

Dear Councilman,

I'm writing to share my experience with Airbnb and ask you consider the importance of home sharing and the positive impact it has had on my life and many others.

I began home sharing less than a year ago and I absolutely love it. I reside in Hollywood right off the boulevard where I've hosted guests from across the globe, from China to Sweden, I've had the pleasure of meeting many wonderful people, some whom I now consider friends.

My most recent wonderful experience was with a guest from New Zealand who happened to arrive on her birthday. As it was her birthday, I thought it would be fun to take her out for a birthday drink, everyone should celebrate their birthday even if it's with someone you just met hours before. We visited a local Hollywood hot spot and bonded over our love of music, she informed my that the Daft Punk poster in my listing persuaded her to book with me.

As we got to talking, she opened up about her decision to book with Airbnb instead of a hotel. She spoke about how she wanted to truly experience Hollywood like a resident of the city. She stated that our bonding over music was the perfect example of something she could never have got with a hotel booking. After a long night of sharing tunes, we now email each other with the latest tracks from our playlists on a weekly basis.

This is just one of many, many examples that myself and Airbnb hosts worldwide can offer over a traditional hotel experience. It's not about the extra large room in the trendiest new building attached to the coolest restaurants in the hippest part of the city. That has its place for so many but for just as many more, human connection has a place, too.

The current draft ordinance would put a halt to some of the greatest experiences I've had and I believe many other have had in the city of Los Angeles. Please take my story and the many letters I hope you're receiving like mine into consideration. Please do the right thing by passing legislation that is supportive of home sharing.

Sincerely,
David E.

June 6, 2016

To: The City of Los Angeles

Planning Department Los Angeles, Cal. 90066

From: Kathy Kissane-Cooley

Re: CPC-2016-1243-CA (Home Sharing Ordinance)

Greetings,

I am writing regarding the proposed Home-Sharing Ordinance (CPC-2016-1243-CA) that would impact Airbnb, VRBO, and other home-sharing sites. In respect to brevity, I have condensed my "full length letter" into a bulleted outline to highlight the pertinent content. The outline is followed by the full length letter containing more detailed information.

Brief summary about me:

- I am working, widowed senior citizen that raised 4 kids in PDR.
- I still have a large mortgage and bills.
- I have children and grandchildren that stay with me for extended stays throughout the year.

I want to spend more time addressing BOTH sides of home sharing, not just the amazing success...

- TOT: It is reasonable and should be expected that Home share hosts pay any/all city Transient Occupancy Taxes and retain an operator's licence.

- Safety: hosts should be mandated to conform to safety requirements including the installation of fire and CO2 monitors as well as fire extinguishers, fire escape plans, etc.
- Negative Externalities of Home Sharing: #1. The negative effect on the amount of available housing for native Angelinos, pushing the up the price on available housing stock. #2. Noise complaints, and density concerns including negative impacts on trash, parking, and security, etc.
- First major flaw with current Draft Proposal strategies: 90 day restriction theoretically is an effective in controlling #2 (above). negative externalities. The actual problem is not the amount of days rented it is the amount of PROBLEM days. The issue is the offending host property NOT the amount of days.
- Second major flaw with current Draft Proposal strategies: Restriction of hosts to one home share listing in the City of L.A. This is intended to put a stop to commercialization of home share by property managers and speculators #1 (above). However, this is unfair to an empty nester with a large home that wants to host guests in my kids old bedrooms. The draft proposal

states that a host can use “extra space” in their home. When not used by my visiting kids the bedrooms in my home are “extra space” and restricting me to only one room would be devastating to the amount of income I am able earn. The current proposal exemplifies the adage of “throwing out the baby with the bathwater”.

Effective strategies not currently included in the current Draft Proposal (but should be;)

- Single family R-1 homes: a “real world” answer to most of the negative problems that are associated with single family home sharing can be solved with one ordinance: The owner (and/or family member) of the home share **MUST** be present on the property during the home share. This will immediately constrain and put the commercial property managers and speculators out of business.
- Multi tenant Condos that operate under an HOA and or CC&Rs would take a vote and decided whether or not they will allow home sharing within their property. Their governing bodies will supersede the City. Duplexes, Triplexes and smaller R-2, R-3 properties would require additional rules to prohibit speculators from buying

them and turning them into de facto hotels depleting the available housing stock for Angelinos.

- “3 Strikes and you're out” clause. If there is a legally registered host that receives 3 complaints in a certain period of time then they would have their home share license put on probation and at that time would be removed from any home share sites. They would be required by the City to appear and respond to the complaints, where they would either show proof of remedies or have their home share license revoked.

In closing common sense in king!: A property owner that is on site will ALWAYS do what is best for them and their property. If maintaining a successful home share on their property is what is best then they will put in place the rules, guidelines and insist on the common courtesy that will ensure they and their guests do not have negative impacts.

When this fails the “3 strikes & You're Out” clause and process provides the City and neighbors the tools to sanction and ultimately halt the activities of bad hosts or rogue property owners.

Your Sincerely,

Kathryn Cooley-Kissane

Extended Letter:

Greetings,

I am writing regarding the proposed Home-Sharing Ordinance (CPC-2016-1243-CA) that would impact Airbnb, VRBO, and other home-sharing sites. I recently attended and spoke in front of Matthew Glesne at the City Planning Commission's hearing on Saturday May 21st.

I am a widowed senior citizen that lives and has raised 4 kids in my Playa Del Rey home. I have survived a divorce, the deaths of 2 husbands, breast cancer (twice) and a knee replacement. Despite the fact that I have worked my entire life I still have a large mortgage (over 700k) and the bills to go with it. Since my husband died in 2008 many people have told me that I would not be able to stay in my home, both physically and financially. I refused to give in have not stopped working to keep my home.

I have worked for over 40 years as a professional photographer (www.bcs76.com) in my home based studio. I am partners with my oldest son and as the only mother/son photography team in Hollywood we have had the privilege of shooting many of the most successful children and teenaged stars over the last 25 years. Many of whom have grown up to be today's top box office draws and television stars. On

April 15th, 2014 I was shooting a client and fell off of an apple box directly onto my good knee (the non knee replacement) and I shattered my patella. This was a painful recovery that took me almost 4 months to completely heal. I was petrified, because I knew I could not pay my mortgage. My son and his wife had recently traveled using the home sharing site Airbnb and suggested that if I hosted it would give me the ability to earn some much needed income.

I am blessed to have 4 grandchildren. My daughter lives 90+ minutes away and during her two most recent high risk pregnancies my ability to house them and give her and the kids access to the specialists at Children's Hospital and Cedars Sinai ensured their healthy starts and the health of my daughter that has the Factor V Leiden, a blood clotting disorder. Moreover, due to her husband's busy travel schedule I usually have all 5 of them staying with me for at least two weekends each month and often for longer, especially during the summer.

Like most of the Hosts I know, I have many amazing stories of hosting artists, families, and visitors from all over the world. Some coming to see our sites and some coming to see new grandchildren or sick family members that are my neighbors. Additionally, specifically because I have the pack

& plays, bikes, high chairs and ability to comfortably host children we have had many families tell us that this is the first time they have been able to afford to visit Los Angeles. As senior citizen who has home cared for my dying husband, I also have the walkers, shower seats, and raised toilets necessary for many of the senior citizens that I have hosted. They all come here, spend their money and enjoy our city and state. However, I want to spend more time addressing both sides of home sharing, not just the amazing success. Here in Playa Del Rey we experience both sides of home sharing.

First off it is reasonable and should be expected that Home share hosts pay any/all city Transient Occupancy Taxes and retain an operator's license. Moreover, hosts should be mandated to conform to safety requirements including the installation of fire and CO2 monitors as well as fire extinguishers, fire escape plans, etc.

The ordinances in the Draft Proposal are designed to address the negative externalities of home sharing which fall into two categories: 1. The current negative impact of Home Sharing on the amount of available housing for native Angelinos. 2. Noise complaints, and impacts on trash and parking, security, etc. The proposed tools are: a 90 day

overall restriction and the restriction of only 1 listing per host in Los Angeles.

Unfortunately both of these have significant flaws as proposed. They are flawed both in the fairness of them in regards to the Home Share Hosts AND in their effectiveness to actually reign in the Bad Hosts & the Speculators that are responsible for most of the problems associated with home sharing.

First, the restriction of home sharing to 90 days per year. Theoretically this seems like an effective means for controlling excessive noise complaints, parking, trash, etc. problems that some neighbors of Home Sharing sites are reporting. However, the problem is not the amount of days rented it is the amount of PROBLEM days, and 90 days is WAY too many. The issue is the offending host property NOT the amount of days. Even 7 offending days is too many. This issue can be addressed much more effectively with a “3 Strikes and you're out” clause. If there is a legally registered host that receives 3 complaints in a certain period of time then they would have their home share license put on probation and at that time would be removed from any home share sites. They would be required by the City to appear and respond to the complaints, where they would either

show proof of remedies or have their home share licence revoked.

Second, regarding restriction of hosts to one home share listing in the City of L.A. This is intended to put a stop to commercialization of home share by property managers and speculators. However, this is unfair to me who is an empty nester with a large home that wants to host guests in my kids old bedrooms. The draft proposal specifically denotes that a host would be able to use the “extra space” in their home. The bedrooms in my home are “extra space” and being restricted to only home sharing one of them would be devastating to amount of additional income I can earn with home sharing. The current proposal exemplifies the adage of “throwing out the baby with the bathwater”.

It is of absolute paramount importance to distinguish that different legislative tools will be required to address the various types of housing in Los Angeles, specifically, multi tenant (condos apartments) including R-2, R-3 and up vs. single family R-1 homes.

In regards to single family R-1 homes, the “boots on the ground”, “real world” answer to most of the negative problems that are associated with single family home sharing can be solved with one ordinance: The owner (and/or

family member) of the home share **MUST** be present on the property during the home share. This will immediately constrain and put the commercial property managers and speculators out of business. The legislation as proposed is simply unfair.

