

**From:** evelyn f <oh\_evelyn@outlook.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, June 2, 2022 9:26 AM

**To:** Supervisor Rowe <Supervisor.Rowe@bos.sbcounty.gov>; Supervisor Hagman <Supervisor.Hagman@bos.sbcounty.gov>; Supervisor Baca <Supervisor.Baca@bos.sbcounty.gov>; Supervisor Rutherford <Supervisor.Rutherford@bos.sbcounty.gov>; Supervisor Cook <Supervisor.Cook@bos.sbcounty.gov>

**Cc:** Nunez, Ignacio - LUS <Ignacio.Nunez@lus.sbcounty.gov>; Doublet, David <David.Doublet@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** A note from an STR host: Lake Arrowhead



To SBC Board of Supervisors:

With the supervisor meeting in sight, I'd like to take a moment to share my thoughts on the current STR situation in our unincorporated areas.

It is, without a doubt, effecting us - from locals having to move out of their long term rental with many of these houses being sold... to corporations taking over multiple houses to add to their luxury vacation rental business. These businesses are in our neighborhoods while the business owners live in other cities, states, countries even. On top of this, our Code Enforcement is lacking.

You must put a PAUSE ON NEW STR PERMITS until a solution can be implemented to bring back some balance. People are seeing other areas placing reasonable restrictions. People are also seeing that nothing is being done here in unincorporated SBC. It is in your hands to do the right thing here.

As I mentioned in the subject line, my primary residence is in Lake Arrowhead and I do periodically rent it as an STR to try and offset costs. With the massive influx of new STRs, I am no longer getting this income. It is what it is and I will manage, but this problem is much larger than this! Please help.

Thank you,

Evelyn  
Lake Arrowhead

-----Original Message-----

From: Linda Doyle <lndoyle@earthlink.net>

Sent: Friday, May 27, 2022 1:02 PM

To: COB - Internet E-Mail <COB@sbccounty.gov>

Subject: STR feedback

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you can confirm the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

I have a point of clarification. The Redline document indicates that a STR cannot be owned by a business entity.

Is an LLC a business entity?

thank you,

Linda

**From:** Eia Aguirre <eia.aguirre06@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2022 3:18 AM  
**To:** COB - Internet E-Mail <COB@sbcounty.gov>  
**Subject:** short term rentals



why cant the city put a stop to what type of property is gonna turn into a airbnb.. I think which will be good is with the new structure that r being built. all over town should only be a airbnb.. houses that were once a rental should stay a rental.. I think a three bedroom home is a waste for a one night stay.. when people that need a home can be renting it out instead.. so only new homes being built should be airbnb thank u I like that the houses that were at one time not taking care of the yards were ugly.. but the short term rentals really helped the city out we got upgraded homes in the area that look very nice empty lots getting filled. so I would like to know what y'all think? only new house that are being built in 2021 and 2022 year should only be short term. I work for airbnb and it just a waste of property to have a airbnb for a 3 bedroom.. like it cost a lot of money to keep it up the maintenance, cleans, toliet paper, bills, replacing things that brake so much thought go into these homes.. thank u from Maria Aguirre

**From:** Clayton Steenberg <csteenber@verizon.net>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2022 10:40 AM

**To:** COB - Internet E-Mail <COB@sbccounty.gov>

**Subject:** STR's



As a 10 year resident of Joshua Tree and a lifelong professor of criminal law and criminology, I am simply amazed at the legal disregard that SBC is in the process of approving for STR regulations. The real key to getting people to obey laws is making certain they are clearly defined, and legally enforceable in courts. In all honesty, you have created a legal nightmare in your current state of wording and display. A defense lawyer will have no trouble circumventing your statutes.

**Let me begin with your suggested posting for short term renters about noise:**

“We know you have good taste in music, but your neighbors might not. So **turn down the volume and keep all noise to a minimum.** Guests are advised to adhere to quiet hours between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.”

Having been a law enforcement officer of 17 years, I find it strange to address potential violators this way. Can you imagine “we know you have a propensity to drive fast and have good control, but please be considerate of others and do not speed.” Yeah, that works really well. NOT!

Please eliminate the so-called humor in the mandate and state it for what it is: Guests are REQUIRED to adhere to quiet hours and not make excessive prohibited noises during the daytime or operational hours of 7:00 am to 10:00 pm. Then cite the following STR code:

“Loud and Disturbing Noise. (1) It is unlawful for any owner, renter, occupant, or guest located at an STR short-term residential rental unit to make, cause to be made, or allow to be made, either willfully or through failure to exercise control, any loud, excessive, impulsive, or **intrusive noise that disturbs the peace or quiet or that causes discomfort or annoyance to any reasonable person** of normal sensitivities in the area. Such types of noises or actions causing noises may include, but are not limited to, yelling, shouting, hooting loud laughter, whistling, singing, playing a musical instrument, emitting or transmitting any playing loud music or noise from any mechanical or electrical sound making or sound amplifying devices, and the habitual barking dogs.

