

Ben Fulmer

From: Sarah Terwilliger <sterwilliger@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 07, 2017 10:18 AM
To: councilgroup
Subject: P&Z Interviews-- please respond
Attachments: P&Z Final Packet.pdf

Mayor and Council members,

Attached please find the application packet with essay responses for the current P&Z vacancies. There are 3 eligible seats, in which one member, Laura Berner Hudson is eligible and interested in reappointment.

There are 7 candidates, including Ms. Hudson. Please send me your top THREE recommendations for interviews to be conducted prior to the 10/3 Council Meeting by next **Monday, 9/11 at 5:00**. I will then compile the results for the Bds/Comm review and recommendation at the upcoming 9/12 meeting. Also, because Ms. Hudson is an incumbent she will automatically get an interview, please do not include her in your top 3.

Please let me know if you should have any questions.

Thanks!
Sarah

Sarah Terwilliger
Deputy City Clerk
City of Asheville
(828) 259-5839

Ben Fulmer

From: Brian Haynes <brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2017 5:12 PM
To: Gary Jackson;councilgroup
Subject: Fwd: alternatives to gentrification
Attachments: AvlGentFinalReport6-30-14.pdf

Gary,

After reading through the Comprehensive Plan Draft I'm not seeing where the strategies proposed in this 2014 report are specifically addressed. As this issue has been made a priority by both the previous and current council can we look at adding this to the plan. If it's there and I'm missing it please let me know. Thanks Brian

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Brian Haynes** <bhaynes@ashevillehabitat.org>
Date: Wed, Aug 2, 2017 at 2:27 PM
Subject: alternatives to gentrification
To: "brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com" <brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com>

Ben Fulmer

From: Brian Haynes <bhaynes@ashevillehabitat.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2017 2:28 PM
To: brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com
Subject: alt to gen
Attachments: AvlGentFinalReport6-30-14.pdf

Brian Haynes

Upper Showroom Supervisor
Asheville Area Habitat for Humanity
828-777-9443
ashevillehabitat.org



Make a resolution with lasting impact. [Volunteer or Donate](#) with Asheville Habitat to help families build a better future.

Ben Fulmer

From: Brian Haynes <bhaynes@ashevillehabitat.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2017 2:28 PM
To: brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com
Subject: gentrification
Attachments: AvlGentFinalReport6-30-14.pdf

Ben Fulmer

From: Brian Haynes <bhaynes@ashevillehabitat.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2017 2:28 PM
To: brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com
Subject: alternatives to gentrification
Attachments: AvlGentFinalReport6-30-14.pdf

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2017 1:02 PM
To: Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Gwen Wisler; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: Draft March 28 Minutes
Attachments: Minutes 2017-MAR-28.pdf

Please let me know if you'd like any corrections by Noon on Wed. April 5.

Thanks,
Maggie

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC
City Clerk
City of Asheville
Post Office Box 7148
Asheville, N.C. 28802
828-259-5601 (phone)
828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 10:26 AM
To: Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell - Email; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Gwen Wisler; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: Draft 2-14-17 Council Minutes
Attachments: m170214.pdf

Please let me know if you'd like any changes no later than Wednesday, March 1 at Noon.

Thanks,
Maggie

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC
City Clerk
City of Asheville
Post Office Box 7148
Asheville, N.C. 28802
828-259-5601 (phone)
828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: Lou Farquhar <jloufarquhar@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 11:15 AM
To: Richard Lee
Cc: David Rodgers; Cecil Bothwell; councilgroup; ashevillecan@googlegroups.com
Subject: Re: [CAN] Re: Please reconsider the facts on ADUs

Rich,

Thank you for reasoned response. I think the reason ADU owners are the "bogeyman" is because they're easy targets. Not very vocal because they're small in number and also worried about being ratted out by "neighbors", city enforcement lurking in alleys and expensive software trolling for illegal listings. Also it seems every discussion gets hi-jacked by throwing in whole house rentals which are the source of most of the complaints.

At the end of the day, using David as an example, it's always much easier to blame and shame ADU owners and not do the hard work of finding a solution to the lack of affordable housing. I'm hopeful that with the new enforcement data being collected and follow up on the new Homestay permitting, we will finally get some REAL facts on the impact to neighborhoods and some REAL numbers on "100's and thousands" of ADU's.

Lou Farquhar

On Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 7:22 PM, Richard Lee <ric.hardlee@live.com> wrote:

There are lots of ways that housing stock is removed from circulation: when its bought for a vacation when its spot for a vacation home that stands empty most of the time. When it's downtown apartments whose residents are evicted to create a boutique hotel or "mixed use". When it's turned into businesses Northside or around Shiloh. When it's a divided house that's recombined back into a restored mansion. Or simply the spec building bubble that means developers putting a \$450k house on every tiny lot instead of building things the local employment pool can afford.

The city doesn't have policies about any of these. You can buy up houses and let them stand empty all you want. You can convert them to regular bed and breakfasts or, if you're downtown, into unlimited short-term rentals with the city's blessing. I note that, of all of these, building and renting an ADU is the most likely to be practiced by people of modest means, local people without much going for them except maybe some equity in their home, rather than a large developer or wealthy out-of-town investor in downtown properties.

Doesn't it seem strange that of all uses, this one that we can't even say is the biggest drag on the housing market has become the bogeyman? Every other use gets a pass -- or applause as a boon to the local tax base. As it happens I agree there should be a lot of limits on STRs, on who owns them and where. But I can't help notice that once again the practice of the lowest stakeholder is vilified for what the richest does at will. If we're going to curtail STRs, and we should, let's not drag the housing debate into it. Or let's drag every practice in equally.

Rich

----- Original message -----

From: David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com>

Date: 1/18/17 7:04 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com>

Cc: Lou Farquhar <jloufarquhar@gmail.com>, councilgroup <AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov>, ashevillecan@googlegroups.com

Subject: [CAN] Re: Please reconsider the facts on ADUs

Cecil,

What is the lie? I just stated facts. Please explain what you think is a lie.

Really. Lets deal with the facts starting with this:

1. Converting homes to hotels equals less housing.
2. We need more not less housing.

This is pretty basic and what it boils down too. We have a choice to make we either need more housing or we don't.

David L. Rodgers

On Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 6:23 PM, Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> wrote:

David,

Your answer fails to address your lies about other people's financial situations.

You really need to sit down and shut up, IMHO.

-C

On Jan 18, 2017, at 12:52 PM, David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com> wrote:

Lou,

The basic facts are this:

1. We don't have enough housing in Asheville. You and I agree on this.
2. Our city goals, policies, development incentives and now \$25 Million plus interest all clearly are behind getting more units of housing built in our city. You and I both agree on this too I presume.
3. Allowing whole homes to be used as hotels (let's be clear ADUs are homes) subtracts units of housing. This is a basic math problem that is just a fact we have to face.

I imagine this third point you probably will want to use the presentation your husband gave to council as a rebuttal. The Portland "model" does not account for the cannibalization of existing

housing in our market here in Asheville where the ratio of tourists to citizens is drastically much higher (this is why we threw this idea out on the task force).

Is the Farquhar / Tierney model of buying homes with ADUs that were long term rentals and turning them into hotels adding or subtracting units of housing? It is clear between your two households we as a city now have two less units of housing. Is this the example of what we want replicated hundreds of times losing hundreds of homes for use as hotels?

I get that you don't want to be a landlord with long term tenants and can respect that. It is your right to do what you want within the zoning. The real issue I see here is we really can't afford to have hundreds or thousands of folks follow the example and path you want to go down. Maybe thousands seems like a crazy number, but how many hotel rooms were added in the last five years? I can easily see entire neighborhoods turned into beach front / resort areas where the majority are transients. Whole houses are next using Cecil's logic we "have to legalize it" in order to regulate. So if this reasoning is true about ADUs it is true about whole homes and is where we are headed (personally I reject this flawed logic).

We have lots of garage apartments in our neighborhoods. These are real homes and some of the most affordable options. The zoning is there for a reason. We need housing to be used as housing, not hotels. As one who works with Habitat for Humanity I am sure you understand more than I just how important it is for families to have a place to call home.

Please, I hope you reconsider this a bit more and put your personal self-interests aside and live within the zoning we have. The rules are there for a reason - we need more homes not hotels in our residential zoned neighborhoods.

David L. Rodgers

On Thu, Jan 12, 2017 at 12:20 PM, Lou Farquhar <jloufarquhar@gmail.com> wrote:
Bless yer heart, David.....

You don't know me but I am the wife who is on John's "property card" He chooses to ignore you but I can't...maybe it's a "woman thing" needing to have the last word. If so I own that. I suppose we should be flattered by your portrayal of "millionaire businessman" but in the final analysis, I think your letter says more about you----a bit squishy on facts and heavy on insinuation.

To flesh out your "revelations" (not that anyone really cares) let me give you some facts. We moved to Asheville in 2006 from DC and bought our house in Fairview and the Timberlake condo followed in 2008 as a joint purchase with my sister and her husband. We decided to move closer to downtown in 2014 and listed the Fairview house for sale. As often happens, it did not sell so is now rented long term. My sister and her husband live in the Timberlake condo. And no, not **"several other properties in Buncombe County of over One Million Dollars"**. Would that that were true. And no, no LLC's to look for.....

Again along the lines of "who cares?", we purchased our 100 y/o Norwood Park house because we fell in love with it...not because we needed or wanted extra income from the rental apartment. The 450 SF furnished apartment (or should I say "hotel"?) above the detached carriage house (25 feet from our house) is our "guest room" used by visiting family, friends , friends of friends and the parents and children of neighbors. The bottom floor of the carriage

house was renovated as a writing space for John and a quilting studio for me. Long term tenants (affordable or otherwise) would not allow the flexibility and privacy we want 25 feet from our house. Short term guests, yes: we control who, when and whether.

I suppose your diatribe may sway some who choose to see John as you portrayed him. but people who know him see him as a pragmatic, fact seeking, consensus promoting angry liberal. I believe people are entitled to their opinions but not their "facts" and his work on the Task Force speaks to that. Of course he argued for "his side" ...just as you did. We still believe that the use of ADU's for short term rentals is not the Apocalypse so many seek to describe and can be a flexible source of both income and housing when regulated and licensed under the current Homestay ordinance.

The Asheville Blade recently published enforcement data on each of the 127 violations presented by City Enforcement at the December CC meeting. I looked at this data and it appears that *maybe* 12 are ADU's...less than 10%. Of these 12, all appear to have been either "anonymously" reported or found through new city compliance software. No mention was made of noise, parking, sketchy behavior or any of the other scare-mongering reasons given for banning their use. Going forward, more data from City Enforcement will help to inform the discussions: How many are ADU's with owners on site? How many are single family homes with no owner present? Are the verified noise, parking, nuisance reports really just from whole house rentals as it appears? Opponents of ANY short term rentals always lump ADU's and whole houses together under one Apocalyptic umbrella...let's prove it once and for all with real facts, especially now that you can add legal Homestays to the mix and see if those horrible predictions have come true.

