PC Committee

From: Eve Hogan <evehogan@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2016 6:50 AM

To: PC Committee

Cc: Gladys Baisa; Robert Carroll; Elle Cochran; Mike White; Michael Victorino; Don

Couch; Donald S. Guzman

Subject: Testimony regarding Wet Bars and kitchenettes

Aloha,

I am sorry I can't be there to testify in person, but I'm flying to see my dad (on hospice).

I want to reiterate my previous position that the term "wet bar" is not what you are actually trying to control. As you know, the definition of a wet bar is "a bar or counter equipped with running water and a sink, for serving alcoholic drinks at home." and let's be honest, this is not actually what you are trying to control. People will continue to drink no matter what you do... even in a bedroom without a sink. So my guess is that what people are actually using the wet bar for is preparation of food and micromanaging "wet bars" in a room with a bed (or any other room in the house) is not stopping people from preparing food, it is merely making it less convenient and less sanitary.

I realize you are trying to stop illegal vacation rentals with this law, but the unintended consequences are counter to the bigger picture. You are minimizing housing, period.

Illegal vacation rentals will continue regardless of whether there is a wet bar, people will just make food in the bathroom. (there are not kitchenettes in hotel rooms and people rent them all the time). This is not the solution. You will just increase the potential of food poisoning and other diseases.

In the event of a legal bed and breakfast, the homeowner is not actually allowed to cook for the guest per Health Department laws, and encouraging strangers to be inside your citizen's homes when a simple "kitchenette" can make both the guests and the homeowners safer and more sanitary is a critical consideration.

Then there is the housing crisis. If you want to solve the housing crisis, allowing people to have a "kitchenette" will encourage them to provide housing. If you expect the homeowners of Maui to help solve your housing crisis (as you clearly do with the ,Affordable Accessory Dwelling Bill) you need to allow them to have more than one kitchen. Allowing people to build another unit is a step in the right direction but it is so costly to build another building that the likelihood of these new dwellings being "affordable" is questionable. Allowing them to make already existing rooms into dwelling units is a FAR MORE AFFORDABLE method of solving the housing crisis. Plus, it makes no sense that the rich can have a "catering kitchen" but the regular citizen is limited to one kitchen. In Toronto they resolved their housing problem by ENCOURAGING the homeowners to put in a "Second Suite" inside their homes. Your affordable Accessory Dwelling Bill attempts to solve the problem and the wet bar bill attempts to create the problem. I encourage you to look at how mixed these messages are.

As I pointed out in previous testimony, do you really want your inspectors spending their time going to the homes of your citizens and measuring the size of their refrigerators and sinks when the only difference either makes is convenience?

Do you really want to tell people they can't have a sink and a refrigerator in the same room with a bed, when they can have a refrigerator in every other room in the house including the carport or garage?

Do you really want to force people to prepare food in the far less sanitary conditions of bathrooms and at outdoor kitchens?

By allowing people to have studio Ohana's you would drastically reduce your housing crisis....or make the people who are already providing housing in their Ohana's law abiding instead of outlaws for renting to other citizens.

Allowing kitchenettes in other rooms allows families to watch over their elderly while still giving the elderly a sense of independence.

The wet bar law you are considering is one of those "solutions" to a problem that will create or continue a whole bunch of other problems.

Thank you for your wisdom in reconsideration of this bill. Sincerely, Eve Hogan