Thomas and Brigid,

Regret that I will not be able to attend the public hearing tomorrow evening. Please accept my feedback and comments below for the record.

There is much to like in the draft regulations. I appreciate that the guiding principle is to preserve Langley as a residential community while protecting against becoming a resort town.

Miscellaneous comments, questions, and observations:

1. Inspections: I saw that inspection will be required for initial application as a condition of approving the license, but I did not see mention of who will perform the inspection and whether there will be a cost. Unclear whether inspections will be required as part of annual license renewal or at some other interval.

2. Failure to obtain a license: What is the penalty for operating a Type IV STR without obtaining a license? How to address the “I didn't know” defense which we heard at last year’s public hearing to consider creating the moratorium?

3. Complaints and Enforcement: What is the appropriate process for submitting complaints for violation of any of the STR regulations by either the owner/operator or the tenant(s)? Is it necessary to specify the process to assure that the City will respond promptly when the behavior is disturbing peace for nearby residents and immediate remedy is called for?

4. Third party monitoring…I believe the idea was raised for the City to contract with a third party service to assist with enforcement and identifying non-complying STRs. Does the City plan to do this and, if so, should this be included in the STR regulations?

5. Maximum number of Type IV STRs: I suggest Council establish the maximum number of Type IV licenses to be active at any one time rather than number of licenses issued/year. Regardless of approach, how will this number be determined, how will it be enforced, and under what circumstances will the number be increased or decreased?

6. Multi-family buildings: I noted that only one unit of a duplex can be used as STR. What standard will apply to triplex, fourplex or larger condo or apartment building/complex?

All for now. Happy to dialogue further if it might be helpful.

Respectfully,

Walt Blackford
415 First Street
Langley, WA
Hi Brigid,
Bob and I were both really impressed with the level of commitment and integrity that you and the City have regarding the vacation rental coding investigation. Impressive. We know you can't please everyone, us included. But you're in there pitching!

We were relieved to hear that you are limiting the number of bedrooms relative to septic tank capacity! So, regarding Robb's, we assume that means that he can now only advertise as having two bedrooms, which is the truth? He must be clear about that, but, if we see they're still advertising 3, should we let you know? VRBO lists 3 of bedrooms and # of people. So, what are the limitations there for his property? For our rentals in Chile we make that very clear.

Thanks again!
Judyth and Bob

--
My wife and I own the property at 111 First Street.

Please note my following comments regarding the proposed regulations on short term rentals.

The chart indicates that all parking must be on the subject property, regardless of zone. This would make establishment of new, or the conversion of existing, STRs in the Central Business District impossible for some parcels. There are many properties, particularly on First Street that have very limited potential for off-street parking. I can see the need for this regulation in the residential zones, but the CBD is the ideal spot for STRs and they should be encouraged in this area.

Given the special nature of the downtown area, I would suggest that a change be made to the use chart so that the CURRENT parking requirements apply to all parcels in the CBD, and the new parking requirements apply to all other zones.

Thank you for your time and effort on this issue.

David Price

david@davidpriceprojects.com
Here are more comments about STRs

Brigid Reynolds MCIP, MCP, RPP
Director of Community Planning
City of Langley
(360) 221-4219
planning@langleywa.org
www.langleywa.org

Hi Brigid,
I attended the public meeting on proposed short-term rental regulations but did not have time to leave my comments on the sheet provided. I was impressed with the reasonableness of the current proposal, and with the fact that the committee was able to distill down the most important issues into a fair policy. Congratulations on that work.

We have two comments to put before the PAB on this issue:
1. If we were not operating as a seasonal short-term rental, our property would NOT be available as a long-term rental. We rented our house as a LTR for 3 years and ended that relationship so that we could spend more time at the house ourselves. We do not intend to make our house available as a LTR again.
2. As we only rent our place for a maximum of 7 weekends/year (almost exclusively to families attending weddings in the summer), and we do not yet live there fulltime, we are strongly opposed to the imposition of commercial water/sewer rates for our property. Given that we are on a septic tank and are already paying full water and sewer rates, despite minimal use, we would elect not to operate as a STR rather than to be penalized with year-around commercial rates. This would amount to undue burden on our property, particularly given the services (not) used.

Again, thank you for the careful work that has been done on this issue.

Regards,
Karen & Greg Wisont
995 Cedar Circle