

Stephen J. Manfredi, M.D.
32727 Avenida Lestonnac
Temecula, Ca. 92592
Cell (951) 312-9003 Fax (951) 694-8458
SJManfredi@aol.com

John Hildebrand, Planning Director
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street – 12th Floor
Riverside, Ca. 92502-1629

April 2, 2022

Re: Short Term Rental Occupancy And Quantity Must Be Capped

The daytime and nighttime occupancy of Short-Term Rentals (STRs) as well as maximum number of STRs allowed in our neighborhoods must be capped for the following reasons:

1. When short-term rentals were first debated in the courts, attorneys and clients that were in favor of short-term rentals argued that short-term rentals are a "single-family home use", and that short-term rentals are compatible with other single-family homes in the area.
2. Unfortunately, most STR's that have generated complaints come from un-hosted STR's where too many occupants were allowed to stay. The short-term rentals that have advertised and allowed high occupancies produce more noise, trash, parking problems, and annoyances for neighbors because they are not compatible with the intended single-family use.
3. According to Statista.com, the average American family size is 3.13 persons. The average household size in the United States is 2.6 persons. Allowing occupancies as high as 10 to 25 people at a short-term rental is simply not compatible with surrounding single-family homes. Capping the occupancy of short-term rentals at seven (7) is both reasonable and generous. Additionally, there should be a 10% cap on all STR's allowed to ensure the existing community fabric is maintained.
4. The Draft Ordinance is silent with regards to any maximum size or quantity of STR's. If the "2 plus 1" bedroom rule is used to determine the occupancy for short-term rentals, then the owners of short-term rentals could apply for and construct additional bedrooms. For example, if a short-term rental expanded from 4 to 10 bedrooms, that STR would be able to achieve an occupancy of twenty-one (21) people every day, which is clearly a "hotel-use" and not compatible with other single-family homes in the area.
5. If the owner of a short-term rental desires to maintain more than 7 people, then the STR should be hosted (permanent residency on site) to ensure compliance, but with a cap expanded to a maximum of eleven (11) people. If an event is to occur with any more than 7 people un-hosted, or 11 hosted, then that event should require a Temporary Events Permit from the County of Riverside, with a maximum of one event per calendar year for any STR.
6. The very reason we moved to rural areas was for the peace and quiet. That part of our American dream as well as our property rights have been trampled on and destroyed by many of the noisy, lawless and incompatible use of some STR's.
7. For all of the above reasons, the daytime and nighttime occupancy of Short-Term Rentals must be capped at no higher than seven (7) occupants un-hosted and eleven (11) occupants hosted. The maximum number of STRs allowed in our neighborhood should be 10%, as other communities have done, to further ensure the single-family "neighborhood fabric" is maintained.



Stephen J. Manfredi, M.D.

[Input to Draft Ordinance 927]

Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside

Short Term Rentals (STRs) - Compensation

To whom it may concern on the Board of Supervisors:

Introduction:

This letter is to address my suggestion for compensation of short term rentals in Riverside County as it pertains to me and fellow rural property owners. I have owned my 5 acre property in Riverside County for 36 years, and after personally clearing it of flammable material and grading/paving a road to satisfy fire regulations, did bring up water, tele, electricity and financing to [finally] build a house in 2007 that I call home today. Each step of the way has been and is an uphill battle with a lot of blood, sweat & tears spent, but worth it, considering my pursuit of the American dream of home ownership with friendly and trustworthy neighbors who watch each other's back.

Some history:

One property adjacent to mine was an equestrian corral owned by a contractor who developed a heart condition that ended his business, resulting in a bank foreclosure on his corral. A couple from Hemet who I will refer to as "leeches" bought the discounted foreclosed property, drilled a water well (in direct violation of water department rules, although protected by "the natural law" that water cannot be denied under federal law), tapped into the electrical transformer I built for my property (instead of the 'community' pull-box a few feet away) and put up a pre-fab building called an "Airbnb", essentially a motel. Very long story shortened: when I built my house, the water department said they owned the water rights, requiring my neighbor and me to install 1500 foot of 8" water line (with fire hydrants) with the understanding that we would be reimbursed an appropriate portion of cost if any future property owner needed to tap into it {so much for water dept. rules}. I personally built a 6 foot high stone masonry retaining wall into the side of a hill for an electric transformer that Edison promised me would be dedicated solely for my property {I have since learned my lesson about Edison}. The 'leeches' are benefitting from the 'post card' effect of the paved road, utilities and development, with no compensation to those who gave it to them, nor regard for the unease caused by their transient tenants.

