

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Tim Werner <twerner@villaelegante.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 9:15 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: No to Montecito STR's

To Whom has the power to enforce zoning laws,

Please include me to this long list of people who adamantly oppose the use of STR's in our residential community. I live on Hill Rd in Montecito and have no less than three vacation rentals on my short block. They at times can be horrible neighbors! The entire purpose of creating zoning laws was to allow specific uses in specific areas. Residential zoning means residential usage. STR's are a commercial use and should never be allowed in residentially zoned areas. In the City of SB STR's are only allowed in commercial, R-4, R-4, and HRC zoned areas.

I should know as I own the only legally permitted vacation rental in Santa Barbara. Villa Elegante. I designed and built this concept in the HRC zoned area located by the Santa Barbara Inn and the Double Tree resorts. The permitting process included approval by the Architectural Board of Review, Sign Committee, Planning Commission, and the California Coastal Commission. The development was required to adhere to specific permitting guidelines due to the "commercial" nature of the project. Stringent guidelines for extra parking, ADA accessibility and sidewalk improvements were included during the entitlement process. These same requirements need to be adhered to for any STR usage throughout our community as well.

Additionally, "second" homes that are turned into vacation rentals disrupt the rental market for families who live and work in our community. The vacancy factor in the SB area has never been as low as it is today, and rents are too high for too many families. STR's are dangerous to the residential character of family neighborhoods and harm the people of our community!

Please adopt the correct language in our residential zoned areas to allow the correct enforcement of zoning laws.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

Tim Werner
1180 Hill Rd.
Montecito Ca, 93108

1) Montecito ordinances already prohibit commercial lodging in the form of hotels, motels, inns, bed and breakfast, etc., in residential zones. The Community Plan is to preserve semi-rural, residential living.

You are only asking that the BoS uphold those ordinances by clarifying that STRs are illegal in residential zones.

(2) City of Santa Barbara and many other cities and counties in California have already banned STRs in residential zones.

(3) The purpose of residential zoning in your neighborhood is to provide for single-family, residential living without the nuisances of commercial and industrial uses. Transients have no investment in the neighborhood and residents suffer from excessive: trash, noise, traffic, parking, [anything else you may have endured]. Neighbors become a string of strangers coming and going.

(4) STRs disrupt the fabric of the single-family community with impacts on schools. [MUS has about 50% long-term renters; short-term rentals take that housing off of the market and risk a further declining population].

(5) The notion of allowing "homestays" when an owner is present, is unenforceable and will further put neighbor against neighbor. Am I to knock in my neighbors door to make sure the owner is home every time there is a guest? What if the owner is not there? What is my remedy?

(6) My home is my largest asset. STRs risk a decline in my property value. Who would want to purchase a home adjacent to an STR?

(7) Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac government subsidized loans should not be allowed for these "second" homes that turn into commercial businesses.

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Cori Hayman <corihayman@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 9:50 AM
To: sbcob; Metzger, Jessica
Subject: Fwd: No to Montecito STR's

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tim Werner <twerner@villaelegante.com>
Date: May 31, 2017 at 9:14:27 AM PDT
To: delliott@countyofsb.org
Cc: Cori Hayman <corihayman@cox.net>
Subject: No to Montecito STR's

To Whom has the power to enforce zoning laws,

Please include me to this long list of people who adamantly oppose the use of STR's in our residential community. I live on Hill Rd in Montecito and have no less than three vacation rentals on my short block. They at times can be horrible neighbors! The entire purpose of creating zoning laws was to allow specific uses in specific areas. Residential zoning means residential usage. STR's are a commercial use and should never be allowed in residentially zoned areas. In the City of SB STR's are only allowed in commercial, R-4, R-4, and HRC zoned areas.

I should know as I own the only legally permitted vacation rental in Santa Barbara. Villa Elegante. I designed and built this concept in the HRC zoned area located by the Santa Barbara Inn and the Double Tree resorts. The permitting process included approval by the Architectural Board of Review, Sign Committee, Planning Commission, and the California Coastal Commission. The development was required to adhere to specific permitting guidelines due to the "commercial" nature of the project. Stringent guidelines for extra parking, ADA accessibility and sidewalk improvements were included during the entitlement process. These same requirements need to be adhered to for any STR usage throughout our community as well.

Additionally, "second" homes that are turned into vacation rentals disrupt the rental market for families who live and work in our community. The vacancy factor in the SB area has never been as low as it is today, and rents are too high for too many families. STR's are dangerous to the residential character of family neighborhoods and harm the people of our community!

Please adopt the correct language in our residential zoned areas to allow the correct enforcement of zoning laws.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

Tim Werner
1180 Hill Rd.

1) Montecito ordinances already prohibit commercial lodging in the form of hotels, motels, inns, bed and breakfast, etc., in residential zones. The Community Plan is to preserve semi-rural, residential living.

You are only asking that the BoS uphold those ordinances by clarifying that STRs are illegal in residential zones.

(2) City of Santa Barbara and many other cities and counties in California have already banned STRs in residential zones.

(3) The purpose of residential zoning in your neighborhood is to provide for single-family, residential living without the nuisances of commercial and industrial uses. Transients have no investment in the neighborhood and residents suffer from excessive: trash, noise, traffic, parking, [anything else you may have endured]. Neighbors become a string of strangers coming and going.

(4) STRs disrupt the fabric of the single-family community with impacts on schools. [MUS has about 50% long-term renters; short-term rentals take that housing off of the market and risk a further declining population].

(5) The notion of allowing "homestays" when an owner is present, is unenforceable and will further put neighbor against neighbor. Am I to knock in my neighbors door to make sure the

owner is home every time there is a guest? What if the owner is not there? What is my remedy?

(6) My home is my largest asset. STRs risk a decline in my property value. Who would want to purchase a home adjacent to an STR?

(7) Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac government subsidized loans should not be allowed for these "second" homes that turn into commercial businesses.

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: greg merrill <mac12g@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 10:15 AM
To: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Fw: STR SB County

TO: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors:

As a concerned tax payer and citizen I am writing you today in support of STRs being allowed within the residential neighborhoods of SB County. I offer a unique perspective as my experience as both a past, "above board", owner of a STR in SB , as well as a local property owner who lives next door to a home which was once operated as a "loosely supervised" STR. I have also attended all the past hearings for the City ordinance as well as the last County hearing in Santa Maria.

While I sympathize and also agree with many of the concerns and complaints of those on the "against" side, I also strongly feel the benefits of STRs far out weigh the negativesWITH the vital caveat that a common sense set of guidelines be set forth and enforced. (I.E. If an operator fails to adhere to said guides they lose their license to operate under a 3 strikes system) The situation in the city provides an ideal opportunity to see the ill effects of their ban:

- 1) Millions in lost potential revenue (TOT)
- 2) Sending the message to today's progressive vacationers that SB is closed for business (millions more in lost economic stimulus)
- 3) adding to other factors and ensuring the extinction of the small retailer (lower state shuttered)
- 4) Badly needed rental income (for many) to afford to live in SB was lost.
- 5) neighborhoods are no better off and a case could be made for the opposite.

There are many reasons why DT Santa Barbara is experiencing a rash of recent store closings while lower State st. is falling into disarray. The Homeless situation, unrealistic retail property owners, online retail competition are all valid contributing factors. I concede that some of these factors may not apply to the County situation. However, the reality that millions of dollars of lost retail revenue has resulted from the elimination of STRs in SB is irrefutable. If the same thing is allowed to happen in the County, it will be the kiss of death to towns like Los Olivos, Los Alamos, SY, and countless others that rely on the weekend traveler who supports local business. Today's modern vacation traveler does not want to stay on an AG property or in a C zone in Buelton. They want to walk to a shop, a wine room, and to enjoy a meal. Hotels serve an important niche and will continue to do so. However, families and groups coming to the area would prefer to have the more economical and "homey" choice of renting a home.

I could go on but the main point I would like to convey is that there is a middle ground where all concerned parties can be accommodated. It all comes down to a common sense set of rules that must be adhered to. When I operated my property in SB, I had each traveler sign a detailed lease and set of house rules. It was clear that any violation of a "house rule" (i.e. noise ordinance, max. occupants, pets, smoking) results in the automatic forfeiture of the 1-2k security deposit. I also went to all my surrounding neighbors and gave them my phone number with a friendly suggestion

that they call me if there is an issue. I never had one complaint and we received 5 stars from our guests. The possibility of peaceful coexistence coupled with a bounty of new County revenue is sitting on the table. It is my sincere hope that the County Board of Supervisors will strongly consider the bigger picture and seize the opportunity that the City of SB has squandered. I ask you to please craft some guidelines and allow for progressive change to continue in SB County.

Respectfully Yours,

Greg Merrill

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Jacqueline Lowther <JACKIELOW@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 11:55 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: VACATION RENTALS IN SANTA BARBARA ~
Attachments: Updated Version of Letter Sent to SB Supervisors.docx

Jacqueline Lowther-Phillips
PO Box 40238
Santa Barbara, CA 93140
jackielow@aol.com

May 31, 2017

Dear Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I am well aware that the issue of Vacation Rentals in Santa Barbara County will be coming up for vote at your next session scheduled for June 6, 2017.

I would like to address a few issues that I am certain you will be considering in making your final decision with respect to this topic.

1- Effect of Short-Term Rentals on Affordable Housing in Santa Barbara County

An independent report prepared by California Economic Forecast, in May 12, 2016, indicated that only 16.6% of current STR properties would be converted to long-term rentals or 'for sale' housing stock in the event STR's were banned in SB County. This represents a mere 0.29% of the entire housing stock of SB County.

This small percentage no doubt reflects the fact that most STR's in our community are either primary or secondary homes that owners keep for personal use, which would not be converted to long-term rentals and would remain empty for most of the year.

