

falls within the section 6.e., which requires advance approval of 50% of our abutting property owners. Our concern is that this would subject us to the capriciousness of neighbors who may arbitrarily and unfairly prejudge the concept of short term rental stays such as VRBOs. We have a well maintained home and enjoy and respect our neighborhood, why would we have people that would not care for our home and respect our neighbors stay in our home? This concept that others may think we are renting to groups of noisy hooligans is an insult to my sense of kindness and civic responsibility. We take good care of our home, which has improved the neighborhood, and it would be good that others would see this as a positive rather than focusing on the negative aspect of guests staying in our home. We feel that the proposed complaint process alone is sufficient to weed out other homeowners who may not be as responsible as us, and therefore we ask that you not impose additional rules and restrictions to our zone.

51. **Comment:** If I have to get written permission from 50% of my neighbors to offer my house on AirBNB then everyone else should need to get 50% of neighbors approval as well. Student Housing? 50% approval required. New development? 50% approval required. New shopping center 50% required...and so on
52. **Comment:** I think the green zones that are currently permitting short-term rentals should stay and the proposed orange-striped areas on the map will lose the integrity of residential neighborhoods with families and perhaps school-aged children who walk or bike to school if short-term rentals are allowed here. My biggest concern however is there is an elementary school (WMR) within this zone (and three others just on the perimeter-AEEC, DRES, & CWES), perhaps allowing short-term renters access to small children within visibility of their walking and bus routes. Registered sex offenders cannot live within a certain radius of a school, but short-term renters have no way of being vetted or monitored. I think this should be of primary concern to our city council, school board, and citizens that you are now allowing short-term renters within these school zones. As evidenced with major sporting events in larger cities, sporting events are often a time of increased human trafficking, and I think the City of Auburn is not immune to those concerns. I am NOT IN FAVOR of extending the short-term rentals around the WMR neighborhood or any closely adjacent neighborhood to our elementary schools. This is a recipe for disaster and I urge you to consider our smallest citizens who don't have a voice in this task force.
53. **Comment:** I strongly object to this portion of the regulations: "Article V, 511.04. Detailed Use Regulations: Home Occupations (B)(7) No more than three (3) customers or clients of a home occupation business shall be present on the premises at the same time; for homestays, no more than six (6) adult overnight guests are allowed, per day. No customers, clients or employees shall be allowed to visit the property, nor shall business deliveries be made to a property on which a home occupation business is conducted earlier than 8:00 a.m. or later than 6 p.m.; these hours of operation shall not apply to a homestay." It appears this language would be applicable for all home occupied businesses, not just homestays. If the city would like to have a conversation about home occupied business regulations, I am happy to participate, but this is not appropriate to be included under short term rental regulations. I have had a home occupation permit since 2010. Most of my clients come to my home after 6:00 pm and I often have more than 3 guests. If there is massive outcry against home occupied businesses, please inform me. I have heard of concerns about homestays, but this is the first I have heard of needing to regulate home occupied businesses in this way. I ask that this language be removed from the regulations. I'm happy to discuss this further - [REDACTED]
54. **Comment:** This is the worst idea ever! As a small business owner it would greatly impact my families income with such limits as to how many and what time people can come to MY HOME WHERE I PAY THE MORTGAGE AND BILLS! Unless I personally have done something wrong, small from home businesses should be excluded from such nonsense.
55. **Comment:** Looking at the proposed regulations, which are supposed to be about short term rentals like Air BNB, I am seeing some language that is concerning to me as a small business owner. I'm not sure why there is even language about small businesses in this package. My concern is with the limit on the number of clients I can have on my property at a time and the hour restrictions. I teach a popular local childbirth class, and have considered hosting the class in my home. With the restrictions proposed, I would not be able to have two or more couples over for a class, even though it would be fine for me to have that many people over to my house as guests for dinner. I would like to see the language about home based businesses removed entirely, as it seems to me to be irrelevant to the issue if short term rentals.
56. **Comment:** I strongly object to this portion of the regulations: "Article V, 511.04. Detailed Use Regulations: Home Occupations (B)(7) No more than three (3) customers or clients of a home occupation business shall be present on the premises at the same time; for homestays, no more than six (6) adult overnight guests are allowed, per day. No

customers, clients or employees shall be allowed to visit the property, nor shall business deliveries be made to a property on which a home occupation business is conducted earlier than 8:00 a.m. or later than 6 p.m.; these hours of operation shall not apply to a homestay." It appears this language would be applicable for all home occupied businesses or business activities, not just homestays. At what point do my property rights supercede this ill thought out ordinance? I run a non-profit that is located in Opelika and I very rarely do business in my home, but if I invite donors or board members to a party or dinner at my home, does this become an issue? They are technically "clients." What happens when a minister invites a small group to their home? Does that have to have special permission from the city because technically the pastor is doing business in his home. Where does this ordinance end and homeowner rights begin? It seems to me like too much time is being spent focusing on making sure that students are held prisoner in a certain area of town that the long term residents of Auburn are forgetting that if it were not for the University, Auburn would in no way be what it is currently. I understand that we have to think ahead and look at neighborhood conservation, but this ordinance is overreach plain and simple. Please contact me with any questions at [REDACTED]

57. **Comment:** The language related to placing new limitations on the number of clients and hours clients can be hosted is problematic. Many currently conducting modest and low profile business from their home with a license will no longer be able to do so. For example, the teacher who tutors my children at her home after school will be negatively impacted because when we arrive for tutoring there is another family also there and I'm arriving with three kids. Or, I attend a professional coaching session that's conducted in a small group format (myself and three other ladies/clients). This type of business would no longer be able to operate. Commercial/office rental rates in Auburn make conducting certain business unsustainable and its impractical. Not to mention small professional office spaces are very hard to find. This language seems to reach beyond short term rentals and negatively impact many other areas of business practice. Was there intent to make this reach and slip it in with the short term rental regulation? I ask because I'm struggling to see how these particular constraints (limiting number of clients and hours) has any relation to short term rentals or how it benefits the community. If this the result of problems with those with licenses abusing the opportunity or disturbing their neighbors then let's talk about THAT and work on it in the open as a separate topic.
58. **Comment:** I have a photography/videography business. Although I do not currently meet clients in my home due to being in a rental property, having a residential studio is part of my near future plans once we buy a house. Most of the regulations for home businesses are understandable and would not affect me, however, a few would cause some serious issues. First, a limit of 3 people allowed to visit the business location is problematic. I often work with families with more than 3 members, or have group photo shoots for high school seniors and their friends. The time restriction is also problematic. I conduct sales appointments where families can order prints of their photos. These appointments are usually most convenient for my clients around 7 or 8pm. These regulations would interrupt my business greatly once I have a residential studio. Thank you for your consideration of the photography industry in your future revisions of this proposal.
59. **Comment:** I am very concerned that this regulation for homestays includes regulations covering any other home business. You should keep the regulation strictly dealing with homestays. Should you decide not to do so, the following are specific issues I have with the regulations as written: 1). 500 square feet of HVAC space seems too small. It does not address homes with bigger space or less used space by the residents. My sister, in Florida, uses more of her home than that for storage for her business. I suggest making it a percentage, like 20%, of the home square feet with a maximum of 1000 square feet. 2). A limit of 3 customers at one time is unreasonable. It does not address a family, for example visiting a photographer, visiting at the same time. Why not make it six (6), the same as overnight stays. 3). A cutoff time of 6:00 PM is unreasonable. Some home-based businesses are second jobs worked after the person returns home. With the limit on the number of simultaneous customers, extending the time to 8:00 PM should not any problem at all. And it allows those home-based businesses to do business until a reasonable hour. They are limited by nuisance regulations for being a problem. 4). No advertising material with the hours and/or address is not reasonable at all. Business owners, even home businesses, need to be able to provide customers with business hours and a physical address. The business hours stipulate when customers can, and cannot, have visitors. This in itself addresses the issue, but it is also addressed by the numerous other regulations. 5). I think stipulating that homestays cannot provide any food to the overnight guests is not reasonable. Some homestays may prefer to be at home when they have overnight guests, like a Bed and Breakfast, which a friend of mine operates in Nashville in a residential

neighborhood without any problems whatsoever. And considering the Auburn regulations limit the operation to 60 days per calendar year, this cannot become a B&B. 6). I am curious why the proposed allowable map is so limited. Short term, overnight stays, with the regulations proposed, seems to not be a risk for allowing in any neighborhood. I would have no problem if my neighbors rented their home for a week or two, here and there, for overnight stays. The other regulations are in place to address any potential problems with noise, etc. 7). I am dismayed at the extent to which these regulations address any home business unnecessarily. I greatly understand the need to maintain the quality of our residential neighborhoods. Especially given that Auburn has already allowed developers to destroy the atmosphere of so much of the rest of Auburn, especially downtown. I get the feeling that, much of this regulation is, as other city regulations happen to be, to unnecessarily restrict private citizens in favor of the wealthy developers. This has unquestionably been the history of regulations in this town, and it needs to stop immediately. I would suggest that this regulation be extra cautious that it does not follow the typical history of Auburn.

60. **Comment:** I am opposed to allowing this use in any "Neighborhood Conservation" zoned area. Please consider the lack of logic in allowing it - this zoning prohibits more than two unrelated persons from living together but, with this proposal, would allow for more than two unrelated persons to stay in the house routinely. It would be possible in any given year for a house to be occupied by hundreds of different people with no ties to the neighborhood when it would be illegal for two adults and each of their children to live there (or three friends, etc.). If you are going to allow the use in any NC area (and I fervently hope you won't), I offer two suggestions: (1) do so only on a trial basis for perhaps two years. If the city finds the use is not working compatibly for its constituencies, it could choose not to renew the trial period. Alternatively, if you try to rescind it after passing it permanently, you can expect legal challenges as you "take away" a permitted use. (2) If you allow it in any NC zoning, I believe you should allow it in all NC zoning. If NC zoning is protecting some from this use, I fail to see why it won't protect us all. If you feel you must allow this use anywhere, it seems that the UNS zoning would be appropriate for it. UNS is not the typical quiet neighborhood environment that NC demands. Finally, I would say to any of my neighbors that want to own property zoned for this use, buy where it is allowed, don't try to force your neighbors to tolerate a use that is almost certain to create a nuisance at least some of the time.
61. **Comment:** The information on this webpage is inaccurate. The short term rental proposed ordinance on this webpage is significantly different from the copy used for the task force meetings described on this webpage. Non-primary rentals have not been a feature of any meeting and this version was posted on the city webpage on April 1, 2019. I strenuously object to every part of the non-primary version. I have made these feelings known to the city council members and city officials at city hall. The operators of house-hotels talk about property rights. I understand about rights. However, we have the right to free speech, but we can't commit libel, holler Fire in a theater, talk about hijacking a plane in an airport, make "swatting" calls and on and on. Rights are suborned all the time. When we buy a house where there is a HOA we suborn our rights. When we buy a house in a zoning district we suborn our rights. The legal fact is; property rights are subordinate to zoning ordinances. Zoning ordinances are covenants between the city and residents to maintain compatibility of use. The neighborhoods targeted in this new ordinance are older neighborhoods. They were built before the days of Home Owners Associations. The zoning ordinance was our home owner protection. In these neighborhoods, lots are small, streets are narrow, and houses are closer together. The extra traffic overburdens streets. Noise is worse due to proximity. The "guests" at a house-hotel are most worried about not having to pay for damages. There is no concern for a future relationship with the neighbors. The result is noise, rudeness, and certainly no concern for their temporary neighbors. The current NC ordinance requires compatibility of use. A 100% business in a residential neighborhood is not compatibility of use. The current ordinance requires a minimum stay of 180-days. To refresh your memory, the definition of a neighborhood is defined as "a geographically localized community within a larger city... social communities with considerable face-to-face interaction among members." Council members, you are the face of this mess. Remember you campaigned and asked for this job; but the buck is stopping here on this house-hotel matter. You swore to an oath of office to support the city's existing ordinances (laws). When you campaigned you implored us, the residents of NC districts, to support you so you could look out for us. It is now time to do just that.
62. **Comment:** In order to preserve the integrity of areas designated as Neighborhood Conservation the city has historically and wisely prevented businesses from locating these areas. A house that is being rented out for 240 days

of the year is a business and should only be allowed in non-residential areas. No one would want a non-primary rental next door and it is wrong to propose they be allowed in any neighborhood conservation area especially neighborhoods close to downtown where the lot sizes are small. Having noisy strangers so close could significantly reduce the quality of life of anyone with non-primary rentals close by. This proposal unfairly punishes those of us living in the overlay areas. Non-Primary Rentals should only be allowed in non-residential areas.

63. **Comment:** I want to voice my strong objection to the proposed ordinance changes for Short-term Rentals and Homestays for the following reasons:

1. It is widely recognized that Auburn is a growing and vibrant community. We are known for being an ideal location to raise a family, our excellent schools, strong sense of community, effective city government, and our healthy business environment. The proposed ordinance to allow STRs and Homestays as a conditional use in all NC zoning districts is a threat to the aforementioned factors. It is a proposed change, which has the potential to erode the very essence of what this community holds dear. Non-permanent residents moving in and out every week or weekend at regular intervals will have a negative impact on established neighborhoods and the citizens who live there. For example, areas that families once regarded as safe for their children and who had trust in their neighbors, will become filled with a never-ending stream of strangers who the permanent residents do not know and do not trust.

2. The proposed ordinance changes leave several unanswered questions. For example, how will STRs and Homestays been enforced? Who will pay for this enforcement and what are penalties for non-compliance?

Our City planning department seems under-resourced as it is. And How will the hotel and motel taxes be collected from STR and Homestay owners? Clearly, this proposal as written should be revised so we the citizens through our city council representatives can make informed decisions. 3. I also take issue with the proposal in that it requires the approval of only 50 percent of the adjacent property owners before someone is allowed to turn a single family residence in an NC zone into a STR or Homestay. All adjacent properties will be negatively affected by an STR or Homestay both in terms of quality of life and in the value of their property. Thus, it is only fair and just that a person wishing to turn their single-family residence into a STR or Homestay obtain the approval of 100 percent of all adjacent property owners.

In short, the proposed change to allow STRs and Homestays as a conditional use in all NC zoning districts is bad policy and bad politics. It threatens long-standing communities and puts the business interests of developers and potentially large investors ahead of residential citizens who purchased homes in NC zoning districts in good faith and understanding that they remain traditional single-family neighborhoods.

64. **Comment:** I have lived at this address since 1975. The peace, tranquility, character and safety of our neighborhood (NC-14) will be greatly impacted by this current proposed short term non-primary rentals. I am not against a homeowner renting a portion of their own residence as a short term rental and remaining on site (Homestays). I am totally against investor- owned ("non-primary") rentals in which transient populations occupy whole houses in NC (neighborhood conservation) for 240 days per year.

65. **Comment:** First - I'm not sure where the breakdown in communication occurred - but it has come to my attention that at least one of the city council members appointed to this task force (Bob Parsons) was not consulted about the 2nd drafted proposal. How is that possible? This speaks to a much larger issue within the city's organizational management and planning process. He was 50% of the appointed task force on this very issue? He should have been consulted. Since there's no language on short term rentals (STRs), I understand the need to update the ordinance to cover and regulate STRs separate from long term rentals, however in doing so we shouldn't negate the existing protections of the "NC" zoned areas (or other protections in other zones). The purpose of the "NC" is to protect neighborhoods and conserve them. The zoning ordinance is supposed to be a first line of defense, yet it seems each year, that NC neighborhoods are having to fend off more and more attempts to change the protective nature of the zoning laws to accommodate a few. Even without specific STR language, anyone that has "rented" property to more than two unrelated occupants has violated the existing law. The current draft does little to protect the neighborhood and would seem to have opened to many loopholes and conflicts related to the long term rules. The unrelated occupants issue is a direct conflict with the very idea of short term rentals. There's no way to regulate this on such a short term basis. In addition, the proposed overlay map is quite an overreaction by planning personnel based on the voices of the few rental property owners residing in NC zones. I state that knowing my property actually escaped this proposed overlay. NC Zones should not include STRs by right or by conditional approval. STRs are simply not a good fit for NC

neighborhoods. NC = Neighborhood Conservation. Neighborhood = a neighborly relationship. Conservation = a careful preservation and protection of something I'm open to the "homestay" as long as it is the primary residence of the leaser.

