

ATTACHMENT 2

From: [Erica Batres Lipanovich](#)
To: [Economic Development](#); [Meads, Shari](#); [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Short Term Rental Ordinance
Date: Friday, September 17, 2021 8:50:48 AM

Dear City Council Members,

My name is Erica and I am writing to you in support of the Short Term Rental Ordinance.

My husband and I moved to Santa Rosa to raise our children because we believe in our heart that this city supports community. We recently bought a home in the Hidden Valley neighborhood because we were impressed with the quiet, calm and natural beauty found in this area.

Unfortunately, I have been speaking to neighbors who express concerns that our community is changing due to the increasing prevalence of Short Term Rental properties. Some neighbors are in an impossible situation after a STR moved in next door to them, leading an onslaught of parties and endless vacationers. One neighbor even laments that her neighbor's home is used to host large events such as weddings. This is completely unacceptable.

I just found out that a home two doors down from me was recently sold to an investment company with the intent of renting the 5 bedroom home with a pool as a STR. As you can imagine, a property such as this one will likely attract large groups and parties that will disturb the peaceful neighborhood we all enjoy. My concern is that a STR in our neighborhood will lead to an increase in traffic, noise and nuisance that will inevitably come to our neighborhood. Many neighbors who have had STR on their street have found that after submitting multiple noise complaints to the police, they have just stopped responding.

Further rules and restrictions regarding party size, strict noise enforcement and limits on STR properties in residential communities should be considered. There should be a moratorium on STR in Santa Rosa until cohesive rules governing them are in place.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to continuing to voice our concerns on October 12th.

--

Erica

From: [Nathaniel Lipanovich](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] support for short term rental ordinance and questions
Date: Thursday, September 16, 2021 7:07:04 PM

Hello,

I am a Santa Rosa resident born here and then recently returned. I now live in the Hidden Valley neighborhood. I write in support of an urgency ordinance to regulate short term housing rentals in Santa Rosa. While there may be an appropriate place for such rentals in our city, the currently unregulated status is not acceptable.

I was not able to find a proposed ordinance online, so if you can send one to me I would appreciate it.

Nathaniel Lipanovich

From: [Jim Pratt](#)
To: [Economic Development; Meads, Shari](#)
Cc: ["Jim Pratt \(cvjimpratt@comcast.net\)"](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STRs in Santa Rosa
Date: Thursday, September 16, 2021 6:09:40 PM

Hello:

I am writing to express my great concern about STRs in Santa Rosa, and the lack of a City of Santa Rosa ordinance or policy governing STRs.

My family and I live at [REDACTED] in Santa Rosa, and conversion on a home long owned by the previous owner 2 doors down from us began a month ago. Upon learning it would be an STR, I was shocked to learn there is no ordinance in place. My concern is that this house, and all STRs, could be populated by groups of people far greater than the house, the streets, and the neighborhood can handle. These types of transient residents do not have the same care and concern for the neighborhood. Traffic will increase considerably. We are a neighborhood without sidewalks, and the thought of extra traffic from people not familiar with the neighborhood is frightening. There is no accountability for concerns we have with tenants and their activities, other than to call and complain to our police, who have far more important things to do. Contact information regarding the property owners should be easily available, and signage on the property should reflect this.

I am also greatly concerned that property values will go down. For the amount of property taxes we currently pay, care should be taken to keep our neighborhood a community of residents, NOT short term tenants.

I request that an immediate moratorium be placed on STRs until cohesive rules are in place to govern STRs, and protect our community.

Jim Pratt

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Cindy Wade](#)
To: [Economic Development](#); [Meads, Shari](#); [Short Term Rentals](#)
Cc: RepMikeThompsonCA05@mail.house.gov; letters@pressdemocrat.com
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SHORT TERM RENTAL ORDINANCE
Date: Friday, September 17, 2021 10:05:30 PM
Importance: High

Dear City Council Members,

We Cindy and John Kelly, along with my mom Anna Wade of Rancho Cabeza Drive are writing to you in support of the Short Term Rental Ordinance.

