

**From:** [no-reply@marincounty.org](mailto:no-reply@marincounty.org)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** STR West Marin, Marin County  
**Date:** Monday, October 23, 2023 5:54:48 PM

---

Heather Janssen with email address [trezjanssen@icloud.com](mailto:trezjanssen@icloud.com) would like information about: Hello, and thank you for fielding community sentiments.

We are just one of many families trying to meet the very high cost of life and home ownership in Marin, which is considerable with insurance, mortgage, taxes, and home maintenance, etc. A STR is much different than a hotel room.

I am able to provide a place that feels like home and support the local economy. I pay taxes on any income that is produced.

My guests are mature & respectful, usually attending Spirit Rock, or in town to hike and explore West Marin and take in the coastal beauty.

My neighbors have never complained and they are aware of the small rental.

I provide parking, do not accept pets, and otherwise have zero negative impact on my neighborhood.

Quite the opposite, my guests frequent the local businesses that I recommend.

We are net positive for the local economy, please do not increase fees, require stricter regulations and motel-like signage.

Please support small local businesses.

**From:** [Mary Kay Patton](#)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** STR Draft requirements comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 24, 2023 1:11:33 PM

---

You don't often get email from mk.patton@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

After visiting Dillon Beach for many years, we were fortunate enough to be able to purchase our home at 112 Cypress Ave in 2014 and count ourselves as one of the lucky ones to call this beautiful vacation community our full time home. If you look at the history of this community you will see that it began as a vacation community in the late 1800's and it continues to be. We knew this when we moved here; in fact, we think that the vacation "vibe" adds to the charm of the place and when our life situation required us to be in the Sacramento area part time we were grateful for the opportunity to place our home on the vacation rental market part time so we could offset some costs but still have the house available for us to use. We now have the perspective of full time residents AND a vacation rental owner. Both can live in this community and we support reasonable guidelines to protect neighborhoods but it must be fair and not create hardships for owners. Many owners such as ourselves continue to use our homes with occasional short term rentals when we are not here. Our property would never be available for long term housing.

In response to your draft Short Term Rental guidelines which were distributed recently, we have the following specific comments itemized by section:

1. Section 5.41.060 Caps on the Number of Unhosted Short Term Rental Licenses

**Dillon Beach should be exempt from this requirement.** Dillon Beach was established as and continues to be a vacation community. Most people do not choose to live here full time because of its distance from employment, schools and daily activities/services. Limiting rentals would NOT add to the availability of long term rental housing since it does not meet the needs of most people seeking long term housing. People searching for long term housing usually have two criteria for their decision; location and cost. Dillon Beach has a poor location for working people AND is expensive.

2. Section 5.41.040 Short Term Rental Licenses

By putting specific conditions on this business license that are different from other business licenses (such as transferability, immediate operation cessation following a suspended license, etc) STR businesses are being treated differently from other businesses in the County. This violates equal protection clauses.

**If a license is suspended, where is the due process for an owner pleading their case to reinstate a license? Other business licenses do not operate that way and opens the county to a class action lawsuit.**

**The section on Administrative procedures does not include due process for owners.**

Generally, the purported reason for limiting STRs is that communities want this based on the citing of complaint data (which is statistically insignificant). If a community overwhelmingly does not want it, how can they "opt out". Is there a process for a waiver or exemption?

Lastly, in a community such as Dillon Beach where owners may only be able to afford a home purchase here if they can rent it out on occasion, the real estate market has been seriously impacted by the moratorium on STRs and the new proposed guidelines will only make it worse. The inability to transfer a license to an heir means that children inheriting a home may not be able to keep it. Many of the homes here are owned by children, grandchildren and great

grandchildren of the original owners who knew what a special place Dillon Beach was. This overreaching of the county will destroy decades of enjoyment without adding any benefit here. Please consider my suggestions for communities being exempt.

Thank you.

Mary Kay Patton

**From:** [sophia.setrakian](mailto:sophia.setrakian)  
**To:** [Rodoni, Dennis](mailto:Rodoni.Dennis)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](mailto:Rice.Katie); [Moulton-Peters, Stephanie](mailto:Moulton-Peters.Stephanie); [Sackett, Mary](mailto:Sackett.Mary); [Lucan, Eric](mailto:Lucan.Eric); [STR](#); [PlanningCommission](#)  
**Subject:** Houses Should Be Homes. (West Marin Resident)  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 25, 2023 12:32:57 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [sophiaroxanna@gmail.com](mailto:sophiaroxanna@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am a West Marin resident deeply concerned about the number of residential properties that have been commercialized and turned into short term rentals (STRs) over the past 5 years. Everyone living in West Marin has stories of friends, family, and neighbors who have had to relocate because their long-term rental has been lost. I have a ton of friends that have been pushed out of town. Our communities cannot continue to function without places for local workers, teachers, firefighters, families, and seniors to live!

The draft STR ordinance is a step in the right direction but it has no teeth and doesn't go far enough. The negative effects STRs are having on the housing crisis in West Marin is well-documented in both Marin's Housing Element and its Local Coastal Program. Small communities cannot function when 16% of their limited housing stock is taken away.

The only way to improve this situation is to do what other communities up and down the coast have done – i.e., substantially reduce the number of permitted STRs.

In the Coastal Zone's case, I urge you to reduce the number of unhosted STRs by half, from 480 to 230. Added to the 108 existing hosted STRs, there would still be 338 STRs in our coastal villages; along with existing campgrounds, motels and BnB's, more than enough to serve visitors. This would bring the number of STRs back to 2018 levels.

