Comments from Brighton Area respondents

| I don’t like government intervention. |
| --- |
| I'm in the area by Wasach Mountain Lodge , Rose Lodge along with Milly Lodge. Many night time activities that already create much noise at night. We all should be able to enjoy our national forests, but large parties outside with much noise and alcohol need to be regulated. |
| Individual property rights infringed upon and regulated simply by timing. |
| Who decides which 15% get the permits? Maybe the 15% should cycle through all the properties. When it's your turn you can STR or not |
| We have lived with the impacts of STR's for example - Lake Tahoe. We do not want to live in a neighborhood over run by STR's for someone else's rental investment property. |
| Brighton would be so much better if short term rentals were permanently prohibited. This is the next best choice. |
| STR's are difficult to manage. They have no long term commitment to the community, don't pay the taxes, and often overuse the facilities they rent. |
| I don't even understand what neighborhood density means based on the given example. |
| There may be Six together in a neighborhood and none in another. Should be overall. |
| An owner should be able to do as they see fit with THEIR property. |
| While it is great to have a cap, it’s also nice to have some future flexibility, especially if all landlords follow the rules and totally dependent on water usage and availability. |
| I’m fine with short term rentals. Water usage would be my only worry. |
| I suspect current STRs would fill the 15% limit. What happens if a non STR wants to rent in the future? Would that be prevented? That would seem unfair. |
| I am planning on converting my property to a short term rental in the future |
| Fairly and proportionally addresses legitimate community-specific concerns about STRs (e.g. quiet areas crowded with short-term renters who aren't as invested in the community, limited water/sewer resources) while still allowing for some regulated STRs |
| Some people might not want to be told how to live their lives and manage their property. I feel that but I agree that too many STRs in one area would be bad. |
| I think short term rental density should be controlled. |
| I like the idea, but would want the number even lower than 15% |
| STRs use more water than part time users. Parking is another problem especially in winter. |
| I feel that STR increase property values and decrease automobile traffic in the area. With brighton ski resort, people can stay at a cabin and park there to go skiing. This alleviates some of the traffic on the road as people can then stay at the STR and walk to the ski resort and not use limited resources of parking and road use. Brighton ski resort is a very popular ski resort and traffic congestion is often heavy in winter with limited parking. STRs allow a secondary place for people to park and stay which helps with the existing parking problem. There are almost no other options for people who want to ski and stay near the resort. Parking is also very limited at Brighton Ski resort and STRs help quite a bit with that.  STR also bring in money to the town of brighton and it’s businesses. A STR visitor is more likely to stay in the area and visit a local restaurant or the brighton store, thereby increasing tax revenues and increasing money for the town of brighton and its residents.  Furthermore, STRs increase property values as property can be sold at a higher rate due to the income potential.  I am completely against this proposal. I fee this would damage property values and cause a decline in the area .i fee rather than limit the rentals, enforcement of existing STR statutes would be better. Require all STRe to get their license, be inspected and pay an annual fee. This will also bring in additional revenue to the town of brighton. On top of that, I would propose a rental surcharge on all STRs of 1-2 percent which could then be used to improve revenue for the town of brighton and also could be used to offset any expense associated by STRs management and license enforcement and would be a win-win for brighton. |
| I don't think density restrictions are a good solution for a few reasons. First, STRs already seem to be self regulated to 9% near Brighton and 4% in Silver Fork/Pine Tree. I'm not sure that there is a reason to put a cap on STRs when it is unlikely to rise much higher anyway. Second, if a restriction was reached, how would you decide who is allowed to rent and who is not? Would it be the people who have owned property the longest? Most recently applied? Paid the most money?  If resources (such as water) are a concern then this needs to be a separate conversation, apart from STRs. There would need to be a density restriction implemented on full-time residents as well as STRs since full-time residents undoubtedly consume more resources than homes that allow STRs. Is a density restriction on number of full-time residents being discussed? |
