



PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

Meeting Date: March 12, 2019

Subject: Public comments on items not on the agenda

The following is public correspondence received by the City Clerk's Office after the posting of the original agenda. Individual contact information has been redacted for privacy. This may *not* be a comprehensive collection of the public correspondence, but staff makes its best effort to include all correspondence received to date.

To send correspondence to the City Council, please email Council@LosAltosCA.gov.

Los Altos, CA 94024
March 10, 2019

City Council Members
Los Altos

Dear Ladies,

Saturday's Daily Post contained a frightening story of a beating and attempted rape on the Stevens Creek trail, and the apprehension of the perpetrator at his "home". The description of the man's living arrangement is a dire warning about what could happen to Los Altos with our new ADU laws.

The man lived in a house a block away from the attack. A few days later he got into an altercation with one of several women with whom he shared the house. Police were called and, noticing his resemblance to a police sketch from the Stevens Creek incident and the presence of a bite mark on his hand, arrested him.

The Post story says "he had been staying in a bunk bed with several short-term roommates for about a month..." "Several women staying at the Airbnb told police that they tried to avoid Adonis". "Adonis told police that he had a computer science background and was in Mountain View looking for a job in the tech industry".

Bunk bed? This commercial use of a house sounds worse than operating a hotel, because a hotel offers separate rooms. This is akin to offering submarine type sleeping quarters without military discipline. One thing is certain, the owner of the property doesn't live there.

What have we enabled with our ADU ordinance? Some real estate agent may run the numbers and figure out how many people, at what monthly rent, will make it profitable for an investor to buy a house, build an ADU with the Accessory Structure gimmick, rent two houses and let the City and the neighbors deal with the consequences.

I suggest you **immediately** amend the ADU ordinance to require the owner to live on site. Without that condition the creation of a rental situation as described, building an ADU with the express intent of renting, would probably be legally permanent once established. Subsequently imposing owner occupancy would likely be impossible, leaving a permanent nuisance.

Then rework the whole ADU ordinance into one comprehensible ordinance as other communities have done. The present two ordinances are not only difficult to navigate but constitute a stain on the integrity of our city.

Sincerely



J. Gerald Clements

cc Bruce Barton, Town Crier