Suggestions:

In agreeance with Ordinance 927, I understand the concept of Short Term Rental 'Airbnbs', and believe they have their proper and beneficial place in society, but they don't belong everywhere/anywhere, especially in single family home neighborhoods where people live to trust and depend on their neighbors for peace of mind. I suggest [to add?] a "class system of criteria" that STRs are judged against before being allowed a license to operate, such as a scale from "1 to 10", or thermometer graph from red to blue, where one end of the scale would be acceptable, and the other end would be forbidden. The intermediate categories between acceptable and forbidden would involve tradeoffs and conditions, for example, as you get closer to 'forbidden', the STR owner would need to compensate the neighboring properties on a flat fee basis or per tenant occupancy, whereas, for example, as you approach 'acceptable' the STR Owner would be allowed more lenient restriction on guests or noise. The categories would need to address and be based on how the STR would fit into the community, for example, if the location was close to other hotels & motels it would be rated high on the acceptable end

of the scale, whereas if the area to be located is out in the pine trees under the stars next to a ranch house, it might be prohibited. The intermediate locational categories would need to address criteria such as neighbor's input/objection, security, privacy, parking, line of sight, noise, light, etc.; anything above, for example, the midpoint of the scale would require some degree of compensation from the STR Owner to the adjoining properties.

Conclude:

The sole reason for building my home where I did [zoned single family residence] was for the assurance of having permanent neighbors who I would get to know, but having transient strangers [here today gone tomorrow, at all times] next door often seems to be another one of those adverse 'lessons to be learned' about property ownership; perhaps requiring compensation from STR Owners to adjacent property Owners will help pare the adverse impacts of future STRs.

Thank you,

Dean Hanselman
38095 Via Estado
Temecula, CA 92592

[Input to Draft Ordinance 927]

Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside

Short Term Rentals (STRs) - Compensation

To whom it may concern on the Board of Supervisors:

Introduction:

This letter is to address my suggestion for compensation of short term rentals in Riverside County as it pertains to me and fellow rural property owners. I have owned my 5 acre property in Riverside County for 36 years, and after personally clearing it of flammable material and grading/paving a road to satisfy fire regulations, did bring up water, tele, electricity and financing to [finally] build a house in 2007 that I call home today. Each step of the way has been and is an uphill battle with a lot of blood, sweat & tears spent, but worth it, considering my pursuit of the American dream of home ownership with friendly and trustworthy neighbors who watch each other's back.

Some history:

One property adjacent to mine was an equestrian corral owned by a contractor who developed a heart condition that ended his business, resulting in a bank foreclosure on his corral. A couple from Hemet who I will refer to as "leeches" bought the discounted foreclosed property, drilled a water well (in direct violation of water department rules, although protected by "the natural law" that water cannot be denied under federal law), tapped into the electrical transformer I built for my property (instead of the 'community' pull-box a few feet away) and put up a pre-fab building called an "Airbnb", essentially a motel. Very long story shortened: when I built my house, the water department said they owned the water rights, requiring my neighbor and me to install 1500 foot of 8" water line (with fire hydrants) with the understanding that we would be reimbursed an appropriate portion of cost if any future property owner needed to tap into it {so much for water dept. rules}. I personally built a 6 foot high stone masonry retaining wall into the side of a hill for an electric transformer that Edison promised me would be dedicated solely for my property {I have since learned my lesson about Edison}. The 'leeches' are benefitting from the 'post card' effect of the paved road, utilities and development, with no compensation to those who gave it to them, nor regard for the unease caused by their transient tenants.

Suggestions:

In agreeance with Ordinance 927, I understand the concept of Short Term Rental 'Airbnbs', and believe they have their proper and beneficial place in society, but they don't belong everywhere/anywhere, especially in single family home neighborhoods where people live to trust and depend on their neighbors for peace of mind. I suggest [to add?] a "class system of criteria" that STRs are judged against before being allowed a license to operate, such as a scale from "1 to 10", or thermometer graph from red to blue, where one end of the scale would be acceptable, and the other end would be forbidden. The intermediate categories between acceptable and forbidden would involve tradeoffs and conditions, for example, as you get closer to 'forbidden', the STR owner would need to compensate the neighboring properties on a flat fee basis or per tenant occupancy, whereas, for example, as you approach 'acceptable' the STR Owner would be allowed more lenient restriction on guests or noise. The categories would need to address and be based on how the STR would fit into the community, for example, if the location was close to other hotels & motels it would be rated high on the acceptable end

of the scale, whereas if the area to be located is out in the pine trees under the stars next to a ranch house, it might be prohibited. The intermediate locational categories would need to address criteria such as neighbor's input/objection, security, privacy, parking, line of sight, noise, light, etc.; anything above, for example, the midpoint of the scale would require some degree of compensation from the STR Owner to the adjoining properties.