I do agree with you on one thing you said: the need for affordable housing is obvious, and should be a priority for all of us. I for one am happy my tax increases will go to that end. I have worked on local Habitat building sites every Tuesday for the last 10 years, as well as on trips to Louisiana. I'm concluding my second term on the Habitat Board of Directors. I know first hand the scope of the problem and have seen the results when City, County, State, Feds, non-profits, for-profits, donors and yes, homeowners come together to work on it. Affordable housing works both ways and to Cecil's point, many ADU owners ARE single mothers, widows, divorcees; ADU income can make their own home affordable but you can also add young families and retirees looking to supplement pensions and Social Security.

Your letter to Cecil et al promoting this trope that it's greedy fat cats who are responsible for taking away affordable housing and thus should be required to provide it with our 450 SF ADUs is a cop out: it smacks of NIMBYism and a fatal lack of imagination.

Lou Farquhar

On Wed, Jan 11, 2017 at 9:49 AM, David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com> wrote:
Cecil,

I just saw your posting on the ASTRA Facebook page:

"It has come to my awareness that a seeming majority of persons who are offering short term rentals are single women who need the income. (And no surprise, since women are paid lower and hold more part time jobs, hence needing the income.) I'd be very interested to hear from you in complete confidence if that's the case. I am doing everything I can to make STR of ADUs legal in Asheville and I promise utter confidentiality if you contact me. Either FB message or e-mail.

cecil@braveulysses.com"

Please know that two of the ADU Task Force members are seemingly affluent males wanting to use their ADUs as STRs. Both bought their homes in 2014, John Farquhar in Norwood for \$445,000 and Jackson Tierney in Montford \$565,500. Both have their wives listed on the property cards so I guess you can present this as "women needing the income" to all at city council. I really don't think these two men and their wives are broke and needing the income from running a hotel to survive. It is interesting to note that when these two men purchased homes with ADUs in 2014 the listing of John's said it was a long term rental. Jackson's said it was income producing and my understanding is this was a long term rental too. I understand Jackson did a lot of work to bring his up to code, but the point here is that these were two men bought homes with ADUs that were sheltering citizens, not tourists. **The zoning in place when they bought their homes did not and does not allow STRs.**

Why do you want to convert our housing to hotels?

These are not impoverished individuals. **John Farquhar owns several other properties in Buncombe County of over One Million Dollars. Jackson Tierney owns or owned other investment properties too.** Many smart investors use LLCs so it is hard or impossible to know just how many properties an individual owns.

Maybe John Farquhar or Jackson Tierney can let you know if they are truly destitute and need the additional profit of operating a hotel vs. the income generated from long term rentals. The listing on John's when he bought it in 2014 said the rental rate for the ADU was \$1000 per month. Isn't this enough profit? I guess not.

These two men dishonored the work we did on the ADU Task Force by presenting their own plan, developed secretly. We as a group decided not to use the "Portland model". It is clear they presented this plan to you before the city council meeting where we were all blindsided by John presenting for 10 minutes on a plan we rejected. I hesitated to outline their investments, but it is clear you need to know the leading advocates of changing the zoning is not destitute women. It is two profit maximizing businessmen not satisfied with the profits of long term rentals.

AirBnB is a \$30 Billion company trying to profit converting our housing to hotels.

Cecil, why are you siding with these wealthy men and AirBnB when we obviously need more housing? We are all going to be paying for decades the \$25M plus interest for the housing bonds. It is clear the taxpayers want more, not less housing. The vote was clear on the bonds. ADUs are real housing. It doesn't make sense to convert hundreds of homes into hotels while financing the construction of apartments in the same price point. We might as well flush our tax dollars / bond money down the toilet.

I BCC all ADU Task Force members as I believe in not going behind the backs of others. We all worked too hard over nine meetings developing a path forward to let this get hijacked by wealthy business men not happy with the zoning rules they purchased their homes with now trying to get the rules changed.

I truly hope you reconsider your position on using our homes as Short Term Rentals. ADUs are homes, not hotels.

All the best,

David L. Rodgers

--
You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Asheville CAN" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to AshevilleCAN+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/AshevilleCAN/CAAQRpBgvrn%3DCpgR7%3DFk4M5j1AOeS77RqKR1UVMfAFjb7k4H%3Dww%40mail.gmail.com>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

Ben Fulmer

From: Lou Farquhar <jloufarquhar@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 11:10 AM
To: Cecil Bothwell
Cc: David Rodgers;councilgroup;<ashevillecan@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Re: Please reconsider the facts on ADUs

Thanks for trying, Cecil. People are going to believe what they want to believe....

I'm out also.

LF

On Thu, Jan 19, 2017 at 9:47 AM, Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> wrote:

I apologized to David for my choice of language.

I'm a little fed up with the endless badgering, and as Lou Farquhar pointed out in an e-mail and FB post, David did distribute false information about that family.

I think both sides of this discussion have made their positions eminently clear, so I'm not going to participate in a further e-mail exchange with any of the respondents in this thread concerning the issue.

I recognize that I can be unpleasant when I am ticked off.

-C

On Jan 18, 2017, at 7:04 PM, David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com> wrote:

Cecil,

What is the lie? I just stated facts. Please explain what you think is a lie.

Really. Lets deal with the facts starting with this:

1. Converting homes to hotels equals less housing.
2. We need more not less housing.

This is pretty basic and what it boils down too. We have a choice to make we either need more housing or we don't.

David L. Rodgers

On Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 6:23 PM, Cecil Bothwell <cecilbothwell@gmail.com> wrote:

David,

Your answer fails to address your lies about other people's financial situations.

You really need to sit down and shut up, IMHO.

On Jan 18, 2017, at 12:52 PM, David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com> wrote:

Lou,

The basic facts are this:

1. We don't have enough housing in Asheville. You and I agree on this.
2. Our city goals, policies, development incentives and now \$25 Million plus interest all clearly are behind getting more units of housing built in our city. You and I both agree on this too I presume.
3. Allowing whole homes to be used as hotels (let's be clear ADUs are homes) subtracts units of housing. This is a basic math problem that is just a fact we have to face.

I imagine this third point you probably will want to use the presentation your husband gave to council as a rebuttal. The Portland "model" does not account for the cannibalization of existing housing in our market here in Asheville where the ratio of tourists to citizens is drastically much higher (this is why we threw this idea out on the task force).

Is the Farquhar / Tierney model of buying homes with ADUs that were long term rentals and turning them into hotels adding or subtracting units of housing? It is clear between your two households we as a city now have two less units of housing. Is this the example of what we want replicated hundreds of times losing hundreds of homes for use as hotels?

I get that you don't want to be a landlord with long term tenants and can respect that. It is your right to do what you want within the zoning. The real issue I see here is we really can't afford to have hundreds or thousands of folks follow the example and path you want to go down. Maybe thousands seems like a crazy number, but how many hotel rooms were added in the last five years? I can easily see entire neighborhoods turned into beach front / resort areas where the majority are transients. Whole houses are next using Cecil's logic we "have to legalize it" in order to regulate. So if this reasoning is true about ADUs it is true about whole homes and is where we are headed (personally I reject this flawed logic).

We have lots of garage apartments in our neighborhoods. These are real homes and some of the most affordable options. The zoning is there for a reason. We need housing to be used as housing, not hotels. As one who works with Habitat for Humanity I am sure you understand more than I just how important it is for families to have a place to call home.

Please, I hope you reconsider this a bit more and put your personal self-interests aside and live within the zoning we have. The rules are there for a reason - we need more homes not hotels in our residential zoned neighborhoods.

David L. Rodgers

On Thu, Jan 12, 2017 at 12:20 PM, Lou Farquhar <jloufarquhar@gmail.com> wrote:

Bless yer heart, David.....

You don't know me but I am the wife who is on John's " property card" He chooses to ignore you but I can't...maybe it's a "woman thing" needing to have the last word. If so I own that. I suppose we should be flattered by your portrayal of "millionaire businessman" but in the final analysis, I think your letter says more about you----a bit squishy on facts and heavy on insinuation.

To flesh out your "revelations" (not that anyone really cares) let me give you some facts. We moved to Asheville in 2006 from DC and bought our house in Fairview and the Timberlake condo followed in 2008 as a joint purchase with my sister and her husband. We decided to move closer to downtown in 2014 and listed the Fairview house for sale. As often happens, it did not sell so is now rented long term. My sister and her husband live in the Timberlake condo. And no, not **"several other properties in Buncombe County of over One Million Dollars"**. Would that that were true. And no, no LLC's to look for.....

Again along the lines of "who cares?", we purchased our 100 y/o Norwood Park house because we fell in love with it...not because we needed or wanted extra income from the rental apartment. The 450 SF furnished apartment (or should I say "hotel"?) above the detached carriage house (25 feet from our house) is our "guest room" used by visiting family, friends , friends of friends and the parents and children of neighbors. The bottom floor of the carriage house was renovated as a writing space for John and a quilting studio for me. Long term tenants (affordable or otherwise) would not allow the flexibility and privacy we want 25 feet from our house. Short term guests, yes: we control who, when and whether.

I suppose your diatribe may sway some who choose to see John as you portrayed him. but people who know him see him as a pragmatic, fact seeking, consensus promoting angry liberal. I believe people are entitled to their opinions but not their "facts" and his work on the Task Force speaks to that. Of course he argued for "his side" ...just as you did. We still believe that the use of ADU's for short term rentals is not the Apocalypse so many seek to describe and can be a flexible source of both income and housing when regulated and licensed under the current Homestay ordinance.

The Asheville Blade recently published enforcement data on each of the 127 violations presented by City Enforcement at the December CC meeting. I looked at this data and it appears that *maybe* 12 are ADU's...less than 10%. Of these 12, all appear to have been either "anonymously" reported or found through new city compliance software. No mention was made of noise, parking, sketchy behavior or any of the other scare-mongering reasons given for banning their use. Going forward, more data from City Enforcement will help to inform the discussions: How many are ADU's with owners on site? How many are single family homes with no owner present? Are the verified noise, parking, nuisance reports really just from whole house rentals as it appears? Opponents of ANY short term rentals always lump ADU's and

whole houses together under one Apocalyptic umbrella...let's prove it once and for all with real facts, especially now that you can add legal Homestays to the mix and see if those horrible predictions have come true.