They further find that for half of the estimated increase in the supply of long-term housing created by the prohibition of STR's, it is likely that the rental rates for these properties would exceed \$5,000 per month. This level of monthly rent is generally not considered an "affordable housing" rate. Therefore, any increase in rental properties caused by the prohibition of STR's would not have an impact on the "affordable housing" problem in the region.

2- Do Short-term Rentals Cause More Complaints from Neighbors?

The findings of an independent study performed by the California Economic Forecast in June 2016 revealed that the nuisance report rate for short-term rentals is slightly lower than the rate for all other

residential properties, and they concluded that short-term rentals may actually reduce the rate of nuisance complaints in residential neighborhoods.

This is not surprising given that it is not the length of the rental but rather the screening process which takes place prior to accepting a tenant and the regulations and landlord oversight that are attached to that tenancy that mostly determine the outcome of this experience for all involved. As STR's are usually private residences, their owners are highly motivated to screen out any tenants that might be undesirable.

3- Are Short-term Rentals Good for the Local Economy?

An independent study performed by TXP, Inc., in 2015, reported that the overall impact of STR's throughout Santa Barbara County in 2014 accounted for more than \$471.6 million in economic activity and nearly 5,000 jobs. This leaves no doubt that spending by STR guests contributes greatly to the Santa Barbara economy.

4- Coastal Commission's Position on Short-Term Rentals

In all instances where this decision was brought before the Commission, it has ruled that short-term vacation rentals increase the range of options available to visitors to the coast and such rentals constitute a high-priority visitor service for the public and coastal communities alike. The Coastal Commission supports the increased coastal access opportunities.

A ban on vacation rentals in coastal areas would be inconsistent with the Certified Land Use Plan, in light of the public access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act.

5- Beach Overlays

The Coastal Commission has already supported the creation of Beach Overlays in several coastal communities. This ensures the public's ability to access and recreate on the coast, as mandated by the Coastal Act.

This would be particularly relevant in areas such as Padaro Lane and Miramar Beach. The County should identify and preserve the historic use of STR's in these beach areas.

For all of the above reasons, my position is that instead of banning STR'S, the County and interested parties should work together to develop regulations for STR's that address the concerns raised by some while ensuring consistency with the Coastal Act.

My request to this Board of Supervisors is that it honors the mandate of the Coastal Act and continues to work with all players in developing reasonable and balanced regulations that would allow STR's to continue being a part of the landscape of our community.

PLEASE VOTE "NO" ON THE BAN OF SHORT-TERM RENTALS IN
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

Sincerely,

Jacqueline L. Phillips ~

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Jana Byrne <janabyrne@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 12:17 PM
To: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Cc: sbcob
Subject: Vacation Rentals in SB County

Dear Santa Barbara County Board members:

I am writing to ask that you please consider allowing regulated vacation rentals in SB County, when you vote on Tuesday. Given the budget shortfall, it seems an easy and painless way to ensure that vital services in the County get revenue. Clearly, regulation is important and taxes must be paid, but to ban it not only denies the County a revenue stream but will seriously affect tourism: I could site numerous instances of friends and relatives coming into SB (City) and not being able to find available rooms in a hotel, or not being able to afford them. So, they stayed elsewhere and did not spend money on restaurants and shops here – such an avoidable, wasted financial opportunity for the wider community, not just homeowners. I would hate to see this happen in SB County, when it doesn't have to.

Please give serious consideration to regulated vacation rentals when you vote next week.

Kind regards

Jana Byrne

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Richard Weston Smith <richard@brainstormcreative.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 12:26 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: STR's

Dear County Clerk,

I have lived full time in Santa Barbara for 21 years and I want to let you know that I feel strongly that STR's should be allowed in all zones and properly regulated. STR's have been successfully regulated in other cities, providing a huge boost to tourist revenue to local business, as well as valuable tax revenue that benefits the entire community. The points I would like to make are as follows:

- Issues like parking and noise are easily and effectively enforced by a "three strikes and you're out" policy that will ban offenders from ever renting.
- Concerns over housing shortages would be addressed by only allowing STR's in a family's primary residence, ending the practice of "buy to STR".
- The house we rent is our primary residence, and we live in it 7-8 months a year, when we are not traveling.
- If STR's were banned we would not be selling our home.
- The families we have staying in our house would simply not come to Santa Barbara if STR's were not available, as for many of our guests hotels are undesirable or unaffordable.
- Families on vacation spend far more money in the local economy per week than we do simply living here.
- I regularly hear the complaint that hotels are often unavailable or prohibitively expensive (no one wants to spend \$200 for a room in a Motel 6).
- Banning STR's will not increase hotel occupancy. They will simply go elsewhere.

I urge you to support proper regulation of STR's, so the additional revenue may benefit local businesses and the community at large and encourage tourism in our beautiful city.

Thank you for hearing my opinion

With kind regards,

Richard Weston Smith



Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Timothy Ball <timothyball@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 12:49 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Letter to Supervisors in support of regulation of STR's

Dear Supervisors

I am a long time resident and now in retirement I am enjoying the chance to travel. When away I typically make my home available for visiting families to rent. The extra income allows me to maintain my home in Santa Barbara and I feel like I am making a contribution to the community by paying additional taxes and providing visiting families a safe, friendly and lower cost way to visit and enjoy the central coast. Those of us that call Santa Barbara home are truly blessed to live in such an amazing place, and by making my home available as a STR I feel I provide other families a chance to briefly share and enjoy in our good fortune.

I have been renting for the past 15 years and never had a single complaint from neighbors while renting STR.

Those looking to ban STR's appear to working from fear and ignoring the fact that in locations where STR's are fairly regulated local communities benefit from increased tax revenues, more local jobs, and retiree's (like me) are able to make some extra income allowing us to better keep and maintain our homes.

I urge you to support the regulation of short term rentals as opposed to an outright ban.

Sincerely
Tim Ball
5205 Austin Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Sandra Castellino <sandra@castellinotraining.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 12:59 PM
To: Williams, Das
Cc: sbcob
Subject: Short Term Rental of rooms in a house in SB

Dear Mr Williams (I'm in your district)

I'm writing because I just became aware that there is a meeting June 6 to consider whether to accept the Ordinance prepared by staff last year that bans all STRs in the county. I'm in your district, in the city of SB, and I realize this is a County decision. However, whatever the county does may affect the future decisions for the City of Santa Barbara.

I am an elder whose children grew up and moved out and who is divorced. I chose to rent the extra bedrooms in my home in order to be able to stay in my home of the past 30 years. I am one of many in this situation. All of us need less space once the children move out.

I had a license for 6 years to rent rooms in my home short term. I rented sometimes long term and sometimes short term, depending on my needs at the time. Having a license and paying tax to the city was something I was glad to do to rent short term.

I appreciate living in a city that makes its living from tourists/travelers/students at the local higher education institutions because the city's mission is to keep the air and water clean to attract visitors and students at its many schools. The effect for those of us living here is that there is a focus on a clean environment coming from the city 'fathers' and 'mothers'. I remember reading an article recently that this was a deliberate decision made even before the 1925 earthquake by some of the leaders of the time. If we are going to have tourists coming as part of the way we thrive economically, we need a place for them all to stay.

I currently have only long term renters because I'm complying with the law.

There is a room in my home that I don't want rented long term because I need it when my children come to visit. There are many others in my situation. I am sorry not to be able to offer space to the people who contact me. Now that I'm not advertising, I receive calls from people who have stayed here before and I tell them the law forbids my hosting them. I would appreciate this changing.

I have hosted a son and his wife come to be with his dying father, UCSB and SBCC students who have secured housing that isn't available for a week or two from when school starts, parents coming to visit their college students when all the hotels were full, young couples and families on a limited budget, students coming to town for a seminar. None of these people had the financial means to stay at one of the local hotels.

I was particularly puzzled that renting a room in one's house was lumped in with renting the whole house. Renting a room where I live, I can clearly monitor what is happening and have strict rules that include no loud music, no parties, etc. I also have adequate parking in front of my house. So I was providing a service, obeying the law, paying taxes, not bothering the neighbors, and earning something to offset the high costs of owning a home in Santa Barbara. It felt like a win/win.

Please do what you can to ensure that visitors to Santa Barbara will have access to short term rentals. And that elders such as myself will be able to earn extra money legally by sharing their homes with visitors.

Please especially consider allowing the rental of rooms in one's own home in a residential neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Sandra Castellino
1105 Ontare Road, Santa Barbara
805 705-6144

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Kathleen Weinheimer <kathleenweinheimer@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 1:12 PM
To: sbcob; Metzger, Jessica
Subject: Short term rentals
Attachments: Scan0199.pdf

To the Clerk of the Board,

Please include this letter in the materials for the Board's consideration of the short term rental issue on June 6th.

Thank you.

Kathleen M. Weinheimer
Attorney At Law

420 Alameda Padre Serra
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
Phone (805) 965-2777
Fax (805) 965-6388
kathleenweinheimer@cox.net

KATHLEEN M. WEINHEIMER

ATTORNEY AT LAW

420 ALAMEDA PADRE SERRA

SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93103

TELEPHONE (805) 965-2777

FAX (805) 965-6388

EMAIL: kathleenweinheimer@cox.net

May 30, 2017

Chairwoman Joan Hartmann and Members of the
Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Barbara
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

Re: June 6 Board of Supervisors: Short Term Rentals

Dear Chairwoman Hartmann and Members of the Board:

I represent Deborah Hearst, owner of a property on Oak Road in Montecito. I have appeared before your Board, as well as the County and Montecito Planning Commissions a number of times in the past to urge the passage of a complete ban on short term rentals in Santa Barbara County. By separate letter, Ms. Hearst will share with you her firsthand experience in living next door to one of these commercial operations in a formerly quiet residential neighborhood. We remain convinced that the only way to preserve the residential character of Montecito's single family zones is to adopt the total ban on short term rentals approved by both the Montecito and County Planning Commissions.

