

Short-Term Rental Proposed Ordinance - Public Comments Submitted Through the Village Website as of October 14, 2021

There are 76 total comments with several individuals posting multiple times.

Short Term Rentals

Submitted by J. Dickens. The ordinance is good. However the definition of "Short Term Rentals" applies to 'an owner occupied" What about an owner who lives elsewhere and owns an apartment solely for AirBnB type of rental? A much larger issue than offering a room in an occupied house or apartment.

the proposed regulations are a good start

Submitted by Daniel Kirsner. It is reasonable for short term rentals to be regulated and licensed the same way as bed and breakfasts are. Oak Park's housing stock is limited, and the use of it for housing visitors should be supervised in a consistent manner across traditional (bed and breakfast/hotel) and new (Airbnb, VRBO, etc) channels.

Agree

Submitted by Anonymous. Agree

New regulations are not needed.

Submitted by Matthew Arata. This is an overreaction to a single event. Adding taxes and regulations puts extra burden on residents and provides very little benefit. Having a license will not stop random bad actors, it will only punish residents and property owners.

Strongly agree!!!

Submitted by WEIZHE AN. Strongly agree!!!

Regulations are extreme!

Submitted by Margaret Flynn. I listed my home on Airbnb for about a year so I could spend time with a dying relative. I could not cover my mortgage and costs (no one wants to rent in winter) but it was a big help to make up some of the money. These regulations seemed designed to eliminate Airbnb rentals in Oak Park by putting a huge cost and burden on home owners without offering any useful service. Hardship seems especially severe for homeowners who rent out on an occasional basis.

Village shall relief burdens to residents.

Submitted by William. Village shall relief burdens to residents, including home owners and renters. Imposing these ordinance and fees goes to the opposite. It will also decrease property value as investors are stopped by fees and costs.

Short term

Submitted by TM. Is it a home or a business? Zoning should keep the unwanted business away from homes that prefer not to have it nearby. I think home owners on each block should have a say if they want the risks associated with this on their block. If they do, then set the rules for the business allowed. Just owning a house is not a pass to bring unwanted risks into your community. My 3cTy

License amount is too high and inspection unnecessary

Submitted by Carl Urness. Charging the same amount as bed and breakfasts is unfair for at least two reasons. First, a bed and breakfast is a full-time business, with a primary focus on hospitality. People renting out a room to a person is not primary business income. It is an income supplement. Second, on first impression it seems the idea to use a license and fee attributed to something similar (bed and breakfasts) should make sense. After all it is part of the name for AirBNB. Instead that demonstrates little thought was put toward this ordinance. There is much more nuance in regard to people using a service such as VRBO, AirBNB, etc. to rent out space. Homeowners are not making as much income as the village seems to think. If there is a desire to charge a fee, at minimum it should be lower than a bed and breakfast license. Also, the license fee should be returned to the home owner annually. There is no need for the village to pull that money from citizens. Unless there is some kind of service funded with that money. And at this time, there is no reason for the village to create a new service to regulate this industry. Inspections in this case are at least a double tax, if not more. I say this because each home in Oak Park has to pay for an inspection when working on it. This ordinance proposes a new annual inspection will happen to review the same home. Exactly how much do you expect these rentals to change in a year? And what would be inspected? And what qualifies a person for the job of AirBNB inspector?

Inspections are unnecessary: Part of the reason AirBNB, and other similar services have success is that customers are the best regulator for it. People will provide feedback in the form of star ratings, and each rental is constantly getting rated. That is much more often than annually, more effective, and it does not cost money.

New ordinance is not needed

Submitted by William. Dear Village President, Trustees, Officers, I am shocked by this overwhelming proposal. As a general financial rule, restrictions on real estate will drag down property value. You are also resident of Oak Park and do not want to see the bad trends in this area. The proposed ordinance poses unnecessary regulations, inspections, approval, licensing, and fees to homeowners, and eventually to renters. The property tax in Oak Park is already very high. Who wants another layer of cost? Regarding the hassles of short-term renters, they shall be welcome to the neighborhood. If any renters violate the law, they are subject to legal punishment. Banning or require additional licensing is overdone.

I sincerely hope you stop on this ordinance.

This will hurt diversity in OP/Extreme and Govt overstep

Submitted by T Schultz. As a single mom in Oak Park, short term rental is the only way that I can afford to live in the Village. Single moms have a history of taking in borders to make ends meet. With the taxes as high as they are in OP, this is my only solution. Adding a fee, plus jumping through hoops from the Village (this won't be easy, hello work permit!), and adding in insurance (insurance rates will go up once you add short term rental which the company's already provide), and then parking permits for each guest (now I take care of it for each guest) is too much. This will hurt the poor and remove further economic diversity in this community. I implore the Village to reconsider.

Single Moms

Submitted by Connie. I agree. This is an equity issue. This is a form of discrimination against middle income residents and low income residents. This is Anti American in fact. Say no to this ordinance.

Future Is Airbnb

Submitted by Anonymous. Hi, Cities all over the world are supporting the future concept of Airb&b renting model. Oak Park is a futuristic city that wants to invite residents of all ages. The younger generation will not want to be living in Oak Park. I think City should continue to allow airb&b.

Short Term Rental

Submitted by Lindsay Olson. We have a very active Air B and B on our block. The alley trash and recycle cans are usually overflowing and open to animals so there is a large trash problem in the alley. The late night parties, high volume of people flowing in and out of the building disrupt the neighborly feeling. We essentially have a party house in the neighborhood. The property is not well maintained. The property values on the block are being compromised by visitors with no regard for our community. I'm also disturbed that Air B and B's remove 300 properties from the normal rental/sales market. If we do allow Air B and B's they should be held accountable for property standards and not be allowed to use village services without being compensated for the extra problems they cause. But honestly, I'd prefer to have a strict limit on the number of these rentals in our village or not have them at all.

This is the home owners fault

Submitted by Margaret Flynn. Addressing the first half of the post, for the situation mentioned here - loud noise, overflowing trash cans, and poor maintenance, the home owner is fully at fault and should be held to task. AirBNB host who has a poorly maintained home or who is generating complaints will not be successful.

Short Term Rental

Submitted by Mary Ann Mikelsons. I second the complaints of Lindsay Olson. Our block has an Airbnb "party house." It is a real detriment to our block and potentially dangerous. We even had a motorcycle "gang" stay there last summer with their bikes on the lawns of neighboring houses, noise, speeding, etc. These businesses should be regulated. Maybe what should be hammered out is what form and how expensive the regulations should be rather than whether to have any or none.

No regulations needed here

Submitted by Josh VanderBerg. We've got a mechanism to respond to rowdy parties, and the village can work with online rental agencies to de-list repeat offenders. The village has not shown that this is a significant problem needing new regulation, and has not shown that it has exhausted other methods of addressing the issue via existing enforcement mechanisms. Because of this I can only assume the intent here is not to address any particular problem with short term home rental, but to instead discourage or eliminate short term home rental in oak park via onerous regulation.

