

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q1 Hosted vacation rentals should be allowed, with definitions and rules, in: (Check all that apply)

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Residential Districts	73% 8
Tourist Residential Districts	73% 8
Commercial Districts	64% 7
Only in Commercial Districts	18% 2
Only in Tourist Residential Districts	9% 1
Only in Residential Districts	0% 0
Total Respondents: 11	

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	not including ADUs	2/8/2017 10:32 AM
2	Hosted STVRs are in residential areas inside or on residential property. They should be allowed in any zoning area that also allows for residential housing.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
3	Generally the community seems to be more comfortable that hosted VR have a lesser neighborhood impact.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	In order to achieve policy consistency across the city, I think they should be permitted in ALL areas. Policy must be egalitarian, straight forward, and easy to understand for residents and tourists alike, without the need to consult zoning maps.	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
5	Hosted vacation rentals are consistent with the community's input (that is, that primary residence properties should be allowed to exist because the present owner's oversight reduces potential neighborhood noise and parking problems, and that because these homes are already occupied do not reduce potential rental inventory.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
6	Only Commercial Tourist Residential districts	2/4/2017 10:52 AM
7	with restrictions	2/3/2017 4:56 PM

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q2 Non-Hosted Vacation Rentals should be allowed, with definitions and rules, in: (Check all that apply)

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Tourist Residential Districts	82% 9
Commercial Districts	73% 8
Residential Districts	55% 6
Only in Commercial Districts	9% 1
Only in Residential Districts	0% 0
Only in Tourist Residential Districts	0% 0
Total Respondents: 11	

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	non-hosted should be categorized as a conversion of use	2/8/2017 10:32 AM
2	Non-Hosted STVRs have historically been used in residential areas. They should be allowed in any zoning area that also allows for residential housing.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
3	There are not adequate options here. I would not allow new NHVR outside of the Coastal Zone, so some neighborhoods would only have existing NHVR until they sunset.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	All districts receive visitors, and will be self-regulated, to a certain extent, by demand.	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
5	An application, neighborhood notification, complaint process for neighbors and denial of ensuing permit if there are neighbor complaints regarding noise, parking, etc.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
6	with restrictions	2/3/2017 4:56 PM

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q3 Should a property owner be allowed to reside in their ADU and vacation rent the primary unit?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	64% 7
No	36% 4
Total	11

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	Yes, this may offer many benefits to the property owner. Property owners should be able to use their primary unit if they are not going to be allowed to use their ADU for vacation rental use.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	For existing construction only. Don't allow/encourage the construction of new ADUs to be used as glorified innkeepers' quarters.	2/6/2017 3:30 PM
3	I do not understand the obsession on the part of the city with ADUs...no matter how many times this question is asked, and no matter what the wording, my answer will be the same: legal, permitted, and fully compliant ADU's should be treated as any other dwelling, have much in common with duplexes (which should also be permitted to rent STR unconditionally). In my opinion, if properties share the same APN, then the homeowner should be able to rent either unit STR as long as the owner lives onsite (a requirement for ADUs already). I feel like we continue to litigate this issue, when 9 out of 11 people responded in the last survey that ADU's should be allowed to rent STR. I think we need to move beyond the inordinate focus on ADU's as a form of housing.	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
4	The agreements in place regarding ADUs were that the owner had to reside in one or the other unit (and be living there) in order to rent out the other unit. I don't think it matters which is which; the important part is that the owner resides on the property.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
5	with restrictions	2/3/2017 4:56 PM
6	This does not serve the city's stated goals for a Vacation Rental Ordinance of preserving and enhancing long term housing and preserving neighborhoods for neighbors, not tourists.	2/3/2017 3:44 PM

Q4 The City of Santa Cruz has the following land use permit review levels:1. Principally Permitted: Allowed by right, no plans or permit required, self-verified and regulated2. Staff Level: No public hearing, notice of pending action provided, plans required for compliance review 3. Zoning Administrator: Public hearing required, plans required for compliance review, staff report 4. Planning Commission: Public hearing required, plans required for compliance review, staff reportThe use of a residential home or unit as a Hosted vacation rental should be:

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Principally Permitted	36% 4
Staff Level	27% 3
Prohibited	18% 2
Zoning Administrator	9% 1
Planning Commission	9% 1
Total	11

