

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

NORTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT  
455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 300  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
PHONE: (415) 904-5260  
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



# Th10a

LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (City of Pacifica Short Term Rentals)

June 13, 2024

CORRESPONDENCE



June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024

California Coastal Commission  
455 Market Street, Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
[NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov)

VIA EMAIL

**RE: City of Pacifica LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (City of Pacifica Short Term Rentals) – Oppose Unless Amended**

Dear Honorable Chair Hart and Commissioners,

Better Neighbors Los Angeles is a coalition of hosts, tenants, housing activists and community members. We conduct data analysis and research on the short-term rental industry, including the industry’s impact on coastal communities. In addition, Better Neighbors works to promote short-term rental policies that foster true home-sharing in hosted only short-term rentals within the Coastal Zone because this is the best way to balance the preservation of affordable housing and coastal public access.

As submitted, the City of Pacifica Short Term Rentals LCPA (“LCPA”) does not include several key policies many other coastal cities have adopted to protect housing and provide truly lower-cost overnight accommodations. Unhosted STRs turn desperately-needed coastal housing stock into luxury vacation rentals for the wealthiest travelers. This includes clear definitions of unhosted and hosted short-term rentals, a primary residency requirement for hosts, a limit of one short-term rental per natural person, and a cap on the number of nights an unhosted short-term rental may be operated per year. Without these key provisions, the proposed 150 cap on short-term rentals citywide included in the LCPA will not adequately safeguard existing housing stock nor necessarily contribute affordable overnight accommodation options for visitors. For these reasons, we request the Commission to amend the LCPA to define unhosted and hosted short-term rentals, adopt a primary residency requirement for hosts, place a limit of one short-term rental per person, and include a 60-night cap on the number of nights an unhosted short-term rental may be operated annually.

**Majority of Pacifica STRs are Unhosted and Remove Housing Stock**

According to AirDNA, as of March 2023 there were approximately 198 short-term rentals operating in Pacifica, 173 of which were unhosted.<sup>1</sup> Pacifica has seen also seen

---

<sup>1</sup> Data on file with BNLA. AirDNA combines data from STR websites to put together a picture of the STR market in a particular area: <https://www.airdna.co/>

significant growth in the number of unhosted short-term rentals over the years. Between May 2017 and March 2023, the number of unhosted short-term rentals increased by more than 100 total listings, from 67 in May 2017 to 173 as of March 2023.<sup>2</sup> This sharp increase illustrates the corporatization of housing for tourist-serving accommodations, at the cost of available housing options for long-term residents. According to the Pacifica 2023-2031 Housing Element, this loss of housing stock to tourist-serving accommodations is contributing to fair housing issues within the City: “Pacifica’s housing market is influenced by economic pressures to convert a portion of its housing stock to short-term vacation rentals.”<sup>3</sup> Without an LCPA that adequately differentiates between hosted and unhosted short-term rentals, and makes certain unhosted short-term rentals function as housing, these economic pressures will likely contribute to the threat of displacement of Pacifica’s long-term residents.

### **Pacifica Unhosted STRS Are Not Affordable Overnight Accommodations**

According to a forthcoming report by Nicholas DiRago of the University of California-Los Angeles, the average cost for an unhosted short-term rental in Pacifica’s Coastal Zone ranges from \$235 to \$495 per night.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, the average price per night of a hotel room accommodating two people is \$193.37 as of June 2024.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, on average, an unhosted short-term rental is at minimum \$41.63 more expensive than a comparable hotel room. Unhosted short-term rentals thus cannot be considered affordable overnight accommodations in Pacifica when compared to hotels. As stated in the staff report, Pacifica has approximately 330 hotel rooms, including seven hotels, two of which offer rooms with kitchenettes.

### **Recommendations**

Based on our data analysis, we ask the Commission to amend the LCPA to include the following provisions:

---

<sup>2</sup> Data on file with BNLA. In May 2017, approximately 67 unhosted short-term rentals existed in Pacifica compared to 173 as of March 2023.

<sup>3</sup> Pacifica 2023-2031 Housing Element, Appendix D: City of Pacifica Assessment of Fair Housing, page 169: <https://cityofpacifica.egnyte.com/dl/e1sZRgKp7W>.

<sup>4</sup> Data on file with BNLA. Average daily rate accounts for April 2022-March 2023.

<sup>5</sup> America’s Best Value Inn Pacifica: <https://www.sonesta.com/americas-best-value-inn/ca/pacific/a/americas-best-value-inn-san-francisco-pacific/a>; The Anchor Inn: <https://anchorinnhotels.com/book-now/>; Fairfield Inn & Suites San Francisco Pacifica: <https://www.marriott.com/reservation/rateListMenu.mi>; Inn at Rockaway: [https://www.innatrockaway.com/reservations?room\\_check\\_in=2024-06-06&room\\_check\\_out=2024-06-07&promo\\_code=&rooms=1&room1=2](https://www.innatrockaway.com/reservations?room_check_in=2024-06-06&room_check_out=2024-06-07&promo_code=&rooms=1&room1=2); Pacifica Beach Hotel: <https://be.synxis.com/?adult=1&arrive=2024-06-06&chain=28109&child=0&currency=USD&depart=2024-06-07&hotel=35301&level=hotel&locale=en-US&rooms=1&start=availresults>; Pacifica Lighthouse Hotel, Trademark Collection by Wyndham: <https://www.pacificallighthouse.com/>; Sea Breeze Motel at Rockaway Beach: <https://www.seabreezerockaway.com/>.

1. *Define Unhosted vs. Hosted Short-Term Rentals:* According to the current LCPA, there is no distinction between unhosted and hosted short-term rentals. Currently, unhosted short-term rentals do not function as housing, while hosted short-term rentals necessarily function as housing. The LCPA should be amended to include this distinction for two reasons. First, this distinction will provide the City and the Commission with data needed to better understand the impacts of short-term rentals. Second, this distinction coupled with the 60-night annual cap will provide hosts with the ability to continue renting out their primary residence on a limited basis.
2. *Primary Residency Requirement for Hosts:* The Commission has in the past approved primary residency requirements for short-term rental hosts in jurisdictions such as the City of Half Moon Bay in March 2023.<sup>6</sup> A primary residency requirement ensures a short-term rental is used primarily as housing, with short-term renting as a secondary use.
3. *Limit One STR Per Natural Person:* Without a limit of one short-term rental per natural person, corporate hosts will be allowed to proliferate in Pacifica. By their very nature, corporate hosts do not use their properties as long-term housing, and instead operate these homes as de facto hotels. The Commission most recently approved this policy in Marin County in April 2024.<sup>7</sup>
4. *60-Night Cap on Unhosted STRs Annually:* Unhosted short-term rentals limited to 60 nights per year would be protective of coastal access, especially in a jurisdiction with limited housing stock. Furthermore, with a cap limited to only unhosted short-term rentals, hosted short-term rentals would continue to provide affordable coastal access for visitors. This cap is similar to the one approved by the Commission in March 2023 for the City of Half Moon Bay.<sup>8</sup>

### **Conclusion**

Fundamentally, as submitted, the City of Pacifica's LCPA with a modest 150 cap will not adequately safeguard long-term residents from the impacts of unhosted short-term rentals and will not ensure affordable coastal access for visitors. For these reasons, Better Neighbors asks that you amend the LCPA as outlined in our recommendations. Should you have any questions, please contact Becca Ayala at [rebecca@betterneighborsla.org](mailto:rebecca@betterneighborsla.org).

/s/ Randy Renick

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2023/3/W14b/W14b-3-2023-report.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2024/4/Th9a/Th9a-4-2024-report.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2023/3/W14b/W14b-3-2023-report.pdf>

**From:** [Cindy Abbott](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [KoppmanNorton.Julia@Coastal](mailto:KoppmanNorton.Julia@Coastal); [Ringuette.Oceane@Coastal](mailto:Ringuette.Oceane@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 4:20:01 PM

---

Dear Chair Hart, California Coastal Commissioners and Coastal Staff,

Thank you for all of your work to protect and provide access to the amazing California coast. This includes your recent important discussions (including the CCC December 2023 meeting presentations) about the value of maintaining coastal neighborhoods and recognition that the proliferation of un-hosted short term rentals are impacting the affordability of living on the coast and undermining residential zoning as homes and apartments are changed to commercial enterprises.

In Pacifica – like elsewhere along the coast and in communities throughout California -- we've seen residential neighborhoods negatively impacted as more and more housing is purchased by real estate investors who are converting units to full time un-hosted short-term rentals. The impact has been increased home and rental prices, loss of neighbors and community, and a revolving door of people in and out like at a hotel without the structure of management.

With escalating concerns from throughout Pacifica, the City Council has prioritized further review of the 2018 Short Term Rental (STR) Ordinance and a study session has been promised to take place soon. Why? Because Pacifica residents recognize that the a cap of 150 STR **permits** versus units alone doesn't protect long-term affordable housing and displacement concerns or ensure the safety and vitality of neighborhoods.

- The proposed cap doesn't set guidelines about how to allocate permits and could result in all 150 permits being in the Coastal Zone.
- The 150 permit cap doesn't mitigate the disruption to neighborhood character and safety of un-hosted STRs with unlimited nights per year in residential neighborhoods.

Meaningful updates such as a primary residency requirement, limiting the number of STRs per owner/operator within city limits, and operating limits on the number of rental nights per year, such as have been approved in other coastal communities are needed.

Over the past several years, I've seen homes in my neighborhood where families used to live and kids played, be taken over by short term rentals. I'm part of a growing group of residents who see the negative effects of unhosted STRs on the City and are encouraging positive change that can provide access and accommodations without residential neighborhoods being commercial zones. We look forward to supporting an amended STR Ordinance for your review and approval in the near future.

With appreciation and regard for the work you do,

Cindy Abbott  
West Sharp Park  
Pacifica

**From:** [Gary Furlong](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 4:18:02 PM

---

I would like to thank the commissioners for their efforts on behalf of citizens of this state to maintain and improve the coastal regions of California. Your work is invaluable.

My comments today are in regards to City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short Term Rentals). The city of Pacifica has put forward a revised ordinance in regards to Short Term Rentals in the city of Pacifica, which, among other things, will limit the number of permits for STRs to 150 in the city of Pacifica. For the last 24 years I have resided in the Pedro Point neighborhood of Pacifica; this is a somewhat small, rather geographically isolated neighborhood that is near one of the popular beaches in Pacifica. Over the years our neighborhood has developed into a rather social, friendly neighborhood where neighbors know each other, socialize with each other and generally make a point of helping each other out when there is a need. Really, a version of what many would consider the American dream. However, that is being threatened by the rapid, extensive spread of unhosted short term rentals in our neighborhood. Instead of having a family rent or own a home we have a about 30 houses that now serve as unhosted short term rentals in our small neighborhood; that's 30 UNhosted STRs (there are also some hosted STRs). And this number is growing. These unhosted short term rentals are a threat to the character of our neighborhood; they are removing houses from the housing market as well as driving up the cost of rentals and home prices (points that Dr. David Wachsmuth made to the Coastal Commission in his excellent presentation on December 14, 2023, which I would encourage everyone to review again).

It is my belief that the proposed ordinance for Pacifica hardly begins to address this issue; at most it might be considered a first step though I think it would serve us to have a more forceful first step. The city is proposing 150 permits, not 150 STRs, as some permits are for multiple units. Instead we need an ordinance more akin to some that the Commission has already approved such as the one in Half Moon Bay. Key and essential points of the ordinance for Half Moon Bay are:

- \* a residency requirement; the owner must live at the property for more than half a year before using it as a STR.
- \* only one STR per owner/operator within the city
- \* a limit of no more than 60 operating nights per year for an unhosted STR (personally, I would prefer a much, much lower limit).