66. **Comment:** I live in an area of Auburn that is zoned NC. Our street has experienced issues (noise and commotion) with a homeowner that appears to use his residence as a hotel. The home appears to be rented out to groups both during the week and on weekends. The biggest issue I have with short term rentals in an NC zoning, is that the regulations do not allow homes to be rented to 2 or more unrelated occupants. I have observed short term rentals being rented to large groups with 3-4 vehicles with groups of 8-12 people. This breaches the no more than 2 unrelated people ordinance. On multiple occasions these individuals have carried on parties and brought on noise well into the night. This ruins the neighborhood feel and charm. Thank you for your consideration.
67. **Comment:** I'm concerned with the change affecting Home Occupation Businesses which are not home stays regarding hours of operation and limiting clients. Certain service businesses have to work with clients in the evenings and may exceed 3 people. Photography and home design being just two examples when reviewing work with clients.
68. **Comment:** I do not want transients flooding my neighborhood. This is scheme for a few people to make more money by destroying established neighborhoods. NC districts were established to prevent just this type of threat. No short term overlay period.
69. **Comment:** A major concern as related to Payne St is increased traffic and parking issues. Payne St is a narrow one-way street with parking on one side. The lots are narrow and the houses are very close together. My house shares a driveway with my next door neighbor. The ease with which each resident enters the driveway, parks, and exits the driveway, often involving multiple vehicles, is extremely neighbor-dependent. Street parking is very limited and is often used by residents themselves. This is a close-knit neighborhood and we all "look out" for one another. I feel that something is lost in a neighborhood where any given residence could operate essentially as a hotel for 240 days a year. I'm hoping that I misunderstood the new regulations.
70. **Comment:** We specifically bought a home within NC and within an area that stipulates not more than 2 unrelated occupants as tenants because we wanted to live in a conserved neighborhood. We do not want businesses within our family's neighborhood. Also, there is a regulation in place prohibiting more than 2 unrelated occupants but this proposition would be a contradiction to this regulation as more than 2 unrelated occupants could rent anytime. How about an owner driven recording process to the city for a set amount of days in a year for residents allowing them to vrbo their PRIMARY residence? Collect taxes and keep a log with owner driven recordings that can then enforce fines as needed. Also, creating a map that allows all non primary vrbos to our neighborhoods creates a hotspot for developers to buy out existing homes and create lucrative businesses In neighborhoods not commercial zoned properties. Zoning is important and should keep residential areas residential not as targets for business ventures. I am interested in how this map was created. It omits properties in other areas of Auburn and would therefore allow non primary rentals in the most desirable areas, close to campus. Why is it targeted to specific neighborhoods that seem the most lucrative for investment properties? Lastly, neighbors should approve non primary short term rental status greater than 50% as is stated in proposition-should be 100%. Current property owners rights should be at the forefront and care should be taken at how regulations affect our neighborhoods. These regulations and targeted map make it easier for businesses to thrive in our neighborhoods, not the property owner. No non primary short term rentals in our neighborhood, please! The most important consideration is for the residents who bought (with purpose) family homes within a RESIDENTIAL neighborhood not zoned for businesses
71. **Comment:** On page 3 of the proposed short term rentals regulations, I believe that # 7-10 are too restrictive. As long as the other regulations are followed, I see no need for the restrictions of 7-10. And frankly, a home business occupation is not related to short term rentals and should not be addressed in regulations re: rentals.
72. **Comment:** I am not in favor of permitting the proposed non-primary short term rental overlay. In its current text, it does not protect the best interest of the neighborhoods, specifically the NC District. 240 days of rentals allowed in a calendar year is a high amount of time for multiple renters in and out of 1 residence, specifically in the NC district where the zoning intent is for families and neighbor conservation. The complaints regulation should be more stringent. I do not think there should be a time frame set for complaints. If a neighbor has to complain 3 times in 1 year, the owners of the short term rental should be penalized for a much longer period. Section D) 6., e.) regarding written

authorization to allow the rental is unreasonable. This does not allow a vote from neighbors across the street. This should be a unanimous vote required by all residences surrounding. I realize that Auburn is a destination location for many of all ages year round, and a revised ordinance in some areas to allow rentals such as this may be inevitable. However, this proposed overlay ordinance in its current state is very vague. This should not be permitted unless the language is revised to better protect and preserve our neighborhoods, as relying on the city to enforce a vague ordinance has proved to not be effective in the past (i.e. the unrelated occupancy ordinance).

73. **Comment:** Short Term Rental Proposed Ordinance: Comments and Questions • What was the basis for proposing that STRs be allowed for 240 days annually? It appears the City seeks to accommodate investors' wishes not to have a lot of unrented days (thus investors make more money) instead of protecting the "Neighborhood" in which permanent residents have invested. If the goal is to accommodate demand during periods when hotels might be full, this could be accomplished with much fewer days. For example, Tuscaloosa caps STRs in its overlay to 30 days. The hotel vacancy rate was 41% in 2018 for the A-O area. That vacancy rate might decrease if hotels weren't competing with STRs. • The City has been "researching" STRs for eighteen months. When will that compiled research be publicized? • Why is there no cap on the number of STRs on a street or in a neighborhood? • In the proposed ordinance, a group of collaborating investors can purchase several contiguous houses in NC and then apply for STR licenses for each. These contiguous investors give "consent" for each other, thus the "50%" permission requirement is met. The resulting multiple STRs on a single street would change the character of the Neighborhood to the detriment of family residences. • Why are proposed regulations for "non-primary short-term rentals" so much less restrictive than "Homestays," when Homestays have less impact on the character of a neighborhood? • The term "non-primary short-term rental" is confusing and unclear to ordinary citizens. Why not call them "investor-owned rentals," the typical nomenclature used in other cities' ordinances? • Why doesn't the ordinance require safety equipment, such as smoke detectors, carbon monoxide detectors, or fire extinguishers, provisions which were stricken from the original draft? STRs and Homestays are competing with hotels and B&Bs. STR ordinances in other cities do have safety regulations for licensure. • Why doesn't the proposed ordinance require commercial insurance for STR and Homestay property owners? • Why doesn't the proposed ordinance require an annual inspection, to ensure that smoke detectors, fire extinguishers, etc. are in place? Some communities require fire escape routes to be posted in each room same as for hotels. People expect windows to be functional. • Why is there a "cap" on the number of guests for a Homestay but no guest caps for "non-primary" STR? • Why is there no off-street parking requirement for "non-primary" (investor-owned) STRs? These are competing with hotels, which require one parking place per guest room. Why not require parking spaces based on number of beds offered? • Under the proposed ordinance, one person may reserve a STR for up to 30 days on behalf of a whole group. A second member of that same group could reserve the STR for the next 30 days, and so on. There is no restriction that only 2 unrelated people can occupy the STR and no cap on number of occupants., thus the property could continuously be occupied by 6 or more unrelated people for 480 continuous days (240 days per calendar year). This loophole does not protect the character of the neighborhood and opens the NC zoning up to student occupancy. SHORT TERM RENTALS in NC Auburn's zoning ordinance states that Neighborhood Conservation (NC) zones are "intended to preserve the character of existing neighborhoods" (304.02). Table 4.1 of the current ordinance clearly prohibits commercial uses such as hotels in NC zones. • Permanent residents who have invested in homes located in the proposed NC "overlay" will suffer the consequences since these types of businesses will be concentrated, with no limits, only in the Overlay neighborhoods. I.e, the "neighborhood character" (traquility, safety, stability, property value) of only the "overlay" homeowners is impacted. If this is going to be proposed for NC, it should be permitted city-wide. • The proposed ordinance does not limit the number of STRs on a street or in a neighborhood. • The requirement of "50% of abutting property owners must provide consent" fails to protect the other 50% of abutting property owners who purchased homes with the expectation of single-family/non-transient residency restrictions. The proposed ordinance does not state if all abutting property owners must even be notified—thus a property owner could get the consent of one next-door neighbor and his backyard neighbor without even notifying anyone else. Property owners adjacent to both STR and Homestays should be notified using same procedure as rezoning and variance applications. • The proposed ordinance does not require that STRs and Homestays be clearly identified on a map accessible on the City's website. Thus people seeking to invest in a HOME in an NC zone would have no way of knowing that these types of businesses are located in proximity to a property they are considering

