



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

SUPPORT – PROPOSED SHORT TERM RENTAL ORDINANCE CF #14-1635-S2

1 message

Matthew Beltran <MatthewBeltran-Community@outlook.com>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 10:31 AM

To: "countilmember.bonin@lacity.org" <countilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilmember Bonin:

I would like to applaud the work of you and your staff, as well as those in the Department of City Planning for the recently-released short-term rental ordinance. After years of frustration, I feel that the city is taking an affirmative step forward to control the negative impacts of the short-term rental industry.

The proposed language will help protect neighborhoods and preserve affordable and RSO housing. The ordinance holds host and platforms accountable, but still allows people to make their ends meet if needed.

I look forward to this ordinance being implemented in coming months.

CC:

Matthew Glesne, Department of City Planning
Claire Bowin, Department of City Planning
Tricia Keane, Office of Councilmember Mike Bonin
Justin Wesson, Office of Councilmember Herb Wesson
Sharon Dickinson, Office of City Clerk

Thank you for your time,

Matthew Beltran
Candidate for Secretary of the Venice Neighborhood Council
714-864-0455
matthewbeltran-community@outlook.com
Twitter: @Beltran4VNC



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Sweet Smiling <senyum@dslextreme.com>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 12:49 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

Re: CF#14-1635-S2

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

From:

Yvonne Elliott
2162 Willetta
Hollywood, CA 90068
323 309-2024

Were it not for vacation rentals, you would see me on Hollywood Boulevard pushing a shopping cart. I would lose my house. It's that simple.

My name is Yvonne Elliott and I have been home sharing since 2013.

I got caught up in the whirl of predatory lending when I refinanced my house to invest in my home furnishings business. My mortgage sky rocked from \$400 per month to \$4000. But business was good. I wasn't worried. Then came the financial collapse. Everything hit me at once. Business failure. My husband left me. Bankruptcy. At my age, I could not find a job which would begin to cover my overheads and my social security was a mere \$600 per month. Desperation could barely describe my state of mind. What to do?

The cavalry rushed in with the home sharing alternative. So, I rented out two spaces in my home to short term rentals. The money I earned covered my overheads. A gift from heaven.

With the proposed rule of renting for only 90 days and renting only one space, heaven's gift would be snatched away. I would be unable to pay my mortgage. I have virtually no equity in the house, so, selling it would not help. With only \$600 per month to live on, at 65 years old, I and would end up on the street.

On another point—many of my guests tell me were it not for vacation rentals, they would not have been able to afford to come to Los Angeles. I collect taxes and proudly pay around \$6000 to the city every year. Most of this comes from guests who would not otherwise have visited our city. If renting is restricted to 90 days and one rental space, at best, you can cut that amount in 8 and at worst (if I lose the house) reduce it to zero. So, the loss would not be to me alone, but to the city as well.

Therefore, I beg you on bended knees, to reconsider the terms of short term rentals.

Thank you,



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

My Comments on Proposed Home-Sharing Ordinance CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Arun Vir-Dawkins <sewingcircleproductions@gmail.com>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 2:23 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, fredy.ceja@lacity.org

Dear Mayor Garcetti, Mathew Glesne, Justin Wesson, Sharon Dickinson and Etta Armstrong,

My name is ArunKaur Dawkins and I am an Airbnb Host. I would love to share my comments on the recent draft ordinance which I hope will be read before the May 21st hearing.

I am a proud Los Angelian... and have lived in my current neighborhood for just under 20 years. My neighborhood has seen some great changes and of course Los Angeles has become a very different City than the one I knew when I first arrived in LA.

I am a writer, mother and for many years I was a single mother. My daughter recently graduated Berkeley and my son is starting high school. Being an Airbnb Host has literally liberated me from having to keep 2-3 jobs in my field. I work in production and when I can get work I will sometimes be away from 6am to midnight. It's also feast or famine in our industry and most of the year I am not gainfully employed. Because of my ability to host guests in our small one bedroom apartment we are able to stay above water with our mortgage and help keep our home and family together. And the biggest benefit is that I am not having to take 2-3 jobs a week just to make enough money to pay our bills and high mortgage.

I love to be of service to people. This is one of my greatest gifts. The folks that come to stay are families, children visiting grandparents, mother's seeing their now grown children off to College -- yes, I have spent a bit of time hugging those mothers with tears in their eyes.... it has been one of most rewarding aspects of being an Airbnb host. I have been able to provide a cost-friendly place for entire families to come to Los Angeles and enjoy the City. We all know how costly it is for a entire family to travel together... we certainly don't afford vacations away and in a funny way, we feel Airbnb has bought so many people together from all part of the world, that sometimes the vacation is bought to you. When we receive a guest, we allow our guest to park in our driveway... we also give our guests a detailed list of places to eat, spend their money at stores and malls we like to go to.. etc... and based on their reviews and feedback we know they use our guidebook.

When we rented our space full-time to renters, we ordinarily had TWO renters parking cars on our street. This was not an issue as we live in a pretty quiet neighborhood, but it is not true to say that Airbnb is causing parking issues in my neighborhood. When we rent to Airbnb guests, about 40% of our renters do not have cars. They are either using Uber or Lyft.

As a member of my community, Airbnb hosting has allowed us to take care of repairs to our home... instead of waiting for years to afford new plumbing, we can pay for it by saving our income from hosting.

The 90 day limit you are proposing may work for some but for my family it would cut our income quite a bit. I include my Airbnb income as income on my taxes and so I feel like I am already paying my taxes, but if there was a new law that says I should pay a tax to the City, I am all in favor of doing so.

I am writing to ask you review the many benefits of Airbnb and its impact on LA City.

Thank you,

Yours sincerely,
Arun Kaur



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2 - Short Term Rentals in LA

1 message

Joshua Rehling <josh@joshuarehling.com>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 2:20 PM

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

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

To whom it may concern,

I've been a resident of Venice for the past 6 years. I bought a house here 5 years ago and it's my home. I own a small graphic design company which has been located in Venice for the past 6 years.

