

Hi Scott,

I am a homeowner on the Eastside of Santa Cruz, Windsor Street, and I have lived next door to an ADU for 15 years.

My neighbor used to have long-term renters, sometimes up to 2 years, which was fine with me, but in the past 3-4 years, she has rented her ADU almost exclusively to short-term vacationers or people who need a place to stay up to a month while looking for a job, housing, etc.

This change in her rental policy has affected my quality of life somewhat but definitely the neighborhood in terms of parking, strangers moving in and out, noise at times (although my neighbor has been very responsive to any complaints I may have had, which have been few in number).

The side window of this ADU looks directly onto my bathroom and part of my bedroom, and while I rarely have felt my privacy invaded, I am constantly aware of strangers living very close to me (a 10-foot wide driveway separates me from the ADU).

With a long-term renter, the feelings are different. First, I can get to know that person, make eye contact, be helpful if needed, make friends even if appropriate. With turnover almost constant from spring through Christmas, these opportunities are lost, not to mention the neighborhood is impacted by more traffic, cars parked on the street, strangers milling about along with their friends, and more noise. My neighborhood is somewhat dense to begin with with apartments on Soquel Avenue looking down on my lot.

I need your committee to understand that with no regulations, this neighborhood along with all others in Santa Cruz will change for the worse. There needs to be a limit on the number of short-term ADUS on any given street in Santa Cruz and this number needs to be balanced by other available housing, including apartments, etc.

I urge your committee to encourage landlords by incentivizing them to offer more long-term rental opportunities in Santa Cruz. I realize that money drives many decisions in the rental business and of course, landlords can make way more money with short-term rentals than with long-term ones. However, there is a quality of life and a quality of our neighborhoods that are being jeopardized and compromised if there are no regulations established for short-term rentals.

I also urge your committee to make public comment available at least one time during your upcoming meetings. Please advertise the time and date of that meeting publicly so people like myself can attend and share our concerns with your group.

Thank you.

Farol Henderson

From: D Doherty [mailto:dmdsligo@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:48 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Cc: David Terrazas
Subject: Request for Info re STRs

Hi Scott

Am looking to get the color power point handout you shared last time in ppt format?..tks

Also if available would be nice to get the city fact data in excel format?

Do you have a rough milestone schedule for activities between now and June? And in a bit more detail, what happens between Jan 26th and Feb 23rd?

During the last meeting you appeared to poll committee members to see where to take the discussion to the next step re Restrictive, Limited and Permissible.

When the vote came back leaning well towards **permissible**, you began to figure out how to also go down the less permissible routes!

With Juliana in the Sentinel (Oct 1st 2015) using the words "Stringent" and Mathew's focusing on the county ordinance, I am really really hoping that committee leadership can rise above individual agendas and pursue the prevailing **permissive** route. Given that available STRs are a tiny tiny component of the mostly politically fabricated problem statement, why on round one, go from no ordinance in a city with decades of permissive enforcement to one of **limited** or **restrictive**?

As Ron somewhat alluded to, once an ordinance is in place, your department will have many many opportunities in the years ahead to reengineer it ...(perhaps eventually towards the *stringent* one)

10/1/2015 Sentinel Excerpt

But the issues raised are deep and not easily solved, as city Planning Director Juliana Rebagliati noted Tuesday, saying the process of establishing new regulations regarding vacation rentals could take nine months to complete. Not to mention having to fend off an intense — and organized — backlash against stringent new regulations.

Re Stringent.....Who is driving this assumption, request, policy????

"Having to fend off an intense...." suggests a initial mindset of going all in to create a "financially painful" ordinance for private Santa Cruz hosts! Perhaps a desire for a less intense ordinance could result in a more conciliatory environment!

Clearly the divergent committee makeup that intentionally includes anti competitive factions, multiple hostile agendas and a totally unrealistic timeframe will greatly compromise the quality of the committee's deliverables! Unlike the mandate for the Water committee, this particular committee appears to be more for show over substance.

And it leads me to wonder if a tentative decision has already been made by Mathews et al to essentially replicate the County Ordinance?