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	Hosted rentals shouldn't have the same regulations as non-hosted vacation rentals, however, there should be a process and not a free for all.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	Staff review will allow consideration of neighborhood impacts that might require mitigations.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
3	Enforceability of regulations would be key. I'm not in favor of making things more cumbersome, inconvenient, or complicated. Ease of use encourages greater compliance. This does not mean that I'm against regulation, but I'm in favor of treating fellow resident STR homeowners as adults. Stiff fines for violators, but no need to criminalize those with a demonstrated history of playing by the rules.	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
4	This is a tricky question—we did not discuss this at the meeting. We did discuss requiring an application and review, but I thought an over the counter application, not one requiring plans, compliance review, staff report, public hearing. If you want compliance with any rules, you need to make it as easy as possible to apply and also to enforce otherwise it will be ignored by the public.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
5	with permit and restrictions, zoning required in high density/tourist residential zones	2/3/2017 4:56 PM

Q5 Using the levels of review from Question 4: The use of a residential home or unit in a residential zone for a Non-Hosted vacation rental should be:

Answered: 10 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses
Staff Level Permit	40% 4
Principally Permitted	20% 2
Prohibited	20% 2
Zoning Administrator Permit	10% 1
Planning Commission Resolution	10% 1
Total	10

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	Not allowed	2/8/2017 10:32 AM
2	Historically, we have always had vacation rentals in Santa Cruz. It is an essential part of our tourism and economic growth. However, I do agree that there should be a permit process with easy to understand regulations.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
3	See above. This assumes that the rules staff will apply will be different for NH than they are for H.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	As above.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
5	with permit and restrictions, zoning required in high density/tourist residential zones	2/3/2017 4:56 PM

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q6 Using the levels of review in Question 4: Use of a residential home or unit in Residential Tourist or Commercial Districts for a Non-Hosted vacation rental should be:

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Principally Permitted	27% 3
Staff Level	27% 3
Subject to same review as other lodging facilities (i.e. hotel/motel, B&B)	18% 2
Zoning Administrator	18% 2
Prohibited	9% 1
Planning Commission	0% 0
Total	11

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	There should be the same regulations for non-hosted STVR in residential areas as they are in areas that are zoned mixed use. STVR are NOT hotels and should NOT be treated as such.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	Again, heavy penalties for those to be found in violation, and sound effective, thoughtful, easily intelligible regulation and enforcement for both hosted and non-hosted alike.	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
3	Prohibited except in commercial districts where it should be zoning administrator	2/4/2017 5:21 PM
4	As above.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
5	Because a short term vacation rental is effectively a commercial use of residential property, short term vacation rentals should be regulated in the same manner as any other commercial lodging establishment and should have to undergo the same review process and public hearings.	2/4/2017 10:52 AM

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q7 Should there be a different level of review for units with 4 or more bedrooms?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
No	55% 6
Yes	45% 5
Total	11

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	Larger homes will require more parking. This should be a consideration and perhaps a public review from neighbors should be held.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	When you get beyond 4 bedrooms it is more like a commercial tourist serving establishment and less like a residence.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
3	All short-term rentals should be prohibited outside commercially zoned districts	2/4/2017 5:21 PM
4	Because of the potential numbers of guests, larger houses need to have increased scrutiny. The potential for negative noise and traffic impacts on neighborhoods is vastly increased. I also think that once you get to 4 or more bedrooms the argument that the impact on from these properties is vastly different from that of a B & B starts to disintegrate.	2/4/2017 10:52 AM
5	higher scrutiny for higher number of guests, parking, etc	2/3/2017 4:56 PM

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q8 The following situation(s) should not be considered a vacation rental:

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
On-going month-to-month tenancy of a room in your primary residence	100%	11
On-going month-to-month tenancy of a whole house or residential unit	91%	10
House exchange with no payment	91%	10
Visits from friends and/or relatives with no payment in your primary residence	91%	10
One less-than-30-day period per year	45%	5
Total Respondents: 11		

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	An STVR is rental that offers a monetary exchange during a period less than 30 days.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	All of these are incidental uses of a lesser impact than those who rent their properties as vacation rentals as a primary use of the property.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
3	Poorly formulated question, no?	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
4	Short term should be considered any stay for less than 30 days.	2/4/2017 5:21 PM
5	By your own definition, an ongoing month to month tenancy is not less than 30 days and therefore is not a vacation rental. The same is true for an ongoing month to month rental of a room in your primary residence.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM

Q9 The maximum number of vehicles allowed as part of a Non-Hosted vacation rental shall not exceed the number of existing on-site parking spaces.