My property has a small guest house in the backyard, which I rent via Airbnb. The income that I bring in from the rental greatly helps me cover my mortgage and living expenses as Venice has been getting more and more expensive. I work from home and greet each guest as they arrive, and since I live up front, I'm here the whole time they are. It's not a hotel that I'm running, it's a very personal experience. I'm friends with all of my surrounding neighbors, and they all know I rent my guest house as well. Making sure my street/neighborhood stays family oriented is important to me and my guests respect that.

I've read through the proposed rules about home sharing and for the most part they seem to make sense and are fair. Paying taxes as any other business would, requiring a host to live on the property to avoid sudo-hotels, and most of the other proposals are all good things for home sharing. I have a problem with one item, however, which is the 90 rental days per year cap. I don't think it helps the neighborhood or the city, and instead it will hurt some of it's long time residents cover the rising cost of living.

I'm writing you to ask that you remove the 90 rental day per year cap from the proposal. If it were to be enacted, I would have trouble maintaining my lifestyle here in Venice and would have to entertain moving to a less expensive area or city.

Please feel free to contact me if you'd like to know more about my situation or hear more of my perspective. My cell is (415) 505-1218

Thanks for taking the time to read this, and I hope it makes a difference in your considerations.

Josh

Council file number: CF#14-1635-S2

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

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "recess".

Josh Rehling
recessdesign.com
415-505-1218

From: IraBelgrade@aol.com

Date: May 3, 2016 at 3:16:18 PM PDT

To: matthew.glesne@lacity.org

Cc: cpc@lacity.org, ken.bemstein@lacity.org, claire.bowin@lacity.org, jason.neville@lacity.org, amanda.daflos@lacity.org, steve.blau@lacity.org, arturo.chavez@lacity.org, jennifer.rivera@lacity.org, gerald.gubatan@lacity.org, claudia.rodriguez@lacity.org, ana.guerrero@lacity.org, kevin.keller@lacity.org, ashley.atkinson@lacity.org, renee.weitzer@lacity.org, julia.duncan@lacity.org, sarah.dusseault@lacity.org, adeena.bleich@lacity.org, ara.sargsyan@lacity.org, andy.rodriguez@lacity.org, linn.wyatt@lacity.org, david.weintraub@lacity.org, stanley.yu@lacity.org, helen@mas.la, elizabeth@mas.la, dff@jmbm.com, lj@kanel.com, mvalli@oxy.edu, jbell213@gmail.com

Subject: Re: Second Dwelling Unit (SDU) Ordinance - Staff Report and CPC Hearing

Matthew Glesne, Housing Planner
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Policy Planning and Historic Resources Division: Citywide Unit
200 North Spring Street, Rm. 667
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Matt,

I'm writing in response to this Dept. of City Planning report you sent me. As you well know, I'm a big supporter of repealing the old 1985 Granny Flat ordinance in favor of AB 1866 as a matter of strict urgency and I am attempting to fill the room with more supporters on May 12th just as I did for the Housing Committee session. However, there are two points made in the "Findings" section on page F-1 that I believe are inaccurate and contrary to Councilmembers Cedillo and Fuentes motion to facilitate ADU's and the unanimous City Council vote to direct departments to find ways to preserve unapproved units: 1 - "...that the state's standards require that City zoning requirements relating to height, setback, lot coverage, architectural review, and other applicable zoning requirements must be enforced" and 2 - that a 15ft/5ft rear and side yard setback with a 10 foot separation between buildings "offer significant protections against out of scale new development in single-family neighborhoods."

First, what the state accurately said in letter G of the attached Exhibit B in reference to when a municipality should grant ADU permits ministerially is "Requirements relating to height, setback, lot coverage, architectural review, site plan review, fees, charges, and other zoning requirements generally applicable to residential construction in the zone in which the property is located."

Secondly, there's no reference to anything needing to be "enforced" but in fact it's just the opposite: "zoning requirements *generally applicable*" is there to give municipalities broad flexibility in granting adjustments or variances when needed. Additionally the state says "This section does not limit the authority of local agencies to adopt less restrictive requirements for the creation of second units", which brings me to setbacks and parking.

As you know, I have spent months now preparing my variance application to change my C of O from Garage/Rec Rm to ADU, since I do not have the required setback or covered parking for my main house. In that time I have

documented, verified and photographed 25 unpermitted ADU's in my neighborhood area alone, and those were just the ones that I could visually see. The common obviously visible factors in all of them are that they don't have the required setback or the required covered parking for their main house. Two of the ones I found were two-story structures like my ADU, closer in size to my 1,190 sq. ft. and had less side setback than I have, both with zero setback. However, there was nothing "out of scale" with the ones I found just as there is nothing out of scale with mine on my 6,750 sq. ft property when viewed in comparison to the truly out of scale "McMansion" next door to me (please see attached photos). But the most significant issue is that if the various city departments are going to follow the directive of the city council to find ways to preserve unapproved units, it would be next to impossible to do that without eliminating the setback and covered parking requirements.

Lastly, what I have learned in my many months of preparing my variance application, is that in order to understand and complete it with the maximum possibility for approval, a person needs to have advance degrees in urban planning and architecture...neither of which I or most Angelino's possess, and a well funded rainy day bank account to cover the hefty fees...which I or most Angelino's don't possess either. If the city is going to take seriously the council directive to facilitate ADU's and find ways to preserve the thousands of unpermitted ADU's that exist in Los Angeles and also take seriously the states directive of having the provisions in these ordinances with regard to unit size, parking, fees and other requirements not be so arbitrary, excessive or burdensome, then everyone must start thinking seriously beyond the current emergency legislation to give all homeowners an easy way to legalize their unpermitted ADU's or build one from scratch if they so choose.

Sincerely,

Ira Belgrade
317 South Mansfield Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90036
cell: 818-519-0099
email: irabelgrade@aol.com

In a message dated 4/28/2016 5:46:01 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, matthew.glesne@lacity.org writes:

Interested Parties,

Please find the attached Staff Recommendation Report from the Department of City Planning regarding the proposed Second Dwelling Unit (SDU) repeal ordinance (CPC-2016-1245-CA). The ordinance would repeal subsections 12.24 W.43 and 12.24 W.44 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) for the purpose of complying with state law AB 1866 on Second Dwelling Units and grandfathering Second Dwelling Units permitted since June 23, 2003.

The item will be considered at the **5/12/16** meeting of the City Planning Commission, which will be held at 8:30 AM at City Hall, Board of Public Works Rm 350, at 200 N. Spring Street, 90012. We welcome your attendance and comments.

Written comments may be sent to the City Planning Commission by following the policy described here. You may also CC me.

If you have any questions on this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

—

Matthew Glesne, Housing Planner
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Policy Planning and Historic Resources Division: **Citywide Unit**
200 North Spring Street, Room 667, Los Angeles, 90012
matthew.glesne@lacity.org | 213.978.2666

3 attachments



317 s. mansfield front of property (left) showing adjacent northern property (right) IMG_0660.jpg
2140K



317 s. mansfield full view of ADU facing north west IMG_6860.jpg
3430K

 **Letter to Matthew Glesne re Staff report on SDU ordinance.doc**
27K



HOMEOWNERS OF ENCINO

"Serving the Homeowners of Encino since 1983"

GERALD A. SILVER
President
PO Box 260064
Encino, CA 91426
Phone (818)990-2757

May 3, 2016

Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Citywide Section, City Hall – Room 278
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

Hearing Date: May 12, 2016

cpc@lacity.org
james.k.williams@lacity.org
clerk.webfeedback@lacity.org
matthew.glesne@lacity.org

Subject: Proposed Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance CPC-2016-1245-CA

Homeowners of Encino (HOME) strongly objects to repealing the City's adopted Second Unit Ordinance. It is imperative that the CPC leave in place those standards while it studies new, improved second unit standards that will provide needed additional neighborhood protections. The Planning Department should immediately drop its proposal to repeal the City's adopted second unit standards. There is no urgency to act immediately.

Before addressing Homeowners of Encino's objections to the ordinance repeal, it is important to understand what the State mandates and what it does and does not require of Los Angeles. Government Code Sec. 65852.150 states:

"The Legislature finds and declares that second units are a valuable form of housing in California. *Second units provide housing* for family members, students, the elderly, in-home health care providers, the disabled, and others, at below market prices within existing neighborhoods. *Homeowners who create second units benefit from added income*, and an increased sense of security. It is the intent of the Legislature that any second-unit ordinances adopted by local agencies have the effect of providing for the creation of second units and that provisions in these ordinances relating to matters including unit size, parking, fees and other requirements, are not so *arbitrary, excessive, or burdensome* so as to *unreasonably restrict* the ability of homeowners to create second units in zones in which they are authorized by local ordinance."

(Added by Stats. 1994, Ch. 580, Sec. 1. Effective January 1, 1995.)

The constitutionality of zoning ordinances was upheld under the police power rights of state governments and *local governments* to exercise authority over privately owned real property. Clearly Government Code Sec. 65852.150 does more than merely induce housing. It encourages housing density as a money maker for those who seek to lease, rent or encourage short term tourist housing rentals. State law does not take over control of local housing regulations, nor restrict local housing regulations, as long as they are not "arbitrary", "excessive", "burdensome" or "unreasonably restrictive". Clearly Los Angeles has full domain to impose almost unlimited zoning rules and regulations as long as they are not "arbitrary", "excessive", "burdensome" or "unreasonably restrictive".

Homeowners of Encino has the following objections and concerns regarding the proposed repeal of the

City's adopted second unit standards:

1. The Planning Director's Report [May 12, 2016] on the proposed ordinance repealing the City's existing second unit standards is very misleading. It incorrectly asserts that the City cannot legally continue to administer its adopted second unit standards. According to Judge Chalfont, the City can continue to use its adopted standards -- just as it successfully did between 2003 and 2010, when it issued hundreds of second unit permits.

2. We strongly object to the proposed repeal ordinance because the City's adopted second unit standards provide important protections for surrounding neighborhoods that otherwise could be negatively impacted by second unit development. The adopted standards limit second units to a maximum size of 640 SF, and they forbid development of second units in designated "hillside" areas or that would be visible from the street. In contrast, the very weak State "default" standards that the proposed repeal ordinance would put into place would allow second units as big as 1,200 sq. ft. without any protections regarding the location or visibility of second units.

3. In 2002 because of AB 1866, local governments lost their ability to hold public hearings on second unit applications, to reject them or to impose mitigating conditions. This forced cities to approve second unit applications on a ministerial ("by right") basis, so long as the units meet their adopted local standards. Like other cities, Los Angeles can adopt new, improved local standards in order to better protect neighborhoods. Los Angeles standards could limit a second unit's maximum to 550 sq. ft. and could entirely forbid second units in areas where existing infrastructure capacity (e.g., traffic, sewers, water) cannot adequately serve increased residential density.

4. The asserted "emergency" is vastly overstated. According to the Director's Report, it would take approximately one year to study and adopt new, improved second unit standards. There is no reason why Los Angeles should not study and adopt a new, more protective second unit standards that reduce and or eliminate the negative impacts of second units on surrounding neighborhoods and that preclude second unit construction in areas with substantial infrastructure constraints. During this relatively short period, the City could enforce its existing adopted second unit standards to protect surrounding neighborhoods.

5. The Report contends that the City's existing adopted standards should not be enforced during this one-year period, because some applicants and developers "in the pipeline" would be inconvenienced. In fact, the Report contends that the proposed repealing ordinance needs to be passed on an "urgency" basis to protect these "in the pipeline" developers. But there is no "urgency," and the City should take sufficient time to allow public study and input on its proposed repeal of important existing neighborhood protections.

Unless an administrative appeal was timely filed, no builder with a second unit permit issued prior to the Superior Court's April 4th injunction is jeopardized, since the injunction is prospective only. The Report speculates that up to 175 developers may have already-issued permits in legal jeopardy, but it fails to note how many of these permits were issued prior to April 4th and how many of those have administrative appeals timely filed. The amount of housing stock that might be affected by the injunction in Los Angeles is minuscule and should not be the basis of a wholesale zoning change.