Multi tenant Condos that operate under an HOA and or CC&Rs would take a vote and decided whether or not they will allow home sharing within their property. These governing bodies will supersede the City. Duplexes, Triplexes and smaller R-2, R-3 properties would require additional rules to prohibit speculators from buying them and turning them into de facto hotels depleting the available housing stock for Angelinos.

In closing, the issues both positive and negative about Home Sharing can be complex. But the majority of the concerns will be addressed with common sense: A property owner that is on site will **ALWAYS** do what is best for them and their property. If maintaining a successful home share on their property is what is best then they will put in place the rules, guidelines and insist on the common courtesy that will ensure they and their guests do not have negative impacts on their neighborhood or neighbors. This common sense approach will go a long way to ensure that home

sharing remains a positive for the hosts, neighbors and the city. However, if this system fails the “3 strikes & You’re Out” clause and process provides the City and neighbors the tools to sanction and ultimately halt the activities of bad hosts or rogue property owners.

Your Sincerely,

Kathryn Cooley-Kissane

8242 Sunnysea Drive

Playa Del Rey, CA 90293

310.874.0658



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

RE: Statement on Short Term Home Sharing CASE: CPC-2016-1243-CA ENV-2016-1277-CE

1 message

Andrew C. Griggs <andyc6@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 2:54 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, CPC@lacity.org, Matthew Glesne <matthew.glesne@lacity.org>, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, mike.bonin@lacity.org, Tricia.keane@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councildistrict15@lacity.org

Statement on Short Term Home Sharing

My partner and I attended and spoke at the recent public hearing before the City Planning Commission staff, on the proposed Home Sharing Ordinance and were impressed by a pattern we saw emerging: Many like us, were retired, grappling with devastating health conditions, limitations and disabilities. Your staff heard from hosts with cancer, Parkinson's, and other conditions, all sharing how hosting has allowed us to keep our homes and create jobs for ourselves and others in our communities. Many of us, also, are either retired or active union members. Unite Here is only one union and speaks for only one industry. Many of us also work in our homes in other capacities. These are not just "anecdotal". We are a significant demographic.

STR host after host explained how the sharing economy kept us from losing our homes. Our home is both our biggest asset and our greatest expense. In an economy of rising housing costs and diminished job opportunities, home sharing provides solutions to both these concerns.

At the beginning of the hearing, Community Planning and Historic Resources Division Manager, Ken Bernstein, who probably receives a healthy 6 figure salary, admonished those of us offering STRs as a means of keeping our homes, that we should, if we had housing available more than 90 days a year, offer it to Angelinos.

The landlord tenant relationship is by its definition and by law an adversarial relationship. Is it really fair or safe to demand that STR hosts, at least the ones who attended the hearing, who are disproportionately older, retired, disabled and sick, live in an intimate adversarial environment?

It can be very difficult to remove someone from our homes who lives there more than 30 days. The legal costs and the physical danger of long term renting are much greater than the risks of STR hosting. We can provide more housing options and housing security to ourselves and our community and employees with the income from STR hosting. We put considerable labor, time and finances into establishing our home share. As Airbnb superhosts we provide a responsible and safe option for travelers and community members. Since we began hosting last August we have paid over \$5000 in TOT taxes. We work and communicate closely with neighbors so that our guests are not an imposition on the community, We live in the house with our guests. We provide off street parking for our guests. We support community businesses and subcontractors. We provide affordable short term lodging to family and friends of neighbors who may not have room for guests in their own homes.

We also provide other services out of our home, like renting out the space to the film industry, offering tax services and allowing groups to meet in our auxiliary building. All of this may be prohibited under this ordinance. By working in our home, while home sharing, we can monitor activities in the home and tend to the needs of our guests and our neighbors. We're also eyes on the street, home during the day when others are at work, thus assuring a safer community.

We agree that the landlord hotels need to be eradicated-- when a multi-unit landlord turns apartments into STRs at the expense of the larger housing stock and forces tenants out of their housing through harassment or abuse of Ellis evictions. But to delegate what we can do in our own homes in what is a growing sharing economy, when our homes are often our only resource and our greatest expense, makes no sense unless the goal is to provide a more advantageous economy for developers and multinational hotels. Airbnb seems to be more the lightning rod for these industries, who go unchallenged in their impact on housing and the economy. That so many people can claim that airbnb is ruining the housing economy, while they cannot name a single developer, is not insignificant. That we're all pretending or ignoring the fact that many of the hotels were built upon the destruction of entire neighborhoods, predominantly of very poor people, is also not insignificant. That the city has repeatedly allowed developers to destroy RSO housing and replace it with monstrous unaffordable luxury housing and that this is not part of the discussion on what is truly driving up rents, is pretty outrageous.

While most hosts only rent out a few nights a month, others have established consistent and well run year round businesses out of our homes. some of us have created not only jobs for ourselves, but for members of the community-- our employees, support for local businesses, gardeners. We have two full time employees. We pay significantly more than the proposed \$15 minimum wage, health benefits, sick leave, vacation pay. If employees need to leave in the middle of the day or have to arrive late or leave early to take care of family or personal matters, we can accommodate that. We prioritize hiring from our immediate community, share our resources and provide immediate services, as well as support neighbors who have other cottage industries.

We have a large house so we're able to offer more than 1 listing in our home. The aspects of the ordinance that would hurt us the most are

- limits us to a particular number of days per year (currently proposed at 90, but any limitation would be an imposition),
- Limiting the number of listings
- Limiting the number of groups of guests in our primary residence.
- The prohibition of other non-residential uses that would otherwise be legal and acceptable.

Aside from the very wealthy properties listed as STR hosts, most hosts make less than \$100 a day per listing. That would mean the ordinance would limit this cottage industry to \$9000 a year, and yet would impose taxes on it that are based on the taxes paid by enormous billion dollar hotel corporations that also receive other compensations, loans and disbursements from the city. And yet the hotel industry claims they are the ones at a disadvantage here. What other small business is taxed at 14%? What other small business is limited to earning less than \$9000 a year or conducting business on a part time basis? What other small business is denied the right to develop other sources of income that would otherwise be legal and acceptable? At this rate we will not be able to provide stable employment for ourselves or our employees. This is not a sustainable business model.

Passage of this ordinance would probably push us out of our house and force us to sell it, either leaving L.A. totally or adding ourselves to the numbers of people searching for affordable rental housing in a city that has had no real affordable housing policy since the 80s.

While the stated purpose of the ordinance is to make communities safer and housing more affordable, to protect rent controlled apartments, and address issues of decreased rental stock, I fear that certain provisions of the proposed ordinance would hurt many of the less well off members of the home sharing community, and/or push many of us out of our homes.

Aside from this ordinance, what other comprehensive housing program is being implemented in this city? What other efforts are being made to protect affordable housing and rental stock, particularly for example, the large number of new developments going up all over the city that are getting permits to destroy much of the older, rent controlled housing stock. Just on the block behind our house 2 multifamily houses are being torn down to make way for an apartment building full of pricey large apartments. Another multifamily house is being torn down two blocks down from our house, on our street and another large building is going up that won't have rent stabilization. One of the apartments in one of the houses had been listed on airbnb offering a room in the apartment. The airbnb listing did nothing to harm affordable housing and rental stock in the neighborhood. The new building destroyed 5 homes to be replaced by new unregulated rentals.

To achieve the stated goal of protecting and perhaps expanding affordable housing in the city, the proposed ordinance should stipulate that TOT revenues collected from Home Sharing be allocated to the Housing Trust Fund, to be used for affordable housing.

There is much that the city planners could do to protect the older housing stock, including disallowing their destruction, supporting mom and pop owners who live on the property, provide incentives, subsidies, make it easier to remove a problem boarder or tenant, especially when the owners live on the premises. But it seems the only concern by the city for these older buildings, a significant architectural heritage, is if that they are being used as short term rentals.

The city needs to find ways to make renting older properties, affordable and sustainable and of providing new housing stock that reflects the history and integrity of existing, especially poor communities. Demanding that homeowners with room to spare, offer our homes to strangers on a permanent basis is unfair, unreasonable and unrealistic. This ordinance will create more housing problems, not decrease them. I encourage the Planning Department staff to rework this ordinance so that it is more streamlined and does not hurt the more financially vulnerable members of the community who have made use of this economic opportunity.

--

Andy Griggs



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Demographics of STR hosts in Los Angeles: Their impact on housing in L.A. and the impact of the proposed ordinance on Home Sharing CASE: CPC-2016-1243-CA ENV-2016-1277-CE

1 message

emmarosenthal <emmarosenthal@earthlink.net>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 2:57 PM

Reply-To: emmarosenthal <emmarosenthal@earthlink.net>

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, CPC@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, mike.bonin@lacity.org, Tricia.keane@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.english@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councildistrict15@lacity.org

CASE: CPC-2016-1243-CA ENV-2016-1277-CE

Demographics of STR hosts in Los Angeles: Their impact on housing in L.A. and the impact of the proposed ordinance on Home Sharing

Demographic Groups

Retired and low income home owners: These folks use the opportunity of sites like Airbnb to offset rent and other living expenses not met on pensions or limited salaries. They may rent out one or more rooms, all year or less frequently. They rely on whatever they can bring in in order to make do. This group, along with low income renters, should be the most protected and yet they are the most endangered by the limits of the proposed ordinance. To protect this group:

allow them to rent out more than one room

allow them to maintain more than one listing

do not limit the number of days they can offer their homes on the STR (short term rental) market as long as the listing is their primary residence and hosts are in the residence when they have guests, and

do not limit the other otherwise legal, income producing uses of the home.

Allow whole house listings for periods of time when residents are out of town or otherwise not on the premises. This would be one instance where a limit of the number of days a year a whole house listing is available makes sense: to assure that a landlord isn't doing an end run around rent control. (Any number of days less than a full year would work to achieve this goal.)

