

**From:** "Johnston, Sadhu" <Sadhu.Johnston@vancouver.ca>  
**To:** "Direct to Mayor and Council - DL" <CCDTMACDL@vancouver.ca>  
**CC:** "City Manager's Correspondence Group - DL" <CMCG@vancouver.ca>  
"Krishna, Kaye" <Kaye.Krishna@vancouver.ca>  
"Holm, Kathryn" <Kathryn.Holm@vancouver.ca>  
"Merkley, John" <John.Merkley@vancouver.ca>  
**Date:** 10/23/2017 4:56:03 PM  
**Subject:** Council Questions/Answers re: Short Term Rentals  
**Attachments:** STR Councillor Questions - 10.23.2017.pdf

Greetings Mayor and Council,

Please find attached the staff responses addressing Councillor questions received to-date regarding Short Term Rentals. Should you have any questions, please contact Kaye Krishna at 604.873.7160 / [Kaye.Krishna@vancouver.ca](mailto:Kaye.Krishna@vancouver.ca).

Best,  
Sadhu

**Sadhu Aufochs Johnston** | City Manager  
City of Vancouver | 453 W 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver | BC V5Y 1V4  
604.873.7627 | [Sadhu.johnston@vancouver.ca](mailto:Sadhu.johnston@vancouver.ca)  
Twitter: sadhuajohnston



**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This message and any accompanying documents contain confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose. This message is private and protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying or distribution, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information, is strictly prohibited.

## July 11, 2017 Council Meeting - Regulating Short-Term Rentals

### Councillor Questions and Responses:

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
Councillor Tim Stevenson				
1	Yes	I'd like to start by asking about the problem that we've had with people who rent secondary suites and being evicted, and the cause of that, and why it's so important for us to regulate in regards to this. What have we heard around people being evicted?	What have we heard around people being evicted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff estimate that of the approximately 6,000 active STR units, 400-800 units were diverted from the long-term rental supply either through sale, attrition or eviction</li> <li>• It's very difficult to obtain <i>complete</i> data with respect to STR-related evictions; as data points tend to come from complaints (which implies that the tenant is aware of the reason for eviction), but reports from other cities and rental advocacy groups suggest that STR does directly and indirectly increase the risk of eviction</li> <li>• Staff have also requested information from the Residential Tenancy Board (RTB) on complaints of evictions related to STR; however to-date they have not provided data</li> </ul>
2	Yes	In regards to enforcement - what would you highlight as new enforcement regulations? As things have been lax in terms of enforcement, how are we going to change this?	How are we going to improve enforcement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcement traditionally has been complaint-based or inspection-based, however both approaches can be challenging for STR, in terms of being able to prove that STR occurred, and over what time period</li> <li>• Staff are recommending a new type of offence for <i>marketing</i> short-term rentals without a business licence, for which online advertisements would be supporting evidence</li> <li>• Staff are also</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
				recommending a new approach for STR enforcement, leveraging data available online, and in partnership with Platforms, to identify suspected unlicensed or commercial operators, gather evidence, and to support prioritization of enforcement actions
Councillor George Affleck				
3	Yes	A transient business - someone comes in and then leaves the business - what does this mean in terms of the tracking of it? The operator realizes it is too much work and not as much money as they expected when they got into it and then they get out of it. Why is it transient?	Why is STR Operator turnover so high? What impact does this have on administration and enforcement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STR Operator turnover is high in most major cities in North America</li> <li>• Many STR Operators sign-up online for a one-off stay (e.g. vacation) or because they're curious, but do not stay with the Platforms long-term</li> <li>• It's unclear how the high rate of online turnover will translate into license turnover, but its expected to be much higher than for traditional businesses</li> <li>• High license turnover increases required administration, as it takes more effort to create a new license rather than renew an existing license</li> </ul>
4	Yes	Currently when they (the operators) get out, do they put their homes back in to the long-term renters pool?	Do Operators offer LTR after they have stopped officer STR?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's currently unclear</li> <li>• Many STR Operators have expressed that they prefer the <i>flexibility</i> of STR compared to LTR, and would be unlikely to ever LTR their units, especially if it is their principal residence</li> </ul>
