

To Whom It May Concern:

As I understand it, this bill prohibits local government from enforcing any ordinance restricting any lawfully established residential dwelling unit from being used by its owner for vacation occupancy as defined in ORS 90.100 unless the dwelling is uninhabitable.

As a resident of a small coastal town in Oregon, Yachats, I must strongly protest this bill. Our town is already suffering from the lack of full-time residents in that the cost of housing is absolutely prohibitive for any hourly salaried worker. We have homeless on our streets, and all these huge, uninhabited houses lining our shores. We have no public school in our town, because none of the younger couples who have children can afford to rent in our town. A community needs certain aspects in order to remain a community, and vacation rentals have nothing but deleterious effects on community. Frankly, the paltry amount generated by vacation rentals who are above-board (not airb'n'b) is not sufficient to counter the housing drain.

A residential unit should be inhabited continuously. Nobody has the "right" to have two homes; and if you're greedy enough to have two homes, then you should waste your own money because you can't be in two places at once. There is no reason for a community to have to crumble just so somebody else can make money. If you want to have a commercial property, that is different--but it should be clearly marked, zoned, and regulated as such.

Please do not allow this bill to go anywhere but into the trash.

Sincerely,
Heather Taylor
Yachats, OR