

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q1 Should Short-Term Vacation Rentals (STVRs) be defined and regulated?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	100% 11
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	I agree that there should be some regulations of STVR in the City of Santa Cruz. I think we should adopt some of the same regulations that the county has for STVRs. A percentage of a street/area, an application process, and a sign of emergency contact visably located on the property. Regulations should be clear and well understood. The city also should allow Airbnb to collect the TOT. This will ensure payment from the guest and the funds should be used for affordable housing or building of more long term units.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	Regulation should occur within the PERMISSIVE category that the clear majority of committee members voted for during the last meeting.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
3	The impact of STVR may seems small initially but the airbnb is a growing industry and could have a larger impact over time.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
4	STVR must be defined and regulated in order to curtail the conversion of long-term housing into short-term vacation rentals. The ambiguity has only accelerated the conversion of long-term into short-term rentals. It has now become a problem that has exacerbated the city's housing shortage and displaced residents from their homes.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
5	Similar to the county ordinance, I'd like to see this definition specifically exclude the rental of a single room in a private owner-occupied home. Let's address the problem (party houses, depleted rental/housing stock) by first properly defining it.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
6	STVR, though unregulated for many years, have reached a level of proliferation that has caused the community to react that they should at the very least be regulated and limited in number.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
7	According to cities that have studied the growth of online STVR they are doubling every 19 months. At this rate the city's residential zones will be transformed into hotel districts and local workers will experience lower housing availability. Our vacancy rate for rentals is already extremely low.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

## STVR Subcommittee Survey

### Q2 If STVR rules are established, regulations should include:

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Noise and other behavior expectations	100% 11
Enforcement / Penalty procedures and expectations	100% 11
STVR terms and definitions	91% 10
Parking requirements	91% 10
Occupancy and Group limitations	91% 10
Owner/Operator contact information	91% 10
A limiting factor, such as neighborhood or block concentration	64% 7
A limiting factor, such as a maximum allowable number of STVRs city-wide	45% 5
Limit on the number of STVR's a person or entity may own/operate	45% 5
Limit on the number of days a STVR may be rented	36% 4
Neighbor input	36% 4
Prohibition of Accessory Dwelling Units as STVR	18% 2
<b>Total Respondents: 11</b>	

#	Other limitations, standards and/or comment(s)	Date
1	ADU's should be allowed. Especially during summer months while students are not renting in our city.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	I am open to exploring these as possible options but not necessarily feeling like the selected topics are all necessary	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
3	The premise of disallowing STVR to duplexes, ADUs, or other structures could be legally interpreted as discrimination against a specific class of homeowner. A better way to go about this would be to put an absolute limit (say, 25 per category as a suggestion) of studios, one bedrooms, or two bedrooms that may rent STVR. Tie it to the number of bedrooms rather than the underlying structure.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
4	I believe that we need a restrictive ordinance that does not allow STVR at all. We may need to make exceptions for units already in the system paying TOT and may need to allow some units in commercial or visitor serving zones but I'm not in favor of allowing block concentrations or of setting a maximum number of units.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
5	official complaint procedure for neighbors	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
6	We might consider eliminating the owner certification provision for the Rental Inspection Ordinance as applied to STVRs. The items checked are items I would consider. Whether or not they should be included will depend upon the details.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
7	I believe we don't need to reinvent the wheel or create a new special class of business. If one has a property in a CC or R-T zone they can operate a STVR if they meet the requirements (parking, etc) for hotels in that zoning district. For those in residential zones the city already has a process for approving B&B's. The bed and breakfast ordinance has worked extremely well for over 30 years. Any STVR operating in a residential zone should conform to the requirements set forth for bed and breakfasts. The operators of B&B's in the city had to work within these requirements. Anything less would be unequal application of law. The fact that a few venture capitalists fund a website shouldn't be cause for us to abandon the protections we have had in place for neighborhoods for over a half a century.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q3 Should there be different rules for hosted and non-hosted STVR's?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	64% 7
No	36% 4
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	Permits for hosted rentals should be easier to obtain with fewer rules that non-hosted. Non-hosted should be allowed.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	Hosted should most definitely include duplex and ADU homeowners, and responsible, TOT paying, non-resident homeowners with no prior history of violations that have 24 hour management provisions in place (property management, etc) for addressing any issues	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
3	The City currently allows people to sub-let rooms in their homes to renters and their is no restriction on allowing family and friends from visiting. I would be open to allowing hosted STVRs but only if there is a maximum number of days per year and only if this is something that can actually be regulated.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
4	From reading about this, it seems clear to me that this is very difficult from a regulatory standpoint to differentiate hosted and non-hosted.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
5	In the community survey the distinction is made repeatedly between unhosted vs owner occupied properties in terms of the difference in impact on neighborhoods	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
6	This is difficult to answer, in that there are some criteria that should apply to all STVR's, and some that could properly differentiate between hosted and non-hosted.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
7	The experience in other large cities has taught us that it is very hard to enforce limits on hosted STVR (like the number of days or the number of guests). The city simply does not have the staff or the resources to monitor every stay in every potential STR. If the city creates regulations it cannot enforce it contributes to the opinion among residents that city government is ineffective and out of touch. People lose faith in their government when the laws are unenforceable. For this reason I prefer a ban on STVR in residential zones and allow them in zones where hotels are allowed as a principle permitted use.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

