

Ben Rough

From: Bill Pope <mazamabill@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 11, 2015 2:27 PM
To: Ben Rough; Perry Huston
Cc: 'John Hayes'; Ray L. Campbell; 'Brian Charlton'; 'Central Reservations'
Subject: RE: Zoning changes?

Ben and Perry:

Let me add one more thought. The notion of an “accessory” dwelling or use presupposes a “primary” use or dwelling. Historically, there was always a requirement that the main house be owner-occupied and that the “accessory” house be smaller and clustered close to the main house. If you completely eliminate these conditions, then you are essentially doubling the density in all zones. And if you add that all dwellings can qualify as nightly rentals, regardless of the zone, then you have a prescription for the complete takeover of residential neighborhoods. This also means that many houses currently available for long term rentals to local people will end up going into the short term rental market, which will reduce the already short supply of long term rentals and further drive up the already high rental prices that locals pay.

We can't survive in the Valley unless regular people can afford to buy or rent a house. We don't want to end up like Aspen where working people can't afford housing, or like Cannon Beach where every 3rd house is a tourist rental. So these are serious changes you are proposing, with very significant long term impacts on the Methow Valley (and, I would argue, on the Okanogan River Valley as well). We should move very slowly and carefully consider each of the proposed zoning changes before we decide to change a status quo that works.

Bill

From: Bill Pope [mailto:mazamabill@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 11, 2015 12:38 PM
To: 'Ben Rough'; Perry Huston
Cc: John Hayes; Ray Campbell; Brian Charlton; Central Reservations
Subject: Zoning changes?

Ben and Perry:

I have seen some of the drafts of proposed changes to the zoning code. There are really three that I am most concerned about, which are (a) the addition of a right to build an accessory dwelling unit on nonconforming lots, (b) the elimination of any limitations or restrictions on an “accessory” dwelling unit, and (c) the addition of a “right” to have a nightly rental (or rentals) on any lot in any zone.

I also have a concern about the effects of these changes on the whole notion of a “planned development”, which is a tool that has been crucial to intelligent planning and development in Mazama and elsewhere. If your intent is to effectively double the density of RRD and LDRD zones by allowing two dwelling units of any size on every lot, including nonconforming lots (many less than one acre in size), and then also allow every such structure to be rented as a nightly rental, then you are effectively pulling the rug out from under the PD concept. There is no reason for a developer to agree to clustering or any of the other requirements if he can already double the density and rent all the structures without a PD.

I do note that despite your changes, you have decided to maintain a definition of “commercial”. Pursuant to that definition, any tourist accommodation of any sort is clearly “commercial”. I believe this is the correct way to look at nightly rentals. They are really no different than one unit hotels or motels, and yet you continue to keep hotels, inns and