroachment (Nope). A van bearing a sign opposed to Pacaso in Napa; 'No Timeshare' is</p>

lettered on the pavement. The opponents can count early victories. On Ms. Dullea's street in Napa, Pacaso said this month it would no longer market shares in the house it bought there. The company cited community feedback in its decision to sell the house, which it will sell to a single owner. To calm concerns about reducing the stock of relatively affordable housing, the company also agreed to only buy homes priced above \$2 million. And to help keep the peace, it has placed decibel limiters on stereo systems in its homes. Napa Valley's resistance could become a roadblock for Pacaso's model, which relies on offering luxury-home stays inside traditional residential neighborhoods and away from typical vacation zones. The company so far has launched in 20 U.S. markets and has plans to expand to Europe.

Meeting Date 06/28/21

Subject STR's