Support

Submitted by Amanda Jenkins. I support this ordinance due to the impact of Airbnbs on rental rates and increasing gentrification, and I feel that additional regulation is needed.

Some regulations are important

Submitted by Susan Edwards. Most residents are looking for reasonable choices in which peace and quiet are maintained in their neighborhoods. So, focusing on the amount of people renting and keeping noise to a minimum should be essential when enforcing these regulations along with safety and security for all.

Regulations seem reasonable, but could be tweaked

Submitted by Alex Schwartz. All of the requirements seem like reasonable ways of protecting the consumer and the neighborhood. However, the fee seems higher than necessary to manage the program, although I may be incorrect. Also, would the properties be subject to hotel taxes? Considering they are competing with hotels, this seems only fair.

The proposed regulations are reasonable

Submitted by Daniel Kirsner. It is reasonable for airbnb / other short term rentals to be taxed and regulated in the same manner as bed and breakfasts. This will also allow Oak Park to monitor how much of its housing stock is no longer being used to house permanent residents, which could be a concern.

Agree

Submitted by Anonymous. Agree

Keep Regulations to a Minimum

Submitted by John Pullano. I favor any proposal that will lawfully provide additional operating revenue to the Village and suppress property taxes.

Short term Rental ordinance is not needed

Submitted by Haviva Siegel. I do not think that this ordinance is necessary. I agree that none of this would stop a few bad incidents. And what do inspections have to do with any of this? It seems like the village wants to unnecessarily enter people's properties. All rental units already have expectations, why are these necessary to be added. Let it be treated as any other small rental owner-online video training and apply for license. Have the airbnb or whoever is doing the short term renters also fill out the "crime free addendum" which already exists. Can't owners send an individual renter this form to sign?

This ordinance creates more expense than revenue

Submitted by Terry Mueller. I actually went on the websites and counted the number of AirBNB and VRBO properties in Oak Park. There are a total of 29. This would generate a revenue of \$16,100/year. This is absolutely absurd. There are NOT 300 properties for rent in Oak Park. The cost alone to maintain the program would be more than the program would generate. Better you should go after people with 'party houses' individually and leave everyone else alone. I had a room on AirBNB but had very few visitors and decided to stop because it just wasn't viable. Please leave these poor people alone. People rent out rooms, not because they WANT to, but most likely because they HAVE to. Go after the big violators.

Overarching and punitive response to a non-issue

Submitted by Allison. The issues with parties at a rental space and harm/danger connected to it should be dealt with in an appropriate and legal fashion directly with the parties involved, not by creating excess and burdensome/costly parameters for homeowners to deal with. . The many visitors to Oak Park each year drive much needed tax revenue and general interest into the area. This proposal is putting an undue burden onto hosts who choose to host in Oak Park, and will push them out of the area to bordering communities. The village should be holding Airbnb accountable for vetting guests, not creating lots of red tape and costs for anyone opening their home to visitors.

guest limits seem extreme

Submitted by Derwin Pope. Limiting visitors (to only four for example for a two bedroom) would not allow someone to have a few guests or family over for dinner etc. while visiting Oak Park. I know that's not intended, but the ordinance is currently worded that way.

posting requirements create potential safety risk

Submitted by Derwin Pope. The requirement to post a license on the front of the residence seems extreme (if the location is properly registered then all is on record) and likely to let passers-by know that a portion of the house or apartment may be intermittently vacant at times. I think this poses an unnecessary risk to the homeowner.

Short term rental units need to be owner occupied?

Submitted by Linda Small. This ordinance says unit must be owner-occupied except when short-term rented. This is punitive for a small two flat owner who wants to rent out one unit while living in another. OWNER OCCUPANCY should NOT be required!!

Excessive

Submitted by N Townsend. I have been renting out my coachhouse problem free since 2015. I have never dealt with a gathering, rent families, travelers and many others. Why hire someone to inspect properties which have been problem free for years. Why now determining restrictions on property size? I have a one bedroom with a pull out couch for guests, I have hosted many families of 4 with kids and now that is too many? Seems like a money grab for the village. Responsible renters should not have to deal with these restrictions.

Regulate all B&Bs the same

Submitted by Alex Bartel. If someone wants to run a bed and breakfast out of their house they should be subject to the same regulations as any other B&B or hotel including, registration, insurance, and inspections. It's common sense to require businesses to operate on a level playing field.

Not good neighbors

Submitted by TW. We have one on our block. Driving through the trash after the weekend parties overflowing out of trash and recycling bin filled with trash. The two bedroom sized house is listed for 15 guests...we live very close to each other, the house is a mess. Big parties most weekends some Thursday to Sunday nights. I've reported to Airbnb and the village. I think the regulations might be too expensive, but they are needed.

It's a bit much and is focused on the wrong issue.

Submitted by Dominique B. These new rules push toward discouraging short term rentals versus managing them more effectively. We have an AirBnB on our block and have had our share of issues, but these new rules are excessive and go too far for limited issues. Areas of focus should be: 1) A means for neighbors to get in contact with the owner on an issue. 2) Parking regulations whether its a pass or permit should be implemented 3) Occupancy should be limited to the excessive i.e. over 15 no matter the size.

I believe the rentals serve a need and should not be over regulated, but managed more effectively by the village.

Existing condo declarations and apartment lease terms

Submitted by Susan Green. Condominium HOA documents and apartment leases typically contain language that determines whether or not an owner or occupant can engage in short-term rentals of their unit or apartment. As it is currently written, the Village's proposed ordinance gives permission to any condominium owner or apartment renter who wants to engage in short-term rentals if they follow the guidelines in the ordinance, regardless of any terms prohibiting such rentals in their legal HOA or apartment lease documents. Should it pass, the Village's proposed ordinance needs to include a statement that the ordinance does not supersede the terms of existing HOA declarations and rules & regulations and/or apartment lease documents, which are legally binding on owners and renters.

Guest limits should be higher

Submitted by Amanda Adkison. The proposed guest limits do not make sense and seem arbitrary. For instance, many short-term rentals have a pull-out couch which will allow sleeping space for 2 guests in addition to the other sleeping spaces for guests in bedrooms. For instance, in a 2 bedroom short-term rental, up to 4 guests should be able to sleep in bedrooms (depending upon the size of the bedrooms/beds), and up to 2 additional guests should be able to sleep on a pull-out couch. However, the ordinance is proposing a maximum of 4 guests in a 2 bedroom home. The proposed numbers are arbitrary and do not consider that many homes in Oak Park are various sizes with different types of rooms that could comfortably and safely allow for higher guest limits.