purchasing. • ENFORCEMENT: Auburn's current ordinance already specifies that rentals in NC for less than 180 days are illegal. This law is not enforced even when neighbors report it. Therefore it is unlikely that enforcement will take place under the proposed ordinance. Conclusion: No STRs should be allowed in NC zones. There are numerous other locations in Auburn for investors who want to profit from STRs. For example, NRD and RDD have "re-development" into other uses as an objective. The Harper Avenue/Dean Road area is one example where STRs might be an appropriate fit. Vacant condos and apartments in non-NC zones also could offer an alternative to hotels for families wishing larger accommodations than a hotel room. Locating STRs in UN-S, UN-E, and UN-W will not change the characters of those neighborhoods, thus a "by right" is an appropriate recommendation in those zones. . ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Combining "Home Occupation" and "Home stays" makes this proposed ordinance extremely confusing (in addition to the terminology "non-primary STR"). Renting one's entire personal residence to over-night guests and not even remaining on site is not truly a "home occupation" in the sense of running a business out of one's home in which a handful of people might come and go in the course of a day but do not stay over-night. Homestay provisions should be made a separate distinct section on the Ordinance, separated from Non-primary/(investor-owned) section. Home Occupation section should be left as is. Each should be treated as a stand alone and considered on its own merits. Why not include a "two strikes and you're out" provision for violating approved provisions? Why not include mandatory high monetary penalties? Why the inconsistency between Table 4-1 and Paragraph 14f and g? STR should have same requirements as Homestays with respect to deliveries, overnight guests, parking, etc.

74. **Comment:** I strongly oppose having short term non-primary residences in in-town neighborhoods. I bought a house on Pinedale with the understanding that I would have neighbors living in the houses next-door. It's not fair for the homeowners living in the houses if their neighbors are using their houses strictly as rentals. I would be OK with homeowners using their primary residence a certain amount of times per year (5 or so) for short-term rentals, but am completely against people being able to have non-primary houses being used solely as short-term rentals. If this passes then a large number of houses in-town will strictly be game-day rentals and it will take away the charm of the in-town neighborhoods. Also, the proposed map makes no sense.

75. **Comment:** I do not support changing NC zoning regulations to allow short term rentals, because I do not think it improves the health, safety, and welfare of my family or neighbors. I currently have the opportunity to get to know my neighbors and I prefer to continue to have that opportunity.

Should decision makers disagree and the NC regulations are modified to allow transients in the NC neighborhoods, I think the current proposal is still flawed. I think non-enforced regulations are no better than no regulations. I do not want my taxes to support programs I feel are detrimental to the community, but I do not see new user funded means or systems to pay for and enable enforcement addressed in this current proposal. I also think forcing abutting property owners to vote to approve a proposed rental site is not conducive to neighborhood harmony. But that said, I think the requirement needs to be changed back to 100% approval because any negative effects will not be necessarily equal to all abutting neighbors.

I think separating the on-site owner rentals and the off-site owner rentals into two different proposals decided at two different times will render a more desirable final policy.

I purchased in a NC zone with an expectation it would remain a NC zone retaining all the positive aspects consistent with the goals and objections of our city plan.

76. **Comment:** There are a number of reasons why I am, as a resident of the "proposed overlay" neighborhood, strongly opposed to the proposed regulation pertaining to the 240 days/year non-resident short term rentals. 1. These are full time businesses and have no place in residential neighborhoods appropriately zoned as "neighborhood conservation." 2. The targeted neighborhoods do not have the infrastructure needed to support these businesses (e.g. adequate off-street parking, separation between homes). 3. Questionable legality of essentially changing a zoning law without using established procedures for doing so. 4. Arbitrary imposition of a burden on targeted neighborhoods that is not imposed on other neighborhoods. 5. Degradation of what are at present highly desired residential neighborhoods that contribute to the charm and character of "the loveliest village." 6. A clear disconnect with the stated values/purposes of the 240/yr regulation – "to provide residents of the City of Auburn a wide range of opportunities in the use of their residences in profitable activities. However, the character of the City's residential areas must also be preserved." The owners of these businesses are not likely to be residents of the neighborhood and may not even be Auburn residents! 7. Related to point #6 above, these business owners are unlikely to be accountable to neighbors of the business in the

way that the traditional Air BNB residents are to their next door neighbors. In summary, the proposed regulation for non-resident full time short term rentals is a really bad idea that will, over time, lead to a further degradation of inner city residential neighborhoods and a decline in the livability of the “lovliest village.” Please don’t do this.

77. **Comment:** Why are we even talking about making house-hotels in neighborhood conservation districts? There is no benefit to the neighborhood at all, under any circumstances. How does this qualify as neighborhood conservation in any way? The only one benefiting in any way is the investor/house owner who in many cases would not be a citizen of Auburn or Alabama for that matter. Why are we benefiting such a person who does not reside in the house at the expense of neighborhood residents? Any “guests” in a house-hotel is in Auburn to celebrate some event. They will rent a space wherever it is available. If house-hotels are in mixed use districts, that is where they will stay, or in existing hotels. John Wild reports hotel occupancy rates in Auburn were down 5.3% in 2018 from 2017 to 58.9%. There are already plenty of rental spaces. People will stay wherever there is space available. It is not necessary to destroy neighborhoods. It is hard to imagine city officials decided to go into public service to enrich a few non-residents at the expense of many permanent residents. There is only one possible position for this issue. Maintain existing neighborhoods, enforce existing regulations, confine business to business areas, or mixed use developments.
78. **Comment:** I think that short term rental should be confined to apartments, condominiums, and multi-unit dwellings. In other words, dwellings that are essentially designed for renting and can handle the transient nature of short term rental contracts. I agree with long term residents in neighborhood settings that short term rentals will be undesirable and a nuisance. I think most people would agree that it would be disturbing to be unsure of who is living (staying) in close proximity to your house on a daily basis. Beyond noise, trash, and extra vehicles, there is the safety issue. More strangers around means more strange activities that could cause residents that just wanted a quiet neighborhood setting to have anxiety and increase their demands on the police for more monitoring. The zoning of a neighborhood implies just that, family style housing with a semblance of permanence. By changing the zoning of these neighborhoods close to campus, you are changing the landscape of the downtown area from an historic zone that benefits all who pass, to a tourism zone that benefits only the few willing to place their bets and get lucky. I would not like to see Auburn turn into a city that cherishes investors over families.
79. **Comment:** Thank you for addressing STR! It is an enormous undertaking and there are so many viewpoints. My husband and I even differ in parts. So knowing you can't make everyone happy... Rental properties, whether long term or short term, are a business, that are next door to homeowner, other rentals, or commercial property. I own and operate a STNPR in an NRD zone (and have for a year). (I have operated one in the UC for 3 years previously) The premise, “I own my property and I have the right to use it as I please, as long as I don’t use my property in a way that would infringe on my neighbor’s right to enjoy the same privilege.” is an obligation I tried to keep in mind as I wrote my comments: 1. Enforceability of Provisions Two of the provisions in the draft ordinance are not reasonably enforceable. While they may be included as basic guidelines, I believe that these limits will be routinely violated. --All provisions that limit the number of days rented. The city has no way of knowing the number of days a property is rented, beyond what the homeowner reports. The listing sites generally do not readily or easily reflect the number of nights rented but instead focus on how many guests or groups you have hosted. --All provisions that limit the number of guests. It is unreasonable to check how many guests are at any given STR. By the time a complaint could be made with planning the guests in question would most likely be gone. I know that many of the listings currently available in Auburn are for higher occupancy than that – 8 adults is actually closer to the average per listing. 2. Lack of STR Accountability for Licensing There is no mention of any way to hold STR's easily and inexpensively accountable. One way of doing this that has been used successfully in NOLA for STRs is to require owners to post their business license number on all listings and advertisements. If all work vehicles are required to have a sticker, license numbers can be required in listing titles. If a listing is seen without a license number, the owner or listing agent would be contacted by the city enforcement agent. Makes verifying listings on VRBO/AirBnB for non-compliant hosts easy. Meet the request for the ability for all citizens to be able to see where STR's are located. A city GIS layer based on the addresses approved by zoning certificate required to purchase the business license could be posted on the city's website. If a resident becomes aware of a STR in their neighborhood that does not appear on this map, it should be reportable. If not included the planning ordinance they should be incorporated into a sister regulation under finance. Fair and equitable compliance with tax codes and business licenses have been my complaint for over 2 years. Please include enforceable