A word about the legality of decibel codes. Many courts have ruled them unenforceable. Since the topography of an area changes the nature of sound, the meters being used can vary greatly and the decibel reading at the point of emersion can be greater at a further distance. Meaning, the guests at the short term rental behind my house might not actually think the noise is loud, but by the time it get to my house it becomes amplified. How is such matters to be rectified when my decibel meter reading is likely different than the owners? Such issues must be considered when formulating law.

Please pay more attention to noise complaints of local residents and provide us with some sense of more quiet and privacy from the continual invasion of non-resident entrepreneurs who do not reside here full time.

Also understand that when local residents feel abandoned by enforcement and bad laws, they have a well-documented history of becoming vigilantes to correct what is perceived an unequal balance of their basic rights.

We already have examples of this concerning both STR's and ORV enforcement. I would suggest citizens are becoming more-and-more vigil in their attempts to reclaim their sense of privacy and solace back again from intruders.

I am more than willing to expand on any of my comments and provide academic and legal sources to verify my statements.

Clayton Steenberg  
csteenber@verizon.net  
760-366-3609

**From:** Board Meeting Comments <BoardMeetingComments@cob.sbcounty.gov>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 29, 2022 9:37 AM

**To:** Board Meeting Comments <BoardMeetingComments@cob.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** Public Comments: Address a Specific Agenda Item:

The following request was submitted from the COB Public Comments for Board Meetings website.

**Contact Information**

Judy Massey  
1366 Jemez Trail Flamingo Heights  
Yucca Valley , California 92284  
7604017403  
judyleemassey@outlook.com

**Request Information**

Request: Address a Specific Agenda Item

Agenda Item:

Comments: I live within three miles of the proposed Flamingo Heights clamping site, which I think would be a huge blunder if allowed to happen. I have many concerns. The Old Woman Springs Road highway is not equipped to handle the traffic it would generate. It's extremely dangerous to travel as it currently is, on any given day. Very near the area still carries the burnt Joshua trees and other results of wild fires showing the extreme vulnerability to (and difficulty in putting out) fires in the area. Most longtime locals never consider using a fire pit as glamorous and fun as that may seem. Once again, do we just overlook the protected status of our endangered Joshua trees, tortoises and other natural flora and fauna? Oh, I know, no tortoises we're seen living there, but they live by me, less than 3 miles away. Who did the study? As a photographer, night sky enthusiast and nature lover, light pollution is not something I signed up for when I moved here; nor is sound pollution. That area should be owned and regulated by a nature conservancy, not a glampsite. It doesn't fit into our rural zoning or lifestyle that the locals came here for. Perhaps, such a proposal would fit an area near the Hammer event, where more people are excited about high level activities. I don't know, but it doesn't belong here.

Thank You.

System Admin

**Note:** This email is being sent from an unmonitored mailbox. Please do not reply.

Good Morning,

I'd like to make the following remarks regarding the proposed changes to the county short-term rental ordinance being discussed on 3/3/2022.

1. I oppose the proposed change in the occupancy calculation.

- The proposed limits do not consider all homeowners. For example, I recently remodeled my "open plan" 900 sf home which previously could sleep 6, and will now only sleep 2. This is unacceptable. had I known this would happen I would not have spent so much money remodeling my home. The occupancy formula proposed in the ordinance redline fails to take the needs of the Desert Region into account.

2. I oppose the proposed change to a two night minimum stay.

- Many well behaved visitors can spend only a single night in the Hi Desert as one stop on a longer trip.  
In addition to shortchanging visitors, housekeepers would see reduced work if single-night stays were eliminated.  
At a minimum, single-night stays Sunday through Thursday must continue to be allowed

Best,

Tom Donahue

(c): 862-354-7873

(e): donahue.tom1@gmail.com

NOTICE: This email and any attachments may contain confidential and proprietary information and is for the sole use of the intended recipient for the stated purpose. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

**Comments on  
Revised Draft Housing Element Released for Public Review- May 23.2022  
Debra Douglas, Resident of Joshua Tree, CA May 25, 2022**

Provided to County of San Bernardino Planning Commission and  
Paul McDougall  
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT

County Program 4 is in black, resident comments are in green italics.

**Program 4. Short-term Rentals**

The proliferation of short-term, whole-home rentals can reduce the amount of available rental housing

(particularly that which is affordable) for people who work in a seasonal and permanent basis in the

Mountain and Desert regions (and drive up the cost of housing in the Valley region).

*Short Term Rentals (STR) HAVE reduced affordable housing for working residents in the Morongo Valley, including 29 Palms, Wonder Valley, Joshua Tree, Yucca Valley, Landers and Morongo.*

*There are months when there are ZERO rentals are listed for sale in the local paper. This is compared to years past when there were dozens of available rentals. This drives cost of living, displacement of families, loss of safe neighborhoods, cost of social services and environmental costs.*

Short-term rentals

may also have a negative impact on local hotel/motel businesses. The County permits private homes,

including ADUs, to serve as short-term rentals in the Mountain and Desert regions (maximum stay of

30 days). In the Valley region, private homes or ADUs must be rented for a term longer than 30 days.

