



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
BOS Recd. 8-23-21

UPDATED: VHR Anti-clustering, a mis-step in regulation

Caleb Fry <caleb@vratahoe.com>

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 4:10 PM

To: County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

My prior item was sent prematurely. I apologize. Below is an updated / revised letter I ask to be submitted to public comment and for the file on this matter.

Thank you,

Caleb

--

Dear BOS,

My name is Caleb. I started a VHR home service company about 14 years ago and we currently employ about 35 locals.

VHR's have been an explosive and challenging issue for communities around the world. I get it, and it's unsurprising our government has struggled to manage it (particularly in the city). One major area I see for improvement is enforcement. It's hard to see how much energy, resources, ordinance proposals, and community emotion has been exhausted to this matter when we apparently have just 1 person working in enforcement who lives 1.5 hours away in Placerville.

A cap, anti clustering - neither will do anything for the disrupted local crying for help from the pain of living next to a problem rental. And those folks need support!!

I'm unaware of any data that suggests 'anti-clustering' provides solutions.

I ask the BOS to pause. Allow the cap to take some effect while we weather the economic storms of COVID and the fires. A lot has been given and earned by the anti-VHR folks, and I think it is totally appropriate to pause on this issue while considering other, data driven solutions:

- An enforcement team that is NOT our police, meets and greets guests, surveys properties, responds promptly to issues, etc.
- Establish a Review and Solutions action committee (addresses actual problem VHR's and service teams, complex cases, ordinance revisions, etc).
- Minimize # of allowed guests
- Require professional management, noise monitoring, driveway camera, and similar technology

Thank you for your time reviewing my points and considering my position.

Respectfully,

Caleb



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS RCVD. 8-23-21

Please vote NO to any cluster buffer limitation

Mimi K <tahoebellehost@tahoebelle.com>

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 3:41 PM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, edc.cob@edcgov.us, brendan.ferry@edcgov.us

Dear EDC Board Members,

I implore you to vote NO to the implementation of a 500' buffer requirement for future VHR permits. This will harm locals and cause long-term job loss to low wage workers (cleaners, handy people, maintenance workers, etc).

- I myself am nearing retirement after a lifetime of living in Lake Tahoe. I'd like to take time to travel and visit family and occasionally rent my house to make ends meet since social security will not be enough. But I would never be able to get a permit since there's an existing long standing VHR 7 houses away and one street over from my home BUT within ~400' distance. No permit for this long time local.
- This is true of many other locals who may want to occasionally rent their home part time (not annual lease) to make ends meet.

Your Ordinance 5.56 has only been in effect for a short period of time and now new permits are on hold anyways due to the new 900 cap that went into effect. We should monitor the effectiveness of these changes before we add more government restrictions. What are you doing to actually crack down on the homes and renters that actually cause any problems?

It's easy to impose government restrictions on others, especially when it does not affect you.

It will affect me and my family and many other well-meaning residents and 2nd home owners who have done nothing to add to any issues. Crack down on the existing offenders - don't penalize those who have not caused any strife.

Please vote no.

Thank you,
Mimi Kwan
El Dorado County, Tahoe Basin resident

Public Comment #22

County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Bos Recd. 8-23-21

VHR Clustering

Laura Avila <laura.avila@sbcglobal.net>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 3:30 PM

Hello

I understand there is a meeting tomorrow regarding the new clustering rule Sec 5.56.056. I like know if there is still an opportunity to oppose this new rule. I currently hold a VHR permit and there is another home right next to mine and several others nearby. I know the rule states it does not affect current permit holders in good standing, so it currently would not affect me. However, another concern is that the rule only applies to current ownership. So my questions is if we were to sell the property the permit could not be transferrable? Pending a application from the current owner.

If this is the intent, I strongly oppose to this and would like to know how to voice my complaint for tomorrow meeting?



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS REV. 8-23-21

NO VHR BUFFER

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

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 3:12 PM

Please do not vote for the 500 ft VHR buffer. This is not necessary since the cap of 900 was put into place. Since the BOS voted on the cap, permits immediately jumped from low 700, up to the max of 900, and now has a waiting list of close to 100. The buffer will essentially invalidate the waiting list, and not allow another VHR permit to be issued. .