| This creates an arbitrary timing issue with respect to the value of properties. Those that are able to rent out will generally have a higher intrinsic value. Based on timing of when rentals come in and out of the market property owners would not have a good sense as to whether their property would be allowed or not. Additionally the canyon does not have the infrastructure for future hotels but demand in the canyon has drastically increased. That means the existing properties and few new properties that can service that demand should be allowed to. |
| I believe that properties in Brighton are limited and little further growth is coming. So any property already present should be "grandfathered" into any future plan. We lived in Rbighton with no interest in renting out again but then life happened and we are now in New Zealand. To best survive our absence (financially as well as winter climate related), a short term rental agreement contract with a RESPONSIBLE MANAGER such as Carole McCalla is a win win for the home owner, the tourist, and the town on Brighton. Otherwise homes will fall into disarray or will be sold. |
| I think that short term rentals add a lot of benefits to the Brighton area. Instead of people driving frequently up and down the canyon and parking alongside the roads, they are driving up and staying in one place. Therefore, decreasing the traffic congestion. They are spending their money to support the few local businesses in Brighton. An added benefit is the increase in property values for Brighton. If you are concerned about additional cost then just add an additional fee/tax to nightly rentals. |
| Might want to rent in the future. |
| Seems reasonable but not a fan of STR in BCC |
| A percentage cap might be useful, however it would be manifestly unfair to allow the same property owners to establish a permanent claim to the available rentals once the cap has been reached. Licenses allowing rentals should be provided round robin or via an annual lottery to allow equal access to any property owner who desires to establish a rental business. |
| Parking and noise |
| Short term renters do no respect the rights of others in particular property boundaries  They are here today and gone tomorrow so they don’t care |
| Concerns about having enough water. |
| A clear plan on how often STR permits are renewed to open up new spaces would be critical to the success of this option. Why is water availability a concern if each cabin has a water permit? In theory all owners could become full time residents. |
| We are moving into our property next month that we have been trying to build for approximately 7 years into a neighborhood where the community allows short term rentals. I believe that you would be destroying property values, making other properties more valuable that already do short term rentals, and causing more issues than good. I also believe that if people purchased their property knowing what was possible then that should be how it stays. I don't believe this is going to solve the problem. I believe it is taking away peoples property rights and what they purchased. |
| This is arbitrary and unfair and against property rights protected by law. As long as renters follow the already set guidelines they should not be a nuisance to anyone. |
| !5% is an extremely low number. How would you determine what properties can be rented? I think an annual limit on the days of short term rental for a property is reasonable.  Many owners will not be able to retain their properties if they can't maintain rental income. You will soon have properties that will need to be sold. Our quaint cabins will not be bought up by the uber wealthy. We don't want to be Park City. Let's not lose the Brighton charm. |
| Rentals don’t use more water. For example, if I live here full-time and I would use more water than a short term rental because they are not always occupied. |
| I would agree as long as it was rotated among owners who wanted to rent. Not fair if I do t rent now but chose to in future but nothing was available |
| Allocation of permits would need to flow to any new home desiring and prior year permits would need to expire. It could be 5 years before a unit may come back into the pool. |
| If a property is over the allowed density, but is a permitted STR, it should be allowed to continue. In many cases rental income went into the planning of financing the purchase. Also, I'm concerned about the mechanism of awarding new STR permits, with images of the scramble for bar licenses in Utah. With the exception of Solitude, there are limited spots for guests except in STRs. 15% also seems low for many areas. That said, some restrictions do seem reasonable, and certainly utility services could reasonable limit density. |
| It's taking away rights as a property owner, which is illegal. |
| While I do not rent my property for short term rental, limiting the number allows current short term rental owners to an elitist attitude. I would like the same opportunity should I decide to rent out my property in the future. I think that limiting short term rentals would be okay, but EACH short term property owner should have to reapply on an annual or biannual basis, allowing new short term rental owners the opportunity. |