6. The Director's Report and the proposed repeal ordinance are premised on two fundamentally flawed economic premises. First, the Report asserts that repealing the City's adopted standards will increase the supply of second units and thus the amount of affordable housing within the City. But this assertion totally ignores the fact that repealing existing neighborhood protections might increase the number of second unit permits, at most, by the paltry amount of only about 30 permits per year -- not even a "drop in the bucket" given the Report's concession that the City needs to build many thousands of affordable units in the next few years. Certainly, this paltry amount is not sufficient to positively impact in any meaningful way the overall price of housing within the City. Further, none of the contemplated additional 30 second units that supposedly would be built under the lenient state "default" standards are proposed to have any imposed "affordability" constraints. Second unit developers' will set their rental charges at whatever the market will bear. In the great majority of the City's single family neighborhoods, new second units will rent at rates far beyond any affordability

criteria. Another rationale the Planning Dept contends that this will help low income, and “moderate income homeowners with supplemental income.” This is a fallacy as they will be the least likely to be able to finance such projects. This will thereby open up more affluent areas to SDU and jeopardize the quality of life in these areas thru higher density and a more transient population, with no roots or anchors in the community.

7. Second, the Report contends that a key positive result of abandoning neighborhood protections will be that applicants who build second units in accord with the weak “default” standards will be able to make more money -- thereby incentivizing additional residential construction. Unstated, however, is that, in seeking to maximize their profits, second unit developers operating under the state “default” standards will very likely list these units for short term rental on AirBNB and similar websites, thereby greatly magnifying potential negative impacts on surrounding neighborhoods. It is also conceivable that many low and middle income families seeking additional cash-flow from the SDU could fall prey to unscrupulous financing schemes that were so prevalent prior to the 2008 Financial Crisis.

8. The Director’s Report wrongly asserts that, even without the protections of the adopted second unit standards, only a relatively few second units will likely be in the high 1,200 SF range, will be overly visible from the street or will otherwise adversely impact their surrounding neighborhoods. The Superior Court expressly found that virtually the entire increase in second unit permits that began in 2010 (when the City began enforcing the lenient state “default” standards, rather than the City’s adopted standards) consisted of permits that substantially exceeded the adopted standards designed to protect surrounding neighborhoods.

Cordially yours,



Gerald A. Silver
President

Cc: Council offices
City Clerk



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Comments on Proposed Home-Sharing Ordinance CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Lisa Hoyle <hoyle.lisa@gmail.com>

Tue, May 3, 2016 at 1:33 PM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: Matthew Glesne <matthew.glesne@lacity.org>

Hello Sharon, Etta & Matthew

Thank you for sending out this draft ordinance. My name is Lisa Swift and I am an Airbnb host. I do have a few comments on the draft ordinance which I would like to respectfully submit for consideration.

I would like to start out by saying that I am very excited that an ordinance has been drafted - I (and many Airbnb hosts) are very eager for regulation to begin and for us to have clear rules to abide by. Overall I feel that the ordinance has a number of excellent items included such as the requirement to register as a home-sharing host, as well as the "Host Requirements" listed under Section E. I am also glad that all Airbnb hosts will be required to pay the Transient Occupancy Tax. In my own personal efforts to comply with city law, I have paid the TOT myself for all of my home-sharing activity since starting back in February of 2015.

However, there are a couple items that deeply concern me. Before I address these, I would like to share some background on my Home-Sharing story:

I am a mother of a special needs child - when my son was 2 months old we found out he has a rare genetic condition. Managing that condition with 7 therapy sessions a week (physical therapy, speech therapy and occupational therapy), in addition to ongoing doctor appointments (he sees a geneticist, neurosurgeon, ENT and orthopedist in addition to his regular pediatrician), has prohibited me from being able to return to work as I had expected before he was born. My husband and I were faced with the challenge of unexpectedly living on one income while also paying tens of thousands in medical bills for my son - at the beginning it seemed as though we would lose our home. Then we started renting out a small guest house in our backyard on Airbnb and that income has allowed us to stay in our home and pay our bills.

Our guest house is approximately 300 square feet and contains a bed, bathroom and closet. There is no kitchen so it would never be suitable for a long-term rental. However, it is listed on Airbnb as an "entire house" because it is a separate structure from our main house and provides privacy for guests. There are many Airbnb listings that are just like ours, so the notion that Airbnb is removing long-term housing from the market is totally false, because many of the Airbnb listings (like ours) could not be used for long term housing.

Now - to address the items on the Draft Ordinance that concern me:

The item of greatest concern to me is Item #3 under Section D - Prohibitions: the limitation of Home-Sharing to 90 days per calendar year. What is the reason for this limitation? It seems arbitrary and unnecessary given that hotels in the city of Los Angeles had a record year in revenue for 2015. My guest house was rented for 126 nights in 2015 - these rentals provided essential income for my family which has allowed us to continue paying our mortgage and stay in our home. Because my son's care makes me unable to hold a full-time job for the time-being, being an Airbnb host has become my job and I take it very seriously. The 90-day limitation seems to unfairly discriminate against people like me for whom home home-sharing is our business. A hotel does not have to limit their rentals to 90 days, why does a home-sharing host have to? Especially if a host is in compliance with ALL other requirements of the ordinance there should be no limitation. If a host ensures that there are no nuisance violations, pays all taxes, and provides a safe rental in compliance with all regulations of the ordinance, there should be no limitation on the number of days permitted to home share. I believe that by implementing this limitation, the City of Los Angeles will lose valuable tax revenue.

Guests who stay in my guest house have informed me that they would not otherwise be able to travel to LA were it not for affordable rentals on Airbnb. Home-sharing allows low-budget tourists to bring their tourism dollars to Los Angeles - funds that would otherwise be lost to more affordable travel destinations.

I respectfully implore you to please re-consider the 90-day Home-Sharing limitation.

The second item that concerns me Item #5 under Section D - Prohibitions: No person shall offer or engage in Home-Sharing in any part of the property not approved for residential occupancy, including but not limited to a vehicle parked on the property, a storage shed, recreation room, trailer or garage or any temporary structure like a tent. Although this issue does not apply to my personal situation, I think it is an unfair limitation. If a person wants to rent their RV and there is demand for such a rental, and the Host is otherwise in compliance with ALL the standards of the ordinance, then there should be no reason to restrict this type of rental. Please re-consider this limitation.

Thank you very much for taking the time to consider my comments. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to contribute.