Low income renters: Even under rent control, rents in L.A. are too damn high. Rent control only protects established tenants. New tenants pay market rates and with limitations on how much and how often landlords can raise rents, there exists a disincentive to skip rent increases. It takes years for the rental costs to go below market rate. Some folks rent out space on their sofas or stay with friends or in their cars and rent out their studio or one bedroom apartments from time to time.

To protect this group

make landlords enforce their own leases (the portion of the ordinance that requires landlord permission could lead to extortion, abuse and coercion),

don't include these listings in the ban on home sharing in RSO (rent controlled) properties, as long as the listing is their primary residence and hosts are in the residence when they have guests. This would be another instance where a limit of the number of days a year a whole house listing is available makes sense.

The listings of these hosts (low income homeowners and renters) not only do not decrease rental unit stock, but by providing money to help meet rent and mortgage, prevent more people from displacement and from having to look for rental housing in the already limited low income rental market.

Mom and Pop landlords in RSO buildings: These landlords live on the property and own no other properties, renting out their RSO units to long term tenants and rooms in their own unit to STR guests. These homeowners should be rewarded with the option to home share in their own unit, as a means of offsetting the costs of maintaining the other units and keeping rents low. The city has not done enough to support mom and pops, who often have deep and long term relationships with tenants and a commitment to low rents.

Bicoastal Angelinos: This is a big issue and demographic among STR hosts in this city, with many people "in the industry", gone on assignment for so much of the year. Especially for people trying to get established in the industry, extra income from renting out their homes when they aren't in town can be very important. These hosts do not have the option of renting out their space to long term tenants, as they need a home to return to, but they also need to offset living and housing expenses both when they are away and when they are in town. These listings also have no impact on low income rental availability.

Luxury Homes, Vacation Homes: These listings have the most to offer the city in the form of tax revenue. Their existence of the market also has no bearing on affordable rental options, as low income renters cannot afford these homes anyway.

Multiple Listing Agents of whole house, whole apartment listings, or multiple listings of rooms in various apartments: This group consists of landlords who have turned their apartment buildings into hotels and have either not re-rented apartments to new tenants when tenants have moved out, or have applied aggressive techniques or violated Ellis Act eviction policies to transition the apartments into a hotel. These are the only short term rentals contributing to the loss of affordable housing and rental stock. Writing the ordinance that would eliminate this abuse of the sharing economy would be simple and would be highly supported and welcomed by most of the city's populace. The LAHD already exists to regulate these landlords and the system of anonymous reporting could be more widely publicized to hold these listers accountable. These types of listings should not be allowed under any circumstances. The only exception to this rule would be management companies who serve individual homeowners sharing their primary residences. Documentation and verification should be provided to assure that management companies of individual listings are not abusing the system and eliminating housing.

The benefits of Home Sharing are huge. Home Sharing

Offsets rent and mortgage by providing supplemental income to meet housing and living expenses.

Provides employment for hosts in their own homes-- an actual cottage industry

Provides employment in the larger community

Supports local small businesses in neighborhoods that might not benefit otherwise from the tourist industry. (No one comes to L.A. to go to the corner panaderia or the local taco truck.)

Provides needed revenue in the form of the hotel tax, a heavy tax for small businesses already paying property taxes and income taxes, but one that many hosts have been paying for some time (voluntarily), and one many would willingly pay for the continued opportunity to remain as STR hosts.

Provides access to areas of the city financially out of reach to most working people. A weekend in a canyon house or a week at the beach may be affordable where as purchasing housing in those areas remains prohibitive

Problems in the ordinance

According to the Planning Department, the draft ordinance was the result of a request from City Council to come up with a plan that would

Be based in the primary residence of the host

Collect TOT

Protect rent stabilized housing

Instead, the planning department devised a complex criteria that would make it nearly impossible and unviable for renters and homeowners to offer short term rentals anywhere within the city of Los Angeles. If the purpose of this proposed ordinance was to destroy home sharing without explicitly doing so, then the proposal is expertly and perfectly drafted.

The limitations within the proposal that would prohibit the use of the property for otherwise legal uses, along with the extreme limitations on the number of listings within a primary residence, number of days hosting is allowed and the number of groups of guests, creates a very hostile environment for anyone working from their home, attempting to keep, and afford our housing.

The areas of gravest concern are:

The 90 (or 180 or 200 or any number of....) day limit

The single listing limit

The one set of guests limit

The prohibition on other services and non-residential uses

For most host, home sharing for 90 days equals less than \$9000 of gross income. This does not even cover property costs, let alone pay salaries, mortgages or rent. No business model exists that would so severely limit the business.

To then tax and regulate this business like a hotel is preposterous. All this noise about \$9000?

STR hosts may have more than one available room in their home, especially after children have grown up and moved out. Some hosts may list entire homes when they are on vacation or when working away from home; listing their homes either as a room in a house or as a whole unit.

In this economy where housing prices are exceptionally high and employment options limited, Home sharing offsets housing costs and provides employment to hundreds of people who might otherwise not be able to afford living in Los Angeles or may be excluded from the mainstream workforce. Individual initiative should be encouraged and the sharing economy has arisen to meet a very important need. In addition to providing employment for hosts, many hosts employ support staff. Hosts would not be able to maintain full employment of staff, increasing limited part time employment.

The proposed ordinance, in addition to limiting the scope of short term rentals to less than a living wage, would prohibit other in home employment options. People working from our homes are more likely to be home sharers. It's a perfect and natural match. -- renting out the space as a film location to the film industry (with or without STR guests present; seeing clients in a private place or separate area on the premises; art, writing, crafts or photography studios; any number of home offices where people do business in their homes. To not allow hosts to diversify our income sources while limiting the number of days and the number of rooms we can be in business is one of the more draconian measures in this ordinance. As written it is not clear if this prohibition would apply to times when no guests are present, or to auxiliary buildings, but present or not, it is severe and irrationally punitive.

While NIMBY homeowners in beach and mountain communities oppose home sharing, as well as other public access to the natural environment surrounding Los Angeles, their concern about party houses warrants some attention. The 90 day, one listing, one set of guests model will encourage "party houses" especially where social groups may want to stay in a larger home. Renting out to smaller groups of individual and family travelers is much less disruptive. The only consistent business model the 90 day limitation allows for is weekend availability. Instead, renting out rooms to individuals and small groups during the week as well as weekends, offering more than one listing to more than one group, for shorter periods of time, encouraging listings in primary residences when hosts are home, encourages families and people on business to use STRs, creates and supports communities and families living in L.A.

Emma Rosenthal
345 Douglas Street
Los Angeles, CA 90026



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

RE: Home Sharing Ordinance CASE: CPC-2016-1243-CA ENV-2016-1277-CE

1 message

Dragonfly Hill <dragonflyhill345@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 2:51 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, CPC@lacity.org, Matthew Glesne <matthew.glesne@lacity.org>, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, mike.bonin@lacity.org, Tricia.keane@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.english@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councildistrict15@lacity.org

Home Sharing and Affordable Housing: Ideas and Solutions

We want to add the following information to the dialogue on affordable housing and short term rentals (STRs). We are the owners of a large house that was in great disrepair when we took ownership. It was due to this disrepair that we were able to squeeze into the L.A. housing market at all. We needed the extra space this house provided as we were planning on working out of our home in a variety of capacities. Over the years we have provided no rent, low rent, pay what you can rent, both long term and short term, to over 50 people. Eventually we had to severely limit this practice when we could no longer keep our own home and afford to supplement people's housing in the current L.A. housing crisis.

It was our policy to work with people who were having difficulty paying rent, sometimes struggling to pay the mortgage and forgoing medicine or groceries ourselves. Without going into the specific personal struggles of our tenants, the situation became dangerous and threatened our own safety, the safety of others living in the house and our ownership of the home. We incurred thousands of dollars in legal fees and damages before the individuals finally left. Some of the damages were reimbursed by insurance, but our coverages became more expensive and tenuous as a result. While we were working to resolve the situation, we could not continue our other work at the house, we couldn't leave the house and it remained unsafe for friends and family to visit us. Most homeowners can't afford to go through this once without losing their homes, and we can't afford to go through it again.

It is very difficult to remove someone from a long term rental even when they are renting rooms in one's own home, and there's the added danger of the intimacy of sharing one's home with strangers without the control over one's own environment. It becomes impossible to leave, as we would still be responsible for the mortgage and liable for safety and maintenance. Without more control over our immediate living quarters we decided to provide short term lodging. We also figured we could provide more stable housing for ourselves and the people in our community who we hired to work for and with us.

We have since used our home to provide short term lodging which provides us the opportunity to have more autonomy, greater disability access, and much needed space. Like many other hosts we are older, retired and living with significant health conditions. In addition to home sharing, we do provide other services to the community and continue to work in our home in other capacities.

We contribute to the local economy by paying the 14% TOT, supporting

and referring our guests to local businesses, we share the food we grow on our urban farm, with our neighbors. We hire from within the community. We provide full time, secure employment, complete with benefits, and well in excess of the proposed \$15 minimum wage. We communicate with our neighbors to assure that our guests are respectful and considerate. We have provided low cost overnight housing to neighbors' families when they visit from out of town. We have housed unhoused people in transitional situations. We have fed people who needed food. We would welcome a city voucher program that would allow short term home sharing to provide transitional housing to unhoused people. We simply can't afford the risks of long term lodging with people with whom we do not have a sustained relationship.

We think this city needs a comprehensive affordable housing plan and we offer the following suggestions for consideration. Blaming home sharers for trying to mitigate the costs of housing, in the absence of any housing policy and limiting our other efforts within our home to provide income, is unfair, and if the real goal is to protect and create affordable housing, ineffective.

