



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

Comments to Proposed Buffer Regulation on VHR's by El Dorado County

1 message

Matt Fischer <fischermat@aol.com>

Sat, May 8, 2021 at 3:34 PM

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

LATE DISTRIBUTION
DATE 5/10/2021
BUS 5/11/2021

Dear El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

I have received a notice from you that you are considering implementing a buffer system of 300 to 1,000 ft. between VHR's in El Dorado County.

I built my home over 15 years ago and invested significant money in it.

I have a VHR permit as a vacation rental with no complaints during this entire period and contributing significant tax dollars to the community.

If this new law is passed I will lose my permit and all my income as other vacation rentals have been permitted near me.

Instead of this buffer proposal I would propose the following.

1. Limit VHR stays to a 3 night minimum. (This will eliminate a great deal of the partiers / disturbances.)
2. Require very strict written contracts that must be agreed and signed by each guest. (No one can book by just checking boxes on a screen. Must sign a written rental agreement)
3. Use VHR funds to fund VHR enforcement allowing neighbors to reach out to an assigned VHR enforcement official who can work with them and the VHR owner to resolve any on going issues.
4. Strictly enforce all VHR rules with regulations on the book.
5. Shut down un permitted VHR's operating in the county.

Enacting these changes will help avoid problems, complaints and impacts to the neighbors.

We must just respect each other including our property rights to co exist.

Let's work together.

Thanks for your consideration.

Thanks

5/10/2021

Edcgov.us Mail - Comments to Proposed Buffer Regulation on VHR's by El Dorado County

Matt Fischer

Sent from Mail for Windows 10



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

May 11, 2021 BOS meeting,Agenda #19

1 message

garf4fun@aol.com <garf4fun@aol.com>

Sat, May 8, 2021 at 7:10 PM

Reply-To: garf4fun@aol.com

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Hi,

Thanks so much for understanding the importance of the 500 foot anti-clustering between VHR's in the South Lake Tahoe area. It is critical that you do vote to have this distance requirement implemented as soon as possible.

We would really appreciate your support of this issue when this item is discussed under agenda #19, at the May 11, 2021 BOS meeting. Anything less than 500 feet, isn't acceptable.

Thank so much!

Ardel Garofalos



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

VHR Question

1 message

James Barr <jcreativeb@sbcglobal.net>

Sun, May 9, 2021 at 2:04 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

This question is in regard to your proposed new buffer zones between VHR's. If passed, how would these new regulations affect existing VHRs? Or would they only apply to proposed new VHRs?

James Barr
El Dorado County Resident for 21 years

Sent from my iPad



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

Proposed VHR buffer

1 message

Aubrie Sell <aubrie.sell@gmail.com>

Sun, May 9, 2021 at 7:21 PM

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Hi! We live in El Dorado county in a beautiful neighborhood off Pioneer Trail. Our neighborhood has average working families and retirees and an abundance of VHRs. We would like a buffer zone to prevent anymore clusters of VHRs. We pay a lot of money in property tax and deserve a livable neighborhood. Several times a year we have VHR guests attempting to enter our house, parking in our driveway or wandering into our yard for "snow play". I work as a preschool teacher year round and need to sleep on weeknights as opposed to noisy vacationers shouting in hot tubs and setting off fireworks. There are several homes in the neighborhood that appear to have a revolving door without the proper permitting. Please save our neighborhoods. It's a matter of public fire safety, kindness, and community. We have enough VHRs.

Aubrie Williams
1211 Huph St, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

--

-Aubrie Sell Williams

aubrie.sell@gmail.com
www.aubriesellwilliams.com



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

Meeting 5/11

1 message

maureen howard-kiely <mkiely4@sbcglobal.net>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Sun, May 9, 2021 at 9:10 PM

We are current VHR owners writing in support of the idea to create a buffer around VHRs. Too many vacation rentals can be detrimental to a neighborhood, compounding issues of noise, garbage, and parking problems. We also agree with and would suggest that all VHRs should be required to install exterior security cameras to assist with surveillance and help with these issues. We would also request that the current VHR permits should be grandfathered in, until the permit is revoked or surrendered, if this buffer is created.

