

## ATTACHMENT A

# Short-Term Rental Survey

Total Survey Respondents: 487




\* Note not all respondents answered every question\*

5/17/2021 5:53:48 PM



### 1. Do you own or rent where you currently live?

Respondents: 484




All responses

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Own	79.96%	387	
Rent	19.21%	93	
Other	0.83%	4	
Total	100%	484	

STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Own	96.43%	189	
Rent	3.57%	7	
Other	0.00%	0	
Total	100%	196	

Non- STR operators



Choice	Percentage	Count	
Own	68.42%	195	
Rent	30.18%	86	
Other	1.40%	4	
Total	100%	285	

#	Respondent	Other
2	50.92.34.100	both
3	205.250.65.128	Live with family
4	24.69.116.94	owned by parent. Living with parent



## 2. Are you currently a short-term rental operator or have plans to become an STR operator?

Respondents: 481

All responses

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	40.75%	196	
No	59.25%	285	
Total	100%	481	



Renters only

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	7.53%	7	
No	92.47%	86	
Total	100%	93	



3. The City of Nanaimo currently recognizes and permits Bed and Breakfasts (room rentals within single-family homes); however, the bylaw does not currently recognize other types of short-term rentals, such as the rental of an entire home or apartment. Do you support the City of Nanaimo including the following definition of Short-Term Rental within Zoning Bylaw 4500: Short-Term Rental (STR) refers to the short-term (less than 30 days) rental of an entire residential dwelling, suite or room located on a residentially zoned property.

Respondents: 469



All responses

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	65.88%	309	
No	34.12%	160	
Total	100%	469	



#### STR operators only

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	78.01%	149	
No	21.99%	42	
Total	100%	191	

#### Non- STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	57.45%	158	
No	42.55%	117	
Total	100%	275	

#### Renters Only

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	56.32%	49	
No	43.68%	38	
Total	100%	87	

#### All comments

#	Yes
3	But short term rentals should not be allowed
4	I support
5	Provided parking is adequate not on the street
6	provided the owner lives on property, or close enough to deal with any complaints from neighbours.
7	I agree that short term rentals should be allowed in entire homes
8	Why 30 days? 15? 60?
9	I am fine as long as the owner is living on the property
10	I have no issue with AirBnB or whatever allowed in Nanaimo as long as there are regulation set up that protect LTR and put their accomodations above a financial venture of someone else. Affordable available housing is more of a public interest that someone's additional income.

<b>11</b>	not enough information in this survey to say
<b>12</b>	Please allow STR of travel trailers that are in good condition and properly hooked up to water and electricity inside the property.
<b>13</b>	Though some STR are more than 30 days




#	No
<b>1</b>	less than 30 days is too short.
<b>2</b>	moderate income people need options other than expensive hotels.
<b>3</b>	This will directly impact the already crisis level vacancy rates. Metro Vancouver has entire apt buildings w/all units designated as short term rentals. This will eventually happen here.
<b>4</b>	I disagree with entire dwellings being short-term rentals.
<b>5</b>	Not if it causes long-term renters to be denied. YES if it opens up MORE rental spaces.
<b>6</b>	Bad idea, will put more pressure on rentals
<b>7</b>	There should be no STR permitted unless approved by all next door neighbors since they are the ones most affected by the additional noise and traffic.
<b>8</b>	Not when it is in part of a home when the owner concurrently lives in the home.
<b>9</b>	STR should be banned in residential neighborhoods
<b>10</b>	30 days is too long to be considered a short term rental. It takes the property out of the market for regular renters.
<b>11</b>	should not include entire house or suite not attached to residence
<b>12</b>	More regulation is not necessary
<b>13</b>	owners businedd
<b>14</b>	How will you deal with the vacancy rate if you do this? Long term renters will be homeless people. Homeless people will cost you more.
<b>15</b>	could mean a month of vacationers on a residential street. These people are on holidays. We dont put hotels on residential streets. We have ample reasonable priced motels in nanaimo. Lets support business please.
<b>16</b>	I consider STR to be a separate building from the main residence.
<b>17</b>	Not ok with entire dwelling rentals - harms long term rental
<b>19</b>	Short term rentals, without strict regulation, takes much needed housing away from the locals who need it. This has been shown in many cities.
<b>20</b>	There should be no time restriction
<b>21</b>	Allowing one property to be rented out without restraints could arbitrarily allow owners to change the conditions and environment of a property or neighborhood.
<b>22</b>	Concern about how a suite is defined and whether a suite in a home can be rented by the owner of the home if the definition does not include the suite portion as part of the primary residence.

