# **ROUND ROBIN QUESTION #15-16**

**AGREE DISAGREE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AREA** | **FULL TIMERS WHO AGREE** | **PART TIMERS WHO AGREE** | **STRs WHO AGREE** |  | **FULL TIMERS WHO DISAGREE** | **PART TIMERS WHO DISAGREE** | **STRs WHO DISAGREE** |
| **BRIGHTON** | **6** | **13** | **0** |  | **12** | **41** | **26** |
| **SILVER FORK** | **10** | **6** | **0** |  | **16** | **27** | **13** |
| **FOREST GLEN** | **5** | **2** | **0** |  | **8** | **6** | **0** |
| **EVERGREEN** | **0** | **3** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| **PINE TREE** | **3** | **1** | **0** |  | **1** | **2** | **0** |
| **CARDIFF** | **1** | **0** | **0** |  | **1** | **0** | **0** |
| **MILL D** | **0** | **0** | **0** |  | **0** | **2** | **0** |
| **OTHER** | **1** | **2** | **1** |  | **3** | **4** | **2** |

[**CLICK HERE FOR ORIGINAL DATA SPREADSHEET FOR QUESTION #15**](http://users.neo.registeredsite.com/4/4/6/22978644/assets/2022_STR_ROUND_ROBIN_QUESTION.pdf)

### **COMMENTS** (Highlights indicate agreement with ANY type of regulation)

1. People should get in line and take turns to rent if the density limit is already reached.
2. I don’t want strs in my neighborhood. If allowed, they shouldn’t always be the same properties
3. Some mechanism is needed to distribute the STR permits. I have not studied this to know if this is the best method.
4. Fairness
5. Although I don’t like the idea of unlimited STR’s this proposal is democratic, treating everyone the same.
6. Sounds fair so some homes would not hog up the available slots
7. This answered my earlier question - but this seems like a lot of work for someone in the town to track - plus I think those who have has STR for a while will say screw it and just do it anyway
8. 15% rather than 25%
9. We agree that only one STR permit is allowed for individuals, families or other legal entities. We feel starting with a grandfathered list of STR permits. As permittees retire applicants on the wait list fill these retirees per seniority that will reassess every year. There should also be a minimum usage per year to keep your STR permit if there is a wait list.
10. Anything that limits STRs is a benefit.
11. The " Round Robin " is fair for all...that's a good solution.
12. This gives all owners an option to rent, although it reduces revenue predictability since you may not be able to rent in any given year.
13. Sounds sort of like a headache for somebody to keep track of.
14. Limits STR’s to some extent
15. If it takes decided to allow a percentage of properties to have short term rentals, Round Robin should go into effect as soon as the percentage cap is reached, whatever that is determined to be.
16. This is an innovative way to deal with an abundance of str's applied for.
17. I favor this proposal in conjunction with other strategies to limit STRs. This proposal addresses equity and discourages persistent utilization of BCC property for STR.
18. No reason. Doesn’t affect or apply to me.
19. This sounds like an equitable way to allocate permits. I'd be interested in hearing from communities that have tried this to see how it actually worked.
20. Sort of agree, however eventually the owners won't be local and we'll have trouble running Brighton and the neighborhoods. We need to heavily tax those rentals.
21. Think this is fair.
22. Need to offer homes to those who previously did not utilize a chance to immediately get in line.
23. This is more fair, so that everyone that wants to participate has a chance
24. As fair as any system
25. We have a short term rental nearby that regularly ignores any regulations currently in place (noise and over occupancy) so we favor restrictions.
26. Same reasoning as the last question; it disincentivizes buying solely for investment. Not renewing a license for any violation would also support this type of system.
27. A good rule but I think it should be applied at 10%
28. If we have to have density restrictions (which I hope we don't, at least not in Brighton Loop), then we definitely need a system like this (waiting list) for people who want to do STRs, but can't. Not entirely sure I understand the explanation above, but the ability to rent STRs should NOT run with the land. That would be even more unfair than restricting STR density on a rotating basis! I'm glad that properties within 1/4 mile of resorts are being considered differently. Many of these homes have been and are being built to accommodate STRs well. It would be crazy to have a well-designed STR be unable to rent, due to density.
29. I am not sure if I clearly understand this option. To be fair, the STR permit should be issued for the property not an individual, as many properties are jointly owned by several family members. Allowing the permit transfer for the STR from one family member to another each year keeping the property in rental status indefinitely would be a disadvantage for other STR single family ownership applicants waiting to move into the rental line up.
30. This proposal would limit total STR’s but at too high level. May also discourage investment in the area solely as STR, which would be positive.