It is our hope that in the near future members of the community will be able to work with the members of the city council and staff to create an ordinance that more closely reflects what will help to preserve our city of Pacifica and neighborhoods like mine. In the meantime we continue to watch houses being removed from the housing market to be made into what are

essentially "micro-hotels", we watch the price of our housing stock and rentals continue to go up as owners of unhosted STRs compete with potential home owners and renters for the available housing stock, we watch neighborhoods such as mine being hollowed out and we watch our city police being called repeatedly to deal with issues at unhosted STRs.

Regards,  
Gary Furlong

**From:** [Kris Geiger](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 3:40:50 PM

---

Dear California Coastal Commissioners, We are respectfully submitting our comments in regard to the ongoing proliferation of un-hosted and/or unpermitted Short Term Rentals (STR) in our neighborhood and City. We participate and support our local community at events, gatherings and as neighbors. However, that is being threatened by the rapid spread in unhosted short term rentals in our neighborhood.

We would like to ensure that the City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short Term Rentals) will limit the number of permits for STRs in the city of Pacifica. We feel there is an urgent need in Pacifica and on our own street to take strong action. It seems that STR proliferation is unending as more and more formerly family occupied houses are lost to absentee owners who offer the homes in all or part as Short Term Rentals. If this trend continues we sense that we are in danger of losing our sense of community.

Moreover, we feel that the proposed ordinance for Pacifica does not fully address the issue; it might be considered a first step but we think it would serve us better to have a more controls in place.

The city is proposing 150 STR permits, not 150 STRs. We need additional protections, such as buildings housing multiple unit STR requiring more than one permit

And adopting the following requirements:

- a residency requirement; the owner must live at the property for a one year period from ownership before using it as a STR.



- only one STR per owner/operator within the city

- a limit of no more than 60 operating nights per year for an unhosted STR (personally, I would prefer a much, much lower limit).

It is our hope that the Pacifica community will be able to have more protections added by working with the City Council, Staff and The Coastal Commission. We need to implement an ordinance that preserves our neighborhoods.

In closing, we appreciate your efforts on behalf of citizens of this state to maintain and improve the coastal areas of California.



**From:** [Patricia Kephart](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 12:23:59 PM

---

Dear California Coastal Commissioners:

Thank you for understanding the negative impacts of unhosted STRs as evidenced by the current ordinance approved in Half Moon Bay.

As a Pacifica resident, the proposed cap will not help address our city's experience. What we need is an amendment to the current STR ordinance to mirror what's in place for Half Moon Bay.

We look forward to working with City staff and council to create this amendment and bring it to the CCC very soon.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Kephart  
1162 Barcelona Dr.  
Pacifica, CA. 94044  
650-678-0476

**From:** [Erin Macias](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 8:00:58 AM

---

I am a Pacifica resident impacted by Short Term Rentals in our community. I am asking you to please mirror what Half Moon Bay has done. The cap needs to be “per unit” not “per permit” as there are operators who acquire housing units and operate multiple under one permit. For example, there is one operator in Pacifica who holds a permit for 17, yes seventeen!, of these rentals. That is 17 families displaced from housing stability and countless more that are directly impacted by the equity issue these rentals create. Short term rentals are not affordable, they are creating barriers to beach access due to their lack of affordability. Please carefully consider the proposal before you and require the cap to be per unit, not per permit. Thank you for your hard work on this difficult issue affecting our coastal communities.

Warmly,  
Erin Macias  
Pacifica CA

**From:** [robert.odonnell](mailto:robert.odonnell@northcentralcoast.com)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 2:55:26 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for your consideration of the issue of Short Term Rentals in Pacifica. We have a real problem in our City with a weak ordinance that needs to be amended. Neighborhoods are being negatively impacted with a slew of STR's unsupervised and degrading the residential areas. Other cities like Half Moon Bay have enacted strong appropriate ordinances to correct this problem and Pacifica needs to do the same. Citizens here are willing and able to work with our City Council and Staff to enact such an ordinance. I encourage the Coastal Commission to support us as we work to be develop and implement an upgraded ordinance to properly manage short term rentals. We hope this can be accomplished in the short term.

