Gibb, Linda A.

From: Heather Ann MacDonald <heatherann@shaw.ca>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 9:09 AM
To: Public Submissions
Cc: Black, Katie; Weiss, Cody G.
Subject: [EXT] Comments on CPS2019-1070 “Short Term Rental Tiered License Category”, referred to the 2019 September 30 Council Meeting

Mayor Nenshi and Members of Council:

As Calgarians who live beside a de facto commercial hotel operation (i.e. a short-term rental/lodging house rented year-round on a full time basis), we offer the following comments on report CPS2019-1070 approved by the Standing Policy Committee on Community and Protective Services on 2019 September 11:

While the report offers a number of good licensing solutions, it does not fully address the social costs, problems, or community concerns that can arise during the operation of short-term rentals, such as the property beside our home.

In the past we have raised objections with Administration such as:

- This business operates in violation of the existing R-1 residential zoning for our street;
- Owners should be paying business taxes, not residential property taxes;
- As commercial business which to date has not required a permit or license, we have not been afforded an opportunity to raise concerns as would normally be required for other home-based businesses;
- It is unclear if property owners are obligated to ensure tenants abide by existing bylaws. Many tenants behave as if they are staying at a holiday resort with minimal consideration for neighbouring homeowners. In our situation, the outdoor speaker system, fire pit, and hot tub encourage behaviours which disrupt our peace and quiet, while renting to multiple families or large groups concurrently significantly increases noise and parking issues;
- If owners are not in residence, they cannot manage problematic behaviour when it occurs. While the owners of this particular property state that no parties are to be held and supposedly impose charges for noise complaints, and while we can and have registered complaints via 311 when issues have occurred (e.g. multiple stag/stagette parties, wedding celebrations, and group BBQs) by the time complaints are investigated, the offending tenants have commonly left the premises. Tenants have told us to “mind your own business” or have ignored our requests when we have voiced concerns directly; and
- We are concerned about our personal safety and the security of our property. Our neighbourhood was not intended to be used as a hotel zone by a highly transient population. We have no idea who or how many people are in residence, so we are extra vigilant when outside, and it has been necessary to install additional security features to protect our home.

Further, it is most disappointing to learn that while Administration engaged the owners of short-term rentals, it appears that no attempt was made to engage homeowners living next door to short-term rentals to understand the impacts and effects on social cohesion within a community, and on citizens like us.

Finally, it was interesting to note that 63% of hosts would not be willing to contribute to a local tax to support local tourism and businesses in Calgary and essentially want The City to limit or minimize regulations. Why is it
acceptable for operators to make money at our expense by running a business next door to our home, discounting our right to peace and quiet and negatively impacting our quality of life without any return to the community and with minimal constraints and limited obligations on owners to ensure tenants are not disruptive?

We are seriously investigating moving from our home of 18 years, leaving behind our beautiful house, ravine view, mature yard/gardens, and our good neighbours up the street, a painful decision which is the direct result of the anxiety and stress of living beside a de facto hotel.

**Resolution Sought:** We respectfully request that in addition to the licensing regulations, Council ask Administration to address the issues and concerns raised by citizens living next to short-term rental properties, particularly lodging houses rented on a full time basis, so that final resulting regulations are considerate and fair to all parties.

Further, we agree that education is paramount and support an extensive education campaign, not only for short-term rental owners but also so that citizens are aware of what remedies are available to address concerns, along with easy-to-find, detailed information on how to access those remedies (e.g. 311, registry of owners with contact information, etc.)

Respectfully,
Robert W. and Heather Ann MacDonald
#54 Kincora Park NW, Calgary, Alberta T3R 1L2
Phone: 403-295-3041, Email: heatherann@shaw.ca

copy: Katie Black A/General Manager, Community and Protective Services
Cody Weiss, author of report CPS2019-1070
Hi, was this added to the record so councilors have access to it?

Thanks!

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Svet Pargov <pargov.svet@gmail.com>
Date: Wed., Sep. 11, 2019, 4:04 p.m.
Subject: Fwd: September 11 short-term rental meeting
To: <cityclerk@calgary.ca>

Hello,

I tried emailing public submission but my email bounced back! Could you please get my word file below on the record?

Thanks!

Svet S Pargov
(587) 983 6164
pargov.svet@gmail.com

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Svet Pargov <pargov.svet@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Sep 11, 2019 at 3:56 PM
Subject: September 11 short-term rental meeting
To: <publicsubmission@calgary.ca>

Hello,

Here are my notes from today's meeting.
Thanks!

Svet S Pargov
(587) 983 6164
pargov.svet@gmail.com
September 11 council meeting – regarding short-term rental accommodations

I would like to speak with you about some specific clauses in the proposed regulations.

(regarding issue that was brought up during the hearing) – Whenever someone books through the Airbnb platform, the host has $1,000,000 liability insurance and $1,000,000 contents insurance (which also covers the condo building). This is insurance is in addition to any other condo insurance the host has. From my experience, dealing with Airbnb has been a lot easier than dealing with insurance agencies.

58.1 (4) - States that a Short Term Rental Licensee must not allow a guest to sleep in a room that does not have a window which provides a means of egress. I want to specify that this would eliminate certain newly built 1-bedroom units that have the bedroom in the center of the unit that were designed in a legally compliant way with the use of sprinkler systems. Additionally, rooms in units on the 20th floor of a high rise with a window do NOT have a way of egress, since the fire trucks cannot reach that high. The fire Marshall and regulations have deemed that sprinkler systems are sufficient for rooms that do not have a way of egress. I am suggesting that short term rentals are held to the same standard that the fire marshall has deemed appropriate. I recommend that the draft regulations be amended to allow for rooms with sprinkler systems.

58.1 (5) - states that Short Term Rental Licensees must not allow more than 2 guests to sleep in a room. This is overall a good regulation to prevent overcrowding. However, there are certain units that it doesn’t make sense for. For example, 1000 square foot open concept studios. The average bedroom is 132 square feet. I recommend that rooms that are larger than 250 square feet (which is double the size of the average room) should be allowed to host 4 guests.

On another note, regarding Councilor’s Chu’s question as to what classifies as a room, I think the wording of “room” is correct to encompass living rooms. However, I agree that it shouldn’t encompass kitchens and bathrooms. I think it is reasonable to have a pullout couch in your living room, but unreasonable to have one in your bathroom. I recommend that this is clarified.

58.1 (9) - states that Short Term Rental Licensees must keep a record of any paid guest and the room that the paid guest stays in. Paid guest is a bit unclear, since hosts don’t often know how the payment was split. I think a more appropriate rule would be to keep a record of “the primary guest with who’s account the booking was made on”. In addition to that, the section states that we must keep a record of what room the “paid guest” sleeps in. In a situation where there are several guests sleeping in a 3-bedroom house, it may be a little bit creepy to keep a record of what room each guest slept in and if they ever switched halfway through their stay. I recommend rewording the paid guest to be “primary guest who’s account the booking was made on” and removing the room tracking system for units that are listed as an “entire place”

In light of the hotel association speaking last during the meeting, I urge the councilors to not amend the draft proposal in a way that will force a significant percentage of Airbnb hosts to shut their doors and to consult with the host community before amending the draft proposal.

Thank you for your time.

Svet Pargov – Pargov.svet@gmail.com – 587-983-6164