From:	Joe Keiser
To:	Sunny Tsou; Andy Wang; Xiomara Cisneros; Hanson Hom; Diana Ariza; Teresa Ruiz; Asheshh Saheba
Cc:	Jennifer Warner
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] DRAFT ORDINANCE COMMENTS: SHORT TERM RENTALS
Date:	Monday, July 6, 2026 11:29:16 AM

I have a scheduling conflict on Monday night July 13, 2026 and can't attend the planning board meeting, but I very much want to express my concern about the draft short term rental ordnance being discussed at that meeting.

I've been asking city officials to put in place a short term rental ordinance for many years, ever since an airbnb starting operating what is essentially an unstaffed hotel next door to us. We live at 916 Otis Dr, and the single family house at 920 Otis has been operating as an airbnb for many years now. The guests who come and go cause all sorts of nuisance issues for our family and our neighborhood. Excessive noise, large gatherings and parties, parking disruptions, general disruptive and disrespectful behavior, police involvement, and a general lack of neighborhood cohesion due to no stable residents.

At the last planning board meeting where this ordinance was discussed (which was over a year ago now), it seemed like the planning board was leaning toward not allowing un-hosted short term rentals. That was great to hear because it would solve the issue we've been dealing with. This ordinance does not appear to implement a non-hosted short term rental ban. There are loopholes in this draft ordinance that will allow the owners of the property next to us to continue operating their airbnb. Also, there is no mechanism as I read it, to address community complaints or issues with permitted rentals.

30-19.5 (a) allows for rentals to operate with a designated local contact.

This is allowing un-hosted rentals. Technically, that is how the airbnb and 920 Otis Dr is operating now. The "local contact" is the husband of the couple who own the property. They live 3 blocks away. I have his number. I can text him anytime. He sometimes responds, but is usually unwilling to help - he tells me to call Airbnb. But as far as this ordinance is concerned, he qualifies as a local contact who is available to respond within 60 minutes. There is no requirement that those responses be helpful or even that he does respond, just that he be available to respond.

30-19.6 (d) specifies Proof of Residence using at least two of the following forms of documentation showing that the location of the proposed STR is the host's primary residence: (a) Motor vehicle registration; (b) California driver's license or state identification card; (c) Voter registration; (d) Income tax return; (e) Property tax bill; or (f) Utility bill.

The couple who owns 920 Otis Dr. live 3 blocks away. It would be a quick and easy thing for them to change the mailing address for any of the above items to 920 Otis Dr., and provide 2 or more of the above residency verifications. All they would need to do is swing by 920 Otis, which is 3 blocks from their house, and which they visit regularly to clean for the next tenants, pick up their mail, and make it appear as if 920 Otis is their primary residence for purposes of this permit. If they simply change the mailing address for any of the above, their permit application would meet the requirement for primary residence, and they can continue operating their airbnb with no consequence or need to change their behavior.

NO COMMUNITY FEEDBACK MECHANISM

Most importantly, I see no mechanism for community feedback about permitted rentals. I see no mechanism that allows for neighbor complaints to impact these permits as drafted. How would a resident be able to impact a permit under this ordinance? A resident cannot appeal a permit as drafted. How would a resident bring information to the permitting dept regarding too many occupants on site (which happens all the time at 920 Otis)? Parties? Noise? Occupant parking violations? I don't even see that any information, other than the 2 pieces of mail, would impact the permit even if the owners do not actually live on site. If the fact that the owners do not actually live at 920 Otis can't impact a permit, then this ordinance doesn't appear to accomplish anything that will help with our situation.

I'm not at all happy with the ordinance as written. It does not appear to limit things to only hosted rentals (off site hosts are allowed), there's too many loopholes that would easily allow the "hotel" next to us to still meet permitting requirements and continue to operate (primary residence can easily be established on paper), and there's no mechanism for neighbor or community complaints that would directly effect a permit. So after years of waiting, this ordinance appears pretty terrible to us.

Joe Keiser
916 Otis Dr.