I do agree with you on one thing you said: the need for affordable housing is obvious, and should be a priority for all of us. I for one am happy my tax increases will go to that end. I have worked on local Habitat building sites every Tuesday for the last 10 years, as well as on trips to Louisiana. I'm concluding my second term on the Habitat Board of Directors. I know first hand the scope of the problem and have seen the results when City, County, State, Feds, non-profits, for-profits, donors and yes, homeowners come together to work on it. Affordable housing works both ways and to Cecil's point, many ADU owners ARE single mothers, widows, divorcees; ADU income can make their own home affordable but you can also add young families and retirees looking to supplement pensions and Social Security.

Your letter to Cecil et al promoting this trope that it's greedy fat cats who are responsible for taking away affordable housing and thus should be required to provide it with our 450 SF ADUs is a cop out: it smacks of NIMBYism and a fatal lack of imagination.

Lou Farquhar

On Wed, Jan 11, 2017 at 9:49 AM, David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com> wrote:

Cecil,

I just saw your posting on the ASTRA Facebook page:

"It has come to my awareness that a seeming majority of persons who are offering short term rentals are single women who need the income. (And no surprise, since women are paid lower and hold more part time jobs, hence needing the income.) I'd be very interested to hear from you in complete confidence if that's the case. I am doing everything I can to make STR of ADUs legal in Asheville and I promise utter confidentiality if you contact me. Either FB message or e-mail. cecil@braveulysses.com"

Please know that two of the ADU Task Force members are seemingly affluent males wanting to use their ADUs as STRs. Both bought their homes in 2014, John Farquhar in Norwood for \$445,000 and Jackson Tierney in Montford \$565,500. Both have their wives listed on the property cards so I guess you can present this as "women needing the income" to all at city council. I really don't think these two men and their wives are broke and needing the income

from running a hotel to survive. It is interesting to note that when these two men purchased homes with ADUs in 2014 the listing of John's said it was a long term rental. Jackson's said it was income producing and my understanding is this was a long term rental too. I understand Jackson did a lot of work to bring his up to code, but the point here is that these were two men bought homes with ADUs that were sheltering citizens, not tourists. **The zoning in place when they bought their homes did not and does not allow STRs.**

Why do you want to convert our housing to hotels?

These are not impoverished individuals. **John Farquhar owns several other properties in Buncombe County of over One Million Dollars. Jackson Tierney owns or owned other investment properties too.** Many smart investors use LLCs so it is hard or impossible to know just how many properties an individual owns.

Maybe John Farquhar or Jackson Tierney can let you know if they are truly destitute and need the additional profit of operating a hotel vs. the income generated from long term rentals. The listing on John's when he bought it in 2014 said the rental rate for the ADU was \$1000 per month. Isn't this enough profit? I guess not.

These two men dishonored the work we did on the ADU Task Force by presenting their own plan, developed secretly. We as a group decided not to use the "Portland model". It is clear they presented this plan to you before the city council meeting where we were all blindsided by John presenting for 10 minutes on a plan we rejected. I hesitated to outline their investments, but it is clear you need to know the leading advocates of changing the zoning is not destitute women. It is two profit maximizing businessmen not satisfied with the profits of long term rentals.

AirBnB is a \$30 Billion company trying to profit converting our housing to hotels.

Cecil, why are you siding with these wealthy men and AirBnB when we obviously need more housing? We are all going to be paying for decades the \$25M plus interest for the housing bonds. It is clear the taxpayers want more, not less housing. The vote was clear on the bonds. ADUs are real housing. It doesn't make sense to convert hundreds of homes into hotels while financing the construction of apartments in the same price point. We might as well flush our tax dollars / bond money down the toilet.

I BCC all ADU Task Force members as I believe in not going behind the backs of others. We all worked too hard over nine meetings developing a path forward to let this get hijacked by wealthy business men not happy with the zoning rules they purchased their homes with now trying to get the rules changed.

I truly hope you reconsider your position on using our homes as Short Term Rentals. ADUs are homes, not hotels.

All the best,

David L. Rodgers

Ben Fulmer

From: Michael Lewis <mlewis6956@charter.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 5:20 AM
To: anne marie doherty;David Rodgers;councilgroup;CAN-Board@googlegroups.com
Subject: Re: [CAN] Please reconsider the facts on ADUs

Well, the Homestay, which is evidently what you did, is no longer an issue. They're legal and always have been. Either from ignorance, or by intent, STR advocates keep mixing the two in their arguments to commercialize residential neighborhoods. It is beginning to appear that STR advocates use stories like yours to blur the issue and confuse the public about what is legal and what is not. Once the differences are obscured, legalizing STRs will gain public support. Then, SUPRISE! Once STRs are approved, there will be no going back whether the position of the folks against STRs (like me) is valid or not. Then the property rights argument will have substance. The STR issue is an unknown, but some people are willing to impose a risk on others.

Just don't mess with neighborhoods.

Mike Lewis

On 1/18/2017 9:44 PM, anne marie doherty wrote:

David,

I am a single mother, long term Asheville resident, who has given countless volunteer hours to improving quality of life for "all" Asheville residents. For example, I worked on the highway issue, organizing a community forum, created and managed a neighborhood website for free, was one of the primary volunteers on Solarize Asheville, tutored children at Isaac Dickson, Odyssey and JCC, precinct chair for years, did Building Bridges, was on Executive Committee of Sierra Club, attended many CAN meeting, even ran the meeting before...perhaps you don't agree with my politics, but I have more than demonstrated my desire for safe, livable, connected, healthy Asheville neighborhoods. When I saw an issue, I didn't just rant about it, I took action and worked for solutions.

I never intended to rent my ADU, it was my guest room, but that wasn't an option when the recession hit. It helped get me through without being forced to sell my home, and it was bloody "hard work" to do it right.

I am in the process of writing my story, help put a human face on the issue, but meanwhile I want to say how tired I am of the "rants" from a few residents, that point to a some bad actors and lump all of us together. I'm so tired of being treated like a criminal.

Am I frustrated with the way the City has handled STR regulation?, you bet I am! Does Airbnb have some serious flaws? yes. I started the STRAA website four years ago, because I realized this was going to be a huge issue for Asheville, and I genuinely wanted to get ahead of the curve and work to craft reasonable regulations, help bring genuine hosts out of hiding to work together. So much for that idea.

The spectrum of hosts is broad, but It is true that at the extremes there tend to be two types of STR hosts. Type 1, those that are "only" in in for the money, don't care much about the neighborhoods, own many properties, don't want to even know who their guests are...

Type 2, legitimate residents, long term property owners that are active in the community, single women or young folks, retired folks, all trying to make it financially, folks that really need the income, hosts that love introducing folks to Asheville, hosting parents of UNCA kids, workshop attendees, new arrivals, and all the other type of visitors to Asheville that can't afford an expensive hotel. When I was attending Lenoir Rhyne's sustainability program, we even did a project how Airbnb could be used to promote sustainability.

It's not going away, and at the moment those that "stayed" underground are being rewarded financially, while those of us that tried to do it right, and tried to work with the City are being punished. I lived the issue of affordable housing for years when raising my daughters alone, I do care about Asheville neighborhoods, and I'm not a criminal! I worked long and hard to own a home, and it's my only retirement plan. - Anne Marie

PS It is my experience that Type 2 hosts tend to live on or near the property and have ADU's.

From the desk of Anne Marie Doherty

On Wed, Jan 11, 2017 at 6:49 AM, David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com> wrote:

Cecil,

I just saw your posting on the ASTRA Facebook page:

"It has come to my awareness that a seeming majority of persons who are offering short term rentals are single women who need the income. (And no surprise, since women are paid lower and hold more part time jobs, hence needing the income.) I'd be very interested to hear from you in complete confidence if that's the case. I am doing everything I can to make STR of ADUs legal in Asheville and I promise utter confidentiality if you contact me. Either FB message or e-mail.

cecil@braveulysses.com"

Please know that two of the ADU Task Force members are seemingly affluent males wanting to use their ADUs as STRs. Both bought their homes in 2014, John Farquhar in Norwood for \$445,000 and Jackson Tierney in Montford \$565,500. Both have their wives listed on the property cards so I guess you can present this as "women needing the income" to all at city council. I really don't think these two men and their wives are broke and needing the income from running a hotel to survive. It is interesting to note that when these two men purchased homes with ADUs in 2014 the listing of John's said it was a long term rental. Jackson's said it was income producing and my understanding is this was a long term rental too. I understand Jackson did a lot of work to bring his up to code, but the point here is that these were two men bought homes with ADUs that were sheltering citizens, not tourists. **The zoning in place when they bought their homes did not and does not allow STRs.**

Why do you want to convert our housing to hotels?

These are not impoverished individuals. **John Farquhar owns several other properties in Buncombe County of over One Million Dollars. Jackson Tierney owns or owned other investment properties too.** Many smart investors use LLCs so it is hard or impossible to know just how many properties an individual owns.

Maybe John Farquhar or Jackson Tierney can let you know if they are truly destitute and need the additional profit of operating a hotel vs. the income generated from long term rentals. The listing on John's when he bought it in 2014 said the rental rate for the ADU was \$1000 per month. Isn't this enough profit? I guess not.

These two men dishonored the work we did on the ADU Task Force by presenting their own plan, developed secretly. We as a group decided not to use the "Portland model". It is clear they presented this plan to you before the city council meeting where we were all blindsided by John presenting for 10 minutes on a plan we rejected. I hesitated to outline their investments, but it is clear you need to know the leading advocates of changing the zoning is not destitute women. It is two profit maximizing businessmen not satisfied with the profits of long term rentals.

AirBnB is a \$30 Billion company trying to profit converting our housing to hotels.

Cecil, why are you siding with these wealthy men and AirBnB when we obviously need more housing? We are all going to be paying for decades the \$25M plus interest for the housing bonds. It is clear the taxpayers want more, not less housing. The vote was clear on the bonds. ADUs are real housing. It doesn't make sense to convert hundreds of homes into hotels while financing the construction of apartments in the same price point. We might as well flush our tax dollars / bond money down the toilet.

I BCC all ADU Task Force members as I believe in not going behind the backs of others. We all worked too hard over nine meetings developing a path forward to let this get hijacked by wealthy business men not happy with the zoning rules they purchased their homes with now trying to get the rules changed.

I truly hope you reconsider your position on using our homes as Short Term Rentals. ADUs are homes, not hotels.

