

## MAYOR'S SHORT-TERM RENTAL TASK FORCE

MEETING OF AUGUST 14, 2019 (5:30 p.m. CDT)

122-B Tichenor Avenue (City Meeting Room), Auburn

### I. ATTENDANCE (in alphabetical order)

#### *Task Force Members:*

Ron Anders, Mayor	<a href="mailto:randers@auburnalabama.org">randers@auburnalabama.org</a>
Forrest E. Cotten, Planning Director	<a href="mailto:fcotten@auburnalabama.org">fcotten@auburnalabama.org</a>
Evan Crawford, Citizen Member	<a href="mailto:evan@crawfordwillisgroup.com">evan@crawfordwillisgroup.com</a>
Marcus Marshall, Planning Commission	<a href="mailto:msm91882@hotmail.com">msm91882@hotmail.com</a>
Megan McGowen, Assistant City Manager	<a href="mailto:mmcgowen@auburnalabama.org">mmcgowen@auburnalabama.org</a>
Bob Parsons, City Councilor	<a href="mailto:bparsons@auburnalabama.org">bparsons@auburnalabama.org</a>
Robert Ritenbaugh, Planning Commission	<a href="mailto:britenbaugh3@gmail.com">brittenbaugh3@gmail.com</a>
Brett A. Smith, City Councilor	<a href="mailto:basmith@auburnalabama.org">basmith@auburnalabama.org</a>
Anna Solomon, Citizen Member	<a href="mailto:annasolom@gmail.com">annasolom@gmail.com</a>
Bruno Ulrich, Citizen Member	<a href="mailto:bulrich@charter.net">bulrich@charter.net</a>

#### *Invited Speaker:*

John Wild, President, A/O Tourism Bureau	<a href="mailto:johnwild@aotourism.com">johnwild@aotourism.com</a>
--	--

*Others:* Meeting was open to public, but not open to receive public comment. The meeting was live streamed on the City's YouTube channel, making it available to the public at-large via <https://www.youtube.com/watch?reload=9&v=cafsvgLFBY0>.

### II. MAYOR ANDERS INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Mayor Anders introduced the Task Force to the public, commenting that the public is welcomed to attend, but that no questions nor comments will be received from the public during the meeting, albeit, the public is invited to provide comments to Task Force members via personal contact, email, or social media following the meeting. The Goal is for Task Force members to take comments received from two (2) public meetings and at other times, along with the outcome from discussions this evening among members, and to provide the Planning Department guidance for use in preparing a revised draft for consideration by the Planning Commission and, ultimately, City Council. The Mayor noted that both the Commission and Council are free to accept the recommendations of the Planning Department and Task Force, or to develop and adopt their own versions of an STR ordinance. Also, there will be advertised public hearing(s) at both the Commission and Council levels. The Mayor reiterated the fact that he initiated the need to address the short-term rental ("STR") issue at the outset of his Administration, formed the Task Force, and requested that the Planning Department prepare the proposal now before the public for consideration. Lastly, the Mayor commented that at this point, he could not nor would predict the final form of the

ordinance. The final form of the ordinance will involve guidance from all parties working together towards the common goal of giving the citizens of Auburn the best possible ordinance that can be achieved through the democratic process. Contributing parties will include Auburn residents, the Task Force, Planning Department, Planning Commission, and City Council.