**Q4 The stated purpose of regulating bed and breakfast uses in residential districts is to "encourage B&B's where they are appropriate, while protecting surrounding residential uses from their commercial impacts." Do you agree the same can be said for STVR's?**

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	55% 6
No	45% 5
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	These are two separate things. B&B have employees and host many different guests at the same time. It is more of a commercial business like a hotel. STVR are rented to one guest group and don't have employees.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	There is a key difference between a one unit STVR and a multiple unit B&B. Presumably, one of the reasons that B&Bs are regulated in this fashion currently has to do with the fact that there may be upwards of 8 to 12 units, which by nature would seem more "commercial" in orientation than a single unit STVR based on sheer volume. The only regulation that would make sense is one that addresses per unit neighborhood impact	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
3	STVRs should not be allowed. The option is always open for someone to convert their home to meet the B&B standards. STVR are asking for a less restrictive environment than what is required of a B&B. It's simply not fair, takes units off of the market and impacts residential neighborhoods.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
4	Yes, and by commercial impacts I would include the impact that STVRs have on the residential rental market.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
5	I agree with the general sentiment, but this is not an apples-to-apples comparison.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
6	Again this is not as clear as a simple yes and no. But for the most part, yes.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
7	I support treating a STVR the same as a B&B. STVR should be treated the same as B&Bs with the same requirements (parking, distance, historic, etc).	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q5 Do you believe there is an operational difference between a B&B and a short-term vacation rental?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	73% 8
No	27% 3
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	List difference(s) and/or Comment	Date
1	See comment above.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	it is my understanding/experience that B&B's are typically unrelated guests in individual rooms and that food is prepared on-site and essentially "sold" to the guest so the health dept requirements and parking are different animals in B&B's than typical residential STVR. If the STVR is more than 1unit, parking needs to be considered accordingly.	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
3	B&B's do not offer guests the option of "opting out" of meal service if they wish to pay a lower rate. STVRs offer a much higher degree fo privacy and independence than B&Bs. No all guests want to socialize with strangers or innkeepers...STVRs offer the option for a more personalized, independent experience. Without knowing for certain, I would say that demand for B&B lodging is slowing over time, and demand for STVR lodging is increasing. Special dietary concerns, monetary considerations, and the desire to time meals and the added independence of being able to come and go, eat on one's own schedule, etc are likely contributing to the rising popularity of STVR's over B&Bs. If I want to eat breakfast at 10:30 instead of from 8:00 to 10:00, for example, I would not book a B&B due to my desire to set my own schedule and avoid paying for a component of the lodging that I may not use (the inclusion of a meal at an inopportune time). If a guest wants to watch television at midnight, they can do that in a STVR, but many B&Bs have restrictions on common area usage after certain hours, etc.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
4	parking requirements, inspections, permitting process, historic nature of the home and zoning requirements.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
5	To me, "B&B" connotes a continuously-operating facility with multiple guest rooms hosting multiple parties at once, making it more like a hotel. I also think of a B&B as the proprietor's primary means of earning a living. A STVR in which the owner occasionally rents 1 guest room within a private home has a much lower impact on the neighborhood and is more akin to a homeowner hosting friends/family. Conversely, a large unsupervised week-after-week "party house" STVR could have a much higher neighborhood impact than a B&B.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
6	B&b has more occupants	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
7	B&B's serve breakfast and are usually if not always hosted. STVR's can be non-hosted, which is an important part of the STVR market that should be preserved.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