Conclude:

The sole reason for building my home where I did [zoned single family residence] was for the assurance of having permanent neighbors who I would get to know, but having transient strangers [here today gone tomorrow, at all times] next door often seems to be another one of those adverse 'lessons to be learned' about property ownership; perhaps requiring compensation from STR Owners to adjacent property Owners will help pare the adverse impacts of future STRs.

Thank you,

Dean Hanselman
38095 Via Estado
Temecula, CA 92592

Jennifer S. Manfredi
32727 Avenida Lestonnac
Temecula, Ca. 92592
Cell (951) 312-8982 Fax (951) 694-8458
JSManfredi@aol.com

John Hildebrand, Planning Director
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street – 12th Floor
Riverside, Ca. 92502-1629

Re: Short-Term Rental DRAFT Ordinance 927.1

April 2, 2022

Dear Planners and District Supervisors:

This letter is in regard to the Short-Term Rental DRAFT Ordinance 927.1. Our family lives next door to a short-term rental (STR) and we are hopeful that strict regulations will be enacted that will limit the noise and problems that STRs are causing. We are not in favor of allowing STRs in Riverside County, but if STRs are to be allowed, then the following regulations should be enacted in order to protect the property rights of the neighboring homes and families:

1. The Maximum Occupancy including non-overnight guests for any STR should be limited to two people per bedroom +1. In addition, the Ordinance should state the following:

Only legally permitted bedrooms shall be used in the above "Maximum Occupancy" calculation. Converted garages, pool homes, offices, or any other attached or detached rooms that were not legally permitted as a residential bedroom at the time of construction shall not be counted as bedrooms.

2. In order to be consistent with the average single-family home in the County of Riverside, the Maximum Occupancy including non-overnight guests for all STRs of any size, with any number of bedrooms should be capped at seven (7) occupants, unless the owner or property manager resides on the same premises in which case the maximum occupancy shall be capped at eleven (11) including the resident property manager or owner. Please note that the average American family size in 2021 is 3.13 persons according to Statista.com, and the average American Household size is 2.6 persons. More than a maximum of seven occupants is not consistent with single family use. Larger occupancies produce more noise and more annoyances to neighbors.

3. Annual on-site inspections of STRs should be required and performed to confirm bedroom counts, fire safety, noise sensors, and ADA access. Because STRs provide the furniture, clean bed sheets, towels and other amenities, STRs are functioning as hotels. Therefore, an annual fire safety inspection by a County Fire Department inspector should be performed in order to ensure that there are adequate fire extinguishers and fire safety precautions in place including functioning smoke alarms and carbon monoxide alarms. ADA access must be provided consistent with what other hotels are required to provide.
An annual general inspection including a bedroom count should also occur.

4. Short-Term Rentals are functioning as businesses. They advertise their businesses on the internet, accept payment online via credit cards, and they pay a Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) to the County of Riverside. All other real-estate-based businesses such as hotels and commercial shopping centers are required to provide ADA access. Therefore, short-term rentals

must provide ADA access as required by the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Otherwise STRs would be in violation of federal ADA law.

5. The County of Riverside shall provide a 24-hour complaint hotline operated seven (7) days each week, 365 days each year. Records of all complaints regarding any STR should be permanently recorded at the County of Riverside, and such information shall be readily available in writing to the public upon written request. Any short-term rental that receives three (3) complaints within a twelve (12) month period shall have its STR certificate revoked and shall not be eligible for renewal.

6. If the owner of a short-term rental desires to host an event, then that event should require a Temporary Event Permit from the County of Riverside, and each STR should be limited to a maximum of one event per calendar year.

7. The minimum rental should be for three (3) nights.

8. The minimum age to rent a short-term rental should be 25 years of age. Please note that in California a person must be at least 25 years of age to rent a rental car.

9. Any property manager or property owner that manages a short-term rental must be a certified property manager. The person who manages the property must live within 30 miles of the short-term rental so that they can personally respond to a complaint if the designated occupant is not readily available by telephone.

10. With regard to on-site parking, all STR parking must be on-site and limited to no more than three (3) cars/vehicles that can be seen from the street. Street parking is not allowed.

11. A minimum fine of \$1,000 (one thousand dollars) per occurrence should be imposed upon any STR that violates any portion of the STR Ordinance. Any non-certified STR should be fined, shut down immediately, and the owner permanently excluded from obtaining a STR certificate in the future.

