

Public Comment #19
BOS Recd. 10-15-24

From: Dr. Holly Hoffman <DrHolly@drhollyhoffman.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 7:22 PM
To: BOS-Clerk of the Board; Lisa D. Watson
Subject: Concerned about 09/10/24 PBD - VHR Ordinance Revision

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Hello,

I am writing to you because I am deeply concerned about the the **09/10/24 PBD - VHR Ordinance Revision** that is on the agenda for the October 15 meeting.

As a proud resident of El Dorado county, I wholeheartedly agree with the reasoning behind this bill. The noise from visitors cannot interfere with the lives of residents and we need to put checks in place to prevent that.

However, my concern is with the details of the new county ordinance regulation. I do not think that Hosted Home Rental (HHR) should be lumped in with VHR's. With the rising inflation and unemployment issues (my husband was laid off in 2023), we needed extra income over the last few years. Hosted short term rentals have been vital for us. Every guest we have had in our extra bedroom has been supervised by us and never caused any issues for any neighbors, for which we can supply written evidence. Not only have we maintained a strict set of rules, we have been actively enforcing it, unlike the people who rent out whole homes. I run a book club of over 30 women in South Lake Tahoe half of which live in the county and none of them have voiced this issue when it comes to hosted rentals. Unfortunately, we are finding out about this revision a little too late. But I will now be spreading word to my community here about this and I know many of my friends and neighbors will be quite upset. We are a younger generation and many of us rely on this hosted rental income to afford our homes here.

It is a win-win situation for everyone:

- Visitors are able to stay in Tahoe at reasonable prices and enjoy this beautiful place.
- Neighbors are protected from any noise by strict host supervision.
- The hosts are able to supplement their income during these financially challenging times.
- The county gets extra tax income.

Therefore, it appears to me that the restrictions may perhaps be further needed for whole home rentals, while the hosted rentals are a great benefit to both our community and its visitors.

If the ordinance passes, it is unclear to us if we'll be able to get a permit. If we do, we may have to do expensive changes to our primary home (e.g, reducing the number of sinks on some of the floors), which will lead to decreased property value and reduced county tax income. Additionally, we will have to spend money on consultants and contractors to navigate this complex regulation. I kindly ask you to consider simplifying the regulation and reorienting it towards the full house rentals, rather than hosted rentals.

I also want to request actual proof that hosted rentals are part of the problem as I have never experienced or heard of that in my neighborhood or even in the larger Tahoe community. Can you please provide me with the data that shows where the complaints have come from? And if they are hosted rentals or not? My hunch is that they are not hosted rentals and may not even be in my region.

I will be at the meeting tomorrow. See you then!

Sincerely,

Dr. Holly Hoffman

--

Holly Hoffman, Psy.D.

Licensed Psychologist in California (PSY 31551) & New York (025788)

<https://www.drhollyhoffman.com/>

(510) 485-9848

Office Hours: Monday-Thursday, closed Friday-Sunday

Notice of Confidentiality: This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files, or previous e-mail messages attached to it, intended only for use by the addressee(s) and may contain privileged or confidential information. Any distribution, reading, copying, disclosing, or use of this communication, as well as any attachments by anyone other than the addressee, is STRICTLY PROHIBITED and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by e-mail (by replying to this message) or by telephone at **(510) 485-9848** and permanently destroy or delete the original transmission and any copies or printouts of this e-mail and its attachments without reading them or saving them to a disk.

E-mail communication can be accessed relatively easily by unauthorized people and, as such, can compromise the privacy and confidentiality of such communication. E-mails are vulnerable to such unauthorized access due to the fact that servers have unlimited and direct access to all e-mails that go through them. A non-encrypted e-mail, such as this, is even more vulnerable to unauthorized access. Please notify me if you decide to avoid or limit, in any way, the use of e-mail. Unless I hear from you otherwise, I will continue to communicate with you via e-mail when necessary or appropriate.

Please do not use e-mail for emergencies. If you are experiencing a crisis and are unable to reach me, immediately call 911 and tell the dispatcher the nature of the emergency and your location.