Thank you for your consideration.
Michael and Maureen Kiely



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

Impacts from VHRs and VHR Anti-Clustering Issue

3 messages

Steve Jacobs <sjemail777@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 4:00 PM

To: BOS <bosone@edcgov.us>, BOS <bostwo@edcgov.us>, BOS <bosthree@edcgov.us>, BOS <bosfour@edcgov.us>, BOS <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Please see the attached letter.

Thank you
Steve Jacobs

 **Letter to BOS - VHRs anti-clustering.docx**
283K

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

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 4:05 PM

To: The BOSFIVE <bosfive@edcgov.us>, Donald Ashton <don.ashton@edcgov.us>, Jeanette Salmon <jeanette.salmon@edcgov.us>, Tiffany Schmid <tiffany.schmid@edcgov.us>, Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>, Brendan Ferry <brendan.ferry@edcgov.us>, Robert Peters <robert.peters@edcgov.us>, Breann Moebius <breann.moebius@edcgov.us>

FYI

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

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.

[Quoted text hidden]

 **Letter to BOS - VHRs anti-clustering.docx**
283K

Steve Jacobs <sjemail777@gmail.com>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 12:26 PM

To: BOS <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Hello. Regarding VHR anti-clustering, I sent the following letter (attached) to the BOS on March 8, 2021.

Upon reviewing the agenda/attachments for tomorrow's meeting concerning VHR clustering, I do not see a copy of my letter in the record of "public comments received".

Perhaps I am missing something, but would you please advise why it is not part of the meeting record?

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Regards
Steve Jacobs

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Steve Jacobs** <sjemail777@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 4:00 PM

Subject: Impacts from VHRs and VHR Anti-Clustering Issue

To: BOS <bosone@edcgov.us>, BOS <bostwo@edcgov.us>, BOS <bosthree@edcgov.us>, BOS <bosfour@edcgov.us>, BOS <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

[Quoted text hidden]



Letter to BOS - VHRs anti-clustering.docx

283K

Steve Jacobs
1981 Mewuk Dr.
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
Sjemail777@gmail.com

March 8, 2021

Sent via Email to:

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors:

John Hidahl	bosone@edcgov.us
George Turnboo	bostwo@edcgov.us
Wendy Thomas	bosthrere@edcgov.us
Lori Parlin	bosfour@edcgov.us
Clerk of the Board	edc.cob@edcgov.us

Re: Impacts from VHRs and VHR Anti-Clustering Issue

Dear Supervisors:

Regarding VHRs and the recent discussion of anti-clustering in our neighborhoods, I offer the following:

1. Our CC&Rs expressly prohibit VHRs to operate in our neighborhoods. VHRs are “commercial business operations” and “lodging houses,” both of which are illegal and not allowed uses under the CC&Rs of Tahoe Paradise.
2. The County has knowingly ignored our CC&Rs and has completely failed to protect its citizens from the harm that VHRs cause. Instead, the County has permitted VHRs in our neighborhoods for the economic benefit of business interests and to further enrich itself in the collection of tax dollars. The permanent residents of this County pay a huge amount of money in property taxes, and the government’s primary duty should be to protect us from this outrage. Instead, the County has recently decided to add even more VHRs.
3. The County clearly knows the extreme disturbance that VHRs cause to our residents. The VHR tourists that come to stay in our neighborhood are almost always completely disrespectful of the tranquility we share with our permanent residents. It does little good to file complaints, as the county’s VHR code enforcement division is entirely overwhelmed, inadequate and ineffective. Unfortunately, many of our great neighbors have already given up and moved away (and many more are thinking of moving) because of VHRs.
4. Until such time as the County government comes to respect its residents and stops this egregious breach of trust, I am in favor of spacing VHRs as far apart as possible. With respect to the various proposals under consideration for VHR anti-clustering, I support **a minimum of 1000 feet of space** between these illegal VHR business operations.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Steve Jacobs



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

VHR's in the County, (South Lake Tahoe)

1 message

loloveart@sbcglobal.net <loloveart@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 2:32 PM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

I am writing in regards to the many VHR's that have replaced owner occupied homes in our area. My husband and I moved here from the Bay Area 27 years ago, after he retired. We wanted to enjoy the beauty and, peace and quiet that is Lake Tahoe! Nobody was talking about VHR's then. It seems ever since the City of South Lake Tahoe took measures to control and curtail the VHR's there, "the greedy people" figured out that the County was easy pickens!