All the best,

David L. Rodgers

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Asheville CAN" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to AshevilleCAN+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/AshevilleCAN/CAAQRpBhd4KTMgnYvNgHq5tjMUKxhDjegYHQ67BhvXgGiY0Bfuw%40mail.gmail.com>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Asheville CAN" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to AshevilleCAN+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/AshevilleCAN/CAKdrFS2PVFh4N-Q%3DTBw2sMyvEYB8vCaifsn1evuXviMjUvZ%2BEA%40mail.gmail.com>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

--

Michael N Lewis
48 Gracelyn Rd.
Asheville, NC 28804
828-252-3684
mlewis6956@charter.net

Ben Fulmer

From: David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 9:49 AM
To: councilgroup
Cc: <ashevillecan@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Please reconsider the facts on ADUs

Cecil,

I just saw your posting on the ASTRA Facebook page:

"It has come to my awareness that a seeming majority of persons who are offering short term rentals are single women who need the income. (And no surprise, since women are paid lower and hold more part time jobs, hence needing the income.) I'd be very interested to hear from you in complete confidence if that's the case. I am doing everything I can to make STR of ADUs legal in Asheville and I promise utter confidentiality if you contact me. Either FB message or e-mail.

cecil@braveulysses.com"

Please know that two of the ADU Task Force members are seemingly affluent males wanting to use their ADUs as STRs. Both bought their homes in 2014, John Farquhar in Norwood for \$445,000 and Jackson Tierney in Montford \$565,500. Both have their wives listed on the property cards so I guess you can present this as "women needing the income" to all at city council. I really don't think these two men and their wives are broke and needing the income from running a hotel to survive. It is interesting to note that when these two men purchased homes with ADUs in 2014 the listing of John's said it was a long term rental. Jackson's said it was income producing and my understanding is this was a long term rental too. I understand Jackson did a lot of work to bring his up to code, but the point here is that these were two men bought homes with ADUs that were sheltering citizens, not tourists. **The zoning in place when they bought their homes did not and does not allow STRs.**

Why do you want to convert our housing to hotels?

These are not impoverished individuals. **John Farquhar owns several other properties in Buncombe County of over One Million Dollars. Jackson Tierney owns or owned other investment properties too.** Many smart investors use LLCs so it is hard or impossible to know just how many properties an individual owns.

Maybe John Farquhar or Jackson Tierney can let you know if they are truly destitute and need the additional profit of operating a hotel vs. the income generated from long term rentals. The listing on John's when he bought it in 2014 said the rental rate for the ADU was \$1000 per month. Isn't this enough profit? I guess not.

These two men dishonored the work we did on the ADU Task Force by presenting their own plan, developed secretly. We as a group decided not to use the "Portland model". It is clear they presented this plan to you before the city council meeting where we were all blindsided by John presenting for 10 minutes on a plan we rejected. I hesitated to outline their investments, but it is clear you need to know the leading advocates of changing the zoning is not destitute women. It is two profit maximizing businessmen not satisfied with the profits of long term rentals.

AirBnB is a \$30 Billion company trying to profit converting our housing to hotels.

Cecil, why are you siding with these wealthy men and AirBnB when we obviously need more housing? We are all going to be paying for decades the \$25M plus interest for the housing bonds. It is clear the taxpayers want more, not less housing. The vote was clear on the bonds. ADUs are real housing. It doesn't make sense to convert hundreds of homes into hotels while financing the construction of apartments in the same price point. We might as well flush our tax dollars / bond money down the toilet.

I BCC all ADU Task Force members as I believe in not going behind the backs of others. We all worked too hard over nine meetings developing a path forward to let this get hijacked by wealthy business men not happy with the zoning rules they purchased their homes with now trying to get the rules changed.

I truly hope you reconsider your position on using our homes as Short Term Rentals. ADUs are homes, not hotels.

All the best,

David L. Rodgers

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Barry <emma04406@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 08, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Richard Lee
Cc: David Rodgers;Michael Lewis;Amy Kemp;councilgroup;AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com
Subject: Re: [CAN] Plan on a Page - No support for STRs. Why do you?

We need to think about how to house homeless people and not our "backyards" and pocketbooks. Where is the voice of the homeless on this forum?
Maggie Barry

On Thu, Jan 5, 2017 at 8:49 AM, Richard Lee <ric.hardlee@live.com> wrote:

I'm always considering. I know we agree on a lot, including strengthening neighborhoods and restricting the number of Airbnb-type rentals in them. We may draw the line in different places, but we have the same goal.

Thank you for going through the plans-on-a-page for the information below. It's very useful and informative. The city should be giving neighborhoods some autonomy or authority over this.

Rich

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com>
Date: 1/5/17 7:13 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: Richard Lee <ric.hardlee@live.com>
Cc: Michael Lewis <mlewis6956@charter.net>, Amy Kemp <aakemp111@gmail.com>, councilgroup <AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov>, AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com
Subject: Re: [CAN] Plan on a Page - No support for STRs. Why do you?

Rich,

Staff spoke clearly about not allowing STRs in residential zoned neighborhoods. Their reasoning applies to using ADUs as STRs. Please read the email I sent about 11 Wayside Dr rezoning for an STR staff and P&Z forcefully rejected.

The ship has not sailed on this issue. Do you want all commercial activities in residential? Zoning has meaning. I chose specifically NOT to share a fence with commercial hotel operations. When I bought my home I considered one a street a way that bordered commercial on Merrimon and specifically chose against this based on wanting to be surrounded by residential zoning and all this offers.

Pulling the rug out from under us and allowing a \$30B firm (Airbnb) to profit from my neighborhood is not what I signed up for when I signed my mortgage.

I donated to your last campaign. I support you on a lot of levels. Please reconsider this. It is clear from the plan on a page, staff reports and P&Z votes that residential zoning needs to keep commercial lodging out. Home businesses without customers coming and going such as my real estate work is much different than hotel operations. There is no additional traffic or late night noise generated.

The ADU rules were super sized to create more housing - not stand alone two bedroom hotels. I live on a .14 acre lot. City staff emailed my parcel and how a 800 sq ft detached home easily fits on my lot. This was to create housing, not hotels.

The ADU Task Force I served on clearly recommended not using ADUs as STRs.

I appreciate your consideration of this.

David

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 5, 2017, at 6:49 AM, Richard Lee <ric.hardlee@live.com> wrote:

The city has already said it's fine with running a commercial enterprise in your residence as long as you live in it and it's a permitted homestay. The debate isn't over some absolute definition of what's a "commercial" property and what's a "residential" one. That ship already sailed. It's about whether home stay rules should mean you live in the house or just live on the property.

Rich

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Michael Lewis <mlewis6956@charter.net>

Date: 1/4/17 8:16 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: Amy Kemp <aakemp111@gmail.com>

Cc: councilgroup <AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov>, AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com, David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: [CAN] Plan on a Page - No support for STRs. Why do you?

I don't even know why we are discussing this. Except....there are folks who want to exploit residential neighborhoods for their own purposes and to the detriment of the neighborhoods. They don't care that some of us choose to live in residential neighborhoods for a reason.

We've had zoning in Asheville since the 1940's. I'm sure we heard from the "property rights" folks back then. "I can do anything I please with my property!" Not! Not when your activity is to the detriment of others. By zoning the City, we allowed various land uses in specific areas. We created zones for commercial purposes, manufacturing and industrial purposes, and

residential purposes. We acknowledged that manufacturing, industrial, and commercial activities might not be compatible with residential neighborhoods. That was true then and it remains so. STRs are commercial activities. They are illegal in residential neighborhoods. They should not be allowed in residential neighborhoods. How simple is that? Keep STRs and other commercial activities **out** of residential neighborhoods. People who have invested in their homes away from commercial entities are entitled to peace and quiet.

Mike Lewis

On 1/4/2017 11:21 AM, Amy Kemp wrote:

Mr Rodgers, whereas I appreciate what you have brought up regarding short-term rentals, there are some very real pieces of this complex puzzle that are not considered in the information I have heard presented on this subject. This information is critical, with the results of the STR landscape unfolding daily as we watch the cost of Asheville's housing increase:

Short-term rentals have broadly impacted the affordability of housing in our community, while resulting in deeply held positions that are dividing neighborhoods while imperiling our ability to free use of our private property. The outcome of the resulting government intervention is impersonal, divisive and an economic burden to our community.

The situation has contributed to our perspective that the government should take on the challenge of regulating the STR "industry" while simultaneously making it responsible for solving the resulting affordable housing crisis. The affect of STR's on our communities is moved into a government arena to be played out by individuals who are not directly impacted by the situation.

Every short-term rental situation is as unique as the individuals involved. In other words, the playing field is extremely complex, and the situations behind them are broad.

Consider this very real situation:

A local resident who has owned and operated ~30 affordable housing units for the past 20+ years. The individual's properties have always rented well below market, and as a result provide housing for numerous struggling individuals over many years.

The cost of housing increases; the owner starts to increase rents, including those of longterm residents. It makes good economic sense! Why leave money on the table??? Although these properties still rent below market, the owner can and does easily justify raising rent on individualss.

That same property owner builds a new home that includes an ADU. The ADU could generate \$2000+ in income monthly, well above what the investor could get for a longterm rental. That income offsets the individual's need to increase rent on 30 affordably housing units. Neighbors don't have an issue. Everyone is a winner, no government involvement required.

There is NO consideration for this situation in the current proposed situation. Writing laws completely overlooks the very real and unique situations that exist within our community. There are tons of landlords in our community that have owned and offered affordable housing for years. What are we doing to encourage those individuals to keep their housing affordable? How are they being recognized and appreciated? How are we working with them, rather than against them?

And how are we considering the individuals whose housing is affordable because they share it? Or those who use the extra income to improve their properties and the community as a whole?

In an effort to keep housing affordable, the first thing that we need are strong neighborhood associations that meet on a regular basis, structured in a manner that will allow them to give consideration to be to all individuals and situations that comprise the shortterm rental landscape.

Strong neighborhood associations would allow those living in neighborhoods to identify all short-term rentals, some of which they may actually want in their neighborhood. It allows for the improvements that can be gained through those rental activities. It allows neighbors to talk to each other rather than to city employees when resolving disputes. Collective decisions are more inclusive and impactful than decisions made by outside parties or legal authorities.

We all relinquish our power when we are not given the ability to participate in outcomes that directly impact us. This is a prime example of relinquishing power rather than taking responsibility for participating in a reasonable and inclusive outcome.

Short-term rental market issues directly affect affordable housing and our overall cost of government, while directly impacting our property rights. We don't need more laws, we simply need to strengthen our neighborhoods, provide them with structure, and allow those within our neighborhoods visibility to the activities and participation in the outcomes.

Sincerely,

Amy Kemp
Concerned and Active Citizen
[828-989-2892](tel:828-989-2892)

Amy

On Fri, Dec 30, 2016 at 10:01 PM, David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com> wrote:

Mayor and Council Members,

At the last meeting three of you voted to move forward with using our ADU homes as hotels. I hope you reconsider this.