5	Yes	On page seven (of the report) it says that the numbers are stabilizing, we are seeing this here and other markets,	Why should we establish a regulatory framework given that the market is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently STR in Vancouver is unlawful; we are seeking to legalize</li> <li>• Although growth in the STR market has slowed (from 80+%/year between 2013-</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		so it begs the question why do anything? Why create all this bureaucracy, spend all this money, and have this state where people misinform us, and neighbours spy on each other? Why are we doing this if we are seeing this stabilization in the market?	stabilizing?	<p>15 to 13% between 2016-17), it is still a fast-growing industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are approximately 6,000 active STR units in Vancouver, providing an estimated 29% of accommodation for the City's transient guests</li> <li>• All other businesses in Vancouver are licensed</li> <li>• Staff recommend establishing a policy framework to focus on preventing commercial operators in the STR market and protecting the LTR market</li> <li>• Staff are also seeking to improve safety relative to the current situation, support the LTR market, and promote neighbourhood fit</li> </ul>
6	Yes	Is it happening because the enforcement is not happening?	Has lack of enforcement resulted in rapid market growth?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many people in Vancouver currently do not realize that STR is unlawful</li> <li>• At the same time, the technology itself has progressed, and is now being rapidly adopted in Vancouver and world-wide - this is believed to be the key factor driving the growth of this market</li> <li>• There is also general perception amongst some existing STR Operators that there will be limited enforcement actions for STR of their principal residence</li> </ul>
7	Yes	There are two parts to the report - there is that and the whole restricting and spying and all the other things	Why is the license fee only \$49; why not make it higher?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because this is new, and because there are already 6,000 STR units, we wanted to reduce the barrier for Operators coming into compliance</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		<p>that we are doing. One of the challenges we have is the marijuana stores and we created a very expensive licensing fee. If instead of restrictions, if people are renting their places for 90 days a year, according to Airbnb, 9 days a month for the rest of the time we don't know what they are doing maybe having friends over?</p> <p>Why not create a really high, very expensive license, charge a lot of money maybe 5 or 10 times as much, and use that money to put back in to creating homes and housing in the city?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$49 is also relatively close to the existing licence fees for Bed and Breakfasts and Long-Term Rentals, and we wanted to align fees for similar services</li> <li>• Staff have also proposed a transaction fee of up to 3% which would be collected/remitted by the Platforms, which may be used to fund housing priorities provided we achieve cost-recovery for licence administration and compliance</li> </ul>
8	Yes	<p>I think that the Revenue Forecasts might be inaccurate- they are overly optimistic. What is the problem we are trying to solve here? Home ownership rights in policy creation of Council. Mentions Empty Home Tax - it could assist in providing clarity on how to create policy for short-term rentals. Also mentions 'Housing</p>	<p>Do the revenue forecasts consider that STR Operators may stop operating, or that they may move to non-compliant platforms?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given that most STR regulatory frameworks in other major cities are relatively new, it is difficult to estimate future compliance levels</li> <li>• 40% to 50% compliance amongst active STR Operators has been achieved in other cities, but is considered an optimistic scenario</li> <li>• Staff have analyzed three potential scenarios (10% compliance, 25% compliance, 40% compliance) and believe that 25% is the most likely</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		Reset'. This policy could lead the public to other platforms that will be next to impossible to track. Data can be conflicting and contradicting itself (as in the surveys).		future scenario
Councillor Melissa De Genova				
9	Yes	If staff had let us know in October that they were going to work with Airbnb and other stakeholders, did they endorse this report and the recommendations? I cannot ask those questions of them after it goes to Public Hearing, so I would like to ask staff today, are they fully supportive of the recommendations and endorsing the report?	Do AirBnB and other STR Platforms support the recommendations in the report?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff have had ongoing discussions and consultation with AirBnB and Expedia (who owns several smaller STR Platforms); other Platforms have not engaged</li> <li>• AirBnB has expressed concerns that homeowners should be able to rent their secondary suites, even if they do not live in the suite</li> <li>• Expedia has suggested that STR Operators should be able to have multiple STR units, such as for secondary properties</li> <li>• Given that the first guiding principle of the project is to protect the long-term rental market, staff recommend that secondary suites and secondary properties should require a principal resident to be eligible for STR</li> </ul>