Sincerely,
Lisa Swift

On Fri, Apr 15, 2016 at 12:02 PM, Matthew Glesne <matthew.glesne@lacity.org> wrote:

Interested Parties,

The Los Angeles Department of City Planning is pleased to present the proposed Home-Sharing Ordinance (HSO), which addresses the issue of short-term rentals in the City of Los Angeles (per CF 16-1435-S2). Attached you will find the draft Ordinance, the Public Hearing notice as well as a Quick Guide/FAQ to help understand the basics of the proposal.

The Home-Sharing ordinance will be presented for public comment at a Public Hearing on Saturday May 21 at 10am at the Deaton Auditorium downtown (please see the hearing notice for more details). Following this, the ordinance will be presented to the City Planning Commission for their consideration (most likely) at their meeting on Thursday June 23rd at 8:30 am in Van Nuys City Hall. You will be advised of that meeting, as well as provided a Staff Recommendation Report, two weeks prior to the meeting. If approved, the ordinance would then proceed to City Council Planning and Land Use Committee for their consideration.

You are also able to submit comments on the draft ordinance directly to me for staff consideration before June 6th (sooner the better). Written comments may also be sent directly to the City Planning Commission per their policy.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions on this matter.

--
Matthew Glesne, Housing Planner
City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Policy Planning and Historic Resources Division: Citywide Unit
200 North Spring Street, Room 667, Los Angeles, 90012
matthew.glesne@lacity.org | 213.978.2666



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

My Comments on Proposed Home-Sharing Ordinance CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Arun Vir-Dawkins <sewingcircleproductions@gmail.com>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 2:23 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, fredy.ceja@lacity.org

Dear Mayor Garcetti, Mathew Glesne, Justin Wesson, Sharon Dickinson and Etta Armstrong,

My name is ArunKaur Dawkins and I am an Airbnb Host. I would love to share my comments on the recent draft ordinance which I hope will be read before the May 21st hearing.

I am a proud Los Angelian... and have lived in my current neighborhood for just under 20 years. My neighborhood has seen some great changes and of course Los Angeles has become a very different City than the one I knew when I first arrived in LA.

I am a writer, mother and for many years I was a single mother. My daughter recently graduated Berkeley and my son is starting high school. Being an Airbnb Host has literally liberated me from having to keep 2-3 jobs in my field. I work in production and when I can get work I will sometimes be away from 6am to midnight. It's also feast or famine in our industry and most of the year I am not gainfully employed. Because of my ability to host guests in our small one bedroom apartment we are able to stay above water with our mortgage and help keep our home and family together. And the biggest benefit is that I am not having to take 2-3 jobs a week just to make enough money to pay our bills and high mortgage.

I love to be of service to people. This is one of my greatest gifts. The folks that come to stay are families, children visiting grandparents, mother's seeing their now grown children off to College -- yes, I have spent a bit of time hugging those mothers with tears in their eyes.... it has been one of most rewarding aspects of being an Airbnb host. I have been able to provide a cost-friendly place for entire families to come to Los Angeles and enjoy the City. We all know how costly it is for a entire family to travel together... we certainly don't afford vacations away and in a funny way, we feel Airbnb has bought so many people together from all part of the world, that sometimes the vacation is bought to you. When we receive a guest, we allow our guest to park in our driveway... we also give our guests a detailed list of places to eat, spend their money at stores and malls we like to go to.. etc... and based on their reviews and feedback we know they use our guidebook.

When we rented our space full-time to renters, we ordinarily had TWO renters parking cars on our street. This was not an issue as we live in a pretty quiet neighborhood, but it is not true to say that Airbnb is causing parking issues in my neighborhood. When we rent to Airbnb guests, about 40% of our renters do not have cars. They are either using Uber or Lyft.

As a member of my community, Airbnb hosting has allowed us to take care of repairs to our home... instead of waiting for years to afford new plumbing, we can pay for it by saving our income from hosting.

The 90 day limit you are proposing may work for some but for my family it would cut our income quite a bit. I include my Airbnb income as income on my taxes and so I feel like I am already paying my taxes, but if there was a new law that says I should pay a tax to the City, I am all in favor of doing so.

I am writing to ask you review the many benefits of Airbnb and its impact on LA City.

Thank you,

Yours sincerely,
Arun Kaur

May 13, 2016

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

Dear Councilman Koretz,

My name is Sharona Nahum, and I have lived in the McCarthy Vista area for the past nine years. I'm married, and a mother to four kids. The reason I'm writing is to let you know why I love home sharing, and why the regulations for this practice should be clear and flexible for hosts like myself.

Since I started hosting with Airbnb, I've been able to meet great tourists from all over the world who couldn't afford hotel prices and still wanted to travel with dignity and feel comfortable. We (my husband and I) as hosts offer our guests a nice place to stay and personalized recommendations on how to explore our neighborhood and the city (restaurants, museums, dry cleaners, spas, boutiques, and so on). My neighborhood benefits from home sharing, because the area businesses are patronized by our guests and other residents have the opportunity to interact with visitors from different backgrounds and cultures.

The additional income is also helpful for us, because property taxes here are not cheap. Hosting allows us to pay taxes in a timely manner, to cover necessary maintenance on our home, and to provide a good life for our children.

I ask that you and the other members of the Los Angeles City Council let us and other well-intentioned, considerate hosts continue to use home-sharing platforms like Airbnb without undue burdens like the lengthy, onsite registration process, the 90-day listing cap, and the confusing guest home regulations included in the recent draft ordinance released by the LA Planning Department.

Looking toward the future, I see only good things coming out of home-sharing, as long as we all work together to ensure bad actors are removed, and good hosts like myself are able to continue welcoming visitors to our neighborhoods in LA.

Thank you for considering your constituency in this matter, and look forward to hearing back from you.

Sincerely,
Sharon Nahum



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Zoe Wedderburn <zwedderburn@gmail.com>

Sat, May 14, 2016 at 11:15 AM

To: Mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, Matthew.glesne@lacity.org, Cpc@lacity.org, Justin@lacity.org,
Councilmembrr.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: Paul.koretz@lacity.org, Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, Etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Council file number - CF#14-1635-S2

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

Availability of short term rentals was so important to me multiple times last year, due to personal circumstances. as a los angelino with low income and hotels costing a fortune I would have been looking at a shelter for accommodation.