| Water issues are a major concern and Brighton and surrounds was initially not intended for full time use. There just isn't enough water for unlimited use. |
|  |
| The appeal of living in Brighton is the community and the space. If this is open to anyone then I fear we will see too many homes being built sitting empty for most of the year. Plus, it impacts the surrounding flora, fauna and animals. |
| There should be no restrictions |
| The ski resorts rely on tourism and limiting rentals would adversely affect the tourist market/income for the entire canyon. |
| we cannot overwhelm a neighborhood's water system for personal profit |
| Private property rights should not be infringed nor concentrated in the hands of a minority |
| I believe that if you have a license and met all regulations you should be allowed to do short term rentals |
| I want to hear and support the needs and interests of my neighbors. We own a 2 unit that has been recognized by the County as 2 rental properties for over 20 years. We definitely want to keep the right for revenue and use in the future. We dont know what our neighbors want and needs are and want to support them too. |
| The purpose of this question is not clear. It would seems fine, should it strictly serve as a means to assess the public opinion regarding STR's within each residential area. Otherwise, it would not seem to represent a quantifiable means to determine the density. Also, it's unlikely the water companies will be able to respond to such as letter, as many of the systems do not meter water use. |
| I am in favor of limiting the number of STR's. |
| We plan to spend more time at the cabin as we get older. If we were to move up full time that would consume more more than STR. |
| I believe it should be less than that. Neighborhoods are for neighbors. I say 10% or less. |
|  |
| Air B&Bs are a nuisance very loud past 10 PM I feel it does need more regulation |
| somewhat arbitrary |
| who determines which household gets to rent, lets say 10 homes= 1 1/2 homes gets to rent...you'll round up to 20 % which then =2 homes....I like the minimal aspect of this proposal but it would seem hard to enforce or regulate |
| Either allow everyone or no one. Maybe only current renters may rent if density is met. May not be good renters. |
|  |
| It’s not the towns responsibility to police short term rentals. Action in this direction will cause a change in leadership. Having advised the committee to make Brighton a town, this was never brought up in any discussion leading to us becoming a town. I wrote the slogan Preserve our Canyon with the understanding it was to preserve it from high taxes and give control back to the neighbors, not take it away from them. Home owners in Brighton pay some of the highest taxes in the state. It is each home owners right to make money from their property in the way they best see fit. Further, policing of this is not realistic. A law without enforcement is silly. If a homeowner sees fit to rent their home, I’m in favor of them doing so. |
| Prefer no short term rentals. |
| I think that some of the areas are different than others and it may not make sense to treat them all the same. |
| If lots qualify by meeting regulations they should not be limited by fiat. |
| That is a ridiculously small percentage of STRs in a community that is surrounded by 2 ski resorts. This is a resort community! What is Park City's "ratio" of STRs to residences? There should be many more STRs than that. It would lessen traffic congestion, because people wouldnt be driving up and down the canyon everyday. There should be no limit. |
| We do not want to give up anymore of our rights as a property owner. |
| Could be ok to limit STR's but people who want to use their property for short term rental may have a case that it would be illegal with regards to property rights. May be difficult to do retroactively. |
| Lots of us this is a second home and want the option of sometimes subsidizing taxes and expenses |
| This is an arbitrary means of who can provide STRs. This restricts my rights in how I use my property. |
| We have been loving, living, working, and a part of the Brighton community for almost 25 years. A few years ago, we were fortunate enough to be able to purchase a 2nd home at Brighton (on the loop). Our home was (and is) a dream come true.  The ability to rent our home short-term for part of the year enables us to own this home and be engaged with the Brighton community. If there was a limit to this ability, we would not be able to afford our home. It could then be easily purchased by an out of state investment company or some other entity that is not tied to, engaged with, and in love with Brighton.  Limiting or ending STRs will result in either empty homes (making areas more susceptible to theft and other issues) or large investors coming in to purchase many properties.  Furthermore, STRs (especially around the Brighton Resort) are a huge benefit to the community, resort, visitors, and locals. There are very limited options on places to stay up the canyon and we need solutions for reducing up and down canyon traffic. These customers also support local restaurants and businesses and these resort communities. The renters who use our home are wonderful, respectful, and also appreciate Brighton in tbe same way as us locals do. |