8	Short Term Vacation Rentals are for all intents and purposes commercial lodging establishments and should be treated as such.	1/20/2017 7:58 PM
9	A B&B is a hosted stay in a residential district. A STVR is exactly the same thing. Regulate them equally.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q6 Do you agree that a residence used solely as a STVR is a commercial use in a residential district?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	55% 6
No	45% 5
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	"Used solely" is defined as NEVER used by the owner- not even for a week or weekend?	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
2	I feel strongly that it is the right of the private property owner to use their property as they see fit, assuming no verifiable and quantifiable negative impact to neighbors.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
3	A residence used solely as a STVR should also be counted as a conversion of a residential unit to a commercial use. At least within the coastal zone this triggers a replacement requirement and relocation benefits for any residents who would be dislocated. For the Housing Element STVRs should also be seen as a conversion and should be counted as a loss of a residential unit.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
4	The determination of what is, or is not, short term is arbitrary. It could be 30, 60, 90 days or whatever. In the end it is all rental housing. To date there has been nothing identified as adverse impacts of STVRs that is not also sometimes an adverse impact of long term rental housing, other than the impact on the availability of long term rental housing itself and the likelihood of being acquainted with one's neighbors. Parking, noise, nuisance behavior, overcrowding, poor maintenance, etc., can occur regardless of whether the rental is long or short term.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q7 Do you agree that the issue of fairness, between residential STVR operators and hotel/motel/B&B operators, should be a consideration when developing STVR regulations?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	73% 8
No	27% 3
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	Again these are two different animals. STVR is a single rental and they are operated differently.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	Only where TOT registration is concerned.	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
3	"Fairness" is an arbitrary concept, this word choice is inappropriate in this context, and should be left out of the equation entirely. One could easily argue that it is "unfair" for city planning departments to allow a usage and then, after great investment and expense has been put forth by homeowners, to suddenly disallow this usage leaving the homeowner no suitable means to recoup their investment. It is my strong recommendation that the city stick to legally sound and defensible language so the city does not invite a subsequent lawsuit predicated upon overly arbitrary and emotionally charged language inherent in regulation.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
4	La Bahia has already provided the required replacement housing units needed to allow for the conversion of the existing units on the La Bahia site. This was a major expense that should also be required in the development of a STVR. Public hearings, TOT, replacement housing requirements, parking requirements, etc. should be similar for both types of development	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
5	Fairness is important to the extent that B&Bs are law-abiding, fee-paying members of the community. However, I also think some of the regulations that apply to B&Bs are about safety and I don't see any reason why safety considerations should be overlooked in STVRs.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
6	Yes, but regulating hotels/motels/B&Bs/STVRs "fairly" does not necessarily mean requiring them to follow exactly the same requirements. I don't think they should be considered perfect direct competitors, as they seem to attract different clientele and have different impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. Certainly collect city TOT for all of the above.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
7	It is a consideration, but would be a data driven analysis. The data on this has yet to be presented. There is a difference between the perception of unfairness and the analysis of whether or not there are real impacts on hotel/motel/B&B operators.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
8	At my B&B to meet the parking requirement a neighboring lot had to be purchased, paved, and fenced to meet the parking requirement. Total cost: \$126,000. How can the city permit a STVR with no parking and say they are providing equal treatment under the law.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q8 Which of the following B&B standards should also apply to STVRs in residential districts? (Check all those that apply)

