



LATE DISTRIBUTION

EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

DATE

8/24/2018

BOS 8/28/2018

Proposed VHR Ordinance

3 messages

Scott Robertson <scott@trescott.org>
To: EDC.COB@edcgov.us

Fri, Aug 24, 2018 at 2:20 PM

I just looked at the proposed ordinance, and after participating in ad-hoc meetings, providing input to the process, and monitoring the progress closely, I am absolutely livid. There are items in the ordinance that are clearly self-serving to specific industry groups and weren't discussed with the community at large. I urge you to reject this proposal, and kick it back to the adhoc committee, and instruct them to come back with something that is representative of the input the committee received.

Just a few things for your consideration:

- 1) What happened to the max occupancy of 12? Who thinks placing purpose-built, illegal hotels, in a residential area, is good idea. There is no reason to do this, unless you're a property manager who makes money from "heads in beds".
- 2) What is "independent garbage collection". I pay for garbage service and I have a bear box. That's already in the ordinance. Does "independent garbage service" mean I also have to pay a Property Manager to come take the garbage out of my bear box, and take to SLT Refuse? You should know that my neighbors love my bear box. Only two hours after my housekeeper took the trash out of my bear box, the neighbors filled it back up. You should be focusing your efforts on mandatory bear box in the entire basin.
- 3) Why did you taking the maximum # vehicles out of the ordinance? Guests can now bring as many vehicles as they want, and park in any legal location? As an owner, you need to help me out, to avoid issues with my neighbors. Limit the # vehicles, commensurate with the occupancy.
- 4) Local Contact is now the property manager - 40% of the properties are owner-managed. These are the owners that care about their neighbors, and care about their properties. They visit their property often. They are not investors. They would never turn the management over to a property manager, who only wants to maximize their fees, at the expense of the owner (through damage, increased maintenance and neighbor relationships). You are requiring the local contact to collect the names of all guests over 18?? As an owner, I collect this info, but I'm not turning my hard-earned guest list (that I pay dearly for, through OTA fees) over to a property manager! This is property managers trying to drive out owner-managed properties, and needs to be stricken from the ordinance.
- 5) You want the local contact to provide guests with written rules? You already removed the guest greeting requirement. This is the same requirement, only worded differently. Local Contact was established so law enforcement had someone to contact, Don't confuse a local contact, with property managers. Property Managers are usually the local contact, but local contacts ARE NOT property managers.
- 6) Local contact to get written signatures from every guest over 18? - First, this would be a violation of the paperwork reduction act of 1980, and again, not the role of a local contact. Guest greetings were determined previously to be unsupportable, so why bring this back under another name.

I am concerned that you do not understand the VHR business very well. Every VHR has an owner, and you should be focusing on supporting owners with an ordinance that meets their needs, not the self-serving needs of property managers. Owners want the ability to properly vet guests, to deny groups that aren't a good fit, to cancel guests that aren't able to follow booking procedures, and to evict guests that don't follow rules. If you focused on the owner needs, and mandated that booking sites allow owners to vet, deny and cancel, you would have less enforcement to do.

Don't waste your time trying to make changes to this proposal. Reject it and send it back for a total rewrite, that is representative of the community input.

Thank you for your time,
Scott Robertson
VHR owner and registered voter.

8/24/2018

Edcgov.us Mail - Proposed VHR Ordinance

To: Scott Robertson <scott@trescott.org>

Thank you. Appropriate public comment provided for upcoming agenda items will be added to the corresponding file.

Office of the Clerk of the Board
El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
530-621-5390

[Quoted text hidden]

Scott Robertson <scott@trescott.org>
To: EDC COB <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fri, Aug 24, 2018 at 3:19 PM

Left out a word in the last sentence. Should read:

Don't waste your time trying to make changes to this proposal. Reject it and send it back for a total rewrite, that is NOT representative of the community input.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

WARNING: This email and any attachments may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any unauthorized review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments) by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments.