

City of Trinidad

Current Summary of STR Ordinance Revisions

Based on Direction Provided to Staff at Council Meetings of 8/10 and 8/23

NOTE – No final decisions have been made; next discussion at regular September Council Meeting

ISSUE	CURRENT COUNCIL DIRECTION	Notes	Consistency with PC Recommendation?
<p>Cap Details – How many, and what mechanism.</p>	<p>Fixed cap in residential zoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UR: cap of 19 (15% of developed lots) • SR: cap of 6 (20% of developed lots) • No cap in other zones 		<p>Identical</p>
<p>How do we get from the current number of licenses down to the cap?</p>	<p>The cap will be reached via attrition. Existing STRs that maintain their license will not be forced out to achieve the cap.</p>		<p>PC recommended allowing a 'grace period', then using a lottery for all licenses, including those of existing STRs</p>
<p>Given a cap - How do we manage a waiting list for permits?</p>	<p>Lottery for new licenses in capped zones.</p>	<p>When an STR license is available in the capped zones, the City will randomly select from a list of interested parties. The party selected will have a set time to apply for and obtain a license.</p>	<p>PC supported a lottery approach (but for all licenses, not just new ones).</p>

ISSUE	CURRENT COUNCIL DIRECTION	Notes	Consistency with PC Recommendation?
Density / buffer restriction*	<p>In the UR zone, new STR licenses will not be issued to properties where the property boundary adjoins another property with an STR license.</p> <p>This requirement will apply to new STR licenses, but existing STRs will be 'grandfathered' in and allowed to continue</p>	Property owners affected by this restriction will have an opportunity to request an exception from the Planning Commission.	The PC recommended a buffer based on a 100' distance. The Council's version is different in detail, but addresses the same issues. The PC did not recommend allowances for existing STRS.
Treat owner-occupied and/or hosted STRs differently?	<p>The Council directed staff to create a 'Homeshare' option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be owner occupied • Owner must be present to host the guests • Limited to no more than one bedroom of their home. 	Homeshare STRs would be exempt from the cap, buffer, and minimum activity requirements. All other aspects of the Ordinance would apply to Homeshare STRs	The PC discussed this but did not recommend it to the Council.
Require Activity on License?	Yes - 60 days minimum activity (nights rented) per year.	Rationale is that if we are limiting the number of STRs, we should ensure the licenses that are available are being used.	Yes
License Term	Annual license renewal process. Administrative (staff) approval	Review each year for compliance and complaints	PC also recommended licenses end after 5 years, to force turnover.

ISSUE	CURRENT COUNCIL DIRECTION	Notes	Consistency with PC Recommendation?
Transferability of Permits	<p>Not transferable except for specific exceptions for spouse.</p> <p>Property transfer to anyone other than spouse triggers the end of that STR License. New owners can apply for a license.</p>	<p>Reduces the influence of an STR license on property values</p> <p>Key to achieving cap via attrition. Turnover allows more people a chance to have an STR</p>	<p>Yes – PC version was slightly less restrictive as it included transfer to children.</p>
Occupancy Limits and Visitor Limits	<p>Max occupancy of two guests per bedroom. Discussion continued on whether children would count.</p> <p>Set total number at property (guests plus their temporary visitors) to double the maximum number of guests, with a max of 20.</p> <p>Intended to reduce parking, noise, nuisance issues.</p>	<p>Current occupancy is two guests per bedroom plus two additional.</p> <p>For example, A three bedroom home can now have 8 overnight guests, and up to 20 at a gathering.</p> <p>With this change a 3 bd home could have 6 overnight guests, and 12 at a gathering.</p>	<p>PC did not include this, although it was suggested by some PC members at the joint PC - CC meeting where the recommendations were finalized.</p>
Complaint Process*	<p>Adopt a formal STR complaint process (outside of the ordinance) based on the model provided and post on the City's website</p>	<p>Ensure transparency</p> <p>Ensure follow-up</p> <p>Ensure all complaints are properly logged and tracked</p>	<p>Yes</p>

ISSUE	CURRENT COUNCIL DIRECTION	Notes	Consistency with PC Recommendation?
Enforcement*	<p>Council Committee and Staff are working on details of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definitions for complaints and significant violations were clarified • City Manager authority to adopt administrative rules and put problem properties on a watch list • Beef up the “Good Neighbor Brochure” • Require “Guest Registry” • Require a Responsible Person to sign and acknowledge rules • Require some form of “Meet and Greet” by owner or manager. Council indicated support for some flexibility in recognition that this may be difficult to achieve, and to enforce in all cases. • Suggest the City adopt a noise ordinance • Suggest the City enact a tiered system for issuing administrative fines 	<p>It is important for the City to enforce STR regulations in order to maintain community compatibility</p> <p>Neighbors have less recourse with STRs (e.g. civil suits) than with long term owners or tenants.</p> <p>Having strong and clear consequences makes bad behavior less likely to occur in the first place</p> <p>Ensure that the rules and consequences are adequately communicated to the occupants</p>	Yes – details TBD.