10	Yes	Someone who has a secondary suite in their home - what makes a secondary suite a suite is really a stove - so if they were to remove that stove and had a hotplate or something like that - could they then	Are there ways of getting around the restriction on secondary suites?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main differences between a secondary suite, and a "part of your home" is that a secondary suite has a kitchen, exterior access, and should also have a separate address</li> <li>• However, currently out of the estimated 30,125 secondary suites in Vancouver, only 5,925 have</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		say that they could have that as part of their home? And then rent that suite out - are there loopholes here?		<p>been permitted by the City - many secondary suites are unknown and do not have their own address</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If an owner is STR'ing an illegal secondary suite (i.e. has a kitchen, but isn't permitted), this would be illegal under the proposed regulations</li> <li>• If the owner removed the kitchen, and ensured that all sleeping rooms met code, then they may rent this space as part of their home (but note: they wouldn't be able to advertise this space as an "entire unit" which significantly reduces their nightly booking price)</li> </ul>
11	Yes	We have a very strict Public Hearing process and I know that staff and Council understand that and I was a little taken aback to see the Mayor and staff holding a press conference to announce what these regulations would mean and concerns about what this process would mean before a proper Public Hearing process. I don't see that with many development applications. Can you elaborate on that and does that in any way compromise the integrity of the Public Hearing	Does the July press conference affect the integrity of the Public Hearing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff objectives in attending this press conference were to communicate the proposed STR regulations ahead of referral to Public Hearing, hopefully improving the Public Hearing process by sharing information</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		process?		
12	Yes	One last question about the licensing fees: is the first licence fee refundable if they are not successful in renting their suite or a room in their house? Or would they be told instead that they have to turn this into a secondary suite instead of it having a hot plate and being a portion of your house?	Is the licence fee refundable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, City business licence fees are not refundable regardless of whether the business is successful</li> </ul>
Councillor Adrienne Carr				
13	Yes	The presentation noted that we expect 70-80% of STRs to be legalized, but only 25%-40% (optimistically) to be in compliance. Why the difference and why is the compliance expectation so low? What do we do with non-compliance?	What is the difference between “legalization” and “compliance”?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Legalization” refers to the percentage of <i>existing</i> STR operators who would be legal under the proposed regulatory framework, provided they were interested in continuing to STR</li> <li>“Compliance” refers to the estimated percentage of active STR operators who, once the regulations are in place, comply with the licensing requirements</li> <li>Given that most STR regulatory frameworks in other major cities are relatively new, it is difficult to estimate future compliance levels</li> <li>40% to 50% compliance amongst active STR operators has been achieved in other cities, but is considered an optimistic scenario</li> </ul>
14	No	What do we do about non-compliance if it’s	What do we do if there is very low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our plan in this instance would be to continue to focus available compliance</li> </ul>



#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		60% of 75%? I'd like to know what the plan is; that's a fairly low level of compliance?	compliance?	<p>resources on commercial operators or STR Operators who have multiple units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff would also take measures to encourage adoption such as through outreach and public communications</li> <li>• If very low compliance persists, we would want to revisit the proposed licensing conditions</li> </ul>
15	No	Do we have any data on the number of the 6,000 STR listings that are: A. Secondary suites and laneway homes, and B. Illegal dwelling units?	How many STR units are in secondary suites, laneway houses, or illegal units?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff manually reviewed randomly-selected AirBnb units in Vancouver posted online and estimated that between 500 and 1,000 of active STR units are secondary suites, although it is unknown how many of these secondary suites are permitted</li> <li>• Staff do not currently have an estimate for the number of laneway houses currently active in the STR market</li> </ul>
16	No	Did we probe in any of our surveys what percent of STR hosts use their suites/bedrooms for family/friends in between times and whether they are willing to rent long-term if they can't do STRs?	What percent of hosts use their units for family/friends in between rentals, and are they willing to rent long-term if they can't do STRs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many STR Operators have commented that they use STR units for family and friends in between periods of having paid guests, and prefer the flexibility of STR relative to long-term renting</li> <li>• In a July 2016 survey, 17% of people reported that their units would be used for long-term rentals if it wasn't an STR unit, and staff expect an even lower percentage for those who use their suites intermittently for family and friends</li> </ul>