Thank you
Scott Robertson



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS RCVD. 8-23-21

NO buffer on VHR please

Nataliya Tyaglo <nataliya.tyaglo@gmail.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 1:47 PM

Dear Members of the board,

I am writing to ask you NOT to adopt the VHR buffer rule.

I am a South Lake Tahoe local, I have lived and rented here for many years and I have finally saved up enough to own my first home.

Please do not have this rule affect local homeowners who just got on the VHR waitlist!

I love and support the community in the Tahoe Basin. Please consider the voices and needs of local homeowners like me who live here on a daily basis in all the seasons, and know the neighborhoods both from a local renter and a local homeowner perspective.

As a local homeowner I foresee the VHR buffer rule to be a detriment to our community.

A buffer rule will spread out new VHRs. Spreading out new VHRs will cause more problems and it is not a solution to any of the issues with VHRs. This is bad for my community.

A buffer would grandfather in existing VHRs, and not stop any current complaints but it would restrict freedoms and opportunities for local homeowners who love and actually contribute to Tahoe's economy and community.

A grandfathered VHR next to my home will prevent me from getting a permit to share my home occasionally for the supplemental income I'll need to sustain my home as a new homeowner.

VHR permits should be granted based on their individual qualities and intentions, not based on a generic distance.

A vacation rental home who's homeowner is rarely in town and hosts parties of more than 10 people is very different from a local homeowner who occasionally greets single families and outdoor enthusiasts and shares their home while away to help make homeownership more affordable and to share the respectful ways of Tahoe lifestyle. A Local homeowner increases the efficient use of a house and decreases a housing problem.

An out of town investor with a grandfathered VHRs still leaves houses and neighborhoods empty for much of the season and prevents affordable living and homeownership for locals.

Please consider local homeowners. I actually live and own a home here.

Distance restrictions will NOT solve the current problems we are facing with VHRs but will make home ownership less sustainable for locals.

Please do NOT add a buffer rule.

Please do not have this rule affect local homeowners who just got on the VHR waitlist.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Nataliya Tyaglo



County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

*Public Comment #22**Box Recd. 8-23-21*

NO buffer until AFTER the current waitlist

Michael Passaretti <mjp16@hotmail.com>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 1:39 PM

Members of the board,

Please ensure new regulations go into effect AFTER current local homeowners on the VHR waitlist get their chance to apply!

As a 22 year local, and a new homeowner, I have been stuck in the middle of recent changes.

I live here, I work here, I own 1 and only 1 house.

I am a local firefighter, I just bought a house surrounded by current VHRs, with the intention of renting out the house when I get sent off on fire assignment.

The VHR buffer would prevent me from renting out my house occasionally, simply because an out of town investor runs his full time VHR business next door to me.

This benefits the people who created the complaints to begin with. Out of town investors with existing VHRs will be prioritized over new local homeowners.

Please be sure new rules do not take effect until AFTER the current VHR waitlist.

Sincerely,
Michael Passaretti

8/23/2021

Edcgov.us Mail - Please! NO VHR Buffer



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
BoS Rcvd. 8.23.21

Please! NO VHR Buffer

Shannon Jean <me@shannonjean.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 1:21 PM

Please vote NO on the proposed VHR buffer!

A buffer would penalize existing VHR owners that have worked so hard with the community.



Public Comment # 22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Bos Recd. 8-23-21

A VHR Buffer hurts Minority business owners!

Shannon Jean <shannon@businessshow.co>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 1:19 PM

Please do NOT implement a VHR buffer! Small minority business owners that live in the Tahoe area will be hurt by a buffer.

PLEASE VOTE NO ON A VHR BUFFER!

8/23/2021

Edcgov.us Mail - A VHR Buffer is BAD for Small Homeowners



Public Comment #22

County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS RCVD. 8-23-21

A VHR Buffer is BAD for Small Homeowners

S. Jean <reboundsales@gmail.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 1:17 PM

Supervisors,

A VHR Buffer will restrict small homeowners and favor existing large VHR's that are owned by corporations.

PLEASE VOTE NO on a VHR Buffer.

Thank you!

8/23/2021

Edcgov.us Mail - Please NO VHR Buffer!



Public Comment #22

County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BoS Recd. 8-23-21

Please NO VHR Buffer!

