

Public Comment #20  
BOS Recd. 5-13-24

**From:** Tom and Diana <tomaso123@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 12, 2024 6:14 PM  
**To:** BOS-Clerk of the Board  
**Subject:** Comments on Proposed VHR Code Changes  
**Attachments:** EDC VHR Changes Letter\_rev 2.docx

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

To: The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

I would like the attached letter read into the record when the topic of VHR ordinance changes comes before the board.

Thank you,

Tom Reneau

To: El Dorado County Supervisors

From: Tom Reneau

Re: Proposed VHR Ordinance Changes

I own a vacation home in South Lake Tahoe (county area) and have rented it to vacationers with a VHR permit for more than 10 years. I like my neighbors in Tahoe and go to great lengths to ensure that our rental activity impacts their quality of life is as little as possible. I have read the proposed changes to the county VHR ordinances and have mixed feelings about them. I support efforts to reduce clusters of VHRs and to strengthen noise compliance by renters. However, there are some specific proposals that go too far and others that will not achieve either of these goals. I offer below my opinions on 5 specific proposals from the report. These are things that I disagree with. Items that I have not commented about, I either endorse or have no strong feeling about.

- 1) Section A4c: Requiring an owner to change their local contact if they receive 2 violations within 18 months doesn't make sense to me. Ordinance violations are rarely the fault of the local contact. They are usually the fault of the renters. If it is found that the local contact failed to inform the renters of the rules, failed to respond to a complaint or address an issue properly on more than one occasion then I can see a need to make a change. I believe this is covered by the proposed change E3. Changing the local contact simply because of 2 violations in 18 months has no effect on the 20 or 30 or more other homes for which that property manager is the local contact. If the local contact is truly the root of the problem then why should they be allowed to continue to be a local contact for any VHR? Furthermore, forcing an owner to switch from company A to another company while another owner is forced to change from company B to another company (possibly company A) doesn't address the problem at all. Don't punish local contacts (and owners) if they have done their job and renters still choose to misbehave. Punish the renters.
- 2) Section D3; It has been my experience that issues arise when renters significantly exceed the stated occupancy limits. Reducing the limit on a 4-bedroom house from 10 to 8 (plus children 5 and younger) is not going to stop renters from having 12 or 14 or more people there. That is when issues arise, and that needs to be addressed, but changing the allowed limit won't do that. Furthermore, I don't see what problem this is trying to solve and I don't think this change will make any difference to noise issues.
- 3) Section D3: 24/7 Occupancy. Who is considered an occupant? What is the difference between an occupant and a visitor? Example: an extended family rents two or more properties for a specific time period and wants to have an afternoon birthday celebration for their grandmother at one of the properties. Are the people coming to the celebration at that property considered occupants or visitors? Is this allowed or not? If not, why not? It seems like the committee only wants renters to sleep at VHRs, not enjoy them. There are already requirements for quiet hours. Now it seems as the committee wants renters quiet at all times. Furthermore, am I considered an occupant when I stay at my own house? What about work crews that I contract with? Are they occupants? I've had more than 10 adults at my house making noise all day long. Would I

have violated the occupancy and noise limits simply by hiring a crew to remove trees from my property while I was there? Who makes the determination as to what people and what noises are acceptable? I think this goes too far.

- 4) Section D4; I strongly disagree with video surveillance. This is under the heading of parking but I don't see how this would aid in enforcing parking controls? Why and how these video feeds will be used is not defined. A large number of VHRs only have enough spaces for the number of cars allowed anyway so if there are more cars than allowed then they would have to be parked on the street, which isn't surveilled anyway. So, what is the point? Furthermore, what about garage parking? Will a video feed be needed from garages next? Beyond the fact there is no clear benefit to having video feeds, they are an invasion of privacy. The driveway (and garage) is private property and it is reasonable for renters and owners to expect to be free of surveillance while on private property. As the owner, will I be surveilled while at my own house? Whom would monitor these video feeds? What will they be looking for? What will they be required to report and what to ignore? Will the video feed be recorded? Cars can still be parked on the street and these cameras would not see them. Will operators actually be looking at and counting people walking down the driveway for occupancy compliance? What about just standing in the driveway? What about cars parked in the garage? Again, video surveillance is an invasion of privacy with no practical benefit to boot. This should not be adopted in any form.
- 5) Section D5; I also have strong opinions about noise level monitoring. I am not opposed to the idea of noise level monitoring, just some of the specific proposals. Noise level monitoring should only be used to confirm or refute a complaint made by a human being. Noise level data should not be the impetus for a violation alone. I hope this is the intent. If so then it must be stated clearly. I agree that the local contact should respond to noise level exceedances so as to address the issue before it annoys a neighbor. However, noise levels inside a house are irrelevant and should not be monitored. Only noise that reaches a neighbor's ear matters. How much noise escapes a house and gets to a neighbor's ear will vary depending on how well the house is built and insulated, whether doors or windows are open or closed, the distance and vegetation between houses, weather conditions, etc. Moreover, noise generated outside the house is by far the largest source of complaints. Therefore, noise levels should only be required to be monitored on the outside of the house and never used as the sole reason for a violation.

Thank you for reading this letter and seriously considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Tom Reneau