Answered: 10 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses
Agree	60% 6
Disagree	40% 4
Total	10

#	Other Parking Standard (please specify)	Date
1	The on-site parking must meet needs based on unit size rather than placing a limit on allowed cars. Enforcement would be too hard	2/8/2017 10:32 AM
2	There should be a limit of vehicles per vacation rental. I am not sure how this should be regulated (permit?). There are homes in Santa Cruz that only offer on-street parking thus this should be a consideration.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
3	The rules for vacation rental parking should be the same as for non-vacation rental parking. We have homes that are rented to a number of unrelated adults (sometimes students) with no limitation on the number of cars. This is a broader issue than just for vacation rentals.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	We need more information about "on site".....is that just in a covered garage, is it the driveway, does it include street parking? Not enough information.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
5	I agree but unless parking is already restricted by permit, no one owns the space on the street in front of their home but the city. Despite good intentions, this is not practical.	2/3/2017 4:56 PM
6	or permit parking	2/3/2017 4:07 PM
7	One off street parking space per bedroom plus one extra guest space.	2/3/2017 3:44 PM

Q10 For the purpose of determining maximum guest occupancy of a vacation rental, should children 8 and above count as occupants?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	73%	8
No	18%	2
All children (below 18 years old) should count as occupants	9%	1
Children (below 18 years old) should not be counted as occupants	0%	0
Total		11

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	12 years and above should be considered an occupant.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	the determination should be up to the property owner	2/3/2017 4:07 PM

Q11 The maximum number of guests allowed in a Non-Hosted vacation rental should be limited to two persons per bedroom plus two.

Answered: 10 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses	
Agree	70%	7
Disagree	20%	2
There should be no limit	10%	1
Total		10

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	Yes, this is the same housing standards in many areas.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	I am concerned about enforcement of this and consequences for breach, so this is a qualified agree.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
3	How will you enforce this?	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
4	this could have a positive effect on the "party" nature of current vacation rentals (i.e. wedding party, family reunion, or other large events) by attempting to monitor numbers	2/3/2017 4:56 PM
5	I don;t see why the City would be getting involved to this level. I don't see the City having the ability enforce such rules. How will people really know who is staying and who might be family around the corner in another house etc?	2/3/2017 4:07 PM

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q12 Should the license or use of Hosted vacation rental be transferable to a new owner at the time of sale of the property?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
No, there should be no expectation that the home can be marketed or sold as a business.	55%	6
Yes	36%	4
I generally agree, but there are variables that should be confirmed with license renewal prior to transfer. (See comment field below)	9%	1
No, for a different reason (see comment field below)	9%	1
Total Respondents: 11		

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	Yes, if the hosted STVR has been in compliance with any regulations set up by the city.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	Hosted rentals should not require a license, similar to the County ordinance. They should be a principally-permitted use.	2/6/2017 3:30 PM
3	This is a qualified no, as it depends upon the overall regulatory structure and whether there are differences in the H v. NH regulations, and the ease with which H VRs can become permitted.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	Deed restrictions that sunset upon sale can have a negative impact on property values. If a demonstrated and quantifiable revenue stream is non-transferable, then the property value would logically be reduced by that same amount. I am genuinely afraid that this would leave the city vulnerable to lawsuits from homeowners.	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
5	Absolutely yes.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
6	Making residential properties permanently approved for STR use does not serve the city's stated goals for a Vacation Rental Ordinance of preserving and enhancing long term housing and preserving neighborhoods for neighbors, not tourists.	2/3/2017 3:44 PM

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q13 Should the license or use of a Non-Hosted vacation rental be transferable at the time of sale of the property?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
No, there should be no expectation that the home can be marketed or sold as a business.	73%	8
Yes	18%	2
I generally agree, but there are variables that should be confirmed with license renewal prior to transfer. (See comment field below)	18%	2
No, for a different reason (see comment field below)	0%	0
Total Respondents: 11		

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	Yes, if the hosted STVR has been in compliance with any regulations set up by the city.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	As long as there have been no neighbor complaints and TOT paid on time, I don't have a problem with it.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
3	if the property changes title, the new owner should have to apply for the "license" or permit	2/3/2017 4:56 PM
4	I think that if someone has run a vacation rental for years, there should be no expectation by the new buyer that it comes with the house, but if there is no history of issues the new owner should be able to do the same.	2/3/2017 4:07 PM
5	Making residential properties permanently approved for STR use does not serve the city's stated goals for a Vacation Rental Ordinance of preserving and enhancing long term housing and preserving neighborhoods for neighbors, not tourists.	2/3/2017 3:44 PM