<b>23</b>	I think there should be an option for people to rent an apartment for a minimum of a week at a time. Families arrive from out of town and need a place to stay. Workers for Harmac and other companies arrive for shorter periods and the companies would like to have a regular place for their employees to stay.
<b>24</b>	Some short term rentals might be month to month. For example, Canadian snowbirds staying 1-2 months, or remote Island residents coming to Nanaimo to give birth (6 weeks) or other medical situations requiring more than 30 days stay.




4. Staff's recommendation is to allow STRs in an entire home where the STR dwelling unit or suite is the primary residence of the STR operator. Primary Residence refers to the home where the operator lives as an owner or tenant for at least 8 months per calendar year, and which is used for bills, identification, taxes, and insurance. Do you support allowing a STR rental in an entire home where the operator is a permanent resident of the dwelling unit or unit?

All responses




Respondents: 470

Choice	Percentage	Count	
<b>Yes</b>	66.17%	311	
<b>No</b>	24.26%	114	
<b>Unsure</b>	9.57%	45	
<b>Total</b>	100%	470	




STR operators only

Choice	Percentage	Count	
<b>Yes</b>	84.46%	163	
<b>No</b>	7.25%	14	
<b>Unsure</b>	8.29%	16	
<b>Total</b>	100%	193	

#### Non-STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	53.09%	146	
No	36.36%	100	
Unsure	10.55%	29	
Total	100%	275	

#### Renters Only

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	43.82%	39	
No	41.57%	37	
Unsure	14.61%	13	
Total	100%	89	

#### All comments

#	Yes
3	But use 6 months per year
4	Reduce residency from 8 to 6 months.
5	Where they are permanent resident or not
6	STR's should be the complete choice of the homeowner not the government.
7	Time limits and not too many in a neighbourhood
8	Also should be allowed if the operator does not live there.
9	It is their home
10	Good idea, allows occupation while away
12	but should also be if not primary residence
13	This is a good regulation that means a property cannot be exclusively, or even mostly, a STR.
15	Y also for secondary property owners
16	I disagree with 8 months. Alot of people live away half the year. This is their house. They should be able to do what they want with it.

<b>17</b>	Max 1 rental unit
<b>18</b>	excluding Stratas
<b>19</b>	8 months is generous

#	No
<b>1</b>	Prefer privacy when staying elsewhere.
<b>2</b>	leading question stop taking away property rights
<b>3</b>	Owner should not need to be there majority of the time
<b>4</b>	This still leads to more traffic and noise and people taking up parking. It's awful to live beside one.
<b>5</b>	As a neighbor, this means people coming and going and we have no idea who they are. Terrible for building any type of community.
<b>6</b>	Owner should be there 12 months
<b>7</b>	Too much noise and parking issues, for the neighbours to deal with.
<b>8</b>	STR should be allowed if owner occupies any portion of the house
<b>9</b>	short term rentals have made it impossible for local people to afford rent. STR should be either made really expensive for people to get in on or made undesirable choice for the home owners. But make sure you differentiate the difference between a Bed n breakfast & an Air B n B. Bed in breakfasts are a staple in the tourism industry.
<b>10</b>	Short term rentals should never be permitted in residences
<b>11</b>	STR should be allowed regardless of owner occupancy
<b>12</b>	This is going to get abused and manipulated
<b>13</b>	I do not support this because I do not have confidence that the 8 months would be monitored and enforced.
<b>14</b>	Ban all STRs
<b>15</b>	No. I have a property I do not live in that I rent to VIU students. It is often vacant for the summer months. Allowing STR of that property would ease the pressure on hotels, allow an otherwise vacant property to see use, and make it less likely that I sell the property.
<b>16</b>	You dont enforce any bylaws now with air bnb and you wont with this
<b>17</b>	I do not support having a requirement for the property to be the operators primary residence.
<b>18</b>	Again, how will you control the already dismal rental vacancy
<b>19</b>	People in Vancouver falsify this easily. They go "home" for inspections, keep an "office" there for appearance. Staff's recommendation is ill-advised and naive.
<b>20</b>	You should allow short term rentals in secondary suites and vacation properties.
<b>21</b>	How do you enforce this? Living somewhere on paper is not hard..

<b>22</b>	parking & parties issues in residential neighbourhood
<b>23</b>	They should be allowed whether or not the the operator lives there
<b>24</b>	Again, enables selfish exploitation at expense of property or neighborhood.
<b>25</b>	I have just retired and purchased a condo downtown in addition to my home. At present, it is a business investment providing critical income. It is also a form of insurance for me that I can downsize easily to a nice condo if my house becomes too much work. I like meeting people and providing accommodation and insight into Nanaimo. I'd like to be able to rent the condo out for one week at a time.