Thank you,

Robert and Jacqueline O'Donnell  
Aspen Dr. Pacifica, CA

Jacqueline O'Donnell

**From:** [Caitlin Quinn](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 7:50:08 AM

---

Dear Commissioners,

I want to thank you for the important work you do that cares for our beautiful coastline—and especially for the work you have been engaging in recently to protect California’s coastal neighborhoods and their resources from being commercialized by unhosted short-term rentals (STRs) and converting neighborhoods into unregulated hotel districts.

In terms of **City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals)**, which requests that a cap of 150 be placed on STR permits (sadly, NOT units) in Pacifica, I ask you to please keep in mind that while restrictions of any kind being placed on unhosted STRs in our beautiful city will be appreciated by residents here, **many of us believe that what our City truly needs is an amended STR ordinance that puts in place the types of restrictions you so wisely granted our sister-city, Half Moon Bay, such as:**

- **A primary residence requirement for all STR owners/operators;**
- **A limit of one (1) STR per owner/operator within the city limits; and**
- **An operating limit of 60 nights per year for unhosted STRs.**

While our City staff currently counts 100 STRs on its permit roster, **the actual number of STRs operating in Pacifica (according to the non-profit data hub, Inside Airbnb) is well over 200.** The majority of these STRs are unhosted and **owned by real estate investors who have taken much-needed homes from our community and converted them into de facto hotels.** In fact, of the **23 homes on my street, 12 of them are now unhosted STRs—that’s 52% of the immediate neighborhood!**

When my partner and I purchased our home in Pacifica’s West Sharp Park neighborhood seven years ago, it was a dream come true. That dream morphed into a nightmare when our next-door neighbor sold their home to a corporation that turned the house into a full-time, unhosted STR. This conversion resulted in a long-term renter—a single woman who works in education non-profit—losing her home. For nearly two years now, we have lived with “checking in” and “checking out” noise at all hours of the night/early morning, trespassing, the dumping of unsorted trash in our bins, cigarette smoke filling our home and impacting our health, distress over dogs left abandoned at the property, and light pollution. We have even had the police come to our door to ask if we had seen “any activities involving children and drugs at the Airbnb next door.”

The corporation that owns and operates the unhosted STR next door to us also owns and operates 17 other unhosted STRs in Pacifica and 180+ STRs across California. It has no interest in being a “good neighbor.” Its only concern is how much profit it can make from renting out the home as a luxury accommodation for \$500+ dollars a night. (Note: the cost to rent this three-bedroom home for the three nights of July 4th weekend is in excess of \$4,600.) In the beginning, we tried to reach out to this corporation, pleading to speak with someone in a leadership role there with whom we could work on abating the issues that were destabilizing our lives and impacting our health, only to be palmed off to a phone number or generic email address that goes to a customer service rep based outside the U.S. When I did finally make contact with a property manager who lives in Northern California, this property manager told me that the solution to being woken up by their guests’ late-night noise was for me to “Go to a doctor and be put on medication.” When we reached out to Airbnb’s Neighborhood Support platform for help, the corporation had its attorney send us a threatening letter—the same type of threatening letter we learned had also been sent to other Pacifica

residents who had complained about other properties owned and operated by this same corporation.

We are not wealthy. It took us nearly 40 years to save up enough money to buy our first home, and we are a single-income family, with that income coming from a non-profit. Our entire life savings has been sunk into a home we thought would be our “forever home” that would take us into retirement. Now, our dreams have turned toward selling this home to escape the ongoing trauma from an untenable situation that has been thrust upon us, only to be told by realtors that the value of our home has been negatively affected because we now live next door to an unhosted STR.

