5/11/2021



Edcgov.us Mail - VHR ban bearing Public Comment #19

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

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 7:27 PM

VHR ban hearing

1 message

Paos ROVD 5/11/21

Dustin Levine <dustinelevine@gmail.com> To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Dear Board -

I implore you to not institute rules or a ban around VHRs in unincorporated EDC. I bought my home two years ago and my being able to is only because I can rely on occasional rental income. If you institute this I will be forced to sell my only home I've ever owned. I have caused no issues. Received no complaints, and only improved upon my property thus improving all neighborhood values.

Please allow homeowners to continue to lawfully and respectfully rent their homes as short term rentals.



VHR Buffer Zones

1 message

Doug Coatney <dougcoatney@gmail.com> To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us> Mon, May 10, 2021 at 9:17 PM

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Buffer zones does nothing to control the impact of poorly managed VHR's on the neighborhoods they exist in. I've been a permitted VHR owner for 20+ years and pay my property taxes just as the full time residents of the neighborhood do. I also contribute far more tax dollars to the county than they do. I also make certain that renters who use my property are respectful to our neighbors and have zero tolerance for anyone causing a problem. I've had one issue in 20+ years of renting which was dealt with swiftly. I would offer that buffer zones are not the solution, but responsible management of existing VHR's is really the solution.

Having a buffer zone seems to imply that it is acceptable to annoy the neighbors who live directly next to a VHR. It's my belief that this is not acceptable at all and that owners should be held accountable for resolving this and putting together plans to prevent this from occurring. If they cannot do so, they should lose their permits and be fined. Lack of enforcement is what has led us to this situation. Creating buffer zones between existing VHR's without strong enforcement is not going to change anything, it simply confines the problem and still makes many full time residents unhappy.

Please understand that the issue is not the number of VHR's or the proximity of those VHR's together. The problem is poorly managed VHR's and poorly enforced processes. Improve the enforcement and use funding to make enforcement actually work for the problematic VHR's. Otherwise this is all an exercise in futility because the buffer plan won't work either.

Thankyou for your consideration,

Doug Coatney



VHR is Important in El Dorado County

1 message

Cory <cory.mcgeehon@gmail.com> To: edc.cob@edcgov.us Mon, May 10, 2021 at 9:23 PM

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors,

I believe hosting is important to me and the community. We have hosted first responders in a pandemic, displaced workers, and By being a host I have kept local workers employed snow removal, cleaners etc during a global pandemic when they lost there job and who would be out of work again if El Dorado places more restrictions on VHR. THe restrictions would also decrease the economy for local restaurants and businesses as tourists do not feel safe staying in hotels from my survey's and prefer the privacy of a quiet home.

The guests are very respectful and quiet mainly coming to spend quality time with there family and friends.

Please do not place more restrictions as this will affect many individuals livelyhood and during a pandemic which has already has made so many financial burdens on the people of el dorado county.

Regards Cory McGeehon



VHR Anti-Clustering Public Comment

1 message

Sharon Sealana <s2sealana@gmail.com>

Tue, May 11, 2021 at 12:15 AM To: The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>, bostwo@edcgov.us, The BOSTHREE <bosthree@edcgov.us>, BOS Four <bostiour@edcgov.us>, County of El Dorado Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

Dear Board of Supervisors,

1. We support 500 feet of buffer between VHRs to prevent clustering of VHRs in residential neighborhoods in the county. For simplicity in enforcement interpretation, we also support a single category of measurement at 500 feet for the buffer zone, including the McMansions - 12 or more occupants.

2. We support maintaining the cap on the number of VHR permits at 900. As others have stated, this will tie in nicely with the 500 foot buffer.

We are full-time residents of South Lake Tahoe, in Montgomery Estates neighborhood. Years ago, we selected this neighborhood to live in, over other neighborhoods, because there had been so many full-time residents living here, and fewer second-home owners, and NO vacation rentals.

We have been disappointed to see the slow deterioration of our neighborhood, causing local friends to move away, leaving a negative impact on the neighborhood. The sense of community is lost, as these homes have become VHRs. There have been two neighbors who have passed away without anyone knowing they that they were deceased. The houses nearby were originally occupied by their neighbors, but now are VHRs. On our own little street, which has only 5 houses, two are occupied by full-time residents, one is a second home used by the family, and the remaining two are VHRs, located side-by-side, directly across the street from our home.

One of these VHRs is a problem VHR, and the other is not. The problem VHR has received numerous complaints, due to noise, excess occupancy and excess vehicles, trash, and rude behavior. Tourists have regularly trespassed on our property and left broken sleds there for us to discard. During this past winter, one of the vehicles from this VHR got stuck trying to drive prior to our tiny street being plowed out, causing a complete blockage, and cutting off all access to the homes on our street. What if there had been an emergency? This is just one example of the problems caused by VHRs being in a small residential neighborhood.