accountability for licensing. 3. Consent Provision (408.002 D 6 e) This new addition to the draft gave me heartburn! No doubt, the idea that a principal cause of trouble with STNPR's is the potential issues neighbors could feel, was the reason for including a requirement that owners secure and provide the written consent of 50% of owners of abutting property before their STNPR be permitted in the conditional overlay zone. I know some current STNPR owners who operate with the implicit consent of their neighbors and I myself have spoken with my neighbors and have explicit verbal consent. Knowing I would have to receive this written consent if an ordinance is approved, as drafted, I have several objections: *Proposed code offers no standard form, process, or guidelines for gaining adjacent owners consent. *Consent can be unreasonably denied by adjacent owner(s) and they are under no requirement to validate their reason for denial. *Consent requests could be delayed or even completely ignored by an adjoining owner. What if an owner cannot be found or contacted? *Consent requests could be difficult and expensive to secure from adjacent properties with multiple owners or that are part of an estate or corporation especially if located out of state. *If the adjoining property is permitted by right to have STNPR's do I need their consent? *If the adjoining property is an apartment complex or vacant land, is consent required for my STNPR? *Consent could be maliciously leveraged by an adjacent owner. *If a neighbor sells their property and the new owner revokes the consent they could cost the STNPR their business. *This process would require annual consent or re-consent for an STNPR to continue their business. This would cause a level of uncertainty in a business setting regarding tenancy that is atypical. Businesses typically have loans and or leases that are from 3-15 years. Consent provisions are not considered good practice and are not generally recommended because legally they: **Are not commonly used. It is rare to find a provision of this nature incorporated into ordinances anywhere. Conversely, finding instances where consent provisions have been removed from ordinances is easy. Courts have ruled they are invalid on the basis that this procedure constitutes an improper delegation of a government's authority. **Are an improper delegation of the city's power. Zoning is the city exercising it's police powers for the protection of the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare. In view of this protection, the City should have the sole right and responsibility for the exercise of the zoning power. **Are not fair and impartial. While the consent provision protects a neighbor from possible arbitrary action by the city in allowing the conditional use, I believe that this provision also deprives a landowner of the opportunity to obtain a fair and impartial hearing on his/her conditional use. Under the consent provision, the adjoining owners are authorized to cast a veto on a property owner's conditional use request before he is permitted to submit that request to zoning! **Deny legal recourse to property owners. I believe that the city is the proper body to weigh the evidence and render a decision on conditional use provided that the ordinance offers adequate safeguards as to notice and hearings. Either the landowner or the adjacent residents would have recourse to the courts from arbitrary or unreasonable use of the zoning powers by the city. 4. Clarification of wording for 511.04 B 14 g I had to go to Planning to have this one explained to me. I now understand it to mean: The home-stay may operate no more than 60 days per year when the residence IS NOT co-occupied (shared) by the owner during rental.....no more than 120 days when the residence IS co-occupied (shared) during the rental period in these zones.....

80. **Comment:** First, I appreciate the effort put into this document as well as the time spent meeting with the stakeholders to address this issue. It is very complicated and difficult to make everyone happy, I understand. My questions/comments concern the enforcement of the ordinance that results from this process. At this time I can identify numerous homes that are short-term non-primary rentals in the areas on the map that are not allowed. How will this be enforced and will there be designated departments or persons within the City of Auburn who will be contacting home owners and enforcing the new ordinance? Will you put into the ordinance that a business license is required and appropriate lodging taxes are expected to be reported? (or insert some verbiage in the home occupation section that indicates all zoning certificates and home occupation permits will be forwarded to the Revenue Department to insure business license is obtained) There is no mention in this document about business licensing; however, anyone obtaining a home occupation permit or zoning certificate needs a business license - could this be mentioned or cross referenced to the business license ordinance? What will be the penalties for violation of the ordinance? (what will be done if a homeowner insists on renting without a ZC and is in violation of the ordinance?) With so many homes used right now as either homestays or STNP rentals, I think it would be prudent to anticipate noncompliance and possible outcomes. Making enforcement complaint driven only results in problems between homeowners and neighbors. I would advocate for an enforcement division either through neighborhood inspection,

planning, or another designated department to avoid problems once this or any ordinance is put into place. Thank you.

81. **Comment:** Article V, 511.04; B-5 -- Certain occupation types and associated vehicles should be reviewed and excludable. For example, any occupation involving large trucks (dump trucks, 18-wheelers, etc.) or or vehicles with an obvious commercial appearance (septic pumping tankers) should be excluded. We have had both situations on our cul-de-sac in the past and they definitely had a negative impact on the ambiance of a NC neighborhood. I am also generally not in favor of home occupations at all in NC neighborhoods that require special vehicles or parking requirements. I am also not in favor of homestays in NC neighborhoods, but they are already here (AirBnB).
82. **Comment:** I appreciate the regulations in attempt to protect the quality of life and our property values for our families as this is our primary residence. I also believe it is smart to ask for input so thanks for the opportunity. However I strongly believe you need to have a all or nothing approach here and both the current and proposed maps lack certain equity in that regard. For example, you are allowing and thereby rewarding my neighbor 4 lots up the street by allowing STRs for him/her. On the flip side I live less than 400 feet away but I am not allowed to do STRs and this is simply not fair to me and everyone on this side of the line. By picking and choosing with this map, anyone on the edge of your map like us can have this argument. Since I am still in close proximity I still have to deal with the negatives of short term occupancy on my street yet I am also not allowed to have any rewards by being afforded the same opportunity to occasionally do the same. So for us and those like us it is a lose lose for me and my family. The fact is my house is probably one the nicest homes on my street and with my experience in hosting with several rental properties in other cities I attract a higher level of clientele that is barred from staying at my house because the law says so. If realize dealing with STRs is a challenge for you and cities across American and beyond but if you level the playing field you will have more revenue to regulate which is what you guys love to do and I have no problem with that. As a citizen and owner who lives here 300 days out of the year I play by the rules whatever they are but in this case we were cut from the team without a chance to play the game. Rethink your logic and factor in equity for all otherwise there is none.
83. **Comment:** My husband and I, along with many of our neighbors, DO NOT support allowing short-term rentals in our neighborhood. Auburn's family-oriented neighborhoods need to remain the same and we certainly want developers coming in and setting up these sorts of businesses. the City could make a separate zoning for such endeavors. We are less concerned about homeowners who occupy there house full time renting out a room occasionally.
84. **Comment:** I live in the proposed short-term non-primary rental overlay on Sherwood Dr. It's a great street about with about 40 houses. About a third of those houses are occupied by families with children (mine included). It's zoned Neighborhood Conservation, and thanks to those zoning rules, our neighborhood is quiet, safe, and full of residents that take pride in their yards and homes. My husband walks to work and my kids walk to Wrights Mill Road Elementary school, walk to the Auburn Public Library on the weekends, and walk up to the Samford pool during the summer. It's very safe and there's not too much traffic or too many cars parked on the street, which is great, because the school bus and garbage trucks can barely fit through when there are cars parked on directly across from each other on opposite sides of the street. Sherwood Drive is cut in half on the Proposed Short Term Rental map available on the city website. It's clear that whoever drew that map has never been on my street -- the boundary line for the proposed area follows a weird city easement and splits the street in half at a very weird place. I invite the STR Task Force to visit my neighborhood before approving that map and before approving these proposed regulations. Visit on a Sunday or Saturday afternoon before it gets too hot. You will see the kids outside on their bikes or playing in their yards, folks walking their dogs, people mowing their lawns. After you visit, I want to know whether or not you believe allowing investor-owned STRs to expand into my neighborhood will conserve what we have there: the uncluttered atmosphere, safety and security, the feeling of community, and the friendly waves from neighbors we know. I don't want those things to go away! I would like to see the research that the City has done that shows it's a good idea to allow investor-owned short-term rentals into neighborhoods like mine. I want to see that my property values will increase (or at least not decrease), and I want to know that our safe neighborhood will continue to be a safe place for our families. Has the city done a long-term study about the effects of STRs on neighborhoods like mine? As it is now, I have heard horror stories about investors coming into neighborhoods, buying up single-family homes and converting single-family them into STRs, and changing the character of the place. I would like to hear from the city some reasons why allowing these