#	Unsure
<b>1</b>	8 months is two academic terms
<b>2</b>	Only if it also includes the ability to rent the whole home and not just a room or suite. I personally prefer to rent Air bnb's where I have the whole place to myself and some privacy.
<b>3</b>	It depends on if the owner moves out of the property during the rental which takes up potential rental property elsewhere. Do whatever is needed to keep rental housing available.
<b>4</b>	What checks would be in place to ensure that the owner is actually present?
<b>5</b>	I would like the 8 months increased to 10.
<b>6</b>	I am okay if they are offering them as short-term rentals, but not as AirBnB's. Any homes or suites that are vacant for more than four months out of the calendar year should be long-term rentals
<b>7</b>	I support a STR whre the owner is in full time residence. for example a suite or room in a house similar to a bed and breakfast. I have concerns about renting the whole house when the owner is not there. Hard to police the 8 month rule. Often becomes a " party house " if the owner is absent thus disturbing the neighbours.. Am against not having at least the 8 month rule. This would take away rental supply
<b>8</b>	I feel this is a trick question - please go to question 3 for my answer - I support the entire residence being rented out and don't care if the owner lives there and yes it can be for under 30 days!
<b>9</b>	We support STR in legal suites that Owners own, but live adjacent to/above/ or below on the owners property.
<b>10</b>	I support short term rentals for legal suites that are attached to the owner's property (two separate dwelling on one property)
<b>11</b>	I suspect enforcement would be difficult
<b>12</b>	Question is unclear. I believe that there should be no requirement for a property to be owner occupied.
<b>13</b>	Not a very clear question
<b>14</b>	not enough information in this survey to say
<b>15</b>	If the owner/occupier of the home and suite can be the same person. Just because there is a 'suite' in a home does not mean that it is not part of the main home and can still be used by the



main home owner. The suite should be considered part of the main home and thus eligible for rental.

**16** I support, but hope that parking, noise etc. implications are considered.

**17** STR should be allowed in part or whole of any residence occupied or not by the owner.

5. Currently the Zoning Bylaw limits the number of guests and guestrooms permitted within a Bed and Breakfast to 2 guest rooms and 4 guests in most residential zones and 4 guestrooms and 6 guests in commercial and multiple family zones. Staff are recommending these limits also be applied to all STRs, including entire home rentals. Do you agree with continuing to apply the existing limits for numbers of guests and guestrooms?

Respondents: 464

All responses

Choice	Percentage	Count		
Yes	59.70%	277	<div></div>	<div></div>
No	40.30%	187	<div></div>	<div></div>
Total	100%	464		

STR operators only

Choice	Percentage	Count		
Yes	52.60%	101	<div></div>	<div></div>
No	47.40%	91	<div></div>	<div></div>
Total	100%	192		

Non-STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count		
Yes	64.81%	175	<div></div>	<div></div>
No	35.19%	95	<div></div>	<div></div>
Total	100%	270		

Renters only

Choice	Percentage	Count		
Yes	65.88%	56	<div></div>	<div></div>
No	34.12%	29	<div></div>	<div></div>
Total	100%	85		

## All comments

#	Yes
2	Increasing this limit will directly impact local neighbourhoods and the social culture/relationships and likely negatively impact the sense of "community".
3	Might as well but what difference does it make
4	only if its made an undesirable option
5	This statement is confusing. Are 2 guest rooms the equivalent of 2 suites or one suite that holds 4 people?
6	Short term is not inexpensive which is what people wsnt
7	If that means 4 adults. For example telling a family with two parents that max 3 children is not reasonablen
9	Yeah, i don't care how many people can rent as long as the owners financial venture is put after ensuring affordable, available housing for residents first
10	I think so, but I'm not sure how this would apply in entire home rentals. Does this mean that you cannot rent your entire home if it has more than 2 rooms in it?

#	No
1	No limits
2	stop taking away property rights this is not your job
3	This would hurt families of 5 or more who need a short term place to live
4	This could negatively impact the STR guests - considering family size and young ST renters (many of them need to joint rent to be able to afford)
5	Limiting is not necessary
6	we need long term rental protection not more short term rentals.
7	Don't limit
8	Allow up to 6 guests
9	Permit use of all bedrooms and persons that can be accomodated
10	Number of guests per room should be a bit higher to allow for families with more than two kids
11	Large homes can accomodate more
12	Why do you want to exclude families?
13	Should allow more people for entire home's. Should be scalable for number of bedrooms in house.
14	Increase number of rooms for BnB and str
15	4 guests or two rentals in one home should not be allowed