### **III. AUBURN/OPELIKA TOURISM BUREAU (the “AOTB”) PRESENTATION**

At Mayor Anders invitation, Mr. John Wild (President, A/O Tourism Bureau) distributed a printed 13-page presentation of staff resumes, role of the AOTB, lodging inventory, tax information, economic impact, and select trends (said document is incorporated herein by reference). Mr. Wild stressed four (4) major points. Following is a summary of his presentation. There are 36 lodging properties with 2993 guest rooms in the Auburn/Opelika area, generating average daily revenues of \$167,000. Councilman Parsons asked whether any STRs were included in the 2,993 rooms. Mr. Wild commented that no STRs were included in the statistic. Eighty-eight (88) percent of the inventory is franchised owned. Currently, the Lodging tax is 13 percent (6 % City; 4 % State; and 3 % AOTB). Worthy of note is the fact that the lodging inventory has increased about 25 percent in four (4) years, with 10 percent of that coming in 2018. Also, STR lodging revenues represented about 0.7 percent. Ms. Solomon inquired as to why that number (0.7 %) was so low, and whether efforts are being made by the tourism industry to track STRs. According to Mr. Wild, the tourism industry is having difficulty to inventory the number of STRs in operation; hence, it is challenged in collecting revenues from hosts. Equally challenging for the Industry is separating owner-occupied and investor-owned (“Non-Primary”) STR sectors and, subsequently, in tracking revenues for collection purposes. According to Mr. Wild, the lodging industry’s overriding concern is participating in a “*level playing field*” with the STRs. A question was asked regarding the vacancy rate of lodging facilities. Mr. Wild responded: Occupancy rate is 59.8 percent (i.e., 40.2 percent vacancy rate). Mr. Ulrich inquired as to whether Mr. Wild was familiar with STR Helper, Inc. Mr. Wild commented that he was not. [Aside: Based on web-based research, it appears STR Helper, Inc. has merged with Home Compliance, Inc. It is this author’s understanding that the City of Auburn has entered into a contract with Home Compliance for select STR-related services]. Mr. Ritenbaugh inquired as to how football games affect lodging occupancy rates. Mr. Wild provided the following: in 2018 occupancy rates ranged from 71.3 % (Alabama State) to 92.6 % (Texas A&M). Also, Mr. Wild noted that the highest average rate for rooms in 2018 page was \$248/night and \$143/night was the lowest. Ms. McGowen commented that it may not, for revenue generating purposes, be so important for lodging facilities in the Auburn and Opelika area to be 100 percent occupied due to the variable rate structure used in pricing event stays.

### **IV. PROPOSED ORDINANCE - REVIEW AND COMMENT**

#### **A. The Proposed Ordinance: Permissiveness Thereof**

Mr. Cotten referenced his July 24, 2019, memorandum to City Manager James Buston III (attached, 3 pp.). Mr. Cotten commented that the first draft was prepared

by him without public input. It contained more restrictive language. Mr. Cotten then noted that two (2) public meetings were held at which the public was invited to comment, one in January and another in May. He noted further that attendees at the first meeting were of a more pro-business (development) orientation (i.e., advocates for short-term rentals) that sought a more permissive ordinance. Subsequent to that meeting, Mr. Cotten acknowledged that he was directed by others to write a considerably more permissive ordinance; one that was substantially more permissive than other ordinances he had reviewed from other communities. That includes Tuscaloosa's ordinance. Mr. Cotten then acknowledged that the second public meeting held in May was attended by residents demanding a more restrictive ordinance, of which the majority of residents who commented reside in the Neighborhood Conservation ("NC") Zoning District, as well as other districts where the "family" criterion is applied [Section 203 of the Zoning Ordinance]. Mr. Cotten further noted that it appeared that some of the concerns expressed at the second meeting would be alleviated were the proposed ordinance to contain language requiring owner occupancy during stays by short-term renters. With respect to the permissive nature of the ordinance, Mayor Anders inquired as to whether Mr. Cotten thought the Task Force should offer recommendations regarding the direction the proposed ordinance should take. Mr. Cotten responded in the affirmative, but further commented that, ultimately, the decision as to whether to consider the Task Force's recommendation is a matter for the Planning Commission to decide. Taken a step further, the ultimate decision will rest with the City Council.

Ms. McGowen commented that in her experiences with task forces it is desirable for them to offer some form of recommendation(s). She further noted that the Non-Primary "By-Right" and "Conditional Use" map was prepared as a best estimate for accommodating Non-Primary STRs, using STR Helper, Inc. as consultant. Assistant City Manager McGowen further commented that the City is by no means obligated to adopt the Map as the basis for regulating Non-Primaries.

Mr. Ulrich referred to the January meeting wherein the majority of attendees offering comments were in favor of a more permissive ordinance. Mr. Ulrich commented that representation for other than the development community was for all intents and purposes absent from the meeting; hence, the City should not have concluded that the community at-large was in favor of a more permissive ordinance. [**Aside:** It should be noted that attendance at both the January and May meetings was for all intents and purposes limited to those living in the "overlay areas" as depicted on STR Helper's map distributed by the City. All other areas in Auburn to be affected by the proposed ordinance were for all intents and purposes absent].

The Mayor commented that the first meeting represented a starting point. It was well attended by the development community; the second by the balance of the community. And, now, is the time to reconcile the differences.

## **B. Non-Primary Rentals vs Homestays – Combine or Treat Separately**

1. Mayor Anders asked the question as to whether the Non-Primary STR should be treated separately from Homestays or whether they should be treated as one. According to Mr. Cotten, STRs should be treated in a “multi-tiered” manner; i.e., *it is not a matter of one shoe fits all*. Ms. Solomon suggested that it would be simpler to have one category instead of separating Non-Primaries and Homestays into two distinct categories. Commissioner Marshall suggested that the two should be separated. Regarding Homestays, people do return to their neighborhoods and come face-to-face with their neighbors; that is not the case with Non-Primary (investor-owned) STRs. Councilman Parsons commented that combining Non-Primaries and Homestays *glosses over the nuances* of short-term rentals. Councilman Parsons has found that while people in, for example, the NC zone may dislike having Homestays in their neighborhood, they can under the right condition tolerate them; quite the contrary is true of investor owned STRs. Councilman Parsons characterized Homestays with that of being a hobbyist while Non-Primaries as a professional business operation. After some additional discussion, Mayor Anders asked the members whether there was a consensus to treat the two STRs separately. Majority of the Task Force members appeared to agree to treat the two separately, seemingly to agree with Mr. Mr. Cotten’s implication that *one shoe does not fit all*.
2. Councilman Smith asked what information will be provided to the Planning Commission so as to formulate a consensus regarding the final form of the STR ordinance. Mr. Cotten commented that Commissioners will have full access to and be provided all of the material prepared to date; e.g., draft ordinances, de facto citizens surveys, public meeting comments; memoranda, etc.
3. Councilman Smith inquired as to whether the proposed ordinance will have an impact on the sublease community. Specifically, the question is whether the owners of rental properties with long term leases (180 days or more) will find themselves violating the ordinance when subletting for short terms (e.g., 30 days +/- during the summer months. Mr. Cotten responded that he did not think that was going to be an issue, albeit, he would defer to the City Attorney for guidance.

## **C. Treating Home (Business) Occupation and Home (Stay) Occupation Separately**

Mr. Ulrich commented that the discussion should focus on three (3) distinct categories. They are as follows: a). Home (Business) Occupation; b). Home (Stay) Occupation; and c). Non-Primary STRs. Mr. Ulrich reported that he has had numerous people operating businesses out of the home ask him to leave the Home (Business) Occupation ordinance alone. They say the current proposal is quite confusing. Similar comments can be found in the City’s two published open-ended surveys, as well as were heard during the May public meeting. Mayor Anders

requested Mr. Cotten address the matter of Home (Business) Occupation vs. Home (Stay) Occupation. Mr. Cotton commented that the question arises as to where under the Zoning Ordinance a separate, distinct section could be devoted to the Home (Stay) Occupation requirements. Mr. Ulrich commented that the distinction can easily be made [**Aside:** Currently, the Home (Business) Occupation resides in Article V, 511.04. Home (Stay) Occupation could, possibly, be accommodated via a new section Article V, 511.09]. Ms. McGowen noted the concern and requested staff to review and evaluate the suggestion and develop a recommendation for consideration.