My husband and I choose to move to Santa Rosa where my husband performs MRI at a local hospital for the Sonoma County community. We recently relocated from a busier area of the city to a home in the Town and Country Heights neighborhood because we were attracted to the quiet, calm and natural beauty found in this area. We thought it the right environment for my elderly disabled mother to enjoy the peace that came along with the area.

Unfortunately, it has come to our and our entire neighborhood communities attention that our community is changing due to the increasing prevalence of Short Term Rental properties. We have been in touch with some neighbors who are in an impossible situation after a STR moved in next door to them, leading an onslaught of parties and endless vacationers. One neighbor even laments that her neighbor's home is used to host large events such as weddings. **This is completely unacceptable.**

We just found out that two homes, one just three doors down from ours was recently sold to an investment company with the intent of renting the 5 bedroom home with a pool as a STR. As you can imagine, a property such as this one will likely attract large groups and parties that will disturb the peaceful neighborhood we all enjoy. Our concern is that **an STR in our neighborhood will lead to an increase in traffic, crime, violence, noise and nuisance that will inevitably come to our neighborhood.**

We are a wildlife corridor, we all have pets, there are many young families with preschool age children and many who enjoy walking their dogs in our wonderful neighborhood; this STR presence will threaten our safety and destroy our sanctity.

Many neighbors who have had STR on their street have found that after submitting multiple noise complaints to the police, they have just stopped responding.

Further rules and restrictions regarding party size, strict noise enforcement and limits on STR properties in residential communities should be considered. There **MUST** be a moratorium on STR in Santa Rosa until cohesive rules governing them

are in place.

Let the department not forget the exorbitant taxes we Citizens of Sonoma County pay to live on our communities and the Invaluable services we bring with us.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to continuing to voice our concerns on October 12th.


--

Cindy and John Kelly, Anna Wade

From: [Bev Curry](#)
To: [Meads, Shari](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Short term rentals
Date: Sunday, September 26, 2021 12:20:15 PM

To our City and Community Leaders:

We live on Pine Ridge Drive and are very concerned about the houses being bought by groups of buyers for the sole purpose of using them as short term rentals, and making money at the expense of harming responsible neighborhood communities. We have heard multiple complaints from individual home owners who have experienced noisy parties and unsafe traffic situations. This seems to be happening with increased frequency and we are in danger of losing the neighborhood spirit where people look after one another and work together to meet community needs. Please make stringent requirements for short term rentals to keep Santa Rosa safe, friendly, and the type of City that we concerned residents want our families to continue living and prospering in.

Beverly Curry, 

From: [Maureen Linde](#)
To: [_CityCouncilListPublic](#); [Rogers, Chris](#); [Meads, Shari](#); [Short Term Rentals](#); [Economic Development](#)
Cc: [Erik Linde](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Short Term Rentals
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 12:32:45 PM

Good afternoon- I am writing to ask that you prohibit short term rentals within residential neighborhoods. It has come to my attention that a house next door to mine has been bought and converted into a short-term rental. The house is a four bedroom home, so under the rules for a short term rental, they are allowed to "host" 10 adults, with an additional 2 guests. This home also has a pool, so you can imagine when 12+ people are on the back deck and in the pool area, it becomes quite loud and disruptive to our peace and quiet.

Recently, there was a group of at least a dozen people staying at the home, blaring their music and smoking pot all afternoon. We couldn't open our windows without becoming overwhelmed by the smell of pot, not to mention the aggravating music. The cars come and go late at night into the early morning hours, their car lights illuminate our bedroom where it wakes us up and as they exit their cars, they are laughing, talking loudly, and slamming doors. We don't have any way to contact the new owners to let them know how disruptive to our lives this AirBnB has become.

It is my understanding the owners are from southern California and they have numerous short term rentals in California and Tennessee. There has got to be some moratorium where individuals who buy in residential areas must live in the home for a certain period of time in order to rent them out and not use them exclusively as their "cash cow". I also believe that short term rentals have exacerbated the housing shortage. They can pay cash for these homes which artificially inflates prices, creating not only a housing shortage, but inflates rental rates and housing prices which are unattainable for our local citizens. They are not invested in our neighborhood, nor do they contribute positively to this community.