Shannon Jean <shannonjjean@gmail.com>
Reply-To: shannonjjean@gmail.com
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 1:16 PM

Board of Supervisors:

A VHR Buffer will penalize those of us that have worked so hard to comply with VHR rules and to create a good neighborhood environment.

PLEASE NO VHR BUFFER

Thank you!



Public Comment #22
 County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
 BOS RCOD. 8-23-21

Public Comment: prohibit new vacation rentals within 500 feet of a legally existing vacation home rental

Azadeh Nolan <azzalu@gmail.com>
 To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 12:25 PM

Dear El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

Public Comment to Vacation rental Ordinance 500ft

Regarding VHR anti-clustering and Item #21-1262 on the upcoming supervisors meeting to be held on August 24, 2021, I offer the following:

WE STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS ADDED EXTREME MEASURE of a 500ft DISTANCE REQUIREMENT BETWEEN VHRs.

How exactly will this restriction prevent the claimed issues such as the following?

- constant traffic (car, pedestrian, snow mobiles)
- loud noises at all hours of the day and night (cars, music, adults partying, children screaming) • trash along the streets
- dog poop (and bags) on the roads and trails
- safety issues due to unattended outdoor fires and overcrowding on units.

It won't.

None of the above will go away when there is 500ft distance between VHR rentals. It can however be resolved with responsible VHR renting. Simply having owners/renters following and implementing the EXISTING VHR ordinances diligently will achieve what's desired.

Hotels are overcrowded/overpriced, making Lake Tahoe Blvd so very congested with traffic. Tourists simply seem to prefer the "tahoe local experience" outside the main strip. I believe implementing a 500ft apart ordinance won't resolve overcrowding or some other justifications brought forward in its favor, it may even further the overcrowding in main hotel areas.

Responsible homeowner property management will and can help. Incentives to simply implement already existing VHR ordinances will work far better than an arbitrary distance rule.

I am a part time resident on Koyukon Dr. and was fortunate enough to obtain one of the last of the 900 VHR permits to rent our cabin when we are not using it, as did our neighbor. This was a deal breaker for us to be able to afford owning now, and working towards full time residency. A dream we have had since our wedding here in 2003. We take this privilege of having a VHR permit very seriously, and rent responsibly.

Not all vacation rentals are basecamps for partiers. MANY of us VHR permit holders rent responsibly and take special care in screening and ensuring we rent responsibly to those that will respect the peace and quiet of the neighborhood they are seeking to stay during their short term stays.

I caution the board in adopting this ordinance amendment. S. Lake is an economy that survives and can only thrive based on tourism. Limiting this with arbitrary distance caps won't solve anything. COVID will eventually end, and when it does... these restrictions will further damage the economy & homeowners/residents ability to use their properties in a way to be able to afford keeping them.

The VHR permit process is already very rigorous, adding more layers will not help further and only hinder economic health for our fulltimers. TAHOE IS A TOURIST destination, with less options for tourists... there will be less thriving in our economy as a result.

Best,
 Azadeh & Jim Nolan



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
Bos RCVd 8-23-21

Vacation Rental Ordinance

JOSEPH GERBAC <gerbacg@aol.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 12:24 PM

Regards.

My name is Joseph Gerbac and I have been a part time resident of El Dorado County for over 40 years. I bought my cabin located at 430 Bayview Dr. Meeks Bay (Tahoe Hills subdivision) in 1979. My two sons and their families spend lots of time at the cabin. Shortly after purchase I started renting it and now that I am over 80 years old I have become dependent on the income generated.

Because the County had my email address wrong and I didn't get notices, my permit and license expired and it appears that I can no longer rent my property. My sons best friends who fell in love with Meeks Bay recently bought an unlive in property up the street from mine (less than 500 feet), got the proper documents and in effect got my right to rent. Being unaware of the situation I helped them do this. This is unjust and wrong.

I might add all properties in Tahoe Hills, with the exception of maybe 4 are unlive in year round. I however allowed a local worker (ran snow cats at Homewood Ski Resort) to stay in my cabin for the last 2 winters.

I could add a lot more but I want to be brief. I urge the Board to reject the proposal. Respectfully I am.