The Montecito Community Plan

Like the General Plan, the Montecito Community Plan includes goals and policies to guide development in Montecito. Included among these is Goal G-M-1, which is to "maintain and preserve the residential, low density, semi-rural character of Montecito." The Montecito Development Code implements this goal by classifying and regulating land uses within the Community Plan area, including uses in the residential zone, which are intended to "protect the residential characteristics of an area and to promote a suitable environment for family life." In addition to these guiding principles are the existing definitions and restrictions in the zoning code, which support the requested STR ban. Perhaps most significant among these is the definition of dwelling: "A room or rooms....occupied or intended to be occupied by a family on a non-transient basis," and the restriction on accessory structures, which limits them to "the exclusive use of the residents of the site and their guest, and [which use] does not involve a commercial enterprise on the site." These existing definitions should provide ample evidence that

Chairwoman Joan Hartmann and Members
of the Board of Supervisors

May 30, 2017

Page two

short term rentals were never intended to be permitted in single family zones and further, that, as with other zones, if a use is not specifically permitted, it cannot be implied.

The adoption of a complete ban on STRs in Montecito is not only defensible, but in fact, necessary to assure consistency with the existing, approved, and controlling Community Plan presently in place. One can assume that in approving the Community Plan and Development Code, the Coastal Commission made findings that these goals and policies were consistent not only with the General Plan, but with the Local Coastal Plan as well, no doubt in part because other zoning designations already provided for transient and visitor-serving opportunities. Arguments that such a ban will negatively impact low cost visitor serving uses or constitute a change requiring a Coastal Development Permit or an amendment to the LCP are misplaced. The STR ban in Montecito is nothing more than a refinement of the existing regulations, and a necessary step to assure consistency with the adopted and approved Community Plan and LCP. Moreover, the record is entirely silent that Montecito STRs have ever come close to providing "low-cost" visitor accommodations. For example, the STR next to my client is listed at an average per night cost of more than \$1000 per night, with a five to seven night minimum. Hardly a low cost option for anyone.

Affordability

While a quick search of the various STR platforms will demonstrate that the claim that STRs provide "low cost visitor serving opportunities" in the Coastal Zone to be a fallacy, the issue of affordability in another context must also be considered. Attached hereto is a letter from the Coastal Housing Coalition opposing any loss in rental housing and specifically objecting the loss of rental housing created by STRs. Clearly, Santa Barbara County can ill afford to put even more strain on the already tight housing market. By banning STRs, at least a portion of these properties will be returned to the long-term rental market, increasing the housing opportunities available for those who actually wish to live and work in our communities.

Enforcement

During the course of the hearings on the proposed STR ban, there has been considerable and justifiable concern about both the cost and ability of staff to enforce such a ban. We appreciate the financial constraints facing the County, but believe that the adoption of the proposed ban is, once again, not a change in policy, but merely a restatement of existing law. It is important to note that prior to 2007, the County regularly enforced the restriction limiting residential use to "non-transient" occupancy, a definition that remains

Chairwoman Joan Hartmann and Members
of the Board of Supervisors

May 30, 2017

Page three

in the Zoning Code today. The reason for the change in policy since that time remains unclear.

Rather than abandon the ban because of budgetary limitations, we would urge the adoption of the ban, with enforcement on a complaint basis until such time as resources permit proactive efforts by staff. This would enable individuals such as my client, who have suffered the negative impacts of a neighboring STR, to file a private nuisance claim against the owner/operator, as violation of an ordinance is a nuisance per se. (See California Government Code Section 38771; Civil Code Section 3493; City of Bakersfield v. Miller (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 93.) There is no justification to abandon this effort, and indeed to abandon residential zoning, solely on the basis of a temporary budgetary shortfall.

The Legality of a Ban

Numerous jurisdictions, including the City of Santa Barbara, have successfully adopted, and in some cases been forced to defend, bans on short term rentals. Information regarding many of these other jurisdictions has been provided through other participants' submittals and will not be repeated here. I would, however, like to emphasize some of the Court's findings in one of the earliest cases upholding an STR ban: Ewing v. City of Carmel-by-the-Sea (1991) 234 Cal. App.3d 1579. The Carmel case relied on two seminal zoning decisions: Euclid v. Ambler Co. (1926) 272 U.S. 365 and Miller v. Board of Public Works (1925) 195 Cal. 477. In these cases, the highest courts in California and the U.S. recognized that maintenance of the character of residential neighborhoods is a proper purpose of zoning. The Supreme Court in Miller noted that "with home ownership comes stability, increased interest in the promotion of public agencies, such as schools and churches, and recognition of the individual's responsibility for his share in the safeguarding of the welfare of the community...which must come from personal participation in projects looking toward community betterment." (Carmel at 1590, citing Miller at 493.) The Carmel court went on to say that:

"Whether or not transient rentals have the other 'unmitigatable, adverse impacts' cited by the council, such rentals undoubtedly affect the essential character of a neighborhood and the stability of a community. Short-term tenants have little interest in public agencies or in the stability of a community. They do not participate in local government, coach little league, or join the hospital guild. They do not lead a scout troop, volunteer at the library, or keep an eye on an elderly neighbor. Literally, they are here today and gone tomorrow - without engaging in the sort of activities that weld and strengthen a community." Carmel at 1591.

Chairwoman Joan Hartmann and Members
of the Board of Supervisors
May 30, 2017
Page four

We urge the Board to follow the precedent of the Carmel decision, as well as the action taken by other jurisdictions cited in the record, and adopt the proposed STR ban.

Homestays

Much has been made of the concept of "homestays" as a compromise to the total STR ban. Unfortunately, homestays raise an even greater challenge to enforcement than a total ban, as the probability of abuse without aggressive enforcement is undeniable. If the Board is inclined to consider homestays as an option, we would urge the Board to continue their consideration of the homestay issue, and take the time necessary to fully develop a trial program that would include the following limitations, at a minimum:

1. A trial program for no more than two (2) years, after which the Board will evaluate the impact on neighborhoods, the number of complaints, the impact on housing stock, and the effectiveness of the permit program and enforcement efforts.
2. Annual, revocable permits with an application fee sufficient to fund the necessary enforcement staff.
3. A limit of no more than two (2) bedrooms that could be rented in each home, with a maximum occupancy of two (2) persons per bedroom.
4. A requirement not only that the owner be present, but that the owner operate the homestay only from his primary residence.
5. A requirement that no accessory structures may be occupied as sleeping quarters by either the owner or the guests during the homestay to prevent rentals of guest houses, cabanas, and the like.
6. A dedicated twenty-four (24) hour "hotline" for complaints and a requirement that owners respond within two (2) hours of receipt of a complaint. If one owner receives more than three (3) verified complaints in a one year period, the permit may be revoked.
7. Notice to neighbors with properties within 300 feet of the proposed homestay that the application for a homestay permit has been filed.
8. Payment of transient occupancy tax.

We remain convinced that homestays present the same conflict with the residential character of the single family zones as other forms of STRs, and are nothing more than a creative way to circumvent the ban. However, if the Board is convinced that homestays must be considered, we would ask that these restrictions be part of any future decision.

In closing, we urge the Board to follow the direction of the County Planning Commission, the Montecito Planning Commission, the Montecito Community Plan, and

Chairwoman Joan Hartmann and Members
of the Board of Supervisors

May 30, 2017

Page five

the Montecito Development Code and uphold the integrity of the single family zone by
banning short term rentals in residential areas. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Kathleen M. Weinheimer', written in black ink.

Kathleen M. Weinheimer

Attachment

Coastal Housing Coalition

November 4, 2015

Chair Brown and Members of the County Planning Commission
County of Santa Barbara
c/o Planning & Development, Hearing Support
123 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

RECEIVED

NOV 03 2015

S.B. COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
112-0001 - 20000

RE: Short Term Rentals Ordinance -- Impact on Workforce Housing

Dear Chair Brown and Members of the County Planning Commission:

The Coastal Housing Coalition (CHC) is a non-profit organization and the voice of local employers and employees in support of workforce housing. The Coalition advocates for housing available to households earning 120-200% of the community Average Median Income (AMI). As such, the Coalition's founding mission is to educate the community about the critical need for middle-income housing and to advocate that community decision makers accommodate such housing in land use decisions.

The Coalition acknowledges the growing trend of residential short term vacation rentals (dwelling units rented for transient use of 30 consecutive days or less) on the South Coast. While short term vacation rentals may be occurring in a variety of zoning districts and housing types, the Coalition is directly concerned with the potential loss of long-term housing stock that may otherwise be available to the local workforce.

In 2015, the Coastal Housing Coalition published South Coast Housing & Its Impacts- Report on Employer and Employee Survey. This report emphasized the importance of housing affordable to workforce households as well as local employers. Workforce households unable to afford housing within a 25 minute commute one-way to work often must find housing in more affordable outlying communities and face a long daily commute. The 2015 study showed this commute significantly reduces their involvement with their local Community (72%), causes them stress (53%) and reduces their overall quality of life (54%).

Likewise, the vast majority of South Coast employers reported that the lack of affordable housing in the South Coast negatively impacts their business in a variety of ways. Of the survey participants, more than two-thirds of South Coast employers indicated they have substantial difficulty retaining employees who want to rent or purchase a quality home, and more than half find it difficult to attract employees from outside the South Coast area to work for their organization due to the high cost of housing.