17	Updated	Did we consult with B&B operators about their inclusion in	Did we consult with traditional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the July proposal, we have amended the proposed regulatory</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		these new regulations and what was their response?	BnBs to inform the proposed regulatory framework?	<p>framework to maintain the existing Bed and Breakfast business licence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing Bed and Breakfast operators in Vancouver will experience no regulatory change</li> <li>Existing Bed and Breakfast operators would have the option to apply for a STR business licence (which would include a maximum of one accommodation per licence, without exception)</li> </ul>
18	Not fully	Will AirBnB and other STR platforms collect the voluntary transaction fee?	Will AirBnB and other STR platforms collect the voluntary transaction fee?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although AirBnB and Expedia have indicated that they are open to this, neither Platform has committed to collecting the voluntary transaction fee</li> <li>In some other cities, AirBnB does collect related taxes and fees</li> </ul>
19	Not fully	Will AirBnB and other STR platforms be required to enforce hosts to include Vancouver business license number?	Will AirBnB and other STR platforms require a Vancouver business license number?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although AirBnB and Expedia have indicated that they are open to this, neither Platform has committed to <i>requiring</i> a valid business licence number</li> <li>The City is currently reviewing options to licence online platforms (for STR and other platform-based services), to enable mandatory licence requirements</li> </ul>
20	No	Have we done public consultations or obtained any data indicating what percentage of secondary suites and laneway homes would be rented to long-term renters that are currently	What percentage of secondary suites and laneway homes would be rented long-term that are currently used as short-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although we don't have a specific survey question for that scenario, 17% of survey respondents said they would use their unit for LTR if it wasn't a short-term rental (equating to approximately 1,000 units)</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		used intermittently by family members and rented as short-term rentals?	term rentals?	
21	No - received in writing	How does a “night cap” minimize negative neighbourhood impacts? (p. 4)	How does a “night cap” minimize negative neighbourhood impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CoV staff are not proposing a “night cap” given that it’s very challenging to enforce</li> <li>• Some other cities have established a night cap on the assumption that it may reduce the frequency of disruptive STR units (simply by reducing the volume of rentals), however many have struggled with enforcement</li> </ul>
22	No - received in writing	As staff have worked at reducing the commercial operators/hosts of STR units (3+ and 10+ units per operator), are we continuing to monitor whether these units are being rented on a long-term basis? (p. 7)	Are former commercial STR units now being used for LTR?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were at least 9 new LTR licences obtained in buildings used by former commercial operators since April</li> <li>• There may also be other ticketed STR units now rented long-term under pre-existing LTR licences</li> </ul>
23	No - received in writing	Do we have analysis from the VEC and Tourism Vancouver on the seasonal impacts, especially in low seasons and on smaller hotels, of 29% of transient guests using STRs?	Do we have seasonable analysis of hotel vacancies; and the impact of STR?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In peak periods hotel vacancy exceeds 90%, and it’s clear that in those situations STR enables people to visit Vancouver who would otherwise have no suitable or affordable place to stay</li> <li>• We have not seen a seasonal analysis of the impact of STR on smaller hotels</li> <li>• The STR data “screen-scraped” from online platforms only reflects a “point in time” for June 2016 and April 2017, and therefore is not suitable for</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
				seasonal analysis
24	No - received in writing	Can you explain why there has been a decrease of 22% in STR units in the West End?	Why did STR units in the West End decrease 22% between June and April?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This may be a statistical anomaly, as there were only 66 West End STR units in the baseline June 2016 data</li> <li>It may also be the result of trends in Strata rules prohibiting short-term rentals</li> </ul>
25	No - received in writing	Was there a role in the promotion of STR of encouraging Vancouver residents to let guests to stay in homes during the 2010 Olympic Games?	Did the Olympics fuel STR in Vancouver?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's hard to say, given that the rapid growth in STR globally (not just in Vancouver) commenced in 2009/2010, the same time as the Olympics</li> <li>It's difficult to isolate how the Olympics contributed to STR vs. the systemic increase the popularity and user base of the STR Platforms in the same time period</li> </ul>
