

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Ana McTaggart  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 01, 2017 2:28 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** Concern about Short Term Rentals

Hi Scott,

I am a graduate student at UCSC. I have unfortunately not had the chance to speak out too much about the housing crisis but it is a very real one! I am "stuck" here for 4-5 more years, and need to ensure safe and stable housing. I believe we must restrict short term rentals in order to do so. I haven't spoken up because I am busy, and also because I didn't even know this was going on. I need to engage more in city politics, lol!

I love Air BnB. I use it all the time while traveling. However, vacation rentals and air BnB are destroying the housing market here, due to the total lack of regulation in a gorgeous, but small, town. I am by no means opposed to people subletting their rooms when they go home for a vacation, but what I am seeing time and again is nice rentals being rented out for thousands of dollars, and only crappy low quality rentals being available. We've seen repeatedly, tourists cramming dozens of people (and often entire school sport's teams) into houses, while students who want a single bedroom are forced to pay over \$1000/bedroom. The parking situation is a nightmare near the boardwalk during the summer, and the fact these houses often have significantly more than 1-2 people per bedroom certainly contributes to it. Even undergraduate students rarely put more than 3 people in one room, but Air BnB will advertise a 2 bedroom as sleeping 6 or more, if one includes every couch, etc. Add in the fact that most students are not partying for fear of eviction, but short term guests often party, and we're painting a bleak picture of neighborhoods, where as opposed to community block parties, tourists make messes that we must clean up.

We've seen time and time again, graduate students only being able to have housing for the school year. We've seen, time and time again, the only pet friendly options are vacation rentals. Many landlords are slumlords, renting out low quality homes. Many students are terrified of eviction. There is simply not enough housing for UCSC students, especially older ones and graduate students. We do not want to live in dorms or doubles in our 30s, we want to have a nice little apartment or a clean and well maintained room in a house! Many of us have children.

Now, this isn't about the entire housing crisis. This is about Air BnB and vacation rentals. What many people do is rent out their spare room on it for much more than they could make in a fair lease, but only per day, not total. What many people do is cram many visitors into a room, and throw loud parties. What many landlords do is maintain and clean their Air BnB, while letting the student housing stock totally deteriorate. The cost differential is real when taken on a day to day basis. However, by allowing long term leases, landlords can make more money, because they do not have to worry about empty rooms during the week. By regulating short term leases, landlords won't be tempted to evict long term tenants over the promise of a higher amount of money on a weekend. The city could also gain a significant amount of funding if they regulated all short term rentals, held them to the same codes as hotels, and required hotel tax. Hotels here are frequently booked, do not let the fear of losing business scare anyone, because there are many customers.

In short, please regulate AirBnB and Short Term Rentals! Please create a regulation with significant teeth in it.

Best,  
Ana

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Dawn and Dean  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 2:12 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** STR

Dear Mr. Harriman,

Due to lack of housing stock in Santa Cruz, it is vital that STR's be discouraged. I attended many City Council Forums last fall and Affordable Housing was the number one concern of this community. STR's will diminish our already inadequate housing stock. The idea that this is even being discussed during times when hardships concerning housing abounds, is beyond the pale!

Neighborhood impacts would be severe, a once thriving community turns into a vacation hot-spot with all its negatives. Who does this serve?

We simply must stand for more than profit instead we must stand for neighborhoods and stand for fairness.

I support a 30 day occupancy requirement. STR's belong in commercially zoned districts where they will be subjected to all the permits, fees and BB codes.

Thank you for your consideration,

Dawn Schott-Norris  
Dean Norris

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Gabriel Cohn  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 4:30 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** Short Term Rentals

Mr. Harriman-

I am just writing to express my opposition to the use of rental property for short term rentals. I believe a cap of 60 days/year or so should be imposed on AirBnB type rentals. This will help to open up more housing stock for students and long term renters, helpign to control our out of control rental prices. Please pass my concerns on to the rest of the committee. Thanks!

-Gabriel Cohn, Santa Cruz Resident

--

Gabriel J. Cohn  
Teacher and Game Designer

**Scott K. Harriman**

---

**From:** Megan Thomas <  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2017 10:42 AM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** short-term rentals

Dear STVR Subcommittee,

I am writing to urge you to ban short-term rentals in Santa Cruz or at least restrict them to commercially-zoned districts.

I am a homeowner, concerned about how short-term rentals negatively impact my community. When rents are outrageously high, it is difficult for people to find safe and secure housing. This impacts renters--by far the majority of our community I'm sure--most directly and harmfully, in ways so obvious I hope I don't need to explain. But it also impacts everyone in our community negatively, when housing is insecure and too expensive. Furthermore, when residential communities end up having short-term rentals inhabited by tourists here for a weekend or a couple of weeks, it erodes the neighborhood in ways big and small.