Rising housing prices and rental rates along with extremely low rental vacancy rates continue to challenge the availability of housing affordable to the workforce. The Coalition is concerned that every short term rental unit not available for long-term housing creates an increasing demand on an already challenged marketplace.

The Coastal Housing Coalition does not support the loss of long-term south coast housing stock that may otherwise be available to the local workforce. We encourage the County to enforce current zoning restrictions and reaffirm policy which protects housing affordable to the local workforce located in any zoning district not intended for this type of commercially oriented use.

Sincerely,

COASTAL HOUSING COALITION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Minus', written in a cursive style.

CRAIG MINUS
President

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Linda Kiefer <ljkief@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 2:25 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Allow stars

Sent from my iPad

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Jeanne Hollingsworth <jeanehollingsworth@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 2:43 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: STR's

Please note I sent this email to all of the county supervisors:

District 1 - Das Williams dwilliams@countyofsb.org
District 2 - Janet Wolf jwolf@countyofsb.org
District 3 - Joan Hartmann jhartmann@countyofsb.org
District 4 - Peter Adam peter.adam@countyofsb.org
District 5 - Steve Lavagnino steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org
SB County Clerk: sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

I am a homeowner in the Santa Ynez Valley and rent my home as a vacation rental. I think the overall feeling about vacation rentals has changed and neighbors now welcome them. When the technology for Airbnb and VRBO was new, it was a shock to the neighbors to see five strange vehicles pull up on the weekends. After learning the wants and needs of my neighbors I enforce strict house rules that include no talking outside after 10:00 PM. I think a three-strikes-and-you-are-out violation rule should be the only regulation on STR's. If a house gets three violations, even if they are unfounded, they should not be able to rent to vacation renters.

But, residential neighborhoods should not be prohibited across the board to provide vacation rental to tourists.

To prevent a proliferation of STR's you can limit the ownership of a vacation rental to one per owner. This prevents the commercialization of the sharing community.

The guest for a vacation rental is not the same as the guest who rents hotels. The vacation renters just go where they can use STR's, they bring in a lot of revenue.

Work closely with Airbnb, their model is well tested and they have a great deal of experience in many markets. Negotiate with them; if they give you information, you won't change the laws. They can confirm who is renting, how many units they own and how much they gross each year.

If STR's are prohibited, I will personally suffer great hardship. The only reason I can afford the mortgage is by renting my home for short-term rentals, on the weekend. Please continue this practice in the residential neighborhoods of the county.

Thank you for listening,

Jeanne Hollingsworth

Jeanne Hollingsworth
805-350-0808
jeanehollingsworth@me.com

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: rob horning <rob@ruletwoillc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 3:07 PM
To: Williams, Das
Cc: sbcob
Subject: STR - Don't do it!

Mr. Das Williams -

My name is Robert Horning and I live in the Coastal Zone of Montecito where I've owned my home and rented it out for short term rentals for over 17 years without a complaint of any kind. We rent out our house during the the summer months and the guests have made friends in the neighborhood. It is a very positive neighborhood experience.

Short term rentals provide a powerful benefit to the local economy. I honestly can't imagine the damage it would do to the local economy to ban guests from renting homes for short periods of time and enjoying beautiful Santa Barbara, and I can't imagine how my guests would feel if they were not welcome to return for their regular vacations. These are extended families interested in gathering family in ways that don't work at a hotel. Short term rental of homes are the right solution. Don't ban them! Please regulate them and penalize the bad actors. Please don't penalize those of us that have followed the regulations and made short term rentals a positive for all.

The theory that banning short term rentals will increase availability of housing for locals and decrease rents is 100% INCORRECT, at least in my neighborhood. People in my neighborhood rent their homes, or cottages, periodically throughout the year to help pay expenses, and I can tell you that they are not going to rent the properties long-term because then they themselves couldn't live there or enjoy the property. In my neighborhood, short term rentals are not a substitute for long-term rentals. It just doesn't work that way.

I must tell you that I once lived in the town of Aspen Colorado and they tried something similar with disastrous results. In the West end of town, they banned short term rentals because of similar thinking that is going on here in SB. The result was not lower prices, not more availability of housing for locals, and not better for the neighborhood. Instead, the neighborhood lost substantial vitality and became an undesirable place to live. The town learned its lesson, eventually overturned the ordinance, and now regulates and embraces short term rentals. I strongly recommend the same for Montecito. That is the community that I want to live in.

I can't say it strongly enough: don't ban short term rentals! Regulate them in a fair manner for the good of all, the citizens, visitors, and the local economy.

Thank You,

Robert P. Horning

- o s a neighbor of a STR, in your experience, STRs have NOT been a nuisance;
- o As an owner of a STR, if they were banned, you would NOT sell or rent your home at an "affordable" rate;
- o As an owner of a STR, you live in your home X number of months (or weeks) throughout the year and therefore would NOT sell your home if STR were banned;
- o As a resident, you urge the Board to allow ALL STRs as a critically needed source of revenue to support County

services, especially in light of the County's large budget deficit;

o As a visitor, you rely on STRs for affordable overnight accommodations to stay in Santa Barbara – especially with a family - and would not be able to afford to visit, or stay as long, if they are banned;

o As a visitor, please protect full home rentals – it is less private and impractical, in many cases, to only rent a room in a home, especially with a family.

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Grace Jackson. <gracejks@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 3:17 PM
To: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Short Term Rental OWNER

Hello,

My family has lived in the foothills of Carpinteria for over 35 years. We own a small condo which we legally rent as a vacation unit. We pay taxes and all the neighbors are happy with the set up. The revenue from our condo provides my parents with retirement income. Banning STRs would drastically affect their ability to be/ stay retired.

Please dont ban STRs in the county. As a tourist destination, I think it is ridiculous to try to force people to only use hotels. Also, hotels are often controlled by rich business people. We are normal residents that rely on STR income! PLEASE dont hurt us!

Thank you.

--

Best,
Grace Jackson

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Kathleen Weinheimer <kathleenweinheimer@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 3:56 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: June 6th hearing
Attachments: Scan0200.pdf

Good afternoon,

Please accept the attached letter from Deborah Hearst for inclusion in the Board packet for the short term rental item on the June 6, 2017 agenda.

Thank you.

Kathleen M. Weinheimer
Attorney At Law

420 Alameda Padre Serra
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
Phone (805) 965-2777
Fax (805) 965-6388
kathleenweinheimer@cox.net

DEBORAH HEARST
241 Oak Road
Montecito, California 93108

May 31, 2017

Chairwoman Joan Hartmann and Members
of the Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Barbara
105 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

Re: Short Term Rentals

Dear Members of the Board:

I am writing to support the total ban on short term rentals recommended by the County and Montecito Planning Commissions. When I bought my home in Montecito, I had no idea that a motel would begin operating next door, no more than 10 feet from my property line. At the time of my purchase, the neighboring property was rented to a long-term tenant. Shortly thereafter, the property was purchased by a Canadian man, who alleged during the review process for his many additions to the property that he was building these improvements for his family, who enjoyed swimming and were looking forward to living in California. However, despite his statements to the contrary to the MBAR, in the years since his purchase, the property has been operated as a vacation rental. A cursory review of the property on VRBO will show that this \$1000+ a night rental is in no way a family home, with absolutely no personal items in the house, but rather is nothing other than a high priced motel. To say that this commercial operation is a residential use makes a mockery of the single family zone designation.

I bought my home in reliance on the single family zone, and would ask the Board to uphold the purpose and intent of that residential zone by enforcing the prohibition on transient use that has existed in the Zoning Ordinance for many years. Please respect the rights of those of us who choose to live in Montecito and adopt a ban on short term rentals.

Sincerely,

Deborah Hearst

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: andrew raaf <asr9754@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 4:21 PM
To: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: Constituents do not support the Vaca-Rental ban

Hello,

I'm a 10+ year resident, UCSB grad, and public servant.

I do not support the ordinance that would "Ban" short-term vacation rentals. I'm sure you've heard many sides to the issue, but vacation rentals are vital to a 21st century economy, especially in a County like ours where tourism dollars are important.

Tourists have many options where to visit, and the fact is that other communities are embracing short-term rentals and finding fair, reasonable ways to permit them and profit from them.

The "Ban" is a step in the wrong direction and a major overreach of government regulation. Private property rights still matter. The opponents of Short-Term rentals are vocal, but please know that there are many of us "normal folk" who don't agree with the ban. Thank you,
Andrew

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Ginny <ginbit@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 5:06 PM
To: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Cc: sbcob
Subject: STRs in SB County

Dear Supervisor,

I am a 76-year old resident of the unincorporated County of Santa Barbara between Santa Barbara and Goleta. I live in a condo style unit, which is very small. I rent out a small bedroom on short-term rental. Since the condo is so small, I could never consider a full-time renter, as I need some breathing room and space, which the STR provides me.

The income that I receive isn't a lot for a small single room, but for me, at my age and inability to work outside the home, this spells the difference between being able to pay my bills and not. I only have one guest at a time in my home, and they are quiet, and peaceful, and parking is not an issue as there is plenty of open parking by my home for guests of the HOA.

The guests I have are often a parent visiting their college student, a guest at a local wedding who cannot afford the hotel rates, or a visitor from out of state or abroad wishing to see and experience Santa Barbara. Some are businessmen, or visiting professors. They are able to come to Santa Barbara, dine at restaurants, and more because they have been able to obtain an affordable room at my STR. I have had many say that they could not visit Santa Barbara if the only option were the hotels, which are out of their budget.

Hosted rentals, such as what I provide by living in the home, is entirely different from those that rent out an entire home, and have no intent to live in the home. I think it is important to differentiate between the two. These visitors are important to Santa Barbara's economy, and most will not be able to visit Santa Barbara, were not for the STRs.

