

**Jamie Gray**

---

**From:** Cheryl Witherill <manager@1849condos.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 17, 2014 1:06 PM  
**To:** Sandra Moberly; Jamie Gray  
**Subject:** SFH letter to Town Council

Hello Sandra,

I was not sure I would have time to submit anything before this evening. I cannot attend as my husband is just two weeks out from knee replacement so my plate is extremely full. Can one of you send to council and get this into the community packet on my behalf – am I too late? Please let me know. I very much appreciate your assistance. I am ccing Jamie as well. If you can confirm either way, that would be fantastic!

Happy Holidays!  
Cheryl

---

Dear Town Council and Mammoth Lakes Community,

Tonight you will discuss the issue of SFH and the option moving forward on a work program. I have been vocal on the subject of single family home rentals for one reason – I care about Mammoth Lakes and what we will become. At this point in my life, I certainly understand that change is inevitable and often good. However, making a change that effects our small community in more negative ways than positive is not a solution or a direction that a majority of this community desires.

I have met with several of our Town Council members individually on this subject. I thank each of you that have offered your time and ear on this subject. As I cannot be there in person this evening, there are a few points that I want to highlight for you. I truly feel that a six month to a year work program and CEQA study will result in spending unnecessary funds on this work program. I hope you take each of these points, as well as our one on one conversations, into consideration prior to making your decision.

- Inventory- it is clear that the work done to prove that we do indeed have the inventory to offer our important guests has just been set aside. We DO INDEED have 100-150 SFHs available in legal or special use areas.
- Bundle of Rights- those that have purchased and invested in our community own a “bundle of rights” that came with that investment. Is it fair that three council members can take away or hand off those rights to others? This does change our neighborhoods – good or bad.
- General Plan – this decision does NOT follow our General Plan (see notes below)
- Foundation – a 6-12 month work plan and CEQA study) costs money that could be put into bettering our foundation. We need to get staff the tools they need to do their job and fix the foundation issues that are affecting the ability to enforce and collect our very important TOT dollars.
- Maintaining our sense of community – I imagine this will always be a controversial issue, anything that potentially has money attached will be. Voting in the direction of such a large change should be done by our community, not five members of our community when it does not follow our General Plan. Put it in the hands of the people. This issue will tear our community apart. Everyone that I have spoken to on this subject, regardless of their view, feels like this is a big enough for a community vote.

My goal in speaking to Town Council on this subject has been to answer the questions posed by staff and to provide facts to maintain our community; now and down the road. I would hate to think that council would disregard our town's General Plan, which is quite clearly in conflict with the idea of transient rentals in residential neighborhoods. I have read

the General Plan. Prior to the past council meeting where this issue was agenized, I reviewed it again in detail and made some notes that are very crucial to these discussions. All California cities must have a general plan. General plans guide the land use management and growth of a community. Members of our community have dedicated countless hours to crafting our General Plan and its intent couldn't be any clearer. The following are statements taken directly from our General Plan:

"Protection of the character and quality of life of stable residential neighborhoods is paramount"

"[We should] locate visitor lodging in appropriate areas"

"[We have the goal of being] a great place to work and live"

"[We need] adequate and appropriate housing that residents and workers can afford"

"Mammoth Lakes will be a well-planned and cohesive community"

"[We should] enhance community character by minimizing noise"

To insert large groups of transient renters into our residential neighborhoods is clearly and fundamentally in opposition to our General Plan. No change of this magnitude should be implemented without a vote of the people.

Here are some additional facts and clarifications regarding our current inventory and process:

- Occupancy is below 45% on average. There are over 150 existing homes that can be rented on a nightly basis and many hundreds more luxury townhomes. There are also dozens of additional rental homes currently being constructed in legal zones. We do not have missing inventory.

- Enforcement is essential and must continue. We must put sufficient time and money into software and other resources that allows town staff to do their job and build our foundation.

- Pilot Program. Is this not what we already have in place? There are hundreds of existing stand-alone homes and luxury townhomes currently for rent on a nightly basis.

The fact of the matter is we already have the legal rental product but we are continuing to fall behind in our ability to properly tax and regulate it as we chase after a theorized pot of gold at the end of the nightly rental rainbow. Let's spend our time, energy and tax dollars building a foundation that will allow our town to grow and move into the future with grace. Let's simply give the staff the tools to do their job and stick to our General Plan. This issue, pushed by a split Council and more importantly a split community, is leading us down a path all of us will come to regret.

Cheryl Witherill

Business owner and Community Member

**Cheryl Witherill**  
**General Manager;**  
**1849 & Snowbird Homeowners Associations &**  
**1849 Mountain Rentals**