



AGENDA REQUEST FORM
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF INYO

For Clerk's Use Only: AGENDA NUMBER
20

- Consent Departmental Correspondence Action Public Hearing
 Scheduled Time Closed Session Informational

FROM: Inyo County Planning Department

FOR THE BOARD MEETING OF: May 29, 2019

SUBJECT: Short-term vacation rentals in the Inyo County Residential Zoning Districts.

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update from staff on the status of the short-term vacation rental issues in the County's Residential Zones and provide input and direction.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION: Short Term vacation rentals have intermittently been viewed as a controversial use in Inyo County over many years and the debate surrounding them continues today. In 2006, during a particularly contentious episode involving short term rentals, the Board of Supervisors provided a finding that stated that short-term rentals were not allowed in the County's residential zones. Planning staff treated short term rentals as zoning violations, based on the 2006 finding until the beginning of 2018 when an ordinance was adopted to allow and regulate them. The drive to allow for short term rentals came from a very active interest from people in the community who wanted to be able to have them and from an uptick in complaints related to their unregulated use in the County that was driven by the increase of people using on-line rental sites to operate them in the County.

Background

At the direction of the Board, planning staff evaluated short-term rental issues and conducted five Community Workshops to discuss Short-Term Vacation Rental issues with the public. These discussions included potential ways to regulate them. Different mechanisms to regulate short term rentals were reviewed by staff and vetted at the public meetings. These included allowing by right with accompanying standards, overlay zones, conditional use permits and varying combinations of them. An evaluation of the comments collected at the community workshops found that most of the people who attended were interested, or at least tolerant, in allowing for short-term rentals in the County as long as adequate regulations were to also be imposed. There were also people in attendance that believed and are still very vocal in protesting that this use is a commercial activity and inappropriate for residential zones. Concerns from both groups included the potential effects to the integrity and safety of residential neighborhoods from short-term rentals. Additionally, the attending public expressed some apprehension regarding the impact of short-term rental proliferation to the limited availability of housing for local residents and more general concerns about parking, noise, pets, partying and trash. The comments provided by the public (attached) and reviews of other jurisdictions' short term rental regulations were used to prepare the Ordinance regulating short-term rentals, which with a recommendation from the Planning Commission, was adopted by the Board in February 2018. Regulations were included for both Hosted (meaning a room or rooms are being rented and an owner of the property is concurrently in the dwelling during the rental period) and Non-Hosted (meaning the rental of a whole house and a property manager is available at all times to address any issues during the rental period).

Currently

The Planning Department has received three complaints regarding short-term vacation rentals since the adoption of the ordinance. The same number as right before it was adopted. There have also been three

somewhat contentious Planning Commission hearings related to applications for non-hosted short-term rentals. This is not an uncommon phenomenon and contentious Planning Commission hearings have been had for a wide array of projects including: mini-storage facilities, Wi-Fi towers and renewable energy policy. The main issues brought forward at these hearings regarding non-hosted short-term rentals are the exact same concerns from people who did not, and still do not, believe that short term rentals are an appropriate use in residential zones. Staff and the Planning Commission have taken the stance that the County would not have adopted a short-term rental ordinance if it thought it was an inappropriate use. Counter to this, there is still a contingent of citizens in the County who believe that there are people looking for short-term rentals for vacation accommodations that do not want to stay in motel/hotels and in the County's tourist based economy this is an important economic opportunity for Inyo County citizens. It can allow for people with second homes to derive some income from them and bring in income from renting out rooms in a home, both without having people living full time in either. Concerns expressed at the application hearings related to neighborhood values, such as parking, dogs, trash, etc. have had additional conditions of approval placed on them by the Planning Commission.

Issues

Planning staff has been receiving reports of issues related to short-term rentals outside of the regular citizen complaint format. These include:

1. Short-term rentals are taking away long-term (over 31-days) rental housing;
2. Short-term rentals should be allowed in multi-family zones;
3. Short term rentals should be allowed in RVs, tents, yurts etc;
4. There should not be any non-hosted short-term rentals;
5. People are buying up property just for short-term rentals;
6. I do not want Short-term rentals in my neighborhood, these come specifically from west Bishop (McLaren and Sunrise) and the Alabama Hills; and,
7. I do not like/trust my neighbor who has one.

Issues examined

1. Planning staff conducted a survey of people who have obtained short-term rental permits. This survey included a question addressing use as a long-term rental prior to getting the short-term rental permit. Eleven of the twenty-four people surveyed indicated that they had used the property for long-term rental at some point in time, including month to month rentals (associated with traveling nurses, teachers and DWP employees). The County has a variety of factors that affect available housing including: high vacancy rates (attached table of County vacancy rates 2010 Census); very little private land; difficulties in providing infrastructure and services and State regulations limiting subdivisions. These are likely more critical factors in the County's housing issues than short-term rentals. It may be wise for the County to look into changing regulations, and policies and identifying programs to provide for more affordable housing.
2. Some jurisdictions do allow for short-term rentals in their multi-family zones. They are the minority, however, and most are highly urbanized areas where multi-family housing is more prevalent. More commonly, jurisdictions, including Inyo County, do not allow for short-term rentals in the multi-family zones as traditionally most 'affordable' housing is provided for in them. For example, the County's R2 zone allows for two single family homes, either attached (duplex) or not attached (standalone dwelling). If an owner can show that all of the setback

requirements of the district can be met, they can also have an accessory dwelling unit (1,200-sq.ft or less). In the R3 zone everything that is allowed for in the R1s and R2s is also allowed and additionally multi-family units (up to 15 depending on the General Plan designation, without a Conditional Use Permit). The R1 districts (R1, RR, RR Starlite, RMH and Open Space) allow for one single-family dwelling and one accessory dwelling unit.

3. The County code only allows for people to stay in trailers while they have an active building permit and on the same property as the permit is for. Tents, trailers and RVs are not considered dwelling units for permanent habitation and neither is a yurt unless it is engineered and built to the same safety and structural standards as a single family home and at this point it is no longer a yurt in the traditional sense.
4. Non-hosted short term rentals were expressed as very desirable by the attending public, during the outreach meetings, when the process for regulating short term rentals started. Staff is concerned that eliminating the non-hosted permit and accompanying regulations will not necessarily eliminate them as a use in the County and this action could result in more non regulated non-hosted short-term rentals. This, in turn, would cause more zoning violations that are inherently difficult to process. Currently, there are 29 hosted and 16 non-hosted permits that have been approved. Thirteen of the hosted permits were obtained strictly to get a non-hosted permit and 16 are being used to operate just a hosted short-rental. All together there are 32 unique properties permitted for short-term rentals and 3 owners obtained both of the permit types to operate both a hosted and a non-hosted rental.
5. Staff has not been able to verify rumors that people are buying up property just for short-term rentals. There have been inquiries to the Planning Department about purchasing multiple properties for short-term rentals and these people have been told that we have a 2 short-term rental per owner limit and owner means at least 20% interest in the property in our regulations.
6. The County chose not to include limiting overlays or language, on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis, when crafting the short-term rental regulations. This was due to the evident interest in having the availability for the permits throughout the County and the fact that there were already short-term rentals operating throughout the County and in the same neighborhoods where a bulk of the complaints are coming from. A large part of impetuous for creating the regulations was to force non-compliant short-term rentals into getting permits and regulating them per the neighborhood values expressed during the public workshops.
7. The County simply cannot regulate neighborhood relationships.

