

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/17/2019 11:22 PM

Council File No: 18-1245

Comments for Public Posting: Thank you for establishing a fair home-sharing ordinance that will discourage investors and multi-lease holders from turning our city's housing stock into rogue hotel rooms and units. As you go forward, I'm glad you have set aside legalization of short-term rentals in RSO units for this separate discussion. I want to outline a number of reasons below why I think short-term-rentals (STR) in RSO units should NOT be permitted if the RSO unit is the owner's primary residence, and why any attempts to conduct a pilot study will be fundamentally flawed. Where RSO owners are themselves short-term renting all or part of their primary residence on that property, you would be permitting a situation with an unfair power dynamic. Regular tenants may feel powerless to complain about the situation for fear of retribution. It's already difficult to utilize RSO remedies when the bad neighbor is the property owner, and the reasons long-term tenants may have problems with an RSO owners' homeshare are many: 1) STR properties require more use of utilities. Given more regular turnaround for cleaning, laundry, garbage, and having guests who are less considerate of these indirect expenses. Now that a building's entire garbage, sewer, and water expenses can be billed directly to the tenants in an RSO property and merely divided by an occupancy factor (as they were in my previous apartment), long-term tenants will in effect be subsidizing the utility expenses of the STR operators. 2) As a former tenant in an RSO property where several units were on airbnb, I know how disruptive it can be to have rogue hotel rooms operating within my building. I can't rely on a consistent living and working environment (important for me considering I regularly work from home due to disability), and it puts my privacy and security in jeopardy and diminishes community. 3) Given the spike in market-rent pricing in the past few years, longer-term tenants in RSO properties are less likely to be able to afford to move out of a building where excessive short-term rentals are impacting quality of life. They may also be less likely to report issues and violations to the city. 4) Where the owner is short-term renting his/her/their primary residence in an RSO property, tenants who may also wish to STR their primary residence are at the mercy of a property owner who, likely, would not prefer competition from within the same building or property. This is a severe conflict of interest. This all

said, I'm sympathetic to renters in RSO buildings who may rely on predictable rent, but might otherwise miss out on opportunities to travel for work, study, pleasure, or family responsibilities if they cannot recoup their rental expenses during their leave. I worry that tenants in those situations will turn to less regulated systems, like craigslist and facebook, for finding short-term occupants. Platforms like Airbnb, however, are often preferable because there are better mechanisms to identify and vet guests, ensure payment, remove guests who violate property rules, and provide insurance to cover damages. Thus, if you are to extend the HSO to RSO properties in any way, I think the fairest option would be to allow only tenants (not owners) of RSO units to register to STR if it is their primary residence, with owner's permission, and for a much restrictive number of days per year, such as 30-60 days. Thank you.