| I just think we need to focus on the current regulations and make sure they are enforced and I am sure from time to time there will be an undesirable issue in the canyon weather it be on the road, at the ski resorts, or at a hotel/ condo or STR but if we can focus on abiding to the current regulations and just relax and see how things are going and revisit possible changes to STR’s in a future years as needed . No let’s get on with running the town! Can we talk traffic, parking, speeding, loud vehicles, etc! Go team! |
| When managed properly, STR's benefit ALL parties: FT residents, the town of Brighton and the environment.  \*FT residents benefit from only having guests/neighbors part of the time, within the year. Also, noise ordinances are enforced, and renters are forced to be quiet.  \*Brighton benefits from the tax revenue.  \*The Environment benefits from reduced traffic and reduced pollution.  As a STR owner, I respect that operating a STR is a privilege and should be allowed to all owners who want to do so, as long as they obtain a business license, and follow taxation reporting etc.  Limiting rentals by density will only encourage "off the radar" rentals and create a divide in the community as is it unfair and unfeasible to not be able to rent out a property if that is the desire and financial need of the owners.  All current STR owners who are compliant, need to be exempt from any & all future restrictions. |
| For the safety of residents and equal share of resources, I strongly agree with this proposal. |
|  |
| Resources in our community are very limited and we need to regulate how we allocate these resources. It is not fair to allow profit makers to use these resources over individuals who simply what to enjoy their properties |

Comments from Silver Fork Area Respondents

| All owners should be treated equally. If a property qualifies for STR, people should get in line and wait their turn if the max rentals have already been reached. |
| --- |
| The fewer short term rental units we can allow is best. |
| Not fair. it violates the equal justice clause of the 14th amendment. |
| Keep the peace. |
| Water issues, noise, parties, parking |
| we should be able to use our property as we choose. Limiting the number of STRs only drives up the value. Addtionally let teh free markets decide. Those rentals that are good will do well and those that dont will fail. There are requirements in place that are working now so why change. Those of use with STR's are small business owners that are abiding by the laws and ordinances that are in place |
| I agree with implementing limitations but this solution does not include any restrictions that prevent a single family from being surrounded by STR's. |
| I am deeply worried about water consumption, and water availability for full- time residents. ...limiting STRs in a reasonable manner would go far for water conservation.  My second concern ....STRs, while advantageous to the property owner, do nothing for building neighborhood and community.  Also, the STR property owners near our residence consistently fail to warn renters of the difficult winter access,.Consequently we are dealing with stranded and lost renters ,blocking our roads and worse. Anything we could do to limit renters in our neighborhood is a good thing ! |
|  |
| Short term rentals change the atmosphere of the neighborhood and increase water use. |
| SHORT TREM RENTALS DETRACT FROM SOLITUDE AND AMBIENCE OF PROPERTIES. THE RENTERS DON'T CARE ABOUT PEACE AND QUIET OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD. |
| overall it makes sense but it would lead to a benefit to those renting out now, locking out others in the future if the cap is in play. consider if there can be an allowance for rotation of the benefit if the cap is reached. |
| This is a fair way to limit STR impacts to the neighborhood & the area resources |
| This keeps the community from having too many transient guests. |
| Not sure of lots, or occupied lots or owners of lots (one owner multiple lots) is the correct denominator in this equation |
| This will help the families most impacted by short term rentals and give the community more say then we currently have. |
| It is the owners property. If they want to rent, they should be able to. |
| Setting the number of maximum STR units will ensure neighborhood cohesiveness , limit increased traffic noise and water usage. STR vehicles in Silver Fork frequently get stuck in our one ways streets causing ingress/egress issues. |
| I would like to see data on the reasoning behind this first - excessive use of the water/sewer, roads, etc |
| How could it be fair that some people can rent their property and others cannot? What if any property could be rented 15% to 20% of the time. |