Furthermore I am concerned about the local businesses that do provide lawful, safe, regulated short-term housing to tourists: When short-term rentals like airbnb proliferate, it hurts these businesses, which have been always been an important pillar of our community's important tourism business.

Short-term rentals should be defined as anything under 30 days. These rentals need to be restricted to commercial zones, subject to permit fees and codes the same as those regulating B&B's, and enforceable with significant fines.

Only these measures can help preserve the residential character of our residential neighborhoods.

Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Megan Thomas  
231 California St,  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

**Scott K. Harriman**

---

**From:** Pauline Seales  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 05, 2017 5:48 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** Air BnB

Please do NOT allow these short term rentals to take over housing desperately need by teachers, police and other residents.

Occasional renting by residents doing "home exchanges" should be allowed but not residences becoming STVR only.

The housing situation is becoming more and more severe, resulting in lots of people driving from further and further away exacerbating climate change and traffic congestion.

Pauline Seales

Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Aaron Wistar  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2017 6:12 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** Message for Short Term Vacation Rental Subcommittee

Hello,

I am writing to urge the STVR subcommittee to adopt restrictive regulations on all short-term rentals in Santa Cruz.

Rents in Santa Cruz are outrageously high, among the highest in the country. And while services like Airbnb are not entirely responsible for this situation, they are certainly making it worse. I personally have friends who were forced out of housing so that the owner could renovate their apartment and list it on Airbnb. Another friend of mine was pushed out of his room in a larger house, only to find it listed on Airbnb a few months later. I am sure they are not alone in this situation.

Access to secure, affordable housing is a basic human right. It should always outweigh the desire of homeowners and landlords for supplemental income. No one will starve if we eliminate short term rentals. When I attended a recent meeting, I heard people claim that without short-term rental income, they would not be able to afford living in Santa Cruz. This is simply not true. If short term rentals were eliminated, homeowners and landlords would still be free to rent out their rooms on month-to-month leases. Renting month-to-month should provide plenty of income without sacrificing too much in the way of flexibility. If we do not eliminate short term rentals, on the other hand, people will continue to be forced out of Santa Cruz, and potentially end up on the street.

I request that the city prohibit rentals of less than 30 days, in all units, regardless of whether or not the owner lives there. I think this measure is necessary because, from what I've read, it is difficult, if not impossible, to enforce regulations that differentiate between owner-occupied and non-owner-occupied rentals. In New York, for example, owner-occupied rentals are still allowed, and it enables people to skirt the law against non-owner-occupied rentals. More importantly, a large portion of the potential housing stock in Santa Cruz is in rooms that could be classified as owner-occupied--such as bedrooms in a shared house or mother-in-law units. If regulation is about increasing the supply of rental units, it can't make an exception for those that are owner-occupied.

Along the same lines, serious penalties and enforcement measures are necessary to make regulation work. Advertising of short term rentals should be prohibited as well, and those who break the law should face a substantial fine.

Thanks for your time,

+++++

Aaron Wistar | M: [518-312-2219](tel:518-312-2219) | E: [awistar@gmail.com](mailto:awistar@gmail.com)

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Stephen David Engel  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2017 8:00 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** To the STVR Sub-Committee

Dear Committee Members,

I am pressed for time, but I wanted to write a quick but emphatic note to say that **I oppose the proliferation of short-term vacation rentals in Santa Cruz**, and that **I support strong regulation** of this sector.

I am a working member of this community. I teach and study full time at the university, and I take editing jobs beyond that. I would like to remain in Santa Cruz for the duration of my doctoral work if not much longer, as I feel at home in and love this city, but I worry that I will not be able to afford it.

**I currently spend more than half of my monthly income to share a two bedroom apartment**—that is, if an attic space with no door qualifies as a bedroom. My roommate and I would take on a third, with one of us sharing a room, but our landlord will not allow it. I feel, on a monthly, weekly, and daily basis anxiety about rent, as do just about all of the other graduate students and undergraduates I know.

A portion of these students have left the city, moving to Oakland or other areas where they can find more reasonable (and by that I mean less insane) housing. I would prefer not to do the same, as proximity to the campus community impacts my ability to succeed in my education and to educate my students well.

Rapidly increasing rent is not a good thing for this community. It cannot be blamed solely on university growth, nor can all of it be blamed on the spillover of Silicon Valley, though both should be of concern to you as well. Another piece—a central piece—of the rental crisis besetting good, respectable, hard-working people here is short-term vacation rentals like Airbnb.

**Please do everything you can to regulate STVRs** and make this city more livable for those of us who struggle to live and work here.

