

**Tourism Overlay District Task Force Kick-off  
Meeting Summary Notes  
November 2, 2021, 9:00 am- 11:00 am  
Breckenridge Town Hall, Lower-level Conference Room**

**Meeting Attendees**

Abby Epperson, Steve