To increase the availability of long-term housing options, the County will conduct a public planning

process and a study to determine if the County should establish a limit on the number of private homes

or ADUs that can be developed and used as short-term rentals in the Mountain and Desert regions.

*There has already been input that has been largely ignored by the County from residents regarding short term rentals. They have not made their consultants accountable to the residents or even provided transparent communication with them. The need is for speed, rather than being given additional time while residents are losing housing.*

*-Limits should not be regional, but by neighborhood and by density within that neighborhood. STRs should not be allowed to be developed from the ground up unless in a commercial zone. STRs should not include both a house and an ADU that are both rented out as STRs. There should be no more than 5% STRs per 640 acres, to preserve affordable rental housing. Preserving rental housing is a goal in another section of the Housing Plan that has not been made accountable when issuing STR permits. There is no financial incentive to the County, who receive taxes and permit fees. This needs*



to be evaluated so the County can receive revenue needed for administration, but not to the detriment of the residents it serves.

-There should be no corporate ownership of STRs. Individual homeowners who have at least 5 years residency, who have contributed to the area through work and forming businesses should have priority. Corporate ownership of STRs does not benefit the local community and takes the vacation dollars or rent away from the local area, just like corporate ownership of housing is now doing.

The study should also evaluate the potential effectiveness of various incentives to encourage long-term

rentals, particularly for local employees and lower income residents. If the study identifies a significant

negative effect on the supply of affordable rental housing and/or motel/hotel industry, the County will

establish incentives to encourage long-term rentals and/or limit the number of total and/or new short-term rentals that can be permitted in the Mountain and Desert regions.

*It is unlikely the County has enough money to provide meaningful subsidies. The more effective response is to limit the amount of permits. Homeowners who convert to STRs are making significant profits and a small incentive will not stop the conversions, which can be seen in towns and cities across the world, no need for additional local study.*

**Objective:** Conduct a public planning process and study to determine the current and projected impact

of short-term rentals on the housing supply throughout the unincorporated county and on the motel/hotel businesses in the Mountain and Desert regions. Establish and implement strategies based

on the study's findings. [Update and resubmit 2018 through 2021 annual progress reports \(APRs\)](#) and

[ensure that future reports account for units \(ADUs, site-built homes, or manufactured homes\) that apply for a short-term rental permit and communicate this information to HCD to remove such units from being counted as long-term housing units \(at any level of affordability\).](#)

**Responsibility:** Community Development and Housing, Land Use Services

**Funding Source:** General Fund

**Timeframe:** Initiate study in 2022 and complete public outreach and engagement in 2023, with a target

completion date no later than 2024. Establish and begin implementation of recommended solutions by

2024 if the study's conclusions support the establishment of incentives and/or a limitation (by region

and/or for specific unincorporated communities); [update 2018-2021 APRs in 2022 and adjust future APRs annually to remove units used for short-term rentals.](#)

*Timeframe: Completion date no later than June 2023, since much of the work to understand STRs has already been done locally, nationally and worldwide. Staff can incorporate what other communities have learned and can benefit our County.*

Hello,

First of all, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to list our home as a short term rental. It has significantly impacted our life and has kept us financially secure through losing a job during covid. We are forever grateful.

My main concern is with the proposed rule change that pertains to desert region.

“A separate permit shall be required for each dwelling unit used as a short-term residential rental unit when there is more than one legal single-family dwelling unit or a duplex on the parcel.

An accessory dwelling unit, primary dwelling unit, guesthouse, casita, or other residential accessory structure may be permitted as a short-term residential rental unit when at least one of the dwelling units (primary dwelling, accessory dwelling unit, or caretaker dwelling) is occupied by the property owner or legal agent. This owner-occupancy requirement shall not apply to a parcel two acres or greater. A maximum of two legal dwelling units per parcel of land may be approved for separate individual short-term residential rental unit permits.

Proposed change:

(1) Only one STR shall be permitted on a single-family residential parcel.

The current rule makes perfect sense. Limiting the amount of permits to one per parcel in a region that commonly has 10-40 acre parcels accomplishes nothing.

I understand that density is an issue. The people pushing for this rule only care about regulating short term rentals until they die. This proposed ordinance has no effect on the actual STVR density and hinders so many properties in the desert region.

We specifically bought a 8.75 acre piece of land to build on based on the fact that we could build multiple units on it, acquire multiple permits, and live on the land for part of the year. It is literally our dream.

On our proposed site plan, there is only 1 neighbor within 400' of the casita and the main house is nearly 800' from the nearest neighbor. These two units will never see each other. They are separated by a mound of earth and won't even know the other exists.

How does having 2 units on this land affect density worse than regions that have full streets of STVR lined up on lots less than 100' wide? (Mountain region)

The rule change is fundamentally wrong. It does nothing for density issues.