I am asking you to put yourself in my shoes. What would you do if your next door neighbor became a short term rental? How would that affect your day-to-day life? I don't think it is fair that I live next to a "commercial" building now instead of a residential home. It adversely affects my home's equity and I think there should be a moratorium on short term rentals within a residential neighborhood.

Please be considerate and look at it as if this were your home.

Thank you kindly,

Maureen & Erik Linde

From: [Marti Murray](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Short Term Rentals
Date: Monday, September 27, 2021 10:39:33 AM

Please support a STR Urgency Ordinance to stop the purchase of homes intended for Short Term Rentals. This will have a lasting negative effect on lack of housing to people who want to live in Santa Rosa and support our community.

Martha Murray

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Cheryl Quist](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment on the Short-Term Rental Urgency Ordinance
Date: Thursday, September 30, 2021 10:29:16 AM

I operate a short-term non-hosted rental property in the Proctor Terrace neighborhood and pay quarterly TOT and BIA taxes to the City of Sant Rosa on behalf of my guests. For 2021 the total estimated tax to be paid to the city is about \$8,000, in addition to about \$11,000 in property taxes. Since I purchased the property in 2019 (as a 1031 exchange) I have made multiple improvements including a new roof, replacement of 200' of broken fencing, replacement of a wood-burning fireplace with a gas insert, installation of a new energy-efficient heating and cooling system, and repair of a broken irrigation system. It is my belief that the upkeep on this home helps to keep the neighborhood looking good while also having a positive impact on energy and water resources. As a host I am actively engaged with each and every guest as they check-in, and since I live close-by, I walk past the house during their stay to make sure that they are behaving appropriately and not disturbing my neighbors. The house is promoted as a 2-bedroom, 2-bath home suitable for up to four guests. There is ample room to park two cars in the driveway, so as not to intrude on traffic moving along busy Bryden Lane. I have never had any complaints from neighbors and my guests regularly rate the house as 5-stars, sparkling clean, and a welcoming place during their visit to Sonoma County Wine Country. I have also hosted fire victims as well as people from out-of-state while helping their family members in Santa Rosa during the Covid lock-down.

As a 71 year old woman, the income from this property helps to cover living expenses for myself and my husband, who is recovering from cancer. It is an essential part of our income. Please do not limit or impair our ability to rent this property just because there are a few hosts that do not play by the rules. It would be more fair to focus your efforts on weeding out the short-term rental operators who do not pay taxes and who fail to keep up their properties and respect their neighbors. We already have so many hoops to jump through to operate a business, I respectfully request that you grandfather existing operators who have had zero complaints and refrain from adding more cumbersome procedures for those of us who are contributing their fair share of taxes while helping to keep the neighborhood a safe and desirable place to live.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Respectfully,
Cheryl Quist

From: [Loren McLaughlin](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STR Draft Ordinance Comments
Date: Thursday, September 30, 2021 8:06:59 PM

From:
Loren McLaughlin
2043 Nordyke Ave
Santa Rosa CA 95401

I strongly urge council members to vote in favor of this ordinance. In particular:

20-48.030: Within reasonable limits, the people renting out their house to visitors must be held accountable for the behavior of the people they rent to.

20-48.070: The noise and safety directives in 20.48.070 are all reasonable and measurable. I am particularly in favor of E2, which will inform the neighborhood of a vacation rental in the area.

I know people who own and manage local vacation rentals, and they are careful and responsible. I myself enjoy vacation rentals when I travel. It's a good system overall. I believe that the owners who pollute our neighborhoods with noisy, dangerous drunks are a few bad apples, and they very much need to be identified and censured.

The people who rent out vacation accommodations receive financial benefit from the neighborhoods. Part of what they charge for is a desirable location. Yes, the ordinance will cut in to their profits, but it's only fair that the owners pay for the use of our neighborhoods for their income.

Thank you,
Loren McLaughlin

From: [Caroline Weaver](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Against ordinance
Date: Thursday, September 30, 2021 9:32:00 PM

Property owners have the right to use their property as they wish first of all. Homes that are a constant nuisance should be fined just like you would if someone lived there full time and caused disturbances regularly. Second, how can you even give attention to this subject while there are unregistered RV's spewing trash all over neighborhoods and setting fires.