**D. Should Either Homestays or Non-Primary STRs be Allowed in the NC**

(Reference Mr. Cotton's (3-page) July 24<sup>th</sup> Memorandum to City Manager Buston). As a **preface** to the discussion, Mr. Ulrich distributed copies of his May 22, 2019, *Short Term Rentals - Guiding Philosophy, Intent, and Considerations* (attached, 3 pp.), which Mr. Ulrich requested be made a part of the Record. Mayor Anders acknowledged the request. Subsequently, Mr. Ulrich highlighted the following passages from the City's Zoning Ordinance:

**Legislative Intent** (Article 1, Section 101):

1. *Give every possible consideration to the public interest, individual rights, and externalities;*
2. *Distribute the benefits and burdens [costs] rationally and fairly among all its citizens;*
3. *Ensure that neighbors are protected from adverse impacts [negative externalities].*

**Purpose** (Article 1, Section 102): [*Promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the present and future inhabitants of Auburn by*]:

- a. *Conserving property values throughout Auburn (102.10);*
- b. *Protecting landowners from adverse impacts of adjoining developments (102.11).*

Mr. Ulrich emphasized that any discussion going forth on STRs should and must take these official public policy objectives into consideration when endorsing changes to the Zoning Ordinance. Mayor Anders so noted the considerations.

**1. Should the Proposed STNPR (Short Term Non-Primary Rental) Boundary or Overlay Be Further Examined**

Ms. Solomon commented that Questions 1 and 4 in Mr. Cotten's memorandum to City Manager Buston should go together (i.e., should the proposed STNPR (Short Term Non-Primary Rental) boundary or overlay be further examined). [Reference here is made to STR Helper, Inc.'s map identified as *Approximate Location of STR by Owner Absence*, which map was distributed by the City].

Mr. Cotten offered a point of clarification regarding the Non-Primaries in the NC District pointing out that permitting Non-Primaries would be through the Conditional Use process in the Overlay map areas (see Article IV Table 4-1). [**Aside:** the discussion did not address Item D.6.e.].

Mr. Ulrich commented that people he's talked with do not want Non-Primary STRs in the NC Zoning District. Both Assistant City Manager McGowen and Mr. Cotten acknowledged that this was what they understood as well. Councilman Parsons commented that the entire overlay allowing Non-Primaries in the "yellow" overlay area should be eliminated with no Non-Primaries being allowed in that area nor in any other area of Auburn wherein the definition of "family" is applicable (i.e., NC, DDH, LDD, NRD zones) [Section 203 and 304 of the Zoning Ordinance]. Councilman Parsons further commented that the STRNP overlay "By Right" (i.e., the "green" area on the map) is enough to accommodate Non-Primary (investor-owned) STRs. Also, Mr. Ulrich noted that he was in favor of allowing the Non-Primary STRs in the "By-Right" (the "green") overlay area [see Article IV, Table 4-1] and not allowing them anywhere outside the currently designated "By-Right" area. Ms. Solomon commented that in her opinion the Non-Primary Conditional Use area (the "yellow" area) should be eliminated and Non-Primaries be allowed as Conditional Use throughout Auburn. Mr. Cotten considered limiting Non-Primary STRs to the "By-Right" area [i.e., UC/CEOD, UN-E, -W, -S; and CRD-U, -S, -W] a reasonable, understandable, and manageable solution to the situation. In response to Councilman Smith's inquiry, Mr. Cotten noted that the ["By-Right"] boundary was drawn to include all of the above referenced zones; hence, none of the zones listed above lie outside the "green" area. Councilman Parsons inquired as to whether the *green* area included the west side of Payne Street. Ms. McGowen and Mr. Cotten noted that said boundary encompasses the east side of Armstrong; it does not include the west side of Payne Street.