NEXT STEPS:

Staff will take the direction from the Board to update the Short Term Rental Ordinance; continue to monitor it; or a combination of both. There are several quick fixes to the Ordinance that can be implemented to reduce some of the confusion in the permitting process and relax some of the fears surrounding this use (attached). These include:

- 18.73.010 (f) – add Bed and Breakfast to the end of the last sentence.

Bed and Breakfast, per the County's zoning code relates to commercial property and there has been some confusion regarding how the commercial bed and breakfasts are taxed versus the short-term rental of residential properties.

- 18.73.030 (d) – remove “provided that the owner also possesses a permit for a non-hosted rental”. The requirement to first obtain a hosted permit to obtain a non-hosted permit is the single most difficult element for people to understand in this ordinance. It causes much consternation during the application process as neighbors do not grasp the difference between the two and they end up befuddled. This suggestion is a work along with the next one.
- 18.73.030 (e) – change to “No more than one parcel on which short-term rentals are permitted may share a common owner”
This should help to quell the fears that speculators are buying up entire neighborhoods for the sole purpose of running short-term rentals by making only one allowed per owner. It also continues to allow for the hosted rental of a primary dwelling unit and a non-hosted rental of an accessory dwelling unit e.g. ‘Granny Unit’ located on the same property. It will not, however, allow for a hosted rental on one property and a non-hosted on another.
- 18.73.040 (9) add “deposit for the cost of the County mailing notices of applications received for hosted and non-hosted permits and for permits granted for both hosted and non-hosted to property owners and neighbors within three-hundred-feet (300’) of the subject property”.
This works with the next suggestion to add a notice for hosted permit applications from the County along with the applicant going door to door.
- 18.73.040 (10)(i) - change the word agreement to acknowledgement.
The word agreement has caused some confusion and built in tension for the applicant and the neighbors who are being asked to sign it. It may help to relax some of this apprehension by removing the term ‘agreement’. This way people are less likely to try to force an agreement from their neighbors and the neighbors do not feel pressured agree to something they either do not like or understand. This will help to clarify that applicants are not asking for permission, but rather an acknowledgement that they spoke to the neighbors about their plans and information has been provided indicating where they can submit concerns.

Additional Ideas

- Limit the number of short-term rentals by permit zones and/or do not allow for short-term rentals in specific neighborhoods similar to cannabis business licenses.
This could be implemented, but it would be best if a short-term rental business license is required along with it - like cannabis. A Conditional Use Permit runs with the land and the enforcement of the regulations that are tied to Conditional Use Permits are also tied to Title 22 (Code Enforcement). An infraction to a specific conditional of approval would be necessary to revoke a Conditional Use Permit outside of the Title 22 process. There is more latitude in a quick revocation of a business license than a Conditional Use Permit. If this idea is moved forward, additional public outreach should be conducted with the neighborhoods with specific people expressing that this would be best for their neighborhood to not allow for short-term rentals to ensure that it is an accurate characterization of the entire

neighborhood. Neighborhood/permit zones would also need to be defined and the area definitions should include a public process.

- Neighborhoods that are against short-term rentals can develop Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs) that expressly prohibit them.
This is a good option for neighborhood associations that incorporate small geographic areas. CC&Rs are imposed in addition to County regulations and the County does not enforce them. CC&Rs would allow more authority to a neighborhood association to restrict uses that are otherwise outright or conditionally allowed by zoning designations within their area of influence.
- Annual short-term rental permit renewals.
This would also make more sense with a license than a Conditional Use Permit due to them running with the land. Each could be conditioned with an annual review, but a revocation would still be tied to either an infraction to a specific conditional of approval or the Title 22 process.
- Do not allow for non-hosted short-term rentals at all.
This can also be implemented, but should have additional public outreach conducted as based on the comments collected for this use prior to the Ordinance adoption, there was quite a bit of expressed interest from the public in allowing for it. The Planning Commission also recommend that the County, if it decides to eliminate non-hosted short-term rentals, should continue to allow for them if they will be conducted in an accessory dwelling unit on the same property where the owner will be on the property and in the primary dwelling unit during the time of the rental.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT: Inyo County Tax Collector Treasurer, Inyo County Assessor, Inyo County Environmental Health and Public Works Departments and the County Sheriff.

FINANCING: General fund resources are utilized to review and update the County's Zoning Code.

APPROVALS

COUNTY COUNSEL:	AGREEMENTS, CONTRACTS AND ORDINANCES AND CLOSED SESSION AND RELATED ITEMS <i>(Must be reviewed and approved by county counsel prior to submission to the board clerk.)</i>
AUDITOR/CONTROLLER:	ACCOUNTING/FINANCE AND RELATED ITEMS <i>(Must be reviewed and approved by the auditor-controller prior to submission to the board clerk.)</i>
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:	PERSONNEL AND RELATED ITEMS <i>(Must be reviewed and approved by the director of personnel services prior to submission to the board clerk.)</i>

DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE:

(Not to be signed until all approvals are received)



Date: 5/20/19

ATTACHMENTS

- Summary of public comments by public outreach venue
- Table of vacancy rates
- Recommended changes to Short Term Rental of Residential Property (in strike out and underline)

**Inyo County Short Term Vacation Rental
Public Outreach Workshop
Northern Inyo Hospital District Board Room
July 6, 2017, 6:00 p.m., Bishop**

Summary of Public Comments

Note on Form: Comments in Black were from the Public. Notes in Red were responses or other comments by County Staff

- Do we have the means to enforce the current prohibition?
It is a relatively slow process, but it can eventually go to the District Attorney. But that takes time.
- Am I understanding correctly that the current policy is no complaint, then no enforcement?
That is correct.
- A duplex pays more in taxes. Would the short term vacation rental also?
With current codes, they would pay more for property tax, but there is no mechanism for TOT until we allow short term vacation rentals.
- Do current operators have to get a business license?
Inyo County does not currently have a business license.
- CC&R's can ban even if we allow. But they are not enforced by the County. They are enforced by civil legal actions brought about by the HOA.
- Find a way to allow short term vacation rentals.
- At bed & breakfasts in England the owner seems to always be present. This seems to work well.
- County should allow but regulate to take advantage of this expanding market. Families are looking for short term vacation rentals. It seems like the issues can be regulated and the additional revenue is of benefit.
- Must be done in such a way as to be respectful to neighbors. But it is good to have this as a possibility.
- The County and the City are remiss in considering this. This will bring strangers around kids. It was not respectful people in Aspendell that triggered this issue in 2006. Not all tourists are respectful.
- There needs to be a way that laws can be enforced quickly, or this isn't going to work.
- We do not know the backgrounds of vacation renters. Just opens up problems. I'm totally against.

- I have been to many hospitality/tourism conferences, like "Visit California". Short term vacation rental market needs to be responsible to hotel community and collect TOT like they do. One solution is to regulate the max days or 2 renters max per room. But guests want this. I have a 6 year old and have rented short term vacation rentals and it has worked well.
- I am concerned about parking impacts.
- There are some tools through the rental sites (like AirBnB) to vet, but there are also horror stories out there. In Bishop, might work in mixed use areas, but I would say to avoid areas that are all single family residential.
- This might be more appropriate in the poorer parts of the County.
- I am a retired hotel guy. I used to think it was competition. But it seems to create synergy, and generally improve the entire transient market. I have changed my mind and believe we should allow. It does need to meet some minimum standards.
- All problems that can happen in a short term vacation rental can also happen in a hotel or a residential neighborhood.
- We should follow examples that are already out there.
- There is a housing shortage. It would be bad to have speculators buy up housing. Maybe limit to primary owners.
- How do we separate the good from the bad? Is there a commonality to the complaints we've received?
(to the second question). Not really, they are very diverse, both in location and type of complaint.
- I have a neighbor doing this and I've never had a problem.
- Hotels could be hurt. How do we prevent that. However we do that, it should be by regulation, not by prohibition.
- What are other jurisdictions doing? Are you OK if it is literally next door?
- AirBnB is taking away from long term rentals in Mammoth. Saw an ad downhere for a rental of 3 rooms, but not sure if it was long or short term.
- How do we regulate animals that people bring? Also granny units seem like a good opportunity. They need to be properly permitted. And when staying in a short term vacation rental, are they negatively affecting the neighbor? Does it negatively affect property values? In our neighborhood I'm concerned with serenity and security. There are 5 widows that live on the street. Insurance is a real issue. 90-95% of home policies do not allow for short term vacation rental. AirBnB has a supplemental policy, but it is untested.

- It needs to be done in such a way as to be fair to motel/hotel owners. I am not against but it needs to be regulated and fair. The biggest problem out there now are in the communities that have not regulated.
- Have there been problems with repeat offenders. **Not that we know of.** Maybe the operator has to have some sort of deposit on file with the County.
- Address all the comments you have up there. There needs to be a strong deterrent system for people who don't comply with the regulations. Penalties or fines.
- Flag lots or lots that gain their access via easements are an issue with increased traffic. Also there should be a safety check of the unit before allowing rental.
- How do we know how to contact property management?
It will probably be posted on a sign.
- Specify that trailers and tents won't be allowed. Also adding units (vacation or otherwise) can overwhelm utilities, and that should be looked at when permitting.
- Will operators have to have a permit of some sort?
Probably
- I agree with the items you have listed and have a few more. Perhaps max days that can be rented per year. Also, keep in mind that our solution may not look like the solutions for any other communities. And it would be good if we could dedicate this TOT to a purpose.
- If R-1, maybe limit to 1 room and two people
- Mule Days started as a way of filling hotels. That was successful, but we don't want to undermine.
- Limiting the number of days a person can rent does not seem necessary.
- Could we limit to multi-family residential zones.
Might be difficult, only because there is not much in the County.
- Are there many high end short term vacation rentals.
Yes, there is currently a house on the market for over \$800,000 that advertises it got \$92k per year in short term vacation rental rent.
- The hosts/operators like meeting the guests.
- There have been problems at the high end house for sale mentioned earlier.
- The hosts might have a good experience....is that also true of the neighbors?
- High end neighborhoods do not necessarily mean high end renters.
- Selective zoning in the past in the County. This might be an existing zoning problem too.

- We need to think about how we would permit and inspect.
- Many people don't complain because they don't know that they can complain and don't know where to complain to.
- You need to talk to the sheriff and get their input on how much of an issue there is and how to enforce.
- Time frame for implementation?
Ideally the end of the year.
- Maybe a quota system. Allow a set number of short term vacation rentals either in a community or the whole County.
- All these problems can occur aside from short term vacation rentals. Are they any worse than other residential users?
- Involve law enforcement in the planning process.
- Could a neighborhood opt out if they did not want to allow?
- Would the process to get the permit involve notifying neighbors? Could the neighbors veto a project.
Yes, neighbors would be notified. And they would be a very strong factor in consideration (though not strictly a veto).
- Permit without having to do CEQA, which is too onerous. But definitely require safety inspections when permitting.

**Inyo County Short Term Vacation Rental
Public Outreach Workshop
American Legion Hall
June 29, 2017, 6:00 p.m., Independence**

Summary of Public Comments

Note on Form: Comments in Black were from the Public. Notes in Red were responses or other comments by County Staff

- Short term vacation rentals should be allowed. Collect TOT. Parking needs to be required in such a way as to not affect the neighbors.
- I have mixed feelings about short term vacation rentals. There is one 15 feet from my house. No noise problems, but there is a high turnover of people and so I don't ever know the people next door. Did not know it was a short term vacation rental when I purchased the home.
- A problem is the availability of housing if short term vacation rentals are allowed.
- My neighbors were bad neighbors, so I purchased the home next to me to do short term vacation rentals and have control of who was in that house. I see the pros and cons of both sides. I am willing to pay the taxes but not willing to be fined for a zoning violation.
- What is the cost of a Conditional Use Permit?
Initial deposit of approximately \$1,500. But could be a bit more or less depending on how complicated.
- 2 people expressed that they are for short term vacation rentals.
- Las Vegas just passed an ordinance on short term vacation rentals. You need to post something visible to let people know it is a short term vacation rental. There is a problem when there is a lack of accountability. And how do these affect property values and requirements at sale of the property.
- Can these houses be categorized as short term vacation rentals (so that the use carries over at sale)?
- Short term vacation rentals must be TOT
- Bed and Breakfasts should be restricted to commercial zones.
- There needs to be a cap on the number of people allowed. Maybe the pillows on the beds or permanent set up sleep spaces.
- Requirements for insurance are not currently enforced. Requiring insurance needs to be enforced and it needs to be comparable to the requirements for hotels.
- Parking as a problem varies with availability

- Short term vacation rentals may cause issues with traffic.
- There needs to be signage with a phone number on who to contact with problems.
- A short term vacation rental needs to have adequate lighting so that the address is clearly visible.
- Signs can be removed. So this takes us back to an on site manager.
- Require some sort of business license.
- A property manager should be available 24 hours a day.
- Require the posting of rules and regulations (hours for noise).
- The new allowance of cannabis might cause more issues with fire.
- Unenforced rules are a problem
- Do not over regulate.
- Educate tenants so they respect the neighbors and neighborhood.
- The fire marshal needs to be involved and fire regulations need to be a high priority.
- It might be a choice between vacation homes and vacant homes. Both have their pros and cons. But a bunch of vacant homes results in a dying town. Short term vacation rentals bring in income.

**Inyo County Short Term Vacation Rental
Public Outreach Workshop
Tecopa Community Center
June 28, 2017, 6:00 p.m., Tecopa**

Summary of Public Comments

Note on Form: Comments in Black were from the Public. Notes in Red were responses or other comments by County Staff

- I have spent time in Joshua Tree, where they have embraced short term vacation rentals and it has really expanded the tourism industry there. This would be really good for the gateway communities to Death Valley. But it does need to be regulated.
- What is the difference between RR and R1?
It is rural residential vs. single family residential (a more urban/suburban residential). The main difference is density. But for this conversation, there is little difference (both currently don't allow short term vacation rentals, and if we allowed, both probably would).
- Can someone stay in and RV?
No. Not allowed in our current code and not considering allowing as part of any short term vacation rental.
- I'm glad that this issue has come up. I'm ill at ease with being outside of the code.
- I have enjoyed operating a short term vacation rental. But I want to pay my fair share of the TOT.
- Currently you can rent accessory dwelling units or houses to long term renters, correct?
30+ day is long term and is allowed. 30 days or less is short term and is not allowed.
- I have feelings both ways. Is there a way that the funds can go back into this community?
- Las Vegas just passed an ordinance on short term vacation rentals. You need permission from neighbors. There is a permit fee that is primarily just a recording fee. Also keep in mind that noise can really travel here in the desert, so that neighbor half a mile away, but with nothing between the two of you can still be heard.
- The anonymous complaint system is really problematic, unfair and arbitrary.
- Noise can be regulated so that it is not a problem.
- Santa Monica regulation forces short term vacation rentals to bring in TOT at the same rate as hotels/motels.
- If there is a problem, who do we notify? We need it clear who we get a hold of to deal with a problem immediately.

- Sound really travels in the desert. You can hear peoples footsteps on the sand a long ways off. And vehicles on the highway even further.
- We should encourage business here and keep the money here.
- AirBnB published an article on how they are revitalizing rural communities. While they definitely are biased, it had good points.
- We have good neighbors here, and we generally should be able to work out anything with our neighbors.
- What is the time frame?
Lots of variables, but we are hopeful for around the end of the year.
- Is it possible to get some sort of CUP before all the regulation is worked out?
Probably not. The regulation is the process to allow for the CUP.
- There needs to be permission from neighbors and a curfew.
- Do not create a process that gives too much power to complaining neighbors.
- What I care about the most is how we keep money in this community.
- Can there be a difference between a room in the house and the whole house in how it is regulated?
- We need to think about how this affects housing.
- Could we have less regulation for the rental of rooms in houses?
- We should have a special district for Tecopa with less restrictions and keep more of the money in Tecopa for a pool.
- Would we sneak something into the law that had nothing to do with vacation rentals?
No, it doesn't really work like that at the County level. That's just sort of a national and state thing.
- Requiring and onsite manager would control speculative purchases of houses for short term vacation rentals.
- Can we look at other jurisdictions for examples. Does the state provide any sort of model code?
While we can look to other jurisdictions for examples, we still want to make sure what we do matches what comes out of this public outreach. The State largely leaves this up to local jurisdictions.
- I am a motel owner. I am good with this as it's a good economic opportunity and it seems that anything that improves the economy helps us all.

**Inyo County Short Term Vacation Rental
Public Outreach Workshop
Town Hall
June 26, 2017, 6:00 p.m., Big Pine**

Summary of Public Comments

Note on Form: Comments in Black were from the Public. Notes in Red were responses or other comments by County Staff

- In 2006, the supervisors did not research the codes to come to their decision. They did not anticipate where vacation rentals would be today.
- A house should be used as a house (not a business, like a vacation rental)
- There is a lot of appeal of short term vacation rentals to Europeans. There is business that comes here that simply will go elsewhere if this type of option is not available.
- The County ordinance is outdated. It was not decided with a lot of foresight. There is now a world-wide network of these vacation rentals. We can choose to participate or not, but it is happening whether we participate or not.
- For a homeowner/neighbor, it seems like there can be lots of issues. But it also seems like these issues can be addressed through regulation.
- Europeans and other travelers may not understand local regulations and customs. We lose the ability to know our neighbors when a house becomes a short term vacation rental.
- Can we limit the days per year for a short term vacation rental? That is a possibility and we have heard of some jurisdictions doing that. I like the idea of a property manager on call or an owner on site.
- You can have neighbor problems for owners or long term renters. Neighbor problems are not unique to short term vacation rentals.
- This definitely should be regulated.
- This has been going on for a long time. It predates the 2006 issue by at least 20 years. That only became an issue because someone in Aspendell got up in arms in 2005.
- There can be nuisance issues even without short term vacation rentals.
- It probably makes sense for property managers to have to meet some sort of criteria. Perhaps licensed real estate agents make sense as property managers.
- Can there be a minor "conditional use" permit, that is less intensive and costs less for short term vacation rentals. Or if not for all short term vacation rentals, can there be for at least renting a room in a house?

