

**From:** [Jacob Patterson](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment -- 1/8/24 CC Mtg., Item No. 8A, Short-Term Rentals  
**Date:** Friday, January 05, 2024 3:54:49 PM

---

City Council,

I think this item is interesting but potentially misguided. First, as staff highlights, expanding beyond the current CBD to other commercial districts is inconsistent with the adopted general plan. The staff report indicates this will require a general plan amendment to the City's housing element. Amending the City's housing element is not a simple matter and it isn't even fully within the City Council's authority to do so because any changes require HCD approval and a rigorous public process. This is an expensive endeavor and I have a feeling that none of you have considered that aspect yet. The substantial costs associated with amending the City's certified housing element were not even mentioned in the fiscal analysis section of the staff report suggesting that staff hasn't considered that aspect of this proposal as well.

There is a much more simple and inexpensive way to address what started this agenda item, which is an inquiry from the property owner concerning an unpermitted vacation rental in the former Ship's Wheel/Rosebud building at Oak and Franklin. The easiest and least expensive way to address that property would be to amend the general plan and the zoning map to rezone that particular property as CBD rather than GC. The property owner could apply for a rezoning tomorrow and they would bear the costs of that simple amendment, which makes sense since it specifically benefits their property rather than the public at large. Why should we use significant public funds to amend our housing element to primarily benefit particular private property owners?

Regards,

--Jacob