Thank you!  
Stephen David Engel

--

Stephen David Engel  
PhD Student  
History of Consciousness  
UC Santa Cruz

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** joshua brahinsky  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2017 8:11 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** AirBnb

Dear Short Term Rental Subcommittee,

I love staying in AirBnbs and I love being able to do whatever I want with the house that I own in Santa Cruz. But I value our community more.

I don't want my neighborhood to become a commercial district. I don't want my kids (6 and 9) to not know the neighbors. I don't want to have houses with lots of empty rooms much of the year. In my last neighborhood, the airbnb became a nice site for shooting up when it was empty. We had airbnb on our property and that was great when the Brazilian families visited. But, more often than not we had no idea who was in our yard or on our block. It was pretty awful. Neighborhoods with unstable populations are far less safe and we should be doing everything we can to create safe and accessible places for long term stability in this town, not more transience.

Short term rentals jack up the rents on our neighbors and push our friends to the margins of Santa Cruz. I have several friends who were evicted to make room for AirBnb. Short term rentals occupy spaces that could house people in our community. This also creates more traffic as they drive back into town to work.

We want diverse, healthy neighborhoods with long term renters and property owners building community together. This is where the basic education about difference and pluralism takes place, on the street. I want this for me and my children and my neighbors.

I have no problem with the occasional rental that allows folks to travel in the summer. But, we should not make this a basic function of our residential areas - folks who need to rent out rooms, make em long term, at least many months. We should limit short term rentals to owner occupied sites. And to a maximum of 30 days a year. To track this, Airbnb can give us their data if they want to do business in our town.

The most crucial thing for me as a homeowner: we should have no problem with the idea that we are a community that makes collective decisions about how our property gets used - I don't get to turn my house into a bar or dancehall, you shouldn't turn yours into a hotel. There is a reason we have zoning. I am willing and really quite happy to forego some profit to increase the quality of my life, the quality of the lives of the renters-friends on my block, and the overall capacity of this city to house a diverse group of people. I hope that you who are homeowners will join me and lead this community towards a genuine concern for our neighborhoods and the people in them. That means seriously limiting short term rentals.

Thanks for your interest and energy in this issue

Josh Brahinsky  
120 Rathburn Way  
Santa Cruz

Stanford Anthropology  
609-558-7470  
<https://ucsc.academia.edu/JoshBrahinsky>



## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** cgunderson  
**Sent:** Monday, February 06, 2017 10:01 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** Air B and B's and other short term tourist usage

Dear Mr. Harriman,

I am a retired teacher who has lived in the rental I am in for almost 4 decades. I have seen so much change in my neighborhood. All of the houses and apartments around me, including where I live, are owned by out of town owners. On the other side of the shared driveway, a real estate CEO from Sacramento bought it and rents it out as Air B and B as well as he and his wife staying in it themselves on some weekends. They are going to have another house built behind the existing house (all for making the biggest possible profit, not for living in it themselves or having it be a granny unit for their parents). So they will then have the Air B and B that they had when they bought the property, but also the new house and 4 more cars. I am saying this because I am disgusted by what has happened to the neighborhood. But I also want to say that it is just logic that having housing for tourists that come for a few days or a week and spending exorbitant amount of money on rent is driving the prices up rapidly for the rest of us who are trying to live here. I am now thinking how I am going to afford to live here the next however many decades that I have left, and I can't see that this is sustainable.

Please try to yoke in the amount of short term housing (none would be perfect.) We have motels and hotels for tourists, which has worked for as long as Santa Cruz has been incorporated as a city. It is getting more and more challenging to live here for the average person. And houses turned short term rentals are taken out of commission for those of us who need a place to LIVE. We can't afford to have rents keep going up like they have been. Who will keep the city running if we can't afford to live here?

Thank you very much,

Cat Gunderson

**Scott K. Harriman**

---

**From:** Jonathan Coleman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 11:18 AM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** Stvr committee letter

Thank you for passing this on to the subcommittee.

Greetings,

I grew up in Santa Cruz and now work for the county as a therapist for low income children and their families. I currently pay a large portion of my paycheck on rent and my partner and I do not even fantasize about buying a house. This means that we will have to move away eventually despite the fact that both of our parents live here.

My own situation is nothing compared to my clients. I cannot even begin to describe the difficulties my clients face when it comes to housing. Many families live in a single room, and typically cannot move even when they want to.

The short term rental problem is serious. But is an easily fixable part of the current income inequality crisis faced by our community: property owners make more and more money while those without property are forced to pay higher and higher prices. What can we expect but increased inequality if short term vacation rentals are allowed to continue?

I ask that you ban these units. This is an opportunity for our community to express our values. What do we value? What do you value?