26	No - received in writing	Are we tracking crime statistics/safety issues in residential neighbourhoods with increases in STRs?	Are we tracking STR related community issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public complaints regarding STR are quickly becoming more common</li> <li>The number of complaints received via 3-1-1 pertaining to STR in 2016, 2015, and 2014 was 144, 19, and 4 respectively (see page 29 for a summary table of 3-1-1 complaints)</li> <li>84% of complaints was for "suspected STR"; 9% was for "multiple listings"; 3% was for STR related safety issues; and 2% was for STR related noise</li> <li>So far in 2017, the City has over 300 STR-related complaints, more than 3x the pace of last year</li> </ul>
27	No - received in writing	What are the problems/opportunities related to non-conforming illegal secondary suites and	What are the problems/opp ortunities related to illegal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STR in illegal secondary suites (or illegal dwelling units in general) may present a safety risk if the</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		STRs?	secondary suites and STRs?	<p>dwelling unit does not comply with building or fire code</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is however an opportunity to use the potential for STR in a secondary suite as an “incentive for safety”, such that the owner legalizes the unit and brings it up to code such that it may be rented short-term (provided it’s someone’s principal residence unit)</li> </ul>
28	No - received in writing	What is our worry about bringing the STR industry into a regulatory framework such that we are proposing a lower business license fee than B&B businesses (p. 29)?	Why is the license fee only \$49; lower than for traditional BnBs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because this is new, and because there are already 6,000 STR units, we wanted to reduce the barrier for Operators coming into compliance</li> <li>• \$49 is also relatively close to the existing licence fees for Bed and Breakfasts (\$47 per sleeping room) and Long-Term Rentals (\$66), and we wanted to align fees for similar services</li> </ul>
29	No - received in writing	What are the estimated revenues the City expects from the voluntary transaction fee on booking prices?	How much money will the transaction fee generate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff estimated that the voluntary transaction fee would generate less than \$100,000 annually, assuming 25% compliance and a 1.5% fee</li> </ul>
30	No - received in writing	Will the City pursue with the provincial government changes to expand our authority to enable us to legally require and collect from STR Platforms a transaction fee of up to 3% of booking prices?	Will the City seek tax authority over STR?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff are recommending the Provincial Government review tax equity between hotels, bed and breakfasts, and STR</li> </ul>

Councillor Andrea Reimer

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
31	Yes	<p>Why the City would require a renter to have permission? And my concern here is if part of the rationale for allowing renters to rent out their suite when they are not there is to allow them to make money to afford livability the asymmetry that is inherent in that, that an owner can rent out anytime whereas a renter has to go to an owner for permission. It is much less likely that they have access to that income so I am curious to why that provision exists and in my opinion an issue for the RTB, and the renter and landlord and not the City.</p> <p>It is not surprising that it is out of respect of the owner, and it seems that is out of disrespect for the renter.</p>	Why do renters require permission from the owner to STR?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Tenancy Agreement governs the tenancy; however in addition to the Tenancy agreement, the City would require that renters get permission from the owner as a condition to ensure that homeowners are aware and give consent for use of their properties for transient accommodation</li> <li>• Transient accommodation carries a different set of safety risks compared to long-term use, as transient guests are not familiar with the units, and for this reason its important that the homeowner is aware that STR is taking place</li> </ul>
32	Yes	In the Advocacy pieces you have a number of taxation advocacy. Given that only 7% of rentals are registered it would seem like there is an opportunity	Can the Province help us improve data on secondary suites?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff agree that there should be better integration of municipal and provincial housing data sets, especially for secondary suites; this is currently being reviewed as part of a separate project</li> <li>• To support the ongoing</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		there to advocate to the Province to ask them to help us register the other 93% as they have all the data that we would need to find those rentals. They would have that data through lease agreements, RTB complaints, evictions, etc. I understand that this is not a matter for Public Hearing, but part of the overall report.		<p>administration and enforcement of the proposed STR regulations, staff have contacted the province to request any available data on RTB complaints, evictions, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's very difficult to obtain <i>complete</i> data with respect to STR-related evictions; as the only data points tend to come from complaints (which implies that the tenant is aware of the reason for eviction)</li> </ul>