I can't find support for short term rentals (STRs) in any of the "Plan on a Page" documents created by neighborhood associations. I did find quite a few in opposition STRs and increased density which will occur if Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are allowed to be built as hotels. It seems most residential neighborhoods like the zoning rules as they are. I put the quotes from the neighborhoods below and hope you take the time to read them.

Please consider this:

1. P&Z voted against using ADUs as STRs.
2. The ADU Task Force recommendation is to not allow ADUs to be used as STRs - we presented a path forward with Core 1 supported by the majority 8 of 12 voted for.
3. Neighborhoods are not supporting STRs (a common theme is we like the zoning we bought our homes with and would like it to stay the same).

Neighborhood quotes from "Plan on a Page"

Source:

<http://www.ashevillenc.gov/Departments/CommunityRelations/NeighborhoodServices/NeighborhoodPlans.aspx>

Albermarle Park:

- Keep commercial uses including short-term and vacation rentals out of the neighborhood
- Maintain our residential neighborhood – our strength, our vision and our challenge
- □□□□□□□□ Short-term and vacation rental threat – City needs to protect in-town neighborhoods and pro-actively enforce its laws and not leave neighbors to do all the local policing; AP needs to be vigilant to these intrusive uses and encourage neighbors to work together to maintain the residential character, be contributing members of the neighborhood and not “strip mine” our local resources for commercial use.

Beverly Hills:

- Neighborhood Challenges - 2) Rentals, Including annual, Homestay and STR
- Neighborhood Responsibility – 2) Homestay and STR violations will be reported to the city by the neighborhood, but regulations have to be promulgated by the city.

Chestnut Hills

- Character how to maintain the neighborhood character amidst increasing density pressure, rising property taxes and values and increasing absentee landlords.
- Maintain the character of the historic, architecturally diverse neighborhood by maintaining the RM8 Zoning classification.

East – West Asheville

- Vision – The single-family character of East-West Asheville neighborhoods is preserved.

Grove Park – Sunset Mountain

- promotion of short-term rentals (such as AirBNB) – could adversely allow commercialization into established residential neighborhood areas.

Grace

- Too much density could destroy the character of our neighborhood. Many of us live on 50' wide lots with just a tiny greenspace in the backyard and our neighbor's backyards. There is a value to greenspace. Noise is an issue and increases with more density.

Heart of Chestnut Hill

- An increase in density requirements will forever change the community and ultimately destroy this historic area.

Kenilworth

- Rising housing prices with resulting property tax increases and purchase of properties for vacation rentals and second homes are creating financial pressure and pushing out residents of a lower socioeconomic status.

Lakeshore Heights

- Maintain the single family home character of the neighborhood
- Support care for neighborhood home structures and properties, and limit additional conversions of owner residences to rental residences

Montford

- Impacts of short-term rentals in the neighborhood, especially impacts on long-term affordable housing and on a sustainable balance of residents to visitors.

Parkway Forest

- We, the residents of Parkway Forest want to see single-family homes that are kept residential and we do not want to see homes turned into commercial-use buildings (such as the Air B&B's).
- Residents are worried about increased density and Air B&Bs which many residents do not want.
- keeping Air B&B out of our neighborhood would ensure that any rental units would be long-term rentals only, also adding to the affordable housing stock.

West End Clingman Area Neighborhood (WECAN)

- Neighborhood Challenges - short term rentals

Why are we considering and still discussing using whole homes (which ADUs are, lets start calling them homes, I've never heard someone say they live in an ADU) as housing for tourists?

As we head into 2017 lets put this issue to rest. It is a fact we need housing. It is a fact ADUs are housing. It is a fact that converting units of housing into hotels reduces our housing stock. It is a fact that many, many neighborhoods do not want short term rentals and want the zoning to remain the same as when they purchased their homes assuming it would preserve the character of their neighborhood. Don't pull the rug out from underneath us by changing the zoning to allow commercial lodging operations displacing our neighbors for more profitable tourists.

You are using millions of our tax dollars every year to create more housing and now an additional \$25M plus interest. All the ADU rental rates I have been finding meet the affordable / workforce rates. Why do you want to allow these to be used as hotels? Aren't the long term rental profits high enough? Do you really want to see folks kicked out of homes so tourists have a place to stay? This is the reality. Real people get kicked out of homes for tourists. I'll gladly meet with you to show you real examples of where this has and is happening if you don't think this is true.

Lets do the right thing in 2017. Quit wasting all the staff time and money reviewing this and your time with public hearings. We have been doing this long enough. Please listen to the advice of P&Z, the ADU Task Force, the neighborhood associations and all the affordable housing advocates.

All the best,

David L. Rodgers

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Asheville CAN" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to AshevilleCAN+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/AshevilleCAN/CAAQRpBjAmwSDXcnLBVcMUbS%3D524SAQu%2Br2QCF0coJ9bLauXXQ%40mail.gmail.com>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Asheville CAN" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to AshevilleCAN+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/AshevilleCAN/CAN9T3%3DbHZf3P%2BRcUUUcif-KpZZyN7byH98m4mESTg90etJF5VA%40mail.gmail.com>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

--

Michael N Lewis
48 Gracelyn Rd.
Asheville, NC 28804
[828-252-3684](tel:828-252-3684)
mlewis6956@charter.net

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Asheville CAN" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to AshevilleCAN+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/AshevilleCAN/141935b5-b6a1-a1f5-db88-7e8070d830f7%40charter.net>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Asheville CAN" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to

AshevilleCAN+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To post to this group, send email to AshevilleCAN@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit

<https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/AshevilleCAN/CY4PR12MB1783C6EDC68BB83E2CF6948186600%4CY4PR12MB1783.namprd12.prod.outlook.com>.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

Ben Fulmer

From: morricat@juno.com
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 1:17 PM
To: <AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov>
Cc: <rodgersdl@gmail.com>
Subject: Please do not support ADUs for STRs.
Attachments: [CAN] Plan on a Page - No support for STRs. Why do you?

Dear Asheville City Council,

Please know I do NOT support at all Short Term Rentals in residential neighborhoods in any form, for single unit housing nor the ADUs (Assessory Dwelling Units). I hope you recognize that quality of life issues and strong neighborhoods contribute to a vital and living community, while allowing commercialization of our residential areas via STRs in any format, will degrade the community in the long run for individual financial gain. I agree with David Roger's analysis attached and hope you will not allow this.

Regards, Catherine Morris, Falconhurst Neighborhood

Ben Fulmer

From: David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 10:29 AM
To: councilgroup
Cc: <ashevillecan@googlegroups.com>;Tuch, Shannon;Gary Jackson
Subject: Staff and P&Z say NO to STRs - Why do you support this?
Attachments: 11 Wayside Staff Report.pdf

Mayor and City Council Members,

City staff and P&Z both spoke forcefully against the 11 Wayside Drive rezoning for use as a short term rental. The request was withdrawn by the applicant so you didn't get to vote on this last April. This case deserves your review and consideration as you consider using whole homes, which Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are, as Short Term Rentals (STRs). The summary staff report is attached (the entire report was too large too email, I'll print and deliver a copy to you if you'd like).

It is clear **staff and P&Z are against Short Term Rentals in residential neighborhoods.**

Here are some quotes from the 11 Wayside Drive staff report:

“Compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan: The use is not compatible with the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan (see below) that focus on housing, compatible development and quality of life. Asheville has determined that a short-term rental in a residential district where the owner is not present on the property introduces the potential for nuisance and compatibility concerns, disrupting the harmony and quality of life in those areas; there are no stated land use goals that describe the commercialization of Asheville’s residential neighborhoods.”

“Relationship between the proposed and adjacent uses: If approved, the short-term rental would be classified as a commercial “lodging use” while all of the surrounding properties are single family residential uses. The commercial use is not consistent or compatible with the surrounding residential land uses.”

"This action does not align with the 2036 Council Vision in any of the eight focus areas."

When staff and P&Z spoke so clearly against allowing our homes to be used as STRs why would you want to open this up to occur anywhere and everywhere with a permit process? It is clear we need to keep commercial lodging operations out of residential neighborhoods. The ADU Task Force and affordable housing advocates do not want ADUs to be used as STRs. The “Plan on a Page” many neighborhoods submitted spoke clearly against short term rentals. Please, please listen and read the attached report.

I appreciate your consideration of this.

All the best,

David L. Rodgers

Ben Fulmer

From: David Rodgers <rodgersdl@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 11:01 PM
To: councilgroup
Cc: <ashevillecan@googlegroups.com>
Subject: Plan on a Page - No support for STRs. Why do you?

Mayor and Council Members,

At the last meeting three of you voted to move forward with using our ADU homes as hotels. I hope you reconsider this.

I can't find support for short term rentals (STRs) in any of the "Plan on a Page" documents created by neighborhood associations. I did find quite a few in opposition STRs and increased density which will occur if Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are allowed to be built as hotels. It seems most residential neighborhoods like the zoning rules as they are. I put the quotes from the neighborhoods below and hope you take the time to read them.

Please consider this:

1. P&Z voted against using ADUs as STRs.
2. The ADU Task Force recommendation is to not allow ADUs to be used as STRs - we presented a path forward with Core 1 supported by the majority 8 of 12 voted for.
3. Neighborhoods are not supporting STRs (a common theme is we like the zoning we bought our homes with and would like it to stay the same).

Neighborhood quotes from "Plan on a Page"

Source:

<http://www.ashevellenc.gov/Departments/CommunityRelations/NeighborhoodServices/NeighborhoodPlans.aspx>
[x](#)

Albermarle Park:

- Keep commercial uses including short-term and vacation rentals out of the neighborhood
- Maintain our residential neighborhood – our strength, our vision and our challenge
- Short-term and vacation rental threat – City needs to protect in-town neighborhoods and pro-actively enforce its laws and not leave neighbors to do all the local policing; AP needs to be vigilant to these intrusive uses and encourage neighbors to work together to maintain the residential character, be contributing members of the neighborhood and not "strip mine" our local resources for commercial use.

Beverly Hills:

- Neighborhood Challenges - 2) Rentals, Including annual, Homestay and STR
- Neighborhood Responsibility – 2) Homestay and STR violations will be reported to the city by the neighborhood, but regulations have to be promulgated by the city.

Chestnut Hills

- Character how to maintain the neighborhood character amidst increasing density pressure, rising property taxes and values and increasing absentee landlords.
- Maintain the character of the historic, architecturally diverse neighborhood by maintaining the RM8 Zoning classification.

East – West Asheville

- Vision – The single-family character of East-West Asheville neighborhoods is preserved.

Grove Park – Sunset Mountain

- promotion of short-term rentals (such as AirBNB) – could adversely allow commercialization into established residential neighborhood areas.

