

Bob Berman
180 NW 73rd Court
Newport, OR 97365
541-265-7736 CindyAndBob@earthlink.net

To: Vacation Rental Ad-Hoc Committee,

Re: Topics for May 2 meeting

A few thoughts on today's topics:

Density Limitations

Some sort of limitations on density are definitely called for. As others have pointed out, there are now residences completely surrounded by VR dwellings.

I would support proximity limits to directly address this issue in the future. By forcing separation, VRDs could no longer dominate a neighborhood. I think 500-1,000 feet would be appropriate. Any new code could be structured to address the condominium issue.

Ownership limits would probably be ineffective because it is very easy to title properties such that a single owner does not show up on multiple properties (family members, LLCs, etc.).

I believe these limits should not apply to any VRs where the owner is always present such as B&Bs and homeshares.

Tenancy Limitations

Speaking from experience, such limits are practically unenforceable.

Prior to the 2012 ordinance, there were tenancy limits on short-term rentals. In our neighborhood, we had (and still have) a problem rental. We complained to the city and were told to document excess tenancy. For THREE YEARS, we documented that this rental was occupied over 30 times per year (the limit at the time was 10 times per year).

We submitted all of our documentation (dates, number of vehicles, license plate numbers) to the city expecting that the ordinance would finally be enforced. But the response from the city was that we had insufficient evidence of a violation and they refused to do anything. I believe that this instance was part of the reason that the revision to the ordinance was initiated.

This possibly could work if 1) all occupancies of the home (except for the owner) were counted, including "friends, relatives, and business associates", and 2) the city specified what would be acceptable evidence for the neighbors to gather.

Homeshares

I think homeshares are more akin to B&Bs than to classic VRs and, as such, do not pose most of the same problems; the presence of the owner on site should eliminate issues such as noise, trespassing, etc. Congestion/parking can still be an issue.

Mapping Alternatives

Just two comments:

I see no reason to prohibit VRs in the areas north of US-20 and east of US-101. These areas are not as desirable for VRs but if an owner can make a go of it, why not?

I know this is a future discussion, but if there are prohibited areas, what is effect on existing VRs? They could be grandfathered in, but would that grandfathering apply to any stricter provisions in the new code? For example, if the current "two per bedroom plus two" is changed to drop the plus two, wouldn't existing VRs be subject to the lower limit?

Thanks you for considering these thoughts during your discussions.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bob Berman", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Bob Berman