From: [Sonia Taylor](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: STR Draft Ordinance Comments
Date: Friday, October 1, 2021 6:59:21 PM

First, I'm delighted that Santa Rosa is finally getting around to adopting a short-term rental ordinance -- long overdue, I believe. I really don't have much of a problem with hosted short-term rentals, but I do have concerns about non-hosted rentals for multiple reasons, including the removal of housing units from long term tenancy by local residents. Additionally, non-hosted short-term rentals are clearly commercial uses, and when they are in any area where long term residents live day to day, the opportunities for conflicts are very high.

Frankly, I'd prefer to severely limit non-hosted short-term rentals.

Following are my comments on the Draft Short-Term Rental Ordinance, for your consideration.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sonia

Sonia Taylor
707-579-8875
great6@sonic.net

1. Section 20-48.030 C -- I believe that RV's, Airstreams and other (usually) mobile "living" units should be prohibited from being used for short-term rentals whether parked on a private lot (as in a driveway) or on a private or public street.
2. Section 20-48.030 G -- It may not be possible to deal with Pacaso and other similar fractional ownership schemes like that in this ordinance, but I think they need to be addressed. At a minimum, such fractional ownership arrangements should be taxed differently than owner occupied housing units or long term rental units, as should generally vacant second, third, etc. homes.
3. Section 20-48.030 J -- All neighbors of any short-term rental, particularly non-hosted short-term rentals, should have the contact information for the "local contact." Otherwise, the only recourse the neighbors will have is to call the police while a violation is taking place (a very bad use of police resources unless, of course, things have escalated to the point that there is no choice but to have the police involved), or they will be unable to ameliorate problems at the time they occur. The only other solution would be to have a city staff person available 24/7 to take complaint calls and then relay them to the "local contact" responsible, and that would be an unnecessary expense. The "local contact" is the responsible party, and should be available.
4. Section 20-48.030 M (and a more general comment) -- Santa Rosa should limit the total number of short-term rentals both as to the entire city, as well as by City Council district, and by neighborhood

and street. There should never be an occasion where a street has more than one non-hosted vacation rental, and no neighborhood should bear the brunt of multiple non-hosted rentals. I'm not sure what these numbers should be (other than no more than one non-hosted rental per block, particularly in any residential district), but I think this should be addressed.

5. Section 20-48.040 -- I believe that if there is more than one short-term rental on a legal parcel, each said short-term rental should require a separate application and approved permit.

6. Section 20-48.040 A/B -- It would be nice to have these acronyms defined, and to have a link to maps on the City's short-term rental web pages. I've been around quite a while and had to look these acronyms up. If we want people to comply with this ordinance, we need to need to make it easy for them to understand where these activities are allowed.

7. Section 20-48.040 D5 -- Elsewhere in this ordinance, it appears that an applicant for a short-term rental permit can only claim one on-street parking space as part of their application, which would lead me to infer that otherwise all parking must be provided on site. However, that's not entirely clear in this proposed ordinance, and should be. I am opposed to any short-term rental being able to use more than one on-street parking space to satisfy their parking requirements.

8. Section 20-48.040 D6 -- What are the requirements for the numbers of smoke detectors, carbon monoxide detectors and fire extinguishers we want to require in a short-term rental? I presume it would change depending on the size of the unit, and know there are state regulations regarding smoke detectors and carbon monoxide detectors, but do they apply to what is essentially a hotel room? Or would that be a different set of regulations? I think this ordinance should establish a baseline for the numbers of each required per unit, perhaps by square footage.

9. Section 20-48.040 I3 -- This appears to tie denial to an address, which I think is a very good idea. There should be no ability for an owner of a problem property where a permit has been suspended or revoked to transfer the property to a related person and continue on.

10. Section 20-48.060 A -- In deference to the fact that we are never likely to have an excess of water again, this ordinance should require that all short-term rentals have the latest in low flow toilets, as well as low flow shower heads and sink faucets. People on vacation, and paying for what is essentially a hotel, are not going to be interested in conserving water (which I understand), but as a condition of a short-term rental permit, the owner of the property should be required to do as much as possible to make it easy for the guests to at least not use as much water.

