

Memo

To: Village Council
From: Doug Willardson
CC: Village Managers
Date: February 16, 202
Re: CONFIDENTIAL Property Acquisitions

Currently, there are a few inter-related land acquisition/development opportunities for the Council to consider. Staff seeks Council's input on which direction they would like to pursue. These opportunities are the Post Office building, lease/arrangements for construction of a parking deck behind the Holly Inn, and the Moore County water tank property.

POST OFFICE BUILDING

As the Council previously discussed, the owner of the Post Office building has expressed interest in selling the building to the Village. An appraisal of the property came back at \$942,000; the current owners originally floated a \$1.5 million selling price. As a reminder, Council was originally interested in purchasing the building because--

- a. it is a valuable asset downtown,
- b. it could provide swing space for library materials while the library is under renovations,
- c. the library lease required the Village to lease the book shop space for a couple of years and the owners would not let the Village assume the lease (this has since been resolved),
- d. it could possibly house the Tufts archives displays long-term and the Welcome Center—decreasing the space needs for an expanded library and eliminating the Welcome Center lease payments at the Theatre building.

Taking a deeper dive into the possibility of the Tufts Archives, Welcome Center and Roast Office sharing the Post Office Building, we analyzed the potential space needs and financial costs.

Space Needs:

- i. Current Space Usage
 1. Tufts Archives: 2,100 sq ft + 376 sq ft shared (office, restroom, Tin Whistle Room)
 2. Tufts Storage (basement): 2,100 sq ft
 3. Welcome Center: 875 sq ft (500 sq ft is minimum)

4. Roast Office: 509 sq ft
5. TOTAL: 5,960 sq ft
- ii. Current square footage of the Post Office:
 1. First floor: 3,751 sq ft
 2. Second floor: 435 sq ft
 3. Basement: 1,454 sq ft
 4. TOTAL: 5,640 sq ft
- iii. Potential Post Office First Floor Usage
 1. Tufts Archives: 2,100 sq ft
 2. Welcome Center: 500 sq ft
 3. Roast Office: 509 sq ft
 4. Common Space: 500 sq ft
 5. Other/Misc: 142 sq ft
 6. TOTAL: 3,751 sq ft

Preliminary estimates show that the public portion of the Tufts Archives, the Welcome Center, and the Roast Office can all be accommodated on the first floor of the Post Office building.

Financial Analysis:

The owner offered to lease the Post Office building to the Village for an estimated cost of \$85,500 annually. The annual cost to purchase the Post Office building is as follows (assumes 100% financing at 2.1%):

- a. At \$1.0 million purchase price: Initially \$70,000 decreasing to \$51,000 over 20 years (\$57,869 average)
- b. At \$1.25 million purchase price: Initially \$88,000 decreasing to \$63,000 over 20 years (\$72,336 average)
- c. At \$1.5 million purchase price: Initially \$106,000 decreasing to \$76,000 over 20 years (\$86,804 average)

If purchasing the Post Office building, the Village can save money from eliminating the Welcome Center lease and will also receive lease revenue from the Roast Office. The Village currently pays \$20,640 annually for the lease of the Welcome Center at the Theatre Building. The Village would receive \$16,532 annually under the current lease terms for the Roast Office.

The June 2020 library needs assessment recommended a library expansion of 9,645 sq ft for a total of 13,470 sq ft of library space. At \$325 per sq ft, the library expansion would cost approximately \$3.1 million. If the 2,476 sq ft currently used by the Tufts Archives could be used as library space it would save an estimated \$805,000 in construction costs. \$805,000 is equivalent to an average debt service payment of \$38,333 under the same 20 year/2.1% rate assumed earlier.

In total, \$20,640 (Theatre Building lease savings) + \$16,532 (Roast Office lease revenue) + 38,333 (construction cost savings) = \$75,505; approximately the same as the debt service payment for purchasing the building at \$1.25 million.

In addition to this, there will be costs to make the Post Office building move-in ready—assume \$84,000 based on renovation cost of \$20 per sq ft. However, purchasing the building also creates a savings from eliminating the \$55,560 annual post office lease paid by the Library Foundation/Village as required under the Village’s agreement with the Library Foundation for the initial two years. Lastly, if the Village purchased the Post Office, it would not need to rent swing-space for library use during construction. This cost is estimated at \$220,000 for 5,000 sq ft of space at \$22/per sq ft for two years.