If the council wishes to appease a few loud voices, I recommend changing the minimum lot size requirement to larger. (5 acres required for multiple permits)

The current changes severely hurt owners in the desert region with giant 5+ acre properties and those who plan to live on their site for part of the year. The rule change is not based on logic. It's based on the loud voices of people who are struggling to adapt to a changing world.

Please take this into consideration

With gratitude,  
Benjamin Allen

Thank you for submitting the request.

Here is a copy of the information you submitted.

**Contact Information**

Louise Marler  
61855 morningside rd  
Joshua tree, California 92252  
3102040452  
LAMarler@mac.com

**Request Information**

Request: Public Comment for a Specific Agenda Item

Agenda Item: Srt permits

Comments: Moratorium on Srt permits immediately. And retrack some of Them. Get control now.

Thank You.

Planning Commission Secretary  
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue  
San Bernardino, CA 92415  
(909) 387-8311

System Admin

**Note:** This email is being sent from an unmonitored mailbox. Please do not reply.

Thank you for submitting the request.

Here is a copy of the information you submitted.

**Contact Information**

Phyllis Moss  
7709 Vista Rd.  
Joshua Tree, California 92252  
818-692-5074  
phyllis.moss@gmail.com

**Request Information**

Request: Public Comment for a Specific Agenda Item

Agenda Item: short term rentals

Comments: I request that you establish some limitations on permits issued for short term rentals in Joshua Tree. I was fortunate to purchase a beautiful home in upper Friendly Hills in 2013. At that time, the area was quiet, the skies were dark and there was very little traffic noise in the area. Things have changed greatly since then! At this time, our house is completely surrounded with houses that are short term rentals. While they are well behaved and following permit guidelines, the impact exists nevertheless. In addition to the noise and light pollution, it is now quite impossible for people to find long term rentals. I propose: 1- limiting the number of permits issued in a designated area. 2- limiting the permits issued for new construction 3- limiting the number of units permitted on a parcel of land 4- creating a special permit category for those (like ourselves) who rent out a room on a casual, occasional basis. The original intent of Air Bnb was to meet people from other places. That has been completely lost to commercialization. Please take up this item on your agenda and give serious consideration to regulating this industry before Joshua Tree is completely ruined! thank you, Phyllis Moss

Thank You.

Planning Commission Secretary  
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue  
San Bernardino, CA 92415  
(909) 387-8311

System Admin

**Note:** This email is being sent from an unmonitored mailbox. Please do not reply.

Thank you for submitting the request.

Here is a copy of the information you submitted.

### **Contact Information**

Jacqueline Nishizawa  
569 San Benito Lane  
Lake Arrowhead, California 92352  
626-482-3191  
jacquelinenishizawa@msn.com

### **Request Information**

Request: Public Comment for a Specific Agenda Item

Agenda Item: 5

Comments: Dear Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, I am a long time property owner of a beautifully maintained, single family home in Lake Arrowhead, and also a responsible and considerate Short Term Rental owner and host. We are friends with all of our full time/part time neighbors and have never had a single complaint. Our property helps support the area's tourist dependent, resort economy consisting of mostly locally owned small businesses, as well as contributes ongoing and important revenue to the County via property taxes, rental permit revenue and quarterly lodging taxes. Upon retirement, we hope to have the option to move full time to Lake Arrowhead, but until that time comes, the ability to rent our property as a short term rental at our current level of rental revenue (and current guest occupancy maximums) is crucial in order to our meet mortgage, tax, insurance, utility and maintenance obligations. We screen every potential renter very carefully, require strict adherence to parking, noise, trash and nuisance rules; and in order to minimize our own maintenance, we also advertise and cap our usual maximum number of guests to 8 adults/children, which is even below the current maximum of 10 adults/children permitted/allowed for our property specifications. However, with the current fair and reasonable occupancy maximums in place today, this still allows me the ability to maintain flexibility at my discretion to make exceptions and allow up to 10 guests at times (e.g., during the Thanksgiving holiday, Christmas holiday, other special occasions/long weekends - when many families enjoy gathering together for a holiday getaway in the mountains) - these peak season rentals and ability to host extended families during the holidays is important rental revenue needed to offset slower rental seasons during spring and fall. This is my second letter of concern to this Commission and Supervisors addressing the subject of new maximum occupancy restrictions being proposed, which would SIGNIFICANTLY reduce our maximum occupancy by up to a WHOPPING 40%, and impact our ability to generate the current level of revenue needed to support our property (until we hopefully retire someday in the mountains)! Our home is a generous size of almost 2,000 square feet, with 3 spacious bedrooms, 2 1/2 baths, and a huge great room which has a large sleeper sofa sectional as well. Under the proposed regulations, our current maximum occupancy of up to 10 adults/children could be decreased down to a maximum 6 adults - again, a whopping and unreasonable reduction of 40% from our current allowable occupancy. For a home of our size, it is unreasonable to assert it only supports a maximum of 6 adults - especially with all the space we have available in our very large bedrooms and great room. In addition, my thoughts turn to a time when my husband and I were much younger, long prior to becoming property owners in Lake Arrowhead, when we rented many, many different vacation homes/cabins in both the Lake Arrowhead and Big Bear