Sincerely,

Jonathan Coleman

Santa Cruz, CA 95060

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Robert Cavooris  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 1:29 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Cc:** Sandy Brown; Chris Krohn; Cynthia Mathews; Richelle Noroyan; David Terrazas; Cynthia Chase; Martine Watkins  
**Subject:** STVR Subcommittee

Dear Members of the STVR Subcommittee,

As a Santa Cruz resident and renter, I urge you to recommend restrictions on short term rentals in Santa Cruz. Finding an affordable and adequate place to live in this city is very difficult right now. Much of this is due to regional trends in employment, industry, and real estate, yet with STR regulations we can take a step to protect the city's character and the well-being of the tenants who make up its majority.

The proliferation of STRs creates scarcity for long term residents. Housing costs, already unaffordable in relation to the median wage of SC residents, will continue to soar if STRs go unregulated. Homelessness, which is on the rise in Santa Cruz, will worsen. Permanent residents that participate in community life will be pushed out.

Consider the larger context: The President of the United States has come to power on a strategy of division and hate. Surely, most of you do not sympathize with the explicit racist, sexist, and xenophobic ideas that have been used to create support for this platform. All evidence suggests, however, that he has mobilized these ideas in the service of specific goals: defending the wealthy and attacking the poor, privatizing public and collective goods, and giving free reign to capital at the expense of increasingly precarious workers. So now you have to ask yourselves: do you disagree with Trump's means, or also his goals?

To allow unrestricted STRs would be to very clearly state a preference for the real estate and tourism industries over the needs of working people, for privatizing community life at the expense of the most vulnerable. Are you ready to state publicly that you share these goals with our current President? If not, then I urge you to consider an alternative:

1. Prevent rentals of less than 30 days in all residential dwellings.
2. Apply this restriction to *all* STRs outside commercially-zoned districts.
3. Subject STRs in commercially-zoned districts to all permit fees and codes that other B&Bs are subject to.
4. Ban the advertisement of STRs in all media, with significant fines for violators.

Now more than ever it is important to make a decision about whether we stand with the wealthy and powerful, or with the marginalized and precarious. That is, with the Trumps of this world, or with the community members, working people, and neighbors here in Santa Cruz. I sincerely hope that the decision is simple for you.

Respectfully,

Robert Cavooris

PhD Candidate  
History of Consciousness



## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Derek Timm ·  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 5:28 PM  
**To:** Ron Powers; Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** STR Committee

Gentlemen,

Just wanted to share a few thoughts after reviewing the agenda for tomorrow that I wanted to share with you and the team.

**TOT Use:** The City can allocate general fund dollars as they choose. Since TOT funds are allocated into the general fund, they can make a decision to spend those dollars where they choose. The Council could make a resolution to commit to use the TOT funds from STVRs as a low-income housing fund, and that would be in line with their goals for this law. So long as it is a resolution, it would essentially be a hand shake agreement by council to allocate the funds as a offset towards affordable housing.

**Hosted:** Should include onsite office (management office) or a resident who permanently resides at the property.

**Concentration/Location:** If the City decides to go this route... It seems that by reviewing the map of existing rentals it can easily determine where the concentrations of vacation rentals already exist and that should be allowed to be heavier, essentially beach zones and near the university probably would allow higher concentrations. Additionally, existing zoning districts that are commercial, visitor serving, or central corridors CC, CBC, CBD etc, and also multi-residential districts like RL seem natural places where uses would be allowed per se, as there is no conflict of use in those zoning area. In purely residential districts, heavier concentrations should be allowed in areas that are near the beaches, which would also fall in line with the Coastal Commission recommendations to other coastal jurisdictions.

**Number of Guests and Occupancy Loads:** Enforcement by hosts on the number of guests is difficult as guests are not always forthcoming with how many people they are bringing. They may sign a contract, but show up with an additional guest. Further, how the city would enforce guest limitations? A typical configuration for a vacation rental is a 2 – 4 person occupancy per bedroom similar to a hotel room. You will typically have king or queen bed in adult rooms and a bedroom with bunk beds for the little ones. A pull-out couch is also sometimes offered, similar to a hotel suite. The County's regulations on this subject trying to enforce certain age of occupants and number of occupants residing appear to be largely unenforceable. It is also difficult to determine who is a guest and who may be visiting but not residing in a unit. The issue of parking is probably more of a concern in the rental of housing by students, where you may have 8-10 different students sharing a 3-4 bedroom house with an equal number of cars located in a neighborhood on a long term basis. In my experience as an owner, a group renting for a 10 person occupancy typically come with 2 cars and sometimes 3 in about 95% of the cases.