The City of Pacifica's current **“good neighbor policies” where unhosted STRs are concerned have been extraordinarily ineffective**—not only for us, but for hundreds of residents across our city. **What is needed is an amended STR ordinance that puts in place the types of restrictions on unhosted STRs that nearly every other city in San Mateo County, including Half Moon Bay, has enacted in order to stem:**

- **the loss of homes;**
- **the loss of families, which means the loss of children in our school systems;**
- **the inflation of housing prices that shut families out of the market;**
- **the devastating drop in the value of the homes of those residents unfortunate enough to live near an unhosted STR;**
- **the strain put on water and other resources for homes that would normally house 3-4 people and now regularly house double or even triple that number of people (people for whom conservation of utilities is not a priority since they are not paying for them);**
- **the degradation of security and community;**
- **and the loss of our neighborhoods’ character.**

I am a member of a growing group of Pacifica residents who are impacted by and concerned with the negative effects of unhosted STRs on our City, and we are committed to working with our City Council and staff on the creation of such amended STR ordinance that we look forward eagerly to bringing before you in the very near future.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Quinn

**From:** [Lyla Reiner](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [Bryan Reiner](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 12:25:30 PM

---

Dear Commissioners,

Full disclosure: We are borrowing language for this letter from another concerned citizen of Pacifica, however, the sentiment remains the same.

We want to thank you for the important work you do that cares for and protects our beautiful coastline—and especially for the work you have been engaging in recently to protect California's coastal neighborhoods and their resources from being commercialized by unhosted short-term rentals (STRs) and converting neighborhoods into unregulated hotel districts.

In terms of the **City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals)**, which requests that a cap of 150 be placed on STR permits (sadly, NOT units) in Pacifica, we ask you to please keep in mind that while restrictions of any kind being placed on unhosted STRs in our beautiful city will be appreciated by residents here, many of us believe that what our City truly needs is an amended STR ordinance that puts in place the types of restrictions you so wisely granted our sister-city, Half Moon Bay, such as:

- A primary residence requirement for all STR owners/operators
- A limit of one (1) STR per owner/operator within the city limits
- An operating limit of 60 nights per year for unhosted STRs.

While our City staff currently counts 100 STRs on its permit roster, the actual number of STRs operating in Pacifica (according to the non-profit data hub, Inside Airbnb) is [230](#). (A search on [Airbnb for Pacifica](#) shows similar numbers). The majority of these STRs are unhosted and owned by real estate investors who have taken much-needed housing stock from our community and converted them into de facto hotels. This causes issues for all of Pacifica, however those of us living in the coastal zone are disproportionately affected.

When my husband and I purchased our home in Pacifica's Pedro Point neighborhood 13 years ago, it was a dream come true for our family of 4 (soon to be 5!). We loved the sense of community here, and knowing all of our immediate neighbors. In 2019, the cottage uphill across the street from us was sold by a lovely young couple (who were looking to move to a larger space to start their family) to a corporation that quickly turned the house into a full-time, unhosted STR. The new owner/operators came in and did a quick job of converting a [2BR/1BA cottage](#) into what is currently listed on STR sites as a [4BR/2BA property](#). Permits were never pulled for any of the illegal conversions that they did, including turning one of the external garage/storage areas into a "guest cottage". This "work" was all completed shortly before the pandemic began, and it has been a nightmare living across from them ever since.

Among the issues we've had to deal with include loud parties, multiple cars parking illegally, "checking in" and "checking out" disturbances (tires screeching because of the guests' inability to navigate the steep driveway), trespassing (guests arriving at our home with poor GPS directions), cigarette and or marijuana smoke filling our home and impacting our health, among other things. We fear for our family's safety and privacy. The STR across from us looks down directly to our property. There's nothing to stop a "guest" from returning to our neighborhood, and we would have no idea which one it was. We have called the police on multiple occasions, yet we hate to do so over things that may seem trivial (not wanting to waste our precious resources).

The corporation that owns and operates the unhosted STR across from us also manages at [least 17 unhosted STRs](#) in Pacifica alone and 180+ STRs across California. It has no interest in being a "good neighbor." Its only concern is how much profit it can make from renting out these homes as luxury accommodations for \$500+ dollars a night. (Note: the cost to rent this property for the 2 nights of July 4th weekend is nearly \$3,000.) Efforts to reach the property managers are difficult. Emails appear to be responded by AI (not actual people) and phone calls are unanswered. The property had a mudslide almost 18 months ago resulting in a muddy waterfall flowing into our driveway and garage. There has been minimal effort for them to construct a retaining wall to prevent further potential damage. We also fear retaliation from this corporation because at one point they had an attorney who sent us threatening letters for having called the police (this same attorney has sent other Pacificans similar letters threatening to take legal action for "impeding his client's business").