| Short term rental of large houses promises to dramatically increase water consumption overall, and especially peak water consumption. |
| Keep Silverfork as is. An overabundance of str's would seem to commercialize it and diminish the quiet and natural beauty. |
| It incentivizes people to rent out their places “under the radar” if the capacity is already met and disincentives them to go through the permitting process. This will erode a feeling of community far more than allowing anyone who wants to rent their place out to do so. The free market will likely keep this number in check anyway. It’s hard work to run a nightly rental. |
| I would also say people need to renew on a regular basis- every 2 years? so that new STR could come into the pool, but the pool of STR would never exceed 15% of the overall community. |
| I knew as soon as you became at town regulations would start coming. I have sewer I have water and I am in compliance with everything. It’s tragic that Bureaucracy has now entered into our community. I don’t like it my taxes have gone from $500 originally to $8000.00 a year. Now you’re saying we can’t rent to make up the difference. The plowing the taxes the police that don’t come up for alarms trash have now become a part of the bureaucracy. |
| Preserving the integrity & quality of our neighborhoods should be a priority. Limiting the number of short term rentals would help do this. There is no assurance that short term renters will care about these values. |
| Because it limits the number of STR |
| Caps are arbitrary, there is nothing to prevent someone who never intends to be an STR from locking up a permit to further limit STRs. |
| Private Property Rights - If all STR stipulations can be met (water, parking etc), should be no limit |
| I do not think this is fair to property owners that bought their properties with expectations of renting them to short term renters. Water is likely used at a higher rate by residents rather than short term rentals and thus this has zero face value. A better way of doing this would be metering the water and charging for high use. |
| Our neighborhoods have different characteristics and need different regulations. I would support restricting STRs to 10-20% of full-time residences within single family neighborhoods. |
| The value of my home will be effected if a homeowner is not able to choose how they use their property |
| Some density limit would be good. But I wouldn’t make it that limited. |
| The town would need to set some limits on what the owners in an area could do. The area should not be allowed to restrict the number below the existing number of licensed rentals. |
| Short term rentals need regulated and limited. It seems out of whack for those of us who want the enjoyment of our investment of a second home, not a rental income investment. |
|  |
| The water issue would need a deeper clarification for me to strongly answer one way or the other. If I have a water share in Silverfork, for example, it should have no bearing whether or not it’s a full timer, LTR or STR. |
| 1. I believe a property owner should have the right to rent their property.  2. Renting may provide necessary income that would enable a property owner to afford/keep their property. |
| I don't want to see investors or companies buying up multiple properties strictly for rental businesses. I'd like to see some restrictions to prevent that. |
| I feel that everyone should have the same opportunity to have their property a short-term rental if they choose, I also am for a harmonious community with guidelines and respect of neighbors. If these things are met, there should not be an issue. A governing committee could be created to make sure rules and regulations are followed and to deal with grievances, governance, and compliance. . |
| I feel that everyone should have the same opportunity to have their property a short-term rental if they choose, I also am for a harmonious community with guidelines and respect of neighbors. If these things are met, there should not be an issue. A governing committee could be created to make sure rules and regulations are followed and to deal with grievances, governance, and compliance. . |
| I can't think of any way to equitably allocate the density unless this is applied to purchasers of land/property that is purchased with full knowledge of the limitations AFTER the limitations are in force. |
| Limiting the number of strs will control the impact on full time residents, it will also limit the Town of Brighton's tax revenue. |
| Rules of usage for a privately owned property should be applied evenly to all property owners regardless of if someone wishes to use it as a a full-time residence or a part-time residence either by Occupying it personally or renting it out either on a long-term or short-term basis. The argument could be made that property owners who wish to occupy year-round consume more resources and public services So only 30% of the properties should be able to be used as full-time residences. Properties that are used as secondary residences or vacation homes are currently taxed at a higher property tax level therefore they should be entitled to more privileges than year around residences according to an equity equation. |