I believe that the loss of the revenues from not only the TOT and Visitors Bureau fee, but money spent at restaurants, wine tasting and more, would be even more

than what is forecast. I have followed the issue in other cities, and most have been able to compromise to either allow hosted rentals and/or other compromises. An all-out ban, would in my opinion, be a very short-sighted decision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ginny (Virginia) Welton

935 Via Nieto

Santa Barbara, CA 93110

B

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: goodlife <mgysan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 5:18 PM
To: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: From an honest TOT payer who brings value to the Santa Ynez Valley with her STR/primary home.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live in Solvang on 7 acres in a house that my dad and mom built over twenty years ago. I lost them both in the last two years. Having moved in three years ago to care for them, I made this house my new residence. After they died, and my promise to my dad to "never sell the house that they loved so much and built as our family homestead" I began renting it out in 2016 on weekends so that I could afford to keep the house which is expensive in its upkeep and property taxes. Renting the house out on weekends has helped me and my brother to keep the house. I stay on the property often with my guests and have met the most wonderful families that come to the valley for reunions, birthdays, wine tasting and weddings. I do not allow parties and make them sign an eleven-page lease--just for two nights! The house lies on nearly 7 acres and my guests, with me there, disturb no one. The lease provides a clause that says **"if there is any noise or parties and I have to intervene with local authorities or neighbors, \$1000 shall be taken out of your security deposit". I do not allow parties, events, pets, smoking, etc.**

I have all white new carpets. After renting to many, many families each weekend over the last year and a half, there is not one stain on the carpets and never is there a problem. I carefully select my guests, meet them at the door and show them how to care for the house.

They all are super respectful, tidy and grateful to have all of their family members be under one roof together. The vacation rental offers a completely different experience than a stay at a hotel. It feels like home to the guest. There, they BBQ together, make breakfast together, play bocce ball in the back yard. My house sleeps 10-12 people with 6 bedrooms. It is more affordable than any hotel and gives them a feeling of being home.

I pay between \$600-\$1000 each month faithfully in TOT. Last year alone, I spent over \$10,000 in TOT gladly--because I can keep my beautiful home on 7 acres and share it with others which brings them joy and memories in a way a hotel stay cannot.

I am on AG 1. My neighbors don't even live in the homes around me. One home in the distance is vacant and is a 2nd home. The other is rarely used.

So, please don't ban all vacation rentals. Some serve a very important purpose. I am one of the honest ones that pays SB County each month and because I can rent my house on weekends only, I can remain in my parent's house which is now mine. I miss them so much that getting to be there and keep the house is a blessing.

I invite any of you and all you to come see my home, high on a hill over looking the Santa Ynez mountains. It is a retreat and a treat to be there amongst the deer, hawks and blue sky. If you ban this property, I will lose my home. You will lose \$11,000 a year just from me.

Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater. The TOT can help our beautiful community, schools, police force, roads and more. Furthermore, my vacation rental encourages lots of business for others: my cleaners, a gardener, plumbers, electricians, Ranch Hands--are all there to help me out when things break. My guests of 10

each weekend come as a group. They all could not afford 5 "Nice" hotel rooms for the price of this rental. They in turn, flush the valley with expenditures for dining, weddings, activities, massage, wineries...etc. Regulating us will bring in so much more TOT...if only 25% are reporting it, imagine the income for our county and what that extra income could accomplish. Banning the STR would cost you in TOT and cost you more to enforce.

The Valley's diverse vacation rentals are part of the valley's allure. Hotels are great for one or two people. But for groups of 6 or more, which I serve, vacation rentals solve a lodging problem and entice them to visit the valley. 98% of my guests are from LA trying to get away to the wine country and stay in a magical place.

Perhaps allowing permits on a case-by-case basis with regulations and inspections would be fair. If you ban this property, I will lose my home. Maybe parcels on 1 acre or more would be more acceptable.... Come and visit me anytime at my house and you will see that it fulfills a need very different from a hotel. That is why I am booked every weekend with groups. They choose staying in my home over a sterile, expensive hotel where they are not able to wake up together and make pancakes for ten.

--

Best Regards,

Michelle K. Gysan, TOT certificate number 552

(805) 448-4674

mgysan@gmail.com

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Cassie Neumann <cassiecneumann@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 5:33 PM
To: Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Cc: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet
Subject: SB short term rental

To Whom it May Concern,

As a short term rental host, I rely on income from my short term rentals to maintain my Montecito property.

What would happen if you banned short term rentals?

Well, my family would struggle , but we would not give up our beautiful summers in Santa Barbara.

We would not sell, as I know many others would not.

I say use the TOTs and focus on improving city services.

Please do not ban short term rentals.

It just seems like a no-brainer to me, and I just can't logically see why this fight has taken so much precious time.

Thanks for your consideration,
Cassie Neumann

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Robert Pearson <robgrantpearson@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 11:49 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: June 6th BOS Meeting, Vacation Rentals and Homelessness in L.A. County jumps 23% as need far outpaces available housing, new count shows

The Honorable Board of Supervisors

Reducing housing supply leads to higher housing costs...and ultimately more homeless. Do not allow the scourge of the sharing economy brought on by AirBnB and the like contribute to this problem.

When housing is allowed to be commercialized for the simple purpose of making more money (read nightly rentals) vs. long term rentals for local workers/residents, our housing problems get worse. You reduce supply; the cost goes up. It's that simple. Thank you for allowing this comment.

Rob Pearson

Homelessness in L.A. County jumps 23% as need far outpaces available housing, new count shows
<http://lat.ms/2rUY2H7>

Sent from my iPad

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: waltonmasters <waltonmasters@cox.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 7:38 AM
To: Williams, Das
Cc: Wolf, Janet; Lavagnino, Steve; Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; sbcob
Subject: Allow Fair Regulation of STRs in Santa Barbara County

Dear Das,

As a 20 year resident and STR owner/operator in Montecito, I am writing to ask you to support STRs in Santa Barbara County. The County can collect the taxes and fairly regulate STRs.

Sincerely,

Charity Walton Masters
2233 Camino del Rosario
Santa Barbara CA 93108

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Rita <ritamayrose@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 9:37 AM
To: sbcob; Lavagnino, Steve; Adam, Peter; Hartmann, Joan; Wolf, Janet; Williams, Das
Subject: STR's

Dear Board Members,

Here we go again with the fight for rights for STR. I really think the time has come to make this legal. This is something that can work for the community.

I am a senior citizen and a home owner in Montecito for over 40 years and run an Airbnb in my home with 2 bedrooms and have been doing this for several years. I pay my taxes and do not impact my neighbors in any negative way as some people have spoken about. If that is a problem in a neighborhood there are safeguards in place to eliminate those rentals.

Most of the people that stay with me are families (tourists) that need a different kind of space than most. Families with kids, grandparents, groups that want a different kind of set up than a hotel. With my set up it is much more of affordable for them and it is a homey atmosphere with a lot more privacy and use of a kitchen if need be. Most guests go to coffee shops, restaurants and all of the types of things that I no longer even think about doing because I live here and I have done it all. Renting bikes, etc., Kids Museums and events, Art and Natural History Museum, Art walk, Imadanari, festivals including Solstice, wine tasting, etc.

I have as much right as any hotel owner to rent a room or my whole house if I so choose. Everything is in place if someone doesn't run it correctly. 3 noise complaints and you are shut down. If it is not up to par and you get bad reviews- you are shut down. Parking issues and you are shut down. This weeds out anyone that is not being responsible. What more do you want?

SB is an expensive town to live in. We all just try to pay our bills, be good citizens, and find a way of making it work here that is legal and ultimately improves our beautiful SB.

When you run an Airbnb you keep your property cleaned up, improved, and bend over backwards to set rules for noise and parking and anything else you can do to honor the neighborhood.

Not everyone that lives here is wealthy and if I didn't do this I could not continue to afford to be here. I want to live in SB, it's been my home for a long time and I am hoping to be able to continue. I also rent rooms to students but these 2 rooms I need when family and grandkids are here so this allows me to block out those dates when my kids are here.

The taxes form STR's paid to the city of SB are substantial and I know that those are needed here so that is another thing to consider.

We are a tourist town as you know. We now have cruise ships docking here that have their drawbacks impacting our small town. They don't stay in hotels but bring in cash for our restaurants, etc. and so we allow it which we did not at one time. Things always change.

Airbnb is a very popular way of renting while traveling and many people will not come here if they can't rent a house for their families or some kind of set up that is different than hotels offer. Let's really be responsible and look at this from every angle not just listen to the few dissenting voices but remember that "times are a changin'" and we have to change with it. This is not hurting our community but enhancing it financially and at the same time making it possible for everyday folk to live here.

Please vote in favor of continuing STR's.

Thank you,
Rita Bourbon
SB resident

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Thomas Zweber <zweberdiagnostics@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 10:08 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Short Term Rental Santa Barbara

Santa Barbara County Clerk,

My name is Dr. Thomas J. Zweber. I am a physician in private practice in Santa Barbara. I have lived in Santa Barbara previously in the 1990s and have been back in Santa Barbara for the last two years. During the time that my family and I lived in Vermont, we would frequently visit Santa Barbara and, with four children, we did not like to stay in hotels. We utilized short-term vacation rentals for a week or two at a time and had wonderful experiences. We probably would not have visited Santa Barbara if the short-term rentals were not available, in that they are available in other very nice places, such as Nantucket, Massachusetts.

I strongly believe that Santa Barbara County should not outlaw short-term vacation rentals. They should allow, but also regulate, all short-term rentals so that appropriate taxes are collected. People that own these rentals should have an agreement with their neighbors and they should be professionally managed. I strongly believe, as a business owner, that the short-term vacation rentals bring in a very good business. Again, some of these people would not come to Santa Barbara and stay at a hotel. I feel that they should not be prohibited in residential zones. Again, if professionally managed, I do not believe that short-term rentals have a negative affect on affordable housing and the like.