Short-term rentals inside of residential neighborhoods became "legal" because various attorneys argued that STRs are consistent with single-family use. Occupancies of 15, 20 or 25 occupants are not consistent with single family use. That is why the Maximum Occupancy for all STRs of any size, with any number of bedrooms should be capped at seven (7) occupants.

In addition, some STR's are located on properties with septic systems that were not designed for large occupancies or "hotel use" but rather were designed for single-family home use. With more than seven (7) occupants present, the septic system will likely become overloaded and present an environmental and health hazard including the failure of the septic system and contamination of local groundwater.

Noisy outdoor gatherings on a daily or weekly basis are not consistent with single family use. Larger gatherings produce more shouting, more outdoor activities, more noise, and more annoyances for neighbors. Neighbors cannot enjoy their own back yard when there is constant daily and/or nightly noise coming from the STR next door. Neighbors have property rights too, including the right to quietly enjoy their own homes and outdoor areas without being frequently annoyed by activities and noise coming from a short-term rental next door or nearby. This is why the maximum STR occupancy must be capped at seven (7) occupants.



Jennifer S. Manfredi

3-29-2022

COMMENTS REGARDING THE DRAFT REVISED ORDINANCE 927 (3-22)

I live in an unincorporated area of Riverside County, governed by an HOA in a community called GlenOak Hills. It generally borders De Portola Rd. from GlenOaks Rd. to Camino Del Vino. The area has many Short-Term Rentals and is in a high fire danger area.

Many of the Short Term Rental visitors are not familiar with the County's ban on fireworks. We have had many occasions where fireworks have been set off by these visitors. One instance actually resulted in a brush fire in a nearby field next to the Danza Del Sol Winery.

Illegal fireworks are a real and present danger to our community and many others in Riverside County. It would be helpful for the County to include information in the "Good Neighbor Brochure" that emphasizes the fire danger to many communities as well as the prohibition of fireworks in the County.

Susan Clay

39076 Chaparral Dr.

Temecula CA 92592

Jennifer S. Manfredi
32727 Avenida Lestonnac
Temecula, Ca. 92592
Cell (951) 312-8982 Fax (951) 694-8458
JSManfredi@aol.com

John Hildebrand, Planning Director
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street – 12th Floor
Riverside, Ca. 92502-1629

April 2, 2022

Re: Temecula Wine Country Zoning and Short-Term Rentals

Dear County Planners and Supervisors:

I am writing in reference to Temecula Wine Country and Short-Term Rental Draft Ordinance 927.1. For the following reasons, I would like to state why short-term rentals in Temecula Wine Country residential areas should not be allowed.

Per the County of Riverside General Plan, Southwest Area Plan, GPA No. 1077 Appendix Q, there are three districts established for the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area (map attached):

- Winery - WC-W and WC-WE
- Equestrian - WC-E
- Residential – WC-R

As cited in the above noted General Plan, policies were specified to “*protect against the location of activities that are incompatible with existing residential and equestrian uses, which could lead to land use conflicts in the future. These policies also establish a framework for implementing Wine Country (WC) Zones and Design Guidelines, which have been established to further promote and preserve the **distinctive character of this unique area.***”.

Per the Southwest Area General Plan No. 1077, the following is the description for Wine Country Residential District:

*The Wine Country – Residential District is located in the central and northeastern portions of the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area. **The purpose of the Residential District is to encourage PERMANENT estate lot residential stock in this region to balance the tourism related activities.***

*SWAP 1.19 **Encourage residential development** that complements the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area as described in the Wine Country – Residential (WC-R) Zone.*

Per County of Riverside Ordinance No. 348.4791, Providing for Land Use Planning and Zoning Regulations and Related Functions of the County of Riverside in Wine Country:

Section 14.98 – Authorized Uses, Wine Country – Residential (WC-R) Zone:

A. Allowed Uses: The following are allowed:

1. One-family dwelling.

*B. **CONDITIONALLY PERMITTED USES WITH A PLOT PLAN.***

The following uses are permitted provided a plot plan has first been approved pursuant to Section 18.30 of this ordinance.

1. *In addition to the principal dwelling, an additional one family dwelling may be permitted for each ten acres of a farm. Any such additional dwelling shall be located on a lot being farmed and may be occupied by the owner, operator, or employee of the farming operation as a one family dwelling provided that: **The dwelling is not rented or offered for lease.***

As residents of Temecula Wine Country, we are aware that the Winery District is an area devoted to tourism. We accept the additional traffic, commercial activities and expansion that comes with growth of the Winery District. We do not accept the inundation of STR tourists in Wine Country **residential areas**.