| If your argument is about water, short term rental properties are unlikely to be rented 365 days/year, so full-term residents will probably be the ones using more water. This is discriminatory and arbitrary. Properties are serviced by different water sources, so it doesn’t seem right to use this as the basis for restricting properties; for instance, our water comes directly from a spring which is used solely by us. Our water use affects nobody else!  Also, all Brighton properties are essentially in a resort area; it seems logical that property owners who buy land in Brighton would do so knowing they are in a resort community, where there are naturally going to be hotels, resorts and rentals by its very nature. |
| It should be up to myself and my family how and what we do with are cabin. |
| Limits STRs overall, but still allows potentially very high density in certain areas. Areas would need to be small to prevent rental "clusters". (If those 30 units in the example above are all on your street, the neighborhood "feel" is gone.)  Also, this would concentrate rental "power" for those that signed up earlier (similar to coveted fishing permits or taxicab medallions) so not equitable for all property owners. |
| I think that this works, however I’m concerned that some residents or second home owners will obtain a license out of a scarcity need rather than actually renting their homes. Perhaps some additional language about ACTIVE rental would go a long ways in making this a great solution rather than a mediocre compromise. |
| The cap should be much higher |
| Dont get lost in the regulatory morass. Keep it simple. |
|  |
| Rentals are good for the towns economy |
| I believe that many of the short term rentals are better taken care of cosmetically, and improve the feel of the area over some of the unkept non-rented properties. |
| I do not believe that Short Term Rentals impact the community any more than full time owners. They spend most of their time at the Ski Resort or down in the valley for the day. It is a drive in and drive out once a day. Folks that live there can go in multiple times a day. |
| I don't believe regulating STR will get the desired outcome. If people don't have an option to rent their cabins or homes when needed or desired, they may lose the ability to afford/keep their cabins/homes. When sold, It's more likely to be purchased as a second home then to bring in a family and build strong communities as described in the regulation above. Look what's happened to mountain towns across the West. |
| While the concept may sound good, I think the enforcement of such a limit will be problematic. Who will be keeping track of this. The only way would be through actual licensenses. What happens if someone has a license but doesn't use it? Does that count towards the 15%? Who will be responsible for enforcement? Will Brighton have staff to check on all the residents of a neighborhood to make sure they aren't renting a property short term? This will boil down to neighbors turning in neighbors (just like what happened with Dan and his weddings). Personally, I don't want fiascos like that taking place within Brighton. Without a clear indication about how Brighton will enforce restrictions, it will create an environment where neighbors will be responsible for implementing the ordiance in the neighborhoods. You can imagine how much mischief someone could create within our neighborhood if someone wanted to. Example, someone could get turned in by a neighbor for a one time short term rental for two weeks over the holiday's (how is a neighbor capable of determining whether this was a short term rental vs. a family get together or a donation to a family member? Does Brighton really want to stoke blood fueds between property owners. Just how will Brighton arbitrate such an accusation? How does a propety owner defend himself from such an accusation. I think that before considering the concept council needs to specify exactly how any restrictions on STRs would be enforced. Putting MSD in charge of enforcement woujld be a complete disaster. It will pit neighbors against neighbors and allow the coucil to sit back and watch the chaos. (Just like the wedding controversy). It would be irresponsible for the council to pass an ordinace to restrict STRs without a clear understanding of how the program would be administered and what it would cost the community. It is the resonsibility of the city council to treat everyone fairly and not set up a situation where a minority in our coummunity get to control everyone else. "  Also what consitutes a "lot?" With a structure or without a structure? How big of a structure will qualify the lot as part of the 300 structures in the pool. Why would you use all lots when many of those lots either don't have a structure or have a structure that wouldn't be eligible for STR. Also, certain lots can't be built on because of slope, sewer, water availaiblity etc. .  I have said it before, Brighton should go talk to the land use planners at Alta and see what their experience has been. It appears that they have zones where short term remtals are not allowed (based on objecctive criteria) but in the zones where STRs are allowed, they do not try and control the number. I'm guessing that they took this approach becuase of the problems of trying to enforce some sort of arbitrary percentage cap.  I think a better approach is to look at protecting the long term rentals in the community like paying the property owner a bonus to keep his property as a long term rental rather than converting it to short term. The bonus could be assessed to the ski areas who need housing for their employees. |