Presently, my wife and I actually own a short-term vacation rental in Santa Barbara. We rely on the income to support our family and also the people that are presently managing and supporting the short-term vacation rental are very well paid and busy. Simply put, that would not be part of the economy minus the fact that it is a vacation rental. We have not had any complaints from our neighbors regarding our short-term vacation rental; they are fully in support of it. I also, as a tax payer, strongly believe these vacation rentals should be regulated strongly and taxes collected.

I feel this is a very important issue for our community and certainly it is for my family.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Zweber, M.D.
2323 de la Vina Street, Suite 208
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
p. 805-845-8895
f. 805-845-8494

The materials in this email are private and may contain Protected Healthcare Information. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that any unauthorized use, disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender via e-mail, telephone or return mail.

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: mariekboudreaux@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 10:47 AM
To: Williams, Das
Cc: sbcob
Subject: short term rentals

Dear Mr. Williams,

I am writing regarding the discussion and vote pending on June 6 about short term rentals in SB County.

I urge you to allow and regulate all short term rentals in SB County. Do NOT prohibit short term rentals in residential areas.

I am an owner of a short term rental in Santa Barbara. I live on site. The space is often used by family visitors and is/was rented 12-20 weekends each year.

The income is/was relied on for living expenses, and in fact, made living in Santa Barbara affordable for me and my family, even after paying expenses and local taxes.

We have never had complaints from neighbors about our short term rental. I am aware of another short term rental nearby which never caused problems for me.

Sincerely,

Marie Boudreaux

Sent from my laptop

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Judith Rubenstein <jmediate20@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 11:32 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: STR's
Attachments: County Supervisors.6.2017.docx

Dear County Clerk,

Please put this letter below in the record for the hearing on the STR's.

Thank you,

Judith Rubenstein
805-637-6850

Judith Rubenstein, MFT, JD
2629 Montrose Place
Santa Barbara CA 93105

County Supervisors
Santa Barbara County

May 31, 2017

Dear Supervisors,

I am a 74-year old Santa Barbara County resident of Mission Canyon Heights. I have owned this home for 17 years (and a prior home for 5 years in the same neighborhood). I hire Turnkey who manages my house as vacation rental when I live in Vermont with my partner (who is from Vermont) for 4-5 months per year, usually between June – October. I work part-time as a Marriage and Family Counselor, and have been a mediator for over 30 years.

I've tried to rent my home for 4 or 5 months, but people want 12-month rentals. The first summer I spent in Vermont, I tried to find renters for 5 months. I tried everything, but couldn't find a renter for that time period. I wound up having to rent my house for 12 months, and then when I came back in the winter to work, I was forced to do short-term rentals in Santa Barbara. After that, I decided that I too needed to do STR's at my home in the summer because finding a 4 or 5 month renter was too difficult.

Therefore, I urge you not to ban STR's but instead impose reasonable regulations – registration, fees, noise restrictions, etc.

And for homeowners like myself who actually live in their homes six months or more per year, a ban on STR's would not give the County more rental housing. Therefore, if any ban is imposed, please carve out an exception for owners who live in their homes 6 months or more. We are different than owners who just buy up property to rent as STR's all year. It isn't fair to put us in the same category.

Thank you,

Judith Rubenstein
Santa Barbara, CA
805-637-6850

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Timothy "Andy" Trabucco <tatrabucco@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 12:39 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Santa Barbara County BOS Meeting June 6th, 2017 - Short-term Rental (STR) Ordinance

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please share the following with the members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors and kindly enter it into the record of the upcoming meeting of June 6th, 2017 as well as any future meetings related to Short Term Rentals (STR) in Santa Barbara County.

Thank you for your assistance.

Andy Trabucco

Dear Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you with a suggestion related to easing the collection of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) from Short term Rentals (STR's) and thereby increasing the TOT income to Santa Barbara County.

Please consider implementing something similar to the following:

- 1. All operators of STR's must register with the County of Santa Barbara.**
- 2. The County of Santa Barbara will identify website provider(s) (VRBO, Airbnb, etc.) who will become qualified to host STR properties.**
- 3. The STR registration process will identify the website provider(s) through which the STR will advertise.**
- 4. The website provider(s) will agree to collect the 12% TOT for every rental and will then remit the collected TOT directly to the County of Santa Barbara on a monthly basis.**

It is my understanding that Airbnb has been designated as "the" website provider for the City of San Francisco. They are currently successfully collecting and remitting TOT for each STR.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andy Trabucco

cc: Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara

Clerk of the Board: sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us.

Supervisor Das Williams (District 1) dwilliams@countyofsb.org

Supervisor Janet Wolf (District 2) jwolf@countyofsb.org

Supervisor Joan Hartmann (District 3) jhartmann@countyofsb.org

Supervisor Peter Adam (District 4) peter.adam@countyofsb.org

Supervisor Steve Lavagnino (District 5) steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Timothy "Andy" Trabucco <tatrabucco@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 12:46 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Williams, Das; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve
Subject: Short Term Rentals (STR) Ordinance - Santa Barbara County BOS Meeting June 6th, 2017

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please share the following with the members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors and kindly enter it into the record of the upcoming meeting of June 6th, 2017 as well as any future meetings related to Short Term Rentals (STR) in Santa Barbara County.

Thank you for your assistance.

Andy Trabucco

Dear Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you with some background and a request for your consideration related to the regulation of short-term rentals (STR's) on AG-I-10 properties.

My wife and I have been residents of Santa Barbara County for more than 35 years. Our home is located in the rural unincorporated area of the County in the Santa Ynez Valley. It is situated on a little more than ten (10) acres and it is my understanding that we are zoned AG-I-10.

In an effort to supplement our income, my wife and I have been periodically renting out our home (primary residence) through the VRBO website for the past couple of years. We have faithfully reported and paid our share of the Tourist Occupancy Tax (TOT). We have also invested a substantial amount in improvements to our home for the purpose of enhancing its appeal to our guests.

As this is our personal home, we are very careful who we open it to and restrict the number of guests to a maximum of six (6) persons in or on the premises at any time. We do not allow any weddings or wedding related events at our home or on our property. Since we are situated on a little more than ten (10) acres, we have ample parking for our guests in a couple of areas around our home. Being on ten (10) plus acres, we can easily park numerous cars completely out of site from any public street or other residence. The majority of our guests are middle aged women and or couples who want to experience the countryside atmosphere found in the Santa Ynez Valley.

We have never received a complaint from anyone. In fact, one would be hard pressed to find anyone in our area that even knows that we sometimes rent our home on a short-term basis.

In addition to the information we provide our guests related to rules and guidelines for their stay, we direct them to local restaurants, markets and other local businesses, helping the local economy.

It would be absurd to think that the periodic short term vacation rental of our multi-million dollar home / property impacts affordable or rental housing. Our home and property are not in the affordable category.

In closing, the periodic short-term rental use of our AG-I-10 property does not have a negative impact. **Please allow and regulate Short Term Rentals on properties that are zoned AG-I-10.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andy Trabucco

cc: Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara

Clerk of the Board: sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us.

Supervisor Das Williams (District 1) dwilliams@countyofsb.org

Supervisor Janet Wolf (District 2) jwolf@countyofsb.org

Supervisor Joan Hartmann (District 3) hartmann@countyofsb.org

Supervisor Peter Adam (District 4) peter.adam@countyofsb.org

Supervisor Steve Lavagnino (District 5) steve.lavagnino@countyofsb.org

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Hilary Anderson <hilaryanderson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 1:16 PM
To: Williams, Das
Cc: Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; sbcob
Subject: In favor or short term rentals
Attachments: H letter to Board of Sups.docx

Please see attached.

Thanks.

Hilary Anderson

Hilary Anderson
2255 Las Canoas Rd,
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

June 1 2017

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

We have lived in Mission Canyon on a two acre parcel for over 25 years.

16 years ago we had a hillside slip between our property and that of our neighbors. Unfortunately we have been tied up in litigation since then and the hillside has only just been repaired. It has taken an inordinate sum of money during which time our home was not saleable.

To be able to stay living on our property, for sixteen years we have rented our home as a short term rental. When we have guests we stay in the guesthouse if we are in town. The rest of the time we live in the house. It is a good and helpful situation.

We raised three children in this house. They are now grown but no longer live in California. When we visit them we stay in short term rental accommodation. In fact, that is how we stay and have done for years when we travel anywhere. It is more practical, congenial and cost effective, and keeps the family together. Hotels are not a viable alternative for large families. We are currently in Spain, in such a set up.

We are very selective to whom we rent our home. It has all our personal things in it that we have spent a lifetime collecting. We are very conscious of the quiet, semi -rural aspect of the Mission Canyon neighborhood and go to great lengths to emphasis this to any potential renters. We have an outdoor curfew of 10 pm and a noise restriction. Guests are aware of this at time of booking and sign a rental agreement that enforces our rules and regulations, being aware their security deposit could be at risk.

We have always paid our TOT.

I hope you will consider this personal perspective amongst the many other positive factors of the short term rental market that benefit Santa Barbara.

Yours,

Hilary Anderson

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Dino Ohanian <dinophoto777@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 2:39 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: SAVE THE SHORT TERM RENTALS!

Good Morning!

I would like to start by introducing myself...My name is Dino Ohanian and I live in Montecito with my wife and we have had a vacation rental for over 8 years. it consists of a separate guest house and is situated on over 1-1/2 acres. Prior to moving to Montecito, we built and ran a "bed and breakfast" in San Francisco for many years...