STRs in NC-zones would be a good thing for the city and neighborhoods! I am concerned about approval and enforcement in the Neighborhood Conservation Zones. The proposed regulations stipulate that STRs in NC zones must get 50% or more approval from all abutting property owners. How long do neighboring property owners have to respond? Does a non-response from an abutting property owner default to an approval or denial of the request for the STR? What plans does the city have to enforce these regulations? I would recommend that the city use tax revenue from these STR's fund an enforcement officer position. I'm disappointed to see the city removed the section about requiring smoke/CO detectors and fire extinguishers. I understand that the city doesn't want to have to enforce such requirements or be held accountable in any way if an STR owner doesn't comply with these regulations, but it's still disappointing. I am glad that Auburn is spending so much time creating regulations for homestays and investor-owned short-term rentals. I love using them! And I'm hopeful that the time and careful examination and discussion of this topic yields very considered and thoughtful results that keep the interests of the homeowners and long-term rentals at the forefront. Thank you for asking for feedback from residents about this issue!

85. **Comment:** Proposed Regulations Permitting Short Term Rental Activity as: Short term non-primary Rentals Homestays Article II, Section 203. Definitions. Homestays: A home occupation in which an individual owns a dwelling unit and uses it as his or her permanent residence and hires part of it out as lodging, including the serving of breakfast to the paid guests. Same requirements as a Bed and Breakfast. Residence, Permanent: No change. Short Term Non-Primary Rental: A dwelling unit that is not the permanent residence of the owner or tenant that is leased in its entirety to one tenant or sub-tenant for periods of less than 180 consecutive days The terms tenant and sub-tenant shall mean one or more persons who as a single group rent a single dwelling unit pursuant to a single reservation and payment. Article IV, Table 4-1. General Regulations – Table of permitted uses. Short term non primary rentals in the NC zone should be prohibited since the occupancy requirements of the NC zones prohibit more than 2 unrelated occupants per dwelling unit. For short term rentals, occupants should include all parties on the lease and their guests. Otherwise this would not be enforceable by the owner or the city. Special Residential SDS* UC/ CEOD UN-E UN- W UN-S NC DDH NRD RDD CDD CRD-U CRD- S CRD- W Short-term Non-Primary Rental P P P P C C C C P P P 408.02. Special Development Standards. D. Institutional, Indoor Recreational & Special Residential Uses. 6. Short Term Non-Primary Rental a) A short term non-primary rental shall be limited to a licensing period of one calendar year starting in January first of the calendar year. b) Every short term non-primary rental unit shall have all smoke and fire detection equipment as required by all rental units within the city of Auburn, Al and also comply with the same building code requirements as other residential rental units in Auburn. In addition the owners shall be required to comply with all rental requirements of the United States Government and the State of Alabama, including fair housing. c) Each short term non-primary rental unit shall obtain a zoning certificate which will be valid from January 1 (or such other date during the calendar year on which the certificate is issued) through December of the calendar year in which the certificate is issued. This zoning certificate will be required to purchase a license on a property to operate a short term non-primary rental. d) Each short term non-primary rental unit shall have a certificate of occupancy issued by the Codes Enforcement Division of the city of Auburn. This certificate can be issued after the applicant pays the application and inspection fee to the Codes Enforcement Division and the property passes the inspection by the city inspector. This certificate of occupancy will be required to purchase a license on the property to operate a short term non-primary rental. e) A short term non-primary rental zoning certificate, certificate of occupancy or City license to operate a short term non-primary rental may be revoked by the Planning Director, Codes Enforcement Director or Finance Director (i) in the event three (3) or more substantiated complaints are received by the city within a calendar year. Or (ii) for failure to maintain compliance with any of the regulations set forth within this section. A property or owner whose zoning certificate, certificate of occupancy or city license to operate a short term non-primary rental has been revoked pursuant to this paragraph shall not be eligible to receive a new certificate of zoning, certificate of occupancy or City License for the remainder of the year and for the entire succeeding year. Substantial complaints will include complaints investigated by the Police Department where violations of any city codes are present on the property or by occupants of the property on joining properties including street rights of way. The Police Department shall not issue any warnings for violations and register all violations as substantiated violations whether any other citations were issued or not. Violations shall be subject to a fine of \$100 per day for the first violation and \$500 per day for the second and any additional violations. The License shall be revoked after the third violation. Each violation continuing until the next day after notice of the

violation shall be a separate violation. All fines shall be assessed against the property and be due along with the ad valorem taxes unless paid in advance. f.) A zoning certificate for any short term non-primary rental shall not be issued in the Redevelopment District (RDD) unless written authorization is provided by all abutting property owners including any property owners across the street from any part of the property requesting the certificate. Article V, 511.04. Detailed Use Regulations: Home Occupations. A. Purpose . (No Change) B. General Regulations. (No Change) 1. Through 10. (No Change) 11. With the exception of homestays, off street parking shall be provided on the premises as required by Section 513. Parking in connection with homestays may use available on street parking areas, only when off street parking cannot be accommodated. On street parking may not block driveway access, mail delivery access and waste disposal access to other properties on the street. Substantiated violations will be assessed to the licensee for violations of these provisions in this ordinance. 12. Through 14f as proposed. (no Change) 14g) The homestay must be owner occupied and may operate no more than 60 days per licensing year when the homestay is located in a NC, DDH, NRD, or LDD zoning district. Homestays may operate 364 days per licensing year when the residence is not owner-occupied in a UC, NN-W, UN-E, UN-S, RDD, R, CDD, CRD-U, CRD-S, CRD-E, and CRD-W zoning districts. h. No food shall be prepared or served to guests of a homestay by the owner or the owners' agent(s) or contractor(s), except owner occupied may serve breakfast when operating as a Bed and Breakfast and complies with all regulations for Bed and Breakfast use. i) Each homestay shall have working smoke detectors, carbon monoxide detection equipment as required by all rental units within the city of Auburn, AL and comply with the same building code requirements as other residential units in Auburn. j) Each homestay shall obtain a zoning certificate which will be valid from January 1 (or such date during the calendar year on which the zoning certificate is issued) through December of the calendar year in which the certificate is issued. This zoning certificate will be required to purchase a license to operate a homestay. This zoning certificate can be purchased from the planning department by filing and application for a zoning certificate and paying the fee for the application. k) Each homestay shall have a certificate of occupancy issued by the codes enforcement Division of the city of Auburn. This certificate of occupancy can be issued after the applicant pays the application and inspection fee to the Codes Enforcement Division and the property passes the inspection by the city inspector. This certificate of occupancy will be required to purchase a license on the property to operate a homestay l) A homestay zoning certificate, certificate of occupancy or City License to operate a homestay may be revoked by the Planning Director, Codes Enforcement Director or Finance Director (i) in the event three (3) or more substantiated complaints are received by the city within a calendar year. Or (ii) for failure to maintain compliance with any of the regulation set forth in this section. A property owner whose zoning certificate, certificate of occupancy or city license to operate a homestay has been revoked pursuant this paragraph, shall not be eligible to receive a new certificate of zoning, certificate of occupancy or city license for the remainder of the year and the full succeeding year. Substantial complaints will include complaints investigated by the Police Department where any violations of city codes are present on the property or by occupants of the property on joining properties including street rights of way. The police department shall not issue any warnings for violations and register all violations as substantiated violations whether any other citations were issued or not. Violation shall be subject to a fine of \$100 per day for the first violation and \$500 per day for the second and any additional violations. The license shall be revoked after the third violation. Each violation continuing until the next day after notice of the violation shall be a separate violation. All fines shall be assessed against the property and be due along with the ad valorem taxes unless paid in advance.

