

PUBLIC INPUT EXERCISE
VHR AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING JULY 26TH, 2018

1. When considering language to cap the number of overnight occupants at 12, not including children 5 and under, keep in mind:

(2) How will you verify ages? Do parents have to carry a birth certificate with them at the VHR?

No data has been provided to show this will create any benefit.

Yes, but count children over 1 year as is currently in the ordinance.

(2) Adults and kids should all be included in total number of occupants. Huge groups could easily abuse the number of people if kids weren't included.

Cap all VHRs to limit of 2/bedrm with a max of 10, no new permitting of 6-8 homes.

Stop building homes no one can live in.

Ban VHR 12 people too many anytime.

Good idea w/ 12 people not including kids just in Tahoe Basin. Homes with acreage have totally different requirements.

Consider a higher cap with acreage over the hill.

Raise the cap to 16.

Occupant limits should be determined by size of home and parking. Do not limit families from visiting.

This is a poor idea for the homes on acreage on the West Slope.

This cap is not right; home size is how cap should be determined.

(2) Should be determined based on property/parking.

Again, there are only four homes with 7 bdrms and two homes w 8 bdrms. Cap should apply only to those homes.

There needs to be a cap in a home. 12 is a good start. Number of children might be a concern considering age.

Okay as long as conditional use permit can be used.

Bad idea. Keep same occupancy as the City of South Lake Tahoe as long as there is enough parking.

Why cap properties that have never generated complaints.

Caps result in reduced/eliminate options for larger family that won't stay in hotels.

Caps equal reduced TOT.

Reduced revenue to owners to maintain their property.

Supply data to justify this change. Statistics provided by CSLT show no correlation between 12+ occupancy houses and a great number of complaints.

Count the children! Lesser of 12 or the formula.

Parking! Most park on paved driveways or in garages at all times not just snow removal.

Only allow parking on paved driveway and not the street.

Please provide data that compares violations to occupancy.

There is no parking for 12 people. The number should be smaller. The huge houses should never have been built.

What's to stop crowds from parking off-site and still be overnight at VHR? "Arrival via Uber, etc. to avoid cars at house."

2. When writing language to require a Conditional Use Permit for occupancy greater than 12, keep in mind:

Review data-based evidence on over 12 occupants. Would be a good way to manage larger homes that are "trouble makers."

Do we need a CUP for this? Do these homes cause problems?

CUP process is far too extensive and expensive.

Never more than 12.

(2) All VHRs are "businesses" and must be conditional use permitted.

Yes, and ensure the occupancy formula still stands (2/bdrm) so that a 2 bdrm isn't rented to 12 people. There are very few families with 12 or more members in a residence.

CUP has to be a one-time fee and application.

Yes, allow preview of homes with minimal parking for home that sleeps 19.

Yes, agreed these people that rent the “hotels” need to understand the cluster renting and parties are major disturbance!!

Always exceptions for right circumstance and surroundings, i.e. lot size.

There are only 4 homes with 7 bedrooms and 2 w. 8 bedrooms. Do it ONLY for these homes larger than 6 bedrooms.

Terrible idea...This makes no sense and will hurt further construction.

This is not a good idea. Large homes on acreage should be exempt.

This should not apply to the West Slope.

No—as long as noise, parking, etc. is not an issue. Better policing/explaining rules.

Require brick and mortar for rental/agencies.

Eliminate on-line renting.

Grandfather locals of 5+ years.

Research the complaints based on size. Do the big homes really cause the problems? Enforcement and quiet hours are the key.

No, enforce existing regulations to eliminate complaints.

CUP for greater than the formula and count kids.

Where do they park? My driveway?

A CUP is just a way to make it sound legal to have more people and noise ruining a neighborhood.

No CUP. Cap it at 12, period.

3. When writing language to institute quiet hours from 10 pm to 8 am for all activities, keep in mind:

(Good idea!

Agree with this—make sure activities are clear though, such as watching TV/windows open. What is the “activity.”

Pretty sure we already have rules for disturbances on the books and they apply to everyone. You need to make sure it states clearly what would be a violation. What if they are watching a movie at 11 pm and the neighbor calls it in? Is there a noise limit?

Yes, noise is noise, not matter whether it comes from a hot tub or a party in the garage. Refer to Section 415 CA Penal Code.

Isn't that law already?

(2) Yes, but also include no outside lights on after 10 pm.

Yes, we want/need to go about our business.

Enforcement of this will resolve many issues/complaints.

Quiet time is definitely a requirement. Hotels have policies for noise and there are consequences for not following those rules. Why should VHR businesses operate differently? Like all things in life, consequences for your actions!

With proper enforcement on this rule, there is no need to discuss a ban!