With this ordinance you can either help restore the balance in our coastal communities or further hollow them out in perpetuity. Please make the right decision.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Name: Sophia Setrakian  
Address: 42 Wharf Rd  
Email: [sophiaroxanna@gmail.com](mailto:sophiaroxanna@gmail.com)

**From:** [no-reply@marincounty.org](mailto:no-reply@marincounty.org)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** NO STR CAPS INVERNESS: NATIONAL PARK GATEWAY  
**Date:** Thursday, October 26, 2023 5:58:26 AM

---

Jennifer Golub with email address [golubjennifer@gmail.com](mailto:golubjennifer@gmail.com) would like information about: I live at the gateway to Pt Reyes National Seashore. Only 1 road in, one must pass my home in Inverness, to access Tomales Bay, beaches and the multitudes of hiking trails. There should be NO CAPS on STR's in INVERNESS. We provide sole access to a national park and shoreline. Yet with 2 million visitors each year, there are less than 25 hotel rooms. 50 guest testimonials are empirical data proving the essential role STR's provide for the public good. Your TOT numbers are wrong. A broken website, the county never replied despite appeal. Caps threaten my future as I will not be able to pay my taxes and arborist bills. Lottery threatens a life of uncertainty. Hosted and unhosted definition is unfair. What if I stay in Berkeley while having guests? My home will never be long term inventory. This campaign is the lobbying effort of an entitled few. Inverness public-school attendance is at an all-time high. I look forward to the return of businesses. A spirit of community. It is time to repair.

**From:** [Mary Kay Patton](#)  
**To:** STR  
**Subject:** Re: STR Draft requirements comments  
**Date:** Thursday, October 26, 2023 10:59:45 AM

You don't often get email from [mik.patton@gmail.com](mailto:mik.patton@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Thank you, Kathleen.

I have one other comment to add to my previous email based on a conversation I heard yesterday. There may be some unintended, environmentally disastrous consequences to the requirement that STRs provide 2 off street parking places. As you know in Dillon Beach many homes do not have ANY off street parking. The lots are very small and homes were constructed in the early 1900's when parking was barely a concept. I have heard that some owners who are currently licensed but do not have the required parking spaces are considering converting greenspace around their homes to parking. The addition of more hardscape (asphalt, cement etc) is detrimental to runoff and replenishment of aquifers and wells. We already have water issues. This policy would add to an already potentially disastrous situation. Any loss of permeable square footage is damaging. To be fair, there absolutely MUST be a waiver process for people who are flatly unable to comply with certain components of your guidelines.

Thank you very much,  
Mary Kay Patton

On Oct 24, 2023, at 2:42 PM, STR <[str@marincounty.org](mailto:str@marincounty.org)> wrote:

Hi Mary Kay,

Thank you for this correspondence. I will be sure to include it in the project record and share this with the Planning Commission prior to their meeting on November 13, 2023.

Best,

Kathleen

**Kathleen Kilgariff**  
PLANNER  
she/her

County of Marin  
Community Development Agency  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite #308  
San Rafael, CA 94903

---

**From:** Mary Kay Patton <[mik.patton@gmail.com](mailto:mik.patton@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 24, 2023 1:11 PM  
**To:** STR <[str@marincounty.org](mailto:str@marincounty.org)>  
**Subject:** STR Draft requirements comments

You don't often get email from [mik.patton@gmail.com](mailto:mik.patton@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

After visiting Dillon Beach for many years, we were fortunate enough to be able to purchase our home at 112 Cypress Ave in 2014 and count ourselves as one of the lucky ones to call this beautiful vacation community our full time home. If you look at the history of this community you will see that it began as a vacation community in the late 1800's and it continues to be. We knew this when we moved here; in fact, we think that the vacation "vibe" adds to the charm of the place and when our life situation required us to be in the Sacramento area part time we were grateful for the opportunity to place our home on the vacation rental market part time so we could offset some costs but still have the house available for us to use. We now have the perspective of full time residents AND a vacation rental owner. Both can live in this community and we support reasonable guidelines to protect neighborhoods but it must be fair and not create hardships for owners. Many owners such as ourselves continue to use our homes with occasional short term rentals when we are not here. Our property would never be available for long term housing.

In response to your draft Short Term Rental guidelines which were distributed recently, we have the following specific comments itemized by section:

1. Section 5.41.060 Caps on the Number of Unhosted Short Term Rental Licenses

**Dillon Beach should be exempt from this requirement.** Dillon Beach was established as and continues to be a vacation community. Most people do not choose to live here full time because of its distance from employment, schools and daily activities/services. Limiting rentals would NOT add to the availability of long term rental housing since it does not meet the needs of most people seeking long term housing. People searching for long term housing usually have two criteria for their decision; location and cost. Dillon Beach has a poor location for working people AND is expensive.

2. Section 5.41.040 Short Term Rental Licenses

By putting specific conditions on this business license that are different from other business licenses (such as transferability, immediate operation cessation following a suspended license, etc) STR businesses are being treated differently from other businesses in the County. This violates equal protection clauses.

**If a license is suspended, where is the due process for an owner pleading their case to reinstate a license? Other business licenses do not operate that way and opens the county to a class action lawsuit. The section on Administrative procedures does not include due process for owners.**

Generally, the purported reason for limiting STRs is that communities want this based on the citing of complaint data (which is statistically insignificant). If a community overwhelmingly does not want it, how can they "opt out". Is there a process for a waiver or exemption?

Lastly, in a community such as Dillon Beach where owners may only be able to afford a home purchase here if they can rent it out on occasion, the real estate market has been seriously impacted by the moratorium on STRs and the new proposed guidelines will only make it worse. The inability to transfer a license to an heir means that children inheriting a home may not be able to keep it. Many of the homes here are owned by children, grandchildren and great grandchildren of the original owners who knew what a special place Dillon Beach was. This overreaching of the county will destroy decades of enjoyment without adding any benefit here. Please consider my suggestions for communities being exempt.

Thank you.  
Mary Kay Patton

Email Disclaimer: <https://www.marincounty.org/main/disclaimers>

**From:** [William Sauro](#)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** Dillon Beach STR Standards  
**Date:** Thursday, October 26, 2023 11:32:43 AM

---

You don't often get email from w@sauro.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Ms. Kathleen Kilgraff  
Marin County Planning Department  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308  
San Rafael, CA 94903

Via USPS and Email

Re: Dillon Beach STR Standards

Few people can afford to own and maintain a beach house these days. Short-term vacation rentals allow many different socio-economic groups to enjoy the serenity and beauty of an area like Dillon Beach.

They also provide income to those who must continually pay increasing property taxes, utility bills and insurance payments. (Homes in Dillon Beach can now only get fire insurance from the California Fair Plan at about triple what we used to pay before insurers black-listed most of Marin County.)

