



County of El Dorado

Vacation Home Rental (VHR) Ad Hoc Committee

April 23, 2018

Supervisor Sue Novasel
Supervisor Michael Ranalli

What is a VHR?

Defined in County Ordinance, Chapter 5.56:

“Vacation home rental means one or more dwelling units, including either a single-family, home, duplex or single condominium unit rented for the purpose of overnight lodging for a period of not less than one night and not more than 30 days other than ongoing month-to-month tenancy granted to the same renter for the same unit.”

Current zoning **does not** define VHR as commercial activity.

VHR Timeline

- ▶ **BOS Meeting January 9, 2018**
 - ▶ Board declined to impose a moratorium on new VHR permits; Ad Hoc Committee to study the issue and return with recommendations
- ▶ **BOS Meeting February 1, 2018**
 - ▶ Ordinance revision concepts presented
 - ▶ Public input exercise
 - ▶ Meeting discontinued prior to public comment and Board discussion
- ▶ **Ad Hoc Committee Meeting February 12, 2018**
 - ▶ Ordinance concepts presented
 - ▶ Results of 2/1/18 exercise presented
 - ▶ Public comment (written and oral)
- ▶ **BOS Meeting March 13, 2018**
 - ▶ Conceptual approval by BOS to proceed with review of VHR functions
- ▶ **Ad Hoc Committee Meeting April 12, 2018**
 - ▶ Policy/enforcement options exercise regarding issue of noise

VHR's in El Dorado County

- ▶ Unincorporated Area outside of Tahoe Basin:
 - ▶ Allowable use of a residence without Conditional Use Permit
 - ▶ Business license required
 - ▶ Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) registration certificate required
 - ▶ Current number of VHR's not known with certainty, as no specific permit is required

VHR's in El Dorado County

- ▶ Tahoe Basin:
 - ▶ Allowable use of a residence without Conditional Use Permit
 - ▶ Business license required
 - ▶ Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) registration certificate required
 - ▶ **Regulated by County Ordinance Code Chapter 5.56**
 - ▶ VHR Permit required
 - ▶ About 822 active permits

Current VHR Ordinance

- ▶ Applies only to unincorporated area in Tahoe Basin
- ▶ Seeks to balance benefits of VHR's with their impacts on neighborhoods and public services
- ▶ Limits occupancy
- ▶ Limits parking
- ▶ Requires "Local Contact Person"
- ▶ Requires notification to occupants of VHR's regarding local laws relating to solid waste, noise, etc.
- ▶ Sets forth monetary penalties for violations

Conceptual Ordinance Revisions

- ▶ Restructure Violation and Penalty Provisions
 - ▶ No warnings
 - ▶ Increase penalties
 - ▶ Current: Warning, \$250, \$500 within 12 month period
 - ▶ Recommended: \$500, \$1,000, \$1,500 within 18 month period
 - ▶ Focus on nuisance behavior
- ▶ Clarify Language throughout Ordinance Reduce subjectivity (for example, use of “best efforts”)
- ▶ Establish clear expectations

Conceptual Ordinance Revisions

- ▶ Require Exterior Signage
 - ▶ Local Contact information (for use by neighbors)
 - ▶ Permit number
 - ▶ Minimum size and font requirements
- ▶ Cap Number of Occupants during Quiet Hours
 - ▶ May not exceed permitted number of occupants between
10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.

Conceptual Ordinance Revisions

- ▶ **Apply Ordinance Countywide**
 - ▶ Begin regulating new and existing VHR's outside Tahoe Basin
 - ▶ Grace period for VHR's with current business licenses to comply
- ▶ **Require Inspections prior to Permit Issuance**
 - ▶ Compliance with ordinance and permit conditions
 - ▶ Health and safety concerns

Conceptual Ordinance Revisions

- ▶ Review County VHR Functions (approved 3.13.18)
 - ▶ Align responsibilities for permitting, inspection, compliance, and enforcement appropriately within County organization
 - ▶ Consider use of technology and contracted services
 - ▶ Cost recovery
- ▶ Bear-Proof Trash Receptacles
 - ▶ Link to revised Public Health and Safety ordinance language

VHR Ad Hoc Committee

Supervisors Novasel (District V) and Ranalli (District IV) designated by Board of Supervisors

- ▶ Goal: Modernized policies and enforcement methods that retain the benefits of VHR's, prevent or mitigate their impact on neighborhoods, and minimize their impact on public services
- ▶ Objectives:
 - ▶ Improve neighborhood compatibility
 - ▶ Avoid overconcentration of VHR's and commercialization of neighborhoods



Discussion Framework

- ▶ For each issue:
 - ▶ Policy Options
 - ▶ Pros
 - ▶ Cons
 - ▶ Enforcement Options
 - ▶ Pros
 - ▶ Cons

Cities/Counties for Comparison

- ▶ How are other jurisdictions addressing VHRs?
- ▶ Chosen for geographical/population/other similarities and tourist industry
- ▶ The List:

Napa County
County of Sonoma
Monterey County
County of Riverside
Santa Barbara County
Marin County
San Luis Obispo County
Placer County
Mono County

Mendocino County
Douglas County, NV
City of South Lake Tahoe
City of Palm Springs
City of Palm Desert
City of Napa
City of Healdsburg
City of Santa Barbara

Meeting Schedule

Date	Meeting	Topic(s)	Location	Time
May 2, 2018	Board of Supervisors	Conceptual Ordinance revisions	South Tahoe Middle School, South Lake Tahoe	5:30 p.m.
May 9, 2018	VHR Ad Hoc	Parking/traffic issues; additional issues as time permits	Lake Tahoe Environmental Science Magnet School, Meyers	5:30 p.m.- 7:30 p.m.
June 11, 2018	VHR Ad Hoc	TBD	BOS Chambers, Placerville	5:30 p.m.- 7:30 p.m.
July 26, 2018	VHR Ad Hoc	TBD	Lake Tahoe Environmental Science Magnet School, Meyers	5:30 p.m.- 7:30 p.m.



Questions?