area as avid skiers - and contributed to the local economy as well - every weekend we could in the winter. Many of these properties we rented (sometimes with another couple as well) were studios (with no bedrooms) with sleeping in the living area, or studios with lofts (again no bedrooms) and sleeping areas in both the living area and loft - the proposed occupancy rule changes would be devastating to these small property owners and unfairly prevent them from obtaining ANY short term rental permits, because there are no formal bedrooms. In addition, the recent positive redlined change, allowing ADUs would also be significantly hindered in its intent, because many ADUs are also studios without a separate bedroom - thus nullifying the intent of allowing ADUs. I implore the Commission and Supervisors to leave the current occupancy maximums unchanged and maintained at the current maximums. I have no major issues with most of the other changes to regulations being proposed (and thank you for eliminating the proposed requirement for external signage, which was just an open invitation for crime and burglary when homes are vacant) and understand the need to strike a fair balance for all concerns in the community, INCLUDING fairness to us, the Short Term Rental Property Owners - we are also your constituents, taxpayers/revenue generators for the County and deserve our concerns be equally listened to and addressed. On behalf of myself and other short term rental owners with properties in the mountain resort/tourist areas, I appreciate your consideration of these important concerns and am hopeful you leave current occupancy requirements unchanged. Sincerely, Jacqueline Nishizawa

Thank You.

Planning Commission Secretary  
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue  
San Bernardino, CA 92415  
(909) 387-8311

System Admin

**Note:** This email is being sent from an unmonitored mailbox. Please do not reply.

Hello,

I recently learned that a new policy is in work for short term rentals (STR) in the Joshua Tree area. Would it be possible for you to share the policy currently in work (red lined document works as well!)

Some of the questions I had are:

- 1) Will there be a capacity for STRs in the future?
- 2) Will STRs be restricted to be in certain zoning areas?
- 3) In general, what are the new rules looking to be in place for STRs?
- 4) What's the time frame these regulations will go into effect?

Thanks!

John

Commissioner Weldy,

The following article about Joshua Tree appeared in today's NYTimes.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/07/travel/joshua-tree-california-airbnb.html%5C>

Apparently, you are allowing LLCs and corporate entities to own and operate *hundreds of STRs* in our neighborhoods!

WHY?

...this is a long way from the concept of home sharing, owner occupancy and a Bed & Breakfast!

Gary Stiler

8524 Little Morongo Rd.

Morongo Valley, CA 92256



Melody Guzman accordion2melody@gmail.com

I clean 3 vacation rentals and am horrified you may be considering limiting my income, halving it, by insisting people have two night minimum stays. I rely on that income.

If you are going to regulate, get the deep pockets and outsiders out of the game by limiting str activity to owner occupied properties or have a three permit limit per holder.

Thank you!

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you can confirm the sender and know the content is safe.

Commissioners,

I live in North Joshua Tree. The proliferation of STR's is ruining our village and our lives. I retired here for peace and quiet, not booming music all weekend, vehicles doing 50 mph + on our primitive dirt roads, bright lights burning all night, and rude tourists trespassing on my land.

There needs to be an immediate halt and cap to this urban terrorism.

Thank you

Jane Fawke

CA certified Master Naturalist.

CA certified Climate Steward.

Retired Conejo Open Space Conservation Agency Park Ranger.

**From:** Jack Tingley <jack@jmtingley.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 1:41 PM

**To:** Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>; LUS - Customer Service <luscustomerservice@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** March 3 2022 Planning Commission Meeting

The Planning Commission meeting I attended March 3, 2022 was informative and well run by Chair Jonathan Weldy. Thank you.

Important points and decisions were made regarding the drafting of the revised STR ordinance.

As I stated during the Public Testimony portion of the meeting. STR's are a business and need to be called a business. I ask the descriptive word BUSINESS be added to 84.28.030 Definitions former section H now J. See below.

(hj) ~~SHORT-TERM RESIDENTIAL RENTAL UNIT—STR BUSINESS OWNER.~~ Means the owner of a property, as defined in § 810.01.170, with a ~~single-family~~ dwelling unit that is being used as a ~~n short-term residential rental unit.~~ STR.; ~~BUSINESS~~ Owner can include a person, corporation, partnership, a personal or family trust, limited liability company (LLC), or limited liability partnership (LLP). ~~any individual or organization~~ An agent ~~working on behalf of such~~ may act on behalf of a property owner to manage the STR BUSINESS; ~~or any individual or organization that has the legal right to rent out, or allow the occupancy of a single-family residential dwelling unit as a short-term residential rental unit.~~

Thanks for accommodating this positive descriptive addition. STR BUSINESS OWNER and STR BUSINESS belong in the above Definitions.