DragonflyHill Urban Farm
345 Douglas Street
L.A. CA 90026

Increasing Affordable Housing Stock in Los Angeles

Los Angeles has not had a comprehensive housing program since the 80s. Since then, large hotels have sprung up, in downtown L.A., displacing entire communities including some of the poorest people in the city, and more recently, developers have taken to building monstrous fake Italian villas and other luxury apartments, introducing L.A. to the \$3000 one bedroom luxury apartment. Older duplexes and triplexes are being bought up and torn down as rent controlled units are replaced by newer larger more profitable apartment buildings not under the scrutiny of rent control, and while there is a move to increase the minimum wage to \$15 an hour, that's hardly sufficient income to provide housing for the average family.

L.A. City Could Increase affordable housing stock

Via rent to own programs, especially in foreclosed rental property

By extending rent control to all rental units built after 1979

By demanding substantial affordable housing units and wheelchair accessible housing in all new housing developments

By ending the \$3000/month one bedroom luxury apartment.

By requiring that all new developments be fully 100% ADA compliant.

By providing incentives to landlords who rent to people marginalized in the current housing market and who make dis-ability accommodations.

By creating opportunities for small landlords to make repairs, dis-ability accommodations and improvements that don't pass on the costs or dislocate current tenants

By enforcing fair housing laws

By providing rent subsidies to low income renters

By supporting small businesses that provide income to families, especially for workers not included in the mainstream workforce,

including street vendors and short term rentals within the primary home of the host

By stipulating that TOT revenues collected from Home Sharing be allocated to the Housing Trust Fund, to be used for affordable housing.

By protecting our communities from predatory lenders, developers, slumlords and displacement

By increasing wages, jobs, job opportunities, educational opportunities, health care, community programs, urban farming and real social services

By ending the criminalization of entire communities, particularly our youth.

By assuring that any new development includes the same number of units being demolished with alternative interim housing to current residents along with priority housing and right of return.

By providing homeowners and duplex and triplex owners support in expedited resolutions of issues with tenants, especially those in the same unit as the owner.

Emma Rosenthal and Andy Griggs
DragonflyHill Urban Farm
Cultivating Community
dragonflyhill.wordpress.com
dragonflyhill345@gmail.com
310.704.3217 or 818.404.5784

Viktor C.
Los Angeles, CA 90024

CF#14-1635-S2

CPC-2016-1243-CA

June 5th 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

My wife and I home share in a historic a residential neighborhood full of professionals, families and professors near Westwood Village & UCLA. We were both present at the hearing on May 21st and found that many of the issues that the people who are against short term rentals were saying that Air BnB hosts are "increasing rents"—in response to this—I'd like to just say that rents and real estate in general is high. Rent is high for monthly tenants outside of AirBnB as well! It really has nothing to do with short-term rentals, it has to do with the market in general. It seems like many of the speakers against home sharing were against gentrification in certain areas, but a lot of the neighborhoods that home sharing is happening in are historically high priced areas—perhaps areas that some of these people couldn't afford anyway.

Another thing people were saying that there is not enough housing and short-term rentals are taking away from the selection. I think there are areas in the city where short term rentals are being over done, but a lot of other neighborhoods really thrive with a mixture of homeowners, long term and short term rentals—places like Westwood or neighborhoods near colleges and universities.

The proposed regulations are way too strict and cast way too far of a net. I think clumping ALL of Los Angeles into these regulations is not fair at all.

My wife and I are recent homeowners (since January 2016) and the income we generate from home sharing ultimately pays our mortgage. I want to work with the city, but please how these restrictions will make it difficult for us to pay off bills and be homeowners.

Please consider the different neighborhoods within Los Angeles, make the registration process simple, provide looser restrictions on how many living spaces you can share and do not limit having guests to 90 days.

Thank you,
Viktor C.
malibucreekstatepark@gmail.com
310-503-9146

RE: council file number: **CF#14-1635-S2**

Planning commission file number: **CPC-2016-1243-CA**

My name is Denisea Wilson and I am an Airbnb host. First, I would like to address a few items on the draft ordinance, which I feel need to be deeply considered.

I would like to start off my draft with just saying "America, land of the free and home of the brave". This quote is used daily, in representation of our country. In my opinion, I feel as if **Item #3 under Section D - Prohibitions: the limitation of Home Sharing to 90 days per calendar year**, limits that ability for me and other fellow hosts; Airbnb allows me the comforts and ability to be "free" here in Los Angeles. I am a working actor here in Los Angeles and Airbnb affords me the ability to not lose my home in periods that I am not working. In addition, Airbnb has allowed me to be a homeowner at the age of 19 years old. If I'm only allowed to rent out my spare room for 90 days, I will never be able to meet my ends and end up homeless. Because of my Airbnb, I don't have to be on welfare and or suck off the state. If I am forced to stop with Airbnb, I will be one more person begging the state for Welfare and food stamps etc, since I can't afford not to. Ordinances should be put in place to help and not to take from the regular tax paying adults who are trying to be productive members of society. There has to be a strong consideration for ALL people in the city and not just the deep pocket hotels who are angry that they're losing business. Personally, I love it that people are wising up and sticking it to them as they have taken advantage of travelers for years. We, Airbnb hosts, don't mind paying taxes – just like the hotels should be forced to charge less, if they want the business. If I have a spare room in the home that I pay for, the city, state or government shouldn't be able to tell me who, how, when it can be used as long as I pay my fair share of taxes. It SHOULD be my ability to allow others to use that space and pay for the time they are in it.

As a U.S citizen I am proud to pay my taxes and give back to my country, therefore the requirement to pay the Transient Occupancy Tax, will be absolutely no problem to me. I will pay the taxes for "MY" business. This is the way I have chosen to work for myself. This is the way I have chosen to provide for myself. I bought my house and I have found a way to keep myself debt free, legally.

Denisea Wilson
407-401-2827



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2_Draft ordinance_Short Term rentals

1 message

dennyfoto <dennyfoto@aol.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 12:36 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org

June 6, 2016

LOS ANGELES 90064

Draft Ordinance_CF#14-1635-S2

CPC-2016-1243-CA

Dear Councilman Wesson,

As a homeowner in the Rancho Park area next to Century City_90064, I have lived in the area since 1964....50 years. I have been a stock photographer through agencies for the past 27 years.

Due to the downfall of my business in 2008, I have had to find additional income to continue living in my home.

I rented out my house and tried the Peace Corps but had to return early due to illness in 2012 September. With the house rented, I lived in an apartment for less than a year. I found it extremely difficult to find any place without leasing for a year and then finding managers who would show up to see the place.

Anyone coming to the Los Angeles area having to rent a place while looking for an apartment or room has great difficulty in finding **short term rentals**.

I moved back to my house in August 2013. I realized for income I could rent out a room through Airbnb with a bath/no kitchen at the back of my house where there was an outside door. Between the hall in my house and the room, there is a locked door which facilitates serving breakfast to the guest. I immediately filled out the transient tax form-paying 14% .

Through Airbnb I was able to meet guests from the U.S. , some of whom were looking for apartments to rent and needed short term rentals. Another service has been to introduce guests to restaurants in my area where I showed them great places for dinner.

The room has given me flexibility to have a place for my family to stay when they come from out of state and at the same time to create additional income through Airbnb.

A vital concern of mine with the suggested ordinance has been the registration number with the public home address, phone number, additional information about the income earned from the room and other private information. It alarms me being a single senior woman for the planning department to have access where anyone in the department could read my private information. Anyone could have access to my home through this suggested "open book" information. In the past I have been on a list where UCLA health dept was attacked by hackers and I have been hacked having to change private information. I not only find this proposed ordinance invasive but a real threat.

I have lived here very safely for many years, paid property taxes, pay for permit to park on the street along with purchasing two permits for people to park and now face next to the Century City area being in the pathway of low flying small jets from the Santa Monica Airport, which no one is addressing. Noise pollution, safety concerns, invasion of privacy, restrictions on my home and property ! What more must I contend with that is a problem of a homeowner. I must have the additional income from my bnb in order to keep my home and not for just 90 days a year rental.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Kate D Ziesmer

CF@14-1635-S2

CPC-2016-1243-CA

dennyfoto@aol.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

NANCI BENNETT <nancibennett@me.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 12:45 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org

CF#14-1635-S2

CPC-2016-1243-CA

Dear Councilmember Bonin, Planning Department and Planning Commission,

I have been a member of the home sharing community since 2014. I had just undergone shoulder surgery, I wasn't able to work and home sharing was a great solution to cover the cost of living in my rent controlled apartment in Venice. I had guests stay with me in my primary residence for a short period of time and was able to cover the same amount of rent and have my home to myself to heal.

A few weeks after my shoulder surgery my father passed. I had been taking care of him financially for the two and half years prior to his death as soon as he was diagnosed with stage four cancer. Home sharing was amazing thru this time, as well.

I was able to cover my rent and the new people that stayed with me kept a positive flow of energy during a sad time. I was still unable to work and had just started physical therapy which was very expensive along with my \$449.00 insurance payment - I freelance so I don't have unemployment or disability.

In July 2015 I was diagnosed with stage 2 cancer. The guest that was staying with me at that time was a nurse working with a medical oncologist. She had hidden beautiful inspirational notes all over my house for me to find. This is the type of community that home sharing promotes. It also brings a sense of global community with in itself which is amazing.

Most of us who home share are not wealthy people buying apartment buildings to make as much money as we can. Instead, we are normal people who may have fallen on very challenging times and struggle to keep up with the cost of living in Los Angeles, regardless if an apartment is rent controlled. I'm grateful that home sharing has prevented me from financial catastrophe.

The idea that there might be restrictions on being able to share rent controlled apartments that are primary residences or that my private, personal data may be compromised if shared with the Planning Department causes great stress.

I encourage the city to look toward San Francisco which allows home sharing in rent controlled units as long as one's income does not exceed the monthly rent and does not require home sharing platforms to share user data.