I've spoke to some of the hosts and renting out their spaces is a means of livelihood and very much needed income.

It benefits the city and has benefitted me immensely - I would hate to see these draconian restrictions applied to this ordinance. Totally unnecessary and will affect far to many people.

Thank you,
Zoe

--
Sent from Gmail Mobile



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2 - Short Term Rentals in LA

1 message

Joshua Rehling <josh@joshuarehling.com>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 2:20 PM

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

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

To whom it may concern,

I've been a resident of Venice for the past 6 years. I bought a house here 5 years ago and it's my home. I own a small graphic design company which has been located in Venice for the past 6 years.

My property has a small guest house in the backyard, which I rent via Airbnb. The income that I bring in from the rental greatly helps me cover my mortgage and living expenses as Venice has been getting more and more expensive. I work from home and greet each guest as they arrive, and since I live up front, I'm here the whole time they are. It's not a hotel that I'm running, it's a very personal experience. I'm friends with all of my surrounding neighbors, and they all know I rent my guest house as well. Making sure my street/neighborhood stays family oriented is important to me and my guests respect that.

I've read through the proposed rules about home sharing and for the most part they seem to make sense and are fair. Paying taxes as any other business would, requiring a host to live on the property to avoid sudo-hotels, and most of the other proposals are all good things for home sharing. I have a problem with one item, however, which is the 90 rental days per year cap. I don't think it helps the neighborhood or the city, and instead it will hurt some of it's long time residents cover the rising cost of living.

I'm writing you to ask that you remove the 90 rental day per year cap from the proposal. If it were to be enacted, I would have trouble maintaining my lifestyle here in Venice and would have to entertain moving to a less expensive area or city.

Please feel free to contact me if you'd like to know more about my situation or hear more of my perspective. My cell is (415) 505-1218

Thanks for taking the time to read this, and I hope it makes a difference in your considerations.

Josh

Council file number: CF#14-1635-S2

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

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "recess".

Josh Rehling
recessdesign.com
415-505-1218

Frank Lutz
P. O. Box 1078
Venice, CA. 90294 – USA
frankalutz@gmail.com

May 14, 2016

Regarding: **SUPPORT – PROPOSED SHORT TERM RENTAL ORDINANCE CF #14-1635-S2**

Follow-up letter

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilman Bonin,

One more matter of grave concern that I have me about the whole AirBnB and short-term rental disaster is this: In hotels, on-site security personnel are required in many locales, for certain hours during the day and/ or night, which seems sensible to me. In the current proposals before you, it seems to me that if a location is going to engage in short-term or overnight rentals, in an apartment building, where permanent residents live, that **there should be some sort of on-site security required**; this assumes that the building is only doing short-term rentals with non-RSO units. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Lutz,
Venice.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

SUPPORT – PROPOSED SHORT TERM RENTAL ORDINANCE CF #14-1635-S2

1 message

Jane <jteis@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 5:10 PM

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

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilmember Bonin:

I would like to applaud the work of you and your staff, as well as those in the Department of City Planning for the recently-released short-term rental ordinance. After years of frustration, I feel that the city is taking an affirmative step forward to control the negative impacts of the short-term rental industry.

The proposed language will help protect neighborhoods and preserve affordable and RSO housing. The ordinance holds host and platforms accountable, but still allows people to make their ends meet if needed.

I look forward to this ordinance being implemented in coming months.

The most important thing in my mind is the preservation of neighborhoods. Those that have rented their rooms and houses on Airbnb have operated illegally in the City of Los Angeles with no regard. They should all be held accountable for that, perhaps by charging them back TOT tax. Airbnb could be asked to make that payment since they are the company that aided and abetted them in that illegal activity by not cooperating with the City to provide the necessary data.

In San Francisco, Airbnb agreed and then paid millions of dollars of back taxes to the City to account for the back TOT tax when they legalized short term rentals. Since they agreed to do it in San Francisco, Airbnb must also do the same here in Los Angeles. Otherwise, you are rewarding illegal activity. There will be new hosts soon, some of whom would not have done so while it is illegal.

Do not reward those who have acted illegally by giving them amnesty for something that they knew and currently know is illegal. Especially the commercial operations should be forced to pay back TOT tax. Ignorance of the law is no excuse.

Sincerely,
Jane Taguchi
1963 Redesdale Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90039

CC:
Matthew Glesne, Department of City Planning
Claire Bowin, Department of City Planning
Tricia Keane, Office of Councilmember Mike Bonin
Justin Wesson, Office of Councilmember Herb Wesson
Sharon Dickinson, Office of City Clerk



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

SUPPORT – PROPOSED SHORT TERM RENTAL ORDINANCE CF #14-1635-S2

1 message

Susan Healy <healydesign@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 5:37 PM

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

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilmember Bonin:

I would like to applaud the work of you and your staff, as well as those in the Department of City Planning for the recently-released short-term rental ordinance. After years of frustration, I feel that the city is taking an affirmative step forward to control the negative impacts of the short-term rental industry.

The proposed language will help protect neighborhoods and preserve affordable and RSO housing. The ordinance holds host and platforms accountable, but still allows people to make their ends meet if needed.

I look forward to this ordinance being implemented in coming months.

CC:

Matthew Glesne, Department of City Planning

Claire Bowin, Department of City Planning

Tricia Keane, Office of Councilmember Mike Bonin

Justin Wesson, Office of Councilmember Herb Wesson

Sharon Dickinson, Office of City Clerk



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Thank you - Draft Ordinance on Short-term Rentals - CF#14-1635-S2

1 message

Daniel Inlender <daniel@inlender.net>

Fri, May 13, 2016 at 6:17 PM

To: tricia.keane@lacity.org, matthew.glesne@lacity.org, justin.wesson@lacity.org, Claire.bowin@lacity.org,

Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: jrgposte@aol.com

Dear Misses Keane, Bowin & Dickinson and Messrs. Glesne and Wesson,

As a follow-up to the voicemail messages I left last month, I wish to write a short note of appreciation for your efforts in producing L.A.'s draft ordinance on short-term rentals. As a native Angeleno in his mid-30's, I see this as one of the most important issues facing this great city. Your energies expended addressing this challenge are remarkable and valued.