Regards,

**Jack**

Jack Tingley  
174 C Lane  
PO BOX 3147 (There is no home mail delivery in Lake Arrowhead)  
Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352  
310-462-7301

**From:** Thomas Donahue <donahue.tom1@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 10:22 AM

**To:** COB - Internet E-Mail <COB@sbcounty.gov>; Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** RE: San Bernardino County Planning Commission Meeting 3/3/2022



Good Morning,

I'm following up with my previous email. During the meeting, code enforcement noted the max occupancy WITH two minors is 14. The redlined ordinance notes 10 as the maximum occupancy, not 12. This would mean a max occupancy WITH minors is limited to 12.

Please provide clarification on this, as I feel 14 is a much more reasonable figure than 12, but I would prefer to see a more comprehensive suggestion which allows for higher occupancy limits on larger parcels and / or larger square footage.

Thank you.

Best,

Tom Donahue

(c): 862-354-7873

(e): donahue.tom1@gmail.com

NOTICE: This email and any attachments may contain confidential and proprietary information and is for the sole use of the intended recipient for the stated purpose. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

**From:** Becky Fink <beckyfinktreehouse@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 9:53 AM

**To:** Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** Regarding 2-night min

**Importance:** High



Hello,

As a permitted STR owner, my model is based on allowing 1-night stays. Most of my guests are women and couples – prop is 600 sq foot. My cleaner is dependent on the increased income from turnovers. Something you may want to consider is how one-night turnovers positively impact local economy.

Thank you,  
Rebecca Fink  
323-719-1916  
61848 Crest Circle Dr  
Joshua Tree, CA

**From:** Lydia Neeley <lydianeeley83@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 1:58 PM

**To:** Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** STR proposed changes



To whom it may concern,

I am writing to vehemently oppose changes to the current STR ordinance.

Most specifically the two night minimum. It is discriminatory to people who's work schedules or finances don't allow them to vacation for more than a night. There are a plethora of legitimate reasons someone might need to rent for only one night and if the goal is to limit parties there are more efficient ways to do it.

The number of cars allowed should be determined by the amount of available spaces on the property. There are many circumstances in which one guest has to meet the rest of their group and carpooling is not always feasible.

No change should be made to how occupancy limits are determined.

External signage is a terrible idea as it advertises that the property is often vacant as well as invites trouble from people who are opposed to vacation rentals. It is a major security risk as well as unnecessary as the county already provides a map on its website as to the location of all STRs in the county.

Please do not recommend these detrimental changes to the Board of Supervisors.

Thank you,  
-Lydia Neeley

**From:** Andrea Ashbacher <andreaashbacher@hotmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 8:32 AM

**To:** Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** One Night Vacation Rentals



Planning Commission,

I would like the board to understand that if you restrict rentals to one night, you are effecting the income for more than just property owners. I am an individual who has owned a home in the area since 2014 and recently set up my Airbnb. I have a 2 night minimum but when my calendar is full except for a few one night stays, I open my calendar to one night stays to keep my housekeeper working and generate additional income for myself. Restricting rentals to one day means my housekeeper works fewer days so she makes less income, I also make less income, and the amount collected for tax revenue is less.

If the concern is one night stays who use a house for a party on the weekend, please limit the weekend stays to require a 2 night minimum and that will solve the problem rather than disallowing one night stays altogether.

Sincerely,  
Andrea Ashbacher

Sent from Mail for Windows

**From:** Jack Unger <junger@ask-wi.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 8:53 AM

**To:** Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** Providing 1-Night Stays for Travelers Passing Through the Desert



Regarding the March 3 Agenda:

I'm commenting in regard to the Short Term Rental (STR) requirement that stays in STRs must be for a minimum of two nights. I'm requesting that the two-night requirement be removed in desert areas. Travelers in the desert are primarily passing **through** the desert and not remaining **in** the desert. They need one-night lodging, not two-night (or more) lodging. Please review and revise the regulations prohibiting one-night stays in desert areas. Thank-you.



**From:** Board Meeting Comments <BoardMeetingComments@cob.sbcounty.gov>

**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2022 5:35 PM

**To:** Board Meeting Comments <BoardMeetingComments@cob.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** Public Comments: Make a General Public Comment

The following request was submitted from the COB Public Comments for Board Meetings website.

**Contact Information**

Annylisa Perez

Los Angeles, California90026

[annyperez@gmail.com](mailto:annyperez@gmail.com)

**Request Information**

Request: Make a General Public Comment

Comments: Hello, I am submitting comments for the Short-term Rentals that the Planning Commission recently passed. First, I wanted to comment on Staff. Although I had never seen both presenters that day, one was clearly prepared than the other. The man with the glasses seemed well informed and prepared for the presentation. While the man sitting next to him seemed he was just handed a script 5 minutes before the start of the meeting. He was clearly put up to presenting this topic and it showed. As a long time owner of multiple STRs in the desert communities, I felt he misrepresented the STR community and I fear that the policy is not being well looked after. I watched the first meeting with the Planning Director and code staff, and although they were met with much rebuttals form residents and Commissioners, they at least seemed well educated in the policy and changes being presented. Second, please find a way to filter out the bad actors that take advantage of this policy. There are many people actually relying on the rental income, that also bring financial benefits to the local communities. Thank you.