Hosting the Archives at a separate location will require a staffing model change. However, there are already plans to hire two additional FTEs when the library is expanded. It is possible that with these additional staff members, the Archives could be appropriately staffed at a separate location especially with support of staff/volunteers from the Welcome Center.

Based on the above assumptions, purchasing the Post Office building has the potential to save money over maintaining the status quo at the Welcome Center and expanding the library and archives fully on the existing site. On top of this, the Village will own an asset that could be sold and the original purchase price recouped (more or less based on market conditions).

In addition to the fiscal benefits, the non-monetary benefits of reducing the physical footprint on the Village Green and the synergy created by combining the Archives museum and Welcome Center should be considered.

HOLLY INN PARKING DECK

Pinehurst Resort is a little hesitant to allow the Village to use the parking area behind the Holly Inn to build a parking deck. They are concerned that there is not full community support for expanding the library and by allowing us to build a parking deck they will be complicit in the expansion and may receive some blowback. They also feel entitled to some compensation for use of the property. They suggested a land swap for a portion of the Moore County water tanks property in exchange for use of the land. Finally, they feel there may not be a need for additional parking particularly after they add 94 spaces at the Carolina Spa. Compounding this, the Resort recently had a conversation with representatives from the State that insinuated the State has some parking plans for the Village.

MOORE COUNTY WATER TANKS

Moore County has expressed interest in meeting with Village staff to discuss disposition of the County water tank property. They indicated that there is interest from the Resort as well. The County suggested a meeting between the Village, the Resort and themselves. As you know, controlling this area would be very beneficial to the implementation of the Village Place small area plan.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the Council direct staff to complete the following:

- a. Engage the seller of the Post Office building with an initial offer of the appraised value and with authority to go up to \$1.2 million, with the understanding that final approval is to be made by the Council.

- b. If the acquisition of the post office is likely, move forward with the release of an RFQ for an architectural firm to renovate/expand the library building on site with archives “museum-like” features being displayed at the post office after the swing space need has ceased.
 - iv. Receive public feedback on library expansion plans. Adjust, if needed.
- c. Determine if there are any potential or actionable plans by the State to develop additional parking in Pinehurst.
- d. Meet with the County regarding the water tank property. Include potential purchase price in the five-year SOP.
- e. Reassess need for parking deck. Meet with the Resort and negotiate compensation for use of Holly Inn lot if parking deck is still a priority. Compensation will be minimal as the resort will still have access to the same number of parking spaces (or even more) as they currently do. Compensation may take the form of a limited number of parking spaces being developed in Village Place to support the Manor or Pine Crest Inn.

Village of Pinehurst
STR Regulatory/Policy Responses

Policy Objectives and Indicators of Success:

1. Traditional neighborhoods retain their character and remain predominantly occupied by long-term residents.
2. Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods.
3. Short term rental properties are not used as ‘party houses’ or for large events. Or short-term rental properties do not create nuisances in the neighborhood by being used frequently for events and parties.
4. Minimize the negative impact of short-term rentals on the quality of life of long-term residents in the Village’s neighborhoods.
5. Short term rental properties should not have occupancy numbers that exceed what is appropriate for the size of the house and parking spaces included on the property.
6. Overnight parking for short term rental properties does not significantly congest residential streets.
7. Short-term rental properties are not modified in ways that make them difficult to transition back for use as traditional owner-occupied residential properties.
8. Minimize public nuisance behaviors such as noise and trash that are often associated with short-term rentals without creating significant additional work for police and code enforcement staff.
9. Help to ensure health and safety of the occupants of short-term rental units.
10. To the extent possible, regulation of short term rentals is accomplished thru standards that apply to the whole Village understanding that some regulations will apply only to short term rental uses.
11. Reduce tensions between short-term rental property owners and their neighbors.

Objective No. 1: Traditional Neighborhoods retain their character and remain predominantly occupied by long-term residents – <u>PDO Amendment-</u> Permitted Zoning District Locations			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Permit in all zoning districts where residential dwelling units are permitted	Does not single out one residential district over another	Allows potential concentration of STRs in various neighborhoods	
Option 2: Prohibit in all residential districts. Grandfathering would apply (see amortization in option 4 below).	Applies uniformly and would eliminate new STRs	Restricts use of property not historically regulated in the community. Which districts? How would they be chosen? Fairness.	
Option 3: Permit in all zoning districts via a special use permit.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	
Option 4: Amortize existing STRs away in single-family zoned districts.	Would eliminate the use in those districts where new regulations would prohibit them.	Which districts? How would they be chosen? Fairness for full and part-time property owners and those who own multiple properties in the Village. Enforcement.	
Option 5: Make as non-conforming use in single-family zoned districts	Non-conforming uses able to exist until the use ceases? How is that determined? Amortize?	Which districts? How chosen? Fairness? (why single out MF districts when the use is still a residential dwelling?)	