16	Owners should be allowed to set limits within reason if they have a business license
17	Too limiting
18	Meh. If we lose a rental space for residents of Nanaimo, then it doesn't really matter how many people are staying there, that spot is lost to long-term rental.
19	Should be higher
20	Remove the limits
21	As a traveler and user of these services this would be very limiting if myself and some friends wanted to rent a house for a weekend to save money on our trip to the city.
22	If you have a room with, eg, a couple of bunk beds for kids you should not be limited to 2 kids for that room.
23	I don't believe the city needs to regulate this
24	The limit should be 1 room, 2 guests
25	zero guests - zero STRs
26	No limits
27	Many people choose short term stays as a family get together - often two families and can easily be a 8-10 person accomodation requirement.
28	depends on size of home and property
29	Not all homes and neighbourhoods are created equal.
30	You dont control it now and wont in the future
31	The existing limits should be lifted
32	This number should be increased to allow for rentals of entire homes. It may be difficult for people to try to 'lock off' portions of their homes to accommodate otherwise. Should not be penalized for having a bigger home.
33	still too high in residential neighbourhoods
34	To me this would depend on the size of the house
35	Most homes have 3 or more bedrooms
36	should allow 2 guests per room
37	i think it is up to the property owner to the maximum numner of people they will accept, and of course they must be easily reachable in order to assist with any issues that may arrise with their guests.
38	More guests should be allowed as some families have more than 4-6people.
39	Increase
40	Would you limit how many people can live in a family home?
41	Discriminates against families who want to stay together. Leave it up to the owner to manage guest number based on particulars.

42	It should be the amount of total bedrooms or sleeping accommodations. What if a family has more than 2 kids?
43	Should be a little more.
44	It should depend on the size of the property and at the discretion of the owner.
45	This should be up to the owner.
46	Some families are bigger than 4 ie. I have 5 daughters and including their spouses would put us at 10 people so a family trip would be out of range.
47	If you're going to allow STRs, larger houses should be included.
48	Often we rent to multi generational families... 2 grandparents, 2 parents and some kids
49	To high a limit in multiple family
50	Family's are going to be renting the STR's so the the regulations need to allow for the size of a family.
51	I think the number should be 10
52	If a visiting family is larger than four people the four person limit shouldn't apply.
53	STR (as defined at less than 30 days) should not be allowed.
54	not enough information in this survey to say
55	That is crazy. That means two families (kids included) cannot rent an STR together for a weekend. Expenses are very high and often a single family cannot pay the expense on their own.
56	As a family with three children we really struggle to find accommodation. I think allowing two adults and three minors is reasonable.
57	If the STR applies to the entire home and the home has more than 2 rooms (in residential zones) then all rooms should be able to be included. 4 guests may also not make sense for the same reason. Perhaps saying 2 guests per guest room would be more reasonable.
58	A large primary house is a perfect place for a family to stay instead of a hotel or several hotel rooms and if the limit is 4 people in a 6 bedroom house when the owner is away that makes no sense.
59	If a unit has multiple bedrooms and can comfortably house more exceeding the current limits I believe an amendment should be considered.
60	What good comes from enforcing this arbitrary limits?
61	I have 4 children, so we are a family of 6. I think the number should be higher.
62	1 room 2 guests
63	Certain families would be unable to secure STR with this in place.
64	These, at times are used as central family meeting points and a whole home that can accomodate more people should be allowed.
65	I think the limitation on guests and guest rooms should be a function of available parking. It is lack of parking overflowing to in front of neighboring that had the potential to upset neighbors. So if there is lots of room for parking why not allow more guests.
66	I think 2 rooms up to 4 guests max is more reasonable for families with children




<b>67</b>	permit 6 guests
<b>68</b>	you are not taking into consideration accompanying children or in-laws
<b>69</b>	I would assume 2 guests per bedroom so with 4 rooms - allow for 8 guests
<b>70</b>	two people per bedroom regardless of the size of the home should be allowed

6. Currently, Bed and Breakfasts are permitted within secondary suites provided the total number of long- and/or short-term rental rooms does not exceed two per dwelling unit (house and suite). Do you support continuing to permit STRs including Bed and Breakfasts within a secondary suite?




#### All Responses

Choice	Percentage	Count	
<b>Yes</b>	69.00%	325	
<b>No</b>	19.75%	93	
<b>Unsure</b>	11.25%	53	
<b>Total</b>	100%	471	




#### STR Operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
<b>Yes</b>	89.06%	171	
<b>No</b>	3.13%	6	
<b>Unsure</b>	7.81%	15	
<b>Total</b>	100%	192	

#### Non- STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
<b>Yes</b>	54.87%	152	
<b>No</b>	31.41%	87	
<b>Unsure</b>	13.72%	38	
<b>Total</b>	100%	277	

## Renters only

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	44.94%	40	
No	35.96%	32	
Unsure	19.10%	17	
Total	100%	89	

## All comments

#	Yes
3	I would like to see 3
4	STR should be allowed in either the primary or secondary suite
5	only if its made an undesirable option
6	Of course
7	Permit and remove the limits
8	All sort term renatals should be allowed
9	Yes, but the city needs to monitor landlords to ensure that they are abiding by this rule
10	But Only one secondary suite should be allowed per dwelling.
11	Only one per residence
12	I would also like to see an allowance of having two suites and a primary dwelling for the operator.
13	But the amount of persons permitted should be based on sleep capacity. Some secondary suites have 3 rooms.
15	As long as #5 above is followed
16	See above
17	But also if the bed and breakfast or short term rental is contained within the main residence.
18	Stricter