- I don't agree with this commercial enterprise being in residential zones.
- If allowed, it needs to be treated like a business. Should have similar taxes, insurance requirements, etc. to a motel.
- This is a good opportunity for someone with a home but that has income problems.
- Regulation may give a framework for setting the rules to allow short term vacation rentals.
- It seems like a full blown conditional use permit is excessive and will put this out of reach of some potential short term vacation rental operators.
- If the process is too onerous, then it will still be done illegally.
- Having a long term rental is also a valuable option in our underserved long term rental market.
- Perhaps we could allow without a CUP, but then if they do not follow the rules they would have to pay a fine or go through the CUP process.
- The CUP process would allow for neighbor input and buy in and decrease the chance of neighbors feeling totally out of control and mad.
- We need to just strengthen regular nuisance laws.
- The operator needs to be educated so they in turn can educate tenants.
- Can we work with and learn from other jurisdictions?
We can and we will. But that said, we also feel like it is important to base what we do on what we get in the way of local feedback and not just take some other jurisdictions code that may not match.
- Renting a room in a house vs. the whole house inherently allows the operator to have more control over the tenants.
- Whole house rental can rejuvenate neglected second homes and make them productive instead of vacant.
- Can we start simple (rooms in houses) and then expand to whole houses later if the first phase is successful?
- Parking has always been a serious issue and needs to be accounted for. Trash also can be a serious issue.
- AirBnB will collect the taxes.
Alisha – possibly, but not necessarily. They have been much more willing to do this for large jurisdictions, less so with small rural jurisdictions, though they seem to be more willing to work with smaller jurisdictions as time passes.

- If we allow whole house short term vacation rentals, we need to require a property manager that is contactable.
- Some communities have set up a vendor contact point. This is a private business that acts as a liaison between the County and the short term vacation rental operators. Often they may be assisting in permits, providing property management services and even possibly.
- We can overregulate....don't.
- Having business licenses as a means of tracking this makes sense.

**Inyo County Short Term Vacation Rental
Public Outreach Workshop
Statham Hall
June 19, 2017, 6:00 p.m., Lone Pine**

Summary of Public Comments

Note on Form: Comments in Black were from the Public. Notes in Red were responses or other comments by County Staff

- Does this sort of regulation apply to the De La Cour Ranch?
Probably not, as that is most likely on a commercial property and designated as a resort. While it may advertise on Air BnB, it is not on a residentially zoned piece of land, so is not what we are talking about tonight.
- Does this sort of regulation apply to USFS cabins?
USFS regulates their lands. Someone from the audience shared that some USFS leases cannot do short term rentals, while others are limited to 30 days per year max.
- Based on current law, can I do a short term rental on a large rural residential property?
If it is zoned residential, not commercial, then no. It is not a size of lot issue, it is what is permitted by the zoning.
- Can you rent to someone long term?
30 days or less is short term vacation rental and is not currently allowed. 31 day or more is long term rental and is allowed.
- I am OK with short term vacation rentals as long as they are taxed and regulated.
Two additional people said that they agreed with this statement.
- Not sure if this is OK in the Alabama hills where I live. I am concerned that short term renters increase the chance of fire and am concerned about fire service to the Alabama Hills area.
- I have a neighbor doing short term vacation rentals. It's OK, I guess, tenants have never been unruly. But I don't like the flow of unknown people, and people have wandered on to my property or have parked in places other than on the property with the short term vacation rental. It makes me feel like I need to be on guard. I also can't reach the owner of that property. I guess I'm OK with short term vacation rentals if the operators are considerate.
- If allowed, there needs to be a public process for approval.
- This is happening anyways. It is better if we can regulate and tax.
- We should evaluate and then allow with incorporated nuisance regulation. The current state of not allowed because it is not stated in the code is a bit of an issue with me. It

needs to be more explicit if not allowed. We need a way to allow on a case by case basis.

- Conditional use permits allow for more flexibility.
- We should look at renting a room in a house differently from renting a whole house.
- Could we impose a limit on the amount of days per year someone can rent?
- In some cities, there are AirBnB managers, who take care of a group of rentals. They tend to be very conscientious, because they want the good reviews.
- Short term vacation rentals can take away from affordable housing.
- Short term vacation rentals can supplement a limited motel room base.
- Short term vacation rentals can drive up rent
- There is a lack of affordable housing in Inyo County.
- What would the people who want this to happen be willing to accept as regulation?
- There should not be commercial type signs in residential areas. Can we regulate signs?
- This list seems reasonable, but regulating the number of days someone can rent does not seem reasonable.
- How would we be able to regulate the number of trips to a particular short term vacation rental?
- We need a faster way to address violations than the current Zoning Violation system.
- If you have a bad regular renter, then maybe you can encourage the owner to go short term vacation rental.
- I don't like a system that is like neighborhood watch and ends up pitting neighbor against neighbor.
- Could we possibly institute a quota, kind of like liquor licenses.
- There is trouble finding local housekeeping. This might make that worse.
- There are programs with cabins and similar where the renter has to do the cleaning.
- If you can't get insurance, does that mean you can't do short term vacation rentals? If we do end up with an insurance requirement, it could possibly keep some from being able to do this.
- We should encourage local rental agencies.
- This is common for the younger generation. We don't want to miss out on that potential market.

- Do we really need this to add to our transient occupancy base?
- Short term vacation rentals attract a different demographic. Families from Europe and the East Coast like short term vacation rentals, sometime more than motels.
- This can provide housing for transient workers.
- Is there some way of letting the tenants sign off on liability for a place that cannot get insurance?
- Allow but regulate....and don't allow rental of tents.
- It might be possible to create neighborhood associations to help regulate (instead of neighbor complaining against neighbor situation).
- This could decrease the number of unused homes possibly.
- Quick strawpoll vote. All votes for, none against.....several people did not vote.

California				Inyo County								
Occupancy Status	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant						
Total:	13,268,682	+/-1,677		9,131	+/-25							
Occupied	12,187,191	+/-20,589	91.8	7,801	+/-211	85.4						
Vacant	1,081,491	+/-19,348	8.2	1,330	+/-213	14.6						
Big Pine CDP				Bishop city			Cartago CDP			Darwin CDP		
Occupancy Status	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant
Total:	730	+/-81		1,872	+/-174		44	+/-31		31	+/-20	
Occupied	614	+/-86	84.1	1,667	+/-147	89.0	44	+/-31	100.0	21	+/-10	67.7
Vacant	116	+/-61	15.9	205	+/-114	11.0	0	+/-132	0.0	10	+/-17	32.3
Dixon Lane-Meadow Creek CDP				Furnace Creek CDP			Independence CDP			Keeler CDP		
Occupancy Status	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant
Total:	1,155	+/-66		56	+/-29		330	+/-60		42	+/-24	
Occupied	1,041	+/-79	90.1	56	+/-29	100.0	231	+/-45	70.0	32	+/-20	76.2
Vacant	114	+/-81	9.9	0	+/-132	0.0	99	+/-41	30.0	10	+/-16	23.8
Lone Pine CDP				Mesa CDP			Olancho CDP			Pearsonville CDP		
Occupancy Status	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant	Total Housing Units	Margin of Error	Percent Occupied/Vacant
Total:	937	+/-97		145	+/-38		28	+/-23		18	+/-15	
Occupied	768	+/-107	82.0	126	+/-35	86.9	19	+/-17	67.9	8	+/-11	44.4
Vacant	169	+/-83	18.0	19	+/-22	13.1	9	+/-14	32.1	10	+/-16	55.6

ATTACHMENT 2

“Chapter 18.73

SHORT-TERM RENTAL OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

- 18.73.010. Definitions.**
- 18.73.020. Short-term rentals prohibited.**
- 18.73.030. Short-term rentals – General requirements.**
- 18.73.040. Permit Application.**
- 18.73.050. Hosted Rental Permit Review Process.**
- 18.73.060. Non-Hosted Rental Permit Review Process.**
- 18.73.070. Permit Modification and Revocation.**
- 18.73.080. Enforcement.**

18.73.010 - Definitions.