### **COMMENTS** (Highlights indicate disagreement with ANY type of regulation)

1. I can understand the reasoning of this idea of fairness but I think this would reek havoc to many of the host's financial model. I would bet that many of the hosts bought their cabins thinking this is how they could afford the cabin which is like a second home and many think of it more as a business and not extra cash. For that reason, I think there would be a huge outcry of the current hosts.
2. Restrictions are necessary, but they should be very carefully balanced against the rights of property owners' rights to use their property.
3. The only one STR per entity part might be hard to justify
4. Less government intervention
5. Either a facility can be rented or it can't. Again...who's going to monitor this...full time job.
6. It is too complicated
7. This prevents those that want to rent. Monopoly by the larger operators
8. Could you make this any more confusing?!?
9. If you rely on rental income to support the house, the year you don’t get to rent is a problem.
10. A homeowner should be able to do what they want with their property
11. Seems way to mgt intensive
12. If you have purchased a property, planning on using it as a rental, it would be impossible to plan your budget, years ahead, if you were beholding to a round robin system.
13. Overly complicated
14. Not sufficiently predictable/stable over time for owners/neighbors
15. Way too complicated and basically unfeasible.
16. Seems so inconsistent, and you never know what you can plan on
17. Too complicated.
18. Properties are not created equally (i.e. proximity to neighbors, parking, etc.). This idea does not look at the whole picture
19. The risk of having many properties near Brighton ski as rentals should be avoided. This would change the nature of the area to purely a money-making endeavor
20. Terrible idea. When a property is at the back end (unrentable), is Brighton going to compensate the owner for the cost of maintaining up-to-date business licenses, advertising and maintenance contracts while the owner has to wait to get to an appropriate place in line? Reservations can happen months in advance, this seems unworkable and unreasonable.
21. STRs provide a means for people to come and enjoy the town of Brighton and actually decrease traffic in the roads as they can stay in the area with less travel up and down the canyon.
22. Too complicated and difficult to enforce
23. It is the owner’s property. If they want to rent, they should be able to.
24. This is easily the worst idea of all. First of all, I think the possibility of the % of STRs going from the current of about 6% all the way to 25% is almost none. Second, the reason owners do short-term rentals is so they can afford to have a home there at all. If I knew there was a possibility that there would be years that I couldn't rent, then I would not be able to afford to have a home in the canyon.
25. Yeah, very strong NO on that one. If restriction on the number is needed, those who have licenses should be grandfathered. When we purchased the home, we had a STR license and are only able to afford the house if we rent it. It would be unjustly punitive to change that now.
26. Why make this a game. Each home sits on private property and we should let property owners decide how to govern their own property as long as it does not affect the safety of others.
27. The problem with this is the short-term rental booking is a contract. The owner will have to honor any bookings made in advance of April. So that complicates things.
28. I don't understand enough to comment
29. It feels like a lottery of luck system with no sustainable business sense.
30. Lame idea. Again... the existing rules are adequate and self-limiting on their own. If you are getting a lot of complaints on noise, parking, or whatever... jack up the fines. To change how a property can be used outside of Century old statutes is a big deal. This is borderline discrimination in making an assumption that if someone does STR... they must not be as good as a full-time resident. All property owners pay taxes. There is a term in real estate called quiet enjoyment which more or less states: “The right of a property owner or tenant to enjoy his or her property without interference. Disruption of quiet enjoyment may constitute a legal nuisance. Leases and rental agreements often contain a “covenant of quiet enjoyment,” expressly obligating the landlord to ensure that tenants live undisturbed.” If the town starts dabbling in STR density restrictions they are opening up a can of worms. Just let people use and enjoy their property. Focus on fines for complaints when an owner or renter disturbs the peace or prevents someone from quiet enjoyment.
31. This will only open things up for people doing things illegally.
32. If the owner purchased the home for rental income this would be impossible to work with. I think owners should know if they can rent their property or not and not be in limbo every year.
33. Whether I am there or someone is staying in my house, I pay my taxes and fees the same as everyone else so why should I be told who and how we use our property. Too much government over reach.
34. 25% too high. If it were 10%, I'd agree with it.
35. Seems complicated.
36. No STRs
37. It’s gonna be the same rationale with every one of these. You’re creating incentives to cheat.
38. If STR are a source of needed income it would be difficult to not know each year if you would be in the pool
39. I hate the idea of Robin Hood. I lived in the neighborhood in Texas where our tax money went to all the poor neighborhoods and we had to have fundraisers to keep our schools going. The schools that our money went to went to football stadiums and big athletic buildings And the population didn’t warrant this expense. It truly robbed from the rich and gave to the poor but it was poorly managed as government always does.
40. How many bad proposals have you come up with please leave us alone
41. It seems open to interpretation and bargaining.
42. Too complicated
43. Not sure this would work for someone who needs to know they will be able to receive a certain level of income each year.