Q14 Should the license or use of a vacation rental be revocable based on complaints or non-compliance with standard conditions?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	100% 11
No	0% 0
Total	11

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	Yes, if an STVR is non-compliant or if the owner is allowing parties, excess trash and parking (causing problems) they should not be allowed a permit.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	A qualified yes, as it depends upon the regulatory structure, warnings and opportunities to cure, etc. Revocation should be a ultimate response for persistent non-compliance when warnings or lesser consequences have not brought violators into compliance.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
3	Complaints would have to be verifiable, and should never be anonymous.	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
4	There needs to be a complaint process, and if the number of complaints exceeds the threshold determined, then the permit is suspended for x amount of time, i.e., not forever.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM

Q15 Placing a small (non-illuminated) sign (18" x 24", for example) identifying the residence as a vacation rental and providing a local contact person's phone number would be:

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Appropriate, as a way to alert the owner of issues or concerns	55%	6
Inappropriate in a residential neighborhood	45%	5
Total		11

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	Yes, this would be very helpful in case of an emergency or disturbance.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	For non-hosted rentals.	2/6/2017 3:30 PM
3	There can be a requirement that VR owners provide information to their neighbors within a radius, but I don't like the idea of signs.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	I'm divided on this. Part of my thinks it would be good, but the other part of me worries about crime implications (perhaps would-be criminals may think that STRs are vacant most of the time, and therefore a target for crime, etc). Also, I'm not a fan of forcing people to put their phone numbers out in the public space.	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
5	Neighbors need to be provided contact info in case of a problem, but I don't think a sign is appropriate	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
6	I think notification and registry would be sufficient. I don;t think that kind of signage is necessary or safe.	2/3/2017 4:07 PM

Q16 If a home or residential unit has been owned/rented as someone's primary residence, should there be some form of compensation, such as replacement or in-lieu fee, when the unit is converted to a Non-Hosted vacation rental?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	55% 6
No	45% 5
Total	11

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	both in the Coastal Zone and in all other zones that allow non-hosted. Relocation benefits should also be provided to the existing tenants, following current relocation law.	2/8/2017 10:32 AM
2	No, only because it warrants further review.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
3	Ideally the conversion fee and other permitting requirements should be prohibitive enough to minimize these sorts of conversions.	2/6/2017 3:30 PM
4	The decision to rent one's residential property, whether long or short term, is not a change of use and should not be treated as such. It is still part of the residential housing market whether long or short term	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
5	I don't really understand this question.	2/4/2017 5:21 PM
6	there are many reasons why an owner might need to rent his/her house out short term. I do not think it is a property owner's responsibility to compensate anyone for doing so as long as they do so legally and pay their TOT. Again how would a homeowner provide 'replacement'? Not realistic, not enforceable.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
7	if by that you mean that the property that is now going to be converted to Non hosted should pay an increased fee.	2/3/2017 4:56 PM

Q17 Large gatherings and celebrations may occur at vacation rentals and include visitors not staying at the vacation rental. Should rules limit the total number of guests to twice the vacation rental's occupancy limit and specify that gatherings/celebrations may only occur between 8am and 10pm?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	64%	7
No	18%	2
The specified hours for large gatherings and celebrations, 8am to 10pm, should be further restricted.	18%	2
Twice the vacation rental's occupancy is too many	9%	1
The specified hours for large gatherings and celebrations, 8am to 10pm, may be increased.	9%	1
Twice the vacation rental's occupancy is too few	0%	0
Total Respondents: 11		

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	This seems like a fair suggestion.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
2	I generally agree, but this seems highly unenforceable. Ideally such situations would be kept under control by the City's existing noise ordinances, neighbor complaints, and the consequences of such complaints (permit revocation?) to the rental owner.	2/6/2017 3:30 PM
3	Personally I would make the noise and hour restrictions the same whether for vacation or non-vacation rentals. As far as the number of parties, I am comfortable that long term residents may have larger parties than vacation rentals. At least long term residents will be there afterwards and have to live with their neighbors.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	I hate the idea of STR party houses, but there has been zero indication that this is actually a problem. The data doesn't support it. Why are we still discussing this?	2/5/2017 9:15 PM
5	Not realistic, not enforceable. The individual contract could specify occupancy limits and quiet hours. Most already do.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
6	some sort of party permit and neighborhood notification would be appropriate. If the neighborhood has permit parking in place, this could be easily enforced by existing parking ordinances if they are 24/7 and not just during school hours.	2/3/2017 4:56 PM