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
The proposed B&B use, as conditioned, will not create noise, parking or other detrimental impacts on the residential neighborhood in which it is located.	82%	9
Parking: Lodging, rooming houses, B&B Inns: 2 on-site spaces, plus 1 for each (rentable) bedroom.	64%	7
B&B inns shall be managed and occupied by the owner of the property.	45%	5
B&B inns require approval of an administrative use permit.	45%	5
No use permit for a B&B may be issued if that use would result in a net loss of multiple dwelling units which have been occupied as such for two years prior to the application date.	45%	5
Signs shall be affixed to the structure, eternally lighted only, and turned off by 10:00 p.m.	45%	5
I think that the current B&B regulations need updating.	45%	5
Guest occupancy shall be limited to fourteen days during any thirty-day period.	36%	4
Guests shall check in and out only between 9:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.	36%	4
Prior to use permit hearing, the B&B applicant shall provide evidence that written comments have been solicited from all owners and occupants of the lands adjoining the proposed use.	36%	4
In Single and Multi-family Residential-Low Rise Districts, there shall be a distance of either two full blocks or 1,500 linear feet, whichever is greater, between B&B Inns.	36%	4
The proposed B&B use will further the preservation of any historic building(s) involved as evidenced by proposed repairs and improvements to the building and property, and the establishment of an economic use if the building which will support it continued maintenance and improvement.	27%	3
The proposed structure for a B&B use shall be listed in the City of Santa Cruz Historic Building Survey.	18%	2
Total Respondents: 11		

#	Comment	Date
1	It is supremely important that regulations keep pace with the times we actually live in. While I feel that STVRs and B&Bs are distinct entities for the reasons stated above, I DO feel that the the regulations on existing B&Bs are overly onerous and outdated. Again, I *do* feel that we have enough B&Bs presently in Santa Cruz to meet the organic demand of those seeking out this type of lodging. I do *not* think this is the case with STVRs, where demand is currently exceeding supply.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
2	Again, I'm not in favor of allowing STVRs	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
3	If anything, current B&B regulations are stricter than I would have expected.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
4	I am not versed in the current B&B issues and regulations	1/21/2017 7:27 PM
5	In most cases applying the B&B regulations would mean that STVR could not comply, and therefore it would essentially eliminate STVRs, as most of them have been designed as long term rental units and will not meet the special criteria.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM



# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q9 Do you agree that a property purchased solely for use as a STVR contributes to higher rental and housing costs?

