The logic that ownership of short term rentals needs to be restricted to a number of units has no merit. How would restricting the size of someone's business remedy the concerns the City is sighting?

I have stayed in many Air BNB properties in different cities. The owners have always been very attentive and keep the properties in impeccable condition. I am sure there have been guests that have caused noise or left messes, but the owners do not have to go through a long process of eviction, so therefore the problems cannot linger. Whereas with regular long term rentals, if you have a problem tenant it could take weeks or even months to have them leave. The City has no restrictions on how many regular longterm rental properties can be owned by a landlord, so why do they target short term rentals? The City's proposed solution is misguided.

STR properties are a great solution for many people, and offer accommodation that is more private than a hotel. Immigrants that have no home or furniture yet. Tourists that want a comfortable home environment. Temporary stay during transitional times in life. Why not establish regulations, fines, taxes, etc., if needed to make sure the owners do keep the properties in good repair and not a nuisance to the community. I have never till now heard that these properties or the owner's care of them is an issue. Why are STR properties being singled out? There are many long term rental properties that are nuisances in the community, negatively affect housing value, safety concerns, etc., but there is no restriction of how many properties a person can own and manage. Whether long term or short term, the problem is not the number of units someone owns, but how they manage and care for them. Regulate that issue, not the quantity of ownership.

Thank you, Sherry Bosa