Joseph E. Gerbac

Sent from my iPad



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Bos Recd 8-23-21

Board of Supervisors VHR request

Coatney, Doug <Doug.Coatney@netapp.com>

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 12:57 PM

To: "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>

Cc: "bosone@edc.gov.us" <bosone@edc.gov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear Sue & other distinguished Board of Supervisor members:

My name is Doug Coatney, for the past 20+ years I have been a volunteer ski patroller at Sierra at Tahoe. One of the things which has allowed me to donate my time freely to the community to help others and put in more volunteer days than anyone else in the program has been my ability to offset costs by renting my property in South Lake in the continually evolving VHR program. My VHR rental income is currently allowing me to finance my son's college education and my daughter's school as well.

In the 25+ years I have been renting my property I have had one complaint and that was dealt with immediately. I installed bear proof containers for 4X 32Gallon trash cans in 2003. I have a hot tub and have enforced quiet periods since 1995. I have always required a written rental agreement signed by renters acknowledging they are guests in the neighborhood and under no circumstances is it acceptable for them to annoy my neighbors at any time with their entire security deposit at risk. My local contact since 2002 has been my next door neighbor Rich Reum who immediately calls me and together we take care of any issues. In fact all of my neighbors have my direct cell phone number and know they can call me at any time if there is ever a disturbance in addition to my local contact! I've continued to conform to the policy changes that El Dorado County has added which has been easy since I have been requiring my guests to comply to much more stringent rules from the beginning.

So you may ask why I am writing you today? Well unfortunately due to the COVID Pandemic and family issues which had arisen surrounding that I made the tragic mistake of not renewing my VHR permit on time. This has led me to having to cancel numerous reservations to avoid issues and be compliant with El Dorado County policies. So now I am unable to rent my property for short term stays at all. Even though arguably I've been one of the most compliant owners in the Tahoe Valley over the past 25 years.

I am currently on the VHR permit wait list since there are more than 900 VHR permits issued in the valley. Further, my property is within 500 ft of other VHR's, so if the proposed policy changes go through, I will not ever be able to rent my property again as a VHR. Therefore I am suggesting to the board that a 500 ft limit does not guarantee that owners are responsible. Instead, I would suggest that the board consider adding an exception for VHR properties who are owner managed directly and not handed off to management companies plus take into account past levels of quality where applicable. Think of this as a quality instead of quantity mandate. Those of us who take an active role in renting our properties and integrate well into our local communities managing the resources effectively should not be excluded from being able to rent our properties any longer simply because others have been negligent and non-compliant. Create the ability to allow high quality people to manage their own properties and be directly accountable and you'll find that the quality of the experience increases in all instances. Restrict the owners who farm out the responsibility of managing their properties to generic agencies.

I made a mistake and during a pandemic failed to renew my VHR permit on time that's on me. Please do not make blanket policy decisions which will preclude high quality owners like me from ever renting property

again in the VHR program. I know that there are many "absent" owners who simply turn over their properties to agencies and are not involved at all in the process and this can adversely impact neighborhoods. There are exceptions to this rule though and there ought to be policy to support people who are those exceptions. There are people who these policies will impact negatively. My employees Rich Reum, Stephan Lane, Carlos & Eloisa Arce and their 4 children for example are already impacted negatively by my losing my permit, my son and daughter who's schooling was being financed by the rental revenue will also be impacted.

I'll also have to reconsider how I'm able to volunteer my time in El Dorado County for the upcoming year as I may no longer be able to afford the expense without offsetting it with rental income.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. I urge you to make policy changes which take into account the quality of the management process and who will be caring for the property and talking to guests directly into account, not only just the quantity or locality of where the rentals are. It would also be ideal if past performance/history was taken into account for those of us that find ourselves in a unique predicament created by dealing with the pandemic and losing our permit by error on our part, not due to any mismanagement or code violations.

At the next Board of Supervisors meeting, I would very much like to address the Board on this item if possible. I will strive to be as concise as possible with your valuable time.

Thankyou!

Doug Coatney

1901 Susquehana Drive

408-888-0105 cell



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Bos Rcvd. 8-23-21

Public Response to Proposed Sec. 5.56.056. – Vacation Home Rental Clustering

Jane Thomason <regalo.jt@gmail.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 12:14 PM

The proposed amendment of a 500 foot density restriction seems to be in response to

- problematic, disruptive vacation rental properties and guests
- a perceived change in community composition from full or part time homeowner residents to landlords

Whether the amendment will assist with either of these issues is a major question. If the issue is disruptive rentals, it is unlikely that making another regulation at County will rein in the disruption. Enforcement of existing regulations is what is required.