The idea of limiting short-term rentals to keep our housing stock available to full-time renters is an admirable approach in some parts of the state, but not in Dillon Beach. There are few employment opportunities in this area, and the rents that would need to be charged for a rental in Dillon Beach would prohibit most renters from living there full-time.

In addition, there are fewer tourists these days coming to the San Francisco Bay Area. Limiting short-term rentals would further reduce the attractiveness of vacations in this area. That would not be a productive approach for the Bay Area.

The communal aspect of vacation rentals cannot be overstated. Consider a weekend getaway with friends or family, where the costs, when divided, become reasonable and affordable. When we offer our home to vacationers, we often have 10 people staying in our home making it a very economic choice for large families and groups. By supporting vacation rentals, you uphold the values of fairness, inclusivity, and community that make Dillon Beach the extraordinary place it is.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We trust you will make a decision that reflects the best interests of all residents and visitors plus preserves the very unique vacation location that is Dillon Beach.

Sincerely,

Ms. Kathleen Kilgraff  
Marin County Planning Department  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308  
San Rafael, CA 94903

Via USPS and Email

Re: Dillon Beach STR Standards

Few people can afford to own and maintain a beach house these days. Short-term vacation rentals allow many different socio-economic groups to enjoy the serenity and beauty of an area like Dillon Beach.

They also provide income to those who must continually pay increasing property taxes, utility bills and insurance payments. (Homes in Dillon Beach can now only get fire insurance from the California Fair Plan at about triple what we used to pay before insurers black-listed most of Marin County.)

The idea of limiting short-term rentals to keep our housing stock available to full-time renters is an admirable approach in some parts of the state, but not in Dillon Beach. There are few employment opportunities in this area, and the rents that would need to be charged for a rental in Dillon Beach would prohibit most renters from living there full-time.

In addition, there are fewer tourists these days coming to the San Francisco Bay Area. Limiting short-term rentals would further reduce the attractiveness of vacations in this area. That would not be a productive approach for the Bay Area.

The communal aspect of vacation rentals cannot be overstated. Consider a weekend getaway with friends or family, where the costs, when divided, become reasonable and affordable. When we offer our home to vacationers, we often have 10 people staying in our home making it a very economic choice for large families and groups. By supporting vacation rentals, you uphold the values of fairness, inclusivity, and community that make Dillon Beach the extraordinary place it is.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We trust you will make a decision that reflects the best interests of all residents and visitors plus preserves the very unique vacation location that is Dillon Beach.

Sincerely,

William H. Sauro

Ronna L. Sauro

--

Cell Phone: (415) 845-6877

Email: [w@sauro.com](mailto:w@sauro.com)



**From:** [Michael Day](#)  
**Subject:** A letter to our Coastal Planning Commission  
**Date:** Sunday, October 29, 2023 6:40:39 PM

---

You don't often get email from dayma1@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I hope this letter finds you in good health and high spirits.

I am writing to you as a passionate advocate for preserving the vibrant community of Dillon Beach in Marin County.

I am deeply concerned about the potential impact of recent discussions regarding vacation rentals in this picturesque coastal area.

Dillon Beach, with its serene ambiance and natural beauty, has become a cherished destination for both locals and visitors alike. The unique appeal of this coastal haven lies not only in its landscapes but also in the diverse experiences it offers to people from various socio-economic backgrounds.

Vacation rentals, facilitated through platforms like Airbnb and VRBO, have played a pivotal role in ensuring equal access to these experiences.

It is essential to acknowledge that not everyone can afford to maintain a million-dollar house in a coastal region, especially given the economic challenges faced by many individuals and families.

Rising living costs, student debt, and existing property tax laws create significant barriers to traditional homeownership.

Vacation rentals provide an invaluable opportunity for individuals to enjoy the beauty of Dillon Beach without the financial burden of permanent ownership.

The communal aspect of vacation rentals cannot be overstated. Consider a weekend getaway with friends or family, where the costs, when divided, become reasonable and affordable.

These shared experiences foster connections, build relationships, and contribute to the sense of community that makes Dillon Beach a unique and welcoming place.

I am deeply concerned about recent discussions suggesting limitations or bans on vacation rentals in Dillon Beach. Such measures would not only curtail equal access to the coast but also jeopardize the inclusive spirit of our community.

I urge you to consider the far-reaching consequences of these decisions.

By supporting vacation rentals, you uphold the values of fairness, inclusivity, and community that make Dillon Beach the extraordinary place it is.

I kindly request your support in preserving vacation rentals in Dillon Beach.

Let us continue to embrace the shared experiences, connections, and memories that these accommodations facilitate.

Your commitment to equal access to coastal experiences will undoubtedly leave a positive legacy for current and future generations in our beloved community.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and your active participation in preserving the essence

of Dillon Beach.

I trust you will make a decision that reflects the best interests of all residents and visitors in Dillon Beach, ensuring the preservation of its unique charm and accessibility.

Warm regards,

Vickie and Michael Day

owners

"365 DAYS" - short term rental at  
365 Oceana Drive, Dillon Beach, CA 94929

**From:** [Cherry grisham](#)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** STR  
**Date:** Sunday, October 29, 2023 12:16:02 PM

---

You don't often get email from [cherrygrisham243@gmail.com](mailto:cherrygrisham243@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Kathleen Kilgraff

Supervisor Rodoni held a town hall zoom meeting on October 25, 2023, for residents of Tomales and Dillon Beach. The last part of the meeting was scheduled for discussing Short Term Rentals (STR) in Dillon Beach. The indication at the meeting was you and your staff will be presenting the report in the next few days to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. I do hope you are listening to the residents of Dillon Beach and other communities. I hope there will be substantial changes reflecting the need of each community avoiding a “cookie cutter, one size fits all” report as reflected on October 23,2023. I was again disappointed by the remarks by the committee in response to communities. And, it was evident from Sup. Rodoni that little in the report has changed after much community input from the Marin County coastal communities. Our input has been disregarded by your team. We have been promised since the June meeting that this is just a draft and that residents really need to express their thoughts. We have expressed our thoughts to no avail.

Dillon Beach has expressed two concerns with the report.