## **2. Phasing Out Nonconforming Non-Primary STRs**

Mr. Ulrich noted the existence of Non-Primary STRs throughout various areas of Auburn. This is per STR Helper's map. Given their existence, requiring the immediate cessation of operations upon adoption of an STR ordinance may impose an undue hardship on their owners. The establishment of a reasonable *phase-out* period may need to be considered for investors to reasonably recoup their investment. Mr. Cotten suggested that as an alternative to a *phase-out* period (Sunset) it may be desirable to establish a *phase-in* period before any adopted ordinance becomes effective. Mr. Ulrich suggested working with the development community to understand their concerns regarding phasing the ordinance's effective date or, alternatively, establishing a Sunset requirement.

## **E. Homestays – Allowable Occupancy Days**

Mr. Cotten attempted to clarify the requirement re: number of allowable stays by zoning districts. According to Mr. Cotten, the schedule is as follows:

- 1. Homestays can operate 60 days per licensing year** (i.e., January 1 – December 31) in zones wherein occupancy is limited to the "family" wherein *[t]wo (2) or*

*more persons residing in a single dwelling unit where all members are related ... , plus one unrelated person [i.e., NC, DDH, NRD, and LDD].*

2. Homestays can operate **120 days per licensing year** in the UC, UN-W, UN-E, UN-S, RDD, R, CDD, CRD-U, CRD-S, CRD-E AND CRD-W zoning districts.
3. Mr. Cotten commented that any conversation to allow or prohibit Homestays in the Neighborhood Conservation (the “NC”) District should, also, include the other zoning classifications that fall under the auspices of the “*family*” [Section 203] guidelines (i.e., DDH, NRD, and LDD zones). Mr. Ulrich agreed.
4. Mr. Ulrich noted that pursuant to the current proposal, the Owner must reside in the dwelling 180 days in order to operate a Homestay [Section 203]. Subsequent to that, the owner may rent for a period of 60 calendar days or 120 days depending on the zoning classification in which the dwelling lies. [**Aside:** The proposed ordinance does not address whether the owner may operate concurrently with the 180-day requirement or sequentially with his/her own occupancy]. In a tangential discussion, Mr. Cotten seemed to suggest that the owner may rent to Homestayors year-around (i.e., outside the provisions in Items # 1 and # 2 above). Mr. Ulrich suggested that the current ordinance does not state that as a possibility. Further clarification is needed.
5. Mayor Anders and Councilman Parsons both inquired as to how to establish number of allowable days. Both Ms. McGowen and Mr. Cotten commented that this is a matter for the Task Force, Planning Commission, and City Council to determine. The proposed ordinance considers a reasonable number of events and accompanying days at those events (See Item E.1 and E.2 above). [**Aside:** Suggestion – in limiting the Non-Primary STRs to the “*By-Right*” zone (i.e., the *green* area on the map) it may be reasonable to extend the allowable days from 240 to 365 calendar days for Non-Primary STRs.]
6. Tangential to the above comments, Mr. Crawford raised the question as to the property rights of owners. Mr. Cotten commented that zoning has a long history of acceptance by local jurisdictions throughout the country, as well as the courts. Mr. Ulrich commented that the provisions set forth above regarding *legislative intent* and *purpose* have been tested and withstood the test of time at all levels of judicial system. Messrs. Cotten and Ulrich agreed that it is a legitimate exercise of local governmental regulatory authority.
7. **Homestays: Allow by-Right or by Conditional Use** Mr. Ulrich commented that it is his understanding that a substantial portion of the community residing in “*family*” designated zones do not want Homestays in their neighborhood, particularly *not by-right*. If Homestays are permitted, residents want them permitted under the Conditional Use guidelines. That allows affected neighbors the opportunity to voice their opinions in an open forum, through the democratic

process. Mr. Cotten expressed his concern approving Homestays via the Conditional Use process. Mr. Cotton maintained that doing so would *pit neighbor against neighbor in an open forum, rather than in private which is preferred*.