Warmly,
Nanci
323-715-6262

WWW.NANCIEBENNETT.COM
WWW.SIDVINTAGE.COM



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Public Comments re: CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

KS <kjs826@icloud.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 12:10 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org
Cc: etta.armstrong@lacity.org, Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Re: council file number: CF#14-1635-S2

Planning commission file number: CPC-2016-1243-CA

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to raise the following objections the proposed regulations on home sharing.

The stated purpose of your proposal is "to allow for the efficient use and sharing of residential structures without detracting from residential character or enjoyment", but the details and tenor of the proposal seem more like an attempt to squash home sharing and cater to the interests of the hotel lobby.

I was one of many hosts who attended local hearings and heard moving stories of people who were able to stay in their homes, thanks to home-sharing; people who were able to care for elderly parents out-of-state, thanks to home-sharing; people who made lasting friendships through home-sharing; people who got by between jobs, thanks to home-sharing; people who might otherwise be a drain on the economy, on various forms of subsistence, instead paying their own way and contributing to the local economy, thanks to home-sharing.

It seems as if all of these stories fell on deaf ears. Why hold hearings if you have no intention of taking into account the overwhelming popularity of home-sharing in your planning? Your proposed ordinance requirements are onerous, excessive, and overreaching. Specifically:

Registration and filing fees. (c) (1)(2)(3)(4)

1. It is intrusive, overreaching and unnecessary to require that a private individual who wants to rent their home out for short periods while they vacation or travel on business file for permission with the city and pay a registration fee to do so.

Exclusion of rent-controlled units, Prohibition (d) (7)

1. A vast majority of renters live in units built before 1979 and fall under Rent Control ordinances. The best estimates I can find is that 80% of all rental units in LA are rent-controlled. It is discriminatory and objectionable to single out some renters and prevent them from exercising the same rights as other renters.
2. By excluding rent controlled units you are excluding MOST renters, while allowing homeowners to host. That is unfair and discriminatory to renters.
3. The city's assumption apparently is that those in rent-controlled units are getting such a deal that they shouldn't require the additional revenue when traveling out of town. But many of those in rent controlled units are paying close to market rates, particularly if they've been in that home for less than 10 years, as owners charge market rates when new tenants move in. Since the owners of many non-rent controlled units will keep increases down in order to keep good tenants, the disparity in the average rental price is not so great as one might think. But again, even if it were, it is unfair and discriminatory to single out a single class of renter and exclude them from the right to sublet their apartment when they vacation.
4. Rent controlled units should be handled as any other rental unit — if the owner has no objection to the

renter subletting for short periods, then the matter should be between those two parties and of no interest whatsoever to the city. SUBLETTING HAS ALWAYS BEEN A MATTER BETWEEN A LANDLORD AND TENANT. IT IS INAPPROPRIATE AND INVASIVE FOR THE CITY TO INTERVENE IN A PRIVATE CONTRACT BETWEEN TWO INDIVIDUALS.

90-day limit. (d)(3)

1. 90 days is an arbitrary limit that makes no sense. If a person is allowed to have a roommate year-round, why is it wrong to rent out a guest room year-round on a short-term basis? Some hosts want the flexibility of sharing their home for a few weeks off and on through out the year, without committing to a full time roomie. That's always been perfectly legal before. Why is the city getting involved in these private matters?
2. There are very good reasons an individual may travel more than 90 days a year -- on business (this is a industry town where many of those working in entertainment go on location for months at a time) or take care of elderly parents (as many boomers are now finding they must do) or just for pleasure (all the more power if you can afford it). For me, I go back east as frequently as I can to help my aging parents. The only thing that allows me to do so is subletting my home while away. I don't want the city stepping on that in any way.

Record-keeping/Host requirements. (e)(2); (f)(4)

1. Both the host and AirBnB keep records of all their income, report such income to the IRS, and pay taxes on it. That is record-keeping enough. It is both onerous and an invasion of privacy to require that hosts report to the city how many nights the home was rented and at what rate. Income is income. Hosting income should be reported the same way any other income is reported. Hosts should not be asked to report every detail of their income to the city, unless the city likewise requires that of every other form of income for individuals or businesses. These regulations, once again, are overreaching and discriminatory.

Limits on listings (f)(1)

1. While I wholeheartedly endorse putting a cap on the number of listings one might have in the city of LA, limiting listings to only one unit is the most restrictive choice possible. If I occasionally host a guest for a few days at a time in my guest room, and then rent out my entire home when I travel, why should that be illegal? I would go further to suggest that someone in the valley who keeps a beach home for the summer should be allowed to rent out the one they are not occupying as much as they like.
2. On the other hand, if one host has 12 listings, clearly his is not a home-sharing situation but a hotelier in the business of renting out single family homes, and special regulations should apply to those entrepreneurs.

Throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

1. If a party is renting out a second home 365 days per year, then it is appropriate to treat that like a business. We can all agree that major corporations who come in and buy up entire buildings for the purposes of short term rentals are not "hosts" but hotels, and should be treated as such.
2. But these regulations require any private individual who is out of town for a few months out of the year to treat their sublets as if it were a full-time business. That is just wrong. This is a tough economy. People trying to make ends meet should be rewarded, not punished, for entrepreneurialism.
3. In treating all hosts with the same onerous regulations, the city is taking a sledgehammer to an issue that is better addressed with a surgeon's scalpel.

If the city proceeds with these excessive regulations, it will have only these effects:

1. It will assure that tourist dollars that would otherwise be coming into the city will be going to other, more sharing-economy friendly cities;
2. Artists and writers, who make up 80% of ABB hosts, will likely leave Los Angeles for friendlier cities. No city planner worth their salt is unaware of how important the artistic community is the vitality of a major city. Where artists go, business follows — as evidenced by the gentrification of downtown LA that began

with artists moving into loft spaces.

3. There will likely be a mass protest in the form of noncompliance, as has taken place in other cities that have tried to implement such regulations. This only creates a nightmare of nearly impossible enforcements.
4. And it will ensure that a small army of hosts and guests will take note in the next election cycle and vote for any candidate who will vow to overturn this legislation. If there no such candidate, you can expect a referendum on the ballot. These regulations taken by a Democratic administration look very much like a pro-Big Business extreme right-wing Republican approach. If the Bernie Sanders campaign has taught us anything, it is that the tolerance for Big Business Republocrats is fading fast. I fear for the political careers of any politician who doesn't embrace a more progressive pro-small entrepreneur/pro-new economy approach in coming months — starting right here, with this ordinance.

City politicians continue to cater to old-economy money interests, while stabbing themselves in the foot by trying to deter new economy businesses. California, and Los Angeles in particular, have always been national trendsetters. It would be a shame to see us fall behind more forward-thinking cities and lose the revenue that is generated not only from this new form of tourism but also into the pockets of its citizens, who then circulate it locally. Home-sharing is creating a velocity of money that is badly needed in this lackluster economy. It is one of the few positive new developments in recent years. Squashing it with these onerous regulations will put the city in peril.

Yes, go after the big businesses posing as home hosts. But leave individual home-sharers alone.

Thank you.

K. Smith
LA, CA 90272



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Feedback in reference to CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Zac M <zkmertens@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 2:03 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Council file number: CF#14-1635-S2

Planning commission file number: CPC-2016-1243-CA

Hello Legislators,

After review of the ordinance I've found some things that will help the rental situation here in LA, such as limiting the amount of home sharing locations to 1 per person. On the flip side I've found many things would greatly affect people like myself who use home sharing to subsidize the extremely high cost of apartment living here in Los Angeles.

My personal experience with home sharing is nothing short of extreme gratitude. Home sharing has been a total blessing as it has quite literally saved me from having to move back to my home town after the company I worked for closed its doors and laid off all of its employees. I had moved to my studio apartment in Venice only 7 days before all of this happened and as you're probably aware, its not cheap to rent here (\$1600 per Mo for 300 sq/ft is no walk in the park). Because I was able to list my place on a home sharing site I was able to not only pay my rent, but also follow my creative passion and invest the time in learning how to film and edit, which led me to my new career. Home sharing also allows me to host incredible people from all over the world and allow them the chance to experience my city from the comfort of a home at a reasonable price while I travel for work.

In terms of safety, I feel that section (f) [Hosting Platform Requirements.], parts 2 & 4 to be very dangerous in terms of information security. If the lists of operators is openly available that puts operators at risk of attack from anyone who may have ill will towards them by having the ability to capture sensitive financial and personal documents.

As for Section D, part(3) [No Person shall operate Home-Sharing for more than 90 days each calendar year.] As someone who travels often for work, being able to use home sharing during this time definitely helps to buffer the high rent cost. Being able to rent for 120 days last year made it possible to continue living here in the place I love and call home. Limitations on operation days will erode the feasibility of home sharing for participants like myself, which in turn causes the city to loose potential tax revenue.

Another concern is the registration process. If the process is online the city will save money, time, and recourses. It will also make the process more streamlined and participants more apt to comply.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Kind regards,

Zac Mertens



June 6, 2016

VIA EMAIL

The Honorable Mike Bonin
Los Angeles City Hall
200 North Spring Street, Room 475
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: Short-Term Residential Rentals
Council File #14-1635-S2**

Dear Councilmember Bonin:

On behalf of the thousands of supporters and community partners standing behind Keep Neighborhoods First, we would like to express our appreciation for your leadership on this issue. The city's recently-released short-term rental ordinance is an affirmative step forward to control the negative impacts of the short-term rental industry. What is being proposed is a positive framework that gives power back to the community, prohibits the conversion of RSO units and affordable housing, requires hosts and platforms to conduct their operations in a responsible manner, and still allows people to help make their ends meet. Where other cities have failed, Los Angeles's ordinance hits the mark.

We would also like to thank the Department of City Planning for listening to stakeholder input and recognizing the need for fairness and balance. Under the draft ordinance, those that participate in home-sharing are still able to do so within reasonable limits, and long-term residents can reclaim the right to the quiet enjoyment of their home without undue disruption by visitors and tourists.