11. Section 20-48.060 A -- Will there be any required inspections, and, if so, there should certainly be service fees for those inspections. If there will be no inspections, well, I suspect we'll never know about compliance with this Section.

12. Section 20-48.060 B/D 1 -- A bedroom should be defined as a separate room with a door. If there are alternative sleeping arrangements, such as, for example, a futon in the living room for

additional sleeping, each such alternative sleeping arrangement that can sleep two people should also require one off-street parking space (and they should be added up, so -- for example -- two single beds, not in a bedroom, equals one additional parking space required).

13. Section 20-48.060 D -- I am concerned about the parking requirements. For a unit with the maximum number of guests -- 10 -- and the maximum number of daytime guests -- 4 -- that could mean that 7 cars, or more, will need parking spaces (assuming 2 people/car). That's a lot of parking for one unit, particularly in a residential neighborhood.

14. Section 20-48.060 D -- I do not know enough about parking availability in CMU, SMU, MMU and NMU zoning districts. Is there adequate parking for existing uses and the proposed short-term rental uses?

15. Section 20-48.070 B 2-- Is there a requirement that each sleep area have two means of egress for evacuation purposes?

16. Section 20-48.070 B 3 -- I'm uncomfortable with allowing guests to have any fire related uses at a short-term rental. I don't believe it's realistic to have the Fire Department inspect each of these types of uses in each proposed short-term rental, and even if they did, guests might not realize how easy fire can go wrong. At the very least, I believe that all fire related uses should be banned in Santa Rosa's WUI zones, but honestly would prefer them just not to be allowed anywhere. It's just too much of a danger for the guests and for the neighbors of these short-term rentals.

17. Section 20-48.070 B 3 b -- If fire related uses are allowed, we should define the minimum "wildfire season" as from August through October, and enlarge that time period that depending on the year.

18. Section 20-48.070 E 2 -- The notice to the neighbors must include, I believe, the "local contact's" contact information, as stated above.

19. Section 20-48.080 A -- I believe that the 30 minute and 45 minute windows are appropriate. If there is a circumstance where the "local contact" won't be available for some reason, it is their responsibility to designate a substitute "local contact" and inform the City and the neighbors of the substitute "local contact" -- that should be a requirement of this ordinance.

20. Section 20-48.080 B -- Is it clear enough that a violation can include such things as improperly advertising a property, a "local contact's" lack of response within the time frames, etc.? Perhaps this should be made more explicit.

21. Section 20-48.080 B -- While I understand the "three strikes, you're out" system, I would prefer revocation to occur at two strikes -- I believe that would inspire a higher level of vetting of guests by the property owners, as well as provide a significant incentive to ensure things go well. Further, I think that the penalties are too low.

22. Section 20-48.080 B -- Finally, is there any appeal process for someone whose permit has been revoked? I would prefer that there be no appeal process of any sort, but think that that should be explicitly stated.

From: [Nathaniel Lipanovich](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Cc: [CityCouncilListPublic](#); [Economic Development](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STR Draft Ordinance Comments
Date: Sunday, October 3, 2021 3:16:10 PM

Good afternoon,

I grew up in Santa Rosa, graduated from SRHS in 2004, and moved back here to raise my kids in 2019. I write in support of the proposed STR emergency ordinance but also ask that more be done. While a good start, it fails to address several key and related issues.

In addition to the current proposal on STRs, I believe that the city needs to immediately put a pause on new STRs while the impact of the current STRs is further investigated and evaluated. I would thus ask that the city council add a moratorium for any new STR that was not already registered with the city (and paying TOT) as of 10/12/21.

Then, with the moratorium in place, further study needs to be conducted to determine the benefits and costs of STRs. For example, do we know the impact of STRs on home prices? I assume that it is driving up home prices by reducing supply, but I don't know.

Another question is whether Santa Rosa can achieve the benefits of STRs if they are excluded from residentially zoned neighborhoods. If a hotel would not be permitted on a residential street, then it isn't clear to me why a non-hosted STR should be permitted.

If the benefits of STRs (e.g. making Santa Rosa more accessible to visitors) can be reached while limiting the location and number of STRs, then those issues should be addressed in the comprehensive legislation on STRs.