Answered: 10 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	80% 8
No	20% 2
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	This is a loaded question and a complicated one at that. Property value and rents depend on location, what amenities are offered, size, etc. We live in a highly desired city. Property values and rents are high in general. Our supply is short and our demand is high.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	but depends on the property type and purchase price relative to market	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
3	The current facts and figures do nothing to support this theory. I believe that it is a reflection of an imperfect capitalist economic system that, love it or hate it, is the law of the land. I think what has pushed up housing costs even more is geographic proximity to high paying jobs (the prosperity of the overall economy), the impact of UCSC's increased enrollment without adding as many additional housing units, and the city's own anti-density, anti-development policies over the years.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
4	the conversion of a residential unit directly impacts our rental housing stock. STVR investors also can pay higher for these units than regular homebuyers so the sales price will go up.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
5	It absolutely does and it's a detriment to our city that this is happening.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
6	Yes I believe that this scenario is THE fundamental problem with STVRs in Santa Cruz. This is what we should be targeting/discouraging/prohibiting.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
7	Not sure, no data exists to support this	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
8	A qualified yes, as this is a matter of degree. We could make the STVR permit not transferrable on sale, and have proximity or number of STVR's in the block limits that would make it uncertain if a new owner would be able to obtain a permit for STVR. This will lessen or eliminate the impact of having STVR's on sale prices. The number of legal STVR's can be kept as a small enough segment of the market to limit the impact on long term leasing rates.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q10 Do you believe that STVR's add more value to a property than a long-term rental?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	64% 7
No	36% 4
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	Yes, because they generate a higher income.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	I need clarification: meaning higher rental income or higher actual property valuation?	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
3	Normally I would say yes, as I believe that it is clearly the case that homeowners can earn more renting short term than long term, but any deed restrictions (as the one currently in place for ADUs) unequivocally lowers property values. No deed restrictions are known to increase property values.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
4	It adds more value to a property in the same way that any kind of upzoning will impact the value of a property. Allowing STVRs is the same thing as a zoning change. Single-family residential zone does not currently allow commercial uses so allowing STVRs is the same as a zoning change for not only the lot where that new use is initiated but for all other lots in the zone where that use is now allowed.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
5	They may add more value to the property, but property values are already astronomically high in Santa Cruz. Property owners who want permissible regulations just so that they can even more rapidly appreciate the value of their homes are only thinking about their own financial gain, not about how to uplift and support the city as a diverse and dynamic whole.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
6	STVRs would not proliferating to the extent that they are if owners weren't profiting from them. This directly affects/distorts the residential real estate and rental markets in town.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
7	neighbors with illegal STVR prefer renting it short term because they make much more money and will not consider renting long term	1/21/2017 7:27 PM
8	This is a qualified yes, and assumes that the STVR is located close enough to the ocean or other tourist attractions such that it could reasonable be rented for most of the year.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
9	Investors value a property based on the gross rents from the highest and best legal use. STVR raise the gross rents and therefor raise the property's value to investors.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q11 Residential properties used solely for STVR's should be:

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Limited through a process, with established standards	64%	7
Prohibited	18%	2
Allowed by right	18%	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	They should be allowed by right but by clear regulations.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	If prohibitions are put in place, they should NOT be retroactive.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
3	I would be willing to revisit this question if and when the housing crisis is behind us, but for now, I think we need to get our priorities straight.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
4	Should be allowed as long as there are no negative impacts on neighbors	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
5	there are two vacation rentals on the corners of west cliff at Swift. They have been solely vacation rentals for at least 22 years, with signs in the windows	1/21/2017 7:27 PM
6	STVRs have been a part of the Santa Cruz rental market for decades. We are a tourist serving community. STVRs should continue to be part of the tourist rental market, within appropriate limits.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
7	Licensed using the city's B&B ordinance.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q12 Should a renter be allowed to use their primary rented residence as a STVR if the property owner gives permission?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	55% 6
No	45% 5
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	STVR should only be rented by the property owner. Too much can go wrong if renters are renting out their dwellings. There is too much liability on the property owner.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	If we consider allowing hosted STVRs it should only be for owner-occupants. I'm not even sure if that should be allowed.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
3	Owners could skirt "owner-operated" requirements by hiring a caretaker/operator who poses as a tenant.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
4	As long as they are present on site	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
5	Provided that the STVR is otherwise in compliance with all applicable regulations. This is a matter of contract between the owner and the primary tenant.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
6	Assuming any other rules are followed, I don't see a substantive difference between an owner and a renter using their residence as a STVR.	1/20/2017 7:58 PM
7	Provided they are granted a permit by the city after meeting the standards in the B&B ordinance.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

### Q13 A property or parcel with multiple rental units should be limited to:

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
A percentage of the total on-site units	36%	4
No limit to STVRs	27%	3
No STVRs	18%	2
One STVR	18%	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	One, if the STVR is operated by the owner of the property who also lives on site. Zero for a property that is corporately-owned or managed by a third party.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
2	Up to the property owner as long as rules are followed	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
3	not versed in this issue	1/21/2017 7:27 PM
4	If we have a limit on the number or percentage of STVRs in a block or proximity limits, they should apply equally to buildings with multiples or SFR.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
5	Assuming it can pass the B&B ordinance.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