#	No
1	this will remove affordable LTR housing units

<b>2</b>	That's restrictive and seems to defeat the purpose of the business model. What if a family wants to run an Air bnb in their secondary suite? What if the secondary suite has two bedrooms? Can it not be rented out to four people?
<b>3</b>	Should rent that out long term, what a waste
<b>4</b>	We have a massive housing shortage.
<b>5</b>	No STR in secondary suites
<b>6</b>	only if you want to intensify the LTR crisis
<b>7</b>	You wont restrict this now and wont in the future
<b>8</b>	Increase rental vacancy! Housing as a commodity is less important than housing actual residents
<b>9</b>	our commercial hotels need the business. please support them
<b>10</b>	unless approved by the homeowner as well
<b>11</b>	Unless the suites are only going to be vacant for less than 4 months out of the calendar year, these suites should be a part of the regular rental market.
<b>12</b>	I think there should only be one short term rental per dwelling
<b>13</b>	We need housing for Nanaimo residents
<b>14</b>	If the owner is living on the property and the property is large, more than two rental rooms should be allowed. For seniors, this may allow them to continue living on their property. House Insurance, building supplies, and the cost of tradespeople have gone through the roof. It is expensive to live on your own property and costs need to be covered. The costs only seem to be increasing.

# Unsure	
<b>1</b>	ONLY if the owner lives within the same property. Otherwise, it would encourage the trend where income property owners re-designate long-term rentals as short term - thereby further reducing city occupancy rates further. It seems likely that management of these sites will be left to the renters themselves as owners are often absent.
<b>2</b>	Whatever it takes to protect LTRs until the housing crisis is resolved.
<b>3</b>	only if owner/operator lives there
<b>4</b>	We have parking issues due to a couple of these in our neighborhood
<b>5</b>	Not if suite and house are rented at the same time
<b>6</b>	please refer to my answer to question 3
<b>7</b>	not enough information in this survey to say






7. Bed and Breakfasts and other STRs do not currently require business licences in the City of Nanaimo. Based on the recommendation of the Affordable Housing Strategy and previous engagement work, Staff are recommending that business licences be required for STRs including Bed and Breakfasts. Do you support requiring business licences for STRs?




---

#### All responses




Respondents: 472

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	54.66%	258	
No	38.35%	181	
Unsure	6.99%	33	
Total	100%	472	




#### STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	22.80%	44	
No	64.77%	125	
Unsure	12.44%	24	
Total	100%	193	

#### Non- STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	76.90%	213	
No	19.86%	55	
Unsure	3.25%	9	
Total	100%	277	

## Renters only

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	81.82%	72	
No	13.64%	12	
Unsure	4.55%	4	
Total	100%	88	

## All comments

#	Yes
3	It possibly adds to the sense of responsibility to the owner.
4	best way to track them
5	A licence makes sense. But nothing ridiculous
6	need to be taxed heavily to encourage owners to rent long term lease
7	If they must exist they should be licensed and taxed higher. Surrounding neighbors should be under a reduced tax rate. It is truly unnerving to live beside people that you have no idea who they are coming and going all the time. It can turn a quiet area into a noisy place. It's really awful.
8	Neighbors should pay less taxes as we now have to put up with more noise and traffic etc.
9	As long as the fee is the minimum amount.
10	All short term rentals should be banned
11	Most important yes of all.
12	Yes its a buisness they should be licenced.
13	Absolutely
14	Strongly support this. Taxes should be adjusted as such. Homes with businesses should pay higher tax rates. These businesses increase traffic and strain infrastructure.
15	I believe this is very important.
16	Theyre operating it as a business.
17	But you need to enforce all rules as well
18	If you're going to do it then yes
19	These are affordable and generate reasonable city revenue. Perhaps the parking considerations may be reduced or reconsidered for eligible STRs.
20	on par with commercial hotel and motels

