

Summary of Public Engagement

Outreach methodology

Public roundtable of approximately 60 residents – January 8, 2019

Online survey – open January 8, 2019 to January 25, 2019

Emails from public – received January 10, 2019 through January 28, 2019

Issues with proposed regulations

- HOA rules sometimes contract zoning regulations
- Concerns of number of guests in few bedrooms
- On-street vs. off-street parking unreasonable
- Applications/violations may overwhelm County staff
- Annual regulation process too burdensome
- Residency requirements/proof
- Neighbor notification should be for all Homestay uses
- Need data for violations/number of operations in County
- Special exceptions for property type (e.g. townhomes) too lenient
- Inspection of long-term rentals should match short-term rentals
- “Disproportionate” response to number of violations

Repeated questions/confusion

- Confusion over grandfathering/non-conforming status of existing homestays
- Confusion over changes to regulations impacting existing, permitted homestays
- 45-day whole-house maximum – confusion over definition and selection of number of days

Clarifications Needed

- Annual regulation fees
- Tax ramifications
- Hotel industry’s involvement in this process
- Special exception criteria

Suggested regulatory approaches – establishing homestays

- Continuity in regulations with City Homestay regulations
- Require HOA notification/compliance on application
- Reduce regulations, as majority of Homestays are not causing issues
- Reduce regulations but tax homestays
- Adjacent owners/managers should be sufficient, esp. on family division parcels
- Emphasize “primary use of these parcels is residential”
- Make number of guest rooms proportional to size of parcel

Suggested regulatory approaches – managing homestays

- Limits on number of guests in addition to bedrooms
- Require proof of homeowner’s insurance for annual inspection
- “Responsible party” nearby instead of on-site manager