44. You should have proof that you are actively renting to maintain your permit each year rather than simply being kicked off the list because you’ve been renting the longest. For cabins that weren’t rented in a given year, they should be swapped out with new applicants to maintain the integrity of the program.
45. You make the people that already have them more profitable and cause others that may need to do this to keep their property harder for them in the future. You also make it harder for them to sell their property in hard times.
46. This is ridiculous, and is trying too hard to make this complicated.
47. This prevents predictability, devalues the properties which are at the back of the line, and increases the value of the properties which are at the front of the line. It puts city administration in the business of managing a process which has tremendous consequences on property values, opening the city up to lawsuits.
48. Such a system seems unnecessary at this point in time.
49. This has significant economic impact on the owners.
50. This sounds like high school. This is not the way to run a neighborhood. I think this would cause much angst.
51. There should be no illegal restrictions attempted to be put in place.
52. Anyone involved in property rental needs a predictable income stream. This won't work.
53. This is working under the assumption that the City should be regulating STR numbers in the first place, which I think is a false narrative to start with. if any additional STR restrictions are enacted, it should not impact current STR license holders - they should be grand-fathered as it is not fair to change the rules after the fact when time and money has already been invested complying with current regulations.
54. There should be no restrictions
55. Again, there is absolutely no need to regulate the number of days a property can be rented annually. This will be done organically by the law of supply and demand.
56. This is asinine and needlessly complex. You people should find more to do to occupy your time rather than come up with asinine proposals that solve nothing.
57. I do not think there should be limits imposed upon property owners that want to rent their property
58. Does this mean that one year I would not be allowed to rent? If an owner has followed the licensing requirements, it was granted and the owner continues to follow the procedure to renew; they should be allowed to continue doing short term rentals.
59. Some with STR rely on the income to pay the mortgage, etc. Our income could not afford the cabin mortgage if denied historical ability to rent short term as occurred last 20+ years at the property.
60. This is crazy! How can someone never know from year to year if they are going to be in the program or not. Often bookings come in a year in advance . Even if it’s once every ten years that you loose the right to rent for one winter what is the property owner supposed to do for income ? I am a Realtor and understand the logistics of real estate purchasing . This will not work.
61. It would be difficult to implement and manage such a restriction. As is often the case, reservations for STR's extend out up to a year in advance. Therefore, the City cannot immediately transfer a STR status from one property to another. There are other complicating factors for both parties, such as licenses and permits, insurance and contractual obligations.
62. I am in favor of limiting the number of STR's.
63. This will again make things inconsistent and make rule following less consistent.
64. Do not take away the right to rent from existing legally licensed rentals.
65. Too much control.
66. Seems overly complicated and a hassle to deal with every year.
67. Again, this seems incredibly paternalistic and costly to inflict on residents in a community.
68. The idea of a round robin, or possibly a lottery system, is good, but not sufficient by itself. As written, this proposal doesn't take into consideration the nature of the neighborhood; it simply caps the STRs at 25% for all neighborhoods. The round robin part then addresses how do grant the applications. Instead, the round robin could be used with the Overlay Map proposal in #9 as a means to fairly grant STRs in the green and yellow regions.
69. This is administratively difficult and also random. If two houses are paying the same tax rate, they should not be limited in different ways. It is also economically unfeasible. Having a home that you can rent out one year but not the next, will create undue economic burden for people who depend on rentals to help pay for their mortgage, their heat, their taxes etc.
70. This seems unfair to property owners if they can't plan for income from their STRs on a regular basis.
71. So you would only be able to renew with the hope that not more people wanted to STR there home next year? We should do that with cars…
72. Nonsensical
73. sounds like a mess
74. This is a bad idea on all levels!!!...administrative costs, bribery, complexity. I call this the Dodo Property. It should be extinct. This is America where everyone should have an equal opportunity!
75. Too complicated to administer fairly. Also makes it difficult for property owners to plan.
76. This is way too messy. First, that is a marketing nightmare. There are all ready those of us who have our budgets set and depend on offsetting costs of home ownership with STR revenue. We personally designed this home specifically as passive income for our retirement. Being un able to run our business for a whole year would be devastating. I also think it would force people that are in a similar situation to ours to have to switch to a long term rental situation. This is bad because that puts one more full time house hold using water & the sewer every day, driving in the canyon every day and the home owner is no longer part of the canyon community.
77. Everyone or no one should be able to rent.
78. 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 do not support the round robin idea. We all pay taxes and should have the opportunity to run a business if guidelines and regulations are met.