21	Absolutely!
22	Unlike long-term rentals which are helping house Nanaimoites, this is a purely business move for vacationers. They should definitely be licensed as such.
23	Feel VERY strongly about this.
24	For standards to be applied
25	I have business license on mine, and I pay the local PST and MRDT tax on my listing which is on the Sunshine Coast.
26	I think it is reasonable to require a business license.
27	I think it is a legit business. And should be required to have a license. I do not think there should be a cap on how many are issued.
29	This should absolutely be mandatory. It allows the city to know just how much housing stock is used as STRs, and it generates funds to pay for the city's work on this issue.
30	It's a business is it not? You could put stipulations saying that if the property is used as STR more than x times per month or year than a BL is required.
31	Absolutely!
32	Selling space is a business.
33	People making income from STR should be forced to report income on their taxes. Forcing a business licence would give the city more recourse for those breaking the rules.
34	Absolutely
35	Requiring a licence may keep landlords accountable and the income made should be taxable.
36	B and B's and STR's must be monitored. Licensing these accommodations is only a money grab unless there is staffing to follow up on complaints and to do spot inspections. There have been several illegal B and B's on Protection Island. There are a couple of excellent B. and B's that get tarnished by poorly run and illegal units.
37	for sure

#	No
1	stop trying to add new taxes and taking away property rights this is not your job
2	Nonsense. This seems like a money-grab. Long-term landlords don't need a business license. Income from rental properties is suitably taxed.
3	bed and breakfasts are not the issue in BC. Issue is with Air BnB just ban them city wide
4	I'm taxed enough thank you
5	Business licence will only make things worse, and discourage people from renting at all.
6	mainly because in my situation I am not in competition with motels, hotels, etc
7	What does a business license have to do with affordable homes
8	It's a money-grab

<b>9</b>	Just a money grab
<b>10</b>	Its more paper and regulations and costs.
<b>11</b>	the idea for most of us is to use the STR on occasion not a full time business.
<b>12</b>	The home is already taxed
<b>13</b>	More beurocracy for the limited STR days and we already pay the occupancy and income taxes.
<b>14</b>	Lodging is a human right, do you guys need your mitts in every single thing possible?
<b>15</b>	not of the owner is a current occupant.
<b>16</b>	We already pay hefty property tax, don't need more paper pusher taxes.
<b>17</b>	Affordable housing will only be affordable if the province or municipality subsidies it
<b>18</b>	no licenses should be required
<b>19</b>	live next to set of B+B homes / they operate well
<b>20</b>	This should be required only if a business licence is also require for long term rentals as well.
<b>21</b>	business licenses are capitalistic in nature
<b>22</b>	I'm not sure what's involved in a business license (fees and rules I'm assuming) but I don't think it is fair to the home owner if they are going to be required to jump through more hoops or pay fees to help house people in STRs or B&Bs.
<b>23</b>	More paperwork for little benefit.
<b>24</b>	Business licencing will not provide any releif to Affordable housing.
<b>25</b>	How would you differentiate between non paying guests and paying guests? And why would you need to? Are you next going to require business licences to sell used goods on Kijiji and Craig's list? Surely staff resources could be put to better use.

<b>#</b>	<b>Unsure</b>
<b>1</b>	Within limits. That is: if someone only rents out 3-4 times a year, I don't think a license should be required/ I am anxious about the cost and oversight. I would need more details to answer. If the cost was
<b>2</b>	not too high and the oversight not too onerous, I would be supportive, because I see the value in being able to keep track and know what's going on in our city
<b>3</b>	Depends on License cost
<b>4</b>	We are not in the city
<b>5</b>	How difficult is it to get a business license? What benefit to the city is there in requiring licenses?
<b>6</b>	License fees should be low.




7 As long as the expectations of the building licence is realistic. If owners provide food, then it is realistic that they take a Food Safe course. Short workshops or online courses on how to manage a B&B business would help support owners to do a good job hosting.

8 Why or why not?




8. The City of Nanaimo currently responds to illegal STRs on a complaint only basis. Some other municipalities take a more active enforcement approach including subscribing to software to monitor and enforce STR rental activity. Would you like the City to take more active enforcement role with respect to STRs?

Respondents: 471




All responses

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	41.61%	196	
No	50.96%	240	
Unsure	7.43%	35	
Total	100%	471	

STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	12.50%	24	
No	79.69%	153	
Unsure	7.81%	15	
Total	100%	192	

Non-STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	62.32%	172	
No	30.43%	84	
Unsure	7.25%	20	
Total	100%	276	

## Renters

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	68.18%	60	
No	21.59%	19	
Unsure	10.23%	9	
Total	100%	88	