86. **Comment:** Everybody wants to make more money. To enlist the aid of city government to enable this at the expense of everybody else is common in big cities but surely should not occur in Auburn. Yet, it seems this way. The first posted published draft was not good. The original ideas of the Planning Dept. had been altered to favor the investors and speculators. This revision is far worse. The entire overlay district is, in effect, being rezoned to permit business operations with few safeguards for the neighbors. To call occupancy of only 6 month per year to be "permanent residence" is absurd. To call operating an unsupervised mini-hotel as "home-stay" is absurd. Definitions are unclear. "Approval of abutting owners" Are these just the neighbors to left and right or does this also include neighbors to the rear and front (i.e. across the street) ? All these question need more work. Particularly outrageous is the de facto rezoning of property in the overlay district to remove protections still in effect for all NC outside the overlay zone. overlay zone; those outside, who do comprise a larger number of voters, are being protected. We inside are not. I note that none of the members of the Task Group live in the overlay area. This needs to return to the drawing board.

Ramming this through is bad policy. It may benefit a few affluent, and possibly non-resident, investors but it adversely affects a large number of true home dwellers. These changes have been slipped through with little input from the existing residents. Much attention seems to have been paid to the investors but little to actual residents in the overlay zone but not for other NC areas.

87. **Comment:** As an event planner and resident in Auburn, doing my best to run a home based business and bring business to Auburn, this bill could have a large negative impact on me. This would limit a bride, groom, and both sets of parents from being at a consultation, all at one time, at my home office. Please reconsider!!
88. **Comment:** In short, I believe that people should be able to rent out their house short term regardless of zoning and was happy to see the re-written language in the new code proposal. Auburn University is similar to the beach in terms of draw and allowing these will expand our ability as a city to welcome overnight guests to our area. This will increase the tax base and be great for local businesses. In my view some of the things that still need addressing before finalizing would be: 1. Clean up the language around homestays and investor owned full time Short Term Rentals (STR's) to make it more clear. The language as it is now is confusing. 2. Make the number of guests relative to the number of bedrooms not an arbitrary 6 people. I have 5 people in my family alone. As written a family such as mine couldn't even add grandparents to the mix without breaking the rule. 3. Remove unenforcible sections of the rule such as number of guests and days permissible. 4. Remove the part of the ordinance that requires 50% neighbor approval. Petty neighbors who don't like you for various reasons aside, how about this for a hypothetical...Suppose my neighbor/neighbors come to me for permission for a STR and I grant it to them. Months pass and I decide to try my hand at it, but they don't want me as competition? The neighbor approval is very subjective and is a terrible way to decide on approval.
89. **Comment:** With the exception of a few things that need addressing in the current proposed regulation, I am happy to see the code move from overly non permissive to its current form. The two issues that I would like to see changed in this version of the code is to remove the neighbor approval section and to not restrict days of use. Thank you!
90. **Comment:** I want limits on short-term rentals in neighborhoods of permanent residents, such as how many days/year it can be done, how many days per month. I also feel there should be no limit if the owner is always living in the home.
91. **Comment:** I commend the subcommittee of City Council members who have worked on this critical regulation for our neighborhoods and the City of Auburn. My recommendation is for that short-term rentals be for no more than 89 days per year. There are plenty of rental properties for long term rentals, ie. more than 90+ days. Here is my reasoning on 89 days: first, 24 days for 7 home football games and A-Day; second, 12 days for 3 university graduation periods plus AHS graduation; third, 20 days for 5 weddings; 25 days for major holidays thru out the year and then an additional 8 days for miscellaneous events and activities. There are many unintended and not considered or thought of ways to abuse 90+ days much less 240 days for short-term rentals. Please keep our citizens and the neighborhoods at the forefront of your considerations and not those out to make money and who probably don't live here anyway and should probably sell their property rather than keep it and run it down as a short-term rental property
92. **Comment:** REGARDING THIS SECTION: e)A zoning certificate for any short term non-primary rental shall not be issued in the Neighborhood Conservation (NC) District, Development District Housing (DDH), Neighborhood Redevelopment District (NRD), or Redevelopment District (RDD) unless written authorization and consent is provided by fifty percent (50%) or more of all abutting property I suggest making authorization and consent much stricter; in some instances, only 1 abutting property owner could permit a waiver, when in fact such a waiver could affect an entire neighborhood adversely.
93. **Comment:** I don't think this is a good idea especially because it impacts local business owners. Many people run businesses from their homes that can require over three clients over a property at time. Also setting a time limit at 6 pm is a bit ridiculous as well because again most people get off work at 6 and if they are unable to access local businesses such as a wedding planner they will have to take time off for the appointment. I think there should be adjustments if this is something that is going to move forward and think about how it impacts businesses specifically the amount of clients and the time curfew.
94. **Comment:** Regardless of Owner-Occupied or not, I see these as "short -term rentals" Page 1 D 6.b Why not require Fire Extinguisher, smoke alarm, etc. These are required in long term rentals-why not short term? Page 3 Parking? A

short term rental should be required to have off-street parking, particularly in areas with a great deal of congestion to accommodate traffic. Where is Article IX? (Fee established) Where are the rest of the pages?

95. **Comment:** Article II section 203: "Homestay: A home occupation in which an individual who owns a dwelling and uses it as his or her permanent residence hires out, as lodging, such dwelling, or any portion thereof. This contradicts Article V 14.g. "Homestay must be owner-occupied" but this is crossed out.
96. **Comment:** As far as I understand it, this is very generous to landlords, and I am not in favor of that. The rise of AirBnbs is good for travelers and landlords (this effect has been well-documented) and not for residents who actually live in neighborhoods. This seems far too lenient to me. Also, it's difficult to understand. I read a lot (not this type of material) and I had to wade through it. I might suggest writing an addendum in more accessible language so that people can understand the changes you are proposing. Finally, why in the world are you downgrading safety equipment? What is the downside of a working fire alarm?
97. **Comment:** Article V, 511.04. Detailed Use Regulations: Home Occupations., 14.g: This paragraph references a home stay as being not owner occupied which is at odds with the rest of the section and is confusing. This paragraph is a representation of the confounding nature of the rest of the document in regards to clearly differentiating non-primary short term rentals and home stays. The home occupations section should only reference homestays and not any other type of short term rental. Or homestays and non-primary should each get their own sections in order to clearly define the two concepts. Aside from the construction of the document being confusing, the content seems fair assuming I correctly understood the proposal.
98. **Comment:** As homeowners of a property on Samford Avenue, which is located in a Neighborhood Conservation (NC) zone, we are concerned about the proposed short term rental ordinance currently under consideration by the city. [REDACTED] and I feel that the proposed new ordinance does not afford enough protections to homeowners in NC areas who bought homes in NC specifically because they wanted property in a location which is intended to preserve the character of existing family oriented neighborhoods. The home we own on Samford Avenue is part of the Pinedale subdivision which is in the proposed overlay area for short term rentals. The Pinedale neighborhood and surrounding NC neighborhoods are currently lovely and relatively stable neighborhoods and we would like to see them continue as such. We are concerned that some of the provisions in the new proposed Short Term Rental Ordinance will distort the intent of an NC neighborhood and will undermine the quality of life for residents of NC neighborhoods in the proposed overlay areas. We also feel that the new proposed short-term rental ordinance undercuts a key feature of the NC zone which is the definition of family as outlined in Section 203 with regard to occupancy. Specifically, we feel that adoption of the proposed short term rental ordinance, as it is currently written, may create neighborhoods which lose the focus on family and become more transient in nature. Among our concerns are the following: → The number of days that a short-term rental property may be rented seems excessive and counter-productive to the intent of an NC neighborhood. → There does not appear to be any limit on the number of occupants that can stay in a short term rental. → Under the terms of the language in the proposed short-term rental ordinance there is an opportunity to violate the intent of preserving family oriented neighborhoods, with an NC designation, and to permit student occupancy where it is currently prohibited. As currently written, the proposed ordinance permits one person to rent a property for up to 30 days on behalf of a group. Therefore, if a group of individuals comes together they could take turns renting a property for up to 480 consecutive days under different names on behalf of the same group (240 in one year and 240 in the next running consecutively). Theoretically, a group of parents could take turns renting a property for students as short term rentals which have no family occupancy requirements (number of unrelated occupants within a dwelling). This seems to violate one of the core intentions of an NC neighborhood designation. → The current language of the proposed ordinance specifies that 50 percent of the abutting property owners must agree to a property becoming a short term rental. We would respectfully suggest that the percentage should be set at a higher percentage especially in an instance where one owner owns multiple properties that abut. → The current language of the proposed short term rental ordinance does not cover pets. Animals that are brought into an area which is unfamiliar, for a short term stay, can exhibit behavioral adjustment issues which can create problems within a neighborhood. → We are concerned that safety features, which should be a part of a rental, such as smoke detectors, and fire extinguishers were eliminated from the proposed ordinance. These features protect the renters, the property and the neighboring properties. → Parking for short term rentals does not appear to be addressed in the proposed