**License duration:** If the City imposes a limitation on the number of licenses total, or licenses in a particular district, then it would make sense that if a license remains unused for a certain period of time (e.g. 12mos.), and the City is not collecting any revenue, the license would expire, which would not prevent the licensee for applying for renewal in the future. Limiting the duration of the permit only creates uncertainty for property owners over their future rights and serves no public policy interest.

**Grandparenting/Transfer of Rights:** Existing STVR's should be able to continue operation and transfer any rights at sale, as owners have invested funds in reliance on the City allowing STR under their existing TOT tax licensing laws. For instance, my personal investment has included over \$2 million in construction costs in reliance on the City's existing

Short Term Rental policies, including but not limited to payment of City fees, payments into the in-lieu affordable housing fund, plus costs for setting up the STR and advertising and building a positive brand for the rental.

**STVR Is Not a Permanent Conversion:** STVR use is not a fixed use, and therefore should not be considered a conversion. If someone tears down a rental home, under City code they must offset by providing new rental housing. However, a home's use as a vacation rental does not prevent that home from being used as a permanent residence or long term rental in the future. The City's own records show that homes have come in and out of use as short term rentals, or are occupied part time by the owners. Requiring someone to pay a permanent conversion fee to offset rental housing, first assumes that the house was rented not owner occupied, and second incorrectly assumes that it will never be rented on a long term basis in the future. Ironically, implementing in-lieu fees would discourage owners from converting STRs into rental housing in the future because of the high cost of conversion paid up front, and owner would be discouraged from losing their STR license. Moreover, this seems to be in direct conflict with the thoughts of implementing a license duration above.

**Review Level:** Permits should be over the counter, and use of already thinly stretched staff time, is an unnecessary use of City resources. The law should be crafted in a way as to not create an overly burdensome application and enforcement scheme. To underscore this point, the City had to bring in a 3<sup>rd</sup> party consultant to review creation of this law. It wouldn't make sense for the City to create additional levels of bureaucracy to enforce a law it doesn't even have time to create.

Scott, thanks again for taking the time to meet with me last week. I did raise the request for addition data with the realtor's association, and I am working on gathering some additional information for you.

Sincerely,  
Derek Timm, Esq.  
Broker & President  
Montalvo Homes & Estates  
[Click to View Commercial Listings](#)  
[Montalvo Homes & Estates Website](#)  
831.239.9203



CA BRE lic#01386067

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Robin Cunningham  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 8:49 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Cc:** robinwc@got.net  
**Subject:** Reflections on STR Subcommittee Mtgs

Feb 7, 2017

Dear Scott,

Thanks again for moderating the meetings. I continue to attend and generate ideas around the proposed goals of the subcommittee, which, as I understand them, are to protect neighborhood integrity (should problems appear to be evident) and to develop regulations for STRs (should regulations be found to benefit). The motives were not clearly defined but the underlying reasoning behind all of the attention on STRs had to do with the assumption that STRs put LTRs and neighborhoods at risk.

I was under the impression that the committee would acquire data to support any new regulations as being beneficial to counteract a known negative. So far, and I have attended each meeting and have read all of the information and notes put online on the City's website, I don't see where any new regulations short of requiring all STRs to pay their fair share of TOT to be helpful.

Complaints about rentals seem to be mostly about LTR student rentals in residential neighborhoods (noise, property damage, parking). STRs, particularly in ADUs, are so minimal in the overall percentage of housing stock that it is quite interesting that this amount of time and attention is being paid to such an insignificant portion of what the City was initially hoping to appropriate into LTR back in 2015. Santa Cruz hotels can barely keep up with demand, and the City has encouraged more hotel construction which will help support our Tourist Economy (and there is no 'off season' in Santa Cruz, by the way), so hopefully the City isn't hoping to appropriate our STRs in order to put a drop in the Hotel bucket either. Neither idea reaps enough reward to be worthy of all of this attention.

The City gets a *great* reward, however, from dollars infused by TOT, and one way to directly benefit the goal of increasing LTR stock would be to assign those dollars toward Affordable Housing development and/or subsidies. This seems an obvious use of this source of income to benefit the goal of LTRs. A simple accounting stream of TOT payments could be directed into an Affordable Housing fund that used to be brought to our City's doorstep by Federal or State funding. It shouldn't be any more complicated than the same utilization of the original sources of government funding. I am encouraging the concept that this should be a primary recommendation.

Regulations are already in place that we STR owners abide by. Registering with the City Finance Dept is one of those and I highly support that all STRs should be registered and paying TOT. I also think it is in the best interests of the online rental platforms or local rental companies to *remit the tax directly to the City* instead of funneling it back to the owners to remit. This would be one way of flushing out the people who rent illegally and would make it easier for the City to monitor. Raising the TOT at this point would only make ALL STR less desirable and would discourage tourist dollars from flowing into our area, so I find that idea unsupportable.