| As long as the property owner or manager is managing the guests in regards to following the rules of being a thoughtful neighbor, being quiet after a certain hour, parking cars where they should be parked, etc, there should not be a problem. |
| I plan on judiciously screening renters ( for use primarily in the ski season) to ensure that they strictly abide by noise and all other ordinances. I think that if this is done, then the community can remain orderly and still have short term rentals and not impact quality of life for all |

Comments from Forest Glen Respondents

| I want to ensure the character of each neighborhood remains an intact community as is presently there and not a strip of motels/cabins of just visitors or owned for commercial purposes of earning incomes for outside investors. In other words I want to make sure that if a neighbor has a need, say of a meal when sick or when they may need help in some other way that they will have neighbors that they know and trust and love.  I want to make sure that each neighborhood has a say in the future of their neighborhood versus the canyon as a whole.  We need to protect the limited supply of available water and each water company understands their capacity more then outsiders. |
| --- |
| Allowing for some properties to have STRs while others don’t strictly based on who started it first does not seem fair to property owners. |
| I strongly favor limiting the number of short term rentals. I haven't thought about what is the best way to do that, or talked to others to hear their views about it, so I'm reluctant to say I strongly agree with this particular proposal. It sounds very reasonable because it lets people closest to the affected area decide exactly how much to allow. Given time to think about it and hear other views, it might be something I would strongly support. |
| If you are over the limit - how do you determine who gets the STR? first come first serve, lottery? Not entirely fair to let a current STR take the space if a new owner wants to have a STR. I like the idea of a limit though. |
|  |
| Don't want STR |
|  |
| I believe in private property rights of an owner. If a property meets the county codes, HOA rules, and town's requirements, there is no need to further limit how an owner chooses to use their property. Let's stay away from Big Brother tactics. I have already heard that the town of Brighton is turning into an HOA on steroids... governments role is not to nuisance the private property rights of owners. If a property meets the requirements to rent STR and complaints are not being made... that should suffice. The role of Brighton should ONLY be to enforce ordinances and levy fines for those not in compliance...not try to fortune tell what the magic number of STR's and full time residents should be. Density restrictions are a bad idea and will hurt property values. You are in essence saying you don't trust an owner to rent out their property lawfully and in compliance... your are restricting their private property rights by putting an arbitrary number of how many uses an owner can enjoy their property. That is as "big brother" as it gets. I believe the town should deal with complaints when someone is not in compliance... not discriminate and restrict the private property rights of owners. PLEASE DO NOT further the discussion density control! The existing rules and regulations are already sufficient to prevent many properties from doing a STR, i.e. water, sewer, parking, etc. I am happy to discuss this topic with anyone who wants more information as to why I think it's a bad idea. My email address is damonlowe@msn.com. |
| We need less STR in the community. It's ruining the community and there are long term rental residents leaving the canyon in droves. There just isn't any place left for long term renters to live. |
|  |
| I like how Bishop, CA has handled their STRs. STRs are allowed if the owner is a full time resident and resides at the property. The STR can be an attached unit or a separate unit on the property. I don't want STRs from nonresidents as they may not be available to deal with issues that arise and I don't want companies buying properties to turn them into STRs. The property owner should be invested in the local community and available and aware of the local issues and conditions. Additionally, the property owner should be on site, impacted, and ready to handle any bad behavior of the renter. |