As the draft ordinance moves forward through the City's legislative process, it is critical that we keep our attention focused on the following issues:

I. Platform Accountability: Registration and Disclosure Requirements

As we have seen in San Francisco, Portland, Santa Monica, and many other jurisdictions, enforcement quickly becomes an insurmountable task if hosting platforms are not required to (1) disclose basic information about their rentals, and (2) remove/cancel illegal listings. Portland does not have this requirement and suffers from a registration compliance rate of lower than 10%. Similarly in San Francisco, of the 9,000+ short-term rentals in that market, over 75% of those units are unregistered and/or illegal.

Los Angeles's registration compliance will suffer the same fate as these other cities if platforms are not required to take down illegal listings. Unless a real sanction is imposed upon the host for skirting the law, they will continue to illegally operate their business. Simply put, there must be repercussions for hosts that do not register. If platforms refuse to list these illegal units, hosts will be forced to register in order to continue doing business. The framework put forth by the draft ordinance is necessary to ensure compliance with the law.

It is also fair and necessary to require hosting platforms to transmit basic information about their sites in order to facilitate the collection of Transient Occupancy Taxes and help with enforcement. Disclosure is limited to discreet and non-confidential information such as the (1) rental address, (2) rental rate, and (3) how many nights the unit will be rented. Every single business in the City of Los Angeles is required to have a business license and pay proper taxes, and the hosting platforms should not be given a free pass. Concerns that submittal of this information constitutes an invasion of privacy or that personal information will be leaked on the internet are baseless and unfounded. The information necessary to collect TOT is not personal or confidential in nature, and the use of this argument is simply an unjustified fear-mongering technique. It should also be noted that the platform itself holds far more extensive and sensitive information on its customers/hosts, and presents a greater privacy danger.

II. Preservation of RSO & Affordable Housing

Short-term rentals have had and will continue to have a disastrous effect on the supply of housing at all income levels if left unchecked. If short-term rental platforms continue to proliferate without regulation, we will continue to see our housing supply constrict and rental costs rise. Perhaps most importantly, we stand to completely diminish Los Angeles' valuable RSO housing stock.

Thus, we are encouraged to see that the ordinance contains a prohibition against the short-term rental of RSO units as well as dedicated affordable housing units. This prohibition is an integral component of the ordinance, and we cannot overemphasize its importance. Without this critical piece, there will be no mechanism able to control the wave of illegal evictions that are happening today and will continue to occur, forcing out vulnerable tenants and families all over Los Angeles. Rent stabilized residents are especially vulnerable to landlord harassment, and we are very happy to see that the City has taken this into consideration when drafting the ordinance.

Furthermore, if rent-stabilized units are allowed to short-term rent, it would make an already challenging enforcement problem even more difficult. It would effectively incentivize illegal subletting, illegal kick-backs, and more unjust evictions. It would also elicit charges of hypocrisy when the City tries to raise money for affordable housing. After all, how can the City claim an urgent need if it allows affordable housing to be converted into vacation rentals?

III. Enforcement

Enforcement is the most challenging aspect of this issue. As time goes on and the City works to refine its system to regulate short-term rentals, it is crucial that the City set-aside the appropriate financial resources and personnel to enforce this ordinance to protect our neighborhoods and rein in scofflaws.

As we stated earlier, the most crucial and cost-effective enforcement tool is the requirement that hosting platforms not post illegal listings on their websites. Without this integral component of the ordinance, the City's enforcement requirements will balloon from needing a few management analysts to track the ordinance to an entire arm of a department. For example, the Santa Monica City Council (whose ordinance does not require platforms to remove illegal listings) set aside a budget of \$410,029 for a dedicated three-person enforcement team. Within a few weeks of implementation, Santa Monica quickly understood the nature of the beast they were facing, and found it difficult to enforce its ordinance because hosts quickly found ways around the regulations and resources were too limited.

In addition, there is no cohesive system in place that will direct traffic between the various departments that have a hand in regulating short-term rentals – Planning, Housing & Community Investment Department, Building & Safety, and even LAPD. Many questions still remain unanswered, such as which department will serve as the primary point of contact and who will have final authority over the issuance of fines, code enforcement, platform violations, and other related issues.

Lastly, our final point has more to do with *compliance* than enforcement. In every other jurisdiction in which they operate, platforms such as Airbnb and HomeAway have been oppositional in both behavior and attitude regarding attempts to regulate their industry. The platforms have repeatedly thumbed their noses at officials in New York, San Francisco, and Portland, and ignored requests to get hosts to comply with the new restrictions. Los Angeles must have the political steadiness and wherewithal to sternly enforce its regulations, stand by the fine structure, set aside adequate funding for enforcement, and require compliance from both platforms and hosts.

IV Private Right of Action

Because of the City's limited resources for enforcement and the limitations of the complaint driven enforcement model, we believe a private right of action is essential to allow property owners and neighbors to take action to enforce the ordinance. The prevailing party should be entitled to reasonable legal fees. This will allow private citizens to get the legal help they need to pursue a claim and at the same time discourage frivolous suits against home sharers who would be entitled to legal fees for defending themselves against frivolous claims.

V. 90 Day Home-Share Cap

To help determine whether the appropriate cap is 90 days, it would also be worthwhile to look into what is the average number of nights per year that a host shares their home. As indicated by AirBnB's own study entitled "The Impact of Home Sharing in Los Angeles," hosts in Los Angeles only share their home 60 nights a year on average. Increasing that number by 30 days, as the draft ordinance does, could unnecessarily create additional burdens on the community and neighboring residents.

We stand with Los Angeles residents, neighborhood associations, the hospitality industry, housing organizations, and labor unions in strong support of this policy and the process moving forward. Thank you for your consideration in this matter, we look forward to continue working with you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Judith Goldman".

Judith "Judy" Goldman
Keep Neighborhoods First

Cc: Mayor Eric Garcetti
City Attorney Mike Feuer
Councilmember Paul Krekorian
Councilmember Bob Blumenfield
Councilmember David Ryu
Councilmember Paul Koretz
Councilmember Nury Martinez
Councilmember Felipe Fuentes
Councilmember Marqueece Harris Dawson
Councilmember Curren Price
Councilmember Herb Wesson
Councilmember Mike Bonin
Councilmember Mitch Englander
Councilmember Mitch O'Farrell
Councilmember Jose Huizar
Councilmember Joe Buscaino
Los Angeles City Planning Commission
Vincent Bertoni
Claire Bowin
Matthew Glesne



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Travel Tech Letter RE: CF#14-1635-S2 CPC-2016-1243-CA

1 message

Matthew Kiessling <mkiessling@traveltech.org>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 2:23 PM

To: "matthew.glesne@lacity.org" <matthew.glesne@lacity.org>, "cpc@lacity.org" <cpc@lacity.org>, "justin.wesson@lacity.org" <justin.wesson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>, "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, "tricia.keane@lacity.org" <tricia.keane@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Dear President Ambroz, Vice President Wilson and Members of the Planning Commission,

The Travel Technology Association (Travel Tech) is the trade association for online travel companies, global distribution systems and short-term rental platforms. Our members include well-known short-term rental companies such as Expedia/HomeAway and VRBO, TripAdvisor/FlipKey, and Airbnb. As you are aware, short-term rental technology companies have created a vibrant marketplace for travelers and property owners, expanding the travel landscape by offering alternative accommodations and providing economic benefits to many communities around the world. With that in mind, Travel Tech writes to voice its concern with the Planning Department's staff recommendations for a draft ordinance to regulate short-term rentals in Los Angeles.

Travel Tech believes that municipal legislation that seeks to deputize Internet platforms for enforcement purposes, by either stating or implying the need for these platforms to police and regulate third party users under the threat of punitive consequences from local government, is a flawed and short-sighted approach to enforcing municipal laws.

Collectively, our members help owners, operators, and hosts connect travelers with hundreds of thousands of properties around the globe. In the United States alone there are nearly forty thousand municipalities, many of whom have existing ordinances or regulations that are specifically designed for, or may be applicable to short-term rentals. With that in mind, expecting short-term rental platforms to determine the status or legality of a specific property listing is virtually impossible to achieve with any accuracy, which renders the proposed ordinance unfeasible.

But beyond the lack of workability, it is even more important to recognize that holding short-term rental platforms accountable for user-generated content flies in the face of the very underpinnings of the federal law that has governed the liability of platforms and users for nearly two decades. The legal certainty provided by Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act established an environment that promotes innovation and has allowed the Internet to thrive.

Congress passed Section 230 in 1996, addressing the treatment of online service providers and platforms, stating, "No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider" (47 U.S.C. § 230). This ensures that an Internet service or platform is not recognized as the publisher when facilitating the speech of a third party. Many courts have upheld a broad interpretation of this law, declaring that intermediaries are not held liable for user-generated content. In short, Section 230 has been enormously important to the growth of the Internet by providing legal certainty to an ever-expanding world of Internet services, including but not limited to social

media, blogs, consumer review sites and forums, search engines, audio and video hosting platforms, online marketplaces, and in the case of our members, travel and accommodations intermediaries and platforms.

The proposed recommendations would require platforms to vet the eligibility of listings and prevent, remove, and cancel any non-compliant listings. The failure to do so would result in fines for the platform. This clearly imposes a level of liability on short-term rental platforms and undermines the preemption contained in Section 230 that "no liability may be imposed under any State or local law," by the passage of laws in direct conflict with it. In a larger context, should state and local governments begin creating a series of laws inconsistent with Section 230, the result would be a legal quagmire that leaves the cities, the platforms, the hosts and travelers in a state of legal and operational uncertainty, benefitting no one.