**Q14 Are you aware of a district, street or neighborhood that is already predominately used for STVRs?**

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	64% 7
No	36% 4
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Specify district, street, neighborhood	Date
1	Westcliff Drive	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	lower seabright neighborhood	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
3	Lower seabright seems dominated by STVRs.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
4	lower west side	1/21/2017 7:27 PM
5	It is apparent that there is a higher concentration of STVRs in the few blocks closest to the ocean.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
6	Lower Seabright	1/20/2017 7:58 PM
7	Lower Seabright. West Cliff Drive. Beach Hill.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

**Q15 In a single-family residential district, a  
STVR should be considered a:**

Answered: 10 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses	
Permanent land use	50%	5
Non-Permanent land use subject to review, approval and renewal	50%	5
<b>Total</b>		<b>10</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	Once the unit has been allowed to convert to use as a STVR the chance that it would convert back to a residential use is not likely because the conversion back would lower the property value.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM

**Q16 The City of Santa Cruz has a residential demolition or conversion ordinance, which includes relocation, replacement housing and in-lieu fee criteria for low- and moderate-income households displaced by demolition or conversion of use. Do you agree that a dwelling used solely as a STVR should be responsible for some form of relocation, replacement or in-lieu fee criteria?**

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	73% 8
No	27% 3
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	Yes, if the city takes away a property regardless of its use the property owner should be compensated.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	STVR's pay TOT.	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
3	But only moving forward. Should NOT be retroactive.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
4	This requirement should be expanded beyond the coastal zone and should be enforced in all areas of the City. We should keep in mind that this requirement comes from the Coastal Commission so we can't simply drop this requirement without going to the Coastal Commission for approval. The Coastal Commission placed this replacement requirement because they are trying to protect affordable housing. They understand that the conversion of units impacts our affordable housing stock.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
5	Why shouldn't they have to abide by the city ordinance?	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
6	I assume the question is whether conversion of a dwelling from Long Term rental to STVR should be establishes as subject to application of such criteria. Conversion from LTR to STVR does not remove the dwelling from the rental stock, it just rents to a different population. STVR may be more affordable vacation facilities for low and moderate income households. These are not apple to apple comparisons.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM



# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q17 Given that there are approximately 23,600 housing units and 288 registered STVR's currently in Santa Cruz, a reasonable limit on the number of STVR's city-wide is:

Answered: 10 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses
Percentage not an appropriate limiting criteria	50% 5
Another percentage	40% 4
1% (236 units)	10% 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>

#	Please specify or Comment	Date
1	2%	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	2% seems about right, but I would defer to other tourist cities for guidance.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
3	I would set the number at the current 288 registered units and then reduce the allowed number as those units change hands or on a shorter but reasonable timeline	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
4	It's clear that certain neighborhoods and communities are shouldering more of the burden than others. Percentages can't really take that into account.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
5	I think strict requirements for owner residency/occupancy/operation, as well as strict limits on the number of nights per year, could help tame the problem without placing an arbitrary numerical cap that curtails the future rights of other property owners who might be late to the game.	1/23/2017 4:35 PM
6	let's figure out the actual number before we set a limit—amnesty first to get them registered	1/21/2017 7:27 PM
7	We need to see data on what percentage of STVR's actually has a significant impact on the level of long term rents. We also need to know the margin of error in the data. Is a difference of 2, 3, or even 5% significant? How do we know, other than anecdotally, what the impact on the long term rental market is?	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
8	Neighborhood density and location is important when considering where these are placed. Currently the STVRs are highly concentrated in a handful of neighborhoods.	1/20/2017 7:58 PM
9	The B&B ordinance limits the number of B&Bs by requiring 1,500 feet between businesses. The reason the city has this limitation is so that entire historic neighborhoods (Walnut Avenue between Chestnut and Center for example or Oceanview Avenue) would not become hotel districts. This value of keeping residential districts residential is even more important today then it was when it was enacted. There is nothing in the city's planning documents that expresses a need to increase the density of lodging in the residential zones. I don't support a wholesale realignment of the neighborhood protections put in place in our residential zones. Today there are 7 licensed B&Bs. Increasing that overnight to 236 or any other number is arbitrary, not supported in the planning documents, and will result in the loss of long term housing for thousands of city residents. We also know from other cities that less than 20% of STVR owners register with the city. Approval of 263 means we will actually end up with over 1,000.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