As noted in the General Plan, the purpose of the Residential District and permanent estate lot residential stock in this region is to balance the tourism related activities created by the Winery District, not create an additional transient activity. Note the important words "**to balance the tourism related activities**". STR's by nature are transient and do not balance the tourism, they add more transients to the community! Jeff Stone, Dan Stevenson and others who crafted the original Plan, were aware that a community with an entirely transient population, isn't a community. By allowing STR's in the Wine Country Residential District, you are negating the very purpose of the well-crafted existing Plan!

I believe for these (3) established mandates, you are in direct violation of the Temecula Wine Country Zoning and Community Plan. As such, please add an exception stating STR's are not allowed in the areas zoned WC-R. Additionally once STR permitting is established in the County, all existing short-term rentals in Wine Country Residential WC-R (which are currently in violation of the community plan) shall not be granted permits.

Sincerely



Jennifer S. Manfredi

Stephen J. Manfredi, M.D.
32727 Avenida Lestonnac
Temecula, Ca. 92592
Cell (951) 312-9003 Fax (951) 694-8458
SJManfredi@aol.com

John Hildebrand, Planning Director
Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street – 12th Floor
Riverside, Ca. 92502-1629

April 2, 2022

Re: Temecula Wine Country Zoning and Short-Term Rentals

Dear County Planners and Supervisors:

I am writing in reference to Temecula Wine Country and Short-Term Rental Draft Ordinance 927.1. For the following reasons, I would like to state why short-term rentals in Temecula Wine Country residential areas should not be allowed.

Per the County of Riverside General Plan, Southwest Area Plan, GPA No. 1077 Appendix Q, there are three districts established for the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area (map attached):

- Winery - WC-W and WC-WE
- Equestrian - WC-E
- Residential – WC-R

As cited in the above noted General Plan, policies were specified to “*protect against the location of activities that are incompatible with existing residential and equestrian uses, which could lead to land use conflicts in the future. These policies also establish a framework for implementing Wine Country (WC) Zones and Design Guidelines, which have been established to further promote and preserve the **distinctive character of this unique area.***”.

Per the Southwest Area General Plan No. 1077, the following is the description for Wine Country Residential District:

*The Wine Country – Residential District is located in the central and northeastern portions of the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area. **The purpose of the Residential District is to encourage PERMANENT estate lot residential stock in this region to balance the tourism related activities.***

*SWAP 1.19 **Encourage residential development** that complements the Temecula Valley Wine Country Policy Area as described in the Wine Country – Residential (WC-R) Zone.*

Per County of Riverside Ordinance No. 348.4791, Providing for Land Use Planning and Zoning Regulations and Related Functions of the County of Riverside in Wine Country:

Section 14.98 – Authorized Uses, Wine Country – Residential (WC-R) Zone:

A. Allowed Uses: The following are allowed:

1. One-family dwelling.

*B. **CONDITIONALLY PERMITTED USES WITH A PLOT PLAN.***

The following uses are permitted provided a plot plan has first been approved pursuant to Section 18.30 of this ordinance.

1. *In addition to the principal dwelling, an additional one family dwelling may be permitted for each ten acres of a farm. Any such additional dwelling shall be located on a lot being farmed and may be occupied by the owner, operator, or employee of the farming operation as a one family dwelling provided that: **The dwelling is not rented or offered for lease.***

As residents of Temecula Wine Country, we are aware that the Winery District is an area devoted to tourism. We accept the additional traffic, commercial activities and expansion that comes with growth of the Winery District. We do not accept the inundation of STR tourists in Wine Country **residential areas**.

As noted in the General Plan, the purpose of the Residential District and permanent estate lot residential stock in this region is to balance the tourism related activities created by the Winery District, not create an additional transient activity. Note the important words "**to balance the tourism related activities**". STR's by nature are transient and do not balance the tourism, they add more transients to the community! Jeff Stone, Dan Stevenson and others who crafted the original Plan, were aware that a community with an entirely transient population, isn't a community. By allowing STR's in the Wine Country Residential District, you are negating the very purpose of the well-crafted existing Plan!

I believe for these (3) established mandates, you are in direct violation of the Temecula Wine Country Zoning and Community Plan. As such, please add an exception stating STR's are not allowed in the areas zoned WC-R. Additionally once STR permitting is established in the County, all existing short-term rentals in Wine Country Residential WC-R (which are currently in violation of the community plan) shall not be granted permits.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "S Manfredi".

Stephen J. Manfredi, M.D.