

Therese F. Sweet
18210 Burke Drive
Plymouth, CA 95669
707-536-9290 – terrisweet@hughes.net

January 5, 2023

Amador County Planning Commission
810 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642

RE: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 agenda, item 7
Short Term Rentals in Accessory Dwelling Units

Dear Commissioners:

As one of many short term rental owners in Amador County, I am surprised that we were not noticed about any deliberations on this subject.

In 2019, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors spent six months studying whether or not there should be restrictions on short term rentals. After several meetings and considerable testimony, it was demonstrated that there was one property causing all the problems. To resolve that issue for the neighbors, the Board of Supervisors decided to enact a Noise Ordinance. The Board decided that restrictions on short term rentals were not necessary.

I am wondering what changed from 2019 that now the Planning Commission is, again, considering restricting short term rentals? Are there legitimate findings? Are there recorded problems? Again, not having been noticed on anything regarding short term rentals since 2019, this is all news.

From the standpoint of having an Accessory Dwelling Unit on one's property, it is far more desirable to be able to rent it for 2 or 3 weekends a month (4-6 days) than for 365 days a year. In this way, an owner can preserve a measure of privacy, and conserve utilities, water, sewer/septic system, and the neighborhood has less wear and tear on local roads and public services. Not to mention that California has rent control so by restricting short term rentals, owners are sentenced to a life of rent control and not being able to evict a tenant or getting paid for months at a time.

As for the argument that short term rentals remove long term rentals from the market, there is no way to prove that. In our case, we would never rent long term because we value our privacy.

I don't understand the rationale behind taking away a property right without any good reason.

Such an ordinance would not apply to any properties within a community interest development. The state has enacted laws which provide that when an owner lives in the main house, the

accessory dwelling unit, or the junior accessory dwelling unit, no one on the property is considered to be a “renter” at all.

I hope the Planning Commission will consider all the documentation from when this issue was considered in 2019, and base its decision on significant findings so that property rights will be preserved.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Therese F. Sweet