From: Pierre Lapeyrade <pierrelapeyrade@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 8:43 PM
To: BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: VHR Ordinance - please vote no as-written

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello,
my name is Pierre Lapeyrade. I live in El Dorado Hills, and also own a vacation rental in south lake tahoe.
If I understand correctly, the intent of the latest VHR proposal is to find a balance between maintaining the peace and natural beauty of our county, while also allowing (promoting?) reasonable levels of tourism to maintain and grow an important part of our economy.

What I'd suggest is that you hit the perceived problem head-on.
Too loud, too rowdy? Fines, then cancellation of VHR permit if not addressed.
Too many cars? Fines, then cancellation of permit.
Improper trash management? Fines, then cancellation of permit.

1. I don't understand why detached rental units (ADUs) are not permitted.
2. Why would you limit this to 1 sink in the tahoe basin? Do we have some bias against cleanliness?
Use the restroom and wash your hands in the kitchen? Rinse your fruit in the bathroom?

In general I think it's important to give hosted rentals a lot more latitude than unhosted. In the end, we can't restrict owners from reasonably enjoying amenities of their own homes as a way to make up for potential bad guest behavior. Again, address the issues/offenders head-on, without creating a series of just-in-case restrictions that burden owners (and guests) unnecessarily.

thanks
Pierre Lapeyrade
(916) 803-6074

From: Brianna Kohr <brianna.kohr@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 10:59 PM
To: BOS-District II; BOS-District III; BOS-District I; BOS-District IV; BOS-District V; BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: VHR Ordinance Proposal - For Public Comment

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Dear Supervisors,

I write this evening after reviewing the updated proposed amendments to the VHR Ordinance to implore the Board not to pass them as currently drafted. There are a number of issues with these proposals, which I have outlined below:

600 Permit Cap Proposal

The latest version of the ordinance would cap the number of VHRs to 600, and only applicants who submitted a permit application prior to November 1, 2020 would be grandfathered such that their permits could not be revoked. This is an extreme measure that was not part of the first proposed draft ordinance. There are property owners who will lose their VHR permits under this proposal, *not because they are bad VHR hosts who negatively impact the community*, but merely because of an arbitrary grandfathering construct that would remove permits from any permit holder who applied after a random date in 2020. The goal of the Board should be to eliminate the few VHRs that are causing problems in the community through better enforcement and regulation, not take a hatchet to the local tourist economy and indiscriminately trampling on existing private property rights by yanking VHR permits from productive and law abiding owners.

The clustering rules have already resulted in a substantial reduction in the number of VHR permits in the County through natural attrition. There is no need for an additional reduction to the existing cap, and in fact it will be detrimental to the County because a further reduction in the existing number of permit holders will (i) result in less TOT revenue to pay County staff and fund County programs, and (ii) harm the local business owners who rely on tourist dollars to keep the lights on at their restaurants and storefronts. I'm not sure how the County plans to pay for its new enforcement staff with a dramatic reduction in the number of permit holders, given that these staff members are paid using TOT dollars.

If for some reason the Board feels the cap must be further reduced from the current allowance of 900, at least do it in a way that doesn't result in any existing VHR owners losing their permits. For example, set the cap at 800 to ensure the 795 existing permit holders are not impacted.

Occupancy Limits

The proposal to reduce occupancy from 2 per bedroom plus 2 to a flat 2 per bedroom is not supported by data or any life-safety rationale. The ordinance already empowers the fire department to reduce occupancy on individual homes where such a reduction is necessary for safety reasons. With the safety issue already addressed through inspections, why should a home that can otherwise comfortably accommodate eight people be limited to hosting six?

The proposed changes to the existing VHR Ordinance should be narrowly tailored to addressing the complaints that motivated them: noise is addressed by revisions to the noise and events sections of the ordinance, trash is addressed by revisions to the trash section, parking is addressed by revisions to the parking section. Arbitrarily reducing occupancy doesn't do anything to address the complaints that the Board received from local residents, it just reduces the amount

of income that will be generated by VHRs, which will in turn reduce the TOT revenue collected by the County and money spent by the (smaller) numbers of VHR guests who patronize local businesses.

