

## SHORT-TERM RESIDENTIAL RENTAL Online Feedback Results as of CLOSE OF SURVEY, 11:59 PM 11/15/2016.

These comments have been sorted into categories by staff for purposes of analysis, based on staff's best interpretation of the author's intent. Comments have not been altered or edited in any other way. Summaries (shown in red) were developed by staff based on review of all comments.

### 1. SURVEY RESPONDENTS

See short-term residential rentals website for [graphic presentation of feedback form responses](#)

Do you live in Arlington?

Yes	375
No	4

Do you own or rent your primary residence?

Own	310
Rent	67

What type of unit do you live in?

Single-family detached house	253
Duplex, semidetached or two-family house	16
Townhouse	29
Multiple-family building (low-rise or high-rise)	80

What best describes your interest in accessory homestay in Arlington? (check all that apply)

I am an Arlington resident	360
I am interested in hosting an accessory homestay	89
I am a hotel owner/manager in Arlington	0
I am an apartment building owner/manager in Arlington	2
I am a hotel or apartment owner/manager outside of Arlington	1
I live in another jurisdiction and am following this process in Arlington	5
I work in/represent the home sharing industry	1
Other	18

You selected "other." Please share in your interest in accessory homestays.

- Interest in startups in general.
- I am an opponent of "accessory homestay," a dubious alternative name.
- Want to make sure they are regulated properly and county receives taxes
- I frequently travel and use these type of services.

- I am interested in staying in an accessory homestay
- I reside in Florida but have lived in Arlington for 22 years.
- Interested in non-hotels for visiting family members & kids.
- I utilize homestays in other cities I visit & want others to here
- Individual insurance costs and additional water, etc utility costs
- freedom to manage your own property
- I have stayed in short term rental Homs in other cities.
- Very concerned about increased of unauthorized short term rentals!
- I've done Airbnb and believe it should not be inhibited by the government
- I use short term rentals when I travel. I want these to continue to be ava
- We use these services frequently in other areas and they are great service
- A potential home buyer might want to have accessory homestays.
- I am wondering about the impact on affordable housing, parking & noise
- Condo Bldg has minimum 6 mo lease requirement, DON'T WANT that to change!

## 2. ZONING DISTRICTS – Comment Summary

### Single-family neighborhoods

- Not appropriate for accessory homestays
- Concerns about encroachment of commercial lodging and associated impacts into residential areas
- Accessory homestays acceptable in both single-family detached and mixed-use neighborhoods

### Multiple-family buildings

- Accessory homestays should be contingent on HOA review and approval
- Accessory homestays in multi-family buildings should not negatively impact surrounding lower density neighborhoods (e.g. parking, trash, noise)
- Regulations should not allow investors to take over a building for 100% short term use
- Appropriate for short-term residential rental use

### Allow in all zoning districts

- Owner-occupancy is most important consideration, but suitable for all zoning districts
- Property owners should be able to use their property in any way they choose
- Allow everywhere, but subject to same regulations as other similar uses (e.g. hotels, taxes, etc.)

In your opinion, in what types of residential dwellings and neighborhoods should accessory homestays be allowed? (check all that apply)

Single-family detached houses	268
Townhouses	252
Duplexes, semidetached or two-family	252
Multiple-family (low, mid or high-rise) within residential neighborhoods	219
Multiple-family (low, mid or high-rise) within mixed-use neighborhoods (e.g. Rosslyn-Ballston, Jefferson-Davis or Columbia Pike corridors)	249
None of the above (accessory homestays should not be allowed)	84

### SINGLE FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS

- I am opposed to short term tenants in our neighborhood. I have an acquaintance who runs an AirBnB rental in DC. She makes a great deal of money doing so. I have serious issues, however, with having strangers migrate through our neighborhood. That is what the hotel areas are for. That is not why I spent a fortune on a house in our neighborhood.
- Keep the neighborhood as it is, mostly single family residences
- Don't commercialize residential neighborhoods.
- Families who invest and live in a residential neighborhood should not suddenly find themselves living next door to what amounts to an apartment just because someone wants to make extra be greedy and rent out their extra bedrooms. This ruins neighborhoods. There are plenty of condos to invest in and or rent in the area. This is wrong for families with small children to have a revolving "hotel" situation next door.
- It is important for the County to tighten requirements for long-term rentals by multiple persons in single family dwellings. Owners are raking in cash illegally and people are clogging residential streets with cars, also against County rules. Please take up this issue.

- I bought a home in a residential neighborhood- not a commercial area. I am 4 blocks off of Columbia Pike. How big is the mixed use footprint 1-2-3 blocks? For people who bought into an area zoned residential, it is unfair to effectively change that zoning after the fact. The process the county is undertaking is not adequate to answer the questions and concerned of current home owners.
- No b&b rentals should be allowed in a community of single-family detached houses. Only in an area zoned for commercial use should this proposal be considered and then only with limitations for a for a single floor that has a desk that can deal with problems of poor behavior and excess noise.
- I believe apartment buildings are the only place accessory homestays should be allowed---but absolutely not allowed in residential neighborhoods.
- Having used homestays in other countries, I think they are more suitable for both single-family detached houses and mixed-use neighborhoods.

#### **MULTIPLE-FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS**

- I am concerned about the illegal conversion of multiple-family buildings being turned into short-term rentals. Having used homestays in other countries, I think they are more suitable for both single-family detached houses and mixed-use neighborhoods.
- Only allow short-term rentals in high-density neighborhoods if the foot and vehicular traffic that it creates does not affect neighboring lower-density neighborhoods. For example, short-term rentals in a C-0-1.0 zone should not crowd or introduce heavy traffic or noise on neighboring R-zones.
- For multiple-family properties, I think the managing residents should vote on how or if to allow it.
- The HOAs of most multi-family dwellings prohibit short-term rentals. If the ordinance allows home stays in other than SFHs, the ordinance should condition approval upon documentation that the HOA does not prohibit short-term rentals.
- For dwellings and neighborhoods subject to homeowners' associations or condominium owners' associations, the membership of each association should decide whether to allow accessory homestays. The county should not force such associations to accept short-term leases (less than 6 months). OTOH, such associations should have the option to accept accessory homestays by amending their bylaws or other governing documents.

#### **ALLOW IN ALL ZONING DISTRICTS**

- We should be welcoming to those who want to come here and also allow residents to try to earn extra money by renting their property (or part of it out). Arlington is expensive, let's not make it harder for residents.
- The mission of home-sharing is good regardless of the zoning district. It benefits both the homeowner and the traveller with minimal, if any, inconvenience to neighbors. The future of the way people travel and how work is done and compensated will be changing. Restrictions on economic activity of residents needs to be minimal to account for the unknowns of the future.
- We think these should be allowed in any of these places, except maybe in apartment buildings, the residents could come up with their own rules.
- The house is my domain and my rights should not be infringed. The only restriction I might find agreeable is that it may not be rented more than 50% of the year.
- Everyone should be allowed-- but they should be subject to the same regulations (and be taxed) just like a hotel
- Allow it everywhere.
- Your house is your home in whatever form it takes. To restrict the ability for accessory homestays to one group only would be to divide the county by the home they can afford, which is unconscionable to me.
- Only owner occupied
- As long as lawful behavior is encouraged, no need to limit in any zoning district
- I believe that owner-occupants, no matter what the kind of home they have, should have the fewest County Government restrictions regarding this type of lodging. This is a way for county residents to offset the high living costs and mortgages in the County. I am certain that allowing short term stays within one's home is a net positive for the County. It would have limited impact on affordable housing, it brings money to County business, and can be done in a sensitive way for neighbors.
- Allow homestays in all housing types. Do not over-regulate, we need less government intrusion into our lives.
- all residential property owners should have the option to offer their homes or rooms for short-term rental on AirBnB, and similar services.

- In my opinion, anyone that owns a house should be able to rent their home to anybody. Don't see why Arlington Board needs to have a say on this issue.
- I believe it should be all or nothing.
- If you own your property you should be able to rent it out for any length as long as it's not against your COA (condos). There should be no restrictions in the county for sing family homes wanting to short term rent.
- As a persons private property, they should be able to do as pleased. Arl Co gov should not be involved. Especially considering, many people are not currently following rental rules as of now. Will
- I believe that the homeowner should have the opportunity to have an accessory homestay in their home for temporary guests and short term rentals. We live in an active vibrant community and should welcome folks that want to visit. In my opinion the accessory homestay is preferable to "group housing rentals", which can become problematic in residential neighborhoods but are allowable by right. There are several home offices and individual proprietors on my street and they are great neighbors.
- Seems any dwelling type should be allowed to have homestays - doesn't seem any different than normal out-of-town guests, daycare, music lessons, etc where people have regular visitors to their house.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT ACCESSORY HOMESTAY - POSITIVE LODGING OPTION**

- Please allow accessory homestays. I may or may not participate, but residents should be free to choose to do so.
- These should be allowed. It helps families pay their rent/mortgage and brings additional tourists to the city/county, when they might otherwise stay in a different city.
- It is crazy to limit Arlingtonians' ability to rent out their properties. People need to be able to make money off their properties in hard times and this is such a great way to do that.
- I have benefited from accessory homestays as a user in various cities in the US and find it an economically attractive alternative to hotels.
- This is a great opportunity to earn extra income while meeting new people from other states and even countries! Unlike a hotel stay it allows the residents to show the guests the beauty of the state from our perspective.
- Renting one's dwelling brings welcome income for many owners, as well as increased revenue for neighboring businesses. Guests do not significantly burden the local county services - a short term renter does not put his kids into the local school system, for example. Each owner has a vested interest in vetting out renters and thus the risk of unsavory transient renters is, frankly, minimal, especially in a highly residential area like Arlington. I fully support the permission of such rentals.
- House sharing has always existed in some shape or form, and company's like Airbnb add insurance and personal verification to the process. The ability to open your house to well kept and friendly guests is a great way to experience cultural immersion and exchange!
- Arlington needs to allow progress. Short stays would be good for economy, good for property owners, good for tourism. If problems develop because of short stays, county should then address them, but give it a try. Our location can be a valuable asset and it seems a pity to have government regulation limit its use. Already tremendous unresolved problems (like rude dog owners) that lead residents withou resource, so that's not a reason to resist change.
- Allowing short term residential rentals will support the local economy via increased tourism and increased tax revenues. It will also give those residents who have lived for many decades in Arlington the opportunity to better afford to stay in the area as it grows increasingly expensive, while often their incomes are otherwise fixed. The market will meet demand, either legally or illegally, so if Arlington bans residential short term rentals it likely will increase unregulated, illegal rentals.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.
- Limiting short-term stays will have a negative impact on Arlington County tourism and economy. The "sharing economy" is part of doing business in 2016 and limiting these opportunities is not ideal for Arlington and very short-sighted. While I appreciate residents' concerns, a vast and far-reaching regulation is not the answer.
- These types of businesses should not be regulated by the government. They self regulate through rating systems on the sites. Please keep government hands off as these are good and affordable for all.
- Regulate noise, litter, etc. do not regulate the ability to offer housing. It is expensive in this area and a good option for many residents.
- In this distressed economy legislation to remove options is overkill.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT ACCESSORY HOMESTAY - ALLOW AND REGULATE TO ADDRESS IMPACTS AND PREVENT ABUSE**

- The County Board should pass regulations designed to preserve the integrity of neighborhoods zoned as residential. People move to residential neighborhoods base on their ambiance. Allowing rentals, unless quite strictly controlled, changes that ambiance to the detriment of other homeowners and legitimate long term renters. I
- While I support accessory homestays, Arlington must be careful on their potential impact on affordable housuing, which might be diminished. Therefore, I would propose they not be allowed in either neighborhoods with high rates of affordable housing or in units below a certain market value or rent, perhaps 80% of average for the county. This risk is highest in multi-unit buildings. Arlington should evaluate the experience of other similarly sized and dense jurisdictions around the country.
- Accessory homestay should not "push out" permanent residents from housing; however, I think it is important for this type of sharing economy to be permitted. Our family of 6 frequently rents around the world and prefer homestays to hotels, we get to know the real community and then eat and shop in the local community.
- no
- It is going to happen that some property owners/homeowners will want to have this option. We should create a workable, fair regulatory framework, such that those abusing regulations can be prevented from continuing to operate.
- While I support the use of personal residences as short term rentals, I believe that restrictions and regulations are necessary.
- There should be some limits imposed on this type of rental. Some suggested rentals: 1) Whole home rentals only, can't rent a room, bed, couch, etc. 2) Must use a service that verifies the identity of the renter, can't use craigslist that is pseudo anonymous, 3) Must use a service that automatically takes and pays appropriate county taxes
- Restrictions would apply so that accessory homestays do not adversely impact neighbors (e.g. parking, noise, crime potential).
- If allowed, accessory homestays must be tightly regulated and controlled, with owners liable for supervision and immediate resolution of problems, with serious penalties -- fines, revocation of license, etc. - for any problems.
- For any attached housing, I believe 2/3 of the ownwers must approve before it is allowed.
- at least 50% of surrounding neighbors should formally register agreement.
- There should be some type of limit on it in residential areas, either through some type of application process that is first-come, first-served, etc. I support it, but I would also like a cap on it.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT ACCESSORY HOMESTAY - SOURCE OF REVENUE**

- Obviously momentum on this is growing, and appears pre-cooked. Any homes used more than two weeks a year for AirBnb or whatever should be taxed as a business and all appropriate fire codes set for hotels should apply. Lax tax and code enforcement raises a host of free rider issues.
- Realistically, people are doing this now in all districts. Whether its allowed in multi-family should be up to each building. But Arlington is losing significant revenue because we're not allowing people to do it legally, so people do it illegally and the County does not get the revenue.
- Not in Favor

#### **DO NOT ALLOW THIS USE**

- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- Accessory homestays should not be allowed in Arlington. They would create health/safety/welfare risks including extra traffic and unknown persons near children, subject customers to substandard or discriminatory practices, and damage property values. Hotels are regulated, in operation and by zoning district and that is beneficial to all of us in Arlington.
- I feel that authorizing accessory homestays will adversely affect property values and should not be permitted. I currently own a townhouse in Arlington and will propose that fellow property owners amend homeowners

association bylaws to prohibit such rentals. There are plenty of commercial property rentals to accommodate short term needs. Don't turn our homes into motels!

- Do not force townhouses, condos etc to deal with the noise and garbage being generated by accessory homestays. The ones in my neighborhood are mostly party stays and generate noise all night long
- airbnbs etc. violate residential zoning - they commercial enterprises like full-fledged hotels. While President of my homeowners association, I fielded complaints over a couple homes providing short-term rentals of a couple months. It is nearly impossible to administer zoning rules as things stand now. Enforcing behaviors in short stays is practically impossible. The whole idea destroys the stability and cohesiveness of a residential community.
- This is a bad idea that will ruin the quality of life in our community and reduce the amount of affordable housing that will be available.
- creates extra traffic in residential area. reduces available housing stock. possible lowering of property values which adversely affects tax revenues. failure to collect appropriate taxes from accessory homestays.
- I don't trust airbnb customers. Hotels have safeguards and procedures in place that residents don't have for strangers that come into the neighborhood through airbnb. I foresee some people trying out airbnb just in order to "case" the neighborhood to figure out when they can rob houses or who to rob. Sure, maybe there is some legitimate business, but overall I just find it very suspicious.
- Multiple-family within residential and within mixed-use neighborhoods are already congested, are already primarily rental neighborhoods, with multiple short-term and long-term home and apartment rental options (including hotels/motels) - so no need to create additional rental categories and have our resources / infrastructure worn down by people who don't pay for them!
- It seems obvious to me that allowing "accessory homestays" within residential areas is a potential if not probable source of friction and societal disruption. The people who own or rent houses in a residential area generally do not expect their neighborhoods and their areas of habitation to be affected by transients and unknown elements. I believe this, based not merely on my own opinion but on the many people I have spoken with in the course of securing petition signatures against a B&B.
- I believe permitting such an accessory use within the low density residential zones would violate the General Land Use Plan. In addition, permitting such could virtually eliminate the characteristics of a One-Family Dwelling District.
- It would destroy the character and quality of residential neighborhoods! Say no to commercialization of residential neighborhoods. They are places for individuals and families to live not a place to squeeze every last dollar out of. Preserve the quality of our neighborhoods! JUST SAY NO!
- Accessory homestays are commercial businesses and have no place in residential communities.
- Hotels are designed for short-stay renters, not single family homes. I am weary of my non-resident neighbors renting out their house on airbnb without any regard to the character of the neighborhood. Our neighborhood is not zoned for hotels!
- This should not be allowed anywhere if it is going to be put next to units that are year round residences. People who bought or rented a house or apartment did not expect to have nightly renters who have no stake in the community.
- There is no need for accessory homestays and no one, including Arlington County has made a case as to why we should have them.
- I think too many accessory dwelling permits in a multiple family residential neighborhood could create too much traffic out of character for the neighborhood and safety considerations -- e.g. introducing too many people with no investment in "the Arlington Way" etc...
- I own a beach home that is rented during the summer through a professional realtor experienced in short term rentals. I know the issues and associated problems of short term rentals. Arlington is not a beach. Arlington does not have a shortage of hotel or furnished apartment-type residences for extended stays. I cannot envision the need.
- As an apartment resident, I am uncomfortable with the idea of strangers having access to my otherwise secured building without the supervision of a resident.
- There are several people in my neighborhood obviously renting rooms in their house short-term and it negatively impacts the rest of us. They take multiple parking spaces, cause noise late at night, and make it hard (if not impossible) to know who your neighbors are. Zoning rules are supposed to keep neighbors from imposing these costs on other neighbors for their own enrichment.