The first concern parking:

--[if !supportLists]-->1 <!--[endif]--> We have explained why one parking place works in a village designed as a vacation community more than 100 years ago when visitors came in horse and buggy. I again advocate that STR be allowed one parking place which reflects size and design, and character of our historic community.

--[if !supportLists]-->2 <!--[endif]-->Guests know the nature of parking in Dillon Beach and adjust. One parking place per home works in Dillon Beach.

The second concern the cap

--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]--> The purpose for changes to STR regulations is to increase housing- housing being mandated by the state. Marin County has spent years avoiding this mandate. Now, the county wants to solve the housing issues by putting the burden on west Marin STR owners which particularly effects Dillon Beach. The committee must know by now that the village does not lend itself to full time living. Unlike other villages, towns, communities in west Marin where people want to live and work and want limited STR, this is not the situation in Dillon Beach. The community has written, reported and spoke why this is so. The committee has disregarded and dismissed this input.

--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]--> The moratorium does not service the purpose of adding additional housing in Dillon Beach and has put a burden on the residents in the village. You must be aware that owners cannot sell their homes if the houses cannot be used as STR, and the value of the home that are STR have lost a third or more of their value. Wealthy owners are buying houses at discounted prices and will keep them for themselves and not for all the residents of California. Realtors are already sending advertising soliciting for sales! Dillon Beach does not need a STR cap. The current report does not accomplish additional housing in Marin Co.

On November 13<sup>th</sup>, I expect you and your staff to abide by your commitment to develop a final report reflecting individual communities- not a duplicate of the recommendations presented at the June 12<sup>th</sup> meeting and October 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Nor a report that merely makes changes that are fixable by all in West Marin- fire extinguisher, smoke alarms, septic inspections- these are not substantive or reflective of each community. I expect the report to reflect what residents of the towns have expressed as is best for their community. For Dillon Beach, I expect substantive- changes to one parking place and no cap on STR.

**From:** [john vaughn](#)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** Dillon Beach — cabin owners and neighbors rentals  
**Date:** Sunday, October 29, 2023 1:18:20 PM

---

[You don't often get email from javpapa47@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Hello Kathleen Kilgraff,

My parents bought a small cabin at Dillon Beach in about 1970. I am a partial family owner. Of course I am concerned about recent increases in renters. For example, people rent and arrive with a super large pick up or SUV. Cabins and lots and streets are very small. There is no room!!! The Dillon Beach Village was built in a different time. There were fewer cars and they were smaller.

Parking is a huge concern with the Marin County Short Term Rental Standards. Please limit village rentals to one large off street space that does not infringe on neighboring property. No on road parking.

Quiet hours — establish and enforce.

Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [no-reply@marincounty.org](mailto:no-reply@marincounty.org)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** Short Term Rental  
**Date:** Sunday, October 29, 2023 8:06:50 PM

---

Donald Read with email address [dread@well.com](mailto:dread@well.com) would like information about:  
Is there a level of compensated occupancy that falls below a short term rental? Suppose I own a home in West Marin and am going to be away for two weeks, and the family of a neighbor would like to use my house during that time. If I don't have a license, may I charge them anything for letting them stay there? A cleaning fee? Compensation based on utility usage?

I suggest that less than 30 days a year should be permitted compensated use without constituting a regulated short term rental. And excess noise or inadequate garbage containment or safety violations should apply to all property owners.

**From:** [no-reply@marincounty.org](mailto:no-reply@marincounty.org)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** Draft STR: Dillon Beach  
**Date:** Sunday, October 29, 2023 9:27:23 PM

---

Mike Prindiville with email address [mikeprindi@gmail.com](mailto:mikeprindi@gmail.com) would like information about:  
Draft STR comments for consideration:

1. Increase STR Ultimate Number for Dillon Beach: Restrictions on rentals will reduce coastal visitors, increase utilization and (potentially) further construction at Dillon Beach Resort, and expand under-utilized housing.
2. Water restrictions must consider housing size and occupancy. Modern digital meters can provide appropriate monitoring status to control usage when installed.
3. Property Tax funding will be negatively impacted. As value of homes currently includes the opportunity for rental (independent of rental status), the resulting standard will reduce county funds and community investment opportunities.

As shared by residents in Jan'23, Dillon Beach is a unique community for residents and visitors to enjoy coastal access. We have an important responsibility to expand housing availability across income levels in California, although it is not clear how SLR restrictions will achieve this objective in coastal communities.

October 30, 2023

To: North Central Coast <NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov>

Subject : Marin County – Short Term Rental Ordinance Update

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to you regarding the short term rental ordinance. Our family owns a home in Dillon Beach. It has been an important part of our life for ten years. We share our home with renters to help us afford the costs involved in a second home. We plan to pass it on thru the family.

Our rental is a gift to families who wish to visit the beach, cook, rest and spend time together in a clean and safe environment. Our rentals here are a boost to the local economy and provides important access to our coastal region, as not everyone can achieve home ownership.

Marin County is currently considering regulations that would ban vacation rentals in parts of the coastal zone in the North Central Coast. According to the Marin County Planning Commission, as stated in the meeting we attended last week, there is a rush to get this accomplished before their affordable housing funds disappear and the moratorium runs out. We don't see the fairness in this. Our village is being targeted and discriminated against. The county has refused to show us data for these changes. Different counties have different ordinances. We cannot be included in data from other areas.

Please take the time to consider the serious impact this will have in Dillon Beach and our homes. These are complex issues and to rush this process and tell us they have a deadline is not fair representation of the constituents they represent. This is a discriminatory policy that is being rushed on us homeowners. We need no caps or limits.

If you do not act to block this legislation, history will not look kindly on your inaction for your constituents. History will tell us whether you represent the people in your district or the large multinational hotel chains that are trying to stop short term rentals.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Cynthia Elliott and family,



100 Cypress Ave. Dillon Beach, Ca

**From:** [KATHLEEN HURLEY](#)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** Comments re Short Term Rental Proposed Ordinance  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2023 10:43:56 AM

---

Attention Kathleen Killgariff  
Please forward to Planning Commission and others as appropriate

Dear Commissioners,

I attended the recent Planning meeting with the large attendance related to a proposed new ordinance for Short Term Rentals. My previous letter was in the packet to the Planning Commission and I appreciate that it was read along with so many others in a pile of correspondence several inches thick.