Noise and Events

I have already registered my objections to the proposed revisions to these sections of the Ordinance in my September 9, 2024 letter to the Board, so I will not rehash them here. However, I encourage the Board to revisit these sections at tomorrow's meeting and direct staff to fine-tune the definitions and words used to regulate noise and events so that the regulations are fair, objective, administrable and narrowly tailored to addressing legitimate grievances. The current proposals are not any of those things.

Snow Removal

It is not possible to keep a driveway clear "at all times" during a snowstorm. We hire a local plowman, and like all the other private plow services, he plows the driveway whenever over six inches of snow has accumulated, but for obvious reasons, he will not do this in the middle of a large snow storm as it would be a fruitless exercise. In those cases, he arrives within 24 hours of the storm's cessation. We can't station people in our driveway 24/7. Please revise the language around snow removal to account for the realities of a snowstorm. It would be more reasonable to require hosts to contract with a plow company that comes regularly than to impose an impossible requirement that driveways be completely clear "at all times".

Exterior Signage

If the County plans to make and sell the exterior signs we must use on our properties, please make them out of metal so that they are not quickly destroyed by sun, rain and snow. Our laminated signage cannot withstand the elements when posted on a bear box.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Brianna

From: Hunter Cuave <hunter.cuave@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 8:39 AM
To: BOS-District II; BOS-District III; BOS-District I; BOS-District IV; BOS-District V; BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: For Public Comment

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Hunter Cuave, and I own a vacation rental in Tahoma with my wife, Brianna. During the last Board of Supervisors meeting at which the El Dorado County VHR ordinance was discussed, we wrote letters for public comment and spoke live regarding our concerns with the proposed amendments. After reviewing the revised draft yesterday, we are deeply saddened to see that our voices were unheard and nothing has changed. In fact, the revised ordinance is even more extreme than the first draft in that it would reduce the cap on the number of VHR permits from 900 to 600. With 795 current permit holders in the County, this would result in the revocation of almost 200 permits (except for a few "grandfathered" in because they applied before the randomly selected date of November 1, 2020).

During the last public meeting, I implored the Board to consider the reasonableness of many of the proposed changes. It seems that my request fell on deaf ears, because the latest draft has gone in the opposite direction by proposing to indiscriminately revoke VHR permits from responsible, law-abiding hosts who contribute positively to the local economy. Trampling on private property rights in this manner is not a reasonable solution to any of the issues that motivated the Board to revisit the current VHR ordinance in the first place (i.e. noise, trash, events, and parking, all of which are already addressed by proposals specifically tailored to those issues).

I want to paint a picture for the Board that illustrates why reducing the cap in the manner proposed is an ill-conceived proposal that ignores both common sense and economic realities.

Let's imagine that the proposed amendments are passed as currently drafted and we, along with up to 200 other families, lose our VHR permit. We love Tahoe and visit our home throughout the year. However, we rely on VHR rental income to offset the mortgage, taxes, and insurance on the home, and without it, will be forced to sell. Since we bought our home in June of 2020, it has doubled in value and is now worth over \$1 million dollars. A similar home two doors down from ours just sold for \$1.5 million dollars. Our house is not one that would be affordable for those on a "local" income to purchase. Since new buyers won't be able to use the home as a VHR due to the buffering rules and permit cap, it will inevitably be purchased by individuals who are so wealthy that they do not need any VHR income to offset their cost of ownership. The buyers who fit this description are second homeowners, likely from the Bay Area.

Once we sell, a home that would normally be occupied around 120 days of the year by VHR guests and generates many thousands of dollars for the County in TOT will be owned by individuals who may visit 20 days a year (as a generous estimate) and will generate \$0.00 in TOT for the County. This is an example drawn from real-life. Specifically, the house across the street and diagonal from us is owned by two families from Marin. Over the past two years, they have used the house no more than 10 times for an average of two to three days per visit. Instead of our guests, who regularly contribute to the local economy of the West Shore all year long, renting skis, kayaks and bikes from the nearby shops, eating out at local restaurants, shopping at the local grocer, and paying occupancy taxes for each night of their stay, you will have neighborhoods comprised of even more absentee second homeowners whose rare visits three to five times a year result in a small fraction of that patronage, coupled with a huge loss of TOT revenue to

support the salaries of the additional County VHR enforcement staff you just hired.