Regards
Douglas

From: Robert Corrigan [mailto:corriganr@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2017 6:08 AM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: Re. The Short Term Rental Review Committee

Hi Mr Harriman,

I was very pleased when the City established a committee to review the short term rental situation in Santa Cruz. I was hoping that the committee would be able to make some fair and reasoned recommendations to the City Council, but based on what I have seen and learned, I'm not sure that it will. In short, I now have the impression that the committee may be stacked with individuals who have a direct financial interest in Airbnb and VRBO type rentals.

To help me with this, I'd appreciate it if you could give me some information.

- When the committee was being established, were any criteria set up for its membership. Was it intended that the committee contain a fair proportional representation of owners vs. renters, and within the owner group, was it intended that there be a fair representation of those who have no direct financial interest in short term rentals vs. those who do.
- Now that the committee has been established, could you tell me how many of the members are renters and how many are owners and, among the owner group, how many own properties that have been or are being used as short term rentals.

I believe that these are reasonable questions and that, if answered as asked, your response would not violate anyone's rights of privacy.

Thank you very much for your help on this, and I hope that the committee is, in fact, able to make some useful recommendations to the City Council.

Rob Corrigan
Santa Cruz

From: Courtney Rudd [mailto:courtneyrudd@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 7:04 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: Short term vacation rentals issue

Dear Scott,

I am expressing my concern and my hope that the city of Santa Cruz will craft a policy or regulation to limit the number of Short Term rental permits or whatever it takes to open up inventory and housing options for the people that LIVE here and are desperately trying to remain here. I am a school teacher. My husband is a city worker in San Jose. We have 2 children and have been watching the real estate market so that we can hopefully find and purchase a reasonably priced home. We are committed to living in Santa Cruz. We have a great community of friends and our children are happily attending DeLaveaga. My district loses teachers because the cost of living is prohibitive. What is the main cause for this? The price of housing, whether trying to own or rent, is the major expense for most residents in Santa Cruz.

A solution to help mitigate the housing shortage, which could be called a housing crisis, would be to limit and regulate the amount of Short Term rentals that are allowed in the city and/or at the least to please collect TOT on them. If home buyers want to purchase investment properties in the city, they would still easily be able to rent the property to the many many people seeking places to live. While I recognize that this may provide less income than short term rentals can, it is important to look at the ENTIRE community's needs over individuals' business. This is taking a utilitarian view which favors the needs of the majority for the greater good of the entire community.

Please consider those of us who work hard and contribute to our community's vibrancy and socio-economic diversity. Do we really need to take the path of San Francisco?

Sincerely
Courtney Rudd
Canfield Avenue, Santa Cruz, 95060 (Lower Ocean neighborhood)

Scott K. Harriman

From: Noreen Pera-Schwartz <gr8grlsmom@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2017 4:07 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: STVR Subcommittee Meeting

Dear Scott,

As I reflect on the overall tone of the meeting that I attended on January 11, a couple of points seem worthy of taking particular note.

1. You specifically asked each of your committee members with which of the 3 general regulation categories for STVRs he/she most closely aligned. The votes of the committee (6 "permissive", 2 "leaning toward permissive", 3 "restrictive") should truly, in my opinion, shape the direction in which your subsequent meetings go. That you would explore further the answer ('permissive' in this case) that brought the most votes, was in fact stated by you prior to conducting the vote. With due respect, my hope is that you follow through with that plan.

After this meeting I went back and looked at the survey results, with specific attention to question 6, 'I believe vacation rentals provide the following community benefits'. Over 58% of those surveyed see added homeowner income as a benefit, with the overwhelming majority of other questions answered favorably for STVRs. With this in mind it appears that the over 1,700 members of the community who took the time to answer the survey, lean with the majority of your sub-committee.

2. From attending numerous meetings on this topic, it seems that whatever opposition is expressed to permitting STVRs, is to those that are not "owner occupied". If the data from the survey and the sentiment from the community points to this, why not explore ways in which to restrict "non-owner occupied" (meaning owner's primary residence is not on the property) and just allow "owner occupied" parcels to use their residential property as they wish?

3. Affordable housing is a crisis that is unlikely to change here in SC, but it is not the responsibility of home-owners. As repeated over and over, existing STVRs, most certainly those that are "owner-occupied", will for the most part, not be converted to long-term rentals. Certainly anything that does come available to rent long-term, will be at market value and not "affordable". This seems especially true for the ADUs that property owners have added or converted at a great expense.