I'm not in favor of developing a large raft of rules and regulations in addition to what already exists, nor am I in favor of time limitations or deed restrictions which infringe upon our property rights and values. Contrary to what one member of the committee said about how he would be pleased to see property values decrease I bet he would not be making that claim if he were a property owner who relied upon his investment to sustain him. Purchasing a home is like any other investment; you want its value to grow. I think *the right to rent STR should not sunset at any point*, not after sale

or transfer, as this is like telling someone they have to remove their garage or a certain percentage of their home prior to selling it; the price will reflect a loss of value no matter what and it will NOT serve to bring down values in general to satisfy those who find buying a home in Santa Cruz out of their range. This property right infringement idea is literally a 'take', it won't help the current state of affairs with LTRs (long term student rentals, etc, which people complain about as being the prime source of the 'degradation of neighborhood integrity'), and won't allow more people to afford to buy here. So, more regulation really makes no sense with regards to regulating ADUs or homes used for STR since the stated goal will not be achievable by those means.

The proposed *regulations have to make sense and should not be suggested gratuitously.* The goal of this committee was to develop ideas that would be useful, enforceable and aimed at the future....and based upon good data. I have not seen any data to support STR is taking away LTR, especially in ADUs. Yet this was the first target of the City. No one had issued any complaints about STR in ADUs, yet we were offered up as the prime suspects for issues regarding 'neighborhood integrity'. HOSTED STRs are the single most self-regulated kind of vacation rental around! I have yet to hear a cogent argument for random new regulations and am becoming more convinced that the City would be in a better position to contribute what it claims to want with increased TOT by enforcing compliance with Finance Department registration and working with rental companies and online platforms.

Thank you for your time and attention,

Robin Cunningham



## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Santa Cruz Tenant Organizing Committee  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 9:39 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** Re: STVR Subcommittee

Dear subcommittee members, city staff,

As renters in Santa Cruz, we urge you to consider strong regulation of short-term vacation rentals in this city. When STVRs commercialize the housing stock in Santa Cruz and turn homes into commodities for making money, they exacerbate an already difficult housing situation. Every building used for an AirBnB rental squeezes the housing market and increases rental prices. Even homebuyers in the city are affected: they must compete against short-term vacation rental management companies when they try to purchase a house. In combination with low wages in Santa Cruz county, it's already too difficult for renters to deal with the high cost. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics report on the second quarter of 2016, our average wages were \$902 per week - versus \$2252 Santa Clara, \$1806 in San Francisco, \$1871 in San Mateo, and \$839 in Salinas.

Unregulated STVRs are dangerous for long term renters. Without realistic eviction protections, a month to month renter has almost no protection beyond a 30 to 60 day notice before having to leave their home. We do not think that STVR owners necessarily want to evict long-term tenants, but the economic reality is that they can make far more money renting short term. Because we can't afford high rents, some of us are forced to live in our cars or on the street while short-term vacation rentals stand empty.

Santa Cruz Tenant Organizing Committee is in favor of a total ban on STVRs and support a strong penalty for violations of such a ban. Removal of STVRs could restore 240 residential units and 124 private rooms (according to the website [insideairbnb.com](http://insideairbnb.com)) to the housing market for long term rental, thus benefitting renters and homebuyers. How? A greater supply of rental housing could lower the cost for renters and homebuyers wouldn't have to compete with deep-pocketed real estate investors who plan to recoup big purchase prices by charging high-end hotel rates for nightly rentals. Maybe some of the people living out of their cars could get back into a house? And let's not forget the large percentage of renters who are UCSC students who need to live near the college.

The city is obligated to protect the housing stock for us tenants who make up a majority (57%) of its residents. We shouldn't be struggling to find shelter while short-term vacation rentals turn neighborhoods into commodities.

Sincerely,

Santa Cruz Tenant Organizing Committee members

Cynthia Berger, Tenant-Counselor-in-Chief, Santa Cruz Tenants Association

Franco Picarella  
Bruce van Allen  
Daniel Rudin  
Kristy Wilbur  
Josh Wilbur  
Samantha Marcum  
Steven David Engel  
Zav Hershfield  
Ruth Valdez  
Mathilde Rand  
Desiree Banzhaf  
Sarah Underwood, 840 Eddy Lane  
Eva Rider  
Isaac S. Blacksin  
Candy Martinez  
Allegra David  
Kyle Chastain  
Etta Tyler, 1517 Delaware Avenue  
Alex Ullman  
Roberta L. McGrath  
Unhae Langis  
Diana Alfaro  
Hunter Bivens, 118 Canfield, Unit D  
Jonathan Coleman, 512 Van Ness Avenue  
Sheila Carrillo  
Fred J. Geiger  
Stefani Giacomazzi  
Casey Hansen  
Mary J. Finnegan, 105 De Anza Court  
Adam Novak, Graduate Student, UC Santa Cruz Genomics Institute  
Jorge A. Flores  
Tobi Stonich

--

Disclaimer: No information in this email should be considered legal advice.  
Please seek out a certified lawyer before taking any sort of legal actions.