Before we bought our home in June of 2020, it sat on the market for six months without any offers. The home was owned by an older couple in Sacramento who used to use it as a getaway but let it sit completely vacant for ten years as their grown children moved away and lost interest in the property. Without the regular care and attention it required, the property racked up substantial deferred maintenance. We had to perform all of that deferred maintenance when we purchased the home and have continued to make improvements since that time, motivated by the pride we have in our home and the positive guest experience we seek to deliver with every stay.

Between 2020 and 2024, we have spent over \$250,000 with local businesses and service providers in order to improve our VHR. These local businesses and service providers include, but are not limited to:

- AW Enterprises, the snow plow service owned by our neighbor one street over
- Chong Mercogliano, our neighbor across the street who runs her own VHR cleaning company and also serves as our local contact
- South Shore Glass and Door
- Tahoe Sand & Gravel
- Cut-Rite Tree & Spray
- Shelton Landscaping Solutions
- Swigard's ACE Hardware
- Lake Tahoe Fireplace
- Kiwi Gallery
- Mountain Roofing
- Pomin's Hot Tubs
- Tahoe City Plumbing
- Tahoe City Lumber
- Kelly Brothers Painting
- Tahoe Fence Company
- Holm Electric
- Arctic Electric
- Mountain Roofing

The purpose of listing these individual businesses is to demonstrate the positive economic impact that our VHR has had on local businesses, not only through our guests' regular patronage of local shops and restaurants, but through our efforts as homeowners to ensure our property is an appealing place for guests to stay.

Non-VHR second homeowners, whose properties sit vacant outside of the few days a year they visit Tahoe, almost never invest the same time and attention towards property maintenance and improvements as owners who have guests they need to keep happy and comfortable. They don't hire regular snow plow services from their local plowman, they don't engage local cleaners or property managers, they don't contract for weekly hot tub servicing, and they barely rake the pine needles each year much less spend tens of thousands of dollars with local landscapers beautifying their backyards.

Reducing the VHR cap will reduce the demand for services from countless local businesses. As VHR hosts whose full-time jobs demand we live outside the County, we may not be able to vote locally, but each one of these local business owners can. If you reduce the current VHR permit cap by hundreds of permits and take economically productive VHRs off the market, you won't just be harming VHR owners. You will be harming the local businesses and their employees whose livelihoods depend on the income those VHRs provided.

With that, I return to my request from the last Board meeting: please let reasonableness be the guiding principle with respect to the amendments being considered. Removing VHR permits from owners whose activities contribute positively to the local economy and who operate their VHRs responsibly in compliance with applicable laws is unreasonable. Why not allow the existing 500-foot buffer continue to naturally reduce the amount of VHRs through attrition that is already

occurring? The Board can and should study the impacts of that attrition to the local economy and various neighborhoods over time rather than pass a knee-jerk proposal to further dramatically reduce the existing permit cap that appears divorced from any supporting data.

When local governments kowtow to a small but vocal minority whose demands are detached from economic reality, unintended consequences often result. The decision by Homewood Ski Resort's ownership to close the entire mountain this winter rather than continue to run at a loss while facing a seemingly never-ending development battle is a perfect example. Homewood employed many West Shore locals and also provided an economic anchor for business such as Obexer's General Store, West Shore Sports (I don't even know how they will stay in business this year since they won't have any rental business), Dog and Bear, Cult Burger, Tahoma Market, etc. The entire economy of the West Shore will feel the impact of this shutdown. Does the Board really want to double down on the damage already done to local businesses by reducing the supply of lodging for tourists?

There are two other areas I would like to touch on that I find unreasonable in the revised ordinance: the occupancy reduction and the subjective definition of noise.

