

From: [Shannon Flavin](#)
To: [Participate](#)
Cc: [GAD - Sun Valley Board of REALTORS](#)
Subject: Short-term rentals
Date: Thursday, November 18, 2021 1:45:39 PM

To whom it may concern,

We would all like to see more long-term rentals available for locals. However, this effort against short-term rentals is a misguided step designed to manufacture long-term housing inventory. The principles are off-base and it will fail. The collateral damage associated with this effort will be more destructive than the issue it is trying to address.

First, most short-term rentals exist for part of the year because the owners want/need to use the property for a substantial portion of the year. The removal of this ability will simply put more stress and expense on vacationers, remove job opportunities and income from property managers, restaurants, waiters, cleaners, ski shops, retail, etc. and provide great opportunity for the limited locations that will be allowed to be used as short-term rentals, which will subsequently remove any long-term rentals that exist in those areas and increase the price these property owners can fetch for their short-term rental. If you think Ketchum is elitist now??? But the most obvious point is that most short-term rentals will NOT become long-term rentals, they will only become "cold beds". If anyone remembers the issues local businesses were having prior to and during the recession, much of the discussion was based on "cold beds" and "hot beds". Owners of very rentable properties were not renting at all, but using it for themselves for short periods of time throughout the year. This resulted in an awful slack period where few businesses were able to survive. I ran a very popular restaurant back in those days and making a profit was brutal. You would simply lose the money in slack that you earned during the busy times. It was not a situation that was sustainable over time.

Short-term rentals will NOT become long-term rentals. I repeat- short-term rentals will NOT become long-term rentals. People who own properties with these values will simply NOT rent them at all. Or some will cash out. This will not have a deep impact on housing prices, as the inventory is so depleted- it will simply add to that depleted inventory.

This is also a clear violation of the property owners rights. The Idaho Supreme Court has said so, and it is simply a matter of time before this ridiculous train of thought is shut down. The City may think it is using tricky and clever language, but Supreme Court Justices do not like their principles being walked on. By the way, there are many local residents who depend on being able to manage properties. Contractors, painters, carpet cleaners, window cleaners, house cleaners, appliance shops, fix-it men/women, chimney sweeps, and so-on. All of these people get calls from property managers and have income from this market.

I get it. We need long-term housing, and I support the efforts made to create it.

This is also a very short-sighted attempt to address something that the administration has been unable to address effectively thus far. If the cities in this valley want to fix this issue, they need to

address it by working in conjunction with the county, where the price of land/SF is significantly less. They can also address it by increasing the density in districts in order to reduce the land basis a developer would pay per residential unit. There are opportunities here, but they are fleeting and limited.

We keep trying to shift the burden to anyone wanting to build something new in the area, taxing them for their investment in our community. What has this provided...not much. Incentivize (don't punish) developers for building the types of units you want to see. Give them a break, so they can make the numbers work and see the benefit of building such units. Our government goes in the opposite direction.

I once witnessed a current City Council member say these words, "We don't want to create a situation where developers can make money from 'Affordable Housing'". I nearly fell from my seat. If you could create that situation, we would not be talking about this right now. Not only is that a false and ignorant perspective, but it represents how misguided these efforts are. Your mission should not be to limit property owner's rights, in order to take a stab at manufacturing a long-term housing inventory, but to create an incentive package significant enough to make a long-term housing development profitable. Then, we would have a chance at actually fixing our current community crisis. And yes, Blaine County and the cities of Bellevue and Hailey should all be working together on this.

Local businesses need employees, but they also need business. Tread cautiously when your government starts limiting the rights of its citizens.

Sincerely,
Concerned Citizen
Supporter of Housing that is Affordable
Ketchum Resident- Shannon Flavin