New minority homeowner to Oak Park

Submitted by Adriana Escarpita. I am Adriana Escarpita Mexican American, new homeowner in OP. I firmly believe providing a chance to allow for room rentals or short term rentals allows for homeowners like me to supplement the heavy taxes of this village. Living in OP has been a dream of mine since I was young. As Covid struck I was able to save money to move into this amazing area but also experienced my wedding postponed 4.times. As all of our upcoming milestones were pushed to 2021 we found Airbnb to be a great solution to earn extra cash. In my case student loans from grad school, a wedding, and furnishing our new home caused a lot of financial stress and simply Airbnb-ing our place while away for our wedding helped tremendously. In addition, it brings revenue to the village. Lastly, as a grad school student I traveled around the country to complete my clinical experiences, thanks to short term rentals I was able to find affordable room and board while studying. If the Village of Oak Park wants to consider itself truly inclusive it needs to lend itself for opportunities like the ones I have experienced as a home owner and as a short term renter.

I use ABNB to rent out a room

Submitted by Carolyn. I use ABNB to rent out a room in my house with no kitchen facilities. This regulation seems excessive for this type of situation vs an entire house rental. Also, Bed and breakfast licensing is not a fit as there is no breakfast! Bed only! If this step is taken watch out residents with garages with living space you will be next!

Inspection is intrusive and burdensome

Submitted by Amanda Adkison. The inspection requirement is overly intrusive and burdensome upon homeowners. The regulations are meant to further "the interest of public health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the Village." Annual inspections by the Village Fire Department, Health Department, and/or Development Customer Services Department seem only vaguely related to that purpose. In addition, the ordinance discusses short-term rentals as offering advantages to the Village, but this inspection requirement seems to contradict that idea, as inspections are a red-tape deterrent to homeowners who wish to offer their properties as short-term rentals.

Please Reconsider

Submitted by DV. My partner and I Airbnb'd our home during a time of financial hardship and it helped us immensely. These regulations would have made it very difficult for us to reap the benefits of Airbnb. Many people are able to afford living in OP because they do short-term rentals, please reconsider these ordinances.

Proposed Village restrictions on Airbnb

Submitted by Tom Jacobs. If the Village board does not wish to allow for the short term rental in OP then say so. Or are you pressured by hotels and B&B in our village?

Please take the side of the homeowner/taxpayer

Submitted by Alan Reed. I have never rented out my house using AirBnB, but someday I may want to. Someday it might help my family pay the mortgage, insurance, maintenance/upkeep or property taxes for our home. Someday it may help us keep our house and stay in Oak Park. Please consider making it easier for Oak Park residents to do this (especially since there are few affordable hotel options nearby) rather than harder. Please consider not imposing unnecessary taxes and fees that pay for village oversight, but add no value to the homeowner. Please consider ways to keep short term rentals viable, but not a burden on the neighborhood. Please don't do what seems to be common — charging fees, but providing no benefit. Does the village really need "a piece of the short term rental action"? You're not a homeowners association, so stop acting like it.

Village is killing golden goose.

Submitted by Grazyna Malanowska. Dear Board Members, My husband and I have been hosting guests since the beginning of Airbnb. It helps to pay the bills since we are seniors and we love meeting people from all over the worlds. The guests are mostly young who rent our room in our house because it is affordable. We are charging now \$63 per night, the guests pay \$80 plus because of the occupancy tax that the Village collects. There are small Airbnb charges. The Airbnb provides an insurance already for a million dollars for unpleasant occurrences. As hosts we clean the room and bathroom and the house, do laundry, often provide simple breakfast. There is a lot of emails to communicate with the guests. We have to rearrange our daily routine to accommodate our guests. They come to OP to visit FLW and frequent our restaurants. They take train to Chicago. Mostly they stay for one night so it is a lot of work. Only ignorant people try to kill Airbnb in OP. The Village should not response to a few who do not understand how the short term rental operates. If the village will pass this ordinance, we will quit the Airbnb all together. Who is going to suffer? Only young people who can afford to travel now.

Also local businesses

Submitted by Margaret Flynn. I agree - and extend that local businesses will suffer. These renters are not looking for hotels or BNBs - they are students and ppl who travel on a shoestring. They will stay in Chicago instead and local businesses (restaurants, Hemingway museum, FLW lose out.

Unnecessary

Submitted by Colin Higgins. As someone who fell in love with Oak Park and bought a house here because we were able to stay in an Airbnb last fall and experience the neighborhood, I think the proposed ordinance is a bad idea. I think it will reduce the number of people listing on Airbnb and increase prices to offset the cost of this unnecessary regulation.

Air B&B

Submitted by Patrick Dailey. 1 person, 2 people ,3 people have problems. How bad? We already have enough government to handle these issues, ie. police, home inspectors (Stanna Ryan) and a whole public works department. The village board has absolutely no qualifications for any such ordinances. The board needs to address each cry baby one on one in person and then evaluate the problem. Stop wasting time pretending you are so important. Village boards have made a muck of this town for the 25 years I have lived here, I'm tired of it!

Proposed Short-Term Rental Ordinance

Submitted by Chris Donovan. Zoning regulations exist for reasons, and one of them is to limit commercial uses in districts zoned strictly for residential use, and one of those limits should be for creating businesses that cater to transient clients/customers. Chapter 8, Section 32 of the ordinance should be amended to include "proposed short-term rentals" with "Bed and Breakfast Establishments" and all the regulations of the existing Village Code. Why re-invent the wheel.

Air BNB

Submitted by Dwayne Smith. I operate an Air BNB rental in Oak Park. The building is a 2 flat building and in-lieu of renting out to a single tenant I decided to try out AirBNB. It has been a great experience. While there are some cons I will focus on the pros. It allows me to open up the unit to guest from all over the world and have them experience Oak Park. It also drives new business to local establishments that I refer to through the portals and word of mouth. I do not feel that because I decided to rent out to AirBNB vs the traditional lease that I should be penalized for the decision. The village is already collecting an additional tax on the unit from the Airbnb portal with no additional service being provided to the owners. I do not understand what the ordinance achieves other than more regulation and tax on those who are tax payers and law abiding citizens. Additionally where I live and host is burdened by parking restrictions that dissuade most tenants and AirBNB guest from staying here. If anything I think there should be a special permit available to those operators and guest who are visiting our lovely village from being burdened with the possibility of being ticketed every night or from 8am to 10am. Now that is something I would pay for.

Tinkering with the Short Term Rental Ordinance

Submitted by Debbie B. While I think it's probably a good idea to set up a framework for an ordinance like this, it seems as if rule-following hosts are saddled with covering the costs of a very few problem guests. I don't know if guests and Airbnb itself can be covered in the ordinance, but if another incident like the shooting happens, I hope the Village will hold Airbnb's feet to the fire and go after the guest for damages. A few comments about the proposed ordinance:

Payment of a \$350 annual fee. A person who occasionally rents out a room in their home should pay a lesser fee than someone who has a large house dedicated to full-time rental. May I suggest: a much lower flat fee to start, then a yearly fee based on percentages.

Annual short-term rental license. Would the host also be subject to the \$10 fee/three-hour seminar for all landlords? Contact information posted in listing. I'm not sure what all this entails, but as a former Airbnb host, this is terrifying to me. Contact information should NOT be made public.

