

David Cripps

A BY-LAW TO ADOPT LICENSING FOR SHORT TERM ACCOMMODATION

In the DRAFT for this by-law, on the first page it states: and whereas Sections 11(3)(7) and 11(3)(8) of the Municipal ACT, authorize a Municipality to pass by-laws respecting HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELL-BEING of persons, parking on property, etc. The Town of Pelham's residents have spoken loud and clear that they are concerned for their health, safety and well being with short term rentals continuing to be allowed in Residential areas. They have shown this by their large attendance at the meeting on October 22, 2019 that was called to deal specifically with Short Term Rentals and also in the 12 letters that were received, 11 of which were against short term rentals in Residential areas.

Section 1: definitions and interpretation

Bed and Breakfast Establishment means a principal residence dwelling in which the owner and operator provides guest rooms..... this should be OWNER only not operator. If the owner is not the operator the situation just leaves itself open to having the same issues that exist now with the short term rentals, specifically in the Lookout Subdivision.

DWELLING, PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE. Means a dwelling unit owned or rented by a person etc..... Consider instead, "means a single family dwelling owned by a person which is their principal place of residency."

OWNER. Omit the words "has a legal right to obtain possession". And by doing so removes anyone being able to lease the dwelling for the purpose of renting it out.

PARKING AREA. Omit "and may include aisles, pedestrian walkways as these spaces as described are NOT Parking places. No cars should be permitted to park where pedestrians might walk, as this poses a possible safety hazard.

The new by-law amendment should state that Bed & Breakfasts that are currently operating legally will not have their licence transferred if they move to a different property within Pelham. Said licence would only be for their current address and may not be transferred to anyone else for any reason nor if the property should be sold. The addresses of those currently operating legally that might be grandfathered should be specifically mentioned in the by-law amendment. ALSO it would be prudent for the future to have a clause that would stipulate that once any of the grandfathered B&B's cease business and their license is no longer valid that at no time in the future should other B&B's be allowed to open up in ANY residential area.

Adding townhouse residential, low density residential in NW Fonthill and East Fonthill are still residential areas and therefore not areas where Council and taxpayers have indicated where they should be.

1) Given that you were directed by council on October 22, 2019 to not allow STA's in residential neighbourhoods, please give us the readers digest version of what this new by-law draft says? Are we allowing them, yes or no? Why, in the proposed by-law to amend Zoning By-Law 1136 (1987) and the By-Law to Adopt Licencing for Short Term rental Accommodation is there No reference to Short Term Rental Accommodations will not be allowed in Residential Areas or did we miss this?

2) The grandfathered five keeps coming up....are there by-laws in place that will ensure that the owner a) cannot move and take his STA status to another location

b) cannot sell the home with the STA as a business feature

c) cannot pass the STA on to family

These grandfathered STA's must be tied to that particular owner and to a particular house and license. Speaking of which, will these people now be getting a license or do they have a license already? If so, does this not open the door for future operations in residential neighbourhoods? As these slowly "die out," will new ones be allowed to take their place to cap the total at five?

3) 27 Timber Creek Crescent

4) 26 Canboro Road

5) 27 Brewerton Boulevard

6) 273 Canboro Road

7) 1541 Haist Street

8) What will happen to the illegal STA's operating in Lookout and at #35 Stonegate Place and other locations?

9) Are we leaving the door open for future STA considerations in residential neighbourhoods? If so why, when there has been so much public outcry against this?

a) How will these be approached.....approval criteria and by whom?

b) How will future councils understand the legwork and public sentiment that has been the basis for this NO STA in residential areas movement?

c) We do not want to go through this every time there is an election.

10) Covid19 is here to stay for who knows how long. How will these grandfathered STAS ensure that their "guests" are healthy?

a) Will they get a health certificate?

b) Will they take the guest's temperature?

c) Will they ensure a safe distance within the STA?

d) What if the guest is asymptomatic?

It was bad enough before COVID19 knowing that transients would be allowed into our neighbourhoods, now we have to worry about possible infected people coming from high density areas. Allowing an STA makes even less sense now. This is a reality and not fear-mongering. It will be years before there is a

11) There is mention of allowing a renter to operate an STA?

Why? A renter has no stake in the property. Someone could buy various houses, place renters in them, and run them as STA's. What is the difference between that and an AIRB&B?

12) We need to define STA.....how does one distinguish between owner on premises and no owner on premises? Should there be a different terms for each one?

13) There has been mention of more than single family dwellings being allowed to have an STA. How does this relate to no STA's in residential neighbourhoods?