For purposes of this chapter, the following definitions apply:

- a. “Guestroom” means any bedroom or other separate area of a dwelling unit utilized as a sleeping area for short-term renters.
- b. “Hosted rental” means a short-term rental of a room(s) within a dwelling that is occupied by the owner during the duration of the the transient renter(s) stay.
- c. “Manager” means the owner or owner’s agent who provides oversight for non-hosted short-term rental activities and is available twenty-four (24) hours per day, seven (7) days per week, during all times that the property is rented as a non-hosted short-term rental to respond to and handle complaints.
- d. “ Non-Hosted rental” means a short-term rental of an entire dwelling unit where the Owner of the dwelling unit does not concurrently occupy the dwelling unit with the transient lodger.
- e. "Owner" shall mean a record owner of the property who is responsible for submitting the application for approval and conducting hosted and non-hosted short-term rental activities pursuant to this chapter. "Owner" shall further include any person or entity with any direct or indirect aggregate ownership interest of 20-percent or more in the subject property, unless the interest is solely a security, lien, or encumbrance.
- f. “Short-term rental” means to provide transient lodging in a dwelling unit, for compensation, for a period of thirty consecutive calendar days or less. “Short-term Rental” does not include transient lodging in county-approved hotels, ~~and~~ motels and bed and breakfasts.

18.73.020. Short-term rentals prohibited.

The short-term rental of residential property is a prohibited use in every zoning district in the County, with the exception of those permitted pursuant to this chapter.

18.73.030. Short-term rentals – General requirements.

Short-term rentals may be permitted on properties zoned Open Space (OS); Rural Residential (RR); Rural Residential Starlite; One-Family Residential (R1); and, Single Residence Mobile Home Combined (RMH), subject to the following requirements and limitations:

- a. No person shall undertake, maintain, authorize, aide, facilitate, or advertise any short-term rental activity that does not comply with the provisions of this Code.
- b. Each short-term rental shall have a Host or Manager readily available to handle any questions or complaints during all short-term rental activities. Any change to the contact information for the Manager of a non-hosted short-term rental shall immediately be provided in writing to the Inyo County Planning Department, to neighboring properties within 300-feet of the short-term vacation rental, and on any postings required by this chapter.
- c. Only one hosted rental per parcel may be permitted.
- d. Only one non-hosted rental per parcel may be permitted. ~~, provided that the owner also possesses a permit for a hosted rental.~~
- e. No more than ~~two~~ one parcel on which short-term rentals are permitted may share a common owner.
- f. No more than five (5) guestrooms per dwelling unit may be permitted for short-term rental activity.
- g. Issuance of a hosted and/or non-hosted short-term rental permit, pursuant to this chapter, is separately required for each dwelling unit in which a short-term rental will occur.
- h. Short-term rentals shall not be permitted in dwelling units that are not compliant with applicable building and safety and/or Environmental Health requirements, or in non-habitable structures, tents, RVs, treehouses, yurts, or other provisions or structures not intended for primary occupancy.
- i. Only two (2) renters are allowed per guestroom. This number does not include children three (3) years and under.
- j. A maximum of one vehicle per guestroom shall be allowed, and the owner shall provide off-street parking for all such allowed vehicles, that the renter(s) shall utilize. The owner shall ensure that the parking limitations are included in short-term rental agreements and in all related advertisements.
- k. Outdoor amplified sound is prohibited.
- l. Quiet hours shall be from 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The host shall ensure that the quiet hours are included in rental agreements and in all advertisements.
- m. Pets, if allowed by owner, shall be secured on the property at all times. Continual barking or other nuisances created by unattended pets are prohibited.
- n. Trash bins and recycling storage containers shall be required for all permitted short-term rentals and such bins and containers shall not be stored within public view

- o. Outdoor fire areas are only permitted in compliance with applicable state and local laws and shall not be utilized by short-term renters during quiet hours.
- p. Short-term rental activity is subject to, and the owner shall comply with, Inyo County Code Chapter 3.20 – Transient Occupancy Tax. The owner shall include the transient occupancy tax registration certificate number on all short-term rental agreements, and in any related advertisements.

18.73.040. Permit Application

In order to obtain a permit authorizing short-term rentals under this chapter, the owner shall submit an application and any applicable fee for a permit to the Planning Director.

- a. The application shall include:
 - 1. Proof of ownership of the subject property;
 - 2. Name, address, and contact information of the owner;
 - 3. Name, address, and contact information of all other record owners of the subject property;
 - 4. Name, address and contact information for the owner's local emergency contact representative in the event the owner is the manager and is unable to be contacted;
 - 5. A site plan prepared on an 8.5"x11" piece of paper showing that the required off-street parking spaces are provided, and the emergency access to the dwelling unit(s).
 - 6. Proof that transient occupancy registration certificate for the subject property has been applied for and/or received;
 - 7. A copy of the rules, regulations, and information that will be posted in a prominent place within six (6) feet of the front door of the short-term rental;
 - 8. A verified list of the names and addresses of the owners of all property within three hundred feet of the exterior boundaries of the property proposed for the short-term rental as shown on the last adopted tax role of the County;
 - 9. A deposit for the cost of the County mailing notices for applications received for hosted and non-hosted permits and for permits granted to property owners and neighbors of an approved short-term rental within three hundred feet (300') of the subject property;
 - 10. For hosted rentals only:
 - i. A Planning Department issued neighborhood agreement acknowledgement form signed by each resident within 300-feet of the proposed hosted rental. If the applicant is unable to obtain the required signatures, the applicant shall provide proof of his/her reasonable attempts to gather those signatures.
- b. Incomplete applications shall be returned to the applicant with an explanation of what is required to make the application complete.

