

May 26, 2020

ATTN: Placer County Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

RE: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) Zoning Text Amendment/ Affordable Housing & Economic Impact

Thank you for approving ADU's with the goal of creating more housing options in Placer County.

I have lived and worked in the greater Tahoe area, including Donner Summit, Truckee and North Lake Tahoe, for the majority of the past twenty years. Having been a single mother and a Realtor, I very clearly understand the need for affordable housing and economic development in our region. I truly appreciate your efforts towards this end.

While reviewing the proposed text amendments, please bear in mind the *unique character* of Eastern Placer County and North Lake Tahoe. We are not San Francisco or L.A. and our needs are different.

Two of the proposed Text Amendments are of specific concern:

1.) Limiting the size of an ADU to 50% of the existing dwelling is not practical and would prevent any new affordable units from being built in many cases.

In the Tahoe Basin there are innumerable very small "worker" cabins built during an era when lumber and the railroad were primary industries. Tiny old cabins are sprinkled throughout the region on properties both large and small. In other areas of Placer they are old mining cabins.

Limiting newly constructed dwellings to 50% of a cabin that is only 400 square feet in size is not practical and defeats the purpose of ADU's, which is to create additional housing opportunities.

Homeowners should be allowed to convert small existing dwellings to ADU's and subsequently allowed to build a new primary dwelling, assuming compliance with all other regulations.

2.) The original wording of the document regarding occupancy and ownership should *not be changed*. The original version stated:

17.56.200

"E. Occupancy. Either the primary or secondary dwelling on the site shall be owner occupied or rented on a long- term basis."

The *original* wording allows flexibility, would create more housing options and could potentially increase tax revenues.

The new wording provides no incentive for a second homeowner to build an ADU, and will negatively impact the economy of the region.

The new wording removes an owners right to rent any portion of their property on a short-term basis and restricts homeowners to only renting the small ADU, instead of the larger dwelling, to long-term tenants.

The economy of the Lake Tahoe region relies on revenues and taxes from short-term overnight and seasonal visitors.

If the Goal of the ADU's is to expand housing options, why is it assumed that a homeowner would not want to convert their larger primary dwelling to the affordable unit, ultimately providing housing for a working class family, instead of only providing affordable housing for single workers in tiny homes.

Requiring owner occupancy does not allow for both units to be rented on either a full time or short-term basis. If we want to create more housing option why not be allowed to rent both units?

Please allow homeowners the option of providing affordable housing, while also generating added revenue to our economy instead of forcing second homeowners to leave their second homes empty and forcing local workers to only live in tiny homes.

Please keep the original wording regarding occupancy and allow homeowners to choose which unit will be occupied full time. This would provide increased housing options and would benefit our local economy.

Thank you for all of your time, hard work and consideration.

Kind regards,

Anthea Humphreys