I assume the thought process for the recommended occupancy reduction is that fewer occupants will create fewer problems. However, if a group of people are bad guests, reducing the group's size by two people will not have a material impact. Six bad guests and eight bad guests cause the same amount of noise, damage, and disruption. There is zero data to support the premise that reducing occupancy by two people will reduce complaints. All this occupancy reduction will accomplish is to reduce the amount of people patronizing local restaurants, grocery stores, and entertainment venues. For the sake of example, let's pretend (for the sake of example) that all 795 existing permitted VHRs can support eight guests under the current ordinance. If all 795 VHRs were fully occupied in one weekend, they would facilitate the stays of 6,360 tourists whose visits contribute to the local economy. Reducing the allowed occupancy to six guests would reduce the number of tourists patronizing local businesses by 1,590 people. Is the thought that reducing the guest occupancy by 1,590 people will result in 1,590 fewer complaints? Of course not: the number of complaints has nothing to do with occupancy. The only thing this type of occupancy reduction will do is reduce the amount of people spending money locally.

Lastly, the proposed ordinance states that there can be no "loud" noise as heard from the property line. This is a ridiculous and subjective standard. I beg the board to change this wording to something measurable. The speed limit on a road is measured in miles per hour. How would anyone enforce the speed limit if the sign said, "slow" "medium" "fast". It doesn't make sense to use the word "loud", the standard should be something objective such as decibels measured at the property line.

In conclusion, I hope you will consider this letter when making your decision. You have the power to impact the livelihoods of many people on the West Shore, and implementing the current draft will be a detriment to the area.

Thank you,
Hunter Cuave

From: Barker Lupine <parb1slt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 9:44 AM
To: BOS-District II; BOS-District III; BOS-District I; BOS-District IV; BOS-District V; BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: Ordinance Amendments - public comment

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Attn: BOS and COB

Please accept this email for Public Comment.

I have a 2nd home in Montgomery Estates and have been permitted since 2018. Whilst the permit cap doesn't mean anything for me, I still do NOT agree with the 600 cap and people losing their permits if they had purchased after November 2020. It is unfair to take away when they are not deserving.

I have a 4 bedroom home and my house can definitely sleep 10 without a problem. I do NOT agree with the occupancy reduction to only 2 per bedroom and losing the extra 2 occupants.

The fines that are to be charged need to be on the cost of the guests. As owners, I do not have the ability to control how my guests operate. I let them know just how important the noise curfew is and to abide by the rules, thankfully I don't have any issues, but I don't agree with the increase in fines - especially for it to fall on the owners.

I do not agree with the time limit of 30 minutes for a local contact response - my local contact lives just 2 miles away and she shouldn't be punished if she is in the school for one of her children's activities or if she is in Carson Shopping or even Safeway shopping!

I do not agree with guests not being able to park on the street - even if it is allowed for locals. Keep it the same please.

I appreciate your attention to my public comments.

Patricia Barker

From: Tiffany Foo <tiffany.n.foo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 9:44 AM
To: BOS-Clerk of the Board; Brooke Laine; lis.watson@edcgov.com
Subject: Strongly against updated HHR regulations

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to you because I am deeply concerned about the the **09/10/24 PBD - VHR Ordinance Revision** that is on the agenda for today's October 15 meeting.

As a resident of El Dorado county, I understand the reasoning behind this bill. Visitors should not interfere with the lives of residents and we need to put checks in place to prevent that.

However, my concern is with the details of the new county ordinance regulation. I do not think that Hosted Home Rental (HHR) should be treated as the same as VHR's. Hosted short term rentals are not the impersonal, unsupervised experiences that predominantly describe VHRs. I live full time in my home and open up a room for guests looking for a more personal and local experience. Every guest we have had in our extra bedroom is greeted and supervised by me and never caused any issues for any neighbors, for which I can supply written evidence. Not only have I been compliant with all the rules for HHRs, I have been actively enforcing them because this is my home and my community, unlike the people who often rent out whole homes.

Unfortunately, we are finding out about this revision a little too late. But I will now be spreading word to my community here about this and I know many of my friends and neighbors will be quite upset. We are a younger generation and many of us rely on this hosted rental income to afford our homes here.

It is a win-win situation for everyone:

- Visitors are able to stay in Tahoe at reasonable prices and enjoy this beautiful place with input and recommendations from locals.
- Neighbors are protected from any noise by strict host supervision.
- The hosts are able to supplement their income during these financially challenging times.
- The county gets extra tax income.

Therefore, it appears to me that the restrictions may perhaps be further needed for whole home rentals, while the hosted rentals are a great benefit to both our community and its visitors.