Rental periods of at least for 24 hours. There are Web sites like Peerspace that make it possible to rent a place for a few hours for business meetings, yoga classes, children's parties, etc. Would this not be allowed?

Short-term rental ordinance

Submitted by Mark Paulsen. In general, I approve of the Village effort to regulate Short-Term Rentals (STR's) via ordinance. Allow me to explain why some sort of regulation is needed, by describing our own experience with an existing Air BnB on our block. We live in Northeast Oak Park in a neighborhood that is R-4 in the Zoning Ordinance. Primarily single-family residences with an occupancy limit of 8 people. Very few exceptions for other uses. So why is it that we have to contend with what is basically an unlicensed motel (not allowed by ordinance in the first place) directly across the street from us? The house is neither owner-occupied nor a primary residence for an owner. It is solely an investment property for an LLC absent from the premises. Not an owner-occupant trying to help with the mortgage or a way to meet people from other countries and cultures. It is a business, pure and simple. A non-responsive absentee landlord. Over the last 3 years, we and our neighbors have had innumerable issues with the operation of this property. Citations and fines for trash overflowing from multiple garbage cans. Zoning and occupancy violations. Noise problems. Use of the premises as a birthday party or graduation venue. Just last week, my wife and I were out 4 days out of five picking up trash off of both parkways and the street because the occupants just tossed it out of the car. Last July, we had 15 motorcyclists and 18 people stay for a long 4th of July weekend. I'm certain there are a lot of neighbors who still remember the noise and congestion for those several days. Once we had 23 people come out and get into a rental coach to go to some conference. We've often had to contend with groups of 10-16 people and the associated cars, with

some occupants residing and and some just visiting. We have dozens and dozens of new "neighbors" just passing through. Light on,lights off. Car doors slamming, often late at night. Impromptu car stereo concerts that I can still hear in bed with the windows closed, even with the car windows closed. groups holding forth in conversation on the front walk late at night. We're only a bad argument away from violence one day. Look, no one minds the real neighbor (you know, the one that lives here all the time) having the occasional kid's party, graduation, retirement, New Year's bash, or get-together, but this is just happening a lot for no other purpose than business, not normal neighborhood activity. There also have been some renters who are quiet and polite and cause no problems. But every time we think things are ok, here we go again. We and others have called and spoken with the Village and also called police at times. There have been citations and fines. Yet the problem housing still remains. The ordinance will at least address some of the issues. Yes, there is room for adjustment and clarification, but something must be done about absent, uncaring, irresponsible investors who care nothing about my residential home. If I wanted to live in a commercial or other area in Oak Park where the uses of property are more expansive and/or permitted, I would have moved there. I didn't. My home is in this neighborhood, and I refuse to see my property values and neighborhood culture degraded by this improper business use of residential property. We have a zoning ordinance. We have a village code. There are regulations about ownership and use of property. It's not like there an unfettered ability to use property as you see fit. Rights and liberties are tempered by the responsibilities of living in a civil society. Sincerely- Mark Paulsen (resident owner since 1990)

Short term rental ordinance.

Submitted by Connie. Mark Paulsen, all of the zoning rules and other ordinances have not helped you with this problem. More ordinances is not going to help. The village needs to enforce the rules and penalize the homeowners. What you want to do is penalize me for that particular bad host.

Ordinances

Submitted by Anonymous. Right - the existing ordinances should be refined and measurable and consistently enforced, particularly the noise related ones. Noise is referenced in 3 places in the Village Ordinances, but a measurable system including 10 minute time limit, decibel levels, noise consistent with neighbors, etc. if the ordinances were refined, the non-emergency number would have a way to establish a 3 strikes your out penalty.

Short term rentals

Submitted by Esther Brodsky. We are retired homeowners in Northeast Oak Park since 1984. Yes, the taxes are high in Oak Park, but we love the community and our neighbors, so have struggled to meet our fiscal responsibility. In the last several years, we feel the quality of life on our block has been negatively affected by an irresponsible LLC owner, who neither inhabits the home, nor to our knowledge, lives or works in Oak Park. As stated by Mark, above, we have put up with overflowing garbage on the block and in the alley, noise at all hours and police visits (wouldn't this put an undue stress on the police department?), congested parking, overflowing numbers of guests in the home, and guests to the home leaving beer cans and bottles in the alley and gathering on the block unmasked during a pandemic (many from out of state). A couple of years ago, I spoke with a guest at this facility, who said his wife was previously from Oak Park and was excited to stay here when they visited family in Illinois. He was a physician and was horrified at the condition of the home they rented. He reported that there were dirty dishes in the cabinets, sheets that didn't fit the beds, and found the home to be a generally dirty and unhealthy condition. He said they couldn't get home soon enough, and would not be staying in Oak Park again. This was embarrassing and a function of an unregulated business operating on our residential block. New neighbors who had a home built next door to the property, just moved from Oak Park. I can't say that the airbnb was the only reason, but I know they were unhappy being next door to what has been basically a party house. I welcome the

Village finally regulating these properties so: 1. Permanent residents can live in peace, security, and not have their property investment negatively impacted by unnecessary noise, parking congestion, garbage not in proper receptacles, etc. 2. Village services (police, health dept. garbage and recycling) are not overwhelmed by these businesses. 3. Absent homeowners do not irresponsibly run an unregulated business on a residential neighborhood. 4. The Village can have an accurate count and mapping of where the airbnbs are located, so no area or block is saturated. At this point, they don't seem to know how many exist or where they are. 5. The reputation of Oak Park, as a desirable community in which to live, is not compromised. We wonder how many comments resisting regulation are from airbnb owners. Many other communities, including Chicago, have regulated airbnbs. Finally Oak Park is considering doing so too. Thank you Trustees.