In the eight years in Montecito that we have been a part of the sharing economy, we have hosted many guests from all over the world. We truly enjoy extending our hospitality and making lasting friendships with visiting tourists who come to enjoy the many attractive features of our region.

Since we do not allow children or pets, it is no wonder that most of our neighbors do not even realize that we have a vacation rental. Our place is really a romantic getaway for couples who need to slow down and spend some quiet time together and regroup!

While they are regrouping they are fulfilling a great economic service to our county. First and foremost, the 12% Transit Occupancy Tax facilitates all sorts of improvements in our county. Then the first thing our guests ask after they settle in is, "Where can we get something to eat?...Where is the nearest grocery store...Where can we rent kayaks...Where is the main shopping district?" So not only are they paying the TOT tax which benefits us all, but they are supporting local businesses and providing jobs for the natives. Ok, so that is a no brainer correct?

But what about the landlords who take advantage? They live in Canada and own a property in Montecito...They rent it out to hordes of young people who party all night, litter the neighborhood while taking up all of the parking spaces? I am definitely just as upset by this errant behavior as anyone else. They should be fined, and with repeated occurrences, they should lose their license to operate.

But the cost of regulation is bemoaned by many in the opposition of vacation rentals. Do they think that because an edict is passed making it illegal to rent vacation rentals, that all of a sudden, everything will cease to be a problem? Hardly, regulation will still be needed to enforce the ban. So why not regulate the bad folks and let the good folks continue with their TOT contributions and patronage of our local businesses? Regulation is a part of life and business!

And that leads me to the definition of a Homestay: A homestay is a vacation rental but with the added requirement that the owners LIVE on the property. This is a very important distinction as the owners have a vested interest in vetting the visitors and regulating their onsite behavior. My wife and I have NEVER had a problem in seven years. Only once we had a couple who brought some of their friends over without our permission and were having a low level party. Well, I was dressed all in black and I appeared out of the bushes and just stared at them until they noticed me. They were frightened and did not know who I was. Well, I finally let them know that I was the owner and that what they were doing was not permitted and the party should disburse or the couple would have to leave immediately. Voila! No more problem! As I tell all of my guests, it is really good that you have the owners on site if there are any problems, as they can fix them immediately!

And also, there has been much talk about loss of housing due to vacation rentals. I believe that this is bogus as most of the vacation rentals would not be on the housing market anyway. It certainly is true in our case. As an owner of a

STR, if they were banned, I would NOT sell or rent my home at an “affordable” rate. There have been numerous studies done, but I will leave that to the experts.

And one final point regarding the so called “desecration of the neighborhoods” philosophy. I know in our case, that is completely false. We have invested the bulk of our income from vacation rentals back into our home and quadrupled our home’s value and have singlehandedly raised the value of homes in our neighborhood immensely. Our neighbors are thankful!

Summing up, we believe that fair and thorough regulation would be necessary with or without a vacation rental ordinance and that the economic pluses certainly outweigh the few problems that occur. Homestays especially should be allowed as they are governed even more intently as the owners are onsite!

Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

Dino and Florida Ohanian

805-698-8950

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Rex Melton <rmelton53@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 3:19 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Short Term Rental Hearing

Regarding the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors hearing we ask the Board respectfully not to create new regulations for individual residential owners who have been operating legally and complying with current regulations including the collection and payment of transient occupancy taxes. There are already regulations to control nuisance violations by poorly managed rentals and impolite guests. There are already parking regulations. The suggestion that vacation rentals reduce the availability of affordable housing is honestly absurd. If vacation rentals are criminalized the homes are not going to become suddenly affordable. There are a number of former vacation rentals in the City that are currently available as month to month rentals \$10000 - \$15000 per month is not affordable for most folks.

We understand there is a vocal minority that for their own reasons do not like vacation rentals however there has to be a balance. Vacation rentals generate a sizable amount of transient occupancy tax for the County and responsible owners should not be penalized for managing their property and contributing to the County coffers with both the TOT and Property Taxes for decades.

Once again we ask the Board not to impose new regulations on existing short terms rentals currently in compliance with the County.

Thank You,
Rex & Christine Melton

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: kelly.rose1@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 3:33 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: June 6, 2017 Board Meeting - Short Term Rental Ordinance Hearing
Attachments: June 6th Board Letter Regarding STRs.doc

Dear Clerk of the Board of Supervisors,

Attached is an electronic copy of our letter to the Board of Supervisors regarding Short Term Rentals in Santa Barbara County. This letter contains our comments on the proposed Short Term Rental Ordinance, which will be discussed at the June 6th Board of Supervisors Hearing.

Would you please distribute our letter to each of the Supervisors.

Thank you for your assistance.
Best Regards,
Kelly and Sandy Rose

Kelly & Sandra Rose
3210 Acampo Road
Los Olivos, CA 93441

June 1, 2017

Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Barbara

Dear Supervisors,

We own and live full time on a property zoned AG I 20, located in the Santa Ynez Valley. We currently have 3 adjacent properties that are operating transient rental businesses. These properties create an environment we wouldn't wish on anyone.

In Santa Barbara County, substantially all of agricultural properties listed on the short term rental websites are located in the Santa Ynez Valley. Because of this, any decision by the Board allowing transient rentals on agricultural zoned properties will have a disproportionate impact on the Santa Ynez Valley. We believe it is critical that the Supervisors understand what your decision will mean to those of us who have worked to preserve the rural nature of the Valley; what it will mean to the future of the Valley; and whether your decision is consistent with the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan.

Beginning in 2015 (nearly 2 years ago), Planning and Development Staff held a number of workshops addressing the issue of transient rentals. The Planning Commission also began hearings on this issue. Many of us attended the workshops and provided input to the Staff. Many of us wrote letters to the Planning Commission and attended and spoke at their hearings on the subject of transient rentals. Both Planning and Development Staff and the Planning Commission recommended allowing transient rentals in commercial, mixed use and tourist zoned areas as well as on AG II zoned property (40+ acres).

At the December 6, 2016 Meeting of the Board, supporters of transient rentals (organized and directed by "Save the Rentals", a transient rental support group) showed up in force to speak about the benefits of transient rentals. Despite two years of work by residents, Planning and Development Staff and the Planning Commission, the Board decided to ignore the recommendations of Staff and the Planning Commission and directed the Staff to come back with proposed regulations

Who Decides What are Fair Regulations?

The supporters of transient rentals repeatedly call for "fair regulations". What does that mean and who determines what is fair? This has been a major problem for cities and counties because history has shown that "fair regulations" aren't necessarily those established by these governmental entities. The reality is that "fair regulations" are those regulations that transient rental hosting websites and owners of transient rentals are actually willing to follow. Until major hosting websites like Airbnb, VRBO, HomeAway, Trip Advisor, Tripping.com. agree to include relevant identification such as short term rental permit numbers, business license numbers, and/or Transient Occupancy

Tax Certificate numbers in their advertisements, the County of Santa Barbara will be virtually powerless to enforce any regulations it establishes. There is simply no way for the County to determine which advertised STRs are legally registered and which ones are operating illegally, let alone which ones are following any regulations established by the County.

The City of Goleta recently passed STR Regulations that included a critical requirement which states that: **“No person shall offer to rent or advertise for rent a short term vacation rental without including in the offer or advertisement the City Permit Number applicable to the property in the form ‘Goleta Permit No.’ The Permit number shall be printed in the same type size as the largest type size used in the main body of the offer or advertisement.”**

Local supporters of transient rentals have pointed to the Goleta STR Regulations as an example of “fair regulations”. Unfortunately, the reality is that none of the hosting websites or the owners utilizing such websites has complied with this regulation. **None of the advertised STRs located in Goleta show the property’s City Permit Number in any advertisement on hosting websites.** Because such advertisements do not list the property address or the name of the property owner, the City of Goleta cannot determine which of the advertised STRs are legally registered and which are not. As a consequence, enforcing the so called “fair regulations” established by Goleta City Council is impossible.

Other California communities such as Anaheim, Santa Monica, San Francisco (the home of Airbnb) as well as New York City (the world’s largest STR market with annual short term rental revenues in excess of \$1 billion) have enacted similar “fair regulations”. **All have been sued by Airbnb.** Airbnb claims that it is protected by the Communications Decency Act and it cannot be required to comply with any city, county or state regulations regarding the content of the advertising on its website.

Even local STR websites like Paradise Retreats (owned by Theo Kracke who is also the founder of “Save the Rentals”) refused to comply with the City of Santa Barbara’s subpoena to provide information on Paradise Retreat’s 100+ STR listings so the City could determine if such properties had Transient Occupancy Tax Certificates. The City had to file a lawsuit in Superior Court to obtain a court order forcing Theo Kracke to comply with the subpoena and provide the requested information. In response to this action, Mr. Kracke brought a lawsuit against the City of Santa Barbara over its prohibition of transient rentals except in designated areas zoned for commercial, hotel and tourist uses.

Thus far, the City of Santa Barbara has identified more than 1,000 illegal STRs, despite the fact that it has been unable to force the cooperation of the major hosting websites like Airbnb, VRBO, HomeAway, etc. in providing information about the STRs listed on such websites. Finding the address of the property and the property owner using other sources has been extremely challenging, time consuming and expensive.

The City of San Francisco recently reported that it has approximately 2,000 legally registered STRs, but it has determined that there are more than 10,000 San Francisco based STRs listed on the major hosting websites.

“Save the Rentals” commissioned a 2016 Survey of STRs located in Santa Barbara County and City. Nearly 25% of the owners surveyed said that if STRs were banned, they would continue to rent their STRs until they were caught. This percentage would only grow in the case of a partial ban and/or where STRs were regulated but the hosting websites continued to refuse to identify which of the STRs were legally registered.