It is exhausting living across from this nuisance property. I've never had high blood pressure in my life until recently.

The City of Pacifica's current "good neighbor policies" where unhosted STRs are concerned have been extraordinarily ineffective—not only for us, but for hundreds of residents across our city. What is needed is an amended STR ordinance that puts in place the types of restrictions on unhosted STRs that nearly every other city in San Mateo County, including Half Moon Bay, has enacted in order to stem:

- the loss of homes for full-time residents
- population decline ([10% decline since 2020 census](#))
- the loss of families, which means the loss of children in our school systems
- the inflation of housing prices that shut families out of the market. Rising rents lead to minimal housing available for long-term rentals (only [35 LTRs](#) available as of today)
- the devastating drop in the value of the homes of those residents unfortunate enough to live near an unhosted STR
- the strain put on water and other resources for homes that would normally house 3-4 people and now regularly house double or even triple that number of people (people for whom conservation of utilities is not a priority since they are not paying for them). Pacifica does not have the infrastructure to handle its current sewage situation
- the degradation of security and community

- and the loss of our neighborhoods' character.

We are members of a growing group of Pacifica residents who are impacted by and concerned with the negative effects of unhosted STRs on our City and we are committed to working with our City Council and staff on the creation of such amended STR ordinance that we look forward eagerly to bringing before you in the very near future.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Thanks and take care,  
Lyla and Bryan Reiner  
1531 Grand Ave, Pacifica, CA 94044

Lyla cell: 415.596.2740



**From:** [Stephanie Robbins](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, June 7, 2024 5:06:05 PM

---

Dear Pacific City Council and Staff,

I want to thank the council for your understanding and concern for the negative impacts of unhosted Short Term Rentals (SRTs) on our coastal communities, as evidenced by the ordinances they have approved in places like Half Moon Bay. However, we the residents of West Sharp Park do not believe the proposed cap will help address the serious issues our City is experiencing due to the large numbers of unhosted STRs in our neighborhood. We need to truly amend our current ordinance to ensure the peace, continuity and safety of our neighborhood. I truly look forward to working with the City Council and staff on the creation of such an amended ordinance and to bringing it before the CCC in the very near future.

Thank you,  
Stephanie Robbins  
15 Santa Rosa Ave

**From:** [Morgen Underhill](#)  
**To:** [NorthCentralCoast@Coastal](mailto:NorthCentralCoast@Coastal)  
**Subject:** Re: Public Comment on June 2024 Agenda Item Thursday 10a - City of Pacifica LCP Amendment No. LCP-2-PAC-23-0023-1 (Short-Term Rentals).  
**Date:** Friday, May 24, 2024 4:42:40 PM

---

Sorry to send a second email, but if the proposed ammendment involves a cap on permits and limiting the number of nights per year, then Google's Gemini AI is really quite impressive.

Also, if that's the case, I'd like to say that nightly limits are probably a bad idea because they address symptoms rather than the causes of the problems we've been having, and that I think it would be much more effective in terms of addressing the problem and in terms of preserving the maximum amount of tax revenue possible for the city, to only place caps on those STRs at which the owner does not reside. STRs that involve homeowners renting out some or all of their own home are not causing the problems we're experiencing; it's the ones where there is no one readily at hand in the moment that guests are behaving inappropriately to hold accountable for their actions.

On Fri, May 24, 2024, 3:33 PM Morgen Underhill <[m.s.underhill23@gmail.com](mailto:m.s.underhill23@gmail.com)> wrote:

Neither the email notification of the hearing, the web pages it directs one to, nor a search of the web has been able to provide insight as to what the proposed ammendment is. I'm sure I either support or oppose it, but first and foremost I support being more explicit in our communications about such things.

That said, if the proposal would involve measures which would make it harder for corporate or absentee STRs to exist and supported the use of STRs as a gig-economy supplemental income by local homeowners, I would support it.