The primacy of community quality of life and public safety

Submitted by James Gates. I want to thank the village board for providing residents an opportunity to comment on a proposed short term rental ordinance. My wife, our children (now adults), and I have lived on our block since 1987. In that time, I have experienced a genuine communal sense of welcoming of new neighbors who purchased a single-family home on our block. I can honestly say that persons of demographics including race, age, creed, nationality, orientation, family size, and career have been warmly welcomed by the residents of our block. That is as it should be in a just and caring community. Since 1987, homeowners on our block and elected village officials have understood that single family housing stock on blocks like ours and others is a key factor in leading families to choose Oak Park as a place to raise a family. Additionally, residential blocks like ours and others promote a sense of community within community, offer an invaluable fusion of diversity and unity, and provide a unique degree of safety in knowing who is among us and especially among our children. I value economic development that understands the need for growth and a respect for the quality-of-life ethos that has made Oak Park a nationally known community for decades. I was honored to serve our village as a former two-term member of the Oak Park District 97 Elementary school board, two-term board president, and a former chair of Oak Park Intergovernmental body (IGOV). IGOV brought together the leaders of all six Oak Park taxing units. In those eight years of public service, I was privileged to serve with people who honorably served the public trust placed in them. Though economic sustainability was a shared priority, foremost in my mind and the minds of all my governmental unit colleagues was safeguarding the quality, diversity, sustainability, and safety of life in Oak Park. The discussion regarding a proposed short-term rental ordinance is an important one. It is especially important because the current village board did not inherit a well-defined and legally enforceable short-term rental ordinance. However, any short-term rental ordinance that does not respect the long-held priority on the quality and safety of life in Oak Park is not in the best short- or long- term interests of our village. In that light, I propose that prior to any vote on a short-term rental ordinance, the village board discuss at multiple open board meetings and seek extensive community engagement focused on the following: - A thorough investigation of in-Illinois and national communities who have extended experience with short-term rental ordinances. This examination would underpin an Oak Park ordinance informed by best practices and practices to avoid. - Zoning that prohibits short term rentals on any block where homes were built as single-family residences. - Zoning that considers a block / area for short term rentals that include properties built as multi-family residences. - Zoning a block / area with multi-family residences as a short- term rental zone should be informed by the support of at least 50% of the owners of those residences. That seems logical in that the village of Oak Park requires approval of 50% of block residents to hold a yard sale or block party. - The creation of a special police, civilian, or hybrid unit with defined powers and authorities to oversee, respond to, and adjudicate complaints relating to a short-term rental in an area zoned for short term rentals. This additional oversight should not be delegated to the Oak Park Police Department. - Intergovernmental discussions that create mechanisms / interventions for residents in areas zoned solely for single-family residences that include direct support contacts when a family / individual evidences a medical emergency occurs that require them to temporarily leave

their residence. However, those mechanisms / interventions would not controvert existing single-family housing zoning ordinances. - In compliance with local, state, and federal laws, property owners of a residence in an area zoned for short-term rentals who wish to use their home for that purpose would be required to: - Complete and acquire a specific license to operate as a short-term rental business. - Present evidence of an on-going subscription to a service, such as a service provided by Airbnb, which conducts background checks on United States-based guests and hosts. These background checks are performed through public state databases and county criminal records, as well as state and national sex offender registries for criminal convictions and sex offender registrations. - Comply with maximum occupancy limits in line with the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development's Fair Housing Act. That act indicates short-term rental occupancy should not exceed a limit of two people per bedroom in rental units. - Pay a substantive annual permit fee and per rental day fee that, at minimum, offsets additional village expenses such as the special short term rental supervisory force, criminal background checks, additional overnight parking enforcement, and enforcement of a fine structure for owners to share with short term renters prior to offering a rental contract. Note: Consequences for renters who commit criminal offenses already exist. - Present proof of a minimum \$1,000,000 liability insurance for any owner using their residence as a short-term rental location. - Require a minimum of 72 hour stay for any short-term rental

I was born in Oak Park, but I grew up in another nearby community. As an adult, I bought my first home, a single-family residence, in south Oak Park because I believed Oak Park to be a diverse place to raise a family in safety and a place where our family could do more than own property. In Oak Park, we could become part of the fabric of the community. As I approach age 70, those beliefs continue, and they underpin my position regarding a proposed a short-term rental ordinance.

Sincerely, Jim Gates, 939 North Marion

Support for short term rental regulations

Submitted by Barbara Hunt

Over the course of several years, our neighborhood has been dealing with many issues related to a house listed for short-term rental. Issues include garbage overflowing and being tossed around garbage cans, large groups of people gathering in and around the house, and loud music and conversation. I have used AirBnb rentals and find them a good alternative to hotels. I have always been hosted by individuals who are responsive and provide a good experience. Unfortunately, the house in question is hosted by someone not living on/near the house. There seems to be little or no control over the house and what is happening inside. I feel hosts need to assume appropriate responsibility for the house and those staying there. They should make a greater effort to be better neighbors. Those of us who have lived in our homes before Airbnbs became popular should be respected so that our neighborhoods can continue to be places in which we want to live. Perhaps increasing fees for hosts may not be the answer. Perhaps the village should track viable complaints against the home owners/hosts. At some point, enough should be enough. The rights of many residents in the neighborhoods should outweigh those of an individual home owner.

In the list of our priorities, is this really the top one?

Submitted by Makesha Flourno. As the owner of two Airbnb properties in Oak Park, I'm personally concerned about the overly burdensome and costly requirements drafted in this ordinance. I'm concerned that we have real issues impacting renters, real issues of equity to deal with, and real budgetary constraints that need the Village staff's focus and attention. To start, living in this community is difficult enough and those of us that are everyday residents will be impacted by a change like this. Taxes are already excruciatingly high and maintenance can make things that much more difficult. When I started down my Airbnb journey, I'd already been living in Oak Park for 18 years (5 years ago), stopped working and had recently been separated from my husband. Airbnb afforded me the opportunity to continue living in this community. Fast forward 5 years later and I've had over 300 guests served in my two spaces. So, I believe that I've earned the right to have a voice

here. According to AirDNA, a STR national public database, there are 138 active rental properties in Oak Park. The majority use the Airbnb platform (77%) while 6% use VRBO and the remaining 17% use both systems. Since Q2 of 2018, there are only 2 more STR properties in Oak Park today than there were then. At our height in Q2 2019, there were 222 active spaces in Oak Park. These units receive an average overall guest rating of 4.61 stars (out of 5); 80% of which have been rated at least 4.5 overall. Airbnb rates these properties on the following attributes; listing accuracy (4.73), value for money (4.66), location (4.81), host communication (4.78), cleanliness (4.67), and ease of check in (4.81). 46% of these properties have moderate to strict cancellation policies, meaning that guests stick and they have good intentions of staying. A third of the guests (32%) stay for 3 or more nights and another third (36%) stay at least 2 nights. In my personal experience my units see a lot of grandma and grandpas, relatives, and are oftentimes occupied by Oak Park residents themselves; they're either doing a renovation, need a work space, or are simply taking a weekend away. The remaining folks are visitors. They're here for high school and college graduations, visitors of the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio, or they are simply here to visit our beautiful community. Our Oak Park Airbnbs are highly maintained and the rating system structure ensures that we are held accountable. If our units are not at a high standard, they simply won't be booked and our ratings will reflect poor conditions. We are simply too sought after of a community for our Airbnb spaces to be anything other than great places to stay. I've hosted several hundred guests - my personal rating is 4.9 stars in both of my spaces. My guests bring sales revenue to our Village's businesses and tax revenue to our Village's bottom line. My guests and the guests of my fellow Oak Park hosts stimulate tourism and revenue for our Village. This ordinance unfairly penalizes and overly burdens hosts that are clearly already doing the things. The inspections, penalties, and process is arbitrary and seem unnecessary...they also come at a cost. To productive hosts, to our current residents, to our small businesses, and to our Village funds that need the revenue support. It also comes at an expense to our Village that no one seems to be focusing on here – so how much will this proposed Ordinance cost our village in additional Village OpEx? And is the juice really worth the squeeze that you'll be putting on hosts that are also neighbors and community members. Finally, let's call a thing a thing... why is our Village leadership allowing Village staff and resources to be manipulated and baited by certain non-community members to focus on non-issues that are not paramount to the Village's imperatives?