Objective No. 1: Traditional neighborhoods retain their character and remain predominantly occupied by long-term residents – <u>PDO Amendment</u> – Limit concentrations in SF districts			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Establish separation requirements between STRs in single-family zoned districts. (e.g. 500 feet apart). <i>Option create different separation requirements by district.</i>	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permit requirements making this impossible to implement. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permit requirements making this impossible to implement. Unclear to date.	
Option 2: Cap the total number of STRs through creation of a zoning overlay district(s). <i>Option create different separation requirements by district.</i>	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permit requirements making this impossible to implement. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permit requirements making this impossible to implement. Unclear to date.	
Option 3: Prohibit in all or selected residential zoning districts.	Would eliminate the use in those districts where new regulations would prohibit them.	Which districts? How would they be chosen? Fairness for full and part-time property owners and those who own multiple properties in the Village. Enforcement.	
Option 4: Amortize STRs away in all or certain residential districts.	Would eliminate the use in those districts. Use same or similar language in previous page.	Enforcement may be costly. Administrative burden and record keeping. Still need to evaluate impacts of Wilmington decision. Use same or similar language in previous page.	

Objective No. 1: Traditional neighborhoods retain their character and remain predominantly occupied by long-term residents –
PDO Amendment –
Define STRs to provide for regulation of the land use (e.g. standards and location)

Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Define STRs as "whole house" rentals; require a minimum 24 hour stay and less than 30 days; residence can be used for up to 14 days as a short term rental without requiring an STR permit.	Establishes land use type which would allow for enforcement. Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permitting. Unclear to date. Provides for up to 14 days of use as an STR without having to meet other potential standards.	Enforceability without a named "grace period" and enforcing a 24 hour minimum stay. Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permitting. Unclear to date.	
Option 2: Define STRs as "whole house" as less than 30 days of consecutive rental and a minimum of a 24 hour stay.	Establishes land use type which would allow for enforcement and the ability to prohibit and permit in various districts. Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permitting. Unclear to date.	Enforceability, especially the 24 hour stay requirement. Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permitting. Unclear to date.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods. <u>Municipal Code Amendment –</u> Prohibit overnight parking in the right-of-way			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Blanket prohibition in all zoning districts.	Uniformity and easier to enforce.	There may be areas where overnight parking can be accommodated without interfering with operation of the street due to street design.	
Option 2: Prohibit parking by area, neighborhood, or zoning district.	Can target areas of need or concern individually. Can allow in areas that meet necessary criteria for ROW parking.	Can be subjective and pit property owners versus property owners.	
Option 3: Prohibit parking by street.	Can target areas of need or concern individually. Can allow in areas that meet necessary criteria for ROW parking.	Can be subjective and pit property owners versus property owners.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods. <u>Municipal Code Amendment –</u> Enforcement/Fines			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Create a tiered and multi violator code enforcement system that escalates per property for violations within a rolling calendar year.	Targets problem properties. Targets all types of violations not just STR related.	Some may view as being too harsh. Administration and record keeping.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods. <u>PDO Amendment –</u> Special Use Permits			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Permit STRs through special use permit.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permitting. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permitting. Unclear to date.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods. <u>PDO Amendments –</u> Establish Standards for STRs - Parking			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Parking. Number of spaces and location of required parking. 1 parking space per bedroom.	Objective Standard. Enforceability.	May have to add more parking on site and create more impervious area. Enforceability without a permit is difficult.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods.