I appreciate the attentiveness and responsiveness shown by the Commission to the various concerns presented.

Comments and questions raised by a number of commissioners in regard to simplifying the proposed regulations I believe are very much on target. Creating duplicative and/or unneeded work that require hiring and training new staff and substantially raising fees and levels of complexity don't seem to make much sense when there are so few noted complaints among those licensed units that currently are operating. License caps can be imposed if need be without having to hire staff to inspect fire extinguishers and signage or parking and to enforce laws or research concerns that are more properly placed with other agencies. I especially want to thank Commissioner Desser for the detailed edit suggestions she made based on citizen comments. I agree it would have been easier and less onerous to amend the existing ordinance than to write so much new language that impose so many new regulations. Keeping it simple is a refrain from many and I agree, whatever can simplify the application and make it less burdensome to comply with and to administer seems in mutual interest. Each added section creates room for misunderstandings, questions of enforcement and added costs. If there are few complaints to the hotline that was created just for reporting problems with STRs then that is an indication most of the present ordinance is working effectively without needing to hire staff and raise fees substantially to cover such hires and various proposed enforcement measures. A self certification with a checklist seems a very practical and inexpensive suggestion for seeking compliance with existing safety and health regulations. These may be certified by the owner and provided in the housing manual to be seen by any renter or occupant. The hotline number would be available to report a problem or seek information. In Stinson Beach the water district monitors use ongoingly and inspects septic systems for function every two years. Would it not make sense for water districts to provide verification of inspection instead of looking for applicants who now pay about \$30 to apply pay \$500 to \$1,000 for private contractor reports on their systems? And why does the CDA want to get into the business of inspections like that when it hasn't done that before and the need is not at all apparent. It almost seems intended to thwart applications but from the wealthiest owners since those fees are not refundable. Why create this extra expense and burden at a time when the number of licenses is proposed for reduction? There is no reason to believe the current licensing which is very simple and straightforward is lacking in such a way that the costs need be increased perhaps 1,000% or more in fees and application costs. Is it not enough to maintain the hotline and advertise it to all neighbors and vacation renters who want to report any issue or violation? Why single out the STR applicants for such detailed extra scrutiny?

One of the bigger concerns for me as an owner of two vacation cottages on one double lot property, is the proposal to limit rentals to one dwelling. I wholeheartedly appreciate Commissioner Desser's recommendation to allow up to three rental dwellings per property if in fact the licenses have existed for several years with no record of complaints. There seems to be a lot of sentiment to roll to the 2018 levels and perhaps that would make a useful benchmark to measure from. There is no better predictor of future success than past success under similar circumstances and those STRs that are already licensed for many

years and which are accepted by the neighbors do not take away from the community. Allowing the continued practice of owners being able to use their own properties for their own short term weekend or vacation use while renting them out at times to help with affordability is a respected practice to help people who are not uber wealthy to find a way to use and share vacation housing. The wealthiest owners don't have to worry about renting as they can afford to keep their vacation home vacant. They will not turn their home into affordable housing or rentals of any sort. It is owners such as myself who bought modest cottages and rent them for a modest vacation rental amount that allows accessibility for middle class people to come out to the beach for a week or a weekend. This helps the community and helps me and my family and friends to enjoy vacation use as well. So, yes, I appreciate the proposal to grandfather, or allow legal non-conforming use of existing STR dwellings.

I also appreciate the comments about due process and giving time for curing a problem or misunderstanding which will surely happen with so much new language and requirements, even if simplified. There are many questions and areas for misunderstandings and people must be given due time to clarify or make their case if there is a misunderstanding or a problem brought to attention. The current proposal is filled with references of immediate revocations and immediate cancellations of licenses for various application flaws or operational shortcomings which will surely be a stressful hardship all around. And with the two violations and you are out clause it seems even more of a landmine, as there is no differentiation with the severity or type of complaint, the signage being a half a foot too low or high, the fire extinguisher not being checked, the application going in a day late or a neighbor calling for noise or parking complaints. Are these all equal? Should there be some discretion in oversight as to how serious complaints or violations may be? What if the complaints are proven unfounded and a neighbor is harassing in order to push out an owner? Not my situation but certainly some neighbors quarrel. Does the CDA want to get into the middle of that kind of thing? Less is more in some cases. I certainly would appreciate a straightforward application process and room to explain if anything about it is not deemed adequate. Having a rental house and source of regular income stripped away is a very big deal for most people, in some respects on par with losing employment or housing. There must be some due process.

In regard to inadequate parking, this was brought up by one neighbor of a non-vacation rental area as a neighbor problem when there are too many cars and also was brought up by those in Dillon Beach who only have one space per dwelling. I believe functioning rentals where no parking concerns are reported should be allowed to continue even with only one designated parking spot as owners should not be penalized for not having off-site space for guest parking when the dwellings were constructed before codes or to the codes at the time. Now, for a studio or one -bedroom vacation cottage built 50 or more years ago, does it serve the community to deny an application renewal because there was no more room for guest parking built on the property? Many little authentic beach cottages have no garage, and some bigger houses that have garages have turned them into living space. It is the newer houses that advertise they sleep 10 to 18 persons that have two spaces that may need to be asked where do the other guests of the house park? Drawings of the house and drawings of the parking plans need not be submitted for an owner to answer straightforward questions such as how many bedrooms, how many occupants allowed, how many off street parking spaces are provided, and even if any neighbor complaints about parking are known. These can all be check-boxed and issues identified. I do not think it is reasonable to demand a smaller, older vacation rental be brought up to current code and a minimum of two parking spaces to apply when the larger, more modern dwellings may rent to a dozen occupants without any requirement to add more guest parking. That hardly seems fair.

Thank you in advance for your thoughtful consideration.

Kathleen Hurley  
representing two licensed beach cottages  
in Stinson Beach

**From:** [no-reply@marincounty.org](mailto:no-reply@marincounty.org)  
**To:** [STR](#)  
**Subject:** Important considerations for STR update  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2023 7:45:25 AM

---

Barb Schwanke with email address [barbaraschwanke3@gmail.com](mailto:barbaraschwanke3@gmail.com) would like information about:

Please realize the unique issues of each home and community.