18.73.050. Hosted Rental Permit Review Process

- a. The Planning Director shall review completed applications for hosted short-term rentals. The Planning Director shall not approve the application absent a finding that the use will comply with the requirements of this Code and other applicable law. Approval of an application for a hosted rental shall be subject to the general requirements of Chapter 18.81 of this Code.
- b. As part of the hosted rental application review, the Planning Director shall consider any relevant comments received from neighboring residents and/or owners regarding the application. The Planning Director may add reasonable conditions to a hosted rental permit in order to prevent impacts of the short-term rental activities from being a nuisance to the surrounding properties, including but not limited to conditions related to specific parking requirements, noise reduction measures, garbage collection, and related property maintenance issues.
- c. The decision of the Planning Director may be appealed to the Planning Commission pursuant to Chapter 18.81 of this Code. The Planning Commission shall review the application in the manner set forth for vacation rental applications in section 18.73.090.

18.73.060. Non-Hosted Short-Term Rental Permit Review Process

- a. Upon receipt of a complete application for a non-hosted short-term rental, the Planning Director shall cause the application to be placed on a Planning Commission agenda for the review of the application as generally required by Chapter 18.81 of this Code. The Planning Director may provide a recommended action and/or any other relevant information to the Planning Commission as part of the agenda item. Approval of an application for a non-hosted short-term rental shall be subject to the general requirements of Chapter 18.81 of this Code.
- b. The decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors consistent with Chapter 18.81 of this Code.

18.73.070. Permit Modification and Revocation

- a. The Planning Director may revoke or modify a short-term rental permit as follows:
 1. Notice and Hearing. Notice shall be mailed to the owner at the address specified in the approval application. The notice shall specify the reason(s) for the modification or revocation and shall designate a time and place of an administrative hearing with the Planning Director no sooner than six and no later than thirty weekdays, excluding holidays, following the mailing date of the notice. The owner shall be provided the opportunity to present written and oral evidence at the hearing. Failure to appear at the hearing shall constitute a waiver of any objections to the proposed modification or revocation.

- i. Following the hearing, the Planning Director may revoke or modify the approval upon making one or more of the following findings:
 - a. The approval was obtained by fraud;
 - b. The short-term rental activity has been or is being conducted in violation of this chapter or other applicable law;
 - c. The conditions of approval have been or are being violated;
 - d. The short-term rental activity constitutes a public nuisance.
2. Notice of decision. A written notice of the Planning Director's decision shall be prepared and mailed to the owner at the address specified in the application for approval. The notice shall contain a statement directing the owner to immediately cease using the property for short-term rentals, and that failure to cease such use may be subject to further legal action and/or enforcement proceedings.
- b. Appeal. The decision of the Planning Director to modify or revoke a short-term rental application may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors consistent with Chapter 18.81 of this Code.

18.73.080. Enforcement

- a. Initial complaints. Initial complaints regarding short-term rental activity on a parcel permitted pursuant to this chapter will generally be directed to the owner or manager identified in the short-term rental permit. The owner of hosted or, the manager of non-hosted short-term rentals shall be responsible for contacting the tenant to correct the problem within ninety (90) minutes, or within forty-five (45) minutes if during quiet hours, including visiting the site if necessary, to ensure that the issue has been corrected. The owner of hosted, or the manager of non-hosted short-term rentals, shall report any such complaints, and their resolutions or attempted resolutions, to the Inyo County Planning Department within twenty-four (24) hours of the occurrence. Failure to respond to complaints or report them to the Planning Department within twenty-four (24) hours of the occurrence shall be considered a violation of this section, and may constitute cause for revocation or modification of the short-term rental permit. Occupants of surrounding properties shall be apprised of this complaint procedure.
- b. The County may enforce the provisions of this Chapter in accordance with Chapter 22 of this Code.”

SECTION TWO: Environmental Determination. The project was reviewed for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the CEQA guidelines, and the County's environmental procedures, and is found to be exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) (general rule) of the CEQA Guidelines, in that the County finds that it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the passage of this ordinance amending the County Code will have a significant effect on the environment.

SECTION THREE: Severability. If any provision or clause of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or clauses or applications of this ordinance which can be implemented without the invalid provision, clause or application; and to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are declared to be severable.

SECTION FOUR: This ordinance shall become effective 30 days from the date of its adoption and final passage, which appears immediately below. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall post this ordinance and also publish the ordinance in the manner prescribed by Government Code section 25124 no later than 15 days after the date of its adoption and final passage. If the Clerk fails to publish this ordinance within said 15 day-period, then the ordinance shall not take effect until 30 days after the date of publication.

DRAFT

Hi Darci,

I was planning to give this testimony today to the board but came down sick. Could you please make sure they all get a copy or read it into record as you see appropriate?

Thanks

George

Page 1

To: Inyo County Board of Supervisors

From: George Lozito
403 Mt Tom Bishop
760 937 6405

I had intended to testify today but as I came down ill, I am asking Darci to present this written testimony.

I came to live in Inyo county in 1974. I was a teacher in Lone Pine, then in Bishop a school principal and spent the last of my 34 years of my education career as the County Superintendent based here in Independence but serving all the county.

So, I've come to learn that there are a few concerns over the issue of non hosted short term rentals:

Workforce housing, compliance with regulations, neighborhood degradation , tourism economy.

Rental housing has always been a problem here. Long before non hosted short term rentals came about. In 1974 I could not get a rental in LP. I ended up renting an old trailer and converted boxcar in Dolomite, the Lone Pine Home Ec teacher lived in a hotel in Independence, and another teacher basically lived place to place: hotel, car even slept in his classroom. There are other issues to bear

Page 2

here: no private land to expand, growing retired pop. are 2 that comes to mind

DIRECT STAFF TO INVESTIGATE ALL THE REASONS FOR WORKFORCE HOUSING SHORTAGES.

If the role of government is to somehow provide or ensure housing for the workforce, don't do it by banning options for private property owners. Rather than banning non hosted short term rentals look into providing that WF housing. Use eminent domain to buy property, build WF housing.

DIRECT STAFF TO LOOK INTO GRANTS TO ACQUIRE LAND AND BUILD WF HOUSING

Compliance . Seems very unfair to punish everyone if one or a few cause problems. Rather than limit property owner options by banning non hosted short term rentals, via your regulations bring any wrongdoer into compliance or revoke their specific permit. Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater here.

As far as complaints and neighborhood degradation ...is this real? Your staff report of April 3 this year shows only 2 complaints were ever made about short term rentals...a car alarm going off and a trash can lid blowing off allowing

Page 3

trash on the street. I sense this is not a reality based fear but a fear from that "not in my backyard" mentality.