If the issue is a perceived change in community composition, that needs actual research and reporting prior to regulation. What is an acceptable community composition, and to what extent is this the provenance of County government? Particularly when this regulation would be applied County wide, not just in the Tahoe Basin. If the concern is that property is being bought by corporations to be exclusively short term rental property, this is not the tool to address that.

This amendment would act to unfairly penalize community members throughout the entire County by preventing them access to legal and profitable use of their major investment when needed. It also penalizes vacationers who are a major source of income for many of our communities--including the Coloma area where I operate a vacation rental and which has a dearth of non-camping accommodations and likewise no disruptive vacation rental issues. We would be impacted by this where there is no cause for additional regulation.

I suggest the problems giving rise to this amendment be clearly stated, and a targeted answer that fairly addresses the issues without causing harm to the greater community be considered in place of this amendment.

Thank you,

Jane Thomason
Lotus, CA



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Bos RCD. 8-23-21

Opposition to proposed VHR permit restrictions

adam landsdorf <landsdorf@hotmail.com>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
Cc: Dana Stone <dana@danarstone.com>

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 11:35 AM

I am writing to oppose the proposed restrictions of 500 ft distance between VHR permits, in addition to the 900 permit cap, being entertained by the El Dorado county Board of Supervisors on Aug 24.

While the intention may be worth considering in densely populated areas such as South Lake Tahoe, it should not apply in less densely populated areas where there are very few VHR permits, already with limited expansion due to the permit cap. The fact that a nearby neighbor has a VHR permit, should not be a reason to infringe on property rights of other neighbors.

Please reconsider the proposal to match the intent, to allow fair and equitable distribution of VHR permits, and with consideration of property owners in areas with less VHR permit density.

Sincerely,
Adam Landsdorf
Homeowner, Rubicon Properties.



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Bees Rcvd. 8-23-21

VHR

Leah Belair <leahbelair@gmail.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 11:26 AM

To The Supervisors,

I currently have a VHR permit in the county. I have been following your agendas and agree with the efforts to control the number of VHR permits. This may sound self serving, but we have owned our house for 22 years and we care about the neighborhood and we hear the valid complaints of the neighbors. We receive so many requests for longer term rentals, we see how impacted the housing market is, and we also see that people are buying houses just to have them as Vacation Rentals, and that some neighborhoods are heavily impacted.

I am not writing this because I am afraid of competition. We currently receive more requests than we are willing or able to accommodate.

We bought our home as a second home and still see it that way. We would keep it regardless of the rental possibilities. So we support all your efforts to control this runaway train.

Regards

Leah Belair
1939 Mewuk Dr
South Lake Tahoe, CA



Public Comment #22
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>
BOS Recd. 8-23-21

Public Comment for the VHR Ordinance Item 8.24.21 BOS Meeting

natalie@ca-tt.com <natalie@ca-tt.com>

Mon, Aug 23, 2021 at 8:29 AM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, Sue Novasel <novasel@aol.com>, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, clay.russell@edcgov.us, don.ashton@edcgov.us, david.livingston@edcgov.us

Hello,

Please see the attached public comment, and if you could be so kind as to confirm receipt that would be appreciated.

Thank you, and have a wonderful Monday.

NATALIE YANISH

CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION OF TRUCKEE TAHOE

12313 Soaring Way Suite 1A

Truckee, Ca 96161

P: 530.550.9999 F: 530.550.9998

E: natalie@ca-tt.com

W: www.ca-tt.com



 **CATT Public Comment 8.23.21 El Dorado County VHR Agenda Item.pdf**
716K



August 20, 2021

To The Honorable El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

John Hidahl, District I
George Turnboo, District II
Wendy Thomas, District III
Lori Parlin, District IV
Sue Novasel, District V

CC: Kim Dawson, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Don Ashton, Chief Administrative Officer
David Livingston, County Counsel

RE: August 24, 2021, Planning and Building Department recommending the Board: 1) Approve the Introduction (First Reading) of Ordinance 5146 amending Title 5 - County Business Taxes, Licenses and Regulations of the El Dorado County Ordinance Code, Chapter 5.56 - Vacation Home Rentals, adding Section 5.56.056 - Vacation Home Rental Clustering; and 2) Waive the full reading of the Ordinance, read by title only and continue this matter to August 31, 2021, for Final Passage (Second Reading).