Are STRs an Agricultural or Residential Use?

STR proponents have repeatedly claimed that STRs are simply a form of residential or agricultural use that should be allowed in any zoned area which allows a single family residence. They also deny that STRs are a commercial use and claim that there is no difference between a weekend rental and a long term rental or lease.

The County of Santa Barbara Code Section 32-11 defines a “Hotel” as: “Any structure or portion of a structure which is occupied or intended or designed for occupancy by transients for dwelling, lodging or sleeping purposes, and includes any hotel, inn, **tourist home or house**, motel ...” The City of Santa Barbara has classified STRs as a Hotel and has restricted them to areas zoned commercial, visitor and mixed use. This same position has been taken by Ojai, Carmel, Irvine, Anaheim, Santa Monica, Carlsbad, Hermosa Beach and Sausalito, all of which banned STRs in areas zoned other than commercial, visitor and mixed use. Locally, Solvang and Buellton also banned STRs except in areas zoned for commercial use. Clearly, there are a number of communities which believe that STRs are not simply a different form of residential or agricultural use.

A number of STRs owners spoke before and sent letters to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors indicating that they bought their STR property for investment purposes and it would be unfair to ban this use. Local Real Estate professionals have claimed that banning STRs would depress the price of homes in Santa Barbara County because there wouldn't be competition between investors and potential home owners to buy these properties. Others have said that they own multiple STRs within Santa Barbara County and elsewhere throughout California and have never experienced any problems with neighbors or the local government. These same people argue that STRs are not a commercial use – just an alternative residential or agricultural use. One such owner recently wrote “guest opinions” in local Santa Barbara County Newspapers arguing that since owners of agricultural zoned properties can operate a commercial fruit or vegetable stand, they should be allowed to operate transient rentals since it is a similar activity. It defies logic and common sense to compare a transient rental to a fruit or vegetable stand.

At the December 2016 Board Meeting, several STR website owners and their attorneys claimed that banning STRs in Coastal Zones violated the Coastal Commissions policy on providing affordable housing for visitors to our local beaches. They argued that that instead of comparing the total “per night” rental of a STR to a hotel, the comparison

should be based on the number of bedrooms of the STR. For example, a luxury 5 bedroom beach house that rents for \$1,800 per night on the Paradise Retreat's website really only costs \$360 per night based on the number of bedrooms – much cheaper than the cost of a room at the Santa Barbara Biltmore. Similarly, a nice 4 bedroom beach home on Paradise Retreat's website that rents for \$1,100 per night costs only \$275 per night based on the number of bedrooms – less expensive than most of Santa Barbara's beach hotels. However, this math only works if you have 8 or 10 people who are willing to live in the same house and split the cost. The underlying premise of this argument is that a STR is a residential or agricultural use, even though they need to compare it to a commercial use – such as a hotel – to support their position. This is just another example which demonstrates that the real issue is money and the ability to short term rentals to compete with commercial hotels.

What is the Long Term Impact of STRs?

The argument that STRs do not impact affordable housing has been factually refuted in community after community – here in California, elsewhere in the US, and in Europe and other overseas markets. Properties that are available for short term rental can easily generate revenue far in excess of what they could produce from a long term rental. These properties are permanently removed from the long term rental market.

In a 2016 Survey commissioned by “Save the Rentals”, it was reported that 15% of owners never use their STR property for personal use; 60% of STR owners personally use their property for less than 90 days a year; and 80% of the STR owners personally use their property for less than 6 months per year. **Expressed in a different way, only 20% of the STR owners use their property as their primary residence and home.** This isn't about renting out your primary residence – it is about making money from your investment property, or from your second or third home.

Additionally, several owners of local hosting websites have claimed that STRs have no impact on the housing market because the median market value of STR properties in Santa Barbara County is in excess of \$2.5 million – far too expensive to be considered as affordable residential housing for purchase or long term rental. However, the owners of these multi million dollar properties don't show up to plead their case before the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors. The people who show up are owners who claim they would lose their homes if they could not continue their STR rental business. With a median market value of STR properties of more than \$2.5 million, these people are clearly in the minority.

We have already begun to see the impact of STRs on our local community. Homes in Los Olivos township tend to be older, smaller in size, on smaller lots and are therefore relatively inexpensive. Because they are in walking distance to wine tasting rooms and restaurants and close to wineries and the Chumash Casino, they are in high demand by STR investors. It is common to see homes in Los Olivos advertised as “perfect for use as weekend and short term vacation rental.” One of the Los Olivos Elementary School Board Members spoke to the Planning Commission about her concern over declining

enrollment at the School resulting from fewer families being able to afford to buy or rent homes in Los Olivos. Los Olivos Elementary School is a treasure. It was just named as a National Blue Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education – one of less than 300 public schools nationwide to receive this prestigious award. It would be a tragedy if local children were denied the opportunity to attend this outstanding School because of the high cost of housing, or if the School was forced to close because of a lack of students.

There is no question that a legally permitted STR has substantial economic value to the current property owner, to their successors in interest, and to future owners. It represents a legal right to generate significant income from a single family residence located outside of commercial, visitor and mixed use zoned areas. It is essentially the right to operate a 4, 5, 6 or more bedroom boutique hotel in areas zoned residential and agricultural – changing the character and nature of those neighborhoods forever. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to undo a decision that allows STRs in residential and agricultural zoned areas. It would be a clear “taking” by the County to strip people of the right the County gave them to commercialize their property – and the zoning restrictions as we currently have will essentially disappear.

If the Board of Supervisors allows transient rentals in residential and agricultural zoned there will be no going back. Pandora’s Box will be opened forever. This will be your legacy to the residents of Santa Barbara County - valuing money over neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Kelly and Sandy Rose

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Ben Claydon <benclaydon@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 3:50 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Please Save Owner Occupied Home-Stays in the County

Dear SB County Clerk,

I finally own a home in Santa Barbara and like everyone else I am struggling with the cost of Santa Barbara. Please save owner-occupied vacation rentals (home-stays) so people can host guests in their own homes. My wife and I converted our garage in to a small studio so her mother could stay with us when she needed to. It was an expensive project, but something we had to do to be able to take care of my mother in law. We are happy to host guests to help pay down the debt we incurred building the studio.

Our experience with guests has always been positive. We meet people when they check in so we can put faces to names and so they feel comfortable reaching out if they need anything or have any questions. Opening the lines of communication is much easier when you can meet someone in person, or if you can just walk over if you need anything. All of our guests have been friendly, quiet, and respectful of the property. I think everyone understands they're visiting someone's home, so they are on their best behavior. All of our guests have fallen in love with Santa Barbara. I wrote a little tour guide and they enjoy knowing the different types of beaches we have, where the shopping is, and our top 5 things you shouldn't miss while here. They enjoy being able to borrow our boogie boards and use the washer/dryer if they need to. It is much better than a hotel for them, and helps them feel much better about their visit.

The income is not only helping pay off the construction debt, but is also helping with our mortgage. We also have a house keeper who helps, so the money has a direct impact on her life. We buy local wines when guests would like a bottle in the studio. We could only afford the house that needed the most amount of work, so the money is helping to repair it and redo the landscaping. Converting the garage has already beautified the property and I'm sure the neighbors are appreciative. We have new fences up and will be doing the front yard soon. It's going to have a huge impact on our street! All that work requires local contractors, who can then pay their own bills and support their families. So the money has a direct impact on our community, in a very local way. It's not being sent off to a hotel's corporate offices or something.

Home-stays have a different impact on the city than do investor-owned rentals. Vacationers can't throw wild parties with the owner on site, and neighbors don't have to worry about strangers in their neighborhoods, because someone's not strange once you meet them! Most home owners want to please their neighbors, so they manage parking and noise. We make sure our guests park on our driveway and we let them know that our quiet hours are between 10pm and 8am. Home-stays allow homeowners the income they may need to maintain their homes, or even improve them, thus improving the neighborhood. I would ask any neighbor; Would there be an issue if the owner lives on site? If they're still living there, maintaining the yard, going to work every day, are you still worried about the impact? I think most people have very different feelings about home stays than they do investor owned BnBs. In addition, many home-stays, due to various personal needs of the home owners, will not be converted to long term rentals. For instance, we need to keep ours flexible for my mother in law. Other people may only have availability seasonally, for instance when the kids are off to college.

There are many reasons why someone would invite people in to their homes, studios, garages or guest houses. The income has been very important for us being able to pay our mortgage. Owning a home in Santa Barbara is hard, and most people with a mortgage are struggling every day. I think there's a common misconception that

homeowners in Santa Barbara are rich, but the fact is, if you're lucky enough to make the down payment, you're going to spend your entire paycheck supporting the mortgage. I know some people like the cultural experience of hosting guests; they enjoy meeting people from other cities or countries. I met one widower who wouldn't be able to afford to live if she couldn't take people in to her kid's old rooms. Some people just like paying it forward, they enjoy home-stays when visiting Europe and want to provide a similar experience for people visiting beautiful Santa Barbara.

Here are a few quotes from hosts around the world:

- I use 15% for little upgrades guests mention.— Allison, Michigan
- I'm sure like many other hosts I pay the mortgage!—Andrew, NYC
- We always separate 10% to reinvest in the property and divide the rest into four accounts: a private pension for me, one for my husband, one to purchase other properties, and one for travel.—Danielle, Rio
- We donate some surplus revenue to local organizations like the Southern Black Forest Nature Park.—Claudia, Zurich

In summary, please save home-stays, they have a very positive impact on our local community and the people who live here. Policing it would be pretty easy; show that your bills are sent there. Many municipalities make the distinction between home-stays and vacation rentals and are much more favorable to home-stays.

Thank you,

Ben Claydon