Short term rental ordinance

Submitted by Karen Walsh. I also live in NE Oak Park 3 doors south of an Air BnB. From reading all comments listed above, it is obvious all Air BnB rentals in OakPark are not alike. It is very different to host renters in your home or owner occupied building on site than it is to rent out a whole house than to numbers of 23 or 15-18 people at once, having loud parties, leaving trash on the premises and in overflowing garbages cans littering the alley. Who among the above commenters would tolerate this in their home, let alone their neighborhood? Another example- one weekday night there was a very large group of people in the house. Later in the evening I saw 2 fire engines/ambulances and several police cars showed up in front of the Air BnB house. I never found out what happened because decided it was safer for me to go back into my house. I think the very important part of the ordinance is to limit the occupancy rate. The A BnB situatuion on our block needs to be eliminated as is or at the very least be more strictly regulated and consistently monitored. Finally, it should also be noted in this time of Covid that many other people going in and out of thathouse whether in large numbers or not did not wear masks. Our neighbors are very careful about this and should not have to tolerate the above behavior to make sure that this investment turns a profit to the owner who does not live in Oak Park. This is not a one time situation and I hope the new regulations are not a sloppy one size fits all for Air BnBs in Oak Park.

In the list of our priorities, is this really the top one?

Submitted by Makesha Flourno. As the owner of two Airbnb properties in Oak Park, I'm personally concerned about the overly burdensome and costly requirements drafted in this ordinance. I'm concerned that we have real issues impacting renters, real issues of equity to deal with, and real budgetary constraints that need the Village staff's focus and attention. To start, living in this community is difficult enough and those of us that are everyday residents will be impacted by a change like this. Taxes are already excruciatingly high and maintenance can make things that much more difficult. When I started down my Airbnb journey, I'd already been living in Oak Park for 18 years (5 years ago), stopped working and had recently been separated from my husband. Airbnb afforded me the opportunity to continue living in this community. Fast forward 5 years later and I've had over 300 guests served in my two spaces. So, I believe that I've earned the right to have a voice here. According to AirDNA, a STR national public database, there are 138 active rental properties in Oak Park. The majority use the Airbnb platform (77%) while 6% use VRBO and the remaining 17% use both systems. Since Q2 of 2018, there are only 2 more STR properties in Oak Park today than there were then. At our height in Q2 2019, there were 222 active spaces in Oak Park.

These units receive an average overall guest rating of 4.61 stars (out of 5); 80% of which have been rated at least 4.5 overall. Airbnb rates these properties on the following attributes; listing accuracy (4.73), value for money (4.66), location (4.81), host communication (4.78), cleanliness (4.67), and ease of check in (4.81). 46% of these properties have moderate to strict cancellation policies, meaning that guests stick and they have good intentions of staying. A third of the guests (32%) stay for 3 or more nights and another third (36%) stay at least 2 nights. In my personal experience my units see a lot of grandma and grandpas, relatives, and are oftentimes occupied by Oak Park residents themselves; they're either doing a renovation, need a work space, or are simply taking a weekend away. The remaining folks are visitors. They're here for high school and college graduations, visitors of the Frank Lloyd Wright Home and Studio, or they are simply here to visit our beautiful community. Our Oak Park Airbnbs are highly maintained and the rating system structure ensures that we are held accountable. If our units are not at a high standard, they simply won't be booked and our ratings will reflect poor conditions. We are simply too sought after of a community for our Airbnb spaces to be anything other than great places to stay. I've hosted several hundred guests - my personal rating is 4.9 stars in both of my spaces. My guests bring sales revenue to our Village's businesses and tax revenue to our Village's bottom line. My guests and the guests of my fellow Oak Park hosts stimulate tourism and revenue for our Village. This ordinance unfairly penalizes and overly burdens hosts that are clearly already doing the things. The inspections, penalties, and process is arbitrary and seem unnecessary...they also come at a cost. To productive hosts, to our current residents, to our small businesses, and to our Village funds that need the revenue support. It also comes at an expense to our Village that no one seems to be focusing on here - so how much will this proposed Ordinance cost our village in additional Village OpEx? And is the juice really worth the squeeze that you'll be putting on hosts that are also neighbors and community members. Finally, let's call a thing a thing... why is our Village leadership allowing Village staff and resources to be manipulated and baited by certain non-community members to focus on non-issues that are not paramount to the Village's imperatives?

Thank you for pulling the data

Submitted by Margaret Flynn. agree let's look at the data before making decisions

One avenue to complain in this situation

Submitted by Margaret Flynn. You may have tried this but AirBNB does take in complaints from neighbors <https://www.airbnb.com/neighbors>

Not sure how effective they are but they do have a vested interest in keeping neighbors happy.

Need to differentiate

Submitted by Margaret Flynn. If you want to rent out your spare room for a few weeks during the summer months (to help you pay your huge property tax bill for example) or if you are taking a once-in-a-lifetime semester sabbatical and want to rent your home during that time, you are subject to these same restrictions? This will make home ownership in Oak Park less attractive.

Airbnbs are great for parties, terrible to live next door to

Submitted by John Meade. Airbnbs make really bad neighbors and I should know since I live near one. They are basically hotels without the costs of security, parking, liability or cleanup. They make the owners a lot of money while trashing the neighborhood. They are great for the owners, terrible for the neighbors. That's the reality of short-term rentals.

This ordinance is not needed and should be opposed!

Submitted by Camile Lindsay Kumi. My husband and I oppose this ordinance. It will deter residents from operating Short-Term Rentals (STRs) which will adversely impact tourism in Oak Park and negatively impact residents who are in need of short-term housing options. It will also make it more difficult for STR owners to afford to stay in Oak Park. My family is on the verge of starting a STR on the Airbnb platform. We are interested in pursuing the STR option because it will allow us to provide temporary housing to Oak Park visitors and in the off time house our friends and families when they visit from outside of the country and other states. However, if this ordinance passes it is likely that we will forego the STR option and instead our garden apartment will remain vacant in between having our friends and family members visit Oak Park. It is not clear what Oak Park is hoping to gain by passing this ordinance. Oak Park STR owners already pay exorbitant property taxes. My family pays more than \$17,000 a year. In addition to that, 4% of the nightly Airbnb rate goes to Oak Park. STR owners have a personal stake in ensuring that our properties are well-maintained and that our guests are law-abiding. If they are not, we risk having our ratings lowered, upsetting our neighbors, and having to pay to repair damage done by our guests. The vast majority of the STRs in Oak Park have extremely high ratings, according to Airbnb the average rating in Oak Park is 4.61%. Owners have that rating because they take great care of their properties without village intervention, and they vet potential guests. The sad reality is that there is no license and no amount of village oversight that is going to prevent sometimes unfortunate situations from occurring. A license will not deter unsavory individuals from attempting to rent our places and it will not cause them to take better care of our places. Instead, it will cause us to stop running STRs which will impact tourism in the village and create a hardship for existing families that find themselves in need of short-term housing. Regarding the argument that rental units or long-term rentals (LTRs) are being taken off the market to accommodate STRs, I would like to see the data supporting that. According to Airbnb data, there are currently only 138 STRs in Oak Park. 138 STRs compared to the more than eight thousand rental units in Oak Park. In fact, according to the Wednesday Journal, over the last five years more than 1,000 rental units were added in Oak Park. The village should focus its attention on those rental units which account for millions of dollars rather than focusing attention on 138 STRs which if included in the rental unit count would only represent .01% of the number of units. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the 138 units were LTRs prior to becoming STRs or that they will become LTRs if their owners are no longer able to afford STRs. I would also like to know where the funds are coming from to hire inspectors for the units. This ordinance states that owners cannot be licensed until inspectors visit their properties. This is yet another salary that Oak Park will have to pay. What happens when there is a backlog? Will owners be forced to go without needed income while waiting for inspectors to be available? Another provision of the ordinance requires that I advertise to the entire world that I am operating an Airbnb. I am concerned about this provision. I am a former prosecutor and now I work in another field that exposes me to individuals who might wish me and my family harm. I simply cannot risk everyone knowing that they can go online and rent the STR located in my house. I am requesting that the board reconsider what will be accomplished by implementing