PDO Amendment –

Establish Standards for STRs – Occupancy Limits

Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: By bedroom (e.g. two persons per bedroom)	Objective Standard. Enforceability.	Enforceability without a permit.	
Option 2: By Unit (e.g. max 8 persons per unit)	Objective Standard. Enforceability.	Enforceability without a permit.	
Option 3: By square foot of unit (e.g. 1 person per 500 feet of heated square footage)	Objective standard. Enforceability	Enforceability without a permit. May increase numbers of occupancy beyond sleeping rooms.	
Option 4: By location in overlay district (e.g. old town 8 persons, lake 6 persons, etc.)	Objective standard. Enforceability	Enforceability without a permit. Subjective standard and fairness between areas or neighborhoods.	
Option 5: By parking space available.	Objective Standard. Enforceability.	Enforceability without a permit. May result in more impervious parking surface	
Option 5: Special Use Permit	Wilmington decision may pre-empt permits. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision may pre-empt permits. Unclear to date.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods. <u>PDO Amendment –</u> Establish Standards for STRs – Safety Standards			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Smoke and carbon monoxide detectors.	Relatively easy standard to implement and already required for most residential occupancies.	Enforceability without an inspection, registration or permission requirement.	
Option 2: Proper exits and other safety requirements.	Relatively easy standard to implement and already required for most residential occupancies.	Enforceability without an inspection, registration or permission requirement.	
Option 3: Posted floorplan with exits in each bedroom.	Relatively easy standard to implement.	Enforceability without an inspection, registration or permission requirement.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods. <u>PDO Amendment –</u> Establish Standards for STRs – Owner/Manager Contact Information			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Post permit and regulations in unit.	Relatively easy standard to draft.	Enforceability without an inspection requirement.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods. <u>PDO Amendment – Enforcement/Fines</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Create a tiered and multi violator code enforcement system that escalates per property for violations within a rolling calendar year.	Targets problem properties. Targets all types of violations not just STR related.	Some may view as being too harsh. Administration and record keeping.	
Option 3: Pursue collection of violations by creating a policy of when to elevate collection of fines to civil action.	May reduce unwanted behavior	Costly and 90% of recovered fines must be remitted to school system.	

Objective No. 2: Short term rental uses do not adversely impact property values in our neighborhoods. <u>Policy/Educational</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Difficult to do without a permit requirement and information contained therein.	
Option 2: Subscription service hotline where nuisances can be reported to service that will contact STR designated representative.	Would take pressure off of Village staff to deal with nuisance flare ups such as noise and parking.	Costly and difficult to do without information from a permit.	
Option 3: Develop voluntary registration program.	Non regulatory	How to incentivize participation into the registration program	

Objective No. 3: STRs not used as party houses or for large events. <u>Municipal Code Amendment</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Adopt unruly gathering/party house ordinance (example, Los Angeles, Stonecrest, GA)	Would apply to all properties.	Enforcement. Application to non ticketed or compensated events.	

Objective No. 3: STRs not used as party houses or for large events. <u>PDO Amendment</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Define as a land use and develop standards for a party house	Defines land use to allow for clarity in regulation.	Enforceability to impromptu parties and public's expectations with respect to shutting down parties. Especially in a zoning ordinance. Can it be written objectively enough?	
Option 2: Prohibit in all districts			

Objective No. 3: STRs not used as party houses or for large events. <u>Policy/Educational</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Not a land use regulation. Difficult to do without a permit.	
Option 2: Subscription service hotline where nuisances can be reported to service that will contact STR designated representative.	Would take pressure off of Village staff to deal with nuisance flare ups such as noise and parking.	Costly and difficult to do without information from a permit.	

Objective No. 4: Minimize negative impacts of STRs. PDO Amendment			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Update parking regulations to require parking to be provided per bedroom.	Objective standard. Enforceability	Enforceability and fairness to other similar situated properties in SFDs. Could create non-uniform environment in neighborhoods.	
Option 2: Update parking space location requirements	Confines parking to "appropriate" areas of a site.	Would apply to all properties within the SFDs. Grandfathered? When would this apply?	
Option 3: Prohibit parking front yard unless on approved parking spaces.	Confines parking to "appropriate" areas of a site.	Would apply to all properties within the SFDs. Defining and enforcing what is "approved" or "appropriate". Enforceability.	
Option 4: Establish occupancy limits by unit.	Limits overall amount of persons renting site.	Enforceability without a permit.	
Option 5: Limit STR concentrations through minimum separation requirements	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt this without allowing a permit requirement to establish the land use.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt this without allowing a permit requirement to establish the land use.	
Option 6: Define STR as a land use and regulate location by district	Establishes land use type and can control by district.	Identifying which districts are appropriate for the land use. Fairness and equitable?	
Option 7: Amortize away existing STRs in single family zoned districts	Can eliminate STRs in specified districts over time.	Identifying which districts are appropriate for the land use. Fairness and equitable?	
Option 8: Permit only through Special Use Permit or when triggered by larger occupancies (>8 persons)	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permit requirements. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt permit requirements. Unclear to date.	