33	Yes	On page 8 of the report it talks about the potential of adding a number of suites - about how many suites could be added. When you talk about potential it would be interesting to understand the mechanism. I understand the mechanism that you're proposing to stop it from being a STR. What mechanism would it be to have it added to rental? Just because it's not STR it doesn't follow that it is therefore long-term rental.	How should we encourage owners to join the LTR market?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 20% to 30% of existing STR units would not be eligible for a licence under the proposed regulatory framework</li> <li>• These owners will have an incentive to consider the LTR of their units in order to at least partially replace the revenue stream from STR</li> <li>• Creating further incentives for owners to long-term rent their unit is an important policy question for the City, but is outside of the scope of this project</li> </ul>
34	Not fully	This is a fairly large question so you may not have the answer at your fingertips. It's informed by a couple of things.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There's emerging research on STR regulations, but not a lot of developed research</li> <li>• Research shows that STR does create upward price on long-term rents, given</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		<p>This main concern on the impact on renters has four main criteria that we are evaluating:</p> <p>A. Is this increasing availability of rental stock?</p> <p>B. Is this increasing affordability of rental stock? These may be two different things</p> <p>C. Is it increasing security of tenure?</p> <p>And;</p> <p>D. Is it increasing safety? Or what is the impact? Is it increasing, decreasing or neutral?</p> <p>Given that there is a number of jurisdictions which have already regulated, I would be curious to learn what they have learnt about these four questions.</p>		<p>the relatively high revenue from STR compared to LTR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some residents have also reported evictions that are suspected to have resulted so that the landlord could STR, decreasing perceived security of tenure for many tenants (although staff do not have access to quantitative data in this regard)</li> <li>• Staff are proposing to work across projects to gather baseline data on availability, affordability, security of tenure, and safety prior to the introduction of the proposed regulations, and then to monitor the market to identify how the STR regulations have impacted metrics</li> <li>• Staff are not sure of the impact of the proposed regulations on affordability; rather regulations focus on avoiding future cost increases due to STR market expansion</li> </ul>
Councillor Elizabeth Ball				
35	Yes	<p>On page 19 it mentions that all STR units should have a maximum of occupancy of two adults sleeping - does that include children? Many rent STRs because they are travelling with their children and they wanted to know if they could continue to do that under this regime?</p>	<p>Could two adults and a child rent a 1-bedroom STR unit?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, two adults and a child could rent a 1-bedroom STR unit</li> <li>• The regulations limit rentals to two adults (excluding children) per sleeping unit</li> <li>• This is similar to existing occupancy load regulations in the Building and Fire By-law</li> </ul>



#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
36	Yes	Hospital patients are using secondary suites that were original built for the children of the family. They are gone now around our hospitals they are being made available for patients that have to come in for longer periods of time but not 30 days. Would it be impossible now for those patients to use the secondary suites that are in homes that people actually live in?	Can owners STR secondary suites which are not their principal residence?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary Suite in the Zoning and Development By-law means: <i>“a smaller dwelling unit within a larger one-family dwelling or two-family dwelling, which must have separate external access and may have shared internal access, but does not include a lock-off unit”</i></li> <li>• Secondary suites are considered to be a separate dwelling unit; rather than a part of home</li> <li>• For this reason, a secondary suite must be a principal residence if it is to be STR’ed</li> <li>• If the secondary suite is not a principal residence, it is not eligible for STR</li> <li>• The key rationale for this policy is to encourage LTR, and minimize the likelihood of residents operating full-time transient accommodation in residential communities</li> </ul>
37	Yes	People who are living in their house and their child is no longer living there in their suite, can they make that suite available for those purposes?	Can owners STR secondary suites which are not their principal residence?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the secondary suite is not a principal residence, it is not eligible for STR</li> <li>• If the child remained the principal residence, then the child would be able to STR the suite provided they obtained a business licence and it is a legal secondary suite</li> </ul>
38	Yes	Children use the secondary suite they go away, so can another student rent that suite? What is the situation where the child is away in an ordinary	Can owners STR secondary suites which are not their principal residence?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the secondary suite is not a principal residence, it is not eligible for STR</li> <li>• Alternative, it could be rented for longer than 30 days at a time</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		space, can this space be used?		