In the survey, question 5, 'Do you have issues or concerns with STVR in your neighborhood? If so, what?' 47% believe that it negatively impacts long-term rental and leads to increased purchase and/or rental cost. (In my opinion this question leads people to answer negatively toward STVR but nevertheless, the answers reflect at least the perception)

So there must be other solutions to impacting housing that the city could take. I have several suggestions that I have previously heard mentioned, but I believe warrant direct discussion and consideration.

- Allow VRBO/HomeAway and Airbnb to collect SCTOT automatically on their website. It forces all STVRs in the city to pay proper tax, and will lead to an automatic increase in funds to potentially help finance Affordable Housing, if that is how the city sees fit to designate the increase in income.
- Raise the SCTOT from the existing 11% to perhaps 12% or 13% to increase same city funds as above.
- Restrict complexes (apartments, townhouses, quad/tri/duplexes) from converting all or most units to STVR. Mandate that when a property within city limits is sold, only a percentage (eg. 20%) or a specific number of units in a larger

complex, will be allowed as STVR. This type of plan also addresses the concern of one of your committee members who witnessed a complex sold to someone outside the community for the explicit conversion to STVR. This problem is not unique as expressed by several persons in your survey.

4. The "neighborhood ambiance" or whatever other term is used to express this concern of the City Council, really does not play out in reality. According to the survey results, most noise, disruption, parking issues in neighborhoods, are the result of houses crammed with students. To me this feels like the 'elephant in the room' as nobody in the city government responds to this issue when it is directly expressed. I do not know what is on the books with respect to controlling housing, but certainly it seems that the city should at the very least strictly limit the number of parking permits issued to each address. Also strict and steep fines should be imposed on property owners who do not comply with neighborhood courtesies and expectations by the neighbors of their tenants.

That said I want you to know that I am a huge fan of UCSC, and a huge fan of young people having access to higher education in our city. I live VERY close to the university, and am impacted daily by students in my neighborhood. I truly love them! But they are young, and living together on their own can create problems for neighbors. Perhaps this does not appear directly related to STVRs, but really STVR opponents need to stop blaming STVRs for neighborhood problems. The reality, based on public expression, is that there are very few, and NONE that are owner-occupied!

I am unable to attend any of the next few meetings. I therefor thought it best that I share my observations, thoughts, and ideas with you going forward. I very much appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the effort to bring reasonable, sensible resolution to the STVR discussion.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful attention.

Best regards,
Noreen Pera-Schwartz

Scott K. Harriman

From: Sean Ullrich <seanuts35@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2017 7:50 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: Short term vacation rental committee

Dear Short Term Rental Committee

As a long time resident of Santa Cruz, I have been following the discussion regarding short term rentals in the city. I took the survey that the city put out last fall and have read the results. This week I read all of the comments and I wanted to tell the committee what I think is important to consider in making your decisions.

I saw that 76% have rented a home, apartment or condo while on their own vacations, so these people appreciate staying at a vacation rental instead of a hotel.

I saw that 80% have not rented out their own homes for short term or vacation rental use, which tells me that even though they may have used a vacation rental, they haven't chosen to do it themselves.

I saw that 51% are aware of there being vacation rentals in their neighborhood, and 36% of the respondents replied that they had no issues with the short term rentals in their neighborhoods.

Of those who did report problems, I saw that noise, parking and garbage were the biggest number of complaints. The second most frequently commented on issue was the concern about spotty or non-enforcement of safety codes, non-payment of transient occupancy tax, lack of permits, and the absence of an official city complaint procedure for neighbors to use.

I also saw mentioned very frequently that there is a big difference in impact on the neighborhoods between owner occupied and non-owner occupied rentals (whether they are student rentals or vacation rentals).

