

June 6, 2016

To: The City of Los Angeles

Planning Department Los Angeles, Cal. 90066

From: William Ballerini

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 a self employed photographer
- Past Board Member of the NCWP
- Very active in community

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.
- Flaws 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. 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.

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,

William Ballerini

7369 West 87th Place

Westchester, CA 90045

June 6, 2016

To: The City of Los Angeles

Planning Department Los Angeles, Cal. 90066

From: Susan Herdzina

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:

- 10 year professor of English in LACCD
- Native of Omaha, NE. With a large family that visits often
- A future mother excited to raise our kids in a neighborhood I love.

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.
- **Flaws 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. 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.

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,

Susan Herdzina

7369 West 87th Place

Westchester, CA 90045



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Mansionization

1 message

Dean Okrand <dokrand@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 8:46 PM

To: wesson@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, vince.bertoni@lacity.org, tom.rothmann@lacity.org, ken.bernstein@lacity.org, craig.weber@lacity.org, nicholas.maricich@lacity.org, phyllis.nathanson@lacity.org, niall.huffman@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, areen.ibranossian@lacity.org, karo.torossian@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org, faisal.alseri@lacity.org, john.darnell@lacity.org, stopmansionization@yahoo.com, elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org
Cc: Elaine Loring <elaine.loring.consulting@gmail.com>

Dear City Council members and Planning Staff,

The first draft of amendments to the BMO/BHO made a good start. By almost 4 to 1, residents' responses supported the meaningful BMO reform outlined in Councilmember Koretz's original [motion](#).

But the latest draft takes a wrong turn by a) preserving loopholes (exemptions and bonuses) that undermined the ordinance in the first place, and b) borrowing elements from recode LA that make the ordinance more difficult to understand and enforce.

The process is off track and is falling behind: Mansionization is spoiling neighborhoods all over LA but Councilmember Koretz's motion (and the first draft of proposed amendments) provided the blueprint for a simple, effective, and reasonable fix that would allow renovations, expansions and new construction, while protecting our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by ugly, unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development.

Please, support *and champion* the intent of Councilmember Koretz's original motion. Ensure that the ordinance does not retain (or create new) harmful loopholes - or get so filled with technobabble that it becomes impossible to understand or enforce.

Your voices carry great weight in this matter. You have a wonderful opportunity to show that you have been listening to stakeholders across the city, and that you care about LA's precious residential neighborhoods. It's time for Los Angeles to put stable, sustainable communities ahead of real estate speculation, political pressure and other interests.

Sincerely,

Dean Okrand
Sherman Oaks
Council District 4



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Please Oppose the City's Proposed repeal of LA Municipal Code Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44...

1 message

Carey Smith <carelesscarey@att.net>

Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 8:47 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, Shawn.Kuk@lacity.org, Clare.Eberle@lacity.org, Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org, Doug.tripp@lacity.org, Hannah.lee@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, Gerald.Gubatan@lacity.org, Sergio.Infanzon@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Dear Councilman Huizar, Planning Director Kuk, Planning Deputy Eberle, Council member Englander, Chief Planning and Land Use Deputy Lee, Chief Legislative Deputy Tripp, Council member Cedillo, Senior Planning Deputy Cubatan, Planning Deputy Infanzon and Legislative Assistant Dickinson:

RE: CF #14-0057-S8

Please oppose the City's proposed repeal of Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44 and to instead retain the protections embedded within those code sections, particularly the prohibition on second dwelling units in Hillside Areas and on substandard streets. I am particularly concerned that the City Council is rushing the proposed repeal without giving our City's neighborhoods and residents an adequate opportunity to provide their input.

The repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances would result in the state's default standards for second dwelling units applying in every neighborhood in the City. This "one size fits all" approach is the wrong land use policy for a City with so many different neighborhoods and will have a negative and lasting impact on our single-family neighborhoods. A major policy decision such as the repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances should be considered only after a thorough study of the potential neighborhood impacts and the options available to the City.

I urge you to delay any action by the PLUM Committee until it has received a full analysis of the options that the City has to comply with state law, the policy implications of repealing the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances, and the potential negative impacts to our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Carey Anderson
carelesscarey@att.net