39	Yes	I just want to make sure that I understand, we are removing the option for parents, patients, children their home people who live in their property cannot rent out their secondary suites for these purposes when this is rolled out?	Can owners STR secondary suites which are not their principal residence?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the secondary suite is not a principal residence, it is not eligible for STR</li> <li>• Currently STR is not legal in the City of Vancouver; so we are not removing any existing options from homeowners</li> </ul>
Kerry Jang				
40	Not fully	I was intrigued about the stories regarding evictions when you spoke to Cllr Stevenson - at city Hall you hear lots of stories, but not a lot of data. I wondered if you can, if possible, bring some information back on the actual evictions? Or on how you propose to collect that data? Because it is all hearsay at the moment. Or something along those lines, as it is important, and the whole purpose for doing this.	What data do we have on evictions related to STR?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff estimate that of the approximately 6,000 active STR units, 400-800 units were diverted from the long-term rental supply either through sale, attrition or eviction</li> <li>• It's very difficult to obtain complete data with respect to STR-related eviction; most data points would come from ex-tenants noticing their former dwelling unit on STR Platforms, but often tenants may not know the reason for eviction</li> <li>• Staff have requested information from the Residential Tenancy Board (RTB) on complaints of evictions related to STR; however to-date they have not provided data</li> <li>• It is clear however that the financial incentives for STR are much greater than for LTR; and the policy aims to align incentives for LTR and STR, even in the absence of quality data on the</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
				rationale for evictions
41	Not fully	<p>“I have just been on the Airbnb sites for Tokyo and Vancouver. Tokyo has lots of listing of whole houses and apartments on the AirBnB site and I know from friends there that there have been complaints about that.” The Vancouver site has fewer laneway houses than when he looked a month ago, maybe they are being rented and not up there at the moment. Question: Since the discussion regarding STRs has come up has it had an impact and have the number of listings dropped off? Like the listings for laneway houses that were originally for long-term rentals. And if you have any data on fewer laneways (no longer on AirBnB) and have they been converted into long-term rentals? I just want to get a sense of whether it is adding a greater supply on the market?</p>	Have the proposed regulations changed the market, even if they have not yet been implemented?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff do not have quantitative evidence of how the announcement of the proposed regulations have impacted the existing STR market (as the latest “screen-scraped” online data is from April 2017), but the number and frequency of 3-1-1 calls has increased since July</li> <li>• The number of commercial operators with more than 10 listings decreased from 25 to 13 between June 2016 and April 2017</li> <li>• The growth of overall STR listings has slowed, but this could either be a result of the proposed regulations, or generally slowing of growth in the STR market</li> <li>• Host compliance (the 3<sup>rd</sup> party contractor that provides “screen-scraping” data) cannot identify laneway houses distinctly</li> </ul>
<b>Councillor Heather Deal</b>				
42	No	If you could find two or three of those scenarios for the Public Hearing that	Can you provide more scenarios illustrating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Appendix C of the July 5 Policy Report for a more extensive list of potential scenarios</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		<p>we know are most likely. I have read the report and seen PowerPoints. I have questions regarding the person that is in town short time to work. We could talk potential individual scenarios forever and not know the answers. You probably know the answers. If you could come up with a couple of categories of those kind of concerns, that are real concerns, so that we know very clearly yes or no on this or that. We have a good list of yeses and nos. As you know there is an endless number of possibilities, this and that, and different factors that might lead to different concerns, from various people. That would be great information to have during the Public Hearing.</p>	<p>how the policy works?</p>	
<b>Councillor Raymond Louie</b>				
43	No	<p>At Public Hearing - please provide more exact numbers - How many secondary suites are there? Legal, unregistered? How many of these long-</p>	<p>How many secondary suites are there: in total, permitted, and in the STR market?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2016, there were an estimated 30,125 secondary suites in Vancouver (source: Census 2016)</li> <li>• There have been 5,925 secondary suite permits issued since 1989 (when</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		term rentals are actually in our city?, so that we can determine what the movement is to short term rental - this program that has been proposed may inhibit the conversion to short term, but it doesn't actually create long-term rental units in our city - but the only way to know that is to determine how many units we actually have.		<p>the permit was created)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As of April 2017, there have been 2,735 permits issued to construct laneway houses in Vancouver</li> <li>Staff manually reviewed randomly-selected AirBnb units in Vancouver posted online and estimated that between 500 and 1,000 of active STR units are secondary suites, although it is unknown how many of these secondary suites are permitted</li> </ul>
