



Public Comment #19
County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

BOS RCVD 5/7/2021

VHR Buffers

Brian Atkins <tahoeprops@gmail.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 12:41 PM

To whom it may concern,

This seems like an unequal, unfair and arbitrary way to discriminate against certain existing VHR's for the reasons listed below.

1. Clientele - A VHR with six loud and obnoxious people can be more disruptive than a house that accommodates a respectful family of 12. To this point larger houses which have higher rates and which focus on higher end clientele tend to book families that are not partiers. So there is also a rate and size issue which determines the level of respect shown by the guests. Finally on this point, some houses with 12 occupancy will book less occupants at any given time. A family of six or 8 may book a 12 person home.
2. Lay of the land - All houses are not created equal. Some houses have natural buffers with trees and or fences, where others are open and have nothing to block sight lines or noise.
3. Neighbors - There are many houses within said proposed parameter restrictions who have neighbors who are never home. The houses would be second homes for some and rarely if ever occupied and not disturbed by any VHR activity. Whereas you may have a home that just makes the parameters and has a quiet family who is very particular about their privacy. This case would be worse than the aforementioned example.
4. Changing the rules - If these rules are put into effect, this would be post purchase for those who already own a VHR, and in every regard will be changing the rules in the middle of the game. In essence it would be like saying that originally you can play on the basketball team if you are over 5 feet tall, then changing the parameters to only being able to participate if you are 6 foot tall.

Many "locals" are able to support their families and workers, like cleaners and service techs, with these VHR's promoting the overall economy, also bringing revenue with taxes and fees collected by the government. To quell certain existing VHR's because they are within a certain distance from each other or other homes is a fair or reasonable solution to protecting non-VHR homeowners.

Thank you for your time.



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

Buffer Zones

Garen Avanesian <garen@silvercavalier.com>
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 11:19 AM

Buffer zones will not discourage people from renting their property without a business license.

Some serious effort will have to be made to find non-licensed rentals and close them down.

Garen Avanesian

VHR21-0269



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

Comments on buffer zones for VHR

1 message

Juan Gomez <j_carlos_gomez@yahoo.com>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 12:11 PM

Dear EDC-BOS:

Although this may seem like a good idea for long term residents who are retired and do not have to work for an income, I think this is detrimental and will bring more unemployment and poverty to the area. Numerous people make a living from working in the hospitality industry in Tahoe: the cleaners, the local property managers, the handy man and contractors that work on this homes. I think as representatives of those residents you should advocate for growing the local economy in a sustainable manner: you have already imposed restrictions on VHR permits awarded.

The most pressing issue should be enforcing current regulations: it is really frustrating that I pay high fees and taxes but when I check VRBO and AirBnB I see a number of neighbors renting their properties and not having permits in place. How about using this extra work-force that would be added for this to really crack down on those violators? I would be more than glad to work with your code enforcement to pinpoint the properties as I know they list the address a bit off in these sites to fly below the radar. Of course we should also make sure that the fines are so significant that violators would not risk it.

Lastly, imposing buffer regulations begs the question on how would you deal with current permitted properties which are in close proximity? This will entail a number of legal issues which would cost EDC lots of tax payers money.

Regards, Juan Gomez/4084067428



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

Re: Agenda Item 21-0524, May 11, 2021 Board of Supervisors Meeting

1 message

Donarae Reynolds <donarae.reynolds@gmail.com>

Thu, May 6, 2021 at 5:59 PM

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

May 6, 2021

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

RE: 21-0524, May 11 meeting--Anti-clustering of the Vacation Rental Homes

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I would like to first thank you for putting the cap of 900 on the Vacation Rental Homes in El Dorado County. I would like to urge you to not consider raising the cap but to keep it at 900. After four years of asking for help, writing letters, and attending meetings in person and on Zoom, this is the first time that we have received any help.

In our neighborhood, we are trying to create a sense of community, where neighbors help neighbors. In the event of an emergency, fire, or evacuation, we want to be there to help one another.

About a month ago, we lost an older gentleman neighbor. During a well check, it was found that this man had been dead for two weeks. On either side of this man's home is a Vacation Rental Home (there is a vacant lot across the street). I wonder if he might have had a chance or if he would not have gone unnoticed for so long if he had real neighbors living on either side of him.

I am writing today to ask that you institute at least a 500-foot or more distance between Vacation Rental Homes. Anything less than 500 feet would be ineffective. We need help now!

If there were less Vacation Rental Homes, there would be more homes available for local workers, local families to either buy or rent full time.