I feel there are some simple fixes to be made, many of which were suggested in the surveys by members of the community. I would like to ask that the committee consider these suggestions:

1. Make short term/vacation rentals only allowed on owner occupied/primary residence properties. This would include any owner occupied situation like renting an individual room within a house, renting or swapping the whole house temporarily when the owners are on vacation themselves, or renting out an ADU that is on their property. This addresses two things, keeping neighborhood impact lower and increasing the amount of available rental housing in the city because the whole houses that are currently used for vacation rentals by absentee landlords would be available only for long term rentals.
2. Create an annual or two-year short term rental permit process that includes notification to neighbors of the existence of the rental and an official complaint procedure outline (including consequences, such as fines for specific garbage, noise, parking complaints). Any property receiving X number of complaints would not be allowed to renew their permit the next time it comes up for renewal. Having this complaint form on line would help.
3. Create a parking permit for short term/vacation rentals that only allows a specific number of cars to be parked (maybe by number of bedrooms?).
4. Make the renting company (airbnb, vrbo,) collect the transient occupancy tax from reservations and submit it directly to the city. This would eliminate the city needing to search for illegal units or people avoiding paying the transient occupancy tax.

Santa Cruz has always been a vacation town, and tourism is our biggest money maker. Making all vacation rentals illegal will just be counterproductive and create a black market for rentals. Following these suggestions could make it so that rentals are safe, permitted and taxed while protecting the interests of the neighborhood.

Thank you for considering the input of the community in your decisions.

Sean Ullrich

Scott K. Harriman

From: Robin Cunningham <robinwc@got.net>
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 3:38 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: STVR Subcommittee

January 23, 2017

Dear Scott,

I am writing this letter as a concerned citizen, a 'Grandparented ADU' owner and a 40 year resident of Santa Cruz who finally owns her own home. I purchased this home because it had an ADU with an active and profitable short term rental history which, after doing the math, would allow me to be able to pay the mortgage and property taxes (which my primary income would not be able to cover). I have been operating respectfully in my neighborhood for 5 years without incident or complaint from my neighbors, a few of which were unaware I was even operating a short term rental here until I asked them if they would write me letters (which have been presented to City Council). If fingers were to be pointed at neighbors who 'cause a decrease in neighborhood integrity' it would be to a lot of long term owners or renters near me, for certain, who allow their dogs to be left outside to bark all night, who let their property dissolve into entropy, who leave garbage and junk lying around as if a decorative display. The worst offenders, in my estimation, are the college party houses, which are long term rentals running unregulated all over town. To my knowledge not one STR has been listed as a problem and it would be interesting to see the actual data of complaints filed.

I understand the concern of residents who have been led to believe that STRs are causing the housing shortage, but we all know that STRs have historically been a reality in our tourist town plus the economic forces that drive up the cost of housing have had the *side effect* of causing people to need to supplement their income, hence the renting out of rooms, garages, garden sheds, etc. In my case and that of many others, the economic calculus was made to either purchase or build an ADU in which to operate a STR to supplement income based upon the ability to recoup investment and provide that necessary additional income to afford to own and live here. At no time prior to the latest STR moratorium was this made clear to anyone in our category before purchasing or permitting our ADUs, so financial plans were made based upon this use being unrestricted. It is a travesty that this assumption has been holding us hostage and is blaming our economic survival in these tough times as the root cause and restriction of use as the ultimate solution to Santa Cruz's housing problems when we all know that the Silicon Valley economy, the student population and our City's own No Growth policies have been the major offenders. We STR owners are merely trying to float in the same boat as everyone else with the tools we have available to us, so this demonization is both wrong-headed and restriction of use will not bear the desired fruit.

I have attended all the STR Committee meetings and at the latest meeting a vote was suggested by you and a poll taken to see where the committee might best focus its research going forward. The *Permissive path vote prevailed* (by 6 permissive, 3 restrictive and 1 limited) yet you said that the committee should then focus on 'both' permissive AND restrictive. Why? Those of us who are paying attention feel that this committee is designed to offer a litany of rules and regulations designed to shut us down entirely and limit our property rights to the point that we will be forced out of business at a time critical to our ability to survive in this town with enough income to hang on to our homes. I'm hoping to retire someday and be able to supplement my SS income and stay here, but any restriction of use of my ADU will put me out of business; then yes, neighborhood integrity will dissolve. Think about the collateral damage imposing restrictions arbitrarily will cause when you will basically gain nothing in return but heartache.

This is the view of someone who has played by the rules, done her homework and is respectful of her neighbors. I want to be sure that under your leadership, the research going forward will focus on what the majority wanted which is toward the Permissive path. I await your response.

Thank you,
Robin Cunningham

Scott K. Harriman

From: 3657311220206e <3657311220206e@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:00 AM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Cc: City Council
Subject: STR committee meeting

Dear Mr. Harriman,

I have been following STR and rentals as a whole with the city for over 2 years now, attending council meetings, etc. I was quite excited to hear that the council was forming a group of community members to examine how to make STR work within the city.