Grace

- Too much density could destroy the character of our neighborhood. Many of us live on 50' wide lots with just a tiny greenspace in the backyard and our neighbor's backyards. There is a value to greenspace. Noise is an issue and increases with more density.

Heart of Chestnut Hill

- An increase in density requirements will forever change the community and ultimately destroy this historic area.

Kenilworth

- Rising housing prices with resulting property tax increases and purchase of properties for vacation rentals and second homes are creating financial pressure and pushing out residents of a lower socioeconomic status.

Lakeshore Heights

- Maintain the single family home character of the neighborhood
- Support care for neighborhood home structures and properties, and limit additional conversions of owner residences to rental residences

Montford

- Impacts of short-term rentals in the neighborhood, especially impacts on long-term affordable housing and on a sustainable balance of residents to visitors.

Parkway Forest

- We, the residents of Parkway Forest want to see single-family homes that are kept residential and we do not want to see homes turned into commercial-use buildings (such as the Air B&B's).
- Residents are worried about increased density and Air B&Bs which many residents do not want.
- keeping Air B&B out of our neighborhood would ensure that any rental units would be long-term rentals only, also adding to the affordable housing stock.

West End Clingman Area Neighborhood (WECAN)

- Neighborhood Challenges - short term rentals

Why are we considering and still discussing using whole homes (which ADUs are, lets start calling them homes, I've never heard someone say they live in an ADU) as housing for tourists?

As we head into 2017 lets put this issue to rest. It is a fact we need housing. It is a fact ADUs are housing. It is a fact that converting units of housing into hotels reduces our housing stock. It is a fact that many, many neighborhoods do not want short term rentals and want the zoning to remain the same as when they purchased their homes assuming it would preserve the character of their neighborhood. Don't pull the rug out from underneath us by changing the zoning to allow commercial lodging operations displacing our neighbors for more profitable tourists.

You are using millions of our tax dollars every year to create more housing and now an additional \$25M plus interest. All the ADU rental rates I have been finding meet the affordable / workforce rates. Why do you want to allow these to be used as hotels? Aren't the long term rental profits high enough? Do you really want to see folks kicked out of homes so tourists have a place to stay? This is the reality. Real people get kicked out of homes for tourists. I'll gladly meet with you to show you real examples of where this has and is happening if you don't think this is true.

Lets do the right thing in 2017. Quit wasting all the staff time and money reviewing this and your time with public hearings. We have been doing this long enough. Please listen to the advice of P&Z, the ADU Task Force, the neighborhood associations and all the affordable housing advocates.

All the best,

David L. Rodgers

Ben Fulmer

From: J Tierney <cttierney1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2016 8:57 AM
To: brianhaynes@avlcouncil.com
Subject: Fwd: ADU Task Force Denouement

Hi Brian,

I received this note from Julie last night updating me on her latest thinking regarding ADU STRs.

I have not responded to her yet, but will do so shortly.

I appreciate your continued and vocal support of this issue.

Jackson

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Julie Mayfield <juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com>
Date: Thu, Dec 15, 2016 at 5:54 PM
Subject: RE: ADU Task Force Denouement
To: J Tierney <cttierney1@gmail.com>

Hi Jackson – I'm going to do some research on how they seem to have reached a better place in Portland. I plan to call some groups I have worked with out there as well as some housing advocates to get their take on it. Their secret sauce may not work here for whatever reason, but it's worth a look if it could lead to increased density and construction of more ADUs for LTR.

We've got some cooling off time with the holidays but I wanted you to know where my head is.

Julie

From: J Tierney [mailto:cttierney1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 4:02 PM

To: Julie Mayfield <juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com>
Subject: Re: ADU Task Force Denouement

Julie,

John Farquhar and I had a good meeting with the mayor. We reviewed the attached pitch with her.

The content of the pitch was similar to the Core 3 document I sent you this morning, but the recommendation in the presentation was framed as an 18 month pilot. We think this is the best path forward so we can move from the unknown to data driven solutions. John Farquhar will present a condensed version of the pitch during the public comments portion of the meeting.

You will likely not get a chance to review the presentation, so here is the recommendations section pasted below:

- Set up 18 month pilot program **(2016 Santa Fe solution)**
- Keep room homestays, add ADU homestays, reaffirm ban on whole house STRs **(2016 Austin solution)**
- Permit ADU homestays in accordance with existing homestay rules; do not add any additional restrictions **(2014 Portland solution)**
- Work with Airbnb to insert permit facsimile, report non-compliance **(2016 New Orleans solution)**
- Allow up to 150 ADU homestay permits on a first-come-first-serve basis **(2017-18 Asheville pilot)**
- At end of pilot period, analyze:
 - number, type and source of neighborhood complaints
 - GIS location of permits
 - rental market conditions in Metro Asheville
 - survey results of ADU owners and neighbors
- Based on information collected, expand, contract or sunset ADU homestays (data driven decision making)

Regards,

Jackson

On Tue, Dec 13, 2016 at 8:39 AM, J Tierney <cttierney1@gmail.com> wrote:

Julie,

If we would have been able to adopt the Portland model, we would have introduced it as Core Idea 3. The attached document outlines what we envision.

About a month ago we requested a meeting with the mayor, but she turned us down because the task force had not yet made its report to council. However, last Thursday the mayor send us an email requesting we meet today at 1:30. Core 3 will form the basis of our conversation. Once we have presented our PowerPoint slides to her, I will forward to you.

Regards,

Jackson

On Mon, Dec 12, 2016 at 10:45 PM, Julie Mayfield <juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com> wrote:

I spent quite awhile tonight reading about Portland and ADUs. It was enough for me to wonder whether we can have our cake and eat it too – meaning have more ADUs generally, which is our express desire, provide additional incentives for them to be LTRs, but allow those that don't use the incentives be used as STRs with perhaps some limitations as suggested in Core Idea 2.

We don't have to vote tomorrow, so there is time for me to explore this with my colleagues as well as others in the planning/urban development world. I've said from the start that I don't want to adopt a policy that frustrates our policy changes from last year to incentivize ADU construction to address our long term housing crisis. If Portland has found that balance – or rather found that the vast majority of new ADUs are being used for LTR rather than STR - then we should look at it.

What would that Core Idea have looked like had you been able to include it?

I look forward to seeing you tomorrow.

Julie

From: J Tierney [mailto:cttierney1@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2016 10:27 PM
To: Julie Mayfield <juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com>
Subject: Re: ADU Task Force Denouement

Hi Julie,

Thanks for getting back to me, especially with your incredibly busy schedule.

You're right, this task force was a different animal and maybe Ed was out of his element. On a different occasion, I saw him MC the leadership breakfast on affordable housing, and thought he did a wonderful job.

For tomorrow night, I was selected by the task force to present Core Idea 2. It's too bad we did not get a chance to present the Portland solution after the voting process was understood by all.

Do you still have an open mind on this topic? I really think you need to see the data we have pulled together on all the good things they are doing in Portland with ADUs and other benchmark cities in the U.S.

Were you able to find out anything else from your Council colleagues?

Jackson

On Sun, Dec 11, 2016 at 2:48 PM, Julie Mayfield <juliemayfield@avlcouncil.com> wrote:

Hello Jackson – I'm sorry it's taken me so long to respond. My day job has been quite demanding this last week, and I wanted to read your entire email before responding.

I am sorry to hear this report of the process. I know Ed Manning well, and he has facilitated several meetings and retreats I've been in. Those have always been good experiences, but also very different kinds of experiences. I have not spoken with anyone else about their experiences on the task force or any other council members who might have heard the same or different reports. The quality of the process is key to being able to rely on the outcome and, having found you to always be reasonable, I am troubled.

Let me do some reaching out to other council members to see what they are hearing. And I'm just now working my way through my council emails, so I may have more on this to inform my thinking. I'll try to be in touch before our meeting Tuesday, but I assume you will be there Tuesday night to provide comments?

Thank you Jackson -

Julie

From: J Tierney [mailto:cttierney1@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2016 3:03 PM

To: Julie Mayfield <julievmayfield@gmail.com>

Cc: AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov

Subject: ADU Task Force Denouement

Julie,

As you know, the ADU Task Force is scheduled to make its final report to City Council on 12/13. After diligently working on this team for over six months, I feel that it is time to provide you some feedback.

In May, you asked me to consider volunteering for this team because I seemed like a "reasonable" person. I went into this effort hopeful that I would be working with other Asheville citizens who were willing to explore compromise solutions for use of ADUs as homestays.

I am now rather disillusioned by the whole process. In my 35 year professional career, I have been on scores of working teams and have participated in well over 100 facilitated meetings. I can confidently say the Asheville ADU Task Force was the most poorly planned, disorganized, inefficient and unprofessional process I have ever been associated with.

I am particularly outraged that the Task Force facilitator was blatantly biased and shut down discussion to prevent discussion on a viable solution that came up after the "voting" process was fully explained in meeting number eight(!).

In my career, I have been on two successful, high profile teams, including an International Association of Machinist union/management team for contract negotiations, and a United Nations working group developing market based solutions for reducing CO2e in the global aviation industry. I only raise these high stakes experiences to provide a context for my observations.

To be respectful of your time, I've left the details on my concerns about the Task Force to the section that follows and you can read as your time and priorities allow.

I would rather discuss with you in person, preferably before 12/13. If this is agreeable to you, please let me know what date/time works best.

Regards,

Jackson

M: [860 680 4121](tel:8606804121)

FEEDBACK ON ADU TASK FORCE

The following are the key areas of concern regarding the planning and execution of the subject team:

Team Construction, Recruitment and Meeting Planning

The twelve slots for team construction had an inherent bias against ADUs as home stays. For example, why was there only a "concerned" neighbor slot and not balanced by including a "supportive" neighbor slot? Why was there a real estate industry slot, but not a small business owner or Chamber of Commerce slot?

We had drafted a memo to the mayor providing these comments on the team make up, but in the end decided not to send it because the public solicitation for members was well underway. We thought that the inherent bias stated above could be ameliorated with the proper vetting and selection of open-minded team members. Were we rudely awakened when Jane Matthews, Barber Melton and David Rodgers showed up to the first meeting as Task Force members and made it crystal clear they would not be supporting any solution that would allow for STRs in ADUs. So much for working together.

The team solicitation announcement said there would be six meetings over a three month period. In our first meeting, our facilitator said he was targeting to finish in four meetings. As it turns out, we had two-and-a-half times that many over a six month period. This was mainly due to the gross incompetence of the facilitator. This not only affected the team outcome, but it burned out the team to the point that most team members just wanted to be done with this topic.

