

**From:** [Bo Day](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Short-term rental ordinance  
**Date:** Thursday, October 05, 2023 8:42:40 AM

---

**Caution:** This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Hello,

My name is Bo Day. I'm a local general contractor and I own and manage 7 long term rentals in the area affected by this ordinance and have done so for over 10-years.

I have two questions and two comments and will spend less than a minute here at the mic.

First, can you please clarify that the hard 2% cap does not apply to people who want to short-term rent some part of their own home or property where they live, the **Home-share rentals?** My reading of this document is unclear as to whether or not those of us who may want to short-term rent a few bedrooms in our own houses will be allowed to after that cap is met. If the goal is to stop losing long-term rentals to the short-term rental market, which I completely understand, it seems that allowing the short term rentals in our own homes or in our yards really just provides an opportunity to support tourism and bring more money into our community. Will home-share rentals be subject to the 2% hard cap?

Second, this draft of the ordinance suggests that any structure that will be permitted as an STR will need to be "Permitted or legal non-conforming." I know of three amazing tree houses and a beautifully set up AirStream trailer that are being used as STR. It would seem to me that this type of creative use of space is exactly what our local government should be encouraging. Individual property owners making the most of their space to generate tourism, build on our colorful Humboldt vibe, and bring revenue into our county. These alternative structures are not suitable for long-term rentals and so their operation doesn't threaten our rental inventory. I hope that future drafts of this ordinance make it clear that people who want to short-term rent structures that are not suitable as long-term rentals will be encouraged to do so and that these structures will not be effected by the hard 2% cap. How will this ordinance support the use of non-traditional buildings as Short term rentals?

Lastly, it seems clear that this draft will grandfather in existing STR by providing them with that two-month early application process. It also seems clear that the 2% hard cap will likely be met simply by the existing units. I understand that many people are currently relying on income from their STR to survive and I respect the general intent of the cap and the early application to protect folks who have invested in their STRs and who are dependent on them. However, the ordinance is also clear that permits can stay with an individual forever. So this ordinance essentially creates a situation where people who already have STRs will get the first

crack and permitting them and will then keep that permit for the rest of their lives. That is deeply unfair and essentially punishes people like me who have been providing long-term rentals for decades. Not only are we shut out of the initial couple years of permitted STR operation but we are shut out forever so long as that hard 2% cap remains in place. Some wealthy individual, or team, who may not even live in our community who has bought up to FIVE homes and is running them fully as STR will be rewarded with lifetime permits to continue doing so while I will be prevented from bringing even one of my existing rentals into the short-term market while my kids are in college. That is absurd and unnecessary. I hope you give serious consideration to the idea of two-year caps on these permits. Perhaps property owners can permit a STR for two years but then must bring that property back to the long-term market for the following two years. This ordinance codifies exactly what you are trying to avoid which is permanently removing long term rentals from the market and supporting wealthy individuals who are currently doing that at scale. Please consider some kind of "term limit" on these permits particularly if you intend to grandfather in all of the existing units.

Lastly, the short comings I see with this ordinance, as a local property owner, are that the ordinance fails to recognize the creativity and flexibility and elbow-grease that is required of most of us to own and keep up property in our area and it fails to recognize the complexity of our actual lives that play out in these houses. What if I need to short-term rent one of my units because my elderly mom will need to stay there for six-months at a time for a few years? I will not be able to permit that. What if I want to provide student housing during the school year and short term rent during the summer when there are more tourists? Don't we desperately need student housing? Yet this ordinance will make that impossible. What if I need to have a space available for my kids to live in and work during the summer when they are home from college but want to offer that space as a STR while they are away to earn money to pay for them to go to college... that dynamic is also impossible under this ordinance.

I support the effort to prevent individuals from buying up local houses and turning existing long term rentals into STR. But this ordinance is a blunt and destructive tool when a more creative and nuanced approach can create such a rich set of opportunities and possibilities. I hope considerably more work is put into this document before it is voted on. It is not ready.