If the ordinance passes, it is unclear to us if we'll be able to get a permit. If we do, we may have to do expensive changes to our primary home (e.g, reducing the number of sinks on some of the floors), which will lead to decreased property value and reduced county tax income. Additionally, we will have to spend money on consultants and contractors to navigate this complex regulation. I kindly ask you to consider simplifying the regulation and reorienting it towards the full house rentals, rather than hosted rentals.

I also want to request actual proof that hosted rentals are part of the problem as I have never experienced or heard of that in my neighborhood or even in the larger Tahoe community. Can you

please provide me with the data that shows where the complaints have come from? And if they are hosted rentals or not? My hunch is that they are not hosted rentals and may not even be in my region.

Sincerely,
Tiffany Foo
1266 Ute Street, South Lake Tahoe
510-734-8457

From: Kim Dawson
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 8:52 AM
To: BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: FW: Comments on proposed county VHR HHR code changes
Attachments: Comments-VHR-HHR-Code_changes10142024.pdf

Kim Dawson
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane, Building A
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5393
kim.dawson@edcgov.us

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s), except as otherwise permitted. Unauthorized interception, review, use, or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, or authorized to receive for the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Thank you for your consideration.

From: Brooke Laine <Brooke.Laine@edcgov.us>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 9:52 PM
To: Kim Dawson <kim.dawson@edcgov.us>
Cc: Lisa D. Watson <Lisa.Watson@edcgov.us>
Subject: Fw: Comments on proposed county VHR HHR code changes

Mr. Remelman sent me the attached comments regarding VHR's and asked that it be sent to the full board. Could you please forward this letter? Brooke

From: Mark Remelman <mremelman.home@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 9:09 PM
To: Brooke Laine <Brooke.Laine@edcgov.us>
Cc: BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>
Subject: Comments on proposed county VHR HHR code changes

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Blaire,
Please pass my comments (attached) on to the full board.
I will be attending the meeting tomorrow and plan to speak.

In my opinion, and many others, this proposed change is a gross governmental overreach. This is carpet bombing rather than a precision strike at the problem. At what point is all of the collateral damage unacceptable?

I am curious why Lori Parlin voted no, if these changes are so important. Hopefully she will be at the meeting and share her reasoning.

Best Regards,
Mark Remelman
510.673.1270 cell

G. Mark Remelman
1530 Aztec Way
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
510.673.1270,
mremelman.home@gmail.com

October 14, 2024

El Dorado County BOS

Attn: Brooke Laine

brooke.laine@edcgov.us

cc: bosfive@edcgov.us

I am writing this letter in response to the proposed VHR regulations update, which if passed will now include “HHR” rentals. I am glad a friend gave me a heads up that this was in process. What was the public notification process?

Regardless of missed opportunities to make comments prior to the changes getting to this point, I must express my grave concerns and dismay at the cavalier approach to lumping HHRs into VHRs in a combined regulation. They are two very different animals.

Item B in your proposed changes states: “County staff has responded to numerous complaints involving excessive noise, disorderly conduct, vandalism, overcrowding, traffic congestion, illegal vehicle parking, and accumulation of refuse at hosted and vacation home rentals which require response from police, fire, paramedic, and/or other public personnel”

Mission Statement (from EDC Web Site) of the planning department is:

We are dedicated to serving our citizens with integrity, efficiency, and transparency. Our professional staff work to simplify the planning and building experience for our citizens to encourage a thriving economy for all.

Yet I am failing to see the transparency here for the statement in Item B. No statistical or data correlation has been made available to the public, documenting these complaints. Yet based on these “numerous complaints” you are proposing to completely overhaul VHR rules and now, intrusively regulate HHRs to the same level as VHRs. Please quantify numerous complaints, are there more than 10, 100, 1000? What is the period these complaints were fielded over? I am sure there is documentation for each of these alleged complaints, so staff should have no issue with compiling list for the public to see (redacting the name of the complainant for privacy), which should be easy.

