



SHORT-TERM RENTAL OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES

Municipal Policy Committee
March 6, 2018

PURPOSE



To provide a follow-up related to public discussion and stakeholder input related to the examination of short-term rentals (STRs) and the development of guiding principles for consideration.

TODAY'S AGENDA



- Stakeholder Input & Survey

STAKEHOLDER INPUT



- Consultant Host Compliance, LLC, conducted four (4) town hall meetings in January and provided an online stakeholder survey
- Town hall meetings were well attended, with a combined 295 residents and stakeholders participating in the workshops

SURVEY OVERVIEW



- 1055 responses received
 - 915 Complete
 - 140 Partial / Incomplete
- 58% of responses were from District 1
- Nearly all respondents (98%) have their primary residence in Arlington
- About half (53%) have never hosted or been an STR guest – anywhere, not just in Arlington. 39% have used a short-term renting platform as a guest and 61 people identified themselves as having been a host

SURVEY OVERVIEW



People who claimed to have been a host answered additional questions:

- 80% are or were hosts in Arlington
- Hosts identified 'making more money than long-term renting' and 'helping to pay my bills' as the main motivators for hosting

SURVEY OVERVIEW



Self-identified residents personal experience as a neighbor to a home being utilized as a STR:

- About a third (34%) live near one or more homes being used as a short-term rental
- Of these residents, 62% are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their personal experience of short-term renting

SURVEY OVERVIEW



Quality of life concerns:

- Respondents felt all the quality of life concerns were ‘very important,’ especially ‘party houses’ (82%) and ‘noise’ (75%). Though still ‘very important,’ traffic and trash were slightly less important
- Four-fifths want restrictions on exterior signage

SURVEY OVERVIEW



About short-term-rental ordinance priorities:

- Half of respondents said the conversion of long-term units to short-term rentals is a ‘critical’ concern. Only 18% said it was ‘not important’
- Survey takers were equally divided about whether short-term renters have more of an obligation to be considerate than other residents
- Three-quarters believe hosts should risk losing their permit if they receive too many complaints

SURVEY OVERVIEW



About short-term-rental ordinance priorities (continued):

- While 43% want neighbors' views to factor into the permitting process of STRs, 27% believe there is no need. 27% take a middle position, where neighbors are informed but not involved
- About 60% think it is 'very important' that STRs follow the same taxes, safety inspections, and zoning requirements as traditional bed & breakfasts, motels, and hotels

HOST COMPLIANCE - SURVEY CONCLUSIONS



- The survey data aligns with town hall meeting statements from residents related to quality of life concerns
- For neighbors, the perception of problems is real, even though many admitted to not knowing if a STR is near them. (For the people who said they live next to an STR, nearly everyone was adamant on experiencing real issues and feeling like the city could not respond to them adequately.)

HOST COMPLIANCE - SURVEY CONCLUSIONS



- The Entertainment District is a unique feature for Arlington on this topic. The mix of huge tourist draws, traditional hotels, and residential neighborhoods - creates an interesting diversity of opinions. Some see STRs as a way for 'average people' to capitalize on the District, some think STRs negatively disrupt their residential street, some just hate the concept. (E.g. Pasadena, Ca. and the Rose Bowl)

HOST COMPLIANCE - SURVEY CONCLUSIONS



- Hosts all say they want to follow the rules, that - like neighbors - they want consistency in the regulations and enforcement. Host Compliance believes there is a strong divide between the hosts with one property and the ones with multiple properties, in terms of their goals and their business models.
- The following slide was provided at the last STR Committee presentation.



POLICY OBJECTIVE CONSIDERATIONS

Policy Objective Considerations

Preserve HOT Revenues and Create Parity Amongst Lodging Industry

- Registration/Permit
- Utilize third-party vendor to provide location & owner data to City
- Require permit number on all advertisements / hosting platforms

Neighborhood Preservation

- Prohibit
- Allow - Clear Definition
- Operational Restrictions
 - Local contact
 - Require informational postings
 - Categorize by type (owner vs not owner occupied / single-family vs multifamily)
 - Non-compliance sanction procedures
 - Maximum occupancy limits
 - Rental period restrictions
 - Provide owner contact information to adjoining property owners
 - Parking restrictions
 - Adopt narrowly tailored regulations
 - Provide for cap on number, percentage or proximity
 - Provide complaint process / hotline

Health and Safety

- Public safety access
- Appropriate insurance
- Mandatory safety inspections
- Safety devices
- Evacuation plan
- Self-inspection checklist
- Complaint driven safety inspections
- Occupancy limits

NEXT STEPS



- Presentation of Public Safety calls for service data



Questions