

**ATTACHMENT TO APPEAL OF DNS
FOR LAND USE CODE AND LICENSING CODE TEXT AMENDMENTS
RELATED TO SHORT TERM RENTALS AND BED AND BREAKFAST USES**

Page 1, Question 1: Appellants

Appellants are the Seattle Short Term Rental Alliance (“SSTRA”), Sea to Sky Rentals LLC and Michelle Acquavella (collectively, “Appellants”).

Page 2, Question 1: What is your interest in the decision? (State how you are affected by it.)

SSTRA is a Washington nonprofit corporation that supports short term rentals in the City of Seattle (“City”). SSTRA’s members own short term rental property, manage short term rental property, use short term rental property, and live or work near short term rental property. Michelle Acquavella is an individual who owns and manages short term rental property. Sea to Sky Rentals LLC is a Washington limited liability company. Michelle Acquavella is its managing member. She and its employees and contractors own or manage short term rental property. The proposed Land Use Code and Licensing Code Text Amendments Related to Short Term Rentals and Bed and Breakfast Uses (“Proposal”) will prohibit or limit short term rentals. This will reduce housing maintenance, encourage neglect or demolition rather than renovation of existing housing, remove housing from the short and long term rental market, reduce housing affordability, reduce the availability of housing for some segments of the population, impact historic structures and increase traffic. These are significant adverse impacts to the built environment, including housing and aesthetics, relationship to existing land use plans and policies, and to transportation. These impacts will harm Appellants. Appellants’ interests are ones the City was required to consider in issuing the Determination of Nonsignificance (“DNS”). Judgment in Appellants’ favor would redress the harm to Appellants.

Page 2, Question 2: What are your objections to the decision? (List and describe what you believe to be the errors, omissions, or other problems with this decision.)

The City failed to comply with the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (“SEPA”). The specific errors in the decision are identified in Appellants’ comment letter on the DNS, which is attached and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

Page 2, Question 3: What relief do you want? (Specify what you want the Examiner to do: reverse the decision, modify conditions, etc.)

Appellants request that the Hearing Examiner reverse the DNS and order the City to: (1) provide additional public notice to affected stakeholders and opportunity to comment; (2) correctly describe the Proposal; (3) prepare an adequate Checklist; and (4) either (a) prepare an EIS addressing the significant adverse environmental impacts of the Proposal or (b) make modifications to the Proposal or adopt mitigation measures to eliminate these significant adverse environmental impacts.