We have enjoyed our home in Marshall on the bay since 1983. Prior to our ownership it was a rustic weekend fishing cabin built in the 1930s. We have updated our septic to code during a remodel several years ago. Our septic use is monitored by the county.

This home was never used nor can it be used for full time occupancy due to our severe water costs during the dry seasons, and our limited water storage capacity. Also the costs of maintenance on this wind and storm batter shoreline would make it impossible to reasonably have a rent that would in anyway contribute to the shortage of housing ,

**From:** [Leila Monroe](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Sarah](#); [STR](#); [PlanningCommission](#); [Jeremy Tejirian](#)  
**Cc:** [West Marin Residents for Housing](#); [David Kimball](#); [harriet@moss.net](#)  
**Subject:** Re. Quantification of STR Operators & Review of STR Regs in Coastal Zone Jurisdictions  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2023 11:53:36 AM  
**Attachments:** [Coastal Zone Jurisdictions Restricting STRs, 10\\_30\\_23.pdf](#)

---

You don't often get email from lmonroe@clearresourcelaw.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Planning Commissioners & CDA Staff,

I'm following up on last week's request for a meeting to discuss the quantification of STR operators as it impacts the STR Ordinance. I would also like to share the attached table, which is a simplified review of Coastal Zone jurisdictions that have adopted regulations that restrict STRs. In summary:

- At least 18 jurisdictions have adopted STR-limiting measures in the Coastal Zone.
  - This far outnumbers the handful of Coastal Zone jurisdictions that have *not* limited STRs but only require licensing and good neighbor policies, such as Sonoma, (due in large part to intense lobbying by Sea Ranch Association) and San Clemente.
  - Santa Barbara and Manhattan Beach had bans that were struck down on Coastal Act procedural grounds.
  - A number of jurisdictions are in the process of writing new STR-limiting rules.
    - Humboldt's 2% Coastal Zone Cap was proposed in September, 2023.
    - Malibu proposed Hosted STRs only (prohibiting Unhosted), and the CCC did not accept this, distinguishing Malibu from Santa Monica for the lesser number of hotels.
- Since 2020, a clear trend has emerged with Coastal Zone jurisdictions using a number of tools to limit STRs:
  - caps, ranging from **.9% - 4%** of housing stock;
  - limitations of number of days hosted;
  - zoning overlays (Commercial zones only);
  - very strict penalties;
  - expensive licensing / permitting costs;
  - 1-2 year licensing terms; and
  - combinations of these measures.

After analysis of all of these examples, and based on what the Coastal Commission has deemed permissible in the last 2 years, the West Marin Residents for Housing are modifying our policy position to call for **a cap of 1% of the housing stock as STRs, with exemption from the caps in in Dillon Beach and Sea Drift**. We feel it is in fact a more defensible number than a 50% reduction, because:

- This approach has been assessed and approved by the CCC in numerous other Coastal jurisdictions: limiting STRs to 1% of housing stock with the

exception of those neighborhoods that have expressed their desire for high levels of STRs (Dillon Beach and Seadrift). Modeling Marin's legislation after San Diego's would give us a shortcut path to a nuanced (e.g. with Tiers for different types of uses) and tested (upheld in Federal Court) model.

- There seems to be an extraordinary amount of confusion about the current numbers of STRs that would be categorized as Hosted vs Unhosted. There is also testimony (i.e. Arianne Dar, BLCT) about the extent and impact of illegal operations. As such, we feel that using the current number of operators for any policy-basis is an arbitrary approach based on circumstance (i.e. the number of operators who just happened to get their licenses prior to the moratorium).

Thank you for taking the time to meet on this important topic. We are also sharing this information with the Supervisors.

Sincerely,  
Leila Monroe

On Tue, Oct 31, 2023 at 11:36 AM West Marin Residents for Housing <[neighbors@westmarinresidentsforhousing.org](mailto:neighbors@westmarinresidentsforhousing.org)> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

**From: West Marin Residents for Housing**

<[neighbors@westmarinresidentsforhousing.org](mailto:neighbors@westmarinresidentsforhousing.org)>

Date: Thu, Oct 26, 2023 at 3:35 PM

Subject: Meeting re. Quantifying STRs and West Marin Residents for Housing Comment Letter on the Draft Short Term Rental Standards

To: <[JTejirian@marincounty.org](mailto:JTejirian@marincounty.org)>, <[sjones@marincounty.org](mailto:sjones@marincounty.org)>

Cc: Harriet Moss <[harriet@moss.net](mailto:harriet@moss.net)>, David Kimball <[bolinasdavid@gmail.com](mailto:bolinasdavid@gmail.com)>, <[leilamonroe@gmail.com](mailto:leilamonroe@gmail.com)>, STR <[str@marincounty.org](mailto:str@marincounty.org)>

Good Afternoon, Sarah & Jeremy.

Would you be available for a brief Zoom meeting with a subset of the West Marin Residents for Housing to discuss the quantification of STR operators, as well as some of the recommendations in our Comment Letter?

I'm not sure if Kathleen is continuing to engage on this issue, but we would welcome her participation, as well as that of anyone else at CDA that you would like to invite.

Thank you for your consideration,

Leila Monroe

--

Leila Dunne Monroe, Esq.  
Founding Partner

Clear Resource Law

415-676-8913

PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This message may contain information that is confidential, privileged or otherwise protected by work product immunity or other legal rules. If you are not the intended recipient to whom the message is addressed, please notify me immediately at the above number and delete it from your system. Any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or other use of a transmission received in error is strictly prohibited.