Furthermore, local governments should not be in the business of picking and choosing whose property rights to protect and to what degree. Widely recognized as fundamental property rights, is the ability to buy, rent or sell one's home. Limiting renting, beyond simple registration and/or an inspection, effectively removes one of those three core rights. Infringing on a homeowners' ability to rent their property sets a dangerous precedent. Practically speaking, in cities throughout the country, occupancy and residency requirements for short-term rentals have proven both ineffective and unenforceable, and implementing these requirements merely creates the illusion of regulation rather than concrete policy solutions.

It is also worth noting that even though the staff's recommendations would provide for a formalized tax scheme, as currently constructed, millions of dollars in transient occupancy taxes presently being collected by the city of Los Angeles on short-term rentals would disappear from the city's revenue stream with the elimination of secondary or traditional vacation rentals.

We recognize that, as with any new and growing industry, the city must establish regulations regarding short-term rentals. However, efforts to create a regulatory framework for short-term rentals must adequately address enforcement and compliance without undermining the legal foundation upon which Internet providers, platforms, and homeowners have come to rely for protection. As such, we urge the City Planning Commission to reconsider these recommendations and instead seek a public policy proposal that promotes innovation and recognizes the value of short-term rentals to the city of Los Angeles.

Travel Tech and its member companies are available to the city as a resource, and we would welcome the opportunity to work with the City on short-term rental regulation.

Sincerely,



Matthew Kiessling

The Travel Technology Association



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

paula chorley <paulachorley@earthlink.net>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 1:26 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org

CF#14-1635-S2 council file number

CPC-2016-1243-CA planning commission file number

Dear Mr. Glesne,

At the beginning of 2015 I had to have knee surgery which required me to go home to Houston for a few months. I had my primary residence during that time to help while not working and incurring medical costs. My job requires me to be very physically active. I am a dog walker. Since then my other knee is also having issues and required therapy and was also hospitalized for stomach problems. So now I have been sharing my extra room out which has been such a GREAT aid in helping me pay my rent while I am recovering from all of these issues as well as while I gradually get back on my feet.

My experience has been nothing but positive, having wonderful people part of a safe community which have been reviewed by peers. These people have a more authentic experience while traveling while supporting me during a difficult time.

I frankly don't know what I will do to keep my head afloat if the opportunity to do this is taken away from me.

I am not a wealthy person who is buying properties and renting them out on airbnb for a profit as a business. I am just a person who was lucky to have an extra room in my house that I could share with travelers in exchange for some money to put towards my rent during a hard time. And the 3 other people I know who homeshare are in the same situation as I am. Just trying to survive and found an amazing way to supplement their income.

I have also used airbnb twice to take a few close excursions on a budget. I would never have been able to afford these experiences otherwise and met wonderful people doing the exact same thing that I am doing. I imagine other travelers coming to LA are in the same boat.

With that said I also have concerns about this draft restricting me to one listing on my primary residence. I also share my entire house when I travel and need both of these options to cover my costs of living.

I hope that this letter will have some bearing in any changes that are being considered for the future of my ability to use airbnb. If I can not continue to use it, I think I will be forced to use craigslist which does not have the sense of security that airbnb provides for a single girl living on her own.

Regards,
Paula Chorley



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

PRO Home Sharing CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Constantine Vlahos <vlahos@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 1:41 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org

Council File Number: CF #14-1635-S2

Planning Commission file number: CPC-2016-1243-CA

Dear Mayor Garcetti, Los Angeles City Council and Matthew Glesne,

It is a scandal that the Los Angeles City Council is proposing to limit cash strapped citizens from renting out a room in their very own home to 90 days per year and is proposing to fine anybody who breaks this law with a \$2000/day fine.

Meanwhile, one of your own, my long time council member Tom LaBonge absconds with taxpayer money, destroys the evidence before leaving office, and the City Council does nothing.

Last I heard, Tom LaBonge took a job with the very hotel industry that is the real and only force pushing for limits on Home Sharing in Los Angeles,

Incidentally, the anti-home sharing agenda was kicked off by Ann Marie Johnson in Silver Lake in 2014, who was then on the staff of City Council Member Tom LaBonge. The Silver Lake pro-Home Sharing residents incited by Ann Marie Johnson's effort, organized and went on to throw out 14 of the 17 council members and replace them with a pro-home sharing slate of candidates in the biggest voter turnout election in Silver Lake memory.

Therefore this home sharing issue has been voted on in the city of Los Angeles and the people have clearly spoken in favor.

Lastly, I would like to point out that American public is totally broke. None other than the Federal Reserve Board conducted a consumer study (link below) that found that 48 percent of Americans said that they could completely cover a hypothetical emergency expense costing \$400 without selling something or borrowing money.

<http://www.federalreserve.gov/econresdata/2014-economic-well-being-of-us-households-in-2013-executive-summary.htm>

American citizens are tapped out, in debt and desperately searching for ways to make ends meet. Against this backdrop, the Los Angeles City Council wants to limit people's ability to rent out a room in their very own home. To add insult to injury, you want to fine us \$2000/day for committing this victimless crime. It truly begs believability that our elected representatives could be this out of touch with their constituents and plainly working to further the agenda of the multinational hotel industry to the direct detriment of the citizenry.

I don't have words to express how enraged I feel that my elected representatives want to restrict me (who pays plenty of property tax) from renting out a room in my home. If passed, it will force me to either sell my house or rent out the entire house and find a rental apartment.

Sincerely,
Tim Vlahos
Los Feliz



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2 Host needs Airbnb income (too tired and pregnant to return to high school teaching)

1 message

Chloe Prentoulis <chloeprent@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 2:53 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org,

councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org

June 6 2016

CF#14-1635-S2

CPC-2016-1243-CA

To whom it may concern,

I'm a homeowner and AirBnb host writing to describe the wonderful ways Airbnb has enhanced my life.

I currently live in a four bedroom home with a detached guesthouse. The guesthouse makes a wonderful place to stay for visitors (both my own friends and Airbnb paying guests) even though it is an 'unrentable' (for long term renters) unit due to the fact that it has no personal parking spot. The income I've received renting out this guesthouse on Airbnb has saved me from (simply put) going broke. I left teaching a year ago to pursue motherhood and simultaneously my partner was laid off from his job. He has been working hard for a year to raise money for a startup, to little avail. If we didn't have the opportunity to earn from the short term rental of our property we would have incurred massive debt and I would've had to return to a career I'm frankly exhausted from. Thanks to the ability to use this asset we've had a great year of hosting happy guests and drawing money into our neighborhood. Not a single guest has thrown a party, disturbed our neighbors or damaged property.

In summary, AirBnb has provided the following benefits:

- Income on an asset that would otherwise sit idle and empty
- Economic contribution to my personal household and my neighborhood
- Major source of relief for circumstances that would otherwise be financially and emotionally very stressful
- A convenient and enjoyable resource for travelers

As I see it, there are no disadvantages to my small business as an STO host:

- The space I am renting is legally unrentable to a long term tenant
- It's my own property and I'm using it to avoid incurring debt and hardship
- There are very few hotels in this neighborhood which means a potential loss of tourism if the supply of affordable accommodation is short/expensive

- No one is disturbed by the Airbnb guests because I carefully vet who stays at my home, providing personalized service to respectful guests

I'd be happy to pay taxes for this privilege. I'd also willingly comply with regulation that ensures Airbnb is being utilized by conscientious hosts who are using this innovative tool to make ends meet and provide a personalized experience to guests. I do not favor regulation that caps the number of days we can rent out our property or force us to share our property, which clearly doesn't make sense in my case given that I'm renting a small detached guesthouse.

Thanks for your attention,

Chloe Prentoulis

949 636 4969

Chloe Prentoulis
(949) 636-4969



Airbnb Host Chloe P.pdf

42K

Multiple Listings, Advertising, Privacy and the 90 Day Cap

Council file number: CF#14-1635-S2

Planning commission file number: CPC-2016-1243-CA

Good evening, thank you for reading this.

Multiple Listings

I list my apartment twice, once for the room and once for the whole apartment. The whole apartment gets rented when we travel and also in harder times to cover additional expenses (we sleep elsewhere). The limit on multiple listings is probably in there to prevent landlords listing multiple places.

Solution: The primary residence restriction fixes that.

Please keep the ordinance simple and don't restrict us from listing our home in the way that best works for us.

Changing Platforms

I get fined if I wake up one day and decide to try a different platform!!!???

Do you really want to hinder me from being able to choose the best platform to advertise on? Make me go through the rigmarole of visiting different government offices each time I want to try a different platform?

Is this in alignment with a capitalist free market? Reporting to government on who you advertise to share your second room with?

Why not just let us advertise our home on any platform we think will work best for us? Let us change platforms as a competitive market would require?

Issue: How to police evil home sharers.

Solution: Recognize we're not evil. Don't police except in extreme cases. It's an age old thing to share your home and receive some payment for it.

The 90 Day Limit Is Essentially A Ban For Almost All Home Sharers

At the recent hearing on the planned ordinance the 90 day limit was the most disputed point. Such a shock was this limit that it overshadowed the many other issues in the ordinance.

Most hosts are hosting people in their homes because they need the money. It's the people who are trying to make ends meet. The 90 day limit stops these people from being able to do this.

There may be other limits through the myriad of other ordinances and regulations out there but they can be addressed and fixed as they arise.

Solution: Setting primary residence as a requirement addresses the issue of landlords converting whole buildings. The 90 day limit is unnecessary.

Banks, landlords and city councils don't stop demanding payments, rent and taxes after 90 days. Why would you even consider stopping us from earning money after 90 days!?

A common concern is that home sharing might destroy the neighborhood.

My experience has been that guests are simply amazing people. I've not had any issues with the hundreds I've hosted. Though I have had issues with neighbors who are long term tenants. Noise and craziness are the main issues.

A place like Venice is then cited. Venice is however not a good example as it is a unique place that attracts millions of tourists each year. Venice benefits from billions of dollars of tourist money. What comes with that is people want to visit there on vacation. They want short term rentals.