this ordinance. Who will it harm? It will harm homeowners and the only thing it accomplishes is forcing cash strapped residents to pay yet another fee.

These New regulations a bit much and really un-necessary

Submitted by Anonymous. It appears we are overreacting to something. Adding taxes to a community, county and state who are already over-taxed is not the answer. Additional regulations are simply an extra burden and frustrating. How about "partnering" with those who wish to do short-term rentals as opposed to "managing, regulating or taxing" them.

Support of Short Term Rentals with provisions

Submitted by Jennifer Settle. Short term rentals play an important role in our community and they are, most often, very good neighbors. I think we should be listening to the local short term rental owners to craft these regulations in an effective way that doesn't put additional burden/costs on them to succeed at their business. I do support the idea of a register of owners and a max. occupancy (although as a family of 5 that has used a 2-bedroom airbnb often, I think the proposed numbers may be off). Posting on exterior should be removed! And inspections only required on limited basis - perhaps for first year or after an incident is reported. There does, however, seem to be a need for more effective ways for all residents and the Village staff to address complaints that cannot be dealt with between neighbors - just as there already exists for any other property in Oak Park in regards to parking, trash, or noise concerns.

Village's Proposal is a Violation Civil Rights

Submitted by MM. - The \$350 fee: The Village using this as a way to earn income is outrageous - especially because you are offering zero services or resources to these home owners.

- inspections? Stay out of our homes. Absolutely unacceptable. These are private residences. This is a municipality not an HOA. - Annual License: Why? Do people that rent their homes not through these services need a license? This again seems like a gross overreach.

- Insurance requirements: These rental services have their own liability coverage. The Village has no right to require this of an individual. In my view this entire idea is a violation of civil rights. If this goes through I would be willing to sign on to a class action lawsuit against the Village on principal alone.

Short Term Host Ordinance

Submitted by Keith Criminger. It is our understanding that this ordinance was drafted as a reaction to an incident at a short-term rental property. This is definitely a concern and the village has every right to look into what happened. As a long time homeowner in Oak Park, I do not want to see wild parties happening on my block, especially where criminal activity occurs. It is a very serious matter. However, this Ordinance seems to be an overreaction to a single incident and is prejudicial against short term hosts. The vast majority of short term hosts operate in a very responsible manner and have had no incidents of parties or situations where the police would need to be called.

Has the Village researched police records to see how many calls they have responded to at parties at single family homes or apartment buildings where there was potentially illegal or criminal activity?

We would venture to guess that the percentage of those calls are at a much higher rate than that of short-term rentals. Does the Village have data on how many incidents have happened at short term rentals in the past 10 years? If so, the information should be presented for everyone to evaluate if this ordinance is justified. There are already law enforcement mechanisms in place to deal with the incident that occurred. It should be handled by law enforcement, not new regulations that punish all short term hosts, most of which have not had any problems at their property at all. This is an overreach of power which puts an undue financial and regulatory burden on its citizens who are simply trying to supplement their income and provide quality accommodations to people visiting the area. Many of those people spend money in Oak Park at our grocery stores, restaurants, and tourist sites.

In addition, we would also like to address a couple of the specific proposed requirements in the Ordinance: 1. Payment of \$350 annual fee. Do hotels and bed and breakfasts pay an annual fee? If not, then why would this cost apply just to short term rental hosts? There was already a 4% tax instituted by Oak Park for short-term rentals a few years ago. This seemed fair as it was in line with what was being taxed on bed and breakfasts and hotels. However, these new fees will tip the balance to be unfair to short term rental hosts. What is the basis for that?

2. Guest register provided to Village upon request. What is the purpose of the Village having access to the guests lists of short-term hosts? We can understand wanting to get that information if any criminal behavior has occurred after the police have had time to investigate. Does the village require this of bed and breakfasts or hotels? If there are problems at a specific short term rental property in a neighborhood, can there be an avenue for neighbors to make a complaint? If the problem is valid, couldn't the village provide a consequence to that particular owner? Instituting an Ordinance on all short-term hosts creates a hardship on hard-working people who are trying to provide for their families.

AirBnB rental regulations

Submitted by T Ryan. The big issue isn't the homeowner that occupies their home who wants to rent out a room or their home periodically. The biggest issue are absentee owners who don't live or who have never lived in the property they want to rent. For this group, renting their property is a business, not a simple homeowner looking to generate a little extra income. These are "mini-hotels" and should be treated as such with strict regulations, proper taxation and oversight. The business should post a security deposit with the village for at least a year to ensure collection of any appropriate fines. Also, for every night of rental there should be a parking pass required to be purchased. In our neighborhood, the airbnb/ VRBO renter at one home never uses the garage, they always park in the front sometimes with 3, 4 or 5 vehicles. Unless controlled, some of these rentals will diminish the overall quality of life for the homeowners and renters who pay all the property taxes to live in Oak Park. Perhaps the neighbors should have a say in properties proposing to offer short term rental just like new proposed businesses post for public comment. If I wanted to live next to a hotel, I would have made that choice but I didn't. Thank you.

Excessive

Submitted by London Black. I believe this is an overreaction to one negative event.

Short-term rental ordinance

Submitted by Mark Paulsen. What is this "thing" that another commenter refers to? To me, it is a "discussion not relevant to the topic" as the Rules about Commenting require. At best it is vague, conspiratorial, and demeaning to the other commenters (and Zoom meeting participants) and should not be permitted on this forum. "Allowing Village staff and resources to be manipulated and baited by certain non-community members to focus on non-issues"? What's that all about? If one has an issue, elucidate it specifically please. Doing less is a disservice to our community.

I am a community member. The Air BnB / Short-Term-Rental issues are real. Air BnB itself is certainly a "non-community" participant.