## Example California Jurisdictions Restricting Short Term Rentals in the Coastal Zone

Jurisdiction	Date effective	Key STR Limiting Requirements: note, most jurisdictions also include requirements for licensing, code compliance, and good neighbor compliance.
Humboldt County, Unincorporated Coastal Areas	Pending; Moratorium in place; draft released 9/2023	Draft Ordinance for Coastal Zone: * 2 year term for conditional use permit for STR * Distinction between Hosted and Unhosted * Short-term Rental Cap. <b>Not more than 2% of the housing stock</b> may be permitted in the Coastal Greater Humboldt Bay Areas: Trinidad Area Plan [AP], McKinleyville AP, Humboldt Bay AP and the Eel River AP. * Limits on neighborhood concentration of STRs and cap at 20 person parties. <a href="https://humboldt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/120899/Draft-Short-term-Rental-Ordinance_coastal-92223">https://humboldt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/120899/Draft-Short-term-Rental-Ordinance_coastal-92223</a>
Half Moon Bay	2023	* Requires annual registration of the short-term vacation rentals. * Maximum occupancy requirements and limits unhosted nights to 60 days in residential zoning districts. <a href="https://www.half-moon-bay.ca.us/931/Short-Term-Rentals">https://www.half-moon-bay.ca.us/931/Short-Term-Rentals</a>
Dana Point	2023	New program to allow STRs in Coastal Zone: Cap – Maximum 115 permits applies to Non-Primary, Multi-Family, and Mixed Use Parcel STRs No Cap – Home Stay and Primary STRs are not associated with the STR cap Cap Adjustment – Each time a Home Stay and Primary STR Permit is issued, the 115 cap is reduced by one (1) Existing STR Permits - 69 Available new Permits – 46 <a href="https://www.danapoint.org/department/community-development/code-enforcement/short-term-rental-permit">https://www.danapoint.org/department/community-development/code-enforcement/short-term-rental-permit</a>
San Diego	2023	Tier 1, Part-Time : Rented for an aggregate of 20 days or less per year. The owner or permanent resident does not need to reside onsite during the STRO. 162 licenses issued; unlimited remaining. Tier 2, Home-Sharing: Renting a room or rooms in the home for more than 20 days per year so long as the owner or permanent resident resides onsite. The owner or permanent resident may be absent from the permanent residence during the STRO for up to 90 days per calendar year. 2,353 issued; unlimited remaining. Tier 3, Whole-Home, Excluding Mission Beach: Rentals for more than 20 days per year where the owner or permanent resident does not reside onsite. <b>The number of licenses issued will not exceed 1% of San Diego's total housing units outside the Mission Beach Community Planning Area.</b> Guest two-night minimum stay required. 4,226 issued; 1,193 remaining. Tier 4, Whole-Home, Mission Beach: Same provisions as tier 3, except the number of licenses issued will not exceed 30% of the Mission Beach Community Planning Area. 1,082 issued, 0 remaining, 118 on waitlist. Both Tier 3 or Tier 4 licenses require utilization for a minimum of 90 days each year in order to maintain the license. <a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/treasurer/short-term-residential-occupancy">https://www.sandiego.gov/treasurer/short-term-residential-occupancy</a>
Seal Beach	2023	* "The total number of STR Permits, combined with STR' s with existing Conditional Use Permits (" CUP"), shall not exceed <b>1% of the residential units</b> in the Coastal Zone." * Permits issued based on lottery. * "An STR Permit is valid for one ( 1) year from the date of issuance." * Large events prohibited. * One permit per STR operator. <a href="https://www.sealbeach.org/ordinance/1701-section-11-4-05-135-of-the-seal-beach-municipal-code">Ordinance 1701, Section 11. 4. 05. 135 of the Seal Beach Municipal Code</a>
Pismo Beach	2018; Moratorium 2023	On June 6, 2023, City Council adopted an Ordinance (O-2023-003) extending a moratorium on the issuance of short-term rental licenses. 2018 Ordinance states: * STRs and homestays shall be permitted only at single-family properties that are the primary residence of the property owner. For purposes of short-term rental or homestay licensing, a property owner shall only have one primary residence at any time. Legally permitted accessory dwelling units occupied by the property owner may be deemed to be the property owner's primary residence. The property owner shall be required to provide proof of primary residence on a yearly basis. The property owner (s) shall be required to be individual owner(s) or trustee(s), and not a corporation, limited liability company, partnership, or other business or commercial entity. * The number of visitors to an STR or homestay shall not exceed a number equal to the allowable occupancy of the STR or homestay at any time. For example, if the maximum overnight occupancy is six, then no more than six additional visitors are allowed. * Maximum of 182 nights per year. <a href="https://pismo-beach.org/881/Short-Term-Rental-Permit">https://pismo-beach.org/881/Short-Term-Rental-Permit</a>
Hermosa Beach	2022	It shall be unlawful for any person to offer or make available for rent or to rent (by way of a rental agreement, lease, license or any other means, whether oral or written) for compensation or consideration a residential dwelling, a dwelling unit or a room in a dwelling for less than 30 consecutive days and for any person to occupy a residential dwelling, a dwelling unit or a room in a dwelling for less than 30 consecutive days pursuant to a rental agreement, lease, license or any other means, whether oral or written, for compensation or consideration <b>except for short-term vacation rentals in nonconforming residential dwelling units in certain commercial zones in compliance with the following requirements.</b> <a href="https://www.hermosabeach.gov/our-government/city-departments/community-development/short-term-vacation-rentals">https://www.hermosabeach.gov/our-government/city-departments/community-development/short-term-vacation-rentals</a>
Monterey County, Coastal Zone	2022	In the coastal areas of the County, short term rentals may be allowed by obtaining a coastal development permit under the category of similar use. These permits cost approximately <b>\$12,000</b> . <a href="https://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-a-h/housing-community-development/permit-center/short-term-rentals">https://www.co.monterey.ca.us/government/departments-a-h/housing-community-development/permit-center/short-term-rentals</a>
Cambria, Cayucos, Avila Beach & Los Osos, San Luis Obispo County	2022	Each community within the County has a specific limitation based on density and/or numeric cap: * Cambria, Cayucos, and Avila Beach limited by density. * Los Osos, "The number of residential vacation rentals established and active (valid and unexpired business license) shall not exceed <b>55</b> ". <a href="https://www.sanluisobispo.gov/2308165-residential-vacation-rentals">San Luis Obispo Municipal Code, Section 23.08.165 - Residential Vacation Rentals.</a> Based on an LOCP FEIR estimating 6,321 existing dwelling units in Los Osos, this is a limit of <b>.87% of the housing stock in Los Osos in STRs.</b> <a href="https://www.sanluisobispo.gov/2308165-residential-vacation-rentals">Los Osos Community Plan Final Environmental Impact Report ADVISORY MEMORANDUM #1</a>