Yes, but even inside activities with windows open can be loud.

I'm pretty sure we already have this—enforce it!

Enforce it. Do not restrict and kill the economy.

Yes, even after the hot tub closes, the party rolls on.

Quiet. All the time for shift workers.

This is the smartest idea yet.

With 12 people across the street, I get to keep my windows closed all summer. Thanks a lot!

4. When writing language to establish penalties for operating a VHR without a permit, keep in mind:

They need to be significant. It's not fair that ethical management companies are doing the right thing and illegal VHRs are operating. Make the fines per day of advertising the site, not just renting the site.

(3) If you want people to comply with the VHR permits, then you cannot cap it. Permits have to be available.

Make it easier to report an illegal VHR. There are dozens of them and we are not getting TOT from them.

(2) Yes, everyone needs to follow the rules if they are renting to short-term visitors.

Increase permit deposit to \$10,000 with forfeiture of two or more violations within two years.

Yes, but people will violate if they can't get a permit or figure out a work around.

Yes, agreed, but cap will cause issues.

Yes, but it has to be enough money so homeowner doesn't say "I don't care about the fine" given they make enough rent to pay it.

Dark, quiet streets after 10 pm. Restrict VHRs in rural areas. No tolerance for renters and VHR owners.

Yes, enforce for all.

Some people just think they are entitled to circumvent regulations and find ways to avoid following rules!

Yes, if the rest of us here have to play by the rules, they all do.

Yes but please simplify the reporter and enforcement mechanism.

Who will pay for the costs of enforcement?

Will the County be checking websites to find homes without a permit? Or just rely on complaints?

5. When writing language to specify fire and life safety requirements, keep in mind:

(8) Yes!

Fire and safety requirements are already the law for houses and businesses. In addition, visitors to our area are often ignorant of our fire danger, so laws should be more stringent than the norm (backyard fires, 4291 PRC, etc.)

We have comprehensive codes for this already. Require 100% compliance enforced by inspection. Fire, electric, life safety.

Safety inspections are a great idea keeping CO and smoke detectors and safety requirements up to code is a must.

For safety of all, inspections are a good idea.

Good idea, the same as taking a test to understand rules, fire safety and especially smoking and throwing butts in back yard.

Long-term rentals should be required to do inspections, too! Agree, implement this!

6. When writing language to fine the party (owner or renter) directly responsible for the violation, keep in mind:

If renter is responsible for violation and owner has informed renter, then no strike to house.

Yes, but not too much. City fine (\$1000) is too much. \$100 is good.

Yes, and high enough to discourage bad behavior. Should both get fined and owner has to prove they told the renters.

Keep fine directed at renters who agreed to policy beforehand.

Fine guests a reasonable fine, not property owners.

Don't be like the City with the bad press—make the fines reasonable.

Yes, but don't hold a guest citation against owner and strike on permit. You're making owners responsible for guests' behavior. Long-term landlords aren't responsible for tenants.

Fine both!

If owner using home they should not be subject to VHR rules. Otherwise renter should be fined, not owner.

Fine owners to pass to tenants. Owner should also be accountable.

Fine occupants and owners on the spot \$1000 for violations and no lenience at hearings.

(2) Fine both. I thought this resolution was already in place. Enforce it!

Fine the people who are breaking the rules. If a long-term tenant breaks the rules, is the property owner fined at the same time?

Great idea, make the party responsible for the noise pay the fine.

Fine the owner. Identifying the renter will be difficult. The owner can pass it on to the renter.

Fine the same as the City of SLT. (No warnings, all the code violations to the ordinance will result in a minimum \$1000 fine to both the owner and renter of the house, three fines in a 24-month period they will lose their permit).

Make deposits high enough to make tenants more likely to follow rules so they won't get fined. A low dollar amount won't bother some people—they would prefer to forfeit their deposit and party on!

Great idea. Fine both and owner cannot get fined if they can prove they notified renter.

Increase fine for owner per property, renter per name.

7. When writing language to require VHR owners and local contact to take an online course on rules and pass a test, keep in mind:

All parties should have all the rules.

Require owners/managers to communicate rules clearly before visitors get here.

(4) Education and enforcement, not restricting!

Education and enforcement work so there is no need for a cap. There is natural, built-in attrition.

Yes, but it's more important that they have the renters sign comprehensive agreements.

(2) Can property managers take the test once for all their properties or do they have to take it for every VHR permit?

Must have brick and mortar and eliminate online registration.

Locals of 5 years in home should be grandfathered in.

Yes, everyone getting a permit should understand the rules and this would force them to read them.

Seems like a waste of taxpayers time and money. Renters should be informed and suffer the consequences if they do not inform themselves. Don't put the burden on the County to manage a course or spend time putting one together. Mailing the ordinance to VHR owners should be sufficient.