## All comments

#	Yes
2	We are in a housing crisis. Nanaimo compared to the rest of Canada, has a particularly high levels of child poverty and homelessness. More enforcement would highlight that the city CARES what happens in neighbourhoods, BEFORE a complain in made. This regulation would show a commitment that the City of Nanaimo actually cares what is happening. When a complaint is the starting point,, it's reactive and it misses the growing trends.
3	owners will do whatever it takes to avoid complying with the law.
4	Because they sure don't seem to care when paying tax payers complain.
5	Even at that we have complained many times and not a single thing was done about it. So much for the average tax payer who is playing by the rules.
6	as long as its better than the snow removal bylaw which is never enfoced. bylaw enforcement in this city is a Joke. There are rural towns in NovaScotia that do a better job with bylaw enforcement. the fines are too small and are pennies to most living in bc., Its cheaper to just pay the fines.
7	Active enforcement role
8	The city should take a more active role for everything. Complaint based is useless.
9	Absolutely
10	There are many illegal suites rented in our city. If only complaints are investigated, many people will not complain to avoid poor relations with neighbors.
11	You currently respond on complaints but dont do anything about it
12	If the staff recommendation is adopted and you don't begin active enforcement, including sniffing out fraudulent claims of residency, I'll not vote for a single person on council in the next election.
13	owners contact number should be posted on residence. On our street the police are having to respond to most of the complaints at air bnb re noise, d be visible on the property
14	Needs to be a level playing field for businesses that are currently 'following the rules' in the traditional hospitality industry.

15	I'm not sure what other measures could be implemented to enforce, but I think more should be done
16	It protects everyone.
17	And all bylaws. Not sure what your staff does all day but they ignore any violations they witness unless they receive a complaint. Even then, it's a tossup if they'll do anything. Would be nice if bylaws did their jobs instead of sitting at the beach and coffee shops all day.
18	Absolutely
19	The burden of reporting should not be placed on neighbours as this can damage relationships.

#	No
2	We are in a housing crisis. The City ought to be MORE accommodating, not Less.
3	You have better things to do
4	If neighbours are happy that speaks volumes to the STR
5	It will require more taxes to be paid for monitoring and discouraging people from a possible needed revenue.
6	Too much oversight.
7	Not needed.
8	Enforcement processes should be reactive and transparent
9	Let individuals chose if they would like to participate in STR's
10	Should be on complaint basis only.
11	The people who actually live in a neighborhood know best what a neighbourhood can tolerate. A one size fits all approach to enforcement does not work.
12	cost will go to taxpayers
13	waste of time and money
14	I belive that if there is an owner that is easily reachable by any neighbours, this should not be an issue.
15	I think that if there are no complaints by neighbors then some freedom should be maintained.
16	Police state- no thank you
17	If the system is working, don't try to fix it.
18	This isn't the solution to affordable housing, punishing tax paying homeowners who want to house guests.
19	Municipalities shouldn't invade personal activity. This is a democratic society, not a socialist one
21	not needed. based on my experience, short term rental do not cause nuisances
22	Do what Vancouver does.






<b>23</b>	Complaint basis works. Considering the city is facing issues regarding lack of affordable housing, rampant homelessness, drug use, and crime in the downtown and a plethora of actual public health and safety problems, i think the budget can be better spent elsewhere.
<b>24</b>	No definition for an 'illegal short term rental' was provided; is there even a definition for such a thing?
<b>25</b>	Home owners have the right to privacy and rent their suites out however they want. Long term tenants have more rights than home owners and home owners are left to pick up the pieces after abusive, unsafe, disrespectful renters. That is why many have switched to STR's.
<b>26</b>	This doesn't make sense if it removes people from a safe and reasonable accommodation and may only increase the homelessness issue.
<b>27</b>	You want more rentals available, make it easier for landlords to offer. Continue to investigate complaints, but leave those alone that are doing a great job and housing ppl.
<b>28</b>	That is very intrusive.
<b>29</b>	Continue responding only to troublesome properties.
<b>30</b>	Absolutely not. Let's not turn Nanaimo into a police state where we are all being watched. Frightening. If STRs are being run well, there will be no complaints. Don't fix something that isn't broken.
<b>31</b>	You can't restrict more housing during such a difficult time to live and find housing. People will leave the city
<b>32</b>	I dont believe it to be required

# Unsure	
<b>1</b>	depends on how much this is an issue/cost of enforcement vs licensing revenue
<b>2</b>	Only if there is a net financial benefit.
<b>3</b>	I don't know if it's a big problem or not right now. I can see why it could make sense, but if it's not a big problem, then I think it's okay to just let it go
<b>4</b>	This depends on what new regs are put in place. In general, I don't think this is a major issue in Nanaimo so complaints suffice, but the situation requires monitoring and this may need to be reassessed.
<b>5</b>	each and every STR should be looked into to reduce foreign investment
<b>6</b>	It depends on the type of tenants. I was reported and asked to shut down, as I rented a travel trailer on my property.




