

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 02/17/2020 11:12 PM

**Council File No:** 18-1245

**Comments for Public Posting:** Myself and many people I know have been participating in what is now known as the "homeshare economy", or simply "airbnb-ing", which is a blend of renting space and tour guiding. I think those who homeshare are very similar to those who Uber. We take an unused or partially used asset, for Uber a car, for Airbnb a space, and generate income with a third-party technology that makes it easy to collect payment, provide insurance, and stay safe (reviews). Myself and others consider it a job. It is not passive nor is it just "short-term" renting. In my community of Venice, many "bad actors" have used technologies like Airbnb to circumvent local zoning laws which prohibit renting units short-term. Clearly this behavior depletes the long-term housing stock and drives rent up for long-term renters while creating a boon for landlords. In an effort to enforce the existing laws, which Airbnb technologies help those "bad actors" to easily break, the City of Los Angeles chose to create a "homesharing" ordinance rather than choosing to enforce existing zoning laws. The homesharing ordinance, as it stands with RSO units, already smacks of discrimination and I could find no clear logic as to why a person like myself, paying \$3,000/month in rent could no longer do the job I loved (hosting some of the 1 million tourists that inundate my community every year, affecting me directly) while my neighbor in a 1978 built place could. NOW, it seems "the city" is listening, and possibly relenting on the ban of RSO, but ONLY for landowners. LANDOWNERS get to participate in this particular part of the tourist trade, people who happened to rent a unit built in the "correct" decade, and who's left out? The little guy. I can't get one straight answer out of a single council person as to WHY an owner cannot convey the right to participate in the share economy to the lessor. This is pure discrimination against renters who are acting in accordance with current law and with permission from the property owner. We represent 60% of residents and in many communities much more and most of us are identified as "rent burdened". Participating in tourism via homesharing allows renters to pay for the high rents. Stabilized does not mean affordable, nor should how much somebody pays for rent be tied into his or her right to participate in this economy fairly. EVERYBODY should get to have one listing for one space in their full-time home. Period. There is no

logic in allowing owner occupied properties to participate from their full-time residence, while not allowing those same rights to be conferred on renters. In fact, allowing owner occupied in RSO units may just compel those owners to take a closer look at the Ellis Act. I cannot think of a single other "right" that a property owner can enjoy, that cannot also be enjoyed by the contract holder for the same space. Uber drivers for example often lease cars and drive for Uber or Lyft partially to pay for that same asset that provides a revenue stream. Essentially, I believe the City of LA is negligent in that they continue to not enforce existing zoning laws that ban non-primary residential units to be rented out - there are "homesharers" with upwards of 10 "entire place" units per "profile" that proliferate technologies like Airbnb, and are the real culprits in driving up rents and depleting housing stock, while allowing the public perception of "illegal rentals" to be conflated with those hosts that are what I call "true homesharers". Individuals who use technologies like Airbnb to conduct legal business by hosting travelers in extra spaces in their full-time homes. Owning the home should not be a pre-requisite for participating. I believe that the homesharing ordinance should NOT be amended to allow landowners to enjoy separate rights to participate in a new economy that didn't exist when most of us chose our RSO rentals. The mayor's office supports homesharing in RSO units for ALL. The contract each individual has with their respective landlords should be between those two parties. NO to special landlord privileges and yes to allowing every single person to host travelers in their full-time residence. Cuba has allowed it for decades. Let's be as progressive as Cuba.