- This has been a very difficult issue with out Townhouse Community. Parking is difficult. One resident is renting out every room (3 bedrooms) of the townhouse by the night. I did not buy into a community and expect to have a commercial business next door.
- It is important to recognize that short term residential rentals occur already in the city through property management companies and are often called corporate housing. These often vacant or high traffic dwellings have the only distinction of being owned by an organization or company often times without the neighbors, or county officials knowledge or concern. However like many things, if it is abused or done in a manner that harms the greater neighborhood, it can become a problem.
- As accessory homestays are very difficult for enforcement authorities within the county to oversee, I view this as greed on the part of the accessory homestay owner which lines their pocket at great expense to the remainder neighbors with regard to quality of living, safety, congestion and security.
- Please consider the security of the rest of an apartment building and the rest of the neighborhood if a few units have heavy transient traffic. Also parking, noise, and general safety
- Consider security risks for multiple-family bldgs with constant overturn of unit keys and bldg security devices.
- Short term rentals do not contribute to the community of neighborhoods as the renters do not tend to interact with the neighbors but they do take up the limited parking. I currently have a couple with a child as well as four unrelated members of their church living across the street. They have six cars parked on the street taking up the limited residential (permit restricted) parking. I have reported the house to the county but they have not apparently taken any action to enforce their code.
- The big issues are parking, # of visitors, and accountability of the owners. Parking Passes should not be provided to these short term stays. 1) They should have no parking privileges other than general public parking or paid parking available to general public. 2) Stays should be limited to 30 days. 3) Community members near the property should have a telephone number and email contact of the owner and a county office who can respond 24. 4) Only owner of a property can get permit
- Additional, it should be up to the apartment complex and apartment renter if they allow short-term rentals.

#### **ENFORCEMENT CAPACITY**

- Arl. County officials are today and will be in the future unable to regulate the short-term rental businesses. I know because I live next to an illegal short-term rental property. Contrary to the presentation by the CHPD on Oct 15, 2016 there are zoning regulations in place for lodging businesses and a short-term rental is a business that per the current regulations requires a business license, use permit, legislative action by the Board, an occupancy permit & building code inspection.
- How would use be identified and monitored if address is not used for business?
- Arlington does not have the infrastructure to ensure compliance with zoning laws and has no way to ensure lodging taxes are collected.
- Need teeth to the regulation or it will be ignored like other zoning matters.
- My answer above is contingent upon Arlington County devoting the resources necessary to "control" the issues that will arise from this concept. Otherwise, my answer is "None of the above".
- rules be enforced? If so, how? There are many current unlawful long term rentals. How will you ever even know who is short-term renting? Honest people will pay. Others will get away with it.
- Arlington County does not uphold its current housing laws. There are 4 boarding houses on this block with 4 to 6 unrelated people living in each of them. Arlington County is aware but doesn't enforce the laws. So why would making residents' homes defacto hotels and setting up laws to regulate them create a better environment for all or even most Arlington residents? You are opening the door for further overcrowding, and more difficult times for those who have to live next door to such dwellings.

#### **DO NOT REGULATE ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- Any Arlington resident should have the right to rent out their personal property for private use. It creates extra income to help subsidize sky high (and rising) Arlington property values and taxes, and makes the Arlington area more accessible for visitors to the area. Homestays also allow visitors to experience a different side of Arlington, and truly immerse themselves in the area's culture. Arlington has great neighborhoods and culture - why close that off from visitors?

- With the economy in the state it's in, accessory homestays may be the only way some Seniors and other lower-income folks can hang on to their house/residence. With all the agitation for "low-income housing", I think it would be incredibly hypocritical for Arlington County to prohibit or severely limit accessory homestay use of appropriate buildings.
- Accessory Homestays are a now a vibrant part of the US economy. Putting unnecessary regulations on this concept in Arlington County will mean less visitors, less income to restaurants and other local businesses, and would not be in keeping with Arlington's "everyone is welcome here" attitude.
- People should be able to use their property how they want to.
- If people want to rent out their residences, they should be able to do so as frequently as they wish. They are the owners of the property, the city is not. And for long-term renters, they and the building owners are the ones with "ownership" interest. Again, not the city. Increased competition for hotels should not be a factor. It should be a free market system. Best price/match for needs wins.
- It is up to the residents of that dwelling or the restrictions of the lease between the tenant and the resident.
- restrictions on private use within homes can only be enforced with complaints compounded by invasion of privacy. Both bad ideas.
- There should be no restriction on how a resident chooses to occupy their property.
- If you are trying to prevent services like AirBnb, please don't. I will not be renting out my home, but telling me that I cannot do so is wrong. For the county to try to enforce a restriction could lead to some scary, police state style elements. And certainly there will be expensive lawsuits. I know the hotels in the area are pushing it, but you have to decide whether you are going to be with the people or with those corporations.
- No need to regulate this matter
- I believe what happens in an individuals home, which is not in breach of current laws, should not be regulated.
- The county has no need to oversee or regulate this. Private citizens should operate their legal businesses according to existing laws and policies without being subject to new ones.
- You should leave the current rules AS THEY ARE. They already define what is allowed, I do not understand the county's insistence on intruding into the home in this manner, and also tangentially by not allowing people to have mini-kitchens in their basements. Renting rooms in one's home is an old, well known practice that affects no one but the homeowner and possibly hotel owners who don't want increased competition. These practices allow the elderly and middle class to stay in their homes.
- Private property as long as it conforms with the zoning should be able to be used for whatever purpose is allowed by current zoning.
- I am particularly concerned with the proposals governing parking and providing food & beverages to guests: these are matters that are governed elsewhere in law and should not be subject to new legislation. To prevent otherwise acceptable changes to property is unnecessary. Preventing the provision of food will do little to keep anyone safe, and much to erode the benefits to culture the sharing economy provides, namely the creation of ties among individuals.

#### UNCATEGORIZED COMMENTS

- I think if people have extra space, and are interested in renting out a portion of their property with someone(s) who agree to the terms of a contract I see no reason to prevent that from a zoning perspective.
- I do believe there should be a defined difference between an owner of any property, who travels 4-6 weeks a year (Or some other limited timeframe) and rents out their unit while they are out of town, vs. a non-owner occupied unit that rents theirs out perpetually.
- I can't believe the county is taking up this issue when it hasn't even evolved. You have commercial real estate issues and your talking about airbnb?
- You must separate the uses allowed!...Allow owners to temporarily rent their property for homestay, but do not lump it in with accessory dwelling units, or renting home offices/studios to artists or contractors. Thank you.
- I generally oppose zoning districts.
- I don't see a need to separate out districts, just housing types.
- I am convinced it's a waste of time/energy/County resources for the Board to try to rush something through on this issue, when the state legislature is known to be working on this (in a much more considered way) AND since we live in VA, what the VA legislature decides is what is going to govern us. There's no end-run around this.

### 3. PORTION OF DWELLING UNITS – COMMENT SUMMARY

#### Both partial rentals and entire dwelling rentals should be allowed

- Flexibility to use all or part of the dwelling is preferred
- Partial rental may be more appropriate for single-family home than condo unit

#### Entire dwelling rentals

- Eliminates sofa rental and/or renting multiple rooms
- Easier to enforce
- Allows for renting while on vacation

#### Partial rentals

- Allows for monitoring of guest behavior
- Consistent with other home occupations

#### In what manner should accessory homestays be allowed (check all that apply)?

Short-term rental of an entire dwelling	244
Short-term rental of a portion of a dwelling	252

#### ALLOW OWNER TO CHOOSE WHETHER TO RENT OUT ALL OR PART OF THE DWELLING

- If folks travel a lot or buy multiple real estate and want to rent out the entire home, regardless of size, to individuals through accessory homestay's, I don't see why not.
- If someone has a whole house they want to rent out for a week, so be it. Why limit this? The homeowners obviously will screen potential renters - no one wants to invite someone into their home who is going to be a nuisance, annoy neighbors, or trash the space. People should be allowed to rent out a room, two rooms, the whole house - whatever.
- As long as the rentals do not exceed the normal use or foot print of a live-in owner, they should be allowed.
- Accessory homestays should allow for both the entire dwelling and portions of a dwelling.
- Please do not limit the income potential of an already expensive area.
- There should be no restriction on how a resident chooses to occupy their property
- There should not be a limit
- The County Board ought to allow homeowners to use their property as they see fit.
- No restrictions
- Because so many homes are so different from one another, as can be their owners' situations, this restriction should be left to circumstances of the homeowner and the 'market'.
- I don't believe we should be deciding who an occupant allows into their space or what they do when they are inside. Any issues should be addressed between occupant and owner, no one else.
- There should be no limitation on what percent of the total floor area is used.
- You should be able to rent part or all of your dwelling.
- Property owners should be able to rent out any/all of their dwelling to interested parties.
- People should be able to user their property how they want to.
- Free market. What would be the benefit of restricting opportunity for more income for the city? Many of the people renting out their space are not going to be in town spending their money anyway. Why not fill that void with tourists who will likely spend more money (and increase city revenue) than primary residents. More space available to rent = more renters=more revenue.
- We do not need more regulation. Allow residents to use their properties as they desire.
- If no there are no fire code violation or occupancy violations then the choice inside the persons house should solely rest on the property owner.

- No restrictions
- Both should be allowed.
- There should be no limit
- Only in owner occupied homes.
- I think it makes sense for it to depend on the size of the building. If it's a large single-family home with a basement apartment - it's easy to have %25 rule. But if someone has a smaller house or apartment and want to rent a room for one night - it's hard to abide by the rule. The rules need to be more flexible.
- whole or portion rentals should not have a distinction. If proportionment is included how is having a nanny or au pair any different than having a portion of the property used for guests? both are used to provide or receive a service.
- I would love the flexibility of portion or full dwelling rental. This would attract family vacationers who might otherwise have difficulty finding suitable and affordable space. My only concern would be how to control investors who might purchase multiple properties for short term rentals squeezing out full time renters. I would hope that could be monitored and controlled in order to accommodate full house or unit rentals when the owner is out of town.
- Because we are such a non-diverse affluent neighborhood (at least North of Lee Highway and west of Quincy Street) we should encourage anything that helps make housing more available.
- Options! Keep Arlingtonians in Arlington!
- It's private property, if someone wants to rent their whole space that is fine with me.
- it depends

#### **ENTIRE UNIT**

- allow it all
- I don't have a problem with someone renting out their entire residence for a short-term stay from time to time. The problem I have is when the residence becomes a veritable hotel and the neighbors are routinely impacted. We have one neighbor in particular who frequently rents out rooms in her house on airbnb (while she remains living in the residence). she is probably making \$2K/month doing this and I think the income should be taxed as such.
- Short-term rental of the portion of a dwelling would allow the dwelling owner to run a "bed & breakfast" type establishment without complying with federal, state and local laws, regulations and ordinances regarding discrimination, health and safety. It should be the whole dwelling or nothing.
- should be entire dwelling so as to avoid 1) overuse of homestays in residential areas that takes away from investing as a stakeholder in a neighborhood and fostering of community 2) significant parking impact of more than one family occupying a dwelling 3) abuse of parking by a homestay renter bringing multiple vehicles. Parking is not overabundant in Arlington.
- Should only allow for whole units. Rooms, beds, couches, should be avoided. For MDUs, must have limit on number at any one address. I would like to avoid the house down the street that has a bunch of rooms they advertise on Craig's List
- This would allow homeowner to rent out home when away for the weekend or a short period of time.

#### **PARTIAL UNIT AND/OR HOMEOWNER SHOULD BE PRESENT DURING RENTAL**

- To at least have some safeguard (as I described above), there should be a resident at home for short-term rentals.
- Homeowners should be there to make sure the renters follow the rules.
- To avoid having homestays turn into something that will raise rents/increase house prices we have to be vigilant that the person renting the space is living in the building. Enforce of the law while allow for rental of the entire house while the person is away will probably be difficult.
- If an entire dwelling is permitted for rental, then the neighborhoods will become full of boutique hotels. Is that what the county wants in residential neighborhoods?
- Short term rental of a whole house would be too chaotic for our neighborhoods and have potentially more cars that would take up street parking that is precious in many neighborhoods. One car wouldn't be bad.
- Owner needs to be resident so can't rent entire dwelling
- I'd like to see the owner in residence and not open the door -- as in DC -- to investors buying houses only to use them exclusively for AirB&B. Whole neighborhoods could turn rental!

- Renting a portion of a dwelling, such as a room in a bed and breakfast arrangement, with the owner present during the guest's stay, could address the parking, noise and crime problems noted above, since one assumes that the host would more closely screen and monitor guests during their stay.
- overnight rentals of entire houses on a regular basis is incompatible with residential neighborhoods.
- Same as other occupations seems a good rule of thumb.
- Short-term rental of an entire building or unit makes it a small hotel, not an accessory use. If this is to be considered a home occupation, the limits should be consistent. And if a bedroom is rented, what about access to the kitchen or living room? Are those areas also counted as rented if used by a lodger? Common hospitality could make portion-rental limits hard to enforce.

#### **DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- As noted above short term rentals in residential areas should be discouraged. If the Board must allow it, it should require portional use only-- suggesting the owner should be present to oversee the behavior of renters.
- I do not think it should be allowed at all -- but if it is, I would subscribe to the 25% model. Accessory homestays should not be allowed anywhere
- No short-term rentals should be allowed of residential property.
- You didn't provide an option for 0% rental allowed. I live in a townhouse complex and am not interested in having folks coming in and out of my neighbor's properties. Parking is a major problem for Arlington residents, and our limited community parking should not be shared with those not permanently residing here.
- None
- do not allow short term rentals
- zero percent - we have lots of hotels in Arlington.
- No percentage of a dwelling should be used for this purpose.
- No short-term rentals
- None should be allowed.
- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- Do not allow either. If you are going to allow it, do not allow rental of the entire dwelling, the owner should have to be present.
- None. Zero.
- don't allow at all
- No percentage of dwelling should be rented overnight or short-stays.
- I think it's a bad idea for Arlington. I'm against it
- Don't allow any but if you do I respond as follows.
- Do not want short term homestays
- Please don't ruin our neighborhoods!!!!
- None of the above. Don't need rooms for accessory homestays
- Zero percentage of dwelling should be used/allowed for accessory homestays.
- Neither, but whichever would limit short-term rental the most
- None. No homestays. No extra cars parking either.
- None
- no short term rentals of one room or entire house.
- 0.0%
- I think the answer should be "none" but if the tide is against me, then certainly a limited portion of the dwelling should be the correct response.
- neither
- zero percent. 0 %
- I do not support accessory homestays in residential neighborhoods.
- Since I am opposed to any short term rental. This is not a relevant to me.

- Overnight or even "short term" rentals of any portion of a residential dwelling should not be allowed. An ordinance requiring a minimum stay of say 30 days should be in place to control the noise, vehicular traffic, unknown tenants, and the safety/ health factors of our residential neighborhoods. Residential communities should be owner-occupied units or long term leased units only.
- Do Not Regulate
- These types of businesses should not be regulated by the government. They self regulate through rating systems on the sites. Please keep government hands off as these are good and affordable for all.
- Do not over-regulate, this is another example of unnecessary government intrusion into our personal rights and freedoms.
- Government should not have a role in choosing who stays in my home - paying guest or otherwise. The county has no business regulating private citizens' use of their residences.
- do not micromanage. No restrictions for property owners who wish to list short-term rentals on AirBnB etc.
- The county board should not restrict accessory home stays in any way.
- People should be allowed to rent whatever percentage of their own home that they deem appropriate. This is none of the county's business.
- Again, this should be up to the owners' not Arlington County Board. Owners should rent accessory homestays to best accommodate their personal needs.
- If you own a property then you should be able to use it in whatever way works for you so long as neighbors right to quiet enjoyment not curtailed. And since my current right to quiet enjoyment is frequently curtailed from neighbors barking and rude dogs (and county rules and enforcement procedure offer no relief), it seems correct to allow new uses for homeowners.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.
- No need to regulate this matter
- Why should the county be able to tell you how much of your place you that you own and pay taxes on and now tell you the exact percentage of spec can be rent.
- Should be up to the market.

#### **ENFORCEMENT CONCERNS**

- It would be a nightmare to comply with or enforce restrictions on the floor area that may be used. This is a great example of bureaucrats making a rule that only make sense to bureaucrats.
- Accessory homestay's provide individuals traveling through the area to have more accomodation options and to meet new people. They allow residents of the area to also meet new people, and boost or gain income during hard times (or just generally). If anything, their allowance add value to the community. Many or all of the accessory homestay companies conduct background checks, etc because it is good for their business to be reliable to its customers on the hosting and renter end.
- Personal property, such as real estate, should not be mandated to have labels such as "accessory homestay" due to the privacy infringement on an individuals home. Although overcrowding would be an issue in these homes the main concern would be enforcing the applicable building standard or code to house individuals. Additionally, subdividing zoning districts to further define personal property will lead to noncompliance for homeowners.
- Need to define terms. There is a difference between allowing renters use user the ping-pong table in the basement or watch TV in the family room and filling the house with air mattresses and sleeping bags.
- What consititutes the entirety of a dwelling? If I rent the couch of a studio out... Is that a portion of a dwelling? Or does the presence in the one room make that rental for the entire house? Similarly, if I rent out my whole dwelling, minus the hallway closet, is that no longer the entirety of the dwelling? This strikes me as well meaning but any limit would be arbitrary and either unenforceable or with unintended consequences.
- How, exactly, is the county going to enforce what percentage of a private dwelling is being temporarily used?
- In order to determine how much a home is used for a homestay, an enforcement agent, inspector or police would have to get a search warrant and invade the privacy of the homeowner. Bad idea.

## GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT ACCESSORY HOMESTAY AND UNCATEGORIZED COMMENTS

- I think this might be appropriately varied by dwelling type. Allowing renting out of an entire single family building likely would bring in a large amount of tax money to the county, so that benefit should not be diminished. Allowing dwellings in multiunit buildings to be fully rented would come closer to a hotel-style arrangement. These should be more carefully considered.
- I think understanding the problem we are trying to solve is important before creating rules. Banning accessory homestays is not the solution. Let's put in protective language to a) ensure permanent residents are not pushed out by others, b) ensure occupants abide by rules related to # of occupants and noise, c) appropriate taxes are collected and paid by those who operate these properties.
- I think if people have extra space, and are interested in renting out a portion of their property with someone(s) who agree to the terms of a contract I see no reason to prevent the 26th person in a 100 person dwelling from doing so (or any other fiat percentage of overall occupancy). People would be more inclined to falsely report their neighbors, and you'd end up with worse communal relations.
- Not at all
- Should be a few bureaucratic rules as possible.
- If there is an owner occupant who is either on-site during the stay or whose primary residence is in the dwelling, there should be few restrictions. Full time rentals or absentee owners could be more regulated because it is different from a person bringing people into their homes.
- Needs to be some oversight of homestayors coming and going on a short term basis; otherwise what is the difference between homestay and hotel.
- Seniors who spend part of the year away might use this as an income source. In general I prefer owner-occupied rental but am sympathetic to needs of part time residents so long as residency is checked and enforced.
- Any small amount of regulatory efforts for short term rentals must be applied to long term rentals as well. It is really comes down to the same thing. Otherwise, your regulation will not stand up in court if it is challenged. I would like to point out that AirBnB rentals have an advantage that they are generally nice properties that are seeking 5 star ratings, long term rentals can be crappy and rented with no regard for safety.
- I do not know how you would enforce portion or partial renting
- Not certain.
- where does a house swap fit into this - not officially a rental but barter
- Homestays should not be allowed without the express permission of immediate neighbors.
- I currently live next door to a si glen family home that is rented out every six months to sets of four young students or recent grads. They have no investment in our community and treat their Space as a running extension of a college sorority or fraternity. I am wary of people on vacation treating our neighborhood as their party zone while I am trying to raise children 100 yards and a shared property line away.
- Unless you place limits you're just creating boarding houses.
- I am worried that homestays will will reduce the pool of affordable housing by reducing the the overall number of housing units available for long-term use.
- We live near a house where the renters are subsequently renting out part of their house as a short-term rental (usually a month at a time). There are at least 6 cars and unrelated people in this house, coming and going, taking up valuable parking, and not adding value as neighbors.
- I am convinced it's a waste of time/energy/County resources for the Board to try to rush something through on this issue, when the state legislature is known to be working on this (in a much more considered way) AND since we live in VA, what the VA legislature decides is what is going to govern us. There's no end-run around this.
- no
- Don't

## 4. PARKING – COMMENT SUMMARY

### Comments about adding new spaces

- Any new parking should conform to all requirements
- Paving of properties is a concern

### Require off-street parking

- Parking is already a problem; creating more parking is generally a good thing
- On-street parking should not be allowed to be used for accessory homestay – require off-street parking to accommodate all lodgers
- Restrict the number of vehicles owned by the host
- Require parking near metro, where on-street parking is limited
- Require parking in neighborhoods where RPP program is in place
- Parking requirements should be determined based on site-specific information about the neighborhood to determine what is most appropriate

### Do not require off-street parking

- Successful units will be those near transit; many visitors use public transportation
- Utilize available street parking; renters should be responsible to find their own parking
- RPP program and other on-street parking restrictions addresses parking through passes available to residents
- Encouraging use of public transit and shared transit options is consistent with County policy

### Require off-street parking under certain circumstances

- Requirement should be determined based on supply/demand or based on streets in the neighborhood
- Requirement should be determined based on each individual case
- Parking should not be required where Metro or frequent bus service is available

### How many off-street parking spaces do you think should be required?

None	200
One, for some dwelling types	152

### For what types of dwelling units should parking be required for accessory homestay (check all that apply):

Single-family detached	132
Duplex/semi-detached/two-family	120
Townhouse	114
Multiple-family served by Metro	81
Multiple-family served by frequent bus service	87

Other home occupations prohibit, once the home occupation is approved, the creation of any additional parking spaces that did not exist at the time of approval. Should a homeowner be allowed to create an additional off-street parking space (subject to all applicable regulations) after an application is approved?

Yes	193
No	150

#### QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ABOUT ZONING REGULATIONS RELATED TO PARKING SPACES

- The problem I see here is that a single-family homeowner could legitimately desire a parking spot, and create one when remodeling. There is no way to determine whether they are doing it for short-term rentals or personal use. If I owned my home, I certainly wouldn't want the county to "assume" I wanted the driveway for rental purposes and deny my request.
- But they should be held to rules as to where parking could be placed -- don't we have a rule about vehicle parking starts at the front wall and goes back? we don't seem to enforce that but we don't want people paving over their front yards to accommodate a short term stay

#### GENERAL COMMENTS RELATED TO PARKING REGULATIONS

- Parking is already a nightmare in Arlington. But it make it better, as younger people choose alternate forms of transportation. Regardless, the county just need to continue to enforce ticketing. I'm absolutely certain that will be done, rigorously, as it is becoming an increasing means of revenue.
- all neighborhoods involved should have some sort of permit system for local residents as the potential for abuse is big
- Commercial parking in residential neighborhoods should be prohibited. Same goes for "Car-to-go" cars that are allowed to park in restricted parking neighborhoods without parking permits....
- Parking needs to be reviewed in relation to coverage, setbacks and other rules governing lot use.
- Again, you are missing the point. Parking is not an issue for short term rentals. Parking for long term rentals produce way more cars and much more of a problem. Houses with four or five renters often have 8 cars per house that are there ALL OF THE TIME. Please observe what is happening in neighborhoods.
- Parking is crucial to any commercial activity. If there isn't enough parking for the rental we shouldn't allow the rental. Tourists are not going to ride buses to residential neighborhoods.
- I live across the street from a 1 family home that is rented to singles. On weekends the residents girlfriends visit. Accommodating multiple cars is not fair to single family home owners in the area.
- Arlington has removed too many parking spaces along the Metro corridor that longtime Alingtonions who now are disabled can't find parking!

#### COMMENTS RELATED TO ADDING NEW PARKING SPACES

- If additional parking is created new application should be required.
- Parking can be added as long as it is conventional to the neighborhood (i.e., driveways similar to those in use at adjacent dwellings, vs. the creation of front yard paving)
- It would seem reasonable for a property owner, particularly those of detached single family homes, to be able to add a driveway or other such off street parking in the same manner they would be able to if they weren't occasionally participating in a "homestay".
- No additional parking spaces can be built--no paving of property
- As long as the space is there to create parking, I don't see why this should be an issue.
- Provided this "creation" conforms to zoning and planning standards, and isnt yet one more excuse for cutting down trees in an already lax regulatory environment for managing lot coverage and iur tree canopy.
- In many parts of Arlington, parking is not a concern, as there are multiple other transportation options available for travelers to the area. Creation of additional parking seems short-sighted and unnecessary.
- Creation of additional off-street parking should be subject to a "building permit" process that recognizes the homestay use.
- A person should be able to modify their property as they feel appropriate, without consideration to this particular matter.
- all parking for accessory homestay must be enclosed so that vehicle of the renters is NOT visible.

- It seems reasonable to allow the parking space to be created after the application is approved because the homeowner wouldn't need it if the application is denied. Another alternative is to make the parking space conditional with application approval. However it is accomplished, a parking space is a must.
- Should be allowed to create, but not required.
- No additional parking spaces should be created for accessory homestay.
- Nothing new should be allowed.

#### **CONSIDER VARIABLE REQUIREMENTS DEPENDING ON SITE-SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS**

- Should be determined by parking supply/demand in the vicinity
- The granting of a homestay "license" should be contingent on the availability of either on-street or off-street parking for a specified maximum number of cars. The on-street parking allowed should be consistent with neighborhood availability of parking.
- Parking should be required for multi-family NOT served by metro (w/in 0.25 mile) or FREQUENT (every 15 minutes, 7 days a week) bus service.
- the limitations that the streets in older areas of Arlington should dictate parking requirements...trash trucks have a difficult time now ... acute when the students are home from college. consider snow removal !!!
- I would add that some townhouses are served by metro and therefore don't need a parking spot while others are not and should have that requirement.
- Parking is at a premium everywhere. Each circumstance should be separately assessed. No single solution can -- or should be -- applied to every circumstance. In the cases I have seen recently, parking is one of the biggest sources of friction and neighborhood disruption -- especially on residential side street that are not arterial,
- I live in the R5 zone and my neighbors have been short-term renting to large numbers of people. Based on this experience, I do not believe adequate parking is available and non-arterial streets, which are only one and one half lanes in width, are not designed to accommodate the increased traffic.

#### **REQUIRE PARKING**

- Do not allow accessory homestays. If you are going to allow them, there should be one parking space for each bedroom being rented, otherwise it will also negatively impact the neighbors with limited parking. However, spaces should have to be behind the home so that the extra cars are not an eyesore, and should not be impermeable so that they are not adding to runoff.
- On-Street parking is one of the issues very likely to create animosity among neighbors. If short term renting is ever allowed, the owner/landlord should be made responsible for supplying adequate parking for guest renters.
- It is critical to ensure that there is parking available to these short-term renters, especially because Metro is so unreliable these days. If parking spaces are not created for the short-term renters, then I fear they would take away parking spaces from residents!
- Off-street parking should be required BEFORE the homestays are approved
- Parking in Arlington is not plentiful and out of county residents already look to game the system for commuting purposes. this makes it worse.
- Creating more parking is a good thing, generally.
- If guests come in a vehicle, a parking place should be required. If they use Metro or bus service, the host wouldn't need a parking space. Multiple-family dwellings are likely to have more parking issues affecting the neighborhoods than single-family detached.
- Parking is a problem.
- I am most concerned about parking.
- Zero percentage of current or future parking should be used/allowed for accessory homestays.
- They should be required to provide all parking to be used at their own expense
- Somehow, the number of vehicles owned by the renter should be restricted so as to avoid negative impact to the neighborhood. One parking space would be inadequate if a multi-bedroom house is rented. I'm not sure what the solution is...
- I think key thing is that you want to avoid the number of cars that are present. There needs to be space for parking as many people will drive here, even if public transit is available.
- There is limited parking near metro areas. I think a unit should have parking if it is renting a unit.

- This will become a serious problem. In my neighborhood 5-6 spaces are taken during the day by home businesses that have home meetings. Overnight guests will make it worse. It will become very popular for families and extended families to use home stays and bring in multiple vehicles into a neighborhood, park and use public transport- much cheaper than hotel parking. this invites vehicle use into DC.
- Parking requirements must be specified and requires unanimous approval by adjacent neighbors.
- My neighborhood has a parking problem for streets next to the apartments next to Columbia Pike. I have mixed feelings about adding more parking spaces -- one neighbor has cemented over his front yard.
- There should be enough parking spaces to accommodate all guest vehicles.
- Short term residential rentals should not be allowed to take up any public street parking. All parking should be required to be on the existing property parking.
- If a street has permit parking they should require off street parking. If the street changes to permitted parking it will require the rent to have off street parking with 1 year.
- Short-term rentals should not be allowed to negatively impact available street parking in residential areas.
- I don't see a way to efficiently enforce a parking restriction without requiring parking for everybody who does this. There is already tremendous demand for street parking because of multi family dwellings having too little on-site parking.
- Already there is such a shortage of parking that residential neighborhoods such as Ashton Heights find commuters parking in the neighborhood to go to the Clarendon Metro ---they regularly park as far from Metro as Pershing Drive.

#### **DO NOT REQUIRE PARKING**

- Isn't Arlington encouraging a car-free diet? I'm confused by this restriction.
- Our streets are already too crowded. Many of us do not own cars. It is difficult to accept that short term renters would be able to use cars when the long term residents are asked to go on the car free diet.
- I think a parking space might be merited, but should not be required. Arlington's policy now us to discourage parking in developments near metro corridors. Why have a blanket policy that would encourage parking for residences in the same metro corridors? Also, requiring a parking space may drive up costs, making the units less affordable. I'd suggest flexibility in dealing with the parking issue.
- Many homes and apartments in Arlington HAVE no off-street parking. Everyone parks on the street, so short-term renters should be no different.
- This allowance to create "accessory homestay" should not encourage greater car density in Arlington.
- You guys have heard of Uber, right? People travel all the time without cars. You don't want to encourage more use of fossil fuels, right? Then why bias toward places that cater to users of fossil fuels?
- Less regulation the better. No need to require off-street parking nor prohibit additional parking spaces if deemed necessary by the home owner.
- This really shouldn't be the County's concern. Seems intrusive and unnecessarily restrictive.
- What applicable regulations? impervious surface covering? I am in favor of reducing impervious surface covering for storm water management. Beyond this, the government should not interfere.
- There may be some need to have parking restrictions, however, I think there are a significant portion of short-term rental users that don't actually utilize personal vehicles. Many likely use public transit, taxis, and ridesharing services like Uber and Lyft when they are renting from places like AirBnB. Imposing a parking rule on everyone, given the previous scenario, would be an unnecessary regulation.
- There's no sense in regulating parking related to Airbnb--many people using Airbnb are not going to bring a car with them, regardless of dwelling type.
- Why they hell would you make it harder for people to rent out their spaces? Putting these restrictions on people is a barrier to entry and would be a detriment to prospective short-term renters. Again, you want more renters so they're here spending money when primary residents are not. Don't make it harder for them.
- Not to
- They homeowner should only be renting what they have, not what others own. No extra parking, no creation of parking. If the homeowner has no parking, we shouldn't create parking for them, they bought knowing the parking.
- off-street parking is absolutely unnecessary for a short-term rental, as many visitors to the area rely on mass transit and ridesharing. But if an owner wishes to provide parking, that should be an available option - following standard process and procedure, of course.

- Many people coming o visit or stay through Airbnb use public transportation
- Many people coming o visit or stay through Airbnb use public transportation
- Given that a family may have as many cars as they wish, i don't see that having the additional car of a guest, of any type- home-share or not, is an undue nuisance. Many home-share guests will not have cars, and will use public transport, cab, lyft, uber, etc.
- I am leery of over-regulating homestays. For owners in places where there is tight parking, common sense prevails. We have rented in the U.S where there was no parking with the property and we figured it out. At times there was a pay to park garage near by where we parked our car or if it was a major city and the property was centrally located, we did not take or rent a car. We used public transportation or taxis.
- The county has made a conscious effort to reduce vehicular congestion; adding more parking spaces goes directly against this objective.
- Parking is a privilege, not a right. County buildings are already subject to parking regulations when they're constructed. Hosts should accurately advertise their parking availability and not be given special treatment and/or additional regulations. If a unit doesn't have adequate guest parking they should have to follow the same zoned parking regulations residents/visitors are subject to or pay for public garage parking. We should be encouraging the use of Arlington's multimodal services.
- There are already numerous little rental cars abandoned in my neighborhood. We don't need more parked cars.
- I do not have stats on this, but my speculation is that many out of town visitors who are staying in a homestay do not have a vehicle and are using public transit, uber, cabs, etc. while visiting. Additionally, if someone was perhaps leaving town for a week and renting out their unit, they could very well let the renter also have use of the owner's vehicle (I have no idea if that's legal or not).
- Are you serious?!?!?? With the current parking shortage in Arlington and a fully-developed Zone parking system? Aw, come on! I think the current FlexPass and Parking Pass ticket books could easily accommodate visitors (as they do admirably when my family comes to visit.)
- Many tourists won't have a car and will utilize public transportation, making this point mute for many situations.
- Renters should be responsible to find their own parking.
- Most successful short term residential rentals are within walking distance of Metro. Most guests don't rent vehicles during their stay. Requiring additional off street parking is an unnecessary burden. In situations where short term rentals are not near public transportation and guests stay because they will rent a vehicle, those neighborhoods have abundant open parking spaces on the street.
- Should use existing parking passes. Should not add any more burden the county or cities. Owners are responsible for providing parking. Keep government out of it!
- If most people who rent a short term rental that is close to metro they will be les likely to have a car.
- I believe that parking requirements will would greatly impact the marketability of the rental unit. Parking should only be restricted if it creates a problem. I live in an area that is close to the metro. The restricted parking in my neighborhood would allow for short term renters to park without problems for neighbors. Also, if I live close to a Metro, my renters would not need a car. Why have a space that may not be used?
- From my experience with Airbnb most renters do not have a vehicle as well parking restrictions are already present in Arlington.
- Sufficient parking laws already in place to regulate...no need for any more.
- I oppose requiring parking, but -- if it is required -- allow residents to apply for special parking.
- Parking should not be regulated by the permit.
- Arlington on street parking restrictions seem to cover this already.
- Arlington has a history of encouraging public transit use, bike use, and walking. Its policies have encouraged transit oriented development throughout the county and specifically along metro & bus corridors. Requiring a parking space is contrary to this. And in fact would encourage more rentals out in the suburbs where there is space for extra parking and encourage visitors to bring cars. In stead we should encourage visitors to stay in metro/ ped/ bike accessible rentals & not to travel by car
- Keep the rules simple....why can't guests park on the street?
- I think most people interested in short-term rental (like Air BnB) would be visitors to the area who would not necessarily be driving a car (e.g., flying in from somewhere), so requirements for parking spaces are not needed.

- Why would you layer on additional rules when there are already driveway/lot coverage regulations in place? Many, many Airbnbers do not even bring cars; they rely on Uber, taxies, and the metro.
- Seems one of Arlington's greatest assets is proximity to metro/DC attractions. Many places have no parking so it seems ludicrous to require it for short stays! (See car-free diet literature from county PR program!!)
- While I think a homeowner has the right to add a parking space to his or her property if desired, I do not think that the county should mandate extra parking for the sake of short term residential rentals.
- Existing zone parking permit requirements should help avoid reducing available resident parking spaces. Residents should have priority access to parking.
- Parking should be left to the standing guest rules of Arlington County and/or the the private rules on whatever private property. Parking should neither be an additional burden on the host, nor on the neighbors and should be the responsibility/liability of the short-term renter.
- Zone should limit to car free visitors
- The attraction of Arlington as a destination is it's proximity to WDC and public transportation. I see no need to provide parking since metro is within walking distance of most neighborhoods in the RB-corridor and HEY-- there is this thing called UBER!
- Parking requirements are unnecessary, because travelers can see whether or not a given accessory homestay has parking available before making booking arrangements.
- They should follow rules of parking as if an out-of-tower. If an owner does not have parking, leasee will have to figure it out.
- Existing parking regulations (zoned parking, etc.) are adequate and the advertising of the property to rent should include parking information.
- Many guests might not have cars, normal parking zone regulations seem sufficient to control parking.
- Lots of people uber now so I don't think there should be a parking spot requirement. Let people do what they want with their properties!

#### **DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- Parking is a problem. Our streets are already overcrowded. This is yet another reason not to allow airbnb-type housing.
- No accessory homestays!
- Also not clear why county is considering this at all--who wants it.
- Also not clear why county is considering this at all--who wants it.
- The very issue of more parking is the reason not to have these!
- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- No short term rentals. No influx of migrant cars.
- this is a high density area. these temp rentals will cause more problems than they are worth and they would be difficult for the county to collect appropriate revenue
- Once a dwelling registers as a short-term rental that all current zoning regulations and requirements apply, plus additional tax be assessed
- Don't need all this bother if we don't have accessory homestays. Please provide the specifics of how they will benefit Arlington, the downsides to residents and how the additional taxes collected will pay for the additional work Arlington has done and will be doing.
- No ST rentals equals no parking issues.
- homesharing promotes additional cars needing parking spaces, all a bad thing, should not be allowed.
- In developments that have assigned parking, short term renters tend to disregard parking space assignments and park wherever they want. We witnessed this in our parking lot last summer (2015) when we had an Airbnb operating in a unit here. Short term renters tend not to pay any attention to rules and regulations in place by HOA or condo associations because they know that there will be no enforcement. By the time the HOA or condo association can take action the short term renters are gone.
- Parking is difficult in Arlington. This will exacerbate the problem.

- This is already a disaster in my neighborhood. The house across the street is one of these horrible rent out the rooms place. Parking and abandonment of vehicles is a problem.

#### **DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE**

- Over-regulation hurts commerce. Stay out of it.
- This is ridiculous
- Home owners can do what they want in their own property.
- It is extremely annoying that the short-term renters take up so much street parking. Some of them don't have parking passes, but they move their cars during the day and return when zoning requirements are not in effect. The only way to avoid this congestion is to not allow them.
- No need to regulate this matter

#### **UNCATEGORIZED**

- This is all a bad idea.
- I think that the person offering the homestay should be willing Displace their personal car in order to accommodate a homestay. This could mean putting their own car on the street or potentially garaging their car in a paid lot/underground garage for the length of the homestay. The offerer is getting the benefit of the additional revenue and parking is, in fact ,one of "the costs of doing business". Offerers who live near good transit should have to demonstrate the paid parking is available
- Parking is already a problem for our many narrow yield streets, and homes with tiny or nonexistent garages. Adding vagabonds who don't understand our zoned parking would create another nightmare - and "renting" parking spaces on our streets violates the whole idea behind our zoned parking.
- On our street, the homeowner herself has two vehicles, so one is parked in their driveway and another is parked on the street. Therefore, when airbnb guests stay there, there is a third car on the street from that dwelling. It isn't much different from the group houses where 4 non-related adults live together and each has a car (we have a few of those on our street also), but it makes the street very congested and tough for residents to park. Not sure what the solution is.
- No permit should be required.
- However, this shouldn't be in contradiction with land use rules regarding how much space can be built out.
- I think they should be allowed similar use than any other resident. Parking proportional to the normal number of people the unit is built for. As it is, there are currently long term rentals to groups that dis-proportionally use more parking spaces than an average home. Up to 6 or more cars for a 3 bedroom house. That should be regulated, but how to enforce it?
- I am concerned about loss of unpaved land if more parking spaces are approved for short-term rentals. Also, our streets are too crowded currently to have the public subsidize rentals by having the short-term renters competing with street parking with residents.
- If Arlington County regulates how a home is shared by the homeowner with family or other guests in a short or long term situation then there is precedence for allowing regulation in a short term rental situation.. We must align short term rental policies with how people use them in long term situations. The time of occupation does not alter the homeowners rights in a subletting or long term guest situation.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.
- the issue is around where the home is located (ie in the RB corridor or in the neighborhoods... very different issue than the options present.

# 5. PRIMARY RESIDENCY

## Require owner occupancy

- Owner-occupancy assures neighborhood stability with residential use as primary interest – when people live in the home, they are more invested in care of the property
- Owner should be on premises whenever a room is rented
- Include a minimum term of ownership prior to eligibility
- Most important piece of the regulation
- Owner occupancy prevents speculative buying for investment purposes
- When owner is present during the rental, the requirements should be lessened

## Do not limit to primary residences or require owner-occupancy

- Neither owner-occupancy, nor a primary residency requirement should be required
- There should be no requirement; many families have employment requirements that necessitate being away for long periods
- Owners should be able to rent their homes to anyone they choose
- Long-term renters should be eligible for accessory homestay

## Require less time for primary residency than identified in the options

- Consider less than 6 months; 4 months would be appropriate, especially given transitory nature and tendency for long-term work assignments for DC-area residents
- Defer to IRS and Virginia tax rules (6 months)
- Consider military and diplomatic families.

How many days/year should constitute primary residency? This could be as little as half the year (185 days) or up to 75 percent of the year (275 days).

6 months (185 days)	166
7 months	18
8 months	17
9 months (275 days)	135

## REQUIRE OWNER OCCUPANCY

- I do strongly believe that the home-share effort should only apply to owner-occupied homes. If one rents a house year-round it should be in the customary business format.
- Again, shorter periods will end up with enforcement difficulties of people who claim to live in a house when in reality the house is an investment and the owner never lives there. Make it 183 days to be consistent with: "A person who lives in Virginia, or maintains a place of abode here, for more than 183 days during the year, or who is a legal (domiciliary) resident of the Commonwealth is considered a Virginia resident for income tax purposes." Arlington is unique in many ways because of the high number of foreign service and military employed individuals who live in the area. These people frequently travel and should be allowed to rent out their places. A minimum cap would be wise at the beginning, with the potential to increase if abuse became common.
- this figure must be high to avoid abuse of homestay by owners, and there must be a way to have owners validate their occupancy days with penalties when violated.
- six months seems fair.

- Some residents have seasonal homes and only occupy each for half the year. So I believe that 6 months is an appropriate minimum.
- You should accommodate Seniors who might "snowbird" and spend half a year or so in their Arlington residence.
- This looks like an issue that unscrupulous owners would most easily take advantage of (i.e., how to disprove that an owner was not present 50% of the time?). for that reason, I suggest making the residency requirement as stringent as possible let to preclude misuse and to reinforce the intent.
- we should not allow anyone to have an accessory homestay in a primary residency...family member exception.
- Homestays should not impact the neighborhood every day of the year. Residents of single family neighborhoods and residents of multi-family structures should essentially not feel much impact from homestays. I think primary residency should be 330 days in order to reduce impact on neighbors.
- If the owner didn't have to occupy the building it would be too easy for those who already own rental homes to establish a short term rental in the rental home and thus create more chaos for the neighborhood and have no site management or responsible person.
- It seems ludicrous to me that an owner should be allowed to not be resident for the entire year and to not be present as a resident during any "accessory homestay" circumstance. This too has been a major source of friction. When "accessory homestay" patrons are present without any supervision by owners -- neighborhood problems are very likely.
- I'd prefer an even higher limit, if legal, something in the range of 90%.
- If the County goes so far as to allow accessory homestays, the owner should be on site at least 9 months of the year. At present, my next door neighbor rents out his/her vacant house on airbnb-- which should be illegal!!!!
- I guess this answers some of my previous concerns.
- My main concern with accessory homestays is how they affect the rental and housing markets for people who live in Arlington. Taking affordable units off the market by having them be full-time accessory homestays is problematic in an area where it's already difficult to find an apartment at a reasonable price, let alone buy a home. This restriction seems like the most sound solution to the concern I have.
- Not interested in absentee landlords - i would impose the 9 month's requirement on multi-family buildings
- This is vital to orderly and secure use.
- Owner should be in residence whenever a room is rented.
- Stabilize neighborhood with residents with a primary interests.
- I would use a combination of actual physical residence and rental. If the nuber of days or parts thereof exceeds the number of days it is occupied, it is a rental or secondary. Up to the owner to rove residence.
- owner/primary occupancy/residency should be required for more than two years before short term use of the residency would be allowed, if at all.
- This is the only regulation that I feel is actually necessary.
- The owner of the rental home next to my home lives in Georgia. She does not care about the impact her renters have on the community. If people LIVE in their homes then their standards and expectations will be higher .
- Owner should be required to live there permanently. Is Arlington trying to make us a beach town? Yuk
- Multiple unit investor-owners should be prohibited in order to preserve the rental housing available pool for county residents.

**DO NOT LIMIT TO PRIMARY RESIDENCES OR REQUIRE OWNER-OCCUPANCY**

- I do not feel that one should only be able to rent out a primary residence. I have rented vacation homes over many years from people who has second homes (including a couple around this area), which is very useful for visiting an area. It doesn't seem right to restrict second home owners to not being able to rent their homes.
- The number of days/year to constitute primary residence isn't defined in the zoning regulations for bed and breakfasts and shouldn't be defined for accessory homestays. I would argue further, that you should eventually allow accessory homestays in multi-family buildings where it is expressly allowed by the owners.
- Unanswered above, because your primary residency should not be defined by a number of days spent. What if you "live" in Arlington, but spend months abroad in military or federal service? It would keep you from meeting any arbitrary standards, and only punish those who serve.
- I don't think it's any of your business how a property-taxpaying owner rents out his or her property, whether it's as a direct landlord, through a management company, or via Airbnb. It's just a cash grab attempt by the County.

- So investors can't participate?
- I think I understand the rationale here (you are trying to avoid having people use accessory homestay in lieu of finding a longer-term renter?). however, I'm not sure why there is a primary residency requirement. there is no primary residency restriction on renting your residence to a long-term renter. I'm not sure why it would be the case here unless accessory homestay is considered much more disruptive than long-term renter.
- Consider someone, who for work or health reasons, needs to spend a lot of time away. Why penalize them? They have to support themselves in the other place, too.
- Day 1 of the signed lease.
- There should not be an occupancy requirement
- Accessory homestays ought to be allowed in any dwelling that the property owner wishes to rent. It shouldn't matter how many days they dwell in said property.
- I do not think there should be ANY minimum amount of days required, but since that is not an option here, I will choose the least amount (6 months).
- I think if people have extra space, and are interested in renting out a portion of their property with someone(s) who agree to the terms of a contract I see no reason to prevent them from doing so based upon the time the owner actively spend at the location.
- There is no need for a residency requirement at all
- This is a leading question. No option for the public to select "Not Primary Residence".There should be no limit. How is this even going to be enforced?
- Accessory homestays should NOT be limited to units that are a primary residence.
- I don't think that the owner should be forced to live in a dwelling.
- I do not think primary residency should be required. Individuals should be able to rent a home even if they are using it for a profit residence and do not live their.
- There should not be a limit. Many families have employment requirements that necessitate living away from home for long periods, even longer than 6 months. They should not be prevented from renting out their place.
- The county board shouldn't adopt any regulations regarding owner occupancy.
- This should not be a requirement. Do corporately owned homes used for business travelers of companies have occupation requirements? How about half way houses owned and operated in neighborhoods with county approval? Do county supervisors need to live with them?
- There should be no primary residency requirements.
- primary residency should not constitute or be a qualifier for the use of the property.
- PR should not be a qualifier for the use of the property
- I chose one because it wouldn't let me continue, but I don't agree with this part. I think this is ridiculous! You're basically preventing owners with multiple properties from using Airbnb, VRBO etc. Again, this shouldn't be up to Arlington County Board. I can rent my house to whoever I want to. This is a democracy, this is The United States of America.
- Wild west policy. Already have enough trouble with State Dept rentals. Can't wait for this boondoggle.
- The host living on site is an important re-strains on things getting out of hand.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT PRIMARY RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT**

- Any more than this would become a hardship for a senior who might be a snowbird and head south for the winter
- If you're spending half a year in a location, you're a resident - not a visitor!
- It would be grossly unfair for a home owner to inflict an influx of transient, non-residents on their neighbors.
- Don't
- Again, what is the problem we are trying to solve?! And are we regulating in the right way?! There are several empty homes in our neighborhood where the owner was trying to rent but has not been able to, there is plenty of parking in our neighborhood. The DC area attracts lots of tourists who wish to visit our national sites; people doing business; etc. it is NOT a party destination...Establish rules to prevent the "pushing out" of renters but I really think this policy is over-reaching.
- I don't necessarily disagree with the idea of having a minimum number of days to constitute primary residency, but I'd like to hear the argument as to why it's necessary.

- once again the potential for abuse is huge, properties need to be the primary residence of owner
- Owner occupants renting part of their homes should have the lowest regulatory requirements. The hurdles for this use should be very low because these are individuals who can directly monitor the visitor, who can deal with neighbor issues, and who pay lots of property taxes. Renter occupants, with landlord permission, would be next. Owner occupants with accessory dwellings would be next. Going up the scale for who gets regulated most would be absentee landlords, and then multifamily units.
- I believe that temporary residents may not have the same consideration for appropriate noise levels, sanitation & parking considerations that permanent residents have, based on my experience in a Florida condo that has recently allowed accessory stays. The temporary residents consider themselves "on vacation" and have shown a lack of respect for noise considerations late at night, and their screaming children run wild in the morning, so that permanent residents/owners are often disturbed.
- Primary residency should mean that a person occupies the dwelling for the majority of the year.
- Apartment rentals in neighborhoods should have the same requirements. Absentee landlords are problematic.
- Would not like to see speculative buying of property for short-term rental profit, arranging appearance of residency, but using property as cash cow. Long-term rentals are a mixed bag as it is, as landlords do not do much for their property.

#### **REQUIRE LESS TIME THAN IDENTIFIED IN THE OPTIONS**

- Make it as short a time as possible. Tourists spend more money.
- Actually, the limit should be much lower. An owner should only be able to rent their dwelling as an accessory homestay for 4 months, total, but not consecutive over the course of a year. Anything else should fall under landlord-tenant law, not a new accessory homestay regulation. I would say less than 6 months if that was an option.
- Requirement should be even less.
- Requirement should be even less.
- Given the transitory nature of many DC-area workers, I believe the county should consider an occupancy requirement as low as 4 months.
- Use the IRS definition. Saves any conversion issues.
- Stay consistent with IRS and State tax rules @ 50%
- this should align with Virginia's regulations for residence under state income tax laws
- Need to consider military and diplomatic families.
- Federal tax law finds 6 months enough, why would Arlington require more?
- The longer the period of time, the more likely the owner in residence will manage the bookings personally.
- I selected the minimum days to account for unanticipated, long-term work assignments.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.

#### **DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- N/A - whole idea stinks.
- If its residential, then there should be no short term rentals, unless previously zoned as such. E.g. a hotel.
- None, no short term rentals allowed.
- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- Do not allow accessory homestays. If you are going to allow them, you should require the homeowner to have their primary residency in the dwelling for the entire year (365 days). There should not be rentals without the owner present, there should not be vacant properties with owners gaming the system, meanwhile harming the neighborhood.
- Opposed to short term rentals
- The ONLY acceptable reason I can see for these arrangements are for in home care where the primary resident occupies the home all year and needs live-in assistance. The primary resident should occupy the home full time!

- This seems difficult to enforce. I do not support accessory homestays in dwelling units occupied by the owner.
- Again, I vote against accessory homestays....period.

#### **DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE**

- This should not be decided by the by the Council.
- Do not regulate this. Will drive up costs for all. Let the market decide.
- It should not be restrictive to just a person who lives in their home as a primary residence. A property owner is the owner regardless of whether they live in the home or rent it out.
- As above: WHY is the County Board wasting energy on this whole issue? Yes, it is important. And Richmond is already working on it. How is it in any way responsible governance to try rushing this through? How does it help anything to antagonize Richmond again? not just along partisan lines. C'mon, people.
- Why exactly is this the government's business? Consider the additional cost and time that it will take to abide by and enforce these rules.
- As a homeowner, I see no difference in my ability to rent my property on a years lease VS an accessory homestay rental. The contract between the tenant and the landlord is a private matter and rights and responsibilities are conveyed through a contract/lease. An accessory homestay client is contractually obligated to abide by the same rules as a long term tenant. All the rules and legal responsibilities apply equally and are equally enforceable.
- Owner Occupancy and Primary Residency requirements seem to be an unnecessarily restrictive limit predominately placed on apartment dwellers. The building owners already have these types of restrictions in their leasing contracts, so it doesn't seem like the County needs to be involved with this.
- Shouldn't exist. A renter should be able to sub let his or her unit per the terms of the applicable lease. No reason for county to have a say here .
- Allow maximum flexibility for the homeowner to come and go as they please.
- No need to regulate this matter
- Owners pay taxes! Stop restricting our options due to life circumstances!
- The county is wasting its time with this issue. It is not an issue that needs to be regulated, overseen, or legally managed. It is a private citizen issue, subject to existing laws with regard to dwellings, parking, and zoning.
- There should be a balance between respecting a property owner's right to do as he or she pleases within their home and protecting the rights neighbors.

#### **ENFORCEMENT COMMENTS**

- Despite what number is eventually used, verifying how many number of days an owner occupies the dwelling would seem very difficult to ascertain and/or enforce.
- How will the police or constabulary or SS find out what goes on in our homes? Neighbor complaints? Search warrants? binoculars. STAY AWAY.
- Again, how are you going to monitor and enforce the length that an owner stays in his house. Ownership and payment of taxes equates to residency.
- This will have to be checked somehow, perhaps through filings along with business tax reports. The County will also have to be willing to police short-term whole-unit rentals, especially of condos and townhouses purchased as investments.
- How will this be enforced? Will the county have a new Office of Verification Of Primary Residence? Building Code inspections and permits are important to ensure that the dwelling/sleeping room/bath are inspected for building code compliance and approved by the building inspector before a permit is approved. My neighbor is renting an uninspected basement sleeping room that was built-out without a permit on file with the county and does not comply with current State of Virginia Building codes.
- Arlington cannot and will not enforce this. So why ask the question? Arlington does not enforce current housing laws.
- how are you going to enforce this?

# 6. MULTIPLE-FAMILY BUILDING CAP – COMMENT SUMMARY

## Do not require a cap

- Condominium buildings have their own ability to limit/building tenants should be able to decide
- Artificially limits market in each building creating undue tension
- Would be impossible to enforce

## Require a cap

- Too many units with accessory homestay creates transient atmosphere, changes character
- Too high a cap may impact new purchaser financing and/or insurance costs
- Cap in order to maintain supply of apartments for full-time residents/prevent market costs from increasing
- Start with limited number, review the limit after a few years of experience

## Further limit – even lower than 25%

- Less than 5-25%
- Do not allow in multiple-family buildings; could create security concerns

## There are other ways to limit accessory homestay that would work better than a cap

- Number of nights a unit can be rented
- Amount of time the unit is occupied by the owner

What, if any, should the limit be on the number of units within any individual multiple-family building that can be approved for an accessory homestay?

No more than 25% of the units	151
No more than 50% of the unit	31
No more than 75% of the units	1
No limit	150

## NO CAP ON NUMBER OF UNITS IN INDIVIDUAL MULTIPLE-FAMILY BUILDINGS

- I think this should be left to the condo boards themselves to decide. If accessory homestay is causing a disruption to the residents of a building, then the condo boards should be able to institute their own regulations to handle it. The county government does not need to get involved.
- The less regulation the better. The whole point of these additions to the zoning regulation is to allow residents to rent using services like AirBnB legally, where they are doing it safely and with money flowing to the County coffers. Putting a limit of the number of units will just push any extra homeowners back to doing it illegally (like right now).
- The county should not regulate people's use of their property. A cap on the number of units that can be used for Airbnb would mean that people in a building who get on Airbnb first get an advantage over people who list their homes later. Enforcement would be a mess, too.

- Why? You're limiting your revenue opportunity by limiting the number of rentals. You want people to be here to take the place of primary residents when the primary residents are not here. Revenue!
- Flexible business structures need to be maintained to adapt to the ever changing environment, specially in a city as transient as DC.
- I really think of this more of a non-issue unless you're in a very small 4-5 unit building. The number of people spending enough time out of their condo AND want to deal with renting it to strangers is going to be a smaller percentage anyway. Only in a small 4-5 unit building would there be a possibility of a high percentage. I think if people have extra space, and are interested in renting out a portion of their property with someone(s) who agree to the terms of a contract I see no reason to prevent the 26th person in a 100 person dwelling from doing so (or any other fiat percentage of overall occupancy). People would be more inclined to falsely report their neighbors, and you'd end up with worse communal relations.
- Actually, homeowner or condominium owner associations of multiple dwelling units should: 1) have the right under state and county law to determine for themselves whether to allow accessory homestays, and 2) have the right under state and county law to set a limit on the number of units used for accessory homestay, including a "zero" limit. MDU homestays cause security, maintenance and liability issues that haven't been fully explored.
- I do not agree with this requirement/proposal
- Because so many homes are so different from one another, as can be their owners' situations, this restriction should be left to circumstances of the homeowner and the 'market'. The county should not regulate different types of homes differently- for the purposes of home-share.
- Let the condos and apartments set their own limits, if any
- So you have to fight your neighbors for the ability to gain a permit? That seems to me like it would exasperate tensions withing a building. And what more right does my neighbor have to be approved for accessory homestay than I do, just because they were able to run faster to the county government offices? Also, that would restrict the ability of new owners to use their property as new people will undoubtedly come in after the max % of units is reached. That doesn't seem quite fair to me.
- There should be no limit. This should be up to the discretion of the building owners.
- Apartment buildings can figure this out for themselves.
- Why limit? In theory, what's the downside to a multi-family unit being used solely for short-term rentals? People should have the right to rent their property out as they see fit.
- This should be determined by the building owner/management, not County.
- This also seems like a way to prevent units in Arlington from being used as full-time, short-term rental properties, though sees slightly more unfair to individuals looking to secure a permit for an accessory homestay. I think I would prefer restrictions on it being their primary residence.
- This should be decided by the property owner/apartment management.
- Multi family; eg condos - those decisions should be made by the condo boards. Apartment buildings the ownership group of the building should set the rules for their property
- Tenants of the building should decide this.
- No limit as long as each unit with an accessory homestay is also occupied by the house, and each unit with an accessory homestay has an additional parking spot for the guest.
- This cap could have potentially dangerous side effects. The first few people to receive a permit would have a potentially lucrative revenue source by capturing an artificially limited market. This is similar to taxi medallions, which result in anti-competitive monopoly behavior by the holders of those permits. Most large buildings already have leasing terms that limit or preclude short-term rentals, so the unit cap is not necessary.
- These limits are unfair because new owners may not be able to rent if the property's allocation is already at maximum. It disadvantages people and does not let them predict opportunities to use the homes they own.
- A multiple family building is not sufficiently described to say either way. If Townhouses, duplexes, semi-detached and two family dwellings are not considered then high rise apartments appear to be the only other units. In which case it should be up to the association to govern themselves.
- Many AirBnB hosts rent their homes only infrequently: to impose a limit in multiple-family units will create tension within those communities between permit holders and those who are unable to attain a permit due to the possession of others by their neighbors.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS ON CAPPING NUMBER OF UNITS IN MULTIPLE-FAMILY BUILDINGS (SEE ALSO NEXT CATEGORY)**

- must limit this or it will be abused.
- This restriction would help maintain a feeling of community within a building. Perhaps information about the current percentage of accessory homestays should be available to potential buyers.
- I believe individual condo assoc and/or homeowner assoc should be able to establish caps for their own properties. but if having a percentage in code would help them do so, then we should put it in.
- I agree with this policy. The multiple family units is where there have been problems in larger cities. I think there should be a distinct difference in how multiple family homestays are regulated. The policy should be less restrictive for single family dwellings.
- There should be a cap - too many strangers in and out of a multiple-family building creates an unsafe environment... already a dangerous thing in a community on the outskirts of DC. I'm concerned that terrorists would exploit these types of rentals.
- A vote of the homeowners association of the multi-family building should determine whether any homestays would be permitted at all. If yes, then no more than 25 per cent. Having been a homestayer myself in a multi-family building, I have some idea of the impact three of us had on the building.
- I believe that character of the unit could be changed to more transient, less neighborly, more "strangers in the hallway" if allowed to exceed 25%.
- Keep the Cap where it does not affect new purchasers in terms of financing or adversely affect individual insurance costs.
- I normally would not support a limit, but we also need to ensure a supply of apartments for full-time residents so as not to drive up rent and decrease full-time dwelling supply.
- Start with 25 percent, and review the limit after a few years of experience.

#### **DO NOT ALLOW IN MULTIPLE-FAMILY BUILDINGS, OR LIMIT TO LESS THAN 25%**

- Zero units within a multi-family dwelling should be permitted to allow short-term rentals.
- I believe multifamily dwellings present the most likely scenarios for misuse and abuse of short-term rentals. Therefore these should be subject to the most stringent restrictions. I'd suggest even lower than 25%.
- Not crazy about letting accessory homestays be set up in multi-family buildings. Could get out of hand very quickly with "tribes" living in way-too-close quarters.
- No more than 10%. Every commercialized home-stay is one less unit available for a family to rent. Commercialized home-stays will be hiding even less affordable in Arlington.
- 0%
- No more than 10% of the units is preferable
- There is no option above for 0% of the units within an individual multiple-family building, which would be my first choice.
- 0 would have been my choice
- No more than 0% - unless building converts to a hotel and is in a commercial district.
- I live in a multiple family dwelling now and do not want Air BNB people staying in my building.
- I prefer 0%, but if accessory homestay is approved this number should be as low as possible and no more than 25%.
- Only selected 25% because 0% was not an option
- None of the above. Zero is the the right answer.
- I'm totally against the idea so how about 0% of units??????
- Should be zero, it is already out of control.
- It is essential that there be strict limits on how many units can be used in this fashion. As indicated above, I do not support permitting these types of rentals in multi family buildings.
- Actually it should be less than 10%.
- no more than 5 % of the units
- I would have security concerns about many units being used as overnight rentals; hotels are required to keep some minimal tabs on customers.
- multiple-family units should not be permitted to use housing for short-term rental/stays.

#### **THERE ARE OTHER WAYS TO LIMIT THE USE THAT WOULD WORK BETTER THAN A CAP ON NUMBER OF UNITS**

- All units should be allowed to do it. Maybe cap the number of nights that each unit can be rented out. Like 45 nights per year or something.
- I'd limit this more through the amount of time the unit is occupied by the "owner" than the number of units. Again, I think we need to be careful about taking units that could be considered affordable out of general use
- No limit if (1) each unit has a single renter or owner who meets the residency requirement of 183/185 days and (2) that single renter or owner does not have other homestay licenses/properties in Virginia.

#### **DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- Again, I don't agree that any rental is a good thing, but you didn't give an option for that response. This law would significantly add workload to homeowner associations to police the rentals. It is not manageable in my opinion, and any requirements will be most likely ignored by those truly wanting to utilize this potential capability.
- Should not be allowed at all.
- no accessory homestays should be allowed
- I prefer this not be allowed at all.
- Do not allow accessory homestays. If you are going to allow them, there should be a limit far below 25%, maybe 5%. The higher the percentage allowed, the worse the health, welfare, and safety effects will be and the worse will be the negative effect on property values.
- Absolutely no short term rentals allowed
- None should be allowed.
- This shouldn't be allowed at all.
- I am against any amendment unless it severely restricts this practice in Arlington
- Residential units should not become hotels....
- Moving in this direction will lower the quality of life in Arlington County!!!
- I really want to avoid the situation where someone bought a house on our street, put in a bunch of mini-fridges in and turned each bedroom into short term rental on craig's list.
- I disagree with any use in Arlington.
- No ST rentals equals no problems with enforcing limits.
- Multiple family dwellings can accommodate the parking problems because they usually have parking lots. However, who vets whether these lodgers are safe for your children or older singles who want a safe place to live. Owners have invested in the property in the neighborhood and pay taxes. Short time renters do not contribute to the community.

#### **DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE**

- This should not be decided by the by the Council.
- If there were a limit, folks could just operate the business without using that address as business address
- Do not regulate this. Will drive up costs for all. Let the market decide.
- Air bnb is good for overall business...will draw more revenues into the County, thus more taxes, we need to encourage this, not dissuade or over-regulate.
- do not limit homeowners who wish to offer their properties on AirBnB.
- This should not be over regulated! If problems arise, deal with those that are there and real.
- No need to regulate this matter
- An owner of a property should be allowed to do as pleased.
- If you are worried about an apartment building being turned into a "hotel" of sorts, if the market deems that feasible, let it happen.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.

#### **ENFORCEMENT**

- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be

properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.

- Another slippery slope that would be a nightmare to monitor and enforce.
- How will this possibly be regulated?
- The rules governing rental apartments need to be very clear. Will leaseholders be considered "owners" and allowed to sublet part of their apartment (a bedroom or couch) for a short-term lodger? If not, who will police this? Will building owners be allowed short-term leasing of some units?
- how are you going to enforce this? what if one unit does it for 1/2 the year and another unit for 1/2 the year.
- I view this as a revolving door issue since this is first come, first serve. How long can a unit be authorized, for example? It seems to me that overseeing compliance would be a great and impossible burden for the county.

#### **MORE STUDY NEEDED**

- I believe that this needs more study.
- Please research the impact home stays are having in NYC on affordable housing. Short term rentals are changing the availability of affordable housing for low income residents.
- I am not necessarily against a multiple-family unit cap, but I would have to learn more about the timeline of the permitting process.

#### **OTHER**

- Any process to apply for such a permit should be minimal and not obstructive.
- None
- Any rental agency allowing these short term rentals should be required to tell potential tenants these terms before making new contracts.
- The real reason people want to curtail the private use of private homes is that they fear garbage, too many cars, noise and crime. These are SECONDARY problems and can be regulated (and are regulated) apart from the behavior that is not problematic at all -- that is: having extra residents in a private home.
- Not at all
- My concern would be a single business owning many units in a private building. Suddenly, this is a commercial building. Bad for owners of other units.
- No property owner that receives federal, county, or state subsidy should be allowed to participate in the program.
- I believe there should sensitivity to short-term accessory homestays in lieu of providing long-term and affordable rental opportunities for the masses. I recently stayed in a airbnb in Seattle, in a multi-tenant building owned by Equity. The airbnb rental, while fine for my weekend use, was a two bedroom apartment, located one floor above the busy regional bus stop. This unit would not be suitable for a long term tenant and solved the rental problem for the landlord and for ME!
- Any multiple family unit should have the consent of all the owners - including the building.

# 7. NUMBER OF LODGERS – COMMENT SUMMARY

## Considerations relevant to limit on number of lodgers

- No more than size of average family should be allowed
- Follow Arlington code for maximum occupancy
- Children should not be counted
- Regulations for accessory homestays should not allow party houses; they are a detriment to our neighborhoods
- Proposed number seems appropriate

## An appropriate maximum depends on several factors

- Dwelling Size
- Unit and building types
- Fire Code requirements

## No limit should be set

- Owners should be allowed to decide what is in their best interest
- There is too much variation in unit size and type to set a maximum appropriate for all dwellings

## How many lodgers should be allowed?

### CONCERN WITH PARTY HOUSES

- Keep this small enough that it is truly for families, and not a group of partiers
- Party houses are a disaster in residential areas.
- this is a very dangerous issue, look at the parties that guy on the Potomac used his house for! Hundreds of party goes in a multi million dollar house. Homestays promote people hosting parties and are very bad!
- Larger families need an option, but party pads should not be tolerated.

### FLEXIBILITY FOR CHILDREN

- Larger groups are families on vacation (our family of 4 + my sister's family of 4 + our father rented a house in Mpls.), and children should not be included in the cap. A family group that includes kids is likely to be less disruptive to neighbors than a equal sized group of college students. Also, logistically family groups often need fewer bedrooms, because kids share rooms and sleep on the floor or in cots and infants sleep in the same room as their parents.
- 2 people per bedroom is fair, except that infants and preschoolers should be exempt from this count.
- allow children/babies if sleep in crib/sleeping bag on floor
- There should be some flexibility for a couple traveling with a child who might use a sleeping bag or an infant who would stay in the same room with them.
- One of the groups of individuals who benefits most from short term rentals are families with small children-- such restrictions may reduce their ability to find suitable accommodations in Arlington. Additionally, the County cannot presume to know the qualities of all individual residences, inevitably making the application of this restriction absurd in some circumstances and weakening the legislation as a whole.
- Two per bedroom plus children is reasonable. I do not think County resources should be spent on policing this policy, though.
- The number allowed should allow for families who are tourists in the area. But it should also allow the homeowner the freedom of making the decision.
- An additional person per bedroom should be allowed if it is a dependent child.
- An additional person per bedroom should be allowed if it is a dependent child.

- I think this may be unfair to large families with small children- so I would cap it at 4 adults, but no limits on children.
- No limit - what if a family is coming to visit the area for a week and wants to rent a residence, and the family includes 2 parents, 3 kids, and 2 grandparents? Not such a stretch, but they wouldn't be allowed with a 6 person cap. Or a set of married siblings (I did this in FL with my sister a few months ago) - 4 adults and 4 kids.
- Larger families need an option, but party pads should not be tolerated.
- Some flexibility for minors accompanied by adults, particularly under the age of 13, should be considered.
- Under 8 year old would not count as a lodger
- Den/Living Room as Bedroom
- Pull out couches in living rooms should count too
- limited to bedrooms and not to include convert offices, studies, family or sewing rooms
- This doesn't take into account that when people rent a whole house pull out coaches, etc. are also available r sleeping quarters.
- Homes with few bedrooms but a lot of common space should be able to house two people in the living room.
- I question whether lodgers should be permitted in areas that don't qualify as bedrooms. Basements in older houses that lack adequate ceiling height and/or properly sized windows come to mind. Under current County code, what qualifies a space in a detached home for use as a bedroom?

#### **LIMIT BASED ON REGULATIONS FOR DEFINING FAMILY**

- No more than the size of the average family: 4
- I believe most people renting their home would not want more than an average family staying in their home
- A limit to the total number of lodgers, which is already in place, makes sense because it creates a distinction between a hotel, which requires greater oversight, and a private home. Keep the rule as it is.
- We should follow the same code Arlington County uses for resident occupancy.

#### **DEPENDS ON THE DWELLING SIZE, TYPE, BUILDING OR FIRE CODE LIMITS OR OTHER FACTORS**

- Require owner to request/county approves occupancy count and stay duration
- Would it be possible for an applicant to appeal for a larger number based on the size of the living space? As long as the space is safe for the number of people, maximum should be allowed.
- There are many large homes in Arlington that can easily accomodate more than 6 people. 2 per bedroom is a problem for studios because they are 0 bedroom. What about a couple with an infant who want to stay in a one bedroom? These hypothetical situations make establishing a maximum number of lodgers problematic.
- Although the maximum number should be 6, the actual number approved should be dwelling-dependent and shall comply with the VUSBC legal occupancy allowances. The VUSBC establishes the square footage of space required per number of persons per sleeping room and provides that the rooms used for sleeping do not include living/dining rooms, non-habitable spaces and other interior public areas.
- This is not a question that can be answered with a single number. If you are renting out one ROOM, obviously 6 people cannot fit. If you are renting out an entire house, 6 people would be no problem.
- The number should depend on the square footage available. Two people per a typical bedroom size.
- No limit with exception of fire code.
- The two per bedroom with a limit of six is acceptable for a single family dwelling. But, multi-family units generally being smaller and there being greater impacts by the homestayers, four is the maximum in my view.
- This might be decided based on sq footage
- Two people per bedroom is not acceptable, especially considering that up to five people could stay in a regular hotel room with two double beds and a roll-out cot. Maximum capacity should be based on unit size.
- This is related to % of dwelling used for rental. Lower numbers better.
- limiting by bedrooms assumes all accessory dwellings are the same size and configuration. There may be adequate space in and outside of the home for one large room with 2 beds and a couch in which 5 could easily sleep in it. However, again if Arlington regulates how private owners live in their own property then there is precedence for regulation.
- It is impossible to set a specific number for maximum lodgers, because it depends on the size of the dwelling. For instance, a homeowner in a 15,000 sq ft house might decide that his rooms are large enough for 4 people.

An apartment dweller in a studio may limit the offering to 2. The homeowners should make this choice on their own, as long as they do not violate existing Arlington County and Commonwealth of Virginia fire codes.

#### **NO LIMIT ON NUMBER OF LODGERS**

- The County should not regulate the number of lodgers; there is too much variation between homes (and lodgers) to say that any particular number is "too many."
- No owner wants their property to be damaged and most homestay owners recognize how much hot water they can offer; so most with a 1 bedroom would not claim 10 people can stay there. However, saying 2 people for the # of bedrooms is over-reaching. What if a family of 4 wants to visit Arlington and it is 2 adults, a baby and a toddler? What if it is a 1bedroom apartment with a pullout sofa? Why can't 4 stay there?!
- At the homeowners discretion it must be that the dwelling be large enough to host two people and if a family has a newborn or child then the choice would be the homeowners. Do not be prejudice against families!
- The number of lodgers hosted should be at the discretion of the host and the company they're going through (e.g., AirBnB).
- So long as there are no noise or other disturbances, I don't feel that the county has a legitimate interest in regulating the number of people who are staying in a home.
- It's really none of the City Board's business who stays with whom or how many people stay with someone.
- There should be no limit. The county has no way of knowing how many people can fit comfortably in a home.
- I am not as sure what the concern is with the number of lodgers.
- I don't think there should be a limit.
- Concerns about having "too many" people at a location, or potential "loud parties" taking place as a result of large groups renting can and should be addressed by previously established rules on noise complaints. Just because something negative COULD happen, doesn't mean we should deny a mutually beneficial exchange from occurring.
- No
- How can the county government find out how man lodgers are in a home? This is so far beyond intrusive I don't know what to say. I remember the case when the Christian commune had to apply for dorm status over on 24th Street. No one should care. The superficial reason people were bothered was that one of the residents was breaking and entering to steal drugs. These neighbors wanted to make everything illegal instead of just addressing the single problem.
- I don't think there should be a cap on how many people
- there should not be a limit, as all potential units will vary in size and layout
- no limit
- Too restrictive!

#### **ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS ON SPECIFIC NUMBERS**

- Agree with the proposed cap.
- It should depend on the number of bedrooms. I think an occupancy limit of 2 people per bedroom is reasonable.
- Limiting to a reasonable number as proposed above is fair.
- 6 just seems like a large number for anything besides a single family home.
- No more than 2 per bedroom plus 1 (for sleep sofa) Eg. 2 bedroom = 5 people max
- Six should be a maximum as consistent with the concept of "homestay". But it should be less as determined by the mix of adults and children, the size of the bedrooms, and the number and size of the bathrooms.
- 2 people per # of bedrooms seems reasonable generally, however you have to also account for families traveling with young children who might want to rent a 1BR apartment and the baby will be sleeping in a portable crib in the same bedroom with the parents.
- 2.5 per bedroom works too
- The stated rule sounds pretty reasonable: "up to the larger of 6 people per night, or 2 people per number of bedrooms in the dwelling per night."
- 2 people per bedroom per night plus 2 Because many people don't mind sleeping on couches and many Airbnb rentals also have air mattresses. If short term-renters and primary residents are ok with that, I don't see why

the city should concern itself. It's more people and more revenue. Also, basing number of people allowed in a rental is better determine by square footage. If fire hazards and liveable space is the issue, what if you have a 4000sf house with 1 BR? Missed opportunity.

- Consider any number up to the SMALLER of 4 adults or children and 2 additional children, or 4 adults or children per bedroom.
- If this truly an accessory home stay then it should be limited to 2 people.
- 2 per bedroom would allow 10 or 12 people to stay in a McMansion. That might be 5 or 6 couples with 5 or 6 cars. That would have a major impact on the neighborhood. Noise, parking, traffic
- 2 per bedroom.
- I think 2 people per room is reasonable, assuming two twin beds or one full/queen/king bed.
- 4 max
- 4 adults max + children under 12
- 6 seems a good number considering people have children, etc.

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

- I am pretty sure this is already generally ignored in South Arlington, I would check into the apartments near Ballston, and along Columbia Pike.
- must have a way to measure and enforce the provision. owners have a profit motive and will maximize renters, so there must be a way to enforce this with consequences if violated.
- living space such as living rooms should be part of room count due to pull out sofas.
- Again, homeowner associations and condominium associations should be left to determine this within their memberships, without interference from the County.
- The proposal seems reasonable, however I would think you would want it to be limited to one party and not permit individual bedrooms to be "sold" separately. There's a big difference between a family staying in a house for a week and a room-by-room night-by-night boarding house or bed-and-breakfast approach.
- What is the current county limit on number of individuals who may reside in a home or primary residence? This is something that should be left up to the home owner, NOT the county.
- Our next door neighbor has 8 unrelated people living in their home, each has their own car and they are abusing the street parking and kindness of their neighbors.... the parking situation is abused and puts kids who ride bikes in our neighborhood in harm's way
- Our next door neighbor has 8 unrelated people living in their home, each has their own car and they are abusing the street parking and kindness of their neighbors.... the parking situation is abused and puts kids who ride bikes in our neighborhood in harm's way
- once again the potential for abuse is huge in residential areas. Need to keep this in the spirit of the concept, eg, extra bedroom, den not a wk long rental for a large group. It will be the immediate neighbors(hood) that will be impacted and enforcement promises to be tough.
- Lodging is determined by the number of bedrooms and beds. each type of property is different
- Family and friends only. The country should put in affordable hotels in commercial areas and collect the taxes rather than destroying neighborhoods.
- Also ridiculous.
- Do allow three people to stay in one room with enough beds. I have travelled using Air Bnb with my children and look for this.
- The home occupation shall have no more effect on adjacent property than normal residential use and the use will be subordinate to the principal use of the premises for dwelling purposes, There shall be no audible noise, detectable vibration or odor beyond the confines of the subject dwelling or accessory building, including transmittal through vertical or horizontal party walls
- Does lodgers = guests, or would lodgers be allowed to bring in friends for a party?
- I think enforcement is impossible and a nightmare for the county. How can the county possibly know that "only 2 per BR" is being complied with. This then puts the burden on neighbors to constantly report for example, "that a dozen people checked into the four bedroom home next door." That is a burden on the neighborhood and a detriment.

- Trusting that business liability insurance will be required and the rates set by how many people. Also that evidence of liability insurance coverage be required as part of the application, including evidence of annual insurance renewal. Owner of a multi-family building should be able to set a lower cap or deny additional lodgers.
- Owners of b&b rentals are usually not in residence to supervise these lodgers. Why should they receive cash while the neighbors are left to deal with the problems of unacceptable renters?
- Please consider some limit per number of bedrooms to avoid overcapacity or disruptive crowding with wall to wall inflatable mattresses. I realize this would be difficult to enforce.
- I would limit the number of vehicles to the parking availability. If the six people are one family with one car, then they can sleep as many as they like in one bedroom.
- I have travelled to many communities where rentals, airbnbs, B&Bs and long term residents co-exist harmoniously. Landlords have to abide by current zoning rules/restrictions, tenants must abide by lease requirements and local laws. We live in a robust, active, urban community that has so much to offer the visitor and traveler. We should welcome folks that want a granular, local experience in our community and we should be proud of what we have to offer. Restaurants/Shopping and a safe area.

### **DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- What if there were 6 to 8 or more different strangers staying at the house next door to you most weekends of the year? How does that add to the neighborliness of one's neighborhood? There's a (good) reason that a motel can't be built in a residential neighborhood. We should stick to that underlying concept.
- We have lots of hotels 2 blocks away.
- This is a bad idea.
- Don't
- No short term rentals allowed in Arlington
- None should be allowed.
- I am against "accessory homestay," in any form, but if it is allowed, it should be limited to no more than two (2) persons per night per "legitimate" bedroom. A legitimate bedroom would not include cots and air mattresses on the floors of living rooms, basements, and other non-sleeping areas.
- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- Do not allow accessory homestays. If you are going to allow them, you should limit them to 4 maximum, like the number of unrelated people who can rent a home, with a maximum of two persons per bedroom rented.
- From my experience with an Airbnb operating in my association in the summer of 2015, there were as many as 5 people staying in a one bedroom unit! Totally unacceptable. A residential neighborhood should be for owner occupied or leased units (with a minimum of 6 months lease) only. There should be no temporary/ hotel/ hostel, Airbnb units in any residential neighborhood.
- Opposed
- No
- I am against any amendment unless it severely restricts this practice in Arlington
- I prefer 0 but if accessory homestay is approved this number should be as low as possible and no more than 2 per dwelling per night.
- No, as none should be the number
- Accessory homestay should not be permitted.
- Again, I disagree with the premise.
- So if for example the home next time was rented out with its four bedrooms I could have 8 complete strangers on a rotating basis living next door to my family. I moved to a neighborhood and NOT a hotel for a reason. This whole idea is potentially horrible considering the proximity of properties and dwellings in Arlington County.
- Do not support any overnight rentals in residential neighborhoods regardless of the number of bedrooms. This means a typical Arlington house with 3 beds and two baths could have 6 unrelated people per night stay in a house or even more if there are more bedrooms. I do not support this at all in residential neighborhoods

especially with the limited parking in much of Arlington. Also if I was looking into buying a house and found out that it was next to a homestay I would not buy it.

- Dont we already have zoning restrictions on unrelated people in single-family homes? This regulation, if it were truly enforced, would immediately be weakened by this boarding house measure.
- NONE!!!
- Since I do not believe that Arlington County should permit any short term rentals, hence my answer.

#### **DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE**

- There's no need for new lodging restrictions
- This should not be decided by the by the Council.
- This sounds like one of those border state, anti-immigrant ideas.
- That should not be decided by the County.
- People will not rent if the number of people make it uncomfortable. Again, let the market and the services ratings decide.
- Arlington government has no business determining how many people can sleep in a room or home. As a current renter and prospective property owner in Arlington, the invasion of privacy and property this question represents is extremely concerning.
- Existing laws govern this....really unenforceable anyway...County needs to get out of the hotel regulation business  
Airbnb regulates this requirement internally by using a "best practices" method.
- limit based on current zoning and occupancy rules
- Current Zoning and Occupancy Rules
- the number of lodgers should be the same as the maximum occupancy for the home listed for rental.
- The county board should not regulate the maximum number of lodgers.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.

## 8. ACCESSORY DWELLINGS – COMMENT SUMMARY

### Do not allow in accessory dwellings

- Reasonable for a family member, but should not be for unrelated guests [this is not a requirement for accessory dwellings but is for family/caregiver suites]
- Accessory dwellings are to facilitate aging-in place or affordable housing, and using for accessory homestay is counter to those goals

### Allow in accessory dwellings

- Accessory dwellings are already regulated, so most appropriate for accessory homestay
- Offers more flexibility than standard lease, so seems appropriate
- If owner is on the premises, either unit would be appropriate for accessory homestay
- Limit occupancy to 2 or fewer
- Allow in either the main dwelling, or accessory dwelling, but not both

### Should an accessory homestay be allowed in accessory dwellings?

Yes, in the main dwelling	12
Yes, in the accessory dwelling	20
Yes, both of the above	237
No	90

### DO NOT ALLOW IN ACCESSORY DWELLINGS

- Hosting lodgers in an accessory dwelling makes the situation much to close to a hotel/motel.
- Makes it too easy to circumvent the intent.
- The purpose of providing an accessory dwelling is to facilitate aging in place or affordable housing. If used for short term rentals they would accomplish neither of those goals.
- Arlington should prohibit accessory dwellings from being used for homestay revenue
- Accessory dwellings should not be permitted to be used as an accessory homestay.
- There county board should not apt any regulations regarding sccessory home stays in accessory dwelling units.
- Unless a family member it should not be allowed.
- Ok for grandparents but not as mini hotels....

### ALLOW IN ACCESSORY DWELLINGS

- Provided there are restrictions so that affordable units don't turn into permanent short-term rentals, accessory homestays in the main and accessory dwellings seems reasonable.
- A bedroom is a bedroom. As above, the maximum capacity of 2 people per bedroom would apply.
- I think if people have extra space, and are interested in renting out a portion of their property with someone(s) who agree to the terms of a contract I see no reason to prevent that based on these specifications.
- I don't even understand why anyone would care if they are staying in a carriage house or the main house. This is the oddest proposed regualtion
- Accessory dwellings are a great way to allow AirBnB but not impact rental market prices. Since rental of detached accessory dwellings is not allowed, AirBnB can fill that space.
- Accessory dwellings are perhaps the most appropriate of all for accessory home stays because they are already tightly regulated for code compliance, parking, etc.
- Allow max flexibility

- Assuming the accessory dwelling meets the requirements under zoning for the owner to occupy it themselves...
- This isn't one I feel strongly on, but seems useful for owners up to managing it, since it offers more flexibility than a regular lease.
- Owner must be on site a resident, then they could rent either unit.
- Might be a great way to get people to build them now, use them for STRR now, and use for accessory dwelling later.
- Absolutely accessory dwellings should be rentable on a short-term basis. Why wouldn't they be?
- Seems like a great use of accessory dwelling units!
- This whole topic needs to be revisited. The rules governing ADs are so restrictive that very few legal ones have been developed, while unapproved and informal second units have proliferated. Pending that full review and conversation, it would make sense to allow accessory homestays in accessory dwellings as long as occupancy limits ( $\leq 2$ ) and off-street parking are enforced.
- No garages or non-attached buildings would be allowed.

#### **ALLOW IN EITHER THE MAIN OR ACCESSORY DWELLING BUT NOT BOTH (UNLESS ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS ARE APPLIED)**

- In either the main dwelling or the accessory dwelling, but not both
- IF both are being used simultaneously, I believe that the owner needs to also be on site. I presume that in that case not all bedrooms would be rented. Owner could move to AD or rent all but one bedroom in main dwelling.
- Home stays should be allowed only in the dwelling in which the owners/renters establish their residency requirements of over half a year.
- The homeowner would have to choose whether to use the main dwelling for homestays or the accessory building. Neighborhood impact would be too great with both structures being used for homestays.

#### **UNCATEGORIZED AND GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT ACCESSORY DWELLINGS**

- An accessory dwelling should be considered no different than a guest bedroom and should have the same limits applied to it, so that it is not always rented out.
- it's very expensive to live in Arlington. Tons of people are already doing this. County board needs to catch up with reality.
- In my experience, most homes in Arlington do not have enough space for accessory dwellings and most that exist do not follow code. Please check this for yourselves.
- The whole ADU thing was jammed down our throats. The decision to allow ADUs had been made prior to the charade of public hearings. Our quick newsletter questionnaire found 1 person out of 111 in favor in Arlington Ridge. Another case of County Board's misuse of their puppet "citizen" Commissions.
- I am a lawyer and I still have no idea what this question means.
- Neighbors will be encouraged to complain? OH NO. Corrosive and very bad.
- Arlington does not always have to follow trends.
- Opposed
- Please provide the specifics of how they will benefit Arlington, the downsides to residents and how the additional taxes collected will pay for the additional work Arlington has done and will be doing.
- Again, limits on # people, # vehicles needed. Also there should be a maximum # nights allowed.
- Limit number of lodgers.
- accessory dwelling units have a lot size requirement – lot area must meet minimum requirements of the zoning district. No short-term accessory homestay should be allowed on non-conforming lots. The home occupation shall have no more effect on adjacent property than normal residential use and the use will be subordinate to the principal use of the premises for dwelling purposes. Short-rental spaces be limited to interior only no unattached spaces
- prohibiting accessory dwellings to be used as an accessory home stay would apply to non-revenue generating occupancy? What about in long term rental situations? Have other municipalities attempted such a regulation and how was successful was it? Seems rather broad with no clear goal and may have worse unintended consequences.
- Again, how would the county oversee enforcement?
- It is a good use. It may benefit Senior property owners and widows/widowers to afford to continue aging in place.
- This proposal is a mistake. I would not object to a related person living in a family or caregiver suite.

- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.

#### **DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE**

- This should not be decided by the by the Council.
- Do not restrict people's reasonable use of their property! You would be destroying home value by reducing the usefulness of accessory dwellings.
- We will soon be dealing with baby boomers requiring additional income and limitations on their personal property will significantly reduce their freedoms.
- Arlington has become an increasingly expensive place to live. Telling residence they are not allowed to use a service like Airbnb will hurt this county's reputation and make it a less desirable place to buy a home.
- Do not regulate this. Will drive up costs for all. Let the market decide.
- I do not believe that these restrictions are necessary. They seem arbitrary and like they are trying to conform the short-term rental with the existing accessory dwelling regulations. My understanding is that the accessory dwelling regulations have not produced a lot of units. I imaging that the regs are too burdensome. In the meantime, Arlington has lots of unregulated/hidden rental units. The last thing the County should do is have regulations that are so burdensome that no one signs up!
- do not micromanage this
- Again, just circumvents the rationale for allowing these separate buildings in the first place. Also, will chickens be allowed, as well?
- No need to regulate this matter

#### **DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- Do not allow accessory homestays. If you are going to allow them, do not allow them in accessory dwellings; this would have all the previously mentioned ill effects, but would also encourage some homeowners to build large accessory dwellings thereby creating more lot coverage and more impermeable surfaces - both of which should be discouraged.
- I prefer no accessory homestay but if accessory homestay is approved it should only be approved for an accessory dwelling. Residences with no accessory dwellings should have no accessory homestays.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT ACCESSORY DWELLINGS**

- You should not be limiting the number of accessory dwellings. People simply build kitchens illegally after construction is complete, and I know of no one who uses them for Airbnb. They use them for in-laws and au pairs.
- I think accessory dwellings are a valid and relevant housing type that will allow more Arlingtonians to age in place, allow more Arlingtonians to afford the rising cost of living, and can allow "sandwich generation" families to care for aging parents.

## 9. FAMILY/CAREGIVER SUITES – COMMENT SUMMARY

### Allow in family/caregiver suites

- A space well-suited for accessory homestay – connected to main dwelling, but private
- Allow to be used when caregiver is not there

### Do not allow in family/caregiver suites

- Family/caregiver suites have a specific purpose and should only be allowed to be used as such; should be converted to meet all dwelling requirements before use for another purpose
- This provision should be revised to address other needs the family/caregiver suite serves, but provision should not be amended to fit this purpose.

Should the family/caregiver suite regulations be revised to allow use of a family/caregiver suite for an accessory homestay?

Yes	233
No	119

### ALLOW IN FAMILY/CAREGIVER SUITES

- Having it sit empty is silly. Why not use it? It's probably the ideal setup for accessory homestays.
- As family situations change, a caregiver may or may not live in at some point in the life of the house. Thus, these bedrooms -when available -should be allowed to be used for home share.
- The family/caregiver may take vacation. People need to be able to fully utilize their space. I think if people have extra space, and are interested in renting out a portion of their property with someone(s) who agree to the terms of a contract I see no reason to prevent that based on these specifications.
- Why not? Aren't they best equipped for this purpose? I don't understand how this restriction makes any sense.
- Do not restrict people's reasonable use of their property! You would be destroying home value by reducing the usefulness of family/caregiver suites.
- Really, "Yes", subject to conditions that only the main part of the house or the caregiver suite shall be designated for homestay in the license application.
- very appropriate use of that type space
- Next to accessory dwellings, these are the most appropriate for short term rentals.
- The family/caregiver suite is probably the best suited space for a homestay. It is connected to the main dwelling and more easily monitored but private enough that the owner occupant is not living with strangers.
- Sure don't care!
- Arlington's limits on in house apartments for seniors or children are SO strict that I support any relaxing of them. They made it so hard and expensive for us to buy a house we could share with my mother in law, and seem to require that her space be smaller and less nice than we would prefer.
- Absolutely family/caregiver suites should be rentable on a short-term basis. Why wouldn't they be?
- Yes, if it is used when a caregiver is not there for some reason.
- Only if person needing care is NOT LOCATED in the residence at the time.
- Seems like a great reuse of this type of suite if it is not in use by a caregiver - better than letting it sit empty.
- This restriction seems arbitrary.

### DO NOT ALLOW IN FAMILY/CAREGIVER SUITES

- That is not the purpose of these suites. Purchase of such units of people interested in using them for short term rentals should be discouraged.
- Keep the purpose limited to the caregiver status, otherwise people will use it as a loophole.
- I suspect if allowed many suites will be built under false pretenses.

- Caregiver or family suites should be limited to their intended purpose. Allowing otherwise invites misuse.
- Mixing apples and oranges...providing a loophole.
- I am not very familiar with family/caregiver suites in Arlington, but it would seem from the definitions provided here, that allowing the caregiver unit to be used as an accessory homestay is contrary to it's purpose, and not allowed by definitions already defined by the county.
- The suite should be reclassified before it can be used
- Suite intended for one purpose. Risky to open that up to overnight stays by lodgers. Many owners would not do a good job staying on top of conditions.
- family/caregiver suites should not be used as an accessory homestay
- I would say yes only if the family / caregiver suite has a complete separate entry from the household to avoid having rooms inside of a house rented out.
- These should be for family/ caregivers only.
- this is a very specific covenant that serves a much-needed purpose. It should not be converted to a for-profit use without surrender of the covenanted use.
- Too many big houses in the area have ability to build in these units and then change the character of the neighborhood. Big houses are bad enough.
- This would put owners who benefitted from the caregiver provision an unfair advantage in diverting a kitchenette unit for short term rental which would be tempting to owners to abuse, and enforcement against such misuse would be problematic.
- I would not object to related person living in a family caregiver suite in single family home.
- This whole provision should be revisited and relaxed to allow such suites in general. Twisting the current definition to permit short-term rentals would delay that discussion.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT FAMILY/CAREGIVER SUITES**

- Caregiver suites were the only thing people showed the slightest favor for in our ADU survey years back.
- What are these regulations currently? I know people with 24 hour a day nursing care. Are they violating a current law? It is outrageous that the government wants to intrude on these things.
- I think this is an important issue with an aging population and it could encourage families to assist each other. I am fully supportive of this because it may allow an aging parent to stay in a child's house instead of in an assisted living facility.
- Family/caregiver suites are a great idea and would help with the myriad of child care issues facing parents.
- By limiting a family/caregiver suite to 2 occupants, we fail to recognize each family's individual situation (which might include close ties with a non-relative).

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT ACCESSORY HOMESTAY OR UNCATEGORIZED**

- Why are we permitting 6 persons to occupy a dwelling under an accessory homestay while the Zoning Ordinance only permits 4 unrelated persons?
- I stayed in one of these suites in Arlington for a couple of months after I graduated from college. Otherwise, I could not have afforded a place in this county and I wouldn't have lived here and bought a home.
- Please provide the specifics of how they will benefit Arlington, the downsides to residents and how the additional taxes collected will pay for the additional work Arlington has done and will be doing.
- lot requirements – lot area must meet minimum requirements of the zoning district. No short-term accessory homestay should be allowed on non-conforming lots. The home occupation shall have no more effect on adjacent property than normal residential use and the use will be subordinate to the principal use of the premises for dwelling purposes.
- This could be on a case by case basis. Considering the caregiver unit is no longer used for this purposes or the person has gone on vacation and need extra income.
- Our family has already needed to provide long-term care to our parents who faced infirmity but creating a family/caregiver suite was not accessible enough for us to make it happen in time to help our loved ones. My husband and I both had to choose between spending time in Arlington with our school-age children and tending to our parents with terminal illness in other cities. Similarly, we struggle with affordable childcare and one viable option an au pair, is difficult to implement.

- See early remark. Shell game, rope a dope move.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.
- Options to keep us in Arlington!
- Household needs change.
- I say yes, but this should benefit only the wealthier homeowners who currently have these type of units. And if they do, short-term rentals are probably already taking place.

**DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE**

- Once again what is wrong with you? As a democrats I am starting to think I should become a republican. This is a example of regulations out of control.
- Also none of the County's business.
- This should not be decided by the by the Council.
- Do not regulate this. Will drive up costs for all. Let the market decide.
- Do not over-regulate.
- Again, imposing this restriction will inevitably lead to circumstances in which its application is absurd, weakening respect for the legislation as a whole.
- as part of the property it is subject to current zoning rules and no regulation should be put to prohibit it from being used for short term rentals as well
- do not micromanage
- No need to regulate this matter

**DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- Do not allow accessory homestays. If you are going to allow them, do not allow them to be placed in space that had received permission for a different use.
- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- Should not be allowed at all.

# 10. FOOD SERVICE – COMMENT SUMMARY

## Food service should not be regulated

- Food service should not be addressed
- Difficulty of enforcement
- Community building opportunity

## Food service should not be allowed

- Food service changes the use to a boarding house, B&B, or hotel
- Food service subject to additional regulation

## Other suggestions

- Allow if host is eating with the guests
- Allow coffee and packaged snacks
- Allow food service if all other regulations and requirements for food service are met
- Allow guest use of kitchen

## Should an accessory homestay host be allowed to prepare and/or serve food to lodgers?

No	120
Only packaged snacks should be allowed to be provided (e.g. pretzels, candy, water, etc.)	38
Only breakfast should be allowed to be served	52
All meals should be allowed to be served	143

## DO NOT REGULATE WHETHER FOOD IS ALLOWED

- A resident should be allowed to have people stay in her home and feed them anything she wants to at any time of day. Ordinances for signs, is one thing. Telling people when they can and cannot feed a guest in their home is another. I understand the concern to not create a bed and breakfast through this new allowance, but it strikes me as inhospitable should an owner be onsite and wish to provide a meal. If they are not charging rate for this, does it need to be prohibited?
- I don't really have a problem with someone serving meals.
- I personally would look to get my own food if I was renting through these services, but I see no reason to restrict this from occurring. A random food illness could occur, but I expect that would be minimal and not a justification for absolute restriction.
- This should not be decided by the by the Council.
- should be up to the host.
- This should be determined by the host.
- So this proposed regulation would prevent visitors from being introduced to Arlington and learn about the way of life here generally, and their hosts specifically. Sharing food is a great way of sharing experience. At this point, you are legislating away kindness and hospitality. We should be proud of our city and hope to share its ideals with all visitors, rather than shun them.
- Also none of the County's business.
- Stop looking for things to regulate. Grown-ups can make their own decisions about where they stay and what they eat.

- The Zoning Ordinance is absurd. People in their own homes should be allowed to serve whatever food they want, to whomever they want. There is no impact on the neighbors if someone is serving meals to their guests, and lodgers realize that they are not being served by a state-inspected commercial kitchen.
- It would be at the guests' discretion if they wanted to eat the meals. No one is forcing them.
- Really if I opened up my home to a family traveling here from a foreign country and I wanted to serve them a dinner and have a welcoming conversation, your telling me you want to make this illegal? Really?no
- Zoning board should not be deciding who the residence Arlington decide to prepare meals for.
- Homestays need to eat too? Don't they?
- I really don't feel like the county has any legitimate interest in who someone chooses to cook dinner for in their own home
- There seems to be no real point in limiting the provision of food - how would that change anything? Why should it be limited? Are we going to regulate the use of food in the fridge in the dwelling as well?
- Really? This is a concern? I should be able to cook my guests a home cooked meal if I want, regardless of whether they're staying for free or for a fee.
- don't micromanage homeowners who rent on AirBnB
- I am not sure why it would need to be regulated, however if the space occupied can support a meal what is the purpose in regulating what may or may not occur?>
- Who cares? This is none of the County's business, and trying to regulate is an infringement on our freedom and privacy.
- Not likely be much demand for all meals, but I see no reason to limit it by regulation.
- Options! But my preference is let me select my own on my own.
- Some hosts like to prepare food, but others don't. This should be a decision left for the host and the tenant to decide.
- I don't know how this generally works in STRR now, but I wouldn't restrict it.
- What public service is provided by limiting the food choices of visitors to a bag of peanuts??? Serve a real meal! It might promote public health! Reduce litter (all those peanut bags)! Sounding like a broken record, but let the new system evolve with fewer regulations and address problems as they arise. While I agree that Arlington has a ways to go in the "responsiveness to citizens' concerns" department, I have hope it can be improved.
- Quit trying to regulate every detail. How are you going to manage this oversight? The Air B&B meter maid?
- The county board should not restrict good service in private homes.
- This can be left to the owners' discretion. I, for example, only provide packaged snacks, fruits and coffee.
- This should not be regulated, in my opinion.
- No need to regulate this matter
- Do not regulate this. Will drive up costs for all. Let the market decide.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.
- Not sure what the point of restricting this is... seems impossible to enforce anyways.

#### **PROHIBIT FOOD SERVICE**

- we should not be competing with hotels for tourist dollars nor competing with restaurants
- Feels like the slipperiest slope of this issue.
- More than breakfast will turn these short-term residential rentals into de facto restaurants as well!
- Previous to taking this survey, I had no strong feelings. Reading definitions here, it would seem that keeping accessory homestay hosts in line with existing regulations for short term rentals would make logical sense.
- I'm a bit ambivalent about this point. But I think if you are not opening the B&B section up entirely it is best to stick with packaged snacks only. I'm not opposed to breakfast being served but then I wonder what else is in the B&B section of the ordinance that potentially should also be incorporated here.
- My choice follows the European model. As such, it deemphasizes food service for most if the day-- consistent with residential surroundings.
- Once again -- "Accessory homestay" is a terrible alternative term. Generally speaking -- the "bed & breakfast" term is more descriptive of what most owner-providers have in mind. I am against the concept -- but I am

especially against the element of the concept of providing food and beverage services in a home setting that is not properly equipped or constructed for this service.

- Breakfast should not be allowed if separate regulations already govern B&Bs. If a person wishes to provide breakfast, they should use that availability.
- Makes it more like a hotel. THIS should be discouraged.
- Having spent 13+ years in the restaurant business, this would seem to open up home kitchens to a LOT of regulation from the Health Dept. That would seem to overburden a dept. to check everyone's kitchen, probably multiple times because they aren't professionals, for a few weeks a year of tax revenue.
- In my experience, homestays include a small kitchen where we could prepare meals if we wanted. I think this is perfectly adequate. Also, there were strict rules about how to dispose of trash. I think this would be very important as homestays should not cause pest problems.
- Short term renters, vacationers can buy their own food, go visit many of the local restaurants that help feed the tax rolls for the county
- "Hotels are not allowed in residential neighborhoods" There is a reason for this, please do not turn our neighborhoods into commercial zones.
- FOOF? Did you know that the state of Virginia requires that a Human Services Permit is required if food is serviced or provided. Hotel/Motel Health Permit is also required and the property must comply with the Commonwealth Virginia Regulations for Hotels/ Lodging units (means any room which is established and maintained for use as a sleeping area for temporary occupancy)!
- Under no circumstances. We are not going into boarding houses. Is Arlington going to begin food inspections of home kitchens?
- Boarding houses gone wild. And no, I don't support easing zoning regs to allow boarding houses on minor arterials!
- Part of the economic draw is to support local restaurants and food services. This option reduces the ability small businesses to benefit from additional travelers. If people want full service stay at a Hotel. This should be lodging only.
- It is clear that this question is inspired by the so-called "Delhi Daba" house. No changes should be made to allow this property or any other to operate as a de facto hotel in a residential neighborhood.
- Some distinction between an accessory use and a hotel needs to be maintained, and this is a reasonable one. Presumably it would not prohibit lodgers from bringing in their own food and eating it at the kitchen table (or would that make the kitchen part of the rented area?).

#### **OTHER FOOD IDEAS AND/OR ALLOW MEALS TO BE SERVED, BUT WITH CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS**

- Like any other use of the house by a family, kitchen use for cooking food should be unlimited.
- Only packaged snacks that do not require heating or other preparations should be allowed to be provided. All material and consumables that are prohibited to minors should also be prohibited from being given to tenants, even to non-minors.
- breakfast + snacks
- I would include coffee. If more is desired then register as bed and breakfast.
- It is customary for Airbnb hosts to leave snacks, drinks, and other items in the rental space for general consumption.
- However, a lodger should be permitted to prepare their own meals if the lodging includes kitchen facilities in the "rental".
- Only if the host is resident in the house and is sharing the meal with the guests.
- With proper zoning for commercial service that can serve food this would work but not adding a restaurant inside a residence.
- ON THE CONDITION THAT the homestay owner/renter meets the same preparation and inspection standards met by other establishments offering the same level of food service.
- For the sake of consistency with bed and breakfasts, seems fair.
- All meals should be allowed to be served. But the homeowner should not be able to advertise or sell food. If a family is eating dinner and wants to invite a renter to participate the County should not interfere. But I do not believe we should want the home owner billing the resident for the food nor advertising their residences on that basis.

- Economy is changing and the revisiting of these regulations is important and I commend the county for taking it on. I do not like hotels and with a family of 6 it is difficult to find lodging that works. Open the door to innovation but protect the guests by building in fees for inspection of the food preparation areas or require the homeowner to take an in-person or online course of food preparation to earn a "certificate" to offer meals.

#### **ENFORCEMENT CONCERNS**

- Who's going to know what is going on inside a private home? Does the police come knocking at meal time with a search warrant? Think this through and realize that no law involving private behavior can possibly be enforced without invasion of privacy. BAD IDEA
- Keep it simple. But enforcement would be challenging in any case.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS AND UNCATEGORIZED COMMENTS**

- Home share is not meant to be intensive regular service, and thus should not be restricted or regulated in a commercial way.
- Please provide the specifics of how they will benefit Arlington, the downsides to residents and how the additional taxes collected will pay for the additional work Arlington has done and will be doing.
- One of the greatest benefits of aspects of the sharing economy, such as short-term rentals, is the connectedness among individuals and communities it fosters. Many Americans regard it as their duty to provide food and beverages to guests, and it improves the experience for both renter and host. Welcome gifts of food and drinks can also provide guests with an introduction to the community, enriching their experience & creating a stronger affection for our town.
- Fine... let them eat cake!
- Allowed, but not required.
- This answer applies only to current County zoning ordinance.
- Menu and cultural exchanges can be a reason to stay in one Air BnB over another, and may give more supervision of the visitors than otherwise.
- The option to provide meals would allow flexibility for business and vacation short term renters and their hosts.
- There should be an exception for caregivers to this rule.
- how are you going to enforce this?
- Seems like a major liability to have unregulated food prepared and served in homes to short term lodgers
- There should be no creep from a B&B to another use such as an event location. If a B&B is established it should focus on only overnight guests and breakfasts and not be allowed to become an event location in a residential neighborhood. They should be restricted from providing events, parties, private dinners, wine tastings or afternoon teas, or other disruptive activities.
- I have found the entire Zoning Department to be incompetent and unable to reason. Don't give them another way to mess up our neighborhoods.
- it's fuzzy.

#### **DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE**

- Opposed
- No
- I think the current regulation as described sounds reasonable assuming breakfast is all inclusive in the rate and they have all of the commercial cooking licenses.

#### **DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- Do not allow accessory homestays. Keep B&Bs (therefore food service) to principal arterials - this helps protect Arlington's neighborhoods health, safety, and welfare, and helps preserve and promote healthy property values.

# 11. PERMIT DURATION – COMMENT SUMMARY

## No permit needed

- Obtaining a permit would be an unnecessary burden
- Process should be streamlined

## Comments on Application Process and Renewal

- Neighborhood comments or complaints should be considered in reissue
- Inspections should be required prior to issuance and renewal

## Other Options for Permit Duration

- Less than one year given turnover and desire to maximize oversight
- Greater than two years to ease burden and minimize oversight

How long should a permit be valid before it has to be renewed (through submittal of a new application in order to update contact information, etc.)?

One year	130
Two years	178

## NO PERMIT SHOULD BE REQUIRED

- although I do not think a permit should be required
- This is a stupid idea. Over-reach by the zoning admin at its finest.
- No permit should be required.
- No Permits needed
- Not sure why this is necessary.
- There should be no permit required. Why the permit? What does Arlington seek to do? It worries me that I need to seek permission from Arlington for the activities that take place in my home, which is worrisome due to historic restrictions on personal choice and behavior.
- I oppose permitting requirements for residential homesharing.
- No permits at all....
- There shouldn't be a permit if the property is already leased or owned by another resident.
- There should be no permit
- There should not be a permit required.
- There should be no permits for accessory homestays. "None" was not an option above.
- Don't make it harder for people.
- do not agree with homestay permits
- This is a leading question. No option for the public to select "No Permit".
- I hope the county is not suggesting that anyone who rents through Airbnb needs a permit. Permitting in Arlington is universally understood to be a nightmare already.
- Are permits necessary? I hope the permitting process is not onerous.
- Permit requires disclosure of use of personal property and unconstitutional. Privacy matters and these permits are violations to the freedoms of the homeowners inside their property.
- No permit - the whole purpose of Airbnb was to make traveling around the world more enjoyable. Allow people of different cultures to share an experience!
- I hesitate to endorse the idea of permits for this very simple activity. Arlington County permitting (Zoning and Building) has become increasingly uncoordinated and time-consuming. The county processes are NOT user-

friendly. Thus, I don't see it as productive to add more tasks for a staff that may well be over-worked and not well-trained in 'customer' oriented results.

- No permits required
- You shouldn't need a permit for this.
- No need for such a permit
- The county should NOT require an accessory homestay permit.
- Why require a permit?
- No permit should be required. It's way too intrusive and too much bureaucracy. There is no requirement nor reason for inspections for long term property rentals and no reason for inspections for short term property rentals. Classifying it as a "home occupation" is absurd. It's rental of property NOT an occupation,
- Permits should not be needed.
- Do not require permits. It will up the costs for the users of this wonderful service.
- I do not support permits for owner occupants who are renting part of their homes. This is not required for rental properties and is an undue burden. People will continue to rent their places out anyway. Regarding true accessory dwellings and rental in multifamily structures a permit would be more appropriate.
- Permits seem like an overreach to me
- As there were only two options, I selected "two years" but there should be no permits required at all. The idea that a homeowner needs a permit to have someone stay in their home (paying or for free) is absurd.
- No Permit should be required...yet another example of government overreach and regulation that stifles small business growth.
- I honk this is over regulating.
- no permit should be required
- Requiring permits for this is silly. Stay out of it.
- I am opposed to requiring a permit.
- There should be no permit required.
- no permits should be needed
- An accessory home stay permit should not be required.
- There should not be a permit.
- Permits should not be required for occupying a space that is legally designated for occupation.
- permits should not be limited either. Not sure why permits would be necessary but understand the county wanting one.
- Should not be a permit requirement. We all live in our homes without government inspections! So do our invited guests. Marketplace with reviews will quickly eliminate the undesirable lodging choices.
- Don't have this!
- I am opposed to required permits. Get the government out of the way.
- A permit shouldn't be needed.
- no permits should be required
- Notice of permit applications should be posted to inform neighbors. Applications should show the location of required parking. Applicants should also have to get a home-occupation business license. The application should not be too nit-picky, i.e. not have to specify to the inch which parts of the home

#### COMMENTS ON APPLICATION AND RENEWAL PROCESS

- County staff should be able to revoke permits in certain circumstances, e.g., frequent disruptions of neighbors.
- County should inspect before renewing and should be able to inspect anytime after three complaints.
- initially one year and then a review in 2 years. would the permit run with the land as use permits do now or with the owner? it should run with the owner and when the house is sold the new owner may or may not choose to ask to renew the permit and at that time an new inspection should be done to make sure the new owner knows the rules and their space continues to be compliant.
- Neighbor references should have to accompany permit renewal...people should be accountable.
- Permit should require the homestay owner to acknowledge the potential issues that are subject to revocation of the permit such as: pushing out renters, overenrolling the # of guests, noise, violation of other county rules and regulation. Property subject to annual inspection fee attached.

- If you have permits, there should be no fee. This should not be used as a means for the county to generate revenue. If you need more revenue, then you should raise the taxes. Units that are given airbnb-type permits should have a different tax rate, and it should be high.
- should require inspection prior to permit issuance. Should comply with current building and fire codes for hotels.
- The County ordinance should state that an application covering an MDU unit or other dwelling governed by a homeowners' or condominium owners' association must be accompanied by a letter from the governing body of the association (or its designee) approving the application as in compliance with the association's governing documents. In addition, the application must include a copy of the relevant governing documents.
- Why make it less? Especially considering that as advertised there is no currently no fee for obtaining an Accessory Homestay Permit. Less time per renewal just means more unpaid hassle for both Arlington homeowners and staff.
- These should be the least restrictive possible. These permits will likely be time consuming for owners to get so it seems unnecessarily arduous to expect them to do it annually.
- In my recent experience -- frequent on-site inspections are necessary to determine what is actually happening at these facilities.
- Each unit should be inspected every year.
- Any neighborhood comments or complaints must be considered in reissue .
- an on-site inspection should be part of the renewal process.
- Granting of renewals should be contingent upon having a satisfactory record. A site with a lot of complaints should not receive an "automatic" renewal.
- Will the county monitor such "accessory homestay" units for health and safety standards? Will part of the application process be an inspection of the potential rental? Will basements with no window egress be allowed to be used for temporary, paid visits?
- It should be contingent upon adherence to regulations. Number of calls or reports to county law enforcement should have a bearing on a continued permit.
- Permits should be approved within 24-48 hours of application.
- Annual renewal on the date of liability insurance renewal.
- If there are complaints that are valid, it should not be renewed. We should operate that it is a privilege, not a right. Any violation they lose the permit 2nd year but after the following year can reapply. No rental for a total of 2 years
- Should have a probationary period at first for 6 months a year then move to one or two year renewals. If there are too many justified complaints across the probation period then the property shouldn't be able to host anymore people immediately and the owners should have to wait a longer amount of time before applying again.
- Would there be other requirements associated with obtaining a permit?
- other than contact information what would the permit require? what safety parameters is the county considering, e.g. sprinklers, egress from basement bedrooms, smoke alarms, radon detectors?

#### **LESS THAN ONE YEAR DURATION**

- period should be short in order to provide maximum enforcement. I suggest first year be probationary.
- zero years.
- Less than 1 Year
- We have a lot of turnover in this area, so owners come and go. Shorter period discourages applicants, allows for more monitoring.

#### **LONGER PERMIT DURATION**

- I'd be open to the first one being 1 year with the possibility of a 5 year term after a year with no complaints. Even every two years might be an unnecessary admin burden for county
- How about three years?
- I would think things like 'Where you live' don't change that much.
- The first permit should be valid for one year, after which (presuming there have not been any problematic issues) subsequent permits can be valid for two years.

- It should be one year for the first year, two years thereafter for good actors. This would allow for the identification and correction of initial problems. The zoning administrator should have the discretion to choose to only a one year renewal if minor violations are found.
- I would choose longer if I could.
- Is there a need to limit the time frame? I would err to the side of longer permits, but if we impose this regulation, and we also cap how many people can provide these services in an area or at a location, we may have increased resentment between residents.
- I think it could be longer even, like 4 or 6 years.
- A switch to longer permits only after we understand the impact of accessory homestays plays out.
- Longer than Two Years
- infinity
- There should either be no limit or a longer term (say 5 years) unless the county can provide a good rationale for short term limits. The need to renew contact information is not sufficient. requiring frequent renewals can add an unnecessary burden on residents and use excessive county resources.

#### **DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY**

- No accessory homestays!
- Oppose this in residential areas categorically
- Certainly no more than one year if allowed at all.
- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- Do not allow accessory homestays. If you are going to allow them, start with the permit period shorter, 6 months, so that ill effects on the neighborhood can be addressed promptly and without having to wait a year.
- Not allowed.
- None should be allowed.
- None should be allowed
- Opposed
- There is no reason to have an accessory homestay. The Zoning Administrators are already overwhelmed with requests for restaurants, retail buildings, offices, child care and medical facilities. Requiring the Zoning Administrators to hand out permits to homestay hosts would be a recipe for disaster. Again, this seems like an unnecessary restriction that serves no particular purpose.
- No
- No years
- I do not support allowing residents to participate in accessory homestay
- I prefer no accessory homestay but if accessory homestay is approved a permit should only be granted for 6 months.
- None should be issued. Please provide the specifics of how they will benefit Arlington, the downsides to residents and how the additional taxes collected will pay for the additional work Arlington has done and will be doing.
- This question presupposes the use of such a building is legal. It shouldn't be, unless it's also zoned as a chicken coop. So I answered this question but register my objection to any such use.

#### **DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE**

- This should not be decided by the by the Council.
- until there is an established history of this concept not being abused need to have a system to stop an owner who is not following the regs w/out it being a legal battle for neighbors.
- No need to regulate this matter
- I have pretty clearly stated my objections to any government intrusion into private home use. If the government doesn't have any exterior awareness of my behavior (such as vast amounts of garbage, unregistered cars, etc) they should not be concerned.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

- The Zoning Department is not competent to regulate existing rules, based on the several interactions I have had as citizen and Association VP and President over the last 14 years.
- Permit - the owner of the short-rental property limited to one Business home occupation license, unanimous approval by adjacent neighbors for permit, The dwelling/sleeping room/bath must be inspected for building code compliance/approved by the building inspector for a permit. The Guest(s) must enter the property through the "Host" front door, no side, back or basement entrance are permitted and applicant must produce proof of insurance/liability coverage.
- The less bureaucracy and administrative work the more likely people will comply with this. Least try to eliminate barriers and streamline the process for everyone. Two years is a good number.
- selected the longer of the two options to reduce the administrative burden of annual permit renewal.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions
  
- Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.
- Make it easier to get the permits and more people with comply.
- Renew every year. The county does not appear to be enforcing existing code for residential single family houses. See previous comment regarding the 7 people living across the street from me. If they allow homestays I am concerned that the lack of enforcement will continue which will be detrimental to the neighborhood communities.
- I think that the Landlord should get a permit and be required to pay taxes as assessed.
- how are you going to enforce this? it will be so expensive.
- Owner turnover too great/possible for two years.
- are to be used for this business, because an owner could modify that after learning what accommodations work for guests and what don't.

## 12. PERMIT REVOCATION – COMMENT SUMMARY

### Reinstatement

- If revoked, no permit should be reissued
- Revocation period should be less than one year if offense is minor
- Revocation period should be greater than two years given likely seriousness of offense

### Enforcement

- Clear complaint substantiation process is needed
- Need better understanding of what is a “substantiated complaint”
- Enforcement based on complaints will encourage complaints from angry neighbors
- Enforcement should have the goal of compliance

### No permit should be required

If an accessory homestay permit is revoked, how long do you think the waiting period should be before a homeowner could apply for an accessory homestay again?

One year	152
Two years	143

### NO REINSTATEMENT

- Revocation should occur after 3 or more substantiated complaints during a six-month period. One year is far too long to allow a community nuisance or unsafe condition to continue. Revocation should be permanent. No second chances.
- forever
- If it's revoked, why would they get to reapply?
- Forever
- If revoked, never reinstate
- If a permit is revoked it should never be reinstated.
- Permanently!
- If it is revoked, that's it. No more soup for you! Ever!
- Other Time Frames
- I think it should be 6 months
- This time frame should be shorter. 6 months. I have to suffer through tenants for 6 months at a time and sometimes that time frame is too long.
- 5years.
- I don't think there should be a waiting period.
- 3 months, first offense
- It should be longer. Especially if there is more than one offense.
- more than 2 years

### REVOCATION PERIOD SHOULD BE LESS THAN ONE YEAR AND/OR DISCRETIONARY

- While I agree that all permit holders should comply and allow inspections, I think even one year might be too much time for minor mistakes that could easily be corrected. In my opinion, minor mistakes should not result in one year permit revocation. I think one year is more than enough time to discipline permit misusing.
- The county needs to be reasonable and consider each situation individually.
- Why not 6 months if all issues have been corrected?

- As in the previous comment- the process of working with the County is not as user-friendly as it used to be. Thus, if we must include provisions for a waiting period, then it should be minimal. Six months is better than a year.
- depends on the severity of the original problem.
- Unless there is a change in ownership. I'd allow a new owner to come right back and get one
- I would pick an shorter time period if I could.
- I don't think there should be a waiting period.
- I would allow the Zoning Administrator some discretion in determining the length of a waiting period.

#### REVOCATION PERIOD SHOULD BE TWO YEARS OR LONGER

- need the consequence of revocation to be severe in order to ensure the permit holder is serious about following the rules.
- Five years would be better.
- Revocation won't occur often. If it happens, a provider has created a serious situation, hence two years is a better incentive than one to discourage problematic behavior.
- The likelihood of misuse is great with this type of program. Violators should be discouraged by having to wait at least 2 years before attempting reinstatement.

#### ENFORCEMENT

- I'm concerned how this will be enforced. It seems like angry neighbors have a lot of power to call into question if the host is doing everything right.
- I hope enforcement is geared toward bringing people into compliance with these complex regulations, not cracking down on misunderstandings.
- Zoning can't enforce existing rules. If you weaken our zoning further, you might as well lay off the entire department, and as you are trashing residential zoning rules.
- My recommendation is to add a substantial graduated monetary fine system to this provision. I also think the County authorities charged with compliance and proper operation of any facility under their purview should make reference to social media -- for example advertising of a home for rent on an on-line site -- in order to determine what is actually happening.
- Revocation should be public record.
- Permits should allow surprise/unannounced inspections. If three inspections are refused, then the permit should be revoked for at least two years
- Clarification on the process of revocation and the issue with current visitors staying. Would short term residents need to vacate the premises immediately?
- Where is the option for "none of the above". YOU CAN BET that neighbor complaints will be filed against "shady" characters and not against "nice" characters. The racist and xenophobic implications are chilling. Please don't allow complaint driven code enforcement at all, especially when such complaints can be so easily used in racist and hostile ways. Complaint-driven code enforcement is very destructive to neighborhood cohesion.
- Noncompliance in all kinds of rental properties is already rampant in the county and enforcement is pathetic.
- How is a "substantiated complaint" defined? I think that the waiting period should depend on the violation.
- First you need to define "substantiated complains" better. What would be such a complaint - about noise, about number of rentals, about dirt? A whole year is way too very punitive.
- The homeowner should be required ro prove they have addressed the complaints and/or reason for the permit revocation before getting a new permit. Simply assigning a waiting period is arbitrary and does not correct the source of the issue. What if the complaints are unfounded? Would there be a means to challenge the complaints. Too often resident use the county complaint system to harrass their neighbors and not for real merit. County staff use no judgement in assessing complaint merits.
- Be specific about the nature of the complaints and what constitutes substantiation. Allow anonymouse complaints, but specify substantiation -- police called and came. Add a category for permanent revocation -- e.g. prostitution or regular "rent parties" with people staying overnighter.
- Please provide clear guidelines on what constitutes a substantiated complaint. "People coming and going" should not count; more serious items such as blocked entrances/driveways or loud late partying should.

- If a license is revoked there should be a hearing regarding the infraction and there should be community input as well as investigation of management/business plan and changes in place to ensure that the operation is sustainable.
- Need to make sure there are controls to keep "grumpy" neighbors from shutting down someone's permit for no reason.
- The channel for asking questions and filing complaints should be very clear and easy to use. Also, the zoning office should modify its apparent practice of regarding every query about a project as a "complaint".

#### NO PERMIT SHOULD BE REQUIRED

- I oppose permitting requirements for residential homesharing.
- No need for this
- There shouldn't be a permit, therefore there should be no waiting period.
- There should be no accessory homestay permits. "Forever" was not an option above.
- Perhaps we should trust the marketplace and not try to expand permitting into new areas.
- There should be no permit
- No permit.
- But there should be no permit required.
- No permit required
- No permit should be required.
- No permit should be required
- No permits should be required.
- Do not require permits. It will up the costs for the users of this wonderful service.
- Owner occupants should not be required to have a permit at all. Their right to use their own dwelling as they see fit should not be infringed upon. Inspectors and county officials should work with the other types of hosts to resolve issues and support this new part of the sharing economy.
- since there should be no permit I don't believe there should be a waiting period for revocation/reinstatement
- I honk this is over regulating.
- I am opposed to requiring a permit. If a permit is required, I don't think the waiting time should exceed 24 hours, but you have not provided that as an option.
- no permits should be issued -- no permits to revoke.
- Accessory home stay permits shouldn't be necessary. Enforcement of these regulations would be complaint driven and therefore selective rather than universal.
- There should be no permit requirement.
- There should not be an accessory homestay permit.
- See above - I'm opposed to government permits.
- Permit should not be needed
- no permits should be required
- No need to regulate this matter

#### DO NOT ALLOW ACCESSORY HOMESTAY

- note the background revoke requirements...do not allow nor reissue a permit
- The homestay should have very little impact on neighbors. Beyond that, the homestay permit should be revoked.
- The County does not have the ability or the capacity to enforce or monitor an accessory homestay ordinance of any kind. The County would have to hire additional staff and create additional regulations that will never be properly enforced. This program is not in the best interest of the County as a whole. Short term rentals is not who we are as a community and if anything it detracts from any sense of good governing.
- No short term rentals should be allowed
- Oppose any accessory homestays!
- Do not allow accessory homestays. Do not allow application again. Why would you allow the wrongful homeowner to do it again?
- I do not support allowing residents to participate in accessory homestay

- no years should be permitted
- Again, it shouldn't be allowed.

#### DO NOT REGULATE THIS USE

- This should not be decided by the Council.
- Airbnb does background checks, people write reviews on their experience they are already self regulating their network

#### UNCATEGORIZED COMMENTS

- You are going to give all airbnb business to DC.
- Make it as tough as possible, so permit holders adhere to regulations.
- - any illegal or criminal behavior endangering any occupants including the renter themselves be it drugs, guns, alcohol, physical violence/abuse, etc
- Yes. If none are issued, we don't have to pay overhead to run the program and concern ourselves with monitoring and revoking.
- Is this America? Less law, not more.
- The more restrictions the County chooses to impose upon permit holders, particularly those which can be argued to not directly contribute to the well-being of guests, renters, or neighbors, the more lenient its terms ought to be for the re-application for permits.
- I think it should be permanent if they do not allow county inspectors. Other violations could be allow the permit to be restored quicker. For example, if there is a repair that is necessary that is quickly re-mediated, they should be allowed to get their license back. However if they don't make the repair, then longer.
- Should be even less if proactive steps are taken to remediate any issues.
- Should be even less if proactive steps are taken to remediate any issues.
- Failure to comply- what are the requirements. Refusal to allow access after reasonable advance notice (what is reasonable notice-please qualify)
- Enforcement -ACZO 12.5.3&15.4 any Bed & Breakfast must have a Use permit. The county doesn't have the resources to adequately regulate this accessory homestay zoning change and to suggest to using a "Substantiated complaint" as a regulation mechanism is ludicrous and a defector abdication of responsibilities to protect the character of Arlington's residential neighbors and to protect public health and safety. The County Board must definitively define the meaning of 'Substantiated Complaint'.
- the permit should not allow inspectors to access the dwelling,
- Again, not in favor of heavy handed regulation. The market has already been running these things outside of regulation for years. Huge problems? Don't think so.
- As long as all parties pay appropriate taxes and adhere to all proper laws including zoning and noise restrictions, Arlington and its residents should welcome this opportunity.
- This must include people who engage in this business without a permit.
- it needs to be long enough to serve as a real incentive NOT to flout the rules.
- Two years, with due process, to encourage compliance.
- If residence is sold does this start new period?
- Accessory homestays should be handicap accessible
- Any rules regarding accessory homestays must be strictly enforced. Penalties for violators should be harsh to ensure compliance.
- The County doesn't have the manpower to inspect thousands of homestay locations. Websites like AirBnB do a much better job, through user feedback and ratings, of providing real-time updates regarding the quality of the dwelling. It would be an epic waste of time and money to send County staff to reproduce this process, for the purpose of revoking someone's permit. The better option is not to require permits at all.
- Change of ownership of residence should also revoke current permit. HOWEVER, new owner should not have to wait two years to apply on own merit. Distinction should be made whether permit revoked for violations or new ownership.