Objective No. 4: Minimize negative impacts of STRs. <u>Municipal Code Amendment</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Adopt unruly gathering/party house ordinance (example, Los Angeles, Stonecrest, GA)	Would apply to all properties.	Enforcement. Application to non ticketed or compensated events.	

Objective No. 4: Minimize negative impacts of STRs. <u>Policy/Educational</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Not a land use regulation. Difficult to do without a permit.	
Option 2: Subscription service hotline where nuisances can be reported to service that will contact STR designated representative.	Would take pressure off of Village staff to deal with nuisance flare ups such as noise and parking.	Costly and difficult to do without information from a permit.	

Objective No. 5: STRs not have occupancy numbers exceeding what is appropriate for property. <u>PDO Amendments</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: By bedroom (e.g. two persons per bedroom)	Objective Standard. Enforceability.	Enforceability without a permit.	
Option 2: By Unit (e.g. max 8 persons per unit)	Objective Standard. Enforceability.	Enforceability without a permit.	
Option 3: By square foot of unit (e.g. 1 person per 500 feet of heated square footage)	Objective standard. Enforceability	Enforceability without a permit. May increase numbers of occupancy beyond sleeping rooms.	
Option 4: By location in overlay district (e.g. old town 8 persons, lake 6 persons, etc.)	Objective standard. Enforceability	Enforceability without a permit. Subjective standard and fairness between areas or neighborhoods.	
Option 5: By parking space available.	Objective Standard. Enforceability.	Enforceability without a permit. May result in more impervious parking surface	
Option 5: Special Use Permit	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	

Objective No. 5: STRs not have occupancy numbers exceeding what is appropriate for property. <u>Policy/Educational</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an "X"
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Not a land use regulation. Difficult to do without a permit.	
Option 2: Develop voluntary registration program.	Non regulatory	How to incentivize participation into the registration program	

Objective No. 6: Overnight ROW parking does not congest residential streets – PDO Amendment			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Parking. Provide adequate parking based on bedrooms (e.g. 1 parking space per bedroom)	Parking provided based on bedrooms.	May increase the amount of spaces and impervious area on site.	
Option 2: Maximum amount of vehicles per approved parking spaces.	Enforceability	Would apply to all general use properties within a district. May increase ROW parking issue. Grandfathering? What if there is ample room on the property?	
Option 3: Prohibit parking in front yard unless on approved spaces.	Enforceability.	May increase amount of impervious area on site. May increase right of way parking without ROW parking prohibition. Apply uniformly across the district? Grandfathering?	

Objective No. 6: Overnight ROW parking does not congest residential streets – Municipal Code Amendment – PROHIBIT PARKING IN ROW			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Blanket overnight parking in all zoning districts.	Uniformity and enforceability	Administration and enforcement with staff impacts. Signage	
Option 2: Prohibit parking by area/neighborhood	Can tailor parking restrictions by areas of need.	Some may feel being singled out and fairness. Signage	
Option 3: Prohibit parking by street	Can tailor parking restrictions by areas of need.	Some may feel being singled out and fairness. Signage	

Objective No. 6: Overnight ROW parking does not congest residential streets – <u>Policy/Educational</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Not a land use regulation. Difficult to do without a permit.	
Option 2: Install parking regulation signage	Easy to install and communicate parking restrictions	Additional sign clutter, cost and maintenance.	
Option 3: Develop voluntary registration program.	Non regulatory	How to incentivize participation into the registration program	

Objective No. 7: STRs not modified in ways making them difficult to transition back to owner-occupied properties – <u>PDO Amendment</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Control location of surface parking locations	Can control where “official” parking spaces are located to fulfill required parking needs	Would apply to all properties in a general use district. Grandfathering? Uniformity?	

Objective No. 8: Minimize public nuisance behaviors without creating significant additional work for Village staff – <u>Municipal Code Amendment</u> ENFORCEMENT/FINES			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Create a tiered and multi violator code enforcement system that escalates per property for violations within a rolling calendar year.	Targets problem properties. Targets all types of violations not just STR related.	Some may view as being too harsh. Administration and record keeping.	
Option 2: Pursue collection of violations by creating a policy of when to elevate collection of fines to civil action.	May reduce unwanted behavior	Costly and 90% of recovered fines must be remitted to school system. Administrative burden.	