There are two elements that are important to examine: the politics of STR and the factual metrics of STR.

There has been a lot in the way of politics, mostly anti STR, lead by council stating that STR is creating the housing crisis, and is the bane of certain council members. With the media visibility of the dislike of hosting organizations, like Homeaway/VRBO and AirBnB, a win against STR by council members quickly pads their ratings with their constituents.

From what I have seen, the council has not, up until this point, been neutral on this examination of this issue. I would argue that your moderation of this issue at the community forum has also not been neutral, but has a hidden agenda against STR. I AM asking for you to be impartial moving forward.

I was surprised at how when the votes on strict, permissive, no change were tallied at the last meeting, you tried to sway the vote, and alter the count for a more restrictive STR tally than what the actual tally was. This undermines the credibility of this process.

What I would like to see is the production of factual information around this issue, as well as inclusion of all rentals as a whole regarding reform. Rentals, Long term, Short term, whole house, shared rooms, should all be reviewed, as regulating them separately, does not create a comprehensive solution.

A lot of complaints about STR, are difficult to isolate and validate are STR issues. One of the biggest was neighborhood preservation, with noise disturbances, parking overflow, and not “knowing” their neighbors. These issues apply equally to long term rental (and in some situations are for worse with long term rentals where UC students are packed into rentals). There really has been no distinguishable facts.

Additionally the collection of rental data for this committee to examine has been unacceptable and negligent. There are no clear metrics on how many rentals are long term in Santa Cruz, where they are located, and how those numbers of available units have changed historically. The same info is missing for STR (except for the maps on the wall last meeting). Rentals metrics should also show rentals, both STR and LTR, are of what type: Multi unit/apartment, room for rent in a house, single family residence, Owner occupied, ADU, etc, which can provide the ability for this committee to make informed decisions.

The other important topic to discuss, prior to invoking new regulation would be discussing how the city will enforce any new regulation, as today, enforcement is poor at best. Most enforcement targets those who are following the rules, and does not address the massive amount of illegal units out there. By introducing new

regulation around STR without similar regulation that applies to all rentals, STR will go further underground, and the city will lose out on the TOT income, and most likely will not be able to enforce.

In closing, I would like to ask for more impartiality on your part, acting as the facilitator, as well as providing enough factual rental data for the committee to make informed decisions. I think that will make these sessions much more effective.

Regards,

Westside Owner/Resident.

P.S. Could you also please provide a detailed list of all of the current council members who have rental properties and the types of rentals they are: STR or LTR? I think it is important for the committee to know what the council members have. There is at least one council member I know of that has 11 units within the city.

Scott K. Harriman

From: Bill Kavanaugh <kavanaugh.bill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 8:45 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Cc: Ron Powers
Subject: Short Term Vacation Rental Subcommittee Meetings

Greetings Scott,

Thank you for your efforts to further understand and investigate the Short Term Vacation Rentals true impact on the City of Santa Cruz. We applaud the move for the City of Santa Cruz to select a STVR Subcommittee to come up with recommendations that reflect a solid majority of the volunteer diverse group who have given their time to make a meaningful difference.

My husband and I have attended both STVR meetings. During the first meeting on Dec. 14th, the divergent committee introduced themselves. Each member had the same materials and access to the same reports. All members were given the opportunity to express their opinions. On Jan. 11th, a poll vote, suggested by you, was taken to focus research and discussion for the few remaining meetings on Restrictive, Limited, Permissive or No Changes. Clearly, the vote (6 for permissive, 2 for limited, and 3 for restrictive) was to focus on Permissive Regulations. It did seem puzzling that after the initial vote by the sub-committee members had selected the permissive regulation path by a clear majority, you decided to look further at and investigate both the restrictive and permissive regulations pathways. We encourage you to stay on track with the Permissible Committee vote. Unless, the input from the STVR subcommittee is truly not being valued & followed, and the intention all along for the City of Santa Cruz is to move forward with the more restrictions plan of action.