Mr. Cotten further commented that the *volume of applications would be overwhelming* in a Conditional Use process. [**Aside:** Extending the above argument (issuing certificates via Conditional Use for Homestays would result in pitting neighbor against neighbor) leads one to call for the complete abandonment of the concept across the board; i.e., the elimination of Section 803 of the Zoning Ordinance. That is not realistic. It is reasonable to believe that the initial run on applications would, in Mr. Cotten's words, be somewhat overwhelming. Once past the initial onslaught of applications, the burden would in all probability become increasingly reasonable. Worthy of note is the fact that the Planning Department, itself, recommended the Conditional Use approach in its current draft as part of the approval process for Non-Primary STRs (See Table 4-1). Also, currently, the Board of Zoning Appeals, Planning Commission, and the City Council encourage the public to openly lend support or opposition to their neighbors' project through public hearings. Further discussion is warranted]. Lastly, Assistant City Manager McGowen noted that issuance of a Conditional Use permit is a one-time event. Licenses would be renewed annually.

Mr. Ulrich noted that under the current proposal anyone applying to the City to operate a Non-Primary STR must obtain written authorization and consent from a minimum of 50 percent of the abutting property owners in the NC, DDH, NRD, and RDD zones (408.02,D.6.e). Councilman Smith inquired as to whether under the Home (Business) Occupation there is a notification requirement. Mr. Cotten responded noting there is no notification requirement for the Home (Business) Occupation. Mr. Ulrich commented that in the typical Home (Business) Occupation there is no noticeable impact. Mr. Cotten agreed, commenting that there is a significant difference between the two.

Commissioner Ritenbaugh inquired as to how other communities handle STR approvals. Both Assistant City Manager McGowen and Mr. Ulrich commented that it is done both ways; for all intents and purposes communities are split 50/50 in their approval process.

- 8. Phase-in and Sunset Provisions** Mr. Cotten stressed that an ordinance is dynamic in nature, subject to change to reflect changing community needs and interests. Mayor Anders commented that it is his desire that the Planning Commission and City Council are always open to reflect those changing needs and interests in their policy decisions. Mr. Ulrich commented that a number of communities across the country that have dealt with the complicated STR subject have adopted either *phase-in* or *Sunset* provisions forcing policy makers

to re-examine the short-term rental issue and to make adjustments reflecting changing community attitudes (See prior discussion in D.2 above).

## **F. ENFORCEMENT**

1. Ms. Solomon expressed concern over the ability to enforce any proposed ordinance; hence, the need to simplify the ordinance as she noted above. She further commented that whatever ordinance is finally adopted, it should be sufficiently stringent to minimize disturbances to existing neighborhoods, possibly to include limitations on the number of Homestays and/or Non-Primary STRs on the block. Mr. Ulrich commented that a number of communities across the country have adopted maximum number of allowable STRs by block, census tract, councilmanic wards, etc. Councilman Smith recommended against adoption of such an ordinance (e.g., a quota system). Ms. McGowen then commented it gets complicated (e.g., how to decide who gets approval and who doesn't, etc.). Mr. Ulrich agreed.
2. Councilman Parsons raised the question of enforceability; i.e., how one is going to regulate the number of days, both with respect to the owner's residency requirement and the Homestayer occupancy days. Mr. Cotten commented that for all intents and purposes enforcement that will be *complaint driven*, albeit, STR Helper, Inc. will assist in enforcement of the ordinance. Also, it is likely that additional staff will be required to enforce the ordinance. Mr. Cotten further iterated that in his research, including talking with other community representatives, the one common thread of concern in dealing with STRs in general was enforcement. Commissioner Marshall expressed his general concerns over enforcement, as well.
3. Mayor Anders stressed the importance of having an ordinance that is enforceable and that the penalties for violating it are sufficiently severe to discourage violating it. As Mayor Anders pointed out, the burden rests with the City to develop an ordinance that in his words "*has teeth.*" Furthermore, Mayor Anders pointed out that approval for operating an STR is a privilege, not a right, one that can be taken away for cause.