Incompetence and Bias of Facilitator

In the first meeting, our City of Asheville contracted facilitator, Ed Manning, said "this was not his process, it was our process." This could not have been further from the truth. As we saw him fumbling through meetings with little to no planning and preparation, John Farquhar and I offered numerous options on pathways forward. These suggestions were made in meetings, emails and calls to Ed. For the most part we were responded with patronizing comments.

As a prime example of how time was wasted, we did not start talking in detail on possible solutions until the **seventh(!)** meeting, and even then in a very controlled and non-productive manner. To sum up how ineffective the meeting dialog was throughout, Carter Webb, who filled one of the neutral party slots, said, "the best conversation we had in the entire nine meeting process was the 30 minutes our facilitator stepped out of the room." High praise for a facilitator? (BTW, ED Manning was out of the room once again making copies that should have been made at the start of the meeting.)

Agendas were not sent in advance of meetings, minutes were so brief they were not useful and Ed arrived exactly at the time of the meeting and wasted the first 30 minutes posting items on the wall, going out of the room to make copies and general chit/ chat.

Ed Manning's bias was evident from the very first meeting. Facts referenced by ADU advocates on the Task Force were challenged to provide sources. And when source references were provided, he neither looked at them nor acknowledged receipt. In contrast, when statistics were referenced by anti-ADU home stay people they were never challenged and simply taken at face value, even when questioned by other task force members. An example of this was Jane Matthews' assertion that ADU as home stays will cause property taxes to go up for the entire neighborhood. Not a single word from Ed. When I said I had spoken to the Buncombe County Tax Department supervisor of appraisers on this exact point and the supervisor said this was virtually impossible for this to happen and provided a detailed explanation, Jane just repeated her original claim. Again, not a word from Ed.

But Ed would contribute when he had something negative to say about STRs. Ed sent a link to an article regarding Airbnb STRs in Portland to the entire task force via email. The article headline had an inflammatory quote from Portland's Director of Housing against STRs; however, when we called the Portland Director of Housing to find out the context of his quote, we found out he was actually in favor of ADUs as home stays; his negative comments were about whole house STRs (and not our scope). Once we broadcasted this person was actually in favor of ADU STRs, Portland was immediately discredited by the anti-ADU people on the Task Force as not being relevant. When we suggested the Portland Housing Director be put on speaker phone to allow others on the team ask questions, we were shut down.

We were so concerned about Ed's blatant bias, Kama Ward sent an email to Gwen Wisler half way through our tenure alerting her to this situation. No action was taken. Why?

"Voting" Process

For eight meetings, all the members of the task force had the understanding that there would be one vote per person (seems logical, right?). But we were informed during the voting in the last 10 minutes of the **eighth(!)** meeting that we had as many votes as there were solutions! Mass confusion ensued and several task force members got angry (myself included). Ed quickly adjourned the meeting and a firestorm ensued via e-mail.

This revelation at the "nth" hour caused great angst because, if this voting scheme (apparently in the facilitator's head only) was understood by all team members from the first meeting, it would have changed how solutions were brought up, discussed and packaged. If we could have as many votes as solutions, there wouldn't be any deterrent to bringing up more solutions and pushing the bounds of what was possible. (Note: In reality, if Ed explained his process of multiple votes per person, I and many others would not have agreed to it.)

Now having an understanding of Ed's "voting" process we attempted to reintroduce the "Portland" experience as one of our solutions in the first ten minutes of the **ninth(!)** meeting. We were shocked when we were told by Ed Manning that the process was closed and no other dialog was allowed! If the city was looking for the best solution, why would the facilitator do this? More bias?

The "Portland" Solution

Despite some people's objection that Portland is not Asheville, there is much to be learned from them; that's the fundamental value of benchmarking.

In short:

- Portland began allowing ADUs in 2014
- They waive development fees for ADUs to incentivize proliferation
- Over 500 have been constructed since 2014, and now ADUs are being built at the rate of one per day
- **ADUs are legal as homestays** if homeowner goes through the STR permitting process.
- The Portland Director of Housing supports ADUs as home stays because ADUs provide neighborhood resiliency (allows people, especially the elderly, to stay in their homes). He says that ADUs are at least 75-80 year housing assets, so he supports their use as STRs because he takes the long view, despite Portland's "housing emergency"

- Studies have shown that if homeowners are allowed to offer ADUs as home stays they are more likely to spend the \$120-150K to build one, and over time there will be **more ADUs available for long term housing than if there were a ban on the use of ADUs as home stays**. This seems counterintuitive at first, but actually makes sense if you spend some time thinking about it
- Flexibility of use is the greatest attribute of ADUs. If someone chooses to use their ADU for home stays, there is a good likelihood it will not be permanent and they will do so for a short period of time, then it will be available for long term rentals. **A Portland researcher has taken data scrapes of the Airbnb website for nine cities worldwide and showed there is a first year attrition rate of 50% for new listings** (i.e., if there are 100 listings on January 1st, 50 of those same listings will have exited the website and no longer in business on December 31st).
- ADUs have been so successful to adding housing units in Portland and increasing density, the city is now working towards allowing two ADUs per lot, one attached ADU and one detached ADU

Why isn't Asheville interested in looking for the best solution?

Why was rampant bias allowed in the planning and execution of the Task Force?

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:30 PM
To: Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell - Email; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Gwen Wisler; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: Draft 12-13-16 City Council Minutes
Attachments: m161213.pdf

Please let me know if you have any changes no later than Tuesday, January 3.

Thanks!!
Maggie

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC
City Clerk
City of Asheville
Post Office Box 7148
Asheville, N.C. 28802
828-259-5601 (phone)
828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: Gary Jackson <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Friday, December 09, 2016 2:43 PM
To: Esther Manheimer
Cc: councilgroup
Subject: FW: HIAC - 5 year plan
Attachments: HIAC Five Year Strategic Plan on Homelessness.final.draft.pdf

In response to your request, the HIAC plan is attached.

From: Christiana Glenn Tugman
Sent: Friday, December 09, 2016 2:37 PM
To: Gary Jackson <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: RE: HIAC - 5 year plan

Please find the pdf. attached.
Thank you and have a good weekend,
Christiana

Christiana Glenn Tugman
Homelessness Lead
The Asheville-Buncombe Homeless Initiative
Community and Economic Development
City of Asheville
P.O. Box 7148
Asheville, NC 28802
t.(828) 251-4048
c.(828) 231-5682
CTugman@ashevillenc.gov

From: Gary Jackson
Sent: Friday, December 09, 2016 2:34 PM
To: Christiana Glenn Tugman <CTugman@ashevillenc.gov>
Cc: Heather Dillashaw <HDillashaw@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: HIAC - 5 year plan

Can you send me a pdf or link to the HIAC five year plan?

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 9:19 AM
To: Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell - Email; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Gwen Wisler; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: Various Bd/Com Minutes
Attachments: Bd & Com Minutes of 7-26-16.docx; Civic Center Commission Minutes8 2 16.docx; CPAC Min 6-1-16.pdf; CPAC Min 7-6-16.pdf; CPAC Min 8-3-16.pdf; 8-3-16 P&Z Minutes.docx; 8-12-16 Downtown Com Minutes.docx; Neighborhood Adv Com Min 6-27-16.pdf; Neighborhood Adv Com Plan.pdf; 8-10-16 HRC Minutes.docx; ABC Bd Min 6-28-16.pdf; ABC Law Enforcement Report July 2016.xlsx; PED 8-16-16 Minutes.pdf

Thanks,
Maggie

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC
City Clerk
City of Asheville
Post Office Box 7148
Asheville, N.C. 28802
828-259-5601 (phone)
828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: Adam Charnack <adam.chnack@hiwirebrewing.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 11:09 AM
To: Keith Young
Cc: Julie Mayfield;councilgroup;Jaime Matthews;Cathy Ball;Barbara Whitehorn;Paul Fetherston;Gary Jackson;Mariate Echeverry;Ken Putnam
Subject: Re: Transit project inclusion in bond referendum
Attachments: High Frequency calculation 7-14-16.pdf; Transit Percent.pdf

Hi everyone,

Thanks for the conversation. I'm truly passionate about this demonstration project and need your help to find the estimated \$175,000-\$350,000 to do so. Your showing of interest is tremendous, and I truly appreciate it.

Since there are a few topic threads going on here, I think it's best to address a few topics individually:

Follow the Transit Master Plan. Thanks, Ms. Ball, for the explanation. My project is a pilot project that I'd like to be funded *outside* of the parameters of the Transit Master Plan. That plan, which the City will be putting an RFP out later this year to update, currently calls for incremental bus improvements over decades. My proposal would aim to show Asheville a glimpse - for one summer - of what the end-product of this incremental change would look like - by running fast, frequent buses through the heart of some of the densest and most popular Asheville neighborhoods. While an incremental improvement like Sunday service, for example, is viewed as a huge win and large step forward amongst City Hall and many transit advocates, to the overwhelming majority of residents of Asheville Sunday service was a news headline that faded quickly. To most in Asheville, adding modest bus service to Sundays - again, a big advance for the community and much appreciated by transit advocates as well as those that must rely upon the service - has little-to-no impact on citizens' daily lives. Further incremental improvements will, over time, add up to a sum that's greater than its parts, but to build support for the future system many transit advocates and City leaders envision, I believe the City needs to demonstrate "what we're missing" by implementing a targeted pilot project that exemplifies what fast, frequent service can look like in our city.