The way that these 900 licensed homes are being used every weekend goes like this—there are at least two to four families occupy these homes, so multiply eight to 14 people times 900 (7,200 - 13,500 persons per weekend). That is the actual occupancy that is occurring. VHR occupants use excess water, sewer, garbage, and parking is always an issue. Not to mention the impact to our sensitive lake, our trails, etc.

Unless you live next to or near a Vacation Home Rental, you do not really understand how they are being used. I know because we have one behind us and one across the street from us.

We need more family-friendly hotels in the tourist corridor with kitchenettes or something that would attract families.

We need your help, and we have been very patiently waiting. We need action now.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

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



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

Buffer Distance VHRs

1 message

Eddie Ranchigoda <eddieranch@gmail.com>

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 11:46 AM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

FWIW, submitting feedback for consideration in lieu of being able to attend the live event.

This strikes me as yet another attempt to throw additional complexities into the VHR world of Tahoe without addressing what the core objectives are.

The stated objectives are:

1. decrease commercialization
2. decrease loss of sense of "community"
3. reduce noise

For #1, Tahoe IS a resort, vacation destination. VHRs are not suddenly turning residential streets and neighborhoods into hotel strips and retail hotspots. The very reason vacationers are drawn to VHRs is they WANT quieter, non hotel-like places to slow down away from city life. Separating VHRs will not decrease commercialization. If the residents want less commercialization that's fine, but address that directly.

For #2, sense of community comes from people and desire to socialize with temporary and permanent neighbors. On the street my VHR is located, I have met some neighbors who are short-term vacationers and they are great. I have also NOT met permanent residents who choose not to come out from their walls and gates. Sense of community cannot be changed by city/county laws.

For #3, if noise is an issue address this directly with the bad landlords/owners who rent to guests who create these noise issues. I have owned my VHR for 7 years and have has 2 noise complaints in 7 years. I try very hard to rent to respectful people who know and follow the rules. Address noise issues at the source, not with a myriad of indirect legislations like limited parking laws, complicated permit processes, and now this silly buffer idea.

Eddie Ranchigoda
VHR owner and half-time Tahoe resident
2428 Cold Creek Trail



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

VHR

1 message

Edward Miller <EM@wildwest-tahoe.com>

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 11:20 AM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

As a 43 year full-time resident, I fully support the implementation of "buffer zones" around VHR/STR's in the Tahoe Basin area of El Dorado County.

Edward Miller
Tahoma

Ed Miller
EM@WildWest-Tahoe.com
530-412-1066



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

Letter for Tuesdays VHR Meeting

1 message

Joshua Priou <jpriou@tahoeres.com>
To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Fri, May 7, 2021 at 1:39 PM

Please find the attached letter to be submitted into the record for the Supervisors meeting on May 11th. Please read the letter to public.

Thank you,

Joshua Priou



El dorado County Letter 05-07-21.doc
369K

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, Ca, 95667

2043 Dunlap Drive
South Lake Tahoe, California 96150
530.544.3234
800.544.3234
FAX 530.542.1860

Re: Supervisors Meeting 05/11/2021
Vacation Rental Clustering

Dear Supervisors,

Why a Clustering Policy?

- **Combats commercialization of neighborhoods** – Wrong! In 2004 TRPA determined that vacation rentals are a residential use. The planning authority for El Dorado County is the TRPA and they determined that vacation rentals are not a commercial use, they are residential.
- **Combats loss of sense of community** – Is there any sense of community? I don't know what it is? In South Lake Tahoe, permanent residents, vacation homes, and vacation rentals are totally mixed. 60% of all homes in South Lake Tahoe are owned by absentee owners, these homes are used as vacation homes and are NOT used as vacation rentals. Having guests stay in vacation rentals actually brings families into our community adding to the sense of community, who else are our children going to play with?
- **Combats nuisance issues** – You have no concept as to whether clustering or lack of clustering will create abnormal nuisances. Clustering is only a concept and if you have a bad neighbor it doesn't matter if they are clustered or not. Don't forget that this could be a local neighbor as well. Years ago, the City Police did a study and found that 75% of all noise complaints were caused by permanent residents.

With all your fancy charts and pictures what studies have been made as to where the problems are coming from? Are they coming from clustered houses? You don't know because you have no statistics as to whether you even have a problem. If you have such a problem, we would suggest you map out the complaints you have with the existing permits and determine what the source of the nuisances are. In the city we have found that regular complainants are causing the preponderance of complaints and they do not involve clustering. Are the complaints you have on record have to do with clustering or due to over sensitive neighbors, or an infrequent tenant who is insensitive to the neighborhood?

We would expect that the leaders would be more diligent in their findings before making decisions without any statistics or merit.

Sincerely,

Jimmie C. Morris
Lake Tahoe Accommodations
775-230-2667
mmjimmel@gmail.com