Recently, my husband and I retired to Santa Cruz in October of 2016. We had purchased property and built our ADU in 2015 with the intention of having **options** to house family and friends, or rent it short term. We followed all City of Santa Cruz housing/permits requirements; along with paying **substantial fees** (no discounts). At no time were we notified in writing that changes and restrictions would be made regarding our ADU. We made major financial plans & investments based on our ADU being unrestricted.

Please let this divergent committee focus on the **Permissive** path as voted. We believe it would make the people of Santa Cruz lose faith in this process if you do not follow and honor the path that a majority of the volunteers have recommended.

Thank you,

Betty and Bill Kavanaugh

Scott K. Harriman

From: Toni Stratos <tstratos@got.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:03 AM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: STR

Hi,

I'm a senior citizen with a STR in my home. This income has actually saved me financially and has allowed me to keep and live in my home. I feel that homeowners rights should be as or more important than the rights of renters. I think that homeowners rights get thrown aside when many of us are having difficulty staying in our homes. Also, I do have an ADU on my property that is rented long term. The people that come short term make almost no impact on the neighborhood. If I was renting the room longterm(which I wouldn't) there would be much more impact, (friends visiting etc). This is the case with the longterm rental.

I don't believe these STR do anything to make this city less affordable. First of all, it is not affordable. The problems in this city with affordable housing are the fact that we have no water, no building or new construction and the university to give a few examples. Also, the price of homes is \$800,000 for median home prices. How is that affordable? If we home owners, who have lived in this area for years, and because of life's circumstances, are forced to sell, who will be living here?

I believe the city council wants to use STRs to placate the city because there's no readily available answers to the housing crisis.

And lastly, these visitors spend a lot of money when they're here in our city and maybe wouldn't come if they didn't have this choice of accommodation.

Thank you,

I hope you will vote positively for STRs, which are also good for global relations!

Toni Stratos

Sent from my iPad

Scott K. Harriman

From: Peggy Pollard <isi.santacruz@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 12:42 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: STVR committee input

Dear Steve Harriman and Short Term Rental Committee,

I'm sorry I cannot attend the upcoming committee meetings due to my working at that time. But I want to give my input, as owner of an ADU in Santa Cruz.

The ability for homeowners living on our own property with an ADU to have the option of renting it out for Short Term Rentals is an INCENTIVE for homeowners to build ADUs with our own family money.

Currently we are renting our ADU on our home property for long term rentals, it is much easier for our home to do so right now, but knowing that we could occasionally, perhaps in summer months, rent it short term means the extremely high cost and highly painful process that we went through to build it would be more worthwhile financially.

If you make it more worthwhile financially, people will build more ADUs

Taking away this option from homeowners for their own private property is DIS-incentivizing people like us to build ADUs and therefore is opposite of your goal of increasing rental housing through local homeowners own funds..

There is NO proof that prohibiting us from having the option to do STR as we see fit will increase affordable housing in Santa Cruz.

Please base our city policies on data, evidence, facts, not the idealistic visions of a few city leaders who have no credible evidence it will work.

Thank you for your just and fair consideration of this important issue.

Peggy Pollard
ISI.SantaCruz@gmail.com
(831)239-3429 www.ISISantaCruz.com

Scott K. Harriman

From: caroline holt <caval3@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 7:44 AM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: STVR issues- Late survey submittal

Dear Scott,

I came to your first meeting but couldn't attend the second due to a funeral.

I just returned from being away for this reason and I just saw I missed the date line to fill out and submit the Subcommittee survey form.

I am a single woman running an Airbnb in a quiet neighborhood. No one has ever complained about me, and barely anyone know I do. I am registered and pay my dues to the City. I was able to remain in Santa Cruz after a divorce due to the possibility of additional income via this way.

I am very respectful of others and I feel like I am offering a service to travelers with a low budget.

I agree that there should be some restrictions on STRV but keep in mind that I would NEVER rent long term as it would be too impactful on my life.

I hope you will be able to share this email with the committee.
Sincerely

Caroline Groux

"Anything or anyone that does not bring you alive is too small for you" (Whyte 2007)
"What ever limits us we call fate" (Ralph Waldo Emerson)

Scott K. Harriman

From: Shannon Freed <shannonfreed@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 9:13 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: Please pass to short term vacation rental committee

Dear committee members,

My name is Shannon Freed. I live in Santa Cruz for 9 months out of the year and spend the summer on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota. I read through much of the concerns to be addressed about short term vacation rentals and how the negatively affect the city.