The changes in Venice come from other things as well including gentrification.

The requirement of primary residence addresses the issues some Venetians complain of.

Funny thing is that a hallmark of the old Venice was high crime rates. There were places police and police helicopters would not go because of snipers. Yes the character of Venice has changed, for better and for worse. That's life.

The other place where a local community has been affected by drama around short term rentals is Playa Del Rey. But home sharing is not the cause there, it's crazy histrionics. People not getting on with each other. People with money and time to fight each other, repeatedly call inspectors as harassment etc rather than just getting on with life.

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

CC: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Anna-Pia Hubacher <annapiahub@yahoo.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 4:38 PM

Reply-To: Anna-Pia Hubacher <annapiahub@yahoo.com>

To: "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>, "matthew.glesne@lacity.org" <matthew.glesne@lacity.org>, "cpc@lacity.org" <cpc@lacity.org>, "justin.wesson@lacity.org" <justin.wesson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, "Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

The council file number: CF#14-1635-S2

The planning commission file number: CPC-2016-1243-CA

My husband and I, and our daughter, rent out 2 rooms in our house as home sharing. We live in our house full time. We fully support home sharing as a business. It helps us greatly, and provides a great experience for people from around the world. They love it. We love it.

Home sharing has allowed my family to stay in our home in Del Rey during business hardships over the last year. It has been a **critical income support as our small business has been reorganized**. Without this we would have had to interrupt and disrupt our child's schooling system and move away. We consider ourselves a contributor to our local community. Having a 90 day limit would not make it possible for to stay here. **And that would cause emotional and financial stress for not only our child but us as well. We have lived in this area for 30+ years. We are the local people and we care about our area.** It is important to keep people like us here as we are the backbone of this area and are involved in many ways in keeping the area safe and family friendly.

We are extremely vigilant in who we allow to stay with us. People who stay with us are the finest people from mostly Europe and Asia. We screen them prior to coming, we meet them upon arrival, we rate them on the hosting website, and they rate us. We have a 5 star rating for over 90% of our customers. And, we offer high ratings to our clients. They are 100% quiet, polite, respectful, upscale, friendly and great people, we have never had any problems, ever. These people improve our communities, and enhance our connection with the world. Also, This has caused us to keep our property in tip top shape which we previously have not done so. **Not only has our home sharing benefited foreigners but also those people who have family nearby and there is no space for them in their homes.**

Our guests are advised by us to patronize local businesses. They shop at many, including Sports Chalet, J. Nichols, Pavilions, Fresh in the Box, Rainbow Acres, Barnes and Nobles, Maxwells Café, the Marina Shopping Center, and many others too numerous to name. We contribute hundreds of references annually to our very local, walking distance businesses.

Our house is cleaner than it ever has been, improving our neighborhood all time.

We are not changing the character of our neighborhood. **Our neighborhood is supported and enhanced. Our neighbors support our business.** We contribute to local business. We live in a highly diverse society in Los Angeles, with wonderful people of all types and nationalities living closer together. Such is the community of Del Rey. Our guests easily fit into our community, and with respect and interest and appreciation for what we provide them.


We approve of taxing and using that tax to help the homeless.

Please do not displace our family. It would be a serious hardship to leave our communities.

We are for disallowing investors from purchasing buildings and turning them into vacation rentals.

Ideally, we have turned our financial situation around so we no longer need to homeshare. Our preference is to not to that. But in the interim we need that income.

Sincerely,
Anna Hubacher

 homesharingjun616.docx
13K

CF#14-1635-S2
CPC-2016-1243-CA

Dear Councilman Ryu,

I am writing to ask you to consider people like me when you draft the final legislation regarding home sharing. I am a US Navy veteran who served 10 years, and I am a resident of Los Angeles in a neighborhood adjacent to Hollywood.


I left the financial security and stability of the military in 2013 to pursue my passion of acting and voice over full-time. Based on my savings, I was able to afford to furnish a comfortable apartment in LA that I shared with a roommate. He met his wife and moved out, which I fully supported, but it left me with a rent bill that I could no longer afford. I took the hit for a few months, but soon was out of money and deeply in credit card debt. Home sharing became an option that was born out of necessity.

I have been hosting guests from around the world in my second bedroom for approximately 8 months, and it has been a wonderful experience! I have been able to recommend restaurants and businesses in the community to my guests, while giving them a view of what the neighborhood and LA has to offer. I have hosted other aspiring musicians, filmmakers, and artists who have been interested in ultimately making a move to this great city to pursue their dreams. My guests have provided me with inspiration, and vice-versa. A few have recently taken permanent residence in Los Angeles, and we remain close friends.

Home sharing has provided my guests with an affordable and personalized experience while in LA, and it has provided me with the opportunity to continue to follow my heart while staying in my current home and not having to relocate. Relocation is also not currently a feasible option for me due to the fact that my income and credit report when I qualified for my current place was considerably higher.

I am not making a profit with home sharing, or planning on investing in any more apartments to share. I am merely trying to offset the cost of my high rent without a permanent roommate while taking the opportunity to meet great people who are interested in this wonderful city. Limiting my ability to share my home to only 90 days per year will create a serious hardship for me. Please take my story and the stories of other's who share their homes into consideration, and pass legislation that allows us to continue to survive while we work toward our career goals. Thank you!

Sincerely,



Mahdi "Mac" Cocci



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF #: 14-1635-S2

1 message

Holly Werlwas <hwerlwas@yahoo.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 4:13 PM

Reply-To: Holly Werlwas <hwerlwas@yahoo.com>

To: "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>, "matthew.glesne@lacity.org" <matthew.glesne@lacity.org>, "cpc@lacity.org" <cpc@lacity.org>, "justin.wesson@lacity.org" <justin.wesson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>

Cc: "Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

LOS ANGELES CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

RE: CASE NUMBER: CPC-2016-1243-CA

CF #: 14-1635-S2

Proposed Zoning Code Amendment

June 6, 2016

ATTN: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org

I am writing this letter in response to the proposal that is being considered for regulating the short-term rental industry in Los Angeles. My husband and I own a duplex in Venice Beach. We live in the upper half and rent the lower half out as a long-term rental. We also rent out a spare bedroom in our own unit on Airbnb.

We attended the meeting downtown a few weeks ago.

It seemed most of the people who spoke up were against the 90-day rental per year limit. We are also against it. I don't know who came up with the arbitrary number of 90 days, but it will not make sense for us financially to continue hosting for just 90 days per year.

As for the registering of guests and payment of fees to rent out a room in our own home; I am offended and annoyed that the city wants me to help finance the homeless crisis by providing them with guests that spend money all over town. If that is the case, then all home based businesses should be required to pay additional fees for the homeless as well. However, if we are required to collect a city tax from each booking, then I think the amount should be shown on the website when they book a room (similar to sales tax) and Airbnb could then collect it and submit it to the city.

I was born here, my husband has lived in Venice for 15 years and recently lost his job due to his company closing their office in Los Angeles and moving it out of state. If we don't find work soon—we will be part of the homeless population. We already pay federal and state taxes on the money we receive from *renting out a spare bedroom*. Additionally, we paid close to \$10,000 in property taxes last year on our home and will again this year.

The total amount of money I earned from Airbnb last year was not even remotely close to enough money to live on. It is just barely enough money to help keep things going until we can find work.

Recent studies have shown a dramatic increase last year in the percentage of visitors to Los Angeles. I have guests from all over the world tell us that they would not be staying in Los Angeles at all if not for Airbnb. They say the only reason they're here for a few days is because I'm charging them so much less than the nearby hotels who want \$300-400+ per night. They can't afford it. Their plane may land here, but every single guest we've had has not made Los Angeles their destination. They want to see Yosemite or the Grand Canyon or San Diego. They do spend quite a bit of money shopping here though.

Depending on the amount of these fees, the amount I charge them will have to go up, which will make the bookings go down, so we will not continue to host.

If the city and county want to tell us what we can and can't do in our own home, where does it end? Why would I have to register myself or my guests? For what? Why is 90 days the magic number? What is the desired outcome of all of these regulations? In other words, what is it that all these ordinances are hoping to achieve and why will these make this city a better place to live?

Is it to stop building owners who are converting units to short term rentals? I hear a lot of people complaining of this going on, however no one seems to say who they are? Why aren't they identified so people will know what they're doing? Building owners who choose to evict tenants for an opportunity to rent to short term renters should be identified and stopped. And that should be the issue. It shouldn't be a blanket ordinance regulating everyone else.

I realize that you have received a ton of letters on this issue and I apologize for making this so long, but I really think this problem is not a problem that should warrant so much attention with all of the real problems going on.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Holly Lisa Werlwas



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Subject: Please don't decrease my ability to host CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Amanda Mandelcorn <omgdada@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 5:24 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org

The council file number: CF#14-1635-S2

The planning commission file number: CPC-2016-1243-CA

Dear Mayor Garcetti, Councilmember David Ryu,

Being an Airbnb host has been a wonderful part of my life and I disagree with the ordinance.

Reduction in Housing Stock

My airbnb has an overwhelming amount of longer stay guests sometimes staying for just under a month and are often future la renters and home buyers. They are looking for a place to settle while looking for their primary residence. Their stay being shorter than 30 days but longer than a few days or weeks makes them this weird in-between. Lowering the amount of days an airbnb host can rent their space is essentially creating the problem of a reduction in housing stock as apposed to solving the problem.

Limiting the rental of my airbnb to 90 days a year.

Airbnb has allowed me to get an education and has taught me the basics of having my own business. Limiting the rental to 90 days would effect me by decreasing the amount of funds I can put towards my education and starting my business. It would also take away funds used to improve the property and make this neighborhood and home a more attractive place to live.

Ultimately, I get to meet some amazing people who are going through a very big part of their lives and I feel grateful to be apart of it. Please don't decrease my ability to do this and to afford my education.

Thank you,

Amanda Mandelcorn