**Q18 If STVR's are prohibited or otherwise limited, is five years a reasonable amount of time to fiscally transition the residential property to an allowed use?**

Answered: 10 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses
No	70% 7
Yes	30% 3
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	My opinion is this should not happen. STVR should not be prohibited. If they are limited the current STVR should be grandfathered in.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	I don't know the answer, but it seems like there needs to be an ability to evaluate case by case as necessary. Some people financially rely on this income and 5 years may not be enough time.	1/24/2017 3:52 PM
3	I don't understand this question.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
4	There should be compliance within the year. I don't really understand why there wouldn't be. Even if someone had STVRs in mind when buying a property, they can easily replace that income with a long-term renter.	1/24/2017 12:10 PM
5	I would not use a time limitation. Assuming the property is currently in compliance with zoning regulations and collecting and paying TOT, I would make the transition event the change of controlling interest in ownership, similar to how the determination is made as to whether there has been a change of ownership that results in re-assessment of real property taxes. Those who have established the use legally should be pre-existing non-conforming for the duration of their ownership, and even as long as the property stays in their family.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
6	I would say 5 years should be the maximum. 2 to 5 years seems reasonable.	1/20/2017 7:58 PM
7	Five years is too long. I think is a property owner can show that they have participated in the city's TOT program for two years and can pass an audit of their TOT they should be given a two year sunset. If a property owner is not registered with the TOT program for two years they should have a six month sunset.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q19 Should more than one group be permitted to simultaneously rent the same STVR?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
No	45% 5
Comment	45% 5
Yes	9% 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	It depends on how the STVR is set up.	1/25/2017 2:20 PM
2	What? Poorly phrased question. I don't understand this question either.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
3	???? This makes no sense to me	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
4	I don't understand the question	1/21/2017 7:27 PM
5	This is a vague question that renders the answers unusable for analysis. If two couples, each with kids, wants to rent a 4 BR house, is that one group or two? What about a couple with kids and two single adults, each with kids. Is that three groups? What if there are two couples that include siblings and their spouses with kids? Is that only one group because they are all family?	1/21/2017 2:52 PM

# STVR Subcommittee Survey

## Q20 If a limit on the number (or location) of STVR's is established, should the ability to operate a vacation rental cease to allow other properties the opportunity to participate in the STVR program?

Answered: 11 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	55% 6
No	45% 5
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>

#	Comment	Date
1	More information needed before this question can be answered accurately.	1/24/2017 2:48 PM
2	Thanks, this survey had some good questions.	1/24/2017 12:40 PM
3	.??? This makes no sense to me	1/21/2017 9:57 PM
4	within reason--similar discussion last meeting.	1/21/2017 7:27 PM
5	The clear consequence of limits on proximity or percentage STVR per block is that not all properties can simultaneously participate in the STVR program. However, if STVR permits do not transfer with sale, new openings for STVR could occur as existing STVRs are sold and lose their status. There could be a wait list of applicants wanting to become permitted STVRs.	1/21/2017 2:52 PM
6	If I'm understanding this correctly... Yes I think a that a limit would mean that some people and not others would be allowed to operate STVRs.	1/20/2017 7:58 PM
7	That is one of the core requirements of the B&B ordinance and it keeps residential neighborhoods from becoming hotel districts. A limit also protects the city's TOT revenue. Hotels generate higher per-night revenues. Getting tourists to leave hotels in favor of less expensive STVR will erode the city's TOT revenue.	1/20/2017 5:20 PM