Huntington Beach	2021	<p>City is divided into two zones: Zone 1 – properties within the City, excluding Sunset Beach; Zone 2 – properties within Sunset Beach</p> <p>Hosted/owner-occupied STRs are allowed in Huntington Beach (Zone 1) and Sunset Beach (Zone 2)</p> <p>Un-hosted/owner un-occupied STRs are allowed in Sunset Beach (Zone 2) who obtain a permit by March 1, 2022</p> <p>A valid, non-transferrable annual City of Huntington Beach Short-Term Rental Permit is required to operate a STR</p> <p>One STR per property (SFR, duplex, triplex, rental properties of any size)</p> <p>Up to 3 STRs per property (on ownership properties with 4 or more units, i.e. condominiums and townhomes if allowed by CC&amp;Rs)</p> <p>Enforcement:</p> <p>Local Contact Person to respond to complaints within one hour after the complaint is received</p> <p>\$1,000 fine each day for each violation of any provision</p> <p>3 violations against a STR Host/Operator within a 12-month period shall result in revocation of STR Permit</p> <p><a href="https://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/departments/planning/short-term-rentals-in-hb.cfm">https://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/departments/planning/short-term-rentals-in-hb.cfm</a></p>
Morro Bay	2020	<p>The maximum allowable number of full-home short-term vacation rentals in residential zones is one hundred seventy-five (175), subject to Nonconforming short-term vacation rentals (lawful rentals predating the ordinance).</p> <p><a href="https://library.municode.com/ca/morro_bay/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT17ZO_CH17.41SHRMVARE">https://library.municode.com/ca/morro_bay/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT17ZO_CH17.41SHRMVARE</a></p> <p>According to a pro-STR advocacy group, "4% of all the housing units in Morro Bay hold STR business licenses and only 2.5% of all housing units have an active vacation rental"</p> <p><a href="https://www.sharemorrobay.com/thefacts">https://www.sharemorrobay.com/thefacts</a></p>
Laguna Beach	2020	<p>Short Term Lodging (STL) only allowed within certain commercially zoned districts (map of these districts illustrates that STLs are <b>not</b> permitted along much of the coast).</p> <p>"To protect the long-term rental housing stock, no more than 20% of the total number of allowable rental units located in the permitted zoning districts may be converted to short-term lodgings"</p> <p>Existing permitted STL units in the residential districts are legal nonconforming and may continue to operate.</p> <p><a href="https://www.lagunabeachcity.net/government/departments/community-development/planning-zoning/current-projects/short-term-lodging">https://www.lagunabeachcity.net/government/departments/community-development/planning-zoning/current-projects/short-term-lodging</a></p>
Santa Cruz	2018	<p>HOSTED A total of 250 owner-occupied/hosted STR permits are available on a first come, first served basis.</p> <p>NON-HOSTED is defined as an STR where the owner does not live in the home or lives in the home for less than 6 months per year. The City will not be issuing new Non-Hosted STR permits. However, there are several existing, legally permitted and operating Non-Hosted STRs that will be allowed to continue under the ordinance.</p> <p><a href="https://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/planning-and-community-development/short-term-rentals">https://www.cityofsantacruz.com/government/city-departments/planning-and-community-development/short-term-rentals</a></p>
Mendocino Town	2017	<p>Mendocino "capped the total number of lodging units in the town, and the CCC found that these caps were justified by proportionally high number of visitor serving units relative to residential units in the town and the variety of accommodations (e.g., campgrounds, low-cost hotels and motels) available in the surrounding area.</p> <p>This LCP amendment also built on many years of effort to balance the town's various unique attributes, including a severely restricted water supply, with its desirability as a vacation destination." (<a href="#">Coastal Commission Staff analysis in Santa Cruz LCP Update at page 3</a>).</p>
San Mateo County, Unincorporated Coastal Zone	2017	<p>Limited to 180 days per year</p> <p><a href="https://www.smcgov.org/planning/short-term-rental-ordinance-coastal-zone">https://www.smcgov.org/planning/short-term-rental-ordinance-coastal-zone</a></p>
San Francisco	2015	<p>Permanent Resident occupies the Residential Unit for no less than 275 days out of the calendar year in which the Residential Unit is rented as a Short-Term Residential Rental. To maintain your Permanent Residency, Residential Unit can only be rented 90 un-hosted nights within a calendar year.</p> <p><a href="https://sfplanning.org/str/faqs-short-term-rentals">https://sfplanning.org/str/faqs-short-term-rentals</a></p>
<b>Bans on Short Term Rentals in the Coastal Zone</b>		
Santa Monica	Originally adopted 2015, amended 2017, 2019.	<p>Defines two types of Short-Term Rentals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•"Home-Sharing" – The law authorizes home-sharing, which is the rental of 30 consecutive days or less of one or more bedrooms in the home that is the primary residence of the host while the host lives on-site in the home throughout the visitor's stay.</li> <li>•""Vacation Rental" – The law continues the City's <b>longstanding prohibition</b> against Vacation Rentals. A vacation rental is the rental of 30 consecutive days or less of a home, in whole or in part, for exclusive transient use. The visitor enjoys the exclusive private use of the unit.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.smgov.net/Departments/PCD/Permits/Short-Term-Rental-Home-Share-Ordinance/#2_Does">https://www.smgov.net/Departments/PCD/Permits/Short-Term-Rental-Home-Share-Ordinance/#2_Does</a></p>
Rancho Palos Verdes	2016	<p>STRs, "are prohibited within the City's residential zoning districts. Violations of the short-term rental prohibition in the City's residential zoning districts maybe subject to fines of \$2,500 for first citation, \$5,000 for the second citation and \$7,500 for the third citation."</p> <p><a href="#">Rancho Palos Verdes, Short Term Rentals</a></p>
Carmel-by-the-Sea	1989	<p><a href="https://ci.carmel.ca.us/post/short-term-rentals">https://ci.carmel.ca.us/post/short-term-rentals</a></p>