Home owner corporations

Submitted by Margaret Flynn. Based on the call, and the special concerns around airbnb where the owner is fully absent, this trend should be considered. I do think there are two fully separate use cases under the "short term rental" umbrella.

<https://www.npr.org/sections/money/2021/08/24/1030151330/a-unicorn-start...>

Another Ordinance to hurt the small business owners

Submitted by Connie. Small business owners can barely stay in business in the Village of Oak Park. You can see the evidence from the many boarded up shops all over this village. People who patronize Airbnb tend to be the type of people who do not want to stay in a large hotel chain.. and they are the kind of people who in my opinion patronize our local restaurants and walk around and go to our small boutiques. Now you want to create a lot of unnecessary inspections and rules to discourage these cottage businesses..This is exactly why people are sick and tired of this Village. You allow large high rises and simultaneously go after Airbnb. If you want to make life better for someone why not create rules for long term tenants that are being abused by large holders of many apartment units. They are discriminating against renters and so on. Despite the fact that there are laws against it the village does absolutely nothing. I've seen it first hand myself. This is nothing but a bully ordinance going after the small business owners. Shame on The Village Board. I am quite frankly angry that this has been brought to the village. I see this as an equity issue and that ultimately the village is going after the little fish because they don't have the courage to go after the big fish. If you want to do something meaningful support the Airbnb hosts and encourage them to participate in something voluntary. Otherwise stop creating rules that will only hurt law abiding citizens. This will do nothing to stop the occasional bad host. Use your resources and go after the real problem people in this village. The large owners of many apartment units abusing renters. If we allow this our Village becomes a police state.

Protect home owners?

Submitted by Anonymous. On the other hand, shouldn't homeowners rights to peace in their own home be protected. Consistent enforcement of revamped ordinances is the key. There can be a balance to protect both sides.

Ordinance creates more expense than revenue

Submitted by Terry Mueller. There are a total of 29 AirBNB and VRBO properties in Oak Park NOT 300. I simply went on the websites and checked. There is no need for a big study on this. 29 properties would generate an annual revenue of \$16,100, virtually making this program an expense, a money losing venture, that will cost more to administer than the income generated by the program. If there are 'party' houses we have laws in place to address these issues. I rented out a room on AirBNB a while back and it simply wasn't worth it. There weren't a zillion tourists clamoring to stay here. Please keep in mind that most people who rent a room on these platforms do so, not because they WANT to, but most likely because they HAVE to. Please reconsider this proposed ordinance that will cost more than it will generate. This isn't that big of a problem and will harm those who are trying to get by.

Noise enforcement relates to air bnb

Submitted by Anonymous. In addition to the air bnb ordinance, the noise ordinances should be revamped to be more measurable- place a 10 minute limit, hours, consistency (shouldn't matter if day or night), # of direct residential neighbors, decibel levels, limiting air bnb and business licenses that are consistent with established neighbors. Just look at some of the neighboring villages to get better examples. In addition, the noise ordinance should be consistently enforced. As we see more and more air bnb and businesses move into residential or residential/commercial or empty space, there are going to be many more noise issues, placing unfair advantage to homeowners who are not able to turn the noise off. Response from the non emergency number should be consistent - if a resident, air bnb guest, or business is loud, the police should ask them to turn it down - 3 strikes your out no questions. From personal experience, the online complaint form does not work as no one from the Village responds; calling the non emergency number is against my nature, but is what is recommended by the village and the police. The resident beat office may try by talking to the parties, but does not have the authority.

community relations doesn't work in these situations as homeowners should not need to negotiate for peace in their own homes. We believe if the Village reviews the noise ordinance, looks inward at their enforcement of the ordinances, and the consistency with how it is enforced across all departments, this would help some of the air bnb issues. From our own personal experience - unfortunately, we believe this line in the village ordinance is clearly one sided and doesn't apply to residents: The Board of Trustees finds that excessive noise endangers physical and emotional health and well-being, interferes with legitimate business and recreational activities, depresses property values,

Just say NO to this proposed ordinance

Submitted by Anonymous. I am not an AirBNB host, but I am a small landlord. I have never done STRs. Still, I was pretty shocked to read this oppressive ordinance. I think I pay \$10 every two years for a "regular" rental license. I don't own a building with 4 or more units, so I am not subject to any inspections. First, a \$350 fee is excessive. If you want to keep track of who is doing it, how about \$10 or \$20/year. (It's \$125 per year in Chicago.) Second, do not do inspections. That is over the top - a waste of government services that will cost money (probably more than \$350) and an intrusion on the hosts. As others have said, these platforms review properties and do a good job weeding out properties that aren't well-maintained. My guess is that an AirBNB host cares a lot more whether their unit looks nice than the landlord of a long-term rental does - we don't get reviewed several times per month. (I don't think they inspect STRs in Chicago.) Third, these businesses already pay the 4% tax. That's enough burden to people who are trying to make a little bit of extra money to survive in Oak Park. Fourth, the capacity restrictions are too low. People aren't using these as long-term dwelling units where these restrictions make sense. As others have said, there is no reason that a one bedroom can't accommodate 4-5 people. Our family of four has often traveled and been unable to afford a two-bedroom unit, so we have done a one bedroom and had the kids sleep on a pull-out or air mattresses. It's still far more space than a hotel room (with two queen beds or a king and a pullout). I understand we don't want parties, so maybe something like "limited to two people over five years old per bedroom, plus an additional three people over 5 years old" (seems reasonable not to count small kids that might sleep with their parents or in a crib). (In Chicago it is 125 sq.ft. of living space per person. In one of my two-bedroom apartments that would be 9 people, which is pretty generous.) Finally, I absolutely sympathize with the homeowners that have complained about particular repeat offenders. I don't want that on my block, and neither does anyone else. But this ordinance is not going to stop that mayhem. It's simply going to be an unnecessary burden on hosts, the vast majority of whom are good hosts and good neighbors. Why can't there be \$10 or \$20 licensing, with no additional strings, but if there are X violations of noise or nuisance ordinances per year, the host's license is revoked for 6 months? If they continue to rent unlicensed, have a fine. Address the actual issues people are most concerned about (partying and noise), and leave the rest of the hosts alone, or mostly alone. VOTE NO on this oppressive ordinance. The citizens of OP do not need the government to micromanage every aspect of their lives. Address serious problems, and leave the rest alone. Thank you for your consideration.

Noise

Submitted by Anonymous. * I think you mean unfair advantage to Airbnb guest/ commercial property. As the homeowner, you do not have the control to turn off the noise

I am in favor of the regulation

Submitted by Jeremy Olsen. I think short term rental regulations are necessary, and the regulations proposed are generally reasonable, given the burdens imposed on neighbors by activities of this sort. I am NOT in favor of banning or eliminating such short terms rentals (Oak Park needs more accommodations for short term guests and tourists, not less. And until some hotels open up in this

town, online services will have to meet the need). I do think the license fee should be a little less, say \$200.