Nathaniel

From: [Duncan Kelm](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STR Draft Ordinance Comments
Date: Sunday, October 3, 2021 10:12:35 AM

Hello,

General comments:

The vast majority (87%+) of short term (30%) rental owners own and rent only one home as a short term rental. This is a small business in essence. The proposal as laid out currently places burdensome and undefined costs on owners. We should be focused on supporting small business and entrepreneurship in our area.

Consider placing a “safe harbor” for anyone that owns less than two properties. The safe harbor could have some of the proposed regulations but would perhaps not require to go to the city for permit. They would be required to stay within the regulations proposed but perhaps not have to go through a “full” permitting. Consider making a lite permit to streamline small business property owners.

We live in a beautiful place and one of our biggest economic drivers is tourism to the area. Short term rentals afford another option for out of town travelers that can make it more affordable in some cases. Under the current restrictions the average nightly rate is close to \$800 a night from quick view of the popular websites. By making this more structured but also embracing the fact that short term rentals have a strong tie to tourism and people visiting our beautiful city.

I would propose a model like San Diego which regulates but offers small operators an exception and a process to operate.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these points.

Regards,

Duncan Kelm
707.280.0824

From: [Christine Tenorio](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STR Draft Ordinance Comments
Date: Sunday, October 3, 2021 7:32:37 PM

Hi,

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I am a hosted short term rental host and am aware of the issues that are occurring with non-hosted short term rentals. I have read through the proposed ordinances and have some feedback that will help to make these ordinances more feasible. I would like to suggest that hosted and non-hosted rental ordinances have different rules. When a short term rental unit owner is onsite, the risk of issues occurring significantly decreases.

Page 4: 20-48.040 D-6: Requiring short term rentals to submit an application seems fair, however, the requirements of the application seem extreme. How does looking at the floor plan of the unit help to solve any of the current issues? Will the city be able to validate the floorplan in a timely manner? Floor plans are not required for rentals over 30 days, so I am unsure why they are relevant for short term rentals.

Page 4: 20-48.040 E: Annual short term rental application seems unnecessary. A renewal period of 2-5 years seems both more realistic and more feasible for the city to manage processing these renewals.

Page 5: 20-48.060 B: Regarding the occupancy limits, when we first built our hosted vacation rental space, we could have added several additional bedrooms to our floorplan but we decided to only build 1 large bedroom and one large living room. We added a sofa bed to our living room as an option. Our 1400 sq ft unit can easily accommodate four guests, by limiting the number of guests down to two for our unit, you will reduce our anticipated revenue for our unit. Occupancy limits should be enforced based on square footage of a unit, not just by the number of bedrooms.

Page 6: 20-48.070 B-1: Requiring landlines for vacation rentals seems like an impractical requirement. Most phone lines are now run through the phone company such as Comcast. When there is an emergency, you lose your phone line just as much as you lose your internet and tv. We have never had a guest who did not have a cell phone. Additionally, with a hosted rental, we are available to go knock on the door and wake up the guests when there is an emergency. This is another reason that hosted rentals should have different rules.

Page 6: 20-48.070 B-3e: This ordinance does not take into consideration pre-existing property features that were created before these requirements. I would suggest that grandfathered properties and/or hosted properties be treated differently. Hosted properties eliminate any potential fire risk because the host would be onsite to address any issues. It makes more sense that properties moving forward need to abide by this requirement.

Page 7: 20-48.070 E-2: Sending a mailed notice within a 600 ft radius seems excessive, especially for those who are hosted short term rentals. Hosted rentals should be exempt from these rules. Property hosts live on site and eliminate any potential noise issues. As a private citizen, I do not know every person within 600 ft of my home, nor do I want to send my contact information to them. It makes more sense to make your immediate neighbors aware.

Also, this is another example of a requirement that does not exist for traditional home rentals, so why is it necessary to have short term rentals comply? I am also concerned with the expense that this could cause for hosts.

It appears that much emphasis is being placed on creating a long list of requirements for short term rentals rather than focusing on the larger problem at hand, the fact that too many short term rentals are currently operating. A short term rental cap should be implemented to prevent entire neighborhoods from becoming short term rentals, rather than making hosts jump through irrelevant hoops.

