This is my tally on Question 9

**For**            **Against**

Brighton -                                  37 for        47against

Cardiff/Mill D -                            2  for         3 against

Forest Glen-                            12 for          6 against

Lady of the Lake/Evergreen -    2 for         1 against

Other-                                        8 for         4 against

Pine Tree-                                 5 for          2 against

Silver Fork-                              37 for        33 against

Total                                       103 for        96 against

But when I copy and pasted without the sort I got the following tally:

For 93

Against 92

Comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9. Overlay map with green, yellow and red zones By placing a color coordinated overlay map over the Town of Brighton certain areas would be designated as green, yellow and red. The green areas would be those areas closest to the ski resorts (approximately 1/4 mile drive to resorts). Green areas would have no restrictions on the number of short term rentals. The yellow area would be further from the resorts and would have density restrictions described in Proposal #1 (examples would be Silver Fork, Pine Tree).The red areas would not be available to do short term rentals due to not being on the sewer system, no year round water, no winter access or other restrictions described in the STR Ordinance (examples would be Forest Glen, Evergreen, Mill D, Mount Haven, Cardiff,etc) | 10. Please explain your reasoning for your answer to #9. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | May be ok to have more density STR's in the areas closer to the resorts. But we don't need a "red" area since there is already a rule that encompasses the stated restrictions. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | I live in Mount Haven |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | If you can say no STR's in one area you should say no to all areas. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Does not seem fair to base this on proximity to resorts |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | And what happens if red area infrastructure changes? Does rezoning take place? |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This scheme is quite similar to #7 above, with the added mechanism for variable densities depending on location. I like it better than #7, but have the same concerns as #8 above. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | It just makes sense |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | No areas should have no restrictions |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | This places more traffic and non-residents in my area. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Seems like the restriction should be applied equally. Everywhere. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | I don’t want any areas to be unlimited short-term rentals |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | STRs should be limitted in all areas. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Seems Reasonable |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | I do feel there should be limits even close to the ski resorts unless a commercial property or zoned differently. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | This seems like a reasonable approach, certainly for the green and red areas. The devil will be the details of the yellow - the boundaries (14 mi, 1/2 mi, 1 mile?) and the allowed density, as in question 8. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Why should ski resorts benefit from this without contributing more to the tax base? |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | Works for us as we have historical licensed rental in the Green (Brighton loop) and seems to make great sense in each area described for both guests and traffic, resources, etc. But we dont know if that fits what other residents / owners want. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | See my answer to the prior question. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | way too complicated |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This assumes that the only attraction of an STR is to skiers. Even a cabin that has seasonal access and water and is not on a sewer could be a seasonal STR for summer hikers, bikers, etc. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Parking and noise |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | The green areas should;d be restricted as well. Greater restrictions to 10% for yellow areas. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | SAA |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | The original idea of Airbnb was the sharing economy. It was also a way for travelers to experience something completely different and more intimate than a hotel. If some one want's to rent out a house with no heat or one with an outhouse and the renter is fully aware and excepts the responsibilities set forth in the rental agreement then let them rent it. On Airbnb you can rent a cave, sleep in the trunk of some persons Tesla, or a tree house. Do you have any idea how many of my guest shovel the drive way? Probably half. It's a big part of the canyon winter experience and that makes them feel like they belong. If some one wants to rent out their camper, let them. The trick is to market to the right people. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | The distance of the property from the ski resort should not determine whether or not one could provide an str. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | I agree, along with my suggestion for the limited areas to be ACTIVE rentals not just license holders. Again, I could see many people that do not actively rent their homes pursuing licenses just for the sake of having a license (or resell value). This would frustrate people like myself who actually try to follow the rules and license our rentals and find real value in owning property in the canyon. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | STR should be allowed in summer even if year-round water and access are not available |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | It’s easy for the green zone as the marketplace will set expectations. A bit more difficult in red zone where it may be a winter cabin lack of access (snowshoe in) that appeals to a rare breed. Shouldn’t restrict especially if they comply with basic issues such as water availability, parking, etc |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | It’s hard to limit property owners rights, but I’m not strongly opposed to it, if there has been a history of short term rental issues. It hasn’t bothered us. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This may work but I would be interested in understanding potential impacts to property values. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | All properties should be subject to the same regulations if they have utilities to accommodate guests. I fail to see any egalitarian principal that suggests this solution. The impact to property owners is very unfairly distributed in this proposal. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | It's a defineable and easy to comprehend concept utilized in other resort communities. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | this is not helping the homeowner at Brighton, each house now can be an STR, might as well live in the Solitude village ....who is going to patrol this area for parties, noice, light pollution, parking problems, crowds, Brighton is to disbursed with homes as Solitude is a condensed location , easier to patrol and regulate...STR's are not primary residences, therefore secondondary houses for people to make a buck with no regards to primary homeowners in the neighborhood (small percent but that doesn't mean we need to but up with the shenanigans of STR's)as for the red zone, that's a no brainer, but needs to be put in writing. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Why does the town need to designate areas. The rental market will do this. The red areas are already denied or restricted by the STR regulations. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Restrictions are necessary, but they should be very carefully balanced against the rights of property owners' rights to use their property. Cardiff Fork does have year round water, winter access. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | For the restricted area, how would permits be distributed? How would future permits be distributed (for example, if someone sold their home would it go to the next person waiting the longest for a permit)? |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Agree with red areas. Do not agree that distance from resorts should be overriding factor in deciding rental status. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | This is a good idea. It concentrates visitors closer to the resorts and thereby reduces community impact. It also reduces safety concerns associated with winter travel in less accessible parts of the canyon. Furthermore, this seems sustainable; new people moving to the area interested in STRs will purchase homes in the green zone, whereas those seeking more solitude will look to the yellow and red areas. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | STRs should either be allowed or prohibited in each neighborhood, based on suitability. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Same answer as #8. We just don’t have a great enforcement mechanism from what I can tell. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | 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 somewhat disagree with this proposal | 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 strongly agree with this proposal | Water, sewer, and access are must haves to be a STR. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | there needs to be a objective and compelling reason to limit STR‘s in certain areas. I believe lack of access during the winter, no connection to sewer or water are valid reasons. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I agree 100% with the Green Zone around the resort because that is where the Manor is located. I also agree that if a house is not connected to year round utilities it obviously can't be rented when the utilities don't work. The owners in the yellow and red zones should decide on their respective zones. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | The question stem is unclear, as it isn't clear this is a winter only policy. If winter only, it may make some sense re. USFS sites. Otherwise, same issue. If you have everyone as a rental, there's no community and you cannot get things done to run a city/neighborhood/etc. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I like this better than the first, but no restrictions on STR seems like lost of rentals but would be good if everyone is really following the rules. - |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I do not want short time rentals in Forest Glen driveways and road parking limited. Too many people in the area can causes problems. Too many cars , blocking road |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | I do think there is a property rights issue that must be addressed if someone is in a yellow area, if there are water and sewer connections, why can one property owner live full-time on their property, and another cannot rent out their property part-time for STRs which should use less water and sewer. As a second property, one pays higher property taxes than a full-time resident, but you are considering taking away ones right to use property. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Would need to see more on this proposal. My property essentially backs onto the Solitude ski resort, but due to driving distance would likely fall into restricted space. See previous objections to Prop. #1. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Spread some of it out around the canyon so it’s not all rentals in one place. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | But I'm concerned about what restrictions would be imposed in the yellow areas. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | I only agree because my property would definitely fall into the green zone (I'm adjacent to Solitude). Realistically, the boundaries from Green to Yellow and Yellow to Red would be very difficult to justify to owners that are on the boundary. There would be a lot of moral hazard in drawing up the boundaries. Lots of politics, positioning and distrust. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Closest to resort should also have similar limitations on density. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Density restrictions need to be used in all eligible STR zones. Having no restrictions near the ski resorts only promotes rental investment properties not communities. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | My permanent home would be designated green  Meaning I can be surrounded by renters |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | I believe it should be based on the number of year round residents and/or non rental properties in each area. Only 10 percent of any neighborhood should be STR. As far as properties without sewage and water, those should not be rented. The fact that a neighborhood is closer to a resort should not increase it's STR density. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | It does make good sense seeing that the ski resort proximity is a good way to regulate they are the primary use recreation of Airbnb rentals |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | My answer to this would be the same as my answer to # 9 and I would want the input of each neighborhood and their water company in making that decision. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | I don't think there should be anymore STR allowed in the canyon. People are doing it illegally anyway and it needs to be more closely monitored, |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | 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. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | The further away from the ski resorts are more community based. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I would still want the areas closest to the resorts to have a day in how many STRs there could be. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Some properties in Pinetree would fall under the red zone as they will not meet all requirements such as sewer hookup. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly agree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly agree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Note my prior answer |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | Same as answer under #7 |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Again, less density is preferred. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | I don't understand why this would be important. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | There are many benefits to lodging close to the resorts. These tenants may not even need a rental car. Both the base of Solitude and Brighton have a more commercial, rather than residential, feel. Solitude has added infrastructure (increased trash and security services) to manage short term tenants. I would like to see Brighton Resort add more services if there are no restrictions on short term rentals at their base. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | Along with STR restrictions by area...Water Shed needs to be managed. Currently there are Not enough restrooms to handle thousands of people that go up the lake Mary trail! The vendors that plan these activities should provide added restrooms, if they profite from these activities. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | Anything that limits STRs is a benefit. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | The properties near the resort are already compromised by too many rentals. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Too much focus on ski resorts and doesn't adequately address overall density or water concerns |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I think we have to have some control over the number of people using our limited resources. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Parking issues in an established well used areas, 1/4 mile |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | It really depends on the individual cabins. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | I think the area around the ski resort is also a great place to hike and I worry this will create more homes being built near or on those trails. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | i dont agree with unlimited STR anywhere but i like the idea that if you dont meet minimum requirements then you cant rent at all |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I am in favor of limiting the number of STR's. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | This proposal will put most of the STR’s in the same zone as our cabin. Not fair to those in the green zone. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal |  |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I believe Silverlakes Estates I and II also falls into this category of yellow or red |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | Unfortunate to the residents within a 1/4 mile of the resorts, but rentals where driving is not needed to access the resort is a plus for the community of Brighton. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | We have a short term rental nearby that regularly ignores any regulations currently in place (noise and over occupancy) so we favor restrictions. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | Keep the peace. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Afraid it would change to increased density in the future in Silver Fork |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | Rentals close to the resort would not change the nature of the area. Not so in Silver fork and Pine Tree. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | SHORT TERM RENTALS RESULT IN MORE TRAFFIC IN THE CANYONS. WE DON'T NEEDTHAT. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | All areas should have the same short term rental policy. This maintains the community atmosphere. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Reduced density within each neighborhood would more equitably share the burden of STRs. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Property owners close to the ski resorts might also want restrictions, perhaps at a different rate than those in the yellow. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Allowing more rentals/congestion for those of us who invested to be close to the lifts again seems backwards. Just asking for respect for those of us who want to enjoy our home, not having to tame the wild west. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Less government intervention |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | I still believe in property rights being taken away is not good for anyone. I understand what you are trying to do but I also have seen it go bad in the other direction that have caused people to loose a cabin that has been in their family for years because they no longer have the option to rent in bad times. If it was already allowed I believe you should continue to allow it but you could do more noise ordinance etc. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This makes sense. Not a great idea to have rentals in areas without good resources. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | I live close to resort and don't rent. Quality of renters can be very bad. Need restrictions everywhere. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Same as above |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | no STR |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | One color or size doesn't fit all. Perhaps people in some green areas might not want STRs around them. Also it's not fair to prohibit STRs for some people and not others in the yellow areas. Red area is fine as is. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Not fair. it violates the equal justice clause of the 14th amendment in yellow areas |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | It is the owners property. If they want to rent, they should be able to. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Brighton should not be granted more privilege than another area. This is discrimination. Silver Fork is relatively as close to the Solitude ski areas as the houses in the town of Brighton are to the Brighton ski areas. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Location shouldn’t determine ability to rent |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | See my answer to #8. This color coding would not do anything for properties that may switch hands and turn to short term rentals with better maintenance outside of the allowable zones. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Red zones and Green Zones only. That is how Alta does it and is the most practical and easiest and objective to enforce. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Leaves to much regulation in the hands of a few to make this decision. No sewer available makes sense, but otherwise to much restriction of individual property rights. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Again confusing - where's the map? |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Again, a home owner should be able to do as they see fit with THEIR property. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | What you defined as the Brighton area should be in the "green zone" |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | This makes sense as if a property doesn’t have proper accommodations for people such as water and sewer it would not be a good rental. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | This solution seems to make a lot of sense. It keeps the resort activity near the resort while allowing the residential areas to maintain their residential atmosphere. However, as mentioned above, this is already happening organically as green areas currently have about 9% STRs and yellow areas have about 4% . |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This seems to have better reasoning for adopting a neighborhood zone and a Commerical zone and could be looked up by a consumer like a zoning map. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I agreee with the need for access to sewer system, water, winter access or other restrictions described in the STR Ordinance (examples would be Forest Glen, Evergreen, Mill D, Mount Haven, Cardiff,etc) BUT why not allow summer rentals. ALSO - If a completed plain ban is present, people will rent illegally |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Our cabin is one of the closets to the ski resort so this would resolve my concern. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | STR permits should include requirements for year round access, fire safety, water, sewer etc. if color coding makes this easier, it could be a good option. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | As long as renters follow the guidelines already set no other regulations should be necessary. We shouldn't make this too complicated. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | It doesn't seem equitable to limit some homeowners, without understanding both the value we're trying to obtain and the harm we're trying to avoid. I don't understand either one. For example, a lack of sewer is listed. Why is the community regulating that? If a homeowner rents their property and it's used enough that they need a new septic system, isn't that the homeowner's issues to deal with? Why would the community suffer enough to need to regulate it? |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | The distance from ski areas should be expanded to at least a half a mile. Off road parking should be a requirement for any rentals. Should sewer be a limting factor? If the owner is able to get their tank drained, this should not be a factor. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Think all areas should be regulated the same |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Proximity is discriminatory against property owners further away |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Not fair nor is it legal. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Please see my previous explanation for opposing these proposals. In addition, the ability to use a property for short term rental while others do not qualify would provide an added economic advantage to short term rentals, for income, an offset of recurring expenses, and also for property resale. THIS IS NOT FAIR FOR THOSE OF US WHO DO NOT RENT OUT OUR PROPERTIES. SHORT TERM RENTALS RUIN THE AMBIENCE OF BRIGHTON, AND THESE RESTRICTIONS REWARD THOSE WHO ALREADY HAVE SHORT TERM RENTAL STATUS. THERE SHOULD BE PENALTIES FOR SHORT TERM RENTAL OWNERS, RATHER THAN REWARDS |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | There should be no restrictions |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | There is no need to regulate the different areas due to proximity to ski resorts because the law of supply and demand will do that naturally without any regulation whatsoever. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | While I don't rent my home, nor do I intend on renting my home, whether or not I do is no business of anyone but myself. The use of my home and its impact on the community, regardless of the identity of the occupant, should be all that is relevant -- if renters use homes subject to the same restrictions as owners, then fine. But just because they're renters that shouldn't impair their ability to use my property like I would. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | The 1/4 mile is too restrictive. I am about 1 mile from the resorts and should be in the green area for Brighton because that is where my renters dki |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | I would need more context into issues with renting in the red areas. The concept of short- term rentals though is one I support. It gives people who can’t afford or can’t accommodate full-time living up the canyon a chance for a new experience. More off the grid experiences are really life changing. It seems like a lot of the anti-short term rental movements are based on class/racial/national discrimination (fear of people not able to live in an area being there part-time). As someone who has lived in metro areas and then moved to utah, I hope we can welcome more people into these otherwise exclusive areas. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | This approach makes so much sense! Our canyon is comprised of varying locations and communities, with differences. People who live within walking distance to a ski resort (especially ski-in properties) need to expect a resort atmosphere, including wide-spread short-term rentals during tourist season. This is different from properties that are not immediately adjacent to tourist draws and which require renters to drive their vehicles to and from those areas.  I also like that Brighton Loop is being considered in the same zone as Solitude Village, as it has more in common with Solitude than it does with places like Silver Fork. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal |  |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | We cannot ask residents to pay high property taxes after they’ve purchased their properties with a plan to pay taxes and provide income for their families. This sounds like a covid bill of shutting down small businesses. I cannot support this. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | I agree that the green area should have no restrictions. However I believe that at least a 1/2 mile radius would be a more reasonable area. I'm not even sure my cabin is within a 1/4 mile radius on Old Prospect Ave. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Don’t want to give up properly right no matter where property is located. |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | We have access to all of the described ordinances and is definitely needed to rent |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | The green and red area designations make sense but the yellow does not. For those in the yellow area, this is an arbitrary means of who can provide STRs. This restricts rights in how people use their property. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This is a more reasonable approach to limiting STRs and respecting the rights of permanent owners, while also respecting the rights of those desiring to rent. It is less arbitrary and reflects a more reasoned designation process. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Of all the proposals this one seems to make the most sense, but overall I do not support further restrictions on STRs. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | Red areas as you defined are a whole other question as you mentioned they don’t meet current regulations. As far as the yellow and green areas I don’t think they need to be separated. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | How did the colors of the map get created? Is it assumed the green areas have fewer FT residents, and therefore it's okay to have more STR's? Standards should be enforced to rent based on SAFTEY and RESOURCES only! I'm concerned these limits and restrictions feel very much like a "not-in-my backyard" type of feel which is an unfortunately common feeling in the community between STR owners and SOME FT residents...   All current STR owners who are compliant, must to be exempt from any & all future restrictions. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Short term renters aren’t bad. Properties are maintained |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Probably reasonable if close to the resorts. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | None of this is necessary. The existing rules and regulations by the county and town are sufficient to restrict STR's appropriately. Again... the town should not turn into another layer of "HOA type governance"... but rather trust that the county FCOZ and other studies were adequate when code was written and that the way it's been done for decades is sufficient. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | If i can't rent my forest glen property why do you care if i don't bother my neighbors. This is beyond crazy and shortsided and I really wish you would stay out of people lives who are just going about their business |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | 1/4 mile is too narrow of a limit - this should be increased to at least 3/4 mile (subject to the property also being attached to the public sewer system). |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This appears to be a more clear proposal. I would still like more details over planning, governance, etc. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This is much better than banning all short term rentals. It seems to give houses on water and sewer systems and closest to the mountain full flexibility. I am less familiar with the other areas, but I am not sure why someone would want to rent a house not on the sewer or water systems anyway. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | You still have all of the problems with proposal #1. This is just an example of how proposal #1 would be implemented. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | I don’t have a problem with requiring proper facilities for short term rentals, but proximity to resorts doesn’t seem to be a great way to prevent short term rentals. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | same as above. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | This approach has a rational approach and the details could be worked out for a fair resolution. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | I should be able to compete with SilverForkLodge and not have an overlay of any kind. Again bureaucracy is the crime of this Township. I wish it would never have taken place. I put a $20,000 Hook onto the sewer system to make my place more in compliance with the area. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | No Sewer, no rental |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | I do not think there should be limits imposed upon property owners that want to rent their property |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | If there is no winter access and no sewer then it is not a good idea to do short term rentals. If there is a problem the fire engines can’t get there. |
| I somewhat agree with this proposal | Every property has individual functional upsides and downsides based on the items listed above. The current criteria for short term rentals that are in place do a pretty good job of determining if short term renting is a reasonable use for each property. I think each property should be a evaluated on its individual qualifications for use as a short term rental instead of trying to allow other property owners to dictate what their neighbors should be allowed by law to do regardless of the neighborhood it is located in. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Current criteria does a good job in evaluating whether or not a property is a candidate for short-term rentals. Instead of restricting property owners’ rights, why not simply enforce the rules we have in place currently? |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Agin its are cabin |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | The cap should be much higher |
| I strongly agree with this proposal | This would allow for |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | It seems that those that live closer to center are favorite children. Why should they have favored privileges. I do understand if there is no water or sewer or access. That automatically excludes them. |
| I somewhat disagree with this proposal | If a property does not have the facilities to accommodate guests (no sewer, water, etc.), then it's probably not a great STR option, and likely wouldn't do well on the STR sites. Does this kind of property need to be regulated by STR regulation? I think it's better managed by the water and sewer districts. |
| I strongly disagree with this proposal | Hard to answer, since I cannot see a map with where the yellow area is, and if Mule Hollow Lane is in the yellow area |
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