DIRECT STAFF TO FUTURE INVESTIGATE COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT OPTIONS

If the unspoken worry is that climbers and outdoor enthusiasts are some kind of bum culture that won't financially contribute to our tourist economy or are a criminal threat...then look at the parked cars in climbing areas...Mercedes vans, 4 wheel suvs, high end campers vehicles costing way beyond \$40,000. This tourist group is large and crosses many cultural borders and has money! We would be smart to look into hosting quarterly climbing festivals here to bring in that tourist money.

DIRECT STAFF TO DO SUCH AN INVESTIGATION

Economic value of non hosted short term rentals. Tourism is a large part of why we even have a workforce here. We need to strike a balance between housing the WF and attracting the tourists who help create that need. The workforce is concentrated in the town areas. Tourists come in part and largely to enjoy the mountain areas. A house in Haggebegers or cabin in Whitney portals is not appropriate for WF housing as is it is for non hosted short term vacation rentals. If you ban non hosted short term rentals rental in vacation destinations like Aspendell etc, you

Page 4

negatively effect the tourist economy without doing any benefit to WF housing issue.

I'm sure you also realize that such a ban will result in many properties sitting vacant half the time making no contribution beyond prop tax to our economy

DIRECT STAFF TO MAP AREAS TO BE EXEMPT FORM ANY BAN ON NON HOSTED SHORT TERM RENTALS SUCH AS ASPENDELL, HABBERGERS, TECOPA , GALICER LODGE, WHITNEY PROTALS ETC.

Thanks for considering my input.

Sincerely,

George and Kerry Lozito

Darcy Ellis

From: Kerry Lozito <kerrylozito@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2019 12:15 PM
To: Darcy Ellis; Jeff Griffiths
Cc: George Lozito
Subject: Thoughts on Short-term Rentals

Good morning-

Darci, George already had a discussion with Jeff this morning about the issues surrounding short-term rentals in Inyo County. Please share my thoughts with the Inyo County Supervisors as well.

I am in agreement that we need to preserve as much housing as we can for the work-force in Inyo County, particularly for those of low income. I also agree that we don't need speculators buying up affordable housing and renting it out for profit that leaves the County. That said, George and I are in escrow for a small house in Aspendell and have considered renting it out (short term) to recoup some of the yearly costs.

We have been looking for a mountain "cabin" for 25 years and have never found anything that wasn't problematic for us. We aren't getting any younger, so we finally settled on a small house that borders Forest Service land. It doesn't have great views, but it's got a cozy, private feel to it. It would make a great short-term rental for a couple or small family: 2 bed, 1 bath, 950 sq. feet.

Tourism is a large part of why we even have a work force in Inyo County, and we need to strike a balance between attracting tourists and housing the people that serve them. The work force is concentrated in town; tourists come largely to enjoy the mountains. The house in Aspendell isn't as appropriate for work-force housing as it is for a part-time home and vacation destination.

Whereas you may face opposition from the lodges that operate in Bishop Creek, I'm sure you're also aware that those lodges don't operate for half the year. There are few options for a Sierra-loving tourist to avoid the crowds in Mammoth and rent a place above snowline near Bishop. In our case, we could also market this property much more affordably than the Mammoth option, to families who just want to come play in the snow.

I'm sure you also realize that if you ban properties as short-term rentals, many will just sit empty half the time and make no additional contribution to the local economy.

I applaud the efforts of the County Supervisors to solve the housing crunch in Inyo County, but I hope the supervisors can consider that an outright countywide ban on short-term rentals may have unintended consequences. Exempting vacation destination areas like Aspendell makes more sense. Residents such as ourselves, with a long-term interest in the welfare and economy of Inyo County, should be allowed to rent out housing that won't be available to the work force anyway.

Sincerely,
Kerry Lozito

PS. Jeff, thanks for all your public service. These issues aren't easy, and I'm always glad to have a straight-shooter like you in government. I really mean that.

Darcy Ellis

From: George Lozito <georgelozito@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2019 11:29 AM
To: Darcy Ellis
Subject: Board input :Short term rental

Hi Darcy,

Please share with the board for tomorrow's meeting.

I am not in favor of removing non-hosted short term rentals from Inyo County. We are currently in escrow on a small vacation home in Aspendell. It will be a place where our family can go to beat the heat in summer and have a winter cabin. To make the dollars work out we plan to put it on a short term rental program. This is not a scheme to make money or buy up affordable housing. It is a way we can have a family vacation spot. Aspendell is not an area of affordable or workforce housing. It is largely a vacation destination.

If the concern of the supervisors is rentals for workforce, then make an ordinance that applies only to Bishop where the rentals are need. Exempt areas like Aspendell.* Otherwise you will be unnecessarily reducing tourist income to our county and more sadly, taking away a property right from some long time Inyo County residents.

Please keep me informed of items on the agenda that relate to this.

Thanks

George Lozito

* According to the board April 3rd, 2019 report, there are only 14 non-hosted permits in the county and only one in Aspendell. Please allow Aspendell and other similar vacation communities to continue non-hosted

short term rentals. Exempt them and make any changes you deem appropriate to the Bishop city area.

--

Tk Geo

georgelozito@gmail.com

Tom Schaniel

From: InyoPlanning
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 7:55 AM
To: Cathreen Richards; Steven Karamitros; Tom Schaniel; Ryan Smith-Standridge
Subject: FW: Inyo County non-hosted short term rentals

Good Morning;

I thought this was a nice letter to start off the week. 😊

Smile,

Paula,

Planning, ext 0263

priesen@inyocounty.us

From: Mike Campbell [<mailto:canosoup@mac.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2019 7:33 PM
To: Ryan Smith-Standridge
Cc: InyoPlanning; Matt Kingsley; diana campbell
Subject: Inyo County non-hosted short term rentals

Hi Everyone,

We wanted to voice our thoughts and experience with the non-hosted short term rentals since there have been recent concerns.

Please see link at bottom of email.

For years, we had a hard time renting our non hosted property long term in Lone Pine, even lowering the monthly rental cost below our mortgage payment in order to maintain our home. When Vacation Rentals came around a little over a year ago, we found many people came to visit the area from all over the world, some staying in local hotels, while others wanted a house so they would have enough room for their family to be in one place.

We know VR's brings tourism revenue into the area, employing local people in order to keep our place running and we are able to reinvest in our home which brings property values up. This also gives us the opportunity to come up on a monthly basis and share the beautiful area with family, friends and some wellness groups which we could not do with a long term rental.

Companies like Airbnb and VRBO help us to verify the renters with state issued ID's, phone numbers and personal ratings along with insurance for owners and renters alike. Inyo County maintains strict guidelines and we are very aware that our license could be revoked at any time. We share these guidelines with our guests, along with our personal house rules before they come. Additionally, our neighbors have a direct line of communication to us at all times and have access to our rental calendar.