While the draft ordinance is not perfect, it is definitely a step in the right direction. I particularly applaud the ordinance's: registration & disclosure requirements; the prohibition of short-term rentals of RSO units; and the stipulation that only primary residences can be made available for short-term rentals. The ordinance demonstrates your honest desire to reach fair resolutions via a transparent process. Your willingness to not only hear, but listen, to all stakeholders is admirable and a source of pride. This is a model to be replicated citywide and beyond.

Please accept my apologies that I cannot attend the public hearing for case number: CPC-2016-1243-CA on Saturday, May 21st. Had I been able to attend, I would have expressed my gratitude in person.

While the road ahead is long, and meaningful enforcement presents a sizeable challenge, I take comfort in your leadership. Like all Angeleno's, I pledge to do my part to ensure that Los Angeles continues to achieve success in its longing to provide a comfortable, safe and desirable home to all of its inhabitants.

With deep appreciation,

Daniel Inlender

E: daniel@inlender.net

T: 310.402.7171

May 13, 2016

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

Dear Councilman Koretz,

My name is Sharona Nahum, and I have lived in the McCarthy Vista area for the past nine years. I'm married, and a mother to four kids. The reason I'm writing is to let you know why I love home sharing, and why the regulations for this practice should be clear and flexible for hosts like myself.

Since I started hosting with Airbnb, I've been able to meet great tourists from all over the world who couldn't afford hotel prices and still wanted to travel with dignity and feel comfortable. We (my husband and I) as hosts offer our guests a nice place to stay and personalized recommendations on how to explore our neighborhood and the city (restaurants, museums, dry cleaners, spas, boutiques, and so on). My neighborhood benefits from home sharing, because the area businesses are patronized by our guests and other residents have the opportunity to interact with visitors from different backgrounds and cultures.

The additional income is also helpful for us, because property taxes here are not cheap. Hosting allows us to pay taxes in a timely manner, to cover necessary maintenance on our home, and to provide a good life for our children.

I ask that you and the other members of the Los Angeles City Council let us and other well-intentioned, considerate hosts continue to use home-sharing platforms like Airbnb without undue burdens like the lengthy, onsite registration process, the 90-day listing cap, and the confusing guest home regulations included in the recent draft ordinance released by the LA Planning Department.

Looking toward the future, I see only good things coming out of home-sharing, as long as we all work together to ensure bad actors are removed, and good hosts like myself are able to continue welcoming visitors to our neighborhoods in LA.

Thank you for considering your constituency in this matter, and look forward to hearing back from you.

Sincerely,
Sharon Nahum



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2

Zoe Wedderburn <zwedderburn@gmail.com>

Sat, May 14, 2016 at 11:15 AM

To: Mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, Matthew.glesne@lacity.org, Cpc@lacity.org, Justin@lacity.org,

Councilmembrr.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: Paul.koretz@lacity.org, Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, Etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Council file number - CF#14-1635-S2

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

Availability of short term rentals was so important to me multiple times last year, due to personal circumstances. as a los angelino with low income and hotels costing a fortune I would have been looking at a shelter for accommodation.

I've spoke to some of the hosts and renting out their spaces is a means of livelihood and very much needed income.

It benefits the city and has benefitted me immensely - I would hate to see these draconian restrictions applied to this ordinance. Totally unnecessary and will affect far to many people.

Thank you,
Zoe

--
Sent from Gmail Mobile

Frank Lutz
P. O. Box 1078
Venice, CA. 90294 – USA
frankalutz@gmail.com

Support – Proposed Short Term Rental Ordinance CF#14-1635-S2

May 13, 2016

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilman Bonin,

Congratulations to you and staff, and the Department of City Planning for this proposed short-term rental ordinance. Your measures can help abate the fearful prospect of turning Venice into a chaotic Rio of the North!

I am a forty-eight year resident, property owner, and property manager of Venice. I have lived for all of that time within one hundred feet of Ocean Front Walk, first on Wavecrest Avenue, and for the past twenty-eight years on Westminster Avenue. I currently manage two multi-family apartment buildings in Venice on Westminster Avenue, plus my own properties.

The current pernicious trend toward favoring the desires of monied interests to buy up and convert long-standing existing multi-family properties in Venice to short-term hotel use is destructive to our community. Not only is it eliminating permanent affordable housing from the residential use market, it is causing tremendous personal stress on those families and individuals who find themselves displaced, after considering Venice their home for many years. The techniques used by the developers are insidious. A paradigm is to take over management or ownership of a property and pressure tenants to move out, or to take over already vacant apartments. Then comes the quiet advertising on social media of those vacant units as available AirBNB, or such, short-term rentals.

The short-term or overnight rental market has caused numerous severe social problems in Venice. The allowing of un-vetted or un-researched short-term visitors, or strangers, into a residential apartment building where full-time tenants reside creates fear, and then more tenants decide to move out. We in the neighborhood hear the drunken behavior, or fights, and hear about stolen belongings, “door-checking” break-ins to apartments, and so forth, perpetrated by some overnight visitors. Last year at one local apartment building two drunken guests who had lost their keys at 2:00am decided to climb up the suspended pull-down fire escape and enter a second floor window. The noise and commotion caused tenants to call the LAPD, for fear of a burglary or robbery; and this woke up the neighbors. And of course, there was no on-site security in the building, because the incident took place in an apartment building, where on-site security is not required. Certainly we are not fools here. We see the unfamiliar cars loaded with passengers and luggage pull up to a local building at any time day or night, and unload. We deal with the cars and vans blocking traffic here on Speedway Avenue and on the adjacent side streets. We know that there is not sufficient local parking for the visiting cars and vans, as we residents don’t have sufficient parking for ourselves and our tenants’ vehicles. We see the same visiting people with their luggage and their cars a day or so later leaving Venice; we know by talking with some of them that they have stayed in a short-term unauthorized, unpermitted rented room, in buildings that advertise “minimum 30-day rentals”.