Legality of Including Pilot Programs in the Bond. Thanks, again, Ms. Ball, for the explanation that "For a project to be funded as part of a bond it has to be a capital investment that has a life of 20 years or more". While I understand what you're saying, I don't see how roadway resurfacing and re-striping, then, would apply. If buying a bus or a transit station is a capital improvement, and it is, and acquiring a right-of-way and building a roadway (or, for a more visceral example, think of the DOT acquiring land and building an interstate), which it is, then the operations and maintenance of buses must fall into the "maintenance and operations" category just as much as resurfacing, respaving, and regrading, et cetera must fall into that same category for roadways. I'm not debating that roadway resurfacing is important - where I live is littered with potholes. While that's upsetting, the lack of adequate alternatives is more so. In short, what I am saying is that there should be some measure of parity for transit such that if the City is planning to "catch up" on roadway maintenance some sort of allocation to "transit innovation/demonstration projects" should be strongly considered. *Note: After re-reading Mr. Jackson's explanation I believe I understand the City's position as to why roadway resurfacing, et cetera is allowed but transit operations funding isn't. See the next paragraph for more thoughts on this. That said, I find the lack of parity for transit extremely troubling.*

Regarding Mr. Jackson's Note about "GO Debt Financing". I understand and respect the language in the text you copied and pasted. The language, after re-reading it, seems to essentially eliminate by design any sort of

transit-related operations project, which is disparaging. Assets are great, but buildings need gas and electricity to function, cars need gas to run, and buses need to be funded to serve the public. **I'm not entirely familiar with what City-funded transit capital projects the City has planned for the next few years in its CIP, but can a portion of such funds be replaced by this GO bond funding and reallocated to "transit innovation/demonstration projects" funds?** *As a side note, thank you, Mr. Jackson, for the TFA link. I'm pretty sure I've read that report before, but have printed it out and will be sure to do so again.*

Mr. Young's BRT Idea. Thanks for the idea, Mr. Young! I appreciate the idea and think that BRT is an excellent and underutilized, relatively low-cost solution to combat congestion and increase transit ridership. BRT, or bus rapid transit, seems to implement "rail-like" characteristics that speed up transit service while doing so for less money than most alternatives and on existing rights-of-way. Ultimately, though, inadequate service levels, and not dedicated rights-of-way, are far and away the largest impediment to transit being effective for 98.5% (1) of Asheville's population. While BRT-like solutions might improve bus speeds, our biggest challenge in Asheville is a lack of funding dedicated toward providing frequent service on important, high-ridership-potential corridors. In short, Mr. Young, I think BRT would be an excellent longer term solution for Asheville. Even if the City were to implement BRT-like capital improvements along certain corridors and the DOT would consent to such improvements, we'd still, though, be in the unenviable position that most capital-oriented programs in our country leave us with where we have expensive capital improvements without the funding to adequately take advantage of those improvements. Examples abound of transit agencies building hundreds of millions of dollars of light-rail and other capital transit improvements and then only funding the operation of trains every 20- or 30-minutes, or similarly infrequently, which, of course, defeats the purpose of the investment. Here are some glaring examples of severely underutilized transit assets: <http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2014/08/20/a-call-for-minimum-service-standards/>. Ultimately, while it may at times feel otherwise to some, Asheville doesn't have the congestion issues commensurate with cities that might feel it necessary to invest in BRT-like capital improvements. Frequency of service, see below, is the primary solution to attracting ridership to our fledgling system.

Service/Frequency is King. At the end of the day, more so than nice stations, comfortable rides, A/C, wi-fi, et cetera, et cetera, transit riders want frequency. As is deducible from the above, the onus for operations funding is upon us, the City, as there are scant resources elsewhere to provide such operations funding. I found this article particularly clarifying: <http://www.citylab.com/amp/article/490913/>. Here are the linchpin sentences: "[R]esearchers compared satisfaction levels with various attributes of regional transit systems between respondents who said they'd recommend their transit service to others and those who wouldn't. Of all the attributes[...], **frequency of service demonstrated the largest gap in satisfaction between transit boosters and detractors**, and it got the very lowest rating from transit detractors. **That suggests that frequent service is essential if you want happy riders.**"

BACKGROUND INFO:

Transit Pilot Concept. The concept is to show Asheville what true transit service looks like - ie. service that ALL of Asheville, not merely the 1.5% who use presently use it but also the other 98.5% (1) can rely upon. Asheville's ART provides approximately 5.1 trips per resident of the city per year, 60% of the ridership per resident as Charleston, 65% as Chattanooga, 32% as Savannah (source: <http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/how-your-citys-public-transit-stacks-up/>). It would run, tentatively, along portions of existing routes from Biltmore Village to downtown through the River Arts district to West Asheville along Haywood Road. In short, this project would provide for 10- to 15-minute frequency along this corridor from 12pm to 12am on Fridays and Saturdays and from 10am to 10pm on Sundays - from Memorial Day through Labor Day of 2017.

Support/Endorsements. The concept has been officially endorsed by the Transit Committee as well as the Multimodal Transportation Commission. While I have been personally working on this project for several years, I have also been building a coalition with and have been having regular meetings with both the Convention and Visitors Bureau as well as Land of Sky on ways to implement this service. A long list of

identified supports can, and most likely will, support such a project, an effort that I will be happy to lead. Such likely supporters would include members of the brewery, non-profit, health care and hospitality industries as well as various business and neighborhood associations.

Cost Calculation. See attached.

Final Note. After two and a half years of efforts as a Transit Committee member and roughly eight months as Chair of the Transit Committee, I am passionate about seeing this project come to fruition. I'd like to do everything in my power to find a way to have it implemented by next summer (2017). I would love to work with the City on a collaborative approach to doing so. Please help me in that effort; I'd be more than happy to meet personally or in a group with as many folks as possible to discuss this project.

I am also prepared to rally official support from a coalition first and then come back to seek the City's support, although I'd prefer the more inclusionary approach of having the City's support first. Frankly, I'm also not sure of my long-term interest in continuing to serve much beyond next summer should I be unsuccessful in implementing this pilot project. Asheville is growing, and that growth can be curated towards more walkable environments by providing adequate transit options, or it can be left unfettered while it naturally disperses towards DOT-subsidized public infrastructure investments. In the end, concentrating investments in auto-first solutions will lead to a decreased quality of life and lack of preparedness for our city's long-term growth. This "transit innovation/demonstration projects" fund would allow the City to implement trial programs to better gauge residents' interest in further transit improvements, while providing a mechanism to refine those solutions and the basis on which to drum up support for further transit investments.

Best,
Adam

Note: (1) Transit mode share is estimated at 1.5% of the city's population. See attached.

--

Adam Charnack
Hi-Wire Brewing, Asheville, NC
"Walk on the Wire Side"
828.738.BIGTOP (2448) (o)
828.738.2450 (direct)
828.407.0447 (c)
adam.chnack@hiwirebrewing.com
Facebook [facebook.com/HiWireBrewing](https://www.facebook.com/HiWireBrewing)
Twitter twitter.com/HiWireBrewing
Instagram [instagram.com/hiwirebrewing](https://www.instagram.com/hiwirebrewing)

Trying to setup an appointment? Here's my availability [link](#).

Ben Fulmer

From: Maggie Burleson <MBurleson@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2016 9:21 AM
To: Brian Haynes; Cecil Bothwell - Email; Esther Manheimer; Gordon Smith; Gwen Wisler; Julie Mayfield; Keith Young
Subject: Accessory Dwelling Unit Task Force - Special Volunteer Opportunity
Attachments: ADU Task Force Information with Questions.docx

Please circulate this special volunteer opportunity as much as possible and let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Maggie

Maggie Burleson, MMC, NCCMC
City Clerk
City of Asheville
Post Office Box 7148
Asheville, N.C. 28802
828-259-5601 (phone)
828-259-5499 (fax)

Ben Fulmer

From: morricat@juno.com
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2016 2:26 PM
To: <rodgersdl@gmail.com>
Cc: <AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov>; <stuch@ashevillenc.gov>; <aglines@ashevillenc.gov>; <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov>; <vsatvika@ashevillenc.gov>; <tokolichany@ashevillenc.gov>
Subject: Re: Fwd: ADU Housing citizens or tourists?
Attachments: Fwd: ADU Housing citizens or tourists?

Hello City Council and Planning Department Staff,

I have read with interest many citizen's comments about using ADU's for short term rentals and temporary vacation housing. The vocal advocates for this proposal seem to be primarily interested in maximizing their profit potential and don't particularly care about the impact on neighbors or their neighborhoods. They mention the convenience of having more money from the rentals and don't seem to want to do long term rentals to alleviate the housing crisis because they would not make as much money that way.

I believe this is a slippery slope to blurring the lines for us all, degrading livable communities to transient housing, increasing traffic concerns and very doubtfully generating the desired tax revenue desired by the city. Enforcement would be a nightmare, turning citizens into the watchdogs. How would enforcement ever be accomplished when the "proof" drives away when the STR ends within a day. I suggest those that want STR's look to establish their domiciles where they can be B&B's, boarding houses, or hotels.

Regards, Catherine Morris, West Asheville

Ben Fulmer

From: Dawa Hitch <DHitch@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 12:20 PM
To: councilgroup
Cc: Gary Jackson;Cathy Ball;Jaime Matthews;Sasha Vrtunski
Subject: Equitable Development Report
Attachments: AshevilleEquitableDevelopmentReport_Final.pdf

Mayor and Council Members,

The attached document is the Draft Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Equitable Development Report. The report includes a cover sheet which describes how the information will be used. Staff is sharing this information with City Council and workshop participants ahead of the posting for the general public.

In a presentation at this Tuesday's City Council meeting, Planning staff will summarize the report and how it will be used in the City's day-to-day work.

All my best,
Dawa

Dawa Hitch

City of Asheville
Director of Communication &
Public Engagement
828.259.5981
www.ashevillenc.gov



Ben Fulmer

From: Keith Young <keithyoung@avlcouncil.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 02, 2016 12:05 PM
To: Cecil Bothwell; Brian Haynes
Subject: Fwd: Mayor's Institute on City Design Report
Attachments: MICD 63_Final Meeting Summary (1).pdf

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jaime Matthews** <JMatthews@ashevillenc.gov>
Date: Wed, Dec 16, 2015 at 11:41 AM
Subject: Mayor's Institute on City Design Report
To: councilgroup <AshevilleNCCouncil@ashevillenc.gov>
Cc: Gary Jackson <GJackson@ashevillenc.gov>, Todd Okolichany <TOkolichany@ashevillenc.gov>, Cathy Ball <cball@ashevillenc.gov>

Good Afternoon,

Please see message below from Esther regarding the attached report from the Mayor's Institute of City Design:

All: Please find attached a report from the Mayors' Institute I attended earlier this year. The report provides information about the Institute, and then makes recommendations about Asheville's project at pages 15-18. Several other cities presented projects as well. We asked this team of experts to make recommendations regarding the Hunt Hill/South Charlotte Street area, an area where the city owns a great deal of land. Let me know if you have any questions.

Esther

Jaime Matthews

Business Services Manager

City Manager's Office

City of Asheville, North Carolina

828-232-4541

jmatthews@ashevillenc.gov

Ben Fulmer

From: Jaime Matthews <JMatthews@ashevillenc.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2015 11:42 AM
To: councilgroup
Cc: Gary Jackson;Todd Okolichany;Cathy Ball
Subject: Mayor's Institute on City Design Report
Attachments: MICD 63_Final Meeting Summary (1).pdf

Good Afternoon,

Please see message below from Esther regarding the attached report from the Mayor's Institute of City Design:

All: Please find attached a report from the Mayors' Institute I attended earlier this year. The report provides information about the Institute, and then makes recommendations about Asheville's project at pages 15-18. Several other cities presented projects as well. We asked this team of experts to make recommendations regarding the Hunt Hill/South Charlotte Street area, an area where the city owns a great deal of land. Let me know if you have any questions.

Esther

Jaime Matthews
Business Services Manager
City Manager's Office
City of Asheville, North Carolina
828-232-4541
jmatthews@ashevillenc.gov