Many of the points are well taken but some assumptions are not always correct. With our rental for example, I explicitly indicate no parties and no loud noise past 10 pm. I am able to employ my neighbor part time to manage the rental and she makes sure that the guests adhere to the rules. She reported this summer that most of the guests parked in the driveway when they arrived, walked everywhere, arrived home late and went to bed.

I myself know many working families who can no longer afford to live here and who have either had to move out of state or now commute from other communities. My husband works at Grocery Outlet and has a co-worker who commutes all the way from Hollister. It seems the majority of the jobs available in Santa Cruz are in the \$11 per hour range which would never cover rent here let alone other living expenses. Affordable housing is in short supply and the waiting list for our county has over 17,000 names and roughly 10 year wait. We are only able to live here because we receive assistance from our family.

I am writing because (while I was unable to read the entire document) from what I was able to read it seems one situation was not addressed. There are many middle class families who rely on vacation rental income of their homes in order to afford to stay here. For us, the only way we can afford to stay in Santa Cruz during the school year is to rent out our home in the highly desirable Seabright neighborhood to short term vacationers which spread out over the year reduces our monthly mortgage to half which is still more than twice what it would be for this size home in South Dakota. Thankfully we have family in South Dakota and a small residence there where we live for free during the summer, we rent to vacationers on our family land there as well to help get through those months.

We also rely on being able to rent our home for the occasional weekend or few days when we have other places to be or stay which helps create an even more "affordable" living situation.

I have friends who own homes who rent out an extra room or a small studio on their property to supplement. One woman on Airbnb who I do not know in person has a camping trailer that she rents out in her yard. No doubt she depends on this to supplement her income.

I write this in good faith to you that you will consider these types of situations when debating what course of action to take and when making your final decision.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

--

Shannon Freed
Homeschool Mother/Santa Cruz Resident
Founder/Director
Earth Tipi
408-859-4624
earthtipi.org

For information on mixing your own plaster from all natural materials check out:

[What Raven Says](#)

Scott K. Harriman

From: Jessica Arlt <jessica_arlt@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 9:47 PM
To: Scott K. Harriman
Subject: Vacation rentals

I have lived in our apartment for six years on Beach Hill, which has recently been purchased and turned into mainly Airbnb's. We were fortunate enough to be allowed to stay but we are only one of about four tenants in the complex of about 14 units to be allowed to do so. As much as I like my new landlords (and they seem very kind and more attentive than the previous landlords) I very much miss having neighbors.

Having a small child and having neighbors that we know and have known for a long time is quite important to us.

Having people coming and going at random times and during random hours it's very disconcerting. Sometimes there are people walking through the complex near our house where my kid is and playing and we don't know who they are. We don't know if it's a transient, we don't know if it's a guest staying in the Airbnb, we don't know who they are. We are now always on guard. We are always right there with him, but we still have to get people away from our area. For six years we have always known our neighbors. And now we know nobody.

We are paying tenants and yet we still have to protect our area to the extreme. We have actually become tenants and security guards at the same time. This is not what we had signed up for. Nobody is on site to manage this, and we are pretty much on our own. The new owners are very kind and to get back on quickly on issues as far as maintenance, but if there is no one working/living/attending the premises it is up to us: the few tenants there, to deal with it.

Our water bill has gone up significantly by about \$35. We actually do not receive a bill from conservice anymore. Our landlords just tell us what to pay and we abide by that with no proof of actual bills.

We truly do love where we live and it is in a great school district. I am able to walk to work. We both, my husband and I, can walk to our child's school. We

can walk to numerous parks for fun with our little one. We definitely do not want to move unless we are forced to, which could happen at anytime.

That thought is very terrifying.

Can we find somewhere nearby? Can we afford it? Do we have to leave Santa Cruz altogether? These are the thoughts that keep me up at night.

The housing in Santa Cruz, having it becoming a lot of Airbnb's pretty much all over the place, is making it extremely hard for us. There is not very many places where we can rent that is affordable or even available.

I have 2 jobs and my husband has a full-time job just to be able to stay here where he and our child were born and raised.

I know this is quite a long email but as you can see this topic completely hits close to home, so to speak and literally.

Very sincerely,

Jessica Arlt

Sent from my iPhone