## 9. Do you support requiring one additional parking space where an STR is located on the property?

Respondents: 466




All responses

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	57.30%	267	
No, more parking should be required	19.10%	89	
No, less parking should be required	23.61%	110	
Total	100%	466	




STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	55.50%	106	
No, more parking should be required	18.32%	35	
No, less parking should be required	26.18%	50	
Total	100%	191	

Non- STR operators

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	58.61%	160	
No, more parking should be required	19.41%	53	
No, less parking should be required	21.98%	60	
Total	100%	273	

Renters

Choice	Percentage	Count	
Yes	60.47%	52	
No, more parking should be required	19.77%	17	
No, less parking should be required	19.77%	17	

<b>Total</b>	100%	86	
--------------	------	----	--

#### All comments

#	Yes
1	Should not be taking up more road space that could be used by walkers/bikers
2	The City should be requiring more parking spaces for most developments. Most neighbourhoods that have secondary suites have their street littered with an excess of parked vehicles, making them feel uncomfortable and unwelcome for pedestrians and kids playing..
3	Unsure
4	No extra spaces in the street. In house driveway only. There are so many extra cars per household on the streets.
5	Street parking negatively affect community walkability.
6	Yes. Parking should be provided. I have had renters from next door use my driveway, without permission.
7	Should follow rules for parking if there is a suite. One off road parking stall to be provided.
8	this question is not clear
9	keep roads clear for residents
10	Yeah, but what does "one more" mean? Clearly if street parking in an area is too tight, an STR should accommodate the cars it generates. But if a home has a 2-car driveway and only 1 car, then making that STR household build a 3rd spot would only decrease greenspace without adding value. So instead of "additional" I would say "dedicated" or something
11	this avoids any on street parking issues that could come into play.
12	One parking space per guest group should be required.
13	If street parking is unavailable
14	1 per guest room
15	We have enough room
16	It's not safe to sidewalks and roads clogged with cars
17	This would be enough for residential zones provided Zoning bylaw updated as per question 5.
18	must be off-street, can be stacked
19	1 additional off street parking for every 2 guests
20	People drive.
21	Yes, we live on a busy cul de sac and it would be extremely annoying to add another vehicle that didn't have a designated spot, semi regularly
22	only if the STR is not the entire home, because then the tenants/visitors would be using the home owners parking spaces as they wouldn't be there.

23	All rental parking should be off street. Street parking should be for guests only.
24	I have found short term renters parking in my driveway.
25	Only if street parking is unavailable.
26	Property should have adequate parking for each set of guests that does not impact neighbors..
27	IF POSSIBLE
28	start enforcing this. So many suites depend on on street parking entirely, burden goes onto the neighbourhood not the rich landlord
29	Perhaps only in parts of the city where it is difficult to find parking...eg. downtown

#	No, more parking should be required
1	more barriers to using your property- this is not your job to reduce the use and enjoyment of private property owners. Deal with the zombies everywhere instead
2	1 parking lot per short term rental unit
4	Get these cars off the streets blocking driveways
5	parking for each room being rented should be required.
6	Only if there is not parking for 2 already.
7	Depends on the number of guests and their vehicles
8	There should have been a bylaw requiring 1 full sized parking spot per bedroom years ago.
9	Let the market decide if its a suitable STR or not.
10	There should be 1 per rental unit
11	If more than 1-2 guests allowed then there should be more than one spot
12	our dead end residential street is full of excess air bnb vehicles in the summer
13	No on street parking
14	I don't support this requirement.
15	Leave as is.
16	If the owner is not there then no further parking should be required.
17	I do not support STR though.
18	should be based on max occupancy

#	No, less parking should be required
1	We are already an authorized suite with extra parking
2	No additional parkings
3	This presumes that renters have a vehicle, which is an error. It would disallow perfectly good and much-needed accommodation spaces.
4	We need to stop increasing the amount of impervious surfaces and removing natural spaces.
5	no parking as it will encourage people to switch to str as opposed to long term leasing, also, more parking ruins neighbourhoods. people need to use public transport.
6	Go green! Discourage vehicle use.
7	No street parking or public transit is more likely
8	Determine parking requirements based on physical characteristics of the building, usage should be irrelevant.
9	Too many rules, let people figure out parking for themselves
10	Indifferent.
11	Not everyone drives
12	I thought we were trying to go green. Why would you encourage more cars and parking spaces which will be built on currently green space (yards etc).
13	If public transit is an option, additional parking is unnecessary
14	existing parking is fine - who wrote these questions very deceiving
15	Street parking is fine if available.
16	Again, your over-complicating the issue. There are already parking enforcement rules in place across the city.
17	Residential neighbourhood usually have more than adequate street parking
18	often STR guests do not have a car
19	often, travellers to not have cars, so parking space requirement is excessive
20	How is parking defined? There are probably a lot of perfectly acceptable places to rent that would not be capable of adding more parking due to other bylaws, other restrictions and aesthetics preventing them from transforming their property into a parking lot.
21	Requiring a certain amount of parking is not conducive to the City's goal of promoting active transportation.
22	Many homes in Nanaimo only have access to street parking.
23	We should be encouraging people to move to a car-free lifestyle. Why require parking when it's possible that the primary resident doesn't have need of it.
24	Parking is weird anyway.
25	Depends on the location and whether Street parking is available.