Dumb. These online tests are a joke.

8. When writing language to notify neighbors about nearby VHRs and provide access to local contact information, keep in mind:

To date, local contacts have been an easy way to shift the burden of enforcement to neighbors. They respond, it happens again, the cycle repeats.

Yes, otherwise read the Sheriff's report and see how much taxpayer time they waste on VHR enforcement.

All VHRs are legitimate "businesses" and must be permitted with conditional use permitting requiring neighborhood radius approval.

No ^

Won't exterior signage accomplish this?

Public comment before approval.

We already notify neighbors by knocking on doors, talking to them and giving brochures and our contact number.

(3) A sign on the property should be enough.

Yes, a quick post card or mailer with your good neighbor brochure.

Update the website—the more knowledge the better.

Yes, important for neighbors to see who they can call to report problems first. Yes and make a map to show all the VHRs.

Local contact information required on permit that is hung on outside of home like city. Not all VHRs have close neighbors. Not all VHRs have problems. People love to travel and staying in homes not our dump hotels.

Make a map with all VHRs to post on the website.

Yes! Owners lie and say it's their friends staying there, not renters.

Good idea but could cause retaliation by neighbors.

Do it! But don't give neighbors the power to veto the permit. You can't determine who can and can't rent their house. Property owner rights!!

Sign is enough. If someone calls the number, there needs to be a human to respond/answer.

We already have one huge VHR that ruined our neighborhood. You should us when additional applications are submitted. We should have a voice in this.

Do NOT make neighbors responsible for policing. This creates conflicts with neighbors and owners.

Just signage. No neighbor notification!

Add a public map of all permitted VHRs.

Unnecessary work to notify neighbors—make it available online.

Sign is enough!!

9. When considering writing language to temporarily limit the number of non-hosted VHR permits in the unincorporated area of the Lake Tahoe Basin to 900, keep in mind:

This will increase our problems. Limit it at current number (as discussed at the last ad hoc committee meeting by the CAO).

I clean houses and have plenty of work and not enough help. Limit them; we also need neighborhoods and locals.

Bad idea, no ban!

Total ban.

No limit.

Seems like a good way to hurt locals and our economy. Bad for Tahoe in general.

False frenzy. The number has never been an issue.

(2) Just the talk of this is already affecting property values and the ability of people to sell homes. Let the market dictate need and concentrate on enforcement. No limit.

Currently this indicates about 10% of County residences if more permits were given, then that number is reduced, how could permits be revoked? Doesn't sound like a good thing to have more permits given.

500' radius between ALL VHRs and Airbnb's thereby eventually creating a cap without calling it one.

A moratorium was requested to keep the problem from getting bigger. This makes it bigger!

You should be able to do with your house as you want.

900? Who came up with this number? Please provide the data.

Need to allow permits to transfer. Bad for the economy as it reduces the TOT.

Kneejerk reaction that needs everyone's input. Not good for locals in construction and real estate industry.

Looking at chart over the last 7 years the numbers seem to regulate themselves, new permits and people not renewing. No need for cap.

This number seems arbitrary and will create a panic of applications without knowing if cheaters exist, the number should be higher.

If the purpose of a limit is to pause for data collection, stop issuing permits.

That works out to just about 10%. Seems like a very small number. Why not make it 15% instead to give a bigger buffer and time for everyone to adjust and not cause an instant issue with housing values like what happened in the City, specifically Tahoe Keys and Heavenly.

(3) NO! This will stall the real estate market and building industry. Heavenly and Tahoe Keys took a 25% decrease in value in the City. We do not want this to happen in the County.

We're already close to this number—this would basically be a ban.

Yes! Limit it now!

(2) With meaningful enforcement, complaints should go down. Does not address long-term rental shortage. Home prices will go down with cap.

Not a good idea. Should or would not address home prices will go down with cap. Affects Tahoe's vacation numbers.

This could increase the number of unpermitted VHRs.

There needs to be a limit or none at all. We need long-term housing.

I can't say I don't agree with a cap, but it needs to be set higher so people can transition to different jobs or areas.

Yes, our neighborhood is at 50% VHRs and growing.

This would kill jobs, property values and new construction.

It would hurt local families – BAD. NO CAP!!!

A limit on the number isn't the answer—enforcement is the answer.

Does nothing to solve the “problem house.” Need enforcement of rules. It will hurt property values and will drive rentals underground.

Owners have rights to what they want to do with their property. They are not responsible for solving housing availability.

Need enforcement, not cap.

Maybe those of you who think VHRs are great should try living next to one and see how you like your peace and quiet taken away from you. Construction industry will not suffer if VHRs are controlled, monitored and limited.