44	No	I am actually more interested in the geographical distribution of both short and long-term - in the report you've done a good job showing where the short term rentals are, but where are the long-term rentals?	Where are long-term rentals in Vancouver?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2016 CMHC Rental Market report provides the geographic distribution of long-term rentals in Vancouver:  <a href="https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/odpub/esub/64467/64467_2016_A01.pdf?fr=1495831479110">https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/odpub/esub/64467/64467_2016_A01.pdf?fr=1495831479110</a> </li> </ul>
45	No	And what are the impacts on the percentage of the ability to pay? High-level of rent rates, whether for long term or short term - conversion to short term may be more impactful on the overall scope of things given that most important of the principles is the first one (preservation of long-term rentals). This information will	How do we know whether this program is effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are several metrics that should be considered in determining whether this program is effective <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vacancy rate</li> <li>Availability rate</li> <li>STR and LTR pricing</li> <li>STR market size</li> <li>SS permits</li> <li>Complaints</li> <li>STR related RTB hearing</li> <li># of listings vs. # of licences</li> </ul> </li> <li>Staff are proposing to establish a baseline for available metrics prior to</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		<p>give us the opportunity in a year's time to really benchmark, but absent the data we don't really know (we won't know) how effective the program is and what sort of adjustments are to be appropriately made.</p>		<p>implementation, track progress and changes, and adjust the policy if required to fulfil the guiding principles for this project</p>
Mayor Gregor Robertson				
46	Yes	<p>Comparing what is proposed in Vancouver as to what is in place in other cities. On the enforcement side, how cities with a comparable set of regulations are doing on the enforcement side? When you looked at these regulations, did your recommendations - were they basically flowing from what is working through the process? Or were most of these other cities are still on early days and everything is still up in the air as to what is actually going to work? What cities have we seen that have good functioning system for regulating and enforcement - Particularly those that have the rental housing prices that we have, which is</p>	<p>How are other cities with similar challenges to Vancouver addressing STR?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STR regulations in other major cities are relatively new, so this is an emerging policy area, with no clear best-in-class model</li> <li>• Most cities are focusing on enabling STR in principal residences, and sometimes in secondary suites attached to principal residences</li> <li>• There are several measures attempted in other cities (e.g. spot zoning, annual caps, multiple units per operator, etc.) which staff have not included in the proposed regulations because of lessons learned elsewhere</li> <li>• The proposed regulations are very similar to the proposed regulations in the City of Toronto, except that Toronto allows STR of secondary suites which are not a principal residence (provided that the secondary suite is inspected and meets building code)</li> <li>• With regard to enforcement, there is a trend towards the proactive aggregation of</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		what is motivating us to even consider this.		<p>data from online sources to identify suspected cases of non-compliance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are also cities which have coordinated “pass-through” registration (e.g. San Francisco, Chicago) which lets users register with the City prior to becoming an Operator on the Platform</li> </ul>
47	Yes	Is there a ‘best in class’ right now that we are aspiring to model after?	Has one city proposed best-in-class STR regulations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no clear best-in-class; no one city has gotten it perfect yet</li> <li>• New Orleans is pleased with their regulations, which allow for some commercial operations, but they also have rental housing advocates concerned about the ongoing impact on LTR and rental prices</li> <li>• Staff support the proposed regulations currently being considered for the City of Toronto, which generally align with Vancouver’s proposed regulations</li> <li>• However, unlike Toronto, Vancouver is prohibiting STR of secondary suites which are not principal residences, with the objective that these units be used primarily as LTR supply</li> </ul>
48	Yes	Vancouver specific approach - housing protection - Our uniqueness: what differentiates us from other cities is our focus on long-term rental protection - I am sure that there are a number of other	Is Vancouver uniquely focused on protecting the LTR market?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other cities have also focused on protecting the LTR market, however Vancouver is unique in that it has the highest rents and lowest rental vacancy in Canada, and therefore has proposed new solutions for protecting the LTR market - such as prohibiting STR in secondary suites which are</li> </ul>

#	Addressed at Meeting?	Transcribed Question	Short-Form Question	Response
		cities that have made housing protection a priority for their regulations?		not principal residences