To The Honorable El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

The Contractor Association of Truckee Tahoe (CATT) submits the following letter regarding the consideration of a policy regarding “buffering” distances between parcels for short term rental permitting. CATT opposes restrictions on the ability for property owners to garner rental income from their real property. Short term rentals or “Vacation Home Rentals (VHRs)” are vital to the South Lake Tahoe economy and allows owners to generate income, which they often reinvest in upgrading their property. Limitations on short term and long term rentals negatively affect future construction, redevelopment, and investment in the region.

A key component that is missing in the calculations of how many parcels will qualify for a VHR permit, is the consideration that not all of the homes that will qualify will be used for VHR purposes. Currently, the amount of housing stock that is in use as a short term rental hovers around 15%. **If this calculation is taken into consideration, demand will never reach the maximum estimated total of 974**

permits. Of those 974 parcels, 99 are vacant lots, and the assumption is that all 99 of those lots would be developed and used as VHRs, which seems unlikely.

- VHRs or short term rentals: Generally less than 15% of the housing stock
- The majority of homes, 85% are split between other uses:
 - Second homes that are not rented out and used exclusively by the owner(s)
 - Primary resident occupied properties
 - Long term rentals

If use of property is extrapolated from the data:

- 15% of existing housing stock utilized as VHRs would result in the following additional possible permits to existing:
 - No buffer: 7,987 candidate parcels x 15% = **1,198***
 - 150 ft: 4,086 candidate parcels x 15% = **613***
 - 300 ft: 2,259 candidate parcels x 15% = **339***
 - 500 ft: 1,364 candidate parcels x 15% = **205*** (this is assuming that the limited qualified parcels are suitable for short term renting, which is not likely the case)

*current demand is not close to reaching this amount and self regulates due to attrition

Buffering's Effect on VHR Numbers

| Buffer Distance | Existing (VHRs in place or Pending) | Candidate (Developed Residential) | Potential (Vacant Residential Buildable) | Eligible (Existing + Candidate + Potential) | Average Impact (Eligible lots removed per buffer) | Maximum (Estimated VHR total) |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| No Buffer | 753 | 7,987 | 1,031 | 9,771 | | 9,771 |
| 150ft | 753 | 4,086 | 470 | 5,309 | 6 | 1,649 |
| 300ft | 753 | 2,259 | 225 | 3,237 | 9 | 1,126 |
| 500ft | 753 | 1,364 | 99 | 2,216 | 10 | 974 |

A “buffer” policy creates a moving target, in that it can change on a day to day basis given the attrition rate of current permits due to existing, expiring, and non-transferable permits upon sale. The math above is a simple explanation for what would be a complex model to create in order to calculate the anticipated number of VHRs. The size and shape of parcels in the county is not uniform, so some neighborhoods will be more affected with disqualified parcels than others. **What is clear, is that the number of VHRs will dwindle over time.**

There is also the consideration of how to implement a “buffering” policy. Waiting lists and tracking of current VHR locations is time consuming for staff and adds a cost burden to the program which is passed onto the consumer. The “buffering” policy seems exhaustive for property owners to navigate and understand.

A locational restriction of use will create the following situation:

- An inequitable policy of allowing some property owners the right to short term rent, and deny others the same right
- The creation of a new commodity through supply and demand of a finite resource (available permits)
- Instability in the housing market created by uncertainty for landlords and buyers and sellers of real estate
- Constant monitoring of waiting lists for disqualified properties because of adjacent parcel existing permits expiration or termination
- A “first come first serve” policy putting neighbors in an adversarial position
- Stigmatizing ineligible parcels and affecting home values, as parcels outside of the buffer area have a superior uses than those within the buffer

CATT further asks that the Supervisors consider the effects of short term rental restrictions, including:

- Impacts to the construction industry
- Job loss in the workforce for businesses directly and indirectly that are VHR based
 - Construction workers, maintenance workers, landscapers, painters, flooring installers, etc.
- Administrative costs for the County staff to administer “buffering” which will be passed onto property owners
- Estimate on loss of overall transient occupancy tax
- Estimate on loss of sales tax of construction materials
- Negative impacts to the redevelopment of the existing aging housing stock

Any impacts on the quality of life in neighborhoods is due to lack of enforcement and not the location of rental properties. CATT encourages the County Supervisors to disapprove the additional consideration of arbitrary “buffering” between parcels. We ask that you allow enforcement of current strict nuisance ordinances to solve the problems instead of creating new unnecessary regulation.