| STR degrades a neighborhood |
| It does not matter how many rental there are as long as they are quite and any ordinance should be based on actual harm rather than perceived harm. This is solving a problem that does not exist. It is just horrible and penalizes people and their property |
| Some limits are a good idea depending on the neighborhood |
| Short term rentals in BCC are concerning. Congestion in areas and limited parking are my concerns. More than any other concern, I am worried about water availability and keeping water in the canyon available to owners, keeping the water pure and accessible to wild life. I am concerned we are driving wildlife out. |
| limits would be nice but how would this be decided as to who can rent and who cannot? Seems like this would create a management headache. Water rights should not be driving factor since theoretically all home could be occupied by full time residents using a full allocation of water. I strongly agree that homes not on sewer should not be allowed to have short term rentals. |
|  |
| The percentage should be based on the number of cabins and not include vacant lots. If it is based on the number of cabins, this would be one important element in deciding how to balance short term rentals, but it is not sufficient. There are other issues, such as winter accessibility and road safety. Winter travel from the valley to Brighton Circle is a lot easier than into many of the neighborhoods that are accessible only via single lane roads; for example, that's why they close off Guardsman road. |
| I would not rather have no short time rentals in the forest Glenn area , without the sewer t |

All other Respondents

| USFS has a regulation to allow no more than 2 weeks/yr. I think that works and should be allowed to help defray $5,000 in taxes/lease fees/yr. I am less clear re. the landowners and would defer to them, although I strongly suspect there is a need to have more local folks to run things than to have everything as rentals. |
| --- |
| Restrictions are necessary, but they should be very carefully balanced against the rights of property owners' rights to use their property. |
| It would depend on the percentage. |
| I care about density in amount of properties in general but I don’t care if those properties are short, long, or permanent resident |

| Parking, noise |
| --- |
| Brighton is a community first and a resort later. It is recognized that rentals can reduce traffic in the lower canyon but they do not reduce traffic in the town of Brighton. |
|  |
| Our property is in Solitude |
| Make the limit stricter. No more than 10% of lots can be STR eligible. |
| I think this is a good way to start. Allow for adjustment after trying it for a few years. |
| I'd like to maintain consistent and conscientious community members in the canyon instead of visitors and tourists that may not have the best interest of the canyon in mind. |
|  |
| It is unclear how and how often the STR density limit would be set, and governance over the process. Would like more details before I make a decision. |
|  |
| Solitude mountain and Brighton mountain are not residential areas. They are the base of ski mountains. There is no elementary school, no middle school, no high school, and no full sized grocery store up the canyon. Any full-time residents knew they were moving into a vacation and ski base area when they did so. A change in zoning now, would be unfair to all of the other property owners, who need some level of short term rental to be able to afford their property, to pay taxes, mortgages etc. The water and sewer are real issues. But that is a different zoning question. Houses should have proper permitting, tanks and disposal at the time they are built. If those systems are not being maintained properly, that is a different issue than short term rentals. |
| Too complicated to administer fairly. |
| STRs tend to be more intrusive in neighborhoods with limited parking. Also there is a tipping point at which too many of them lessens the community. |
| I don’t want my neighborhood turning into a hotel district! |
| You can't give one person the right to rent their property and forbid the neighbor the right to rent thiers within the same zone/ area. This directly violates private property rights and is a lawsuit waiting to happen. Also there are challenges with enforceability on this one. I fail to see pros that out weigh the cons. |
| We have a short term rental nearby that regularly ignores any regulations currently in place (noise and over occupancy) so we favor restrictions. |
| I live in a neighborhood where the water is a big issue and I really don’t want short term rentals to adversely effect our water system. If too many people were using the water at once, it would be an issue. |
| Pinetree has limited water availability and full time residents should have priority on usage. |
| I don’t believe that lease length minimums should be determined by municipalities. I believe that people should be free to travel and live in a way unrestricted by government. |