Thank you,
Christine Tenorio

From: [Javier Tenorio](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STR Draft Ordinance Comments
Date: Sunday, October 3, 2021 1:21:31 PM

Hello,

Firstly, I would like to commend you for taking on the task to implement short term rental ordinances. I am a hosted short term rental host and know there are many short term rental hosts that are abusing their privileges and negatively affecting neighbors and communities. I have reviewed the proposed ordinances and have some feedback that will make these ordinances realistic. In general, I would recommend that hosted and non-hosted rental ordinances be different. Having a short term rental unit owner onsite is very different from a non-hosted rental. A hosted unit owner significantly reduces the risk of any issues.

Page 4: 20-48.040 D-6: I am okay with requiring short term rentals to submit an application, however, the requirements of the application seem extreme. More specifically, a submission of the floor plan seems irrelevant. How will you find the resources to validate the floorplan? The floorplans are not requirements for rentals over 30 days so why should short term rentals be treated any differently?

Page 4: 20-48.040 E: An annual short term rental application seems excessive. Having the City of Santa Rosa processing annual applications seems unrealistic to me. When homeowners invest in building a short term rental, the return on investment needs to be realistic. A two or five year application term seems more realistic.

Page 5: 20-48.060 B: Regarding the occupancy limits, when we first built our hosted vacation rental space, we could have added several additional bedrooms to our floorplan but we decided to only build 1 large bedroom and one large living room. We added a sofa bed to our living room as an option. Our 1400 sq ft unit can easily accommodate four guests, by limiting the number of guests down to two for our unit, you will reduce our anticipated revenue for our unit. Occupancy limits should be enforced based on square footage of a unit, not just by the number of bedrooms.

Page 6: 20-48.070 B-1: Requiring landlines for vacation rentals seems like an unrealistic ask for current short term vacation rental owners. An overwhelming majority of Santa Rosa residents do not use landlines to make phone calls. Moreover, statistics show that the overwhelming majority of vacation travelers book their vacation on portable devices, such as cell phones and laptops. Landlines are a thing of the past. More focus should be aimed at requiring short term rental hosts to have power generators or backup batteries in case of emergencies.

20-48.070 B-3e: This ordinance does not take into consideration older properties that were not required to meet these requirements. This requirement would limit the potential income of existing vacation rentals. If this ordinance were to take place, I would suggest that grandfathered properties and/or hosted properties be treated differently. Hosted properties would eliminate any potential fire risk because the host would be onsite to address any issues.

Page 7: 20-48.070 E-2: Sending a mailed notice within a 600 ft radius seems excessive, especially for those who are hosted short term rentals. These should be exempt from these

rules. Property hosts live on site and would eliminate any potential noise issues.

It seems a lot of emphasis was placed on creating a long list of requirements for short term rentals rather than focusing on the larger problem at hand, the fact that too many short term rentals are currently operating. A short term rental cap should be implemented to prevent entire neighborhoods from becoming short term rentals.

Thank you,

Javier Tenorio

From: [Krystin B.](#)
To: [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] STR Draft Ordinance Comments
Date: Monday, October 4, 2021 10:21:22 PM

Krystin Beaver
3059 Hartley Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

STR Draft Ordinance Comments

Page 5

20-48.060 Occupancy Standards and Parking Requirements.

B. Occupancy Limits. The maximum number of guests allowed in a short-term rental shall not exceed two (2) short-term renters per bedroom and shall not exceed 10 total shortterm renters, including children. The owner shall not allow the short-term rental to be used for any gathering that exceeds the maximum number of short-term renters and allowable daytime guests, or if the minimum parking requirements specified in Section 20-48.060(D) cannot be met.

Comments:

Please consider making the occupancy limit to 10 guests for all STR's. 10 seems to be a standard for the market.

Page 6

B. Life, Safety Requirements.

e. Any firepit, outdoor fireplace, or barbeque/grill that is three feet or smaller in diameter must be located at least 25-feet from a property line, structure, or potentially flammable source including but not limited to trees, umbrellas, decks, or other appurtenant structures.

f. Any firepit, outdoor fireplace, or barbeque/grill that is larger than three feet in diameter must be located at least 50-feet from a property line, structure, or potentially flammable source including but not limited to trees, umbrellas, decks, or other appurtenant structures.

