



Date: Thursday, May 19, 2022

Time: 3:30 PM

Location: Virtual, Zoom Link: https://larimer-org.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_wLZ8JuN0RH2s8j3LOQGkJw

ESTES VALLEY PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

The Larimer County Estes Valley Planning Advisory Committee (Committee) met via Zoom. The meeting started at 3:30 p.m.

Committee members present included: David Converse, Olivia Harper, Mike Kennedy, Linda Moak, Frank Theis, and Drew Webb. Member Poggenpohl was absent.

Commissioner Jody Shadduck-McNally attended.

Staff present included: Tawn Hillenbrand, Amy White, Don Threewitt, Michael Whitley, Matt Lafferty, and Lesli Ellis.

Public present included: 3 members, M and S Howard and Raina Eshelman.

AGENDA

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. AGENDA REVIEW
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL MEETING
- E. COMMUNICATION ITEMS
- F. PUBLIC COMMENT
- G. ACTION ITEMS
- H. DISCUSSION
- I. ADJOURN

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Member Converse made a motion to approve the agenda. Member Kennedy seconded. All voted in favor (6-0).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM APRIL 2022

The language at the top of page 3 should note that Member Converse was recused was not present for the item, and on page 4 it should again note that Member Converse was not a participant.

Member Kennedy made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 21 meeting with the corrections. Member Webb seconded the motion with the corrections. All voted in favor (6-0).

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

Commissioner Shadduck-McNally joined for the early part of the meeting and signed off at 4:00 p.m. She discussed:

- Climate change conversation on May 21.
- Topping out ceremony happened with Behavioral Health.

- Might be interested in the discussion between the Commissioners and Planning Commission about Short-Term Rentals (STRs) that happened on May 11. STRs are a priority in the work plan set for the planners.
- The legislature: Tiny Home bill was passed into law on Tuesday.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- No members of the public commented during this part of the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

- There were no action items scheduled for this meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Short-term Rentals (STRs) and Regulation updates

Staff presented the slides about the program and referenced the memo sent out to the committee earlier in the week. Additionally, they explained that Code Compliance inspectors do not get many complaints. Complaints are mostly about property maintenance issues

Commissioner Shadduck-McNally mentioned her Community Conversation in Estes where someone said “I have no neighbors” because they are all STRs. Should there be a waiting period? Or, should an owner own for a year or two. It's a conversation happening across the state and with a statewide work.

Individual committee member comments and suggestions about STRs included:

- An STR that happens occasionally vs. all the time should have different considerations. The difference is a professional business vs. less frequent rentals. Committee members say they are less concerned with people coming to rent a unit for a few weeks per year vs. 52 weeks per year.
- Covenants say “single family residences” in some cases, and yet STRs have blown up in neighborhoods. Suggestion would be to not have a cap but get rid of them over time in residential areas. A lot of neighborhoods feel like they are in the middle of hotels. Have some consideration to slowly get rid of the density of STRs (e.g., Carriage Hills).
- What are the real issues behind this project? Is it housing? The cap, and STRs don't seem to be having an impact on housing. Is the issue quality of life? Or are we trying to get rid of them? Be focused. Don't try to make this project bigger than it should be. Do: (1) enforce the current regulations, (2) focus on density and restrict density in certain areas. Trying to raise money from STRs for housing and childcare, doesn't make sense. The focus should be narrower.
- The cottage industry has gone unregulated and growth has caused problems and affected the price and availability. Regulations need to be enforced and will take care of problems. Ensure compatibility and have clear and objective criteria. We should not have to approve or deny new STRs that don't meet objective criteria.
- A solution seems to be sound land planning practices. Licenses. Keep accommodations in A and A-1 zoning. Treat residential zoning with residential uses and avoid the quasi-commercial uses in neighborhoods.
- Consider non-transferrable licenses – let them expire.
- Provide better code compliance information to the public so neighbors know they can call in. It is obvious that a lot of planning and effort has happened code compliance, but that information may not have gotten out as widely as it should. People feel like nothing happens – they can't call sheriff or don't get a response. They don't complain, and they get angrier.
- Look at the project pragmatically. If the complaints are not an issue. If housing is not an issue, then what are the issues?
- STRs have distorted the availability and driven up the price of housing and make it hard for workforce to afford housing. Can't find essential workers. That along with neighborhood compatibility seem to be important issues.

- Agree with those points. The Spanish speaking populations finds it difficult to rent. They can find housing for a few months in the winter but not again during the summer. There are disproportionate impacts on different part of the community.
- Criteria says: “STRs should have a minimal impact” but they seem to be having a “big” impact.
- A lot of people who have bought houses are counting on the STR to be affordable to them. People will pay more if they have certain income stream.
- A-1 is supposed to be low impact accommodations (e.g., near Mary’s Lake Road). Duplexes are changing the traffic patterns.
- OK with changing process in the A district vs. A-1. Another member disagrees that A-1 has a density limit, so it is much lower impact. The original zoning was intended for cabins and lower density accommodations. Think the way the density and zoning are set up, A-1 is fine as lower density e.g., 4/acre maximum.
- Think about High Drive and cabins. Require that the cabins be legally built.
- What should the length of a short-term rental? 30 days? Or more or less?
- Issues – Neighborhood, prices, converting short- to long-term rentals. Some folks wouldn’t do a year lease, because folks want to use the unit sometimes.
- Get STRs out of residential areas.
- Apply standards to where they are higher density. Building costs contribute to the lack of affordable housing.
- Find out how many STRs there are.
- Allow long-term rentals because they are a solution to the price of real estate and for some people. Incentivize STRs from short to long-term rental – how is this done?
- Process outlined at the beginning was well conceived.
- Consistent decisions – criteria make it work and are fair. Density, amount of time. How do you quantify minimal impacts? When things aren’t clear, and they have jargon, that causes problems.
- Only 2 fire districts get compensated. Have met with EVFD yesterday about life safety inspections. There is some conversation beginning to coordinate.
- Get away from the restriction of 1 unit per property in the A district.

Stakeholder List Additions: Town Planning Commission

Estes Forward Comprehensive Plan

Staff mentioned that there will be multiple opportunities coming up.

Committee comments included:

- The meeting on May 12 was in two parts – one English and one Spanish. Jose Almeda does a great job of translating and coordinating, and he focused on housing opportunities in the Spanish meeting. There was a lot of conversations about communication issues related to the fires. New system allows to program in the language. A lot of people were looking for rental properties. They didn’t have money to buy.
- On the English side. One of the exercises was to map things. There was some disappointment that the map didn’t generate discussion about the service area and growth.
- Can that map and the service area boundary be on a CompPAC meeting? It stimulates conversation. Frank has a version of the map that can be shared.
- One question on the map – it would be useful to overlap the current zoning. Consultant should find the factors to be included. Conversations will be heated and difficult but should happen.
- Apparently, there is some significant sentiment toward no growth.
- One of the things missing was a health and social issue – more specifics regarding the aging population and elderly there. There isn’t a lot in regard to that.
- Narrow to the issues with the biggest impact.