## **G. LIFE SAFETY**

Mr. Ulrich commented that in some previous public meeting the City Manager noted that the City Attorney was opposed to including life safety considerations in the proposed ordinance. Subsequently, any and all reference to life safety measures and inspections was stricken for the proposed ordinance (e.g., fire extinguishers, smoke and carbon monoxide detectors, and other measures) [Reference Article V, 511.04.B.14.i, and j.]. Mr. Ulrich noted that the City of Auburn through its fire inspections department offers free home life safety inspections upon request. Likewise, inspections are required for work that includes changes to electrical, plumbing, and HVAC systems. Additionally, Mr. Ulrich understands that for a Bed & Breakfast to operate (e.g., Crenshaw Guest House), a final inspection is required

prior to issuance of an occupancy permit or certificate, and that an annual life safety inspection is mandated, as well. Conceptually, the only difference between a B & B and a Homestay is the matter of serving food. By Ordinance, “*Breakfast must be provided daily on the premises for the guests*” (408.02.D.3.e). With respect to Home (Stay) Occupation, “*No food shall be prepared for or served to guests . . .*”. (511.04.B.14.h.). Councilman Smith inquired as to whether the City offers the same services for long-term rentals. Ms. McGowen commented that inspections of such units are not done on a regular basis. Mayor Anders inquired as to whether the City is liable in cases where it issues a business permit for occupancy and life safety measures are a factor in which a life safety related incident occurs. Mr. Cotten noted that he understood the City Attorney did not want to place the City unnecessarily in a situation of assuming liability simply by issuing an occupancy certificate. Assistant City Manager McGowen referred the matter to City Manager Buston who commented that the matter is a subject for the City Attorney to evaluate and upon which to render a decision. [Aside: It should be noted that Homeowner’s Insurance policies may or may not cover damage to property or injury to persons in situations where a homeowner operates a business such as a Homestay. A number of communities, including Tuscaloosa, have mandated proof of coverage and that the city and its agents be named as Additional Insured. This raises the question as to culpability when a governing regulatory body issues occupancy permits and/or certificates for Homestays and property is damaged and/or persons injured by those inhabiting the dwelling].

#### **H. NORTHWEST AUBURN – IMPACT OF SHORT-TERM RENTALS**

Councilman Parsons raised the question regarding the impact of STRs on Northwest Auburn. Mr. Cotten noted that in terms of Non-Primary STRs, there would be no impact given the Task Force’s recommendation of prohibiting Non-Primary STRs in all but the Permitted *By-Right* zones as delineated on STR Helper’s map (the “*green*” area).

#### **I. CLOSING REMARKS:**

Mayor Anders requested the Task Force review their notes and bring any questions and/or concerns to him within the next few days. A determination will be made as to whether another meeting of the Task Force is appropriate or whether its recommendations, along with all supporting documentation prepared to date, are ready to be forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Mr. Cotten estimated that it likely would take four months from the time the Planning Commission receives the proposal to the time City Council receives it for consideration (in short, December). As Mr. Cotten noted any number of variables could extend that timeline.

Meeting Adjourned: circa 6:45 p.m. CDT.

**END OF MEETING NOTES**

Personal Notes:

1. Every reasonable attempt has been made to accurately transcribe and/or summarize comments made by Task Force members. Task Force members are encouraged to review the City's recording of the meeting loaded onto YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?reload=9&v=cafxvgLFBy0>
2. The author welcomes any and all comments, including corrections, to this document. In addition, I welcome the opportunity to sit down with anyone who may read this document to further explain my thoughts, including concerns. More importantly, however, I want to hear your views on this important topic.
3. Please note that in a number of instances you'll find an "Aside" wherein I interject my thoughts outside the meeting venue, raising topics that I think worthy of further discussion.

Prepared by Bruno O. Ulrich 08/19/19