Anyone who opposes the 500' restriction on VHRs has not lived with a problem VHR in close proximity to their home.

Thank you for helping the citizens who voted for you to lead our community.

Sincerely, Sam and Sharon Sealana 1228 Goldpan Court



Clustering Policy 5/11/2021 Meeting

1 message

Zach <zachs300@gmail.com> To: edc.cob@edcgov.us Tue, May 11, 2021 at 1:51 AM

Dear Board of Supervisors,

This is another arbitrary restriction placed on our property with no data to back up these restrictions. I purchased a home outside SLT city limits purposefully to avoid an overbearing local government. Yet, now we have an burdensome, complicated permit process, home inspections and a constant risk of changing rules! With the current cap on permits a clustering policy is just not needed.

Your maps show that one VHR will affect properties located on entirely different streets separated by multiple lots, houses and terrain. How is this fair? Someone a street over that I don't see or hear has a VHR so that affects my property?

These restrictions also affect an income source some people rely on, and even if they don't it removes an option. I just read about a local woman who had a stroke, and is unable to work. She was getting by on her rental income and now lost that due to law changes.

Your reasoning for a cluster policy is insufficient. It is not a fair policy, and is not needed with the cap on permits.

Thank you, Zach Ladner



Public Comments to El Dorado County considering Vacation Home Rental restrictions

1 message

Steve Noll <snoll@designworkshop.com> To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us> Tue, May 11, 2021 at 7:25 AM

Dear County Supervisors, I am submitting this memo for the public record regarding the EI Dorado County Vacation Home Rental restrictions you will be discussing today. While I do think there needs to be some type of management of VHR's I do have a few questions/ concerns that regarding the proposed restrictions.

- 1. I have had a VHR permit with the County for around three years now and want to know if existing VHR's will be "grandfathered" in when any ordinance is adopted? My understanding there are currently less VHR's in the County than the cap the County has placed.
- 2. I don't think there is another existing VHR within the various distance restrictions being considered yet if there is, how will the County address existing permit holders that do not conform to the "distance" that is ultimately adopted?
- 3. I see in the presentation that there are example mappings of how this may look within a neighborhood. Does the County have the ability to actually map a neighborhood where the VHR's currently exist? If so can this be done for my neighborhood which is the Meadow Lakes community across form Sierra House School?

Again, I am not against having some control over this yet need some clarity to understand how existing VHR's will be affected based on the questions posed above. Thank you and look forward to hear from you.

Steve Noll

1528 Plateau Circle

South Lake Tahoe, Ca 956150

Confidentiality note: The above email and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and/or privileged. The information is for the use of the individual or entity originally intended. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information is prohibited. If this transmission is received in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this message and its attachments, if any.



VHR

1 message

cara nelson <ntcinc7@gmail.com> To: edc.cob@edcgov.us Tue, May 11, 2021 at 10:36 AM

Dear BOS,

In consideration of the buffer zones potentially created for VHR, please consider the county zoning.

It is understandable to consider buffers in high density areas such as EDH, CP, & Tahoe Keys neighborhoods.

Yet there are many other VHR on 5-20 acre parcels that mitigate the potential for noise & parking issues & should be considered as safe buffer zones. The size of the parcel has adequately separated the neighboring properties.

Thank you for your consideration,

Barry & Cara Nelson 40 year EDC Homeowners

Sent from my iPhone



Vacation Home Rental requirements for El Dorado County

1 message

Brandon Swain <bswain1228@gmail.com> To: edc.cob@edcgov.us Tue, May 11, 2021 at 1:21 PM

Board of Supervisors,

We have owned a 3 bedroom house on Keller Rd. 2 blocks from the tram at Heavenly California lodge since 1986. We have provided opportunities for visitors to rent the house as a vacation rental since July of 2019. Because of the small size of the house (8 persons occupancy maximum), we have not had any violations from the guests renting the house. Because of the close proximity to Heavenly Valley, we have had many guests enjoy skiing in the winter and the other activities Lake Tahoe offers in the summer. Our family has also utilized the house from time to time as we enjoy the skiing, dining, shopping, and other activities on the South Shore.

The city of South Lake Tahoe has recently notified us that we can no longer rent our house as a VHR as of July 31, 2021 as our location has been determined to be not a resort area even though the Tahoe Seasons Resort Hotel is only 1/10 of a mile from our house. This designation will make it necessary to rent the house full time thus not allowing us to use it or sell the house. We hope that the board will establish these more sensible restrictions county wide enabling us to continue to provide vacations for 8 or less persons and access the many businesses our family so enjoys at South Lake Tahoe into the future. We appreciate this opportunity to provide input to this decision.

Very gratefully yours,

Brandon and Kathy Swain