Thank You.

System Admin

**Note:** This email is being sent from an unmonitored mailbox. Please do not reply.

**From:** Thomas Donahue <donahue.tom1@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2022 10:22 AM

**To:** COB - Internet E-Mail <COB@sbcounty.gov>; Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** RE: San Bernardino County Planning Commission Meeting 3/3/2022



Good Morning,

I'm following up with my previous email. During the meeting, code enforcement noted the max occupancy WITH two minors is 14. The redlined ordinance notes 10 as the maximum occupancy, not 12. This would mean a max occupancy WITH minors is limited to 12.

Please provide clarification on this, as I feel 14 is a much more reasonable figure than 12, but I would prefer to see a more comprehensive suggestion which allows for higher occupancy limits on larger parcels and / or larger square footage.

Thank you.

Best,

Tom Donahue

(c): 862-354-7873

(e): [donahue.tom1@gmail.com](mailto:donahue.tom1@gmail.com)

NOTICE: This email and any attachments may contain confidential and proprietary information and is for the sole use of the intended recipient for the stated purpose. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

**From:** Frederick <fhjeng@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 2, 2022 1:11 PM

**To:** Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>; COB - Internet E-Mail <COB@sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** Comments on San Bernardino County Short Term Rental Ordinance



Dear San Bernardino County Planning Commissioners and Board of Supervisors,

Please accept my comments below regarding the changes to the current San Bernardino County Short Term Rental Ordinance which are now being proposed by Code Enforcement and which the Planning Commission will discuss at its meeting on March 3rd, 2022.

- OCCUPANCY - STANDARDS AND LIMITS

I oppose the proposed change in the occupancy calculation.

The occupancy formula proposed in the ordinance redline fails to take the needs of the Desert Region into account. In the Desert Region large parcels are common. To balance the needs of both the Mountain and Desert Regions, the following alternative occupancy formula should be used:

- a) All listings under 2 acres start with 2 guests.
- b) All listings 2 acres or larger start with 4 guests.
- c) THEN all listings add 2 guests per bedroom in addition to the starting guidelines above.

- NUMBER OF STRs PER PARCEL & ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

I oppose the proposed change which would limit STR permits to 1 per parcel.

The county should encourage construction of ADUs by allowing them to be an STR in addition to a main house STR.

On large (>2 acre) parcels both a home and ADU should continue to be allowed STR permits.

At a minimum, existing properties with 2 STR permits for both house and ADU must be grandfathered in as a valid non-conforming use.

- TWO-NIGHT MINIMUM STAY

I oppose the proposed change to two night minimum stay.

Many well behaved visitors can spend only a single night in the Hi Desert as one stop on a longer trip. In addition to shortchanging visitors, housekeepers would see reduced work if single-night stays were eliminated.

At a minimum, single-night stays Sunday through Thursday must continue to be allowed.

- OCCUPANCY - MINIMUM AGE REQUIREMENT

I oppose the proposed occupancy regulation which differentiates adult and child guests.

STR hosts have no way to control guests booking with children or to verify their minor children's ages.

Moreover, on Airbnb (the most widely used hosting platform) there is no way for a host to specify numbers of adult versus child guests. As a practical matter there is no way for hosts to implement or enforce this proposed rule.

- PARKING

I oppose the proposed change to limit maximum parking.

In the rural desert most parcels have room to park many cars. Parking is really not a concern unless you are in a village. For example, saying that 4 guests staying on a 2.5 acre rural property can only have 2 cars doesn't make any sense. Often times guests are meeting friends or family and they are each coming from different cities. They will each have a car. Parking should be calculated based on the site conditions of the property as it is currently done.

Thank you for your consideration,

Frederick Jeng  
7785 Elwood Street,  
Joshua Tree, CA 92252  
[fhjeng@gmail.com](mailto:fhjeng@gmail.com)  
(310) 486-1004

From: Monique Gaymer-Jones <mgaymerjones@aol.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 2:17 PM  
To: Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>; COB - Internet E-Mail <COB@sbcounty.gov>  
Subject: Ordinance Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you can confirm the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear San Bernardino County Planning Commissioners and Board of Supervisors,

Please accept my comments below regarding the changes to the current San Bernardino County Short Term Rental Ordinance which are now being proposed by Code Enforcement and which the Planning Commission will discuss at its meeting on March 3rd, 2022.

- OCCUPANCY - STANDARDS AND LIMITS

I oppose the proposed change in the occupancy calculation.