The right to rent a property is part of the “bundle of rights” with the purchase of real property, as is quiet enjoyment.

CATT continues to be an interested stakeholder and community organization that advocates for the vitality of the Tahoe region. We appreciate your time in reviewing our comments and hope to be included in policy making that affects the construction industry.

Respectfully Submitted,



Natalie Yanish
South Lake Tahoe Government Affairs Manager
Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe
(c) 775.843.7142
natalie@ca-tt.com
www.ca-tt.com



Our Mission: “To promote a positive business environment for the building and housing industry and enhance opportunities for its members and the community”



Public Comment #22

County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Bos ACVD. 8-23-21

item 21-1262

Leona Allen <allen.leona12@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 21, 2021 at 9:18 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us,
edc.cob@edcgov.us

Cc: Leona Allen <allen.leona12@gmail.com>

Honorable Supervisors...

Please vote to maintain the 500' buffer zone between vacation rentals as well as the 900 cap. We residents appreciate that you have been attentive to our concerns and created the changes to the ordinance.

Sincerely,

Leona Allen
1897 Toppewetah Street
Meyers



Public Comment # 22
 County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS RCW. 8-23-21

Agenda Item #21-1262, August 24, 2021--Second Reading of County Vacation Home Rental Clustering

Donarae Reynolds <donarae.reynolds@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 21, 2021 at 2:20 PM

To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, bostwo@edcgov.us, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, BOS Four <bosfour@edcgov.us>, The BOSFIVE <bosfive@edcgov.us>, County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

August 20, 2021

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

John Hidahl, District I
 George Turnboo, District II
 Wendy Thomas, District III
 Lori Parlin, District IV
 Sue Novasel, District V
 Clerk of the Board

Re: Agenda item #21-1262 for August 24, 2021—Planning and Building Department, Second Reading of County Vacation Home Rental Clustering Ordinance

Dear County Board of Supervisors:

We are strongly in favor of the anti-clustering ordinance for Vacation Home Rentals. Please vote to support the Second Reading and support your local residents in the county.

Many concerned residents have voiced their opinions and concerns at numerous meetings and have written letters over the past four years asking for help in the county to control the Vacation Home Rentals in our neighborhoods

The first help that we recently received was the 900 cap on the Vacation Home Rentals (which we believe is too high) but we do appreciate that help. Now we are asking for the approval of the 500-foot anti-clustering for Vacation Home Rentals. The ordinance will not give us any immediate relief since the current Vacation Home Rentals are grandfathered, but we are hoping that in time we may get some relief.

There has been on-going concern about the excessive numbers of Vacation Home Rentals in our residential neighborhoods, and unless you have one near you, you have not experienced what we experience. Why do you think that we are so strongly complaining?

Single-family vacation homes are housing an average of three to four families every weekend--they share the cost to make it more affordable. What happened to people coming up and staying in hotels like we used to do before moving here in retirement. Don't you support the hotel/motel industry? Where are they in all this?

The sad thing is that this is all amount money---money made by the homeowners, real estate agents, property managers, and the county on the backs of local full-time residents. Homeowners are running businesses in our residential neighborhoods. We are not asking for the moon here, just for your help. We want to enjoy our life and our neighborhood.

Tahoe is a tourist destination we know, and we must share this beauty with those coming to visit, but you must also consider the impact that over tourism has on the beautiful lake and our sensitive forest areas and trails. The Vacation Home Rentals are fueling over tourism. Not to mention the impact that it has on our Fire District, Sheriff's Office, snow removal and road/street conditions. It will be a huge issue if we need to have a mass evacuation due to a fire.

Please approve the second reading for the anti-clustering of Vacation Home Rentals at 500 feet.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave & Donarae Reynolds
2882 Lodgepole Trail
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 304-3262
Donarae.Reynolds@gmail.com