



# Motion to file a Community Impact Statement on Proposed Home-Sharing Ordinance

**Agenda Item:** LUED090616-3  
**Date:** September, 6, 2016  
**Proposed By:** Adam Rich  
**Include motion in Consent Agenda?** Preferably not

---

## Background

The City Council is considering a new ordinance to regulate the practice of home-sharing (e.g. via AirBnB) in Los Angeles. This ordinance does many things, but its main effects are as follows:

1. Home-sharing will now be permitted under city zoning regulations as an accessory use of a residence
2. Home-sharing will be limited to 120 days a year
3. Home-sharing will be limited to the host's primary residence
4. Hosts must register with the City
5. Home-sharing is prohibited for apartments subject to the rent stabilization ordinance (RSO) and for units designated as affordable housing
6. Require hosts to pay a registration fee to the city
7. Renters must have permission from their landlords to share their home
8. Only one home-sharing booking is permitted at one time
9. Hosts must report the total number of nights their home was booked and the amount paid each time to the city on a monthly basis

## Proposed Motion

SORO NC should file the attached Community Impact Statement that advocates the City Council pass the proposed ordinance after making several changes as follows:

1. Neighborhood Councils should be able to opt-out of home-sharing completely or to otherwise modify the regulations to increase or decrease home-sharing in their area.
2. The Mayor or City Council should be empowered to temporarily lift restrictions on home-sharing during a disaster or special event that causes a shortage of available hotel rooms.
3. 100% of all taxes and fees generated from home-sharing should be used to administer and enforce home-sharing regulations.
4. A timeline should be established for the creation of registration and complaint systems. The ordinance should not take effect until these systems are fully functional.
5. A maximum cap on the total number of registered home sharing units should be established

**Doug Fitzsimmons**  
President

**Kevin Gres**  
Vice-President

**Terrence Gomes**  
Treasurer

**Beth Hirsch**  
Secretary

**South Robertson  
Neighborhoods Council**

PO Box 35836  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

P: (310) 295-9920  
F: (310) 295-9906  
E: info@soronc.org

[soronc.org](http://soronc.org)



6. The ordinance should mandate that a certain percentage of home-sharing units in the city be ADA compliant

## Considerations

**Committee review:**  
*(highly recommended)*

Votes For:

Against:

**Amount previously allocated in Committee's working budget:**     \$  
*(applies to funding motions only)*

### Arguments for:

The proposed ordinance benefits our community in several ways:

- It legalizes home sharing, giving our residents extra income
- It puts limits on home-sharing that will prevent housing units from being converted to full time home sharing units
- It makes it easier for the City to enforce its laws and prevent home-sharing from causing problems

The amendments we are asking for will benefit our community by:

- Allowing us to adjust the regulations for our own neighborhoods' needs
- Allow the regulations to be flexible during emergencies to account for displaced people who may need temporary housing
- Allow the regulations to be flexible during special events when demand on hotels is high and affordable lodging is needed
- Ensure that there are sufficient funds to enforce the home-sharing rules, without using other city funds.
- Ensure that home-sharing does not start until the mechanisms to control it are in place.
- Put a cap on the number of home-sharing units, so it doesn't get out of control.
- Ensure that there are ADA compliant home-sharing units available, so that the disabled can benefit from home-sharing.

### Arguments against:

The proposed ordinance legalizes home sharing which could cause problems:

- It means more strangers in our community which can cause security concerns
- It can hurt local hotels
- It can change the character of the neighborhood

It limits home-sharing by banning it on non-primary homes and RSO units depriving those owners of the income and other benefits of home-sharing.

It requires hosts to pay taxes and pay registration fees that burden the hosts.

The amendment we are requesting to allow NCs to modify the rules could create a complicated patchwork of rules throughout the City.

The amendment we are requesting to lift the rules during emergencies and special events may be invoked frequently causing too much home-sharing.

The amendment we are requesting to use 100% of all generated revenue for enforcement could deprive the City of potential revenue.

The maximum cap on home-sharing could deprive potential hosts of the benefits of home-sharing and could raise the price of home-sharing units by constricting supply.