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Allie Hoffman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 11:43 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** re: the STVR subcommittee

Dear Mr. Harriman,

I understand that you are heading up a subcommittee assigned to address short term vacation rentals in Santa Cruz. I would like to voice my concerns regarding loss of long term rentals as more and more homeowners choose to turn their homes into STVR's.

A little about me: I have lived in Santa Cruz since 2010. When I moved here, rents seemed high compared to the places that I have lived previously, but I understood it as being the cost of living in such a beautiful area. I am college educated and work in a full-time salaried non-profit job. I never expected to get rich in public service, but I also never expected that I would be considering leaving a place that I love because I cannot afford to stay here (despite making what would be a solidly middle-class income anywhere else in the country/throughout much of California). Last year, I moved out of the rental property that I inhabited for 4 years because my former landlords were selling the home. I know for a fact that some of the prospective buyers were solely looking for a place that they could permanently use as a STVR. Luckily I found another place to live, though it is costing me \$6,000 a year more than my previous home which has been a significant financial struggle.

In addition to my personal financial struggle related to the loss of long term rental properties, I have witnessed other unintended consequences. I'd be remiss if I didn't mention the crime issue in Santa Cruz. There are obviously different beliefs regarding criminalizing drug use, campers, etc, but what is more striking to me is the ways that communities change when long term residents are replaced with tourists. Research shows that communities are safer and crime rates fall when community members know each other and are working together. I currently have no way of knowing whether strangers entering my neighbor's property are tourists entering a STVR, or if they are attempting petty theft (the most common crime in my neighborhood).

Another unintended consequence of the loss of long term rentals that I've witnessed, is that pets are surrendered at the animal shelter at high rates because renters have to move and can't find anywhere to live that will allow them to have pets. I understand that it's easy to pretend that the increase of STVR's and people being forced to surrender their pets are completely unrelated issues, but the common link is that the housing shortage favors homeowners at the overwhelming expense of renters.

I love this city and am happy to have called it home for the last 7 years. I hope to be able to stay here and continue to build my life. That said, the loss of affordable long term rental properties, coupled with the loss of safe and connected community has caused me to question whether I have a long-term future in Santa Cruz. I believe that we all want safe, thriving community and know that the people are part of what makes Santa Cruz such a special place to live. Because of this, I urge the subcommittee to recommend that: 1) It become unlawful for anyone to rent out a residential dwelling for less than 30 consecutive days. 2) STVR's become subject to the same taxes and regulations that B&B's are subject to. 3) STVR's should be prohibited in residential areas (outside of commercial zones) and there should be a significant fine for violating these rules.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns. Please don't hesitate to contact me with any follow up questions.

Sincerely,

Allie Hoffman

**Scott K. Harriman**

---

**From:** Colleen McCullough >  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 11:43 PM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** AirBnB Concerns

To Whom It May Concern,

This is ridiculous. The housing crisis in Santa Cruz is a looming cloud that continues to grow and plague the residents who live here. Forming a committee of mostly homeowners and real estate advocates is clearly an attack on those who are being pushed out of housing. Please rethink your decisions and priorities.

Best,  
Colleen

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Deborah Lashever  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 08, 2017 9:38 AM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** AirBnB

Dear Sir,

If housing is indeed an issue in Santa Cruz--and we all know it is one of our biggest challenges--then AirBnB must be strictly regulated. AirBnB has been shown in many cities to take much needed rental housing off the market and create a transient culture.

I moved here last year from Venice Beach and I have seen first hand how AirBnB has made it almost impossible to live in Venice without a six figure income. This makes the community less diverse economically and racially and creates much more homelessness with people who love the community--some who are second and third generation community members--but who can no longer afford to live in it. They stay in the community they know and love in vehicles or on the streets or however they can creating more issues for the community to deal with and leaving the displaced people wanting.

What I saw there was that without strict regulation, international companies were buying up multiple houses to make money with AirBnB, hence taking them off the rental market. Whole apartment buildings are seeing their long time tenants kicked out so the greedy landlords can make them into AirBnB hotels. (Lawsuits are currently underway in LA regarding this issue.)