Comments:

I am curious to what these numbers (3ft in diameter or smaller = 25 ft away from property line, structure, trees, etc.) were based on? Did the fire department provide them? Is this based on research or evidence? Our STR has a good sized backyard, (over an 8000 sq ft lot) and according to this requirement, there is not one place where we could put our propane fire pit or the propane BBQ grill. 25 ft. seems excessive and makes it impossible for STR's to offer a very safe and common amenity. Homeowners do not have to abide by this so why would STR guests?

General Comments:

Thank you for offering to receive public feedback on this draft and for taking the time to read through these comments. I listened to the public comments at the last meeting regarding STR's and realize there are a lot of strong feelings about them, and understandably so. In contrast, I wanted to shed some light on our experience. My husband

and I own a STR in Santa Rosa. It was our prior home and we still reside in Santa Rosa. We have a professional property management company and also check in on the home regularly. We have not had any problems or issues in the one year we have been doing this. No parties or events and not one call to the police or upset neighbors. Most guests have been families with kids. We have a bulletin board map with push pins in the home for guests to share where they're visiting from along with a guest book. It is amazing to see that people are literally coming from all over the world. It warms our hearts to share this beautiful space (both our home and Santa Rosa) with others. Reading about the memories they made with their family in our home is delightful. In addition, the income supplement this has provided our single income family has been very helpful. We are not investors and live a very typical middle class family life style. Having a STR in Santa Rosa has been helpful since living in Sonoma County is so expensive and we have 3 children. Overall, our experience having a STR has been all positive. We agree there needs to be regulations and permits for STR's, but do ask that you analyze and consider the impact these rules will have (like not being able to have a fire pit or BBQ in the backyard). Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to attending the meeting 10/12.

From: [Eric Fraser](#)
To: [CA Office; _CityCouncilListPublic](#)
Cc: [Andrew F. Pierce](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Urgency Ordinance: 6 out of 7 votes needed to pass
Date: Thursday, October 7, 2021 7:40:21 AM

Hello Madame Cty Attorney;

Please help us clarify the number of City Council votes needed to pass an Urgency Ordinance.

CA Gov Code 65858a commands a 4/5 vote for passage of an urgency (interim) ordinance. With a 7 member Council, wouldn't that mean 6 of 7 voting in favor would be required for passage?

This is the math:

$$4/5 = 80\%$$

$$7 \times .80 = 5.6$$

5.6 is rounded to 6, as it is assumed that a council member is a whole person.

The information published for the Short-term Rentals Urgency Ordinance may have stated that only 5 members voting in the affirmative is required for passage.

Please confirm that 6 members voting in the affirmative are required, or your justification that supports the City's stated belief that the bar is lower.

Looking forward to being of service,

Eric Fraser
Truth in Tourism
707.479-8247

From: [Eric Fraser](#)
To: [CA Office](#); [_CityCouncilListPublic](#); [Andrew F. Pierce](#); [Short Term Rentals](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Urgency Ordinance: Notification Requirements
Date: Thursday, October 7, 2021 8:36:23 AM

Hello Madame City Attorney;

RE: Short-term Rentals Urgency Ordinance

We are concerned about the lack of notice to the targets of the proposed Short-term Rentals Urgency Ordinance on the agenda for the first public hearing and final vote 10/12/21. There doesn't seem to be a logical reason in the practice of good governance to exclude classes of people (seniors, minorities, property owners, tenants, guests, Superhosts, and more) who are directly impacted by the proposed rules that they will experience major negative repercussions (income loss, diminishment of rights to due process and other constitutional rights, loss without compensation to their investments, and so forth) IF the proposed ordinance passes.

STR property owner information is available from your own Finance department (TOT/BIA account contact names, addresses, and everything you need to know) or by looking at responsive documents found at Nextrequest 21-929.

CA Gov Code 65091(a)1 requires notification to subject property by mail 10 days prior to the public hearing, but that does not appear to have happened. The last mailing we received from the City was our quarterly tax form in mid-September.

Why wasn't a legal notification sent?

Looking forward to being of service,

Eric Fraser
TRUTH IN TOURISM
707.479-8247