Q18 Should any vacation rental regulation include some form of "grandparenting" of existing vacation rentals in good standing?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	82% 9
No	18% 2
Total Respondents: 11	

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	You mean "grandfathering" Good standing to me means that they are currently paying TOT at a minimum. Grandfathering should only allow a transition period rather than being open ended.	2/8/2017 10:32 AM
2	Any and all ADU and STVR (Hosted and Non-Hosted) should be grandfathered in if they are in compliance. If they are behind on any TOT they should be given an opportunity to remedy the situation first.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
3	I would allow grandparenting to continue until such time as a property has a change of ownership that results in re-assessment under the rules for real property taxes.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	The people who have been playing by the rules without neighbor complaints should be allowed to do so.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
5	offer an amnesty period in order to gain compliance. After an appropriate opportunity, any non compliance should be firmly enforced	2/3/2017 4:56 PM
6	Vacation rentals that have been part of the TOT program since before the rise of Airbnb (2010) could be grandfathered.	2/3/2017 3:44 PM

Q19 West Cliff Drive and Lower Seabright: bounded by Murray Street, the Bay, the Harbor, and the San Lorenzo River, should be exempt from any location, proximity or concentration regulations, as these areas have been predominantly and historically used as visitor-serving accommodations.

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Disagree, no district should be exempted from location, proximity, or concentration regulations.	64%	7
Agree	27%	3
Agree, and I would add an area (see comment field below)	9%	1
Total Respondents: 11		

#	Comment (please specify)	Date
1	No residential zone should be included for non-hosted STR	2/8/2017 10:32 AM
2	Seems better to allow historical vacation-rental uses to continue in certain neighborhoods via some sort of grandfathering... Fully exempting these areas might open the door to even more vacation-rentals than already exist.	2/6/2017 3:30 PM
3	However, different districts could have different location, proximity or concentration regulations.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	I dont think it's fair to limit the area and I dont think anyone should be exempt from reasonable regulation. Any rukes need to be fairly applied. I think if you are going to consider 'historically used as visitor serving accommodations ' you need to consider the coastal zone in its entirety.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
5	I think that concentration and proximity regulations need to be enforced in ALL areas, even if location exemptions for these areas are made. There are still people who live full time in these areas and in lower seabright there is still medium density housing that should be preserved for long term rentals.	2/4/2017 10:52 AM
6	on the contrary, they should have higher restriction in residential neighborhoods	2/3/2017 4:56 PM
7	I think before the city would make an exception for particular neighborhood they would have to do town hall meetings in those neighborhoods and maybe a vote for those who live in the neighborhood.	2/3/2017 3:44 PM

Short-Term Vacation Rental Regulations Survey

Q20 As a starting point for considering a concentration limit, there should be no more than two Non-Hosted vacation rentals on each side of a street block.

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Disagree	55%	6
The idea of limiting vacation rentals by location, proximity, concentration, parking, etc, has merit, but requires further evaluation.	45%	5
Agree	9%	1
Total Respondents: 11		

#	Comments (please specify)	Date
1	No non-hosted in residential zones should be allowed	2/8/2017 10:32 AM
2	Needs further review. "A street" is too vague. Perhaps this should be defined as a city block with a percentage of allowed STRV.	2/7/2017 2:56 PM
3	We lack sufficient data to make this determination. It is possible that there may need to be a decision made and then reviewed in a few years to see how things are doing and whether adjustment is appropriate.	2/6/2017 2:46 PM
4	4 empty houses per block?! That is outrageous – way too much! I think short term rentals should be prohibited outside commercially zoned districts, but even if I considered restricting it by concentration, two per side of a street block is hardly worthy of being called a "restriction".	2/4/2017 5:21 PM
5	I am opposed to any discussion of concentration limits. It isn't fair. It would create more enforcement issues. If properties are legal, paying TOT, and with no neighbor complaints, there should be no further limitation.	2/4/2017 3:36 PM
6	depending on the length of the block that could be way to high of a concentration.	2/4/2017 10:52 AM
7	What are we going to do for the ones that already exceed that? Thank lower west side already has several blocks that exceed that--single owner multiple non hosted rentals	2/3/2017 4:56 PM
8	Making two residential properties per block permanently approved for STR use does not serve the city's stated goals for a Vacation Rental Ordinance of preserving and enhancing long term housing and preserving neighborhoods for neighbors, not tourists.	2/3/2017 3:44 PM