Here is a good article highlighting some of the problems of an AirBnB economy.  
<https://therealdeal.com/2015/10/14/how-much-does-airbnb-impact-nyc-rents/>

I hope this committee will vote to preserve the warmth and charming culture of Santa Cruz with an eye toward what is best for the whole community--not just the pocketbooks of a few landowners.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Deborah Lashever

--

Deborah LaShever  
Social Justice Advocate/Author

203 Market St.  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
310.804.6125  
[bohemianexchange@gmail.com](mailto:bohemianexchange@gmail.com)

"Kindness moves through every barrier."

"To change something, build a new model that makes the old model obsolete."  
Buckminster Fuller

"It always seems impossible until its done."

Nelson Mandela

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** Stefani Giacopazzi  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 08, 2017 9:39 AM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** short-term rentals, long-term concerns

Hello,

I'm writing to express my concern about the impact of short-term rentals in Santa Cruz.

As a working professional and current Santa Cruz resident, short-term rentals are increasingly concerning to me. As it stands, if the housing supply remains low, while the presence of tech employees and UCSC students continues to increase, I will soon be out of options for living and working in Santa Cruz.

Short-term rentals consistently drive up rental costs, while forcing down the supply. This is not sustainable, period. If you care at all about the people who live and work in Santa Cruz, those who contribute positively to the community and our local economy, then you will work diligently to regulate short-term rentals.

Now is not the time to put profits ahead of people.

Thank you for your time,  
Stefani Giacopazzi



**Scott K. Harriman**

---

**From:** Hunter Bivens  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 08, 2017 9:52 AM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** ban short term rentals

I am writing to demand that Santa Cruz eliminate short term rentals because they raise rental costs, push working people out of our town, and make neighborhoods into business centers.

Best wishes,  
Hunter Bivens

**Scott K. Harriman**

---

**From:** desiree banzhaf  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 08, 2017 10:14 AM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** AirBnB

I believe short term rentals need to be fairly regulated. They are driving up the cost of living here in Santa Cruz and contribute to the housing shortage.  
Desiree Banzhaf

## Scott K. Harriman

---

**From:** meddle at riseup.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 08, 2017 10:24 AM  
**To:** Scott K. Harriman  
**Subject:** short-term vacation rentals

Hi Scott --

I'm writing to urge the committee on Short-Term Vacation Rentals to ban the practice of renting full lots as vacation homes.

What I mean by "full lots" here is a place where the entire lot is set aside for vacation rentals. If someone wants to rent out a room in the house they live in, or an ADU in their backyard, that is a reasonable way to soften the burden of rent on a homeowner. I get it.

But when people set aside an entire lot for a rental they do two things:

1. They're depriving the long-term rental market of a feasible place to stay
2. They're asking their neighbors and neighborhood to take on a risk that they are not.

To unpack that second one a little bit, I live in Live Oak across the street from a vacation rental. All summer long it's filled with people throwing parties and staying up til midnight hanging out on the front lawn. I have a picture window that faces this house, which means it's basically like the party happens in my living room.

I often (probably 6 or 7 times a season) have to walk across the street, introduce myself to people I've never met before, explain that I live across the street with a 2-year-old and a wife with cancer, and ask them politely to observe the 10pm curfew. I then get to walk back there 20 minutes later and ask them again, most times.

If those people were full-time residents, I would have to do this just one time. Moreover, there's a natural ebb-and-flow with a full-time resident, which would make it unlikely that they would have a party Every Single Weekend of the summer. So I might not have to do it at all.

As it is, I am shouldering a burden that the owner of the house is not. I am affected by the behaviors of their vacation-renters while they are not. I did not move in next to a motel, because I did not want to live with a motel's effluence. Having STVR's as my next-door neighbor imports the irritations of a motel to a residential neighborhood that is otherwise fabulous for a young family.

For God's sake, I'd much rather be tending to my wife and child than

writing this note. Please do your job and represent your constituents so that we don't have to mobilize some gigantic population to stand up to whoever the STVR lobby is.

We have hotels and motels for a reason! If we need more space for tourists, let's build some motels! We can put our people to work doing that.

Best -- Dave Bolger

Santa Cruz, CA 95062

To: Scott Harriman- Short term Rental Committee

I am very concerned that disruptive platforms like Airbnb are exacerbation housing shortages in Santa Cruz and driving up the cost of housing in our community. Most of Airbnb's business is FULL HOUSE RENTALS. I'm glad to see in July 2016, Federal law makers are making formal steps to get involved and have brought this issue to the Federal Trade Commission.

As Airbnb is taking over our neighborhoods, I urge your committee to seriously discuss not allowing short term rentals in Santa Cruz before it's too late. Please stop this major commercial enterprise!

36 year Santa Cruz resident-

*Ann Alberts*

Ann Alberts