ordinance. This can create problems within a neighborhood. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. We would be happy to discuss our concerns with you and to answer any questions you might have.

99. **Comment:** I'm so glad to see Auburn taking steps to make Airbnb's a regulated possibility in Auburn! I have stayed in them all over the U.S and internationally and they are a great way to get a better sense of place. I do think that limiting rentals to six people is an arbitrary number, particularly if you are renting a whole house but overall I am pleased with the direction the city is going on this.
100. **Comment:** Just a few questions that you all may have answers for but i was unclear of after reading these regulations. Thanks for the format of submitting these comments. - How is map selected? Why not include all the city and neighborhoods? - What is the license fee? - Is the proposed orange overlay map allowing all properties in this area to be rented as short term non primary rentals or just homestays? - If only 6 guests allowed per "homestay" is this for each property address? Does 400ft2 studio condo get the same maximum # guests (6) that a 5000ft2 house with 8 bedrooms? What about families coming for graduation, etc. Where can they stay? - What is the process for enforcement? How are complaints substantiated? Is there an appeal process for debunking frivolous complaints? Will new revenue be allocated for hiring this person(s)? Does city get many complaints now? Is it up to the neighborhood to police itself? Do police have to be called for noise, # guests, parties, traffic, etc? - who determines if a property is enlarged to accommodate short term rentals vs enlarged for a mother in law suite for an actual scenario. -If not in this proposed overlay/existing map are these owners allowed to host short term rentals? So if outside this map what is the penalty for not getting a license and hosting any way? -How does consent for short term rentals zoning certificate get revoked/renewed? Once obtained is it always grandfathered?
101. **Comment:** I am opposed to the expansion of short term rentals in the proposed neighborhoods. In addition, 240 days a year limit is scarcely a limit at all.
102. **Comment:** I would like to see options for short term rentals continue as I have many friends and family and that come to visit during football season, and for weddings etc. With young children it's nice to be able to spread out, and not be confined to a hotel room. Thank you for listening!
103. **Comment:** I'm curious who (our what entity) will be responsible for enforcing parking display provisions of this short-term stay plan.
104. **Comment:** I am adamantly opposed to the inclusion of non-primary, investor-owned homes in the most recently expanded version of the proposed zoning regulations. As a resident homeowner who purchased and lives in a NC-zoned neighborhood already significantly impacted by the current homestay and short term rental uses I know FIRST hand what the negative effects on our quality of life these types of rentals cause. The increase in traffic and the addition of more cars on narrow residential streets is a major concern. These are neighborhood lanes where children play, joggers run and my teen regularly walks our dog. I have seen how just the 3 unoccupied rentals with .25 miles of my home create issues, let alone the extending impact of the more than 5 additional STRs within an additional 1/4 mile. If you allow this extension of zoning, these numbers will only increase! The late night noise and the large parties, though restricted in rental agreements have happened in the rentals close to me. Accountability AFTER the fact provides no relief to us nor does the requirement that I must lodge a complaint, again forcing neighbors to become tattlers. Instead, be proactive and PREVENT these nuisances occurring in the first place. Protect my interests as a homeowner AND a resident, not those of outsiders who live elsewhere and do not suffer the consequences that STRs bring. I am a strong believer in homeowner rights and believe the Homestay regulations begin to address these concerns for RESIDENT homeowners who wish to rent their residences. It reflects the kind of compromise that should be sought among and between neighbors who live in and have invested in our neighborhoods. Th This shared interest does not exist for non-primary and non-resident homes and the STR portion of the proposed zoning changes. And the suggestion that tightly regulating these STRs will prevent the kind of issues we already face is naive and unrealistic. More importantly, these STRs in particular, as opposed to the Homestays, are in fundamental opposition to the intents and purposes of long standing NC-zoning. Those of us who have invested our money and our lives in these neighborhoods did so with the assurances that NC-zoning guaranteed. Yet the proposed changes would place the commercial interests of investors who neither live in these neighborhoods nor have had to face the downside of STRs first hand above mine and other residents How is this even conscionable? To place the interests of a few over those of the many does not reflect the kind of values I believe the City of Auburn should be leading with. Once

formalized, our neighborhoods will continue to be cannibalized by those seeking to make money at resident homeowners' expense. Truthfully, I could write endlessly against the inclusion of non-primary investor-owned properties enabled by the STR regulations. What is key is that I know to a person that all the resident homeowners of the 14 homes within my section of Sherwood all oppose STR by non-resident owners. Please place our quality of life at the forefront of this discussion and remember the meaning of representative government - that your actions and your votes should reflect the needs and wishes of the majority, not the few. Especially when it comes to property rights and neighborhood interests of residents and homeowners who actually live in the effected areas. There is not an argument for STRs that won't completely betray the trust of hundreds of effected homeowners in the STR overlay area.

105. **Comment:** I would like to quickly comment on the proposed regulations for short term rentals in Auburn. In short, provided the homeowner has followed the appropriate steps to establish the "business" and is paying the required taxes to the city on rental revenue, I do not support placing restrictions on these homeowners for the use of their private property. If the homeowner does not have the support of his/her neighbors and complaints are filed, I agree that the homeowner should lose the right to operate the short term rental business. With Marriott's recent announcement that they will be entering the AirBnB space, it's clear that SFH short term rentals will continue. The regulations you have proposed are not forward thinking. The sharing economy is part of our future. The proposed regulations should take this reality into consideration.
106. **Comment:** 1. I believe the number of days of operation for short-term non-primary rental should be adjusted for the neighborhoods, similar to the homestays. It does not seem appropriate to have essentially commercial activities occurring for 2/3 of the year in the NC, DDH, NRD, or LDD zoning district even if 50% of the abutting property owners agree. Limiting these to 120 days in these neighborhoods would be consistent with the ratios applied to homestays. 2. The requirement for 50% approval of abutting property of short-term non-primary rental owners in 408.02.D.6.E should be changed to two-thirds of the adjacent property owners. Adjacent is more consistent with other parts of the city code than abutting and recognizes that property owners across the street should have an equal right to approve or disapprove this requirement. Two-thirds instead of 50% seems like a more appropriate bar to allow commercial real estate activities in family neighborhoods.