The occupancy formula proposed in the ordinance redline fails to take the needs of the Desert Region into account. In the Desert Region large parcels are common. To balance the needs of both the Mountain and Desert Regions, the following alternative occupancy formula should be used:

- a) All listings under 2 acres start with 2 guests.
- b) All listings 2 acres or larger start with 4 guests.
- c) THEN all listings add 2 guests per bedroom in addition to the starting guidelines above.

- NUMBER OF STRs PER PARCEL & ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

I oppose the proposed change which would limit STR permits to 1 per parcel.

The county should encourage construction of ADUs by allowing them to be an STR in addition to a main house STR.

On large (>2 acre) parcels both a home and ADU should continue to be allowed STR permits.

At a minimum, existing properties with 2 STR permits for both house and ADU must be grandfathered in as a valid non-conforming use.

- TWO-NIGHT MINIMUM STAY

I oppose the proposed change to two night minimum stay.

Many well behaved visitors can spend only a single night in the Hi Desert as one stop on a longer trip. In addition to shortchanging visitors, housekeepers would see reduced work if single-night stays were eliminated.

At a minimum, single-night stays Sunday through Thursday must continue to be allowed.

- OCCUPANCY - MINIMUM AGE REQUIREMENT

I oppose the proposed occupancy regulation which differentiates adult and child guests.

STR hosts have no way to control guests booking with children or to verify their minor children's ages. Moreover, on Airbnb (the most widely used hosting platform) there is no way for a host to specify numbers of adult versus child guests. As a practical matter there is no way for hosts to implement or enforce this proposed rule.

- PARKING

I oppose the proposed change to limit maximum parking.

In the rural desert most parcels have room to park many cars. Parking is really not a concern unless you are in a village. For example, saying that 4 guests staying on a 2.5 acre rural property can only have 2 cars doesn't make any sense. Often times guests are meeting friends or family and they are each coming from different cities. They will each have a car. Parking should be calculated based on the site conditions of the property as it is currently done.

Thank you for your consideration,

Monique Gaymer-Jones

PO Box 1586

Joshua Tree, Ca 92252

[Mgaymerjones@aol.com](mailto:Mgaymerjones@aol.com)

323-434-6490 Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Tim Hainley <thainley@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 2, 2022 1:35 PM

**To:** COB - Internet E-Mail <COB@sbcounty.gov>; Planning Commission Comments <PlanningCommissionComments@lus.sbcounty.gov>

**Subject:** San Bernardino County Short Term Rental Ordinance



I am writing to express my concern with the proposal to require 2 night minimum stays in the proposed changes to the short term rentals ordinance. I own an STR in Joshua Tree. We frequently have guests who are passing through and want to visit the National Park who stay for one night. We have never had any trouble with or negative experiences with these guests.

Overnight guests contribute to local businesses, help provide shifts for our cleaning crew, and generate significant TOT taxes for SB county. The desert region does not suffer from traffic or crowding issues, so I can't imagine why this would be necessary or to anyone's benefit. If the idea is to prevent large parties, it will unfairly penalize smaller homes like mine that could not even accommodate a large party. It would also be completely ineffective, as the cost difference between one and two nights in most rentals would not be enough to deter a large group of people determined to have a party.

Rather than adding more rules and regulations that inhibit the operation of responsible STRs, enforcing current rules and addressing problem rentals would be a far more productive use of resources.

Tim Hainley  
7084 Sierra Ave  
Joshua Tree

**From:** Gary Stiler <[gstiler@verizon.net](mailto:gstiler@verizon.net)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 4, 2022 9:46 AM  
**To:** Duron, Heidi - LUS <[Heidi.Duron@lus.sbcounty.gov](mailto:Heidi.Duron@lus.sbcounty.gov)>  
**Subject:** STR Code Needs Amending

Ms. Duron,

I live in Morongo Valley.

It's springtime, and I am sadly missing my honeybees. A bear came down the canyon and destroyed the three hives. The bear also destroyed the hives of my neighbor.

A bit of sleuthing revealed a trail of garbage leading to the Short Term Rental, three-quarters of a mile from me. The STR had a large Burtec garbage container. The lid was wide open and garbage was strewn around it.

Why didn't it have an 'animal proof' lid as per code?

...because your STR code only requires animal proofing in the Mountain Region (84.280.70 Conditions of Operation k(1)).

According to your code enforcement officers, I do not live in the Mountain Region. I live in the Desert Region. Therefore, STRs here are not required to 'animal proof' their containers -- apparently because there's no wildlife in the desert???

Huh? I can assure you that we are home to bears, bobcats, mountain lions, racoons, vultures and more.

Frankly, the Code is just plain STUPID on this point and I and my neighbors are paying the price for it!

As the next BOS meeting is scheduled for June 14, I request that you urge the Supervisors to amend 84.280.70, k(1). The code needs to apply the same 'animal proofing' requirement to Desert Region STRs, as the so-called Mt. Region enjoys.

Thank you,  
Gary Stiler  
8524 Little Morongo Rd.  
Morongo Valley  
909-362-2016