I for one would like to see the following:

- 1) The quantities and types of complaints
 - a. Please enumerate the actual numbers associated with the types listed in Item B. (How is the requirement of a Paramedic a problem?)
- 2) What are the locations of these complaints?
 - a. The Tahoe Basin, Snow removal zone or West Slope are too granular.
 - i. Perhaps neighborhoods or permit numbers?
 - b. Were sheriffs or county VHR enforcement dispatched?
 - c. Were citations issued?
 - d. How many were repeat citations?
- 3) How many complaints were against VHRs how many against legal HHRs?
- 4) What percentage of the complaints were:
 - a. For licensed rentals?
 - i. VHR
 - ii. HHR
 - b. For unlicensed rentals?
 - i. VHR
 - ii. HHR

I have read through the public comments to date. It is very clear that trying to quickly push through a poorly written global catch all code updates will have many unintended consequences which is in direct conflict with the planning department mission statement. “Our professional staff work to simplify the planning and **building experience for our citizens to encourage a thriving economy for all.**”

Unlike VHRs, which are often (but not always) corporate money making endeavors, HHRs are often people just trying to augment their income. The cost of living in Tahoe has grown exponentially since I moved here in 2014. I am a senior citizen. I have been considering offering our office / living space as an HHR, not only for the money, but as a social tool. An HHR is exactly what the name implies, the owner hosts and meets the renters. It is an opportunity to meet new people, share the beauty of Tahoe and establish new friendships.

I have no problem getting a permit when and if I do decide to host a rental and pay the TOT. The goal (at least for me) is not to turn it into a money-making endeavor, although the extra cash will help. However, the attempt to roll HHRs into the VHR wrapper is a clear case of government overreach. As proposed, if I have an HHR permit, then I have my family at the house (no renters) and someone complains about noise or using my hot tub after 10PM, I can lose my permit. In my case the renter would not have access. But the point remains, by trying to pound the HHR square peg into the round VHR hole because it is easy is just plain wrong. A public (not hidden) discussion forum of a reasonable and not overly invasive separate set of rules governing HHRs is the proper way to go.

From my perspective, it seems the county is dictating this change to prevent the best kind of tourism, personal presentation. Then saddling of mom & pop rentals with excessive inspection fees and rules that can be bent to reject their permit, possibly forcing them to leave the Tahoe basin is the worst type of governing. I don't understand why specifying parking on non-pervious spaces needs to be stated in the VHR regs, as it is already a county regulation, unless it is again to single out VHRs & HHRs for rejection. The snow removal regulation is irrational for the Tahoe basin. Contracted snow removal services often can't get to their county service addresses, due to the county not clearing the roads for basic access. Again, this appears to be a thinly veiled hook to reject or terminate permits. As stated in the news, California is losing business left and right through over-regulation. If it is the goal of EDC to chase out senior & young residents from the Tahoe Basin, who are just trying to get by, then using over-regulation is a good first step.

Respectfully,

G. Mark Remelman

G. Mark Remelman

From: Pierre Lapeyrade <pierrelapeyrade@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 8:43 PM
To: BOS-Clerk of the Board
Subject: VHR Ordinance - please vote no as-written

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello,
my name is Pierre Lapeyrade. I live in El Dorado Hills, and also own a vacation rental in south lake tahoe.
If I understand correctly, the intent of the latest VHR proposal is to find a balance between maintaining the peace and natural beauty of our county, while also allowing (promoting?) reasonable levels of tourism to maintain and grow an important part of our economy.

What I'd suggest is that you hit the perceived problem head-on.
Too loud, too rowdy? Fines, then cancellation of VHR permit if not addressed.
Too many cars? Fines, then cancellation of permit.
Improper trash management? Fines, then cancellation of permit.

1. I don't understand why detached rental units (ADUs) are not permitted.
2. Why would you limit this to 1 sink in the tahoe basin? Do we have some bias against cleanliness?
Use the restroom and wash your hands in the kitchen? Rinse your fruit in the bathroom?

In general I think it's important to give hosted rentals a lot more latitude than unhosted. In the end, we can't restrict owners from reasonably enjoying amenities of their own homes as a way to make up for potential bad guest behavior. Again, address the issues/offenders head-on, without creating a series of just-in-case restrictions that burden owners (and guests) unnecessarily.

thanks
Pierre Lapeyrade
(916) 803-6074