79. That will never work. Lol. No one will be in favor of this.
80. I don't like this because I think predictable rental income is more important than maximizing rental income. Hence my soft support for limitations described in #13.
81. puts too much uncertainty for the home owner
82. Full-time residence should be part of this round robin proposal to see if they can use their property in the manner they wish If property owners who wish to rent their properties need to comply by these requirements. This sounds a little ridiculous doesn’t it?
83. Again, treat ALL property owners equally. Are you putting full-time resident properties in this “round robin” pool? Government should never place arbitrary, unequal restrictions on property owners. This proposal feels a lot like a lottery, in which property rights are tossed about according to arbitrary placement in a pool. This seems utterly inappropriate and should never have even been proposed; it’s ludicrous and offensive.
84. Our home is in the loop and we bought it specifically with the intent of using it a legal, fully compliant STR each year. This proposal would take away our ability to run our business and would greatly diminish the resell value. I think the "Loop" should be exempt like Solitude is..
85. This proposal is fraught with unfairness and over-regulation intent. It assumes a much larger STR pool than exists.
86. it should be up to me to use the cabin as we see fit
87. Please stop! If I own 2 cabins, you are telling me I would only be able to rent out one? who is making these rules?
88. No regulation.
89. This proposal has too many moving parts and would be expensive to enforce. Not sure what the end game is for this--cut down on rentals?
90. You would you never know where you were at and need the income to keep your property up
91. This is completely arbitrary and violates my rights in how I use my home.
92. This procedure would be rife with confusion and unfairness. It will result in an arbitrary limitation on property/rental rights based on who is most on the ball with getting in line.
93. There is a great benefit to the community with (well managed) STRs. Reduced traffic, taxes paid to Brighton, customers on site to support local restaurants and businesses, and many others. None of these limits make sense or are in sync with the actual beneficial services STRs support.
94. This proposal would protect the interests of the owners who want to rent without undue impacts on their neighbors. The zones would need to be designed small enough to prevent large clusters of rentals in a small area.
95. This is my least favorite of all proposals.
96. We should get a license and be able to continue to rent year after year
97. This will discourage investment in Brighton properties and will harm current investors who have put money into properties at Brighton. Also difficult to enforce.
98. If you understand how Airbnb and vrbo, for example, work is that it takes a while to become successful based on their systems. The longer you are advertising with them you can eventually earn a preferred rating through obtaining excellent reviews which is the only way to get your listing moved toward the front of the line. If you take away the ability to advertise on these platforms it could take years to gain current success. Penalizing those short term rentals that are currently excellent examples of what our community needs and possibly allowing a poor performer to enter the rental market for no reason and also significantly reducing the amount of tax revenue that could be collected.
99. This is a horrible idea. Who will manage this? Wow. Just wow. IF you understand how STR's are prioritized on VRBO and Airbnb, we are given priority to be at the to of the searches based upon YEARS of our response rate by a QUALITY owner (this must be within 24 hours). Our property search being pushed at the top of searches is also based the quality and accuracy of our property. You cannot simply just toggle on/off on these websites and expect to get traction and bookings, as well as QUALITY guests. Also, this Round Robin limitation only penalizes current successful and quality STR owners, as it prioritizes new & unknown STR rentals, over a current rental who has had a successful history. This also opens the town up to exponential RISK for non-performing STR's and provides ZERO incentive for STR owners be good hosts if their listing is only going to get pulled in x number of years. Those STR's that are operating well, takes years to figure out. Like anything in life, those that do it well make it look easy. I invite the Town Council to interview more STR owners to truly understand how much we truly care about the town and the community, and how insulting it is to be scrutinized and potentially limited on how we manage our family's pride & joy of a ski property. Please call me if you ever want to chat. I've unfortunately never been contacted to provide any STR insight to those who have not managed or owned one. We can all walk in others shoes before judging.
100. We must not jeopardize someone’s decision to risk investment just so that everyone can have a turn.
101. This makes it tough for properties that are set up primarily for STR
102. Not fair
103. Just let people short term but hold them to a high maintenance standards. Limit parking to appropriate lot size. Make them live near and respond in a timely fashion to issues
104. It is too complicated.
105. Again, I don't agree with the regulated proposal. It sounds like STR fees would go up to cover all the work it takes to manage these type of regulations.
106. Even more of an enforcement nightmare and giving MSD more power over all of us. MSD can't be trusted as evidenced by the wedding fiasco. The only way for Brighton to consider passing a STR limitation ordinance is when Brighton gets out of the MSD. (That could be years). Implementation of this by MSD and the DAs office is completely unacceptable. If the town council takes this approach, I would recommend that the town be terminated since it is being managed by the same group of fascists as it was before incorporation.
107. It just encourages owners to keep renting after their turn and doesn’t make much sense to me