We have some neighbors that we have known for almost as long as we have lived here, as well as other neighbors who are 2nd homeowners. They take pride in their homes and have had enjoyed them for a number of years. But the other day, one of our permanent long time neighbors told me they were considering selling their home and moving to Montana, due to the fact there are 3 VHR's side by side on their street now. And they are afraid that the neighborhood will become problematic, noisy, and be overrun with VHR's! This really hit home with me!

My husband and I have been reading the weekly Sheriff's reports in the South Tahoe Now daily newsletter, and the issues with the VHR's are obvious, not to say costly to the homeowners (taxes) here.

At least 500 ft. distance between VHR's is absolutely necessary!

Respectfully submitted,

Lois Loveless

loloveart@sbcglobal.net



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

VHR Agenda Item 5/11/21 El Dorado County Supervisors

1 message

Natalie Yanish <natalieyanish@gmail.com>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 3:00 PM

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

Hello,

Attached is public comment for item #19 on the agenda at tomorrow's meeting. Please confirm receipt.

Warm Regards,

Natalie Yanish
South Lake Tahoe Government Affairs Manager
Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe
(c) 775.843.7142
www.ca-tt.com
(o) 530.550.9999



CATT Public Comment 5.11.21 El Dorado County VHR Agenda Item.pdf
260K



May 9, 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: May 11, 2021 Board of Supervisors Meeting Agenda Item #19. 21-0524: Presentation on options to address Vacation Home Rental clusters in the Tahoe Basin and provide direction to staff.

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”, or disqualifying parcels from receiving a short term rental permit that are located near other parcels that have existing permits. CATT opposes restrictions on private property rights and the ability for property owners to garner rental income from their real property. CATT also continues to oppose a cap on the number of permits available in El Dorado County. Limitations on short term and long term rentals negatively affect future construction, redevelopment, and investment in the region.

The presentation with GIS mapping and parcel “buffering” distances included in the agenda item does not take into account the consideration of the percentage of parcels that are traditionally VHR use:

- 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 considered in the data:

- 15% of existing housing stock utilized as VHRs would result in the following:
 - No buffer: 7,987 candidate parcels x 15% = **1,198** (current demand does not reach this amount and self regulates due to attrition)
 - 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**

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

The math is not quite this simple, as it is impossible to calculate how the number of parcels available for VHR permits will be affected, due to the ever-changing landscape of existing, expiring, non-transferable permits upon sale, and new applications. Because parcels in the County are often different in size, shape, and location – there is no way to extrapolate an accurate estimate of expected impact on the number of VHRs with “buffering” restrictions. Potential VHRs or vacant parcels, will not be built for some time (based on only 30 new allocations available for new construction per year), or possibly some not at all due to buildability issues or lack of availability of future allocations.

In addition, a layer of “buffering” on top of an overall cap on the number of available permits is a confusing and technical process that is exhaustive for property owners to navigate and understand, and for staff to administer. For example – how will staff determine who on the waiting lists of nearby properties might become first eligible when permits become inactive?

A locational restriction of use will create the following situation:

- An inequitable policy of allowing some property owners the right to rent, and deny others the same right
- The creation of a new commodity through supply and demand of a finite resource (available permits)
- Instability and 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

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

In reviewing nuisance violations on VHRs, it appears that only a few verified complaints resulting in violations happen each week. Creating more regulations will not solve nuisance issues. If residents of short term rentals, long term rentals, primary residences, or second homes violate that law, they should be held accountable.

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 redact the current cap on short term rental permits (numbers are regulated due to attrition), and disapprove the additional consideration of arbitrary buffering zones between parcels. We ask that you allow the implementation of newly hired code enforcement officers to terminate VHR permits for offenders of existing strict nuisance ordinances.

Instead of an “us vs. them” mentality, which is heard from residents who dislike VHR uses, an educational or community stakeholder based approach would better address friction or complaints. 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”