Now we see the same people who have tried to spirit-in the AirBNB concept to local apartment buildings, virtually unfettered by local code enforcement, taking the next step toward their Venice-as-Miami-Beach goal: use conversion of local apartment buildings, at the cultural expense of the Venice community. Councilmen Wessen and Bonin, I believe in the ancient concept of the Social Contract, and I would hope that you as a public officials do as well. Embodied in that concept is the notion that rules, codes, laws in a civil society will be administered with an even hand to all members. But we see in Venice that, for example, in the case of the

overnight visitor phenomenon, the perpetrators, owners of the buildings where this is taking place, at best are getting a hand-slap or fine, and allowed to continue violating the regulatory codes. No code enforcement.

After this has gone on for years, we now see what seems to be a preferential treatment for some of these entities when they want to do a use conversion, despite the impact on the community. I wonder to myself if this uneven regulatory application is happening in adjacent communities, too, such as Mar Vista, Palms, and so on. I wonder ultimately the old Latin question: *Cui bono?* To whose benefit? Who has something to gain here? Is it just the developers? Not likely, as the City of LA must see a benefit in revenues, one supposes. But who else? Is there a political expediency at play here? Or perhaps it is the obverse side of the *cui bono* coin, the side that asks the question: What are you afraid of, if you oppose those people? Are you afraid they might sue the City?

Gentlemen, you have the opportunity to leave a positive legacy in your names during your tenure on the City Council. You know Venice quite well. I would hope that you will be effective in curtailing these code violations viz-a-viz the overnight and short-stay visitor market; and furthermore that you will oppose the use conversion of apartment buildings to hotels.

Thank you for your attention to this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Lutz

The Morrison Building
14 Westminster Avenue
Suite C
Venice, CA 90291

Frank Lutz
P. O. Box 1078
Venice, CA. 90294 – USA
frankalutz@gmail.com

May 14, 2016

Regarding: **SUPPORT – PROPOSED SHORT TERM RENTAL ORDINANCE CF #14-1635-S2**

Follow-up letter

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilman Bonin,

One more matter of grave concern that I have me about the whole AirBnB and short-term rental disaster is this: In hotels, on-site security personnel are required in many locales, for certain hours during the day and/ or night, which seems sensible to me. In the current proposals before you, it seems to me that if a location is going to engage in short-term or overnight rentals, in an apartment building, where permanent residents live, that **there should be some sort of on-site security required**; this assumes that the building is only doing short-term rentals with non-RSO units. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Lutz,
Venice.

To whom it may concern,

May 17, 2016

I taught fourth grade at LAUSD for twenty years and retired two years ago. I have been an Airbnb host in council district 15 for a year and a half. The income from Airbnb has supplemented my retirement income so I can now make ends meet. If Airbnb's policy changed to a 90 day cap per year, this would be a financial burden for me.

I have had guests stay with me from all over the world. They have contributed to the local economy by frequenting neighborhood restaurants, grocery stores, clothing stores and movies theaters. I started Airbnb for financial reasons, but I have learned through this process the best part of Airbnb are the relationships. Now I have extended family in Turkey, Alabama, and Italy!

Airbnb is a win-win-win situation. The guest, the local economy and the host all benefit from this service.

Thank you,

N. Woods

Council file number: CF#14-1635-S2

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



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF#14-1635-S2

Debbie Pollack <debbiepollack@me.com>

Mon, May 16, 2016 at 9:51 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

Hello. I am an Airbnb Host in Sherman Oaks who rents two rooms in my primary residence to support myself.

I am eager for short term rentals in Los Angeles to have regulations and I am thrilled that the TOT will bring new revenue to the City of Los Angeles. But I am very troubled and worried about some of the items. I would like to ask you to reconsider a few points on the ordinance.

My greatest concerns are 90 day limits per calendar (item #3 under Section D) and ONE listing per host (item #6 of Section D). First and foremost, Airbnb is my full time job. I have been off unemployment for over two years now because of the income Airbnb has brought to my household. I am the sole bread winner of the household since my divorce 3 years ago. I am able to remain in the home that I have owned for 28 years - the home where I raised my family. I sometimes rent my rooms to family members of my neighbors during the holidays and many of them depend on my Airbnb for their families. My rooms are rented an average of 27 days a month. I think it is completely unfair to regulate an home owner/owner occupied host as long as they are compliant with all requirements of the ordinance. My suites are listed as entire home/apt on Airbnb because each have a private entrance, private bathroom but there is no possibility these listing could be considered as permanent housing in the City of Los Angeles. Because my rentals are very affordable, I have been told by my guests, they are able to spend more "tourist dollars" in Los Angeles than if they were staying in a more expensive hotel. I will be UNABLE to afford to stay in my home if I cannot rent out these rooms on a STR basis. I need and WANT to continue with the small business I have to carefully and lovingly created.

I ask you to eliminate the 90 limitation on STRs and allow me to welcome guests into the two listings at my home.

Lastly, Airbnb creates new experiences for travelers by offering a variety of rental spaces. I think it is unfair to limit what kind of accommodations are offered. Item #5 under Section D seems an unreasonable restriction. As long as a host is in full compliance with all of the ordinance, I don't feel the type of rental should be restricted.

Like many hosts who depend on the income of our STRs, I will attend the public hearing this Saturday. I pray you will see how much people like me need to be able to make an income from our homes. I think there are many necessary points on the ordinance, I ask you, please, let me stay in my home and continue the enjoyment of being a small business owner who welcomes guest to Los Angeles from all over the world.

Most sincerely,

Deborah Pollack
4572 Greenbush Avenue
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

SUPPORT – PROPOSED SHORT TERM RENTAL ORDINANCE CF #14-1635-S2

Deborah Krall <dkrall124@earthlink.net>

Mon, May 16, 2016 at 2:18 PM

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

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilmember Bonin:

I would like to applaud the work of you and your staff, as well as those in the Department of City Planning for the recently-released short-term rental ordinance. After years of frustration, I feel that the city is taking an affirmative step forward to control the negative impacts of the short-term rental industry.

The proposed language will help protect neighborhoods and preserve affordable and RSO housing. The ordinance holds host and platforms accountable, but still allows people to make their ends meet if needed.

I look forward to this ordinance being implemented in coming months.

CC:

Matthew Glesne, Department of City Planning

Claire Bowin, Department of City Planning

Tricia Keane, Office of Councilmember Mike Bonin

Justin Wesson, Office of Councilmember Herb Wesson

Sharon Dickinson, Office of City Clerk