Objective No. 8: Minimize public nuisance behaviors without creating significant additional work for Village staff – <u>Policy/Educational</u> ENFORCEMENT/FINES			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Not a land use regulation. Difficult to do without a permit.	
Option 2: Subscription service hotline where nuisances can be reported to service that will contact STR designated representative.	Option 3: Develop voluntary registration program.	Non regulatory	How to incentivize participation into the registration program
Option 3: Develop voluntary registration program.	Non regulatory	How to incentivize participation into the registration program	

Objective No. 9: Help to ensure health and safety of occupants of STRs – PDO Amendments			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Limit overall unit occupancy	Can develop objective standard such as two persons per bedroom.	Enforceability without a permit.	

Objective No. 9: Help to ensure health and safety of occupants of STRs – Municipal Code Amendments MINIMUM SAFETY REQUIREMENTS			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Require minimum safety requirements and inspection prior to permitting.	Enforceability. Wilmington decision appears to pre-empt local permitting. Unclear to date. Minimum Housing Code may be better avenue to enforce.	Enforceability would generally come from an occupant. Potential staff work load impacts.	
Option 2: Require posted floor and fire escape plans in bedrooms.	Relatively easy to implement.	Maintenance. Enforceability without an inspection, registration or permission.	

Objective No. 9: Help to ensure health and safety of occupants of STRs – Policy/Educational			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Not a land use regulation. Difficult to do without a permit.	

Objective No. 10: Some STR standards will apply only to STRs – PDO Amendment			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Define STR as a land use	Establishes land use type that can be regulated and controlled within various districts.	Subjectivity of what districts to permit. May not address different types of interim rental situations.	
Option 2: Regulate location of STR in various districts	Can control location of STRs. Use same or similar language as above.	Subjective. Which districts chosen? Use same or similar language as above.	
Option 3: Limit concentration through minimum separation or cap requirements.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	
Option 4: Establish occupancy limits per unit	Objective standard. Enforceability.	Subjective. Enforceability without a permit.	
Option 5: Through Special Use Permits	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	

Objective No. 10: Some STR standards will apply only to STRs – Policy/Educational			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Not a land use regulation. Difficult to do without a permit.	
Option 2: Subscription service hotline where nuisances can be reported to service that will contact STR designated representative.	Would take pressure off of Village staff to deal with nuisance flare ups such as noise and parking.	Costly and difficult to do without information from a permit.	
Option 3: Develop voluntary registration program.	Non regulatory	How to incentivize participation into the registration program	

Objective No. 11: Reduce tensions between STR owners and neighbors – PDO Amendments			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Define STR as a land use	Establishes land use type that can be regulated and controlled within various districts.	Subjectivity of what districts to permit. May not address different types of interim rental situations.	
Option 2: Regulate location of STR in various districts	Establishes land use type that can be regulated and controlled within various districts.	Subjectivity of what districts to permit. May not address different types of interim rental situations.	
Option 3: Limit concentration through minimum separation or cap requirements.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	
Option 4: Establish occupancy limits per unit	Objective standard. Enforceability.	Subjective. Enforceability without a permit.	
Option 5: Establish occupancy limits by bedroom	Objective standard. Enforceability.	Subjective. Enforceability without a permit.	
Option 6: Regulate required parking placement	Objective standard. Enforceability.	Will apply to all properties within the district.	
Option 7: Through Special Use Permits	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	Wilmington decision appears to pre-empts permit requirements. Unclear to date.	
Option 8: Define party house as a land use and develop standards	Defines land use to allow for clarity in regulation.	Enforceability to impromptu parties and public’s expectations with respect to shutting down parties.	

Objective No. 11: Reduce tensions between STR owners and neighbors – <u>Municipal Code Amendment</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Adopt party house/unruly gathering ordinance	Would apply to all properties.	Enforcement. Application to non ticketed or compensated events. Expectations of public in “shutting down” events on the spot.	

Objective No. 11: Reduce tensions between STR owners and neighbors – <u>Policy/Educational</u>			
Option	Pros	Cons	Indicate Preferred Option with an “X”
Option 1: Good Neighbor Guide. Create guide and send to neighbors and require posting in unit.	Relatively easy low cost measure that could lessen tensions between neighbors.	Not a land use regulation. Difficult to do without a permit.	
Option 2: Subscription service hotline where nuisances can be reported to service that will contact STR designated representative.	Would take pressure off of Village staff to deal with nuisance flare ups such as noise and parking.	Costly and difficult to do without information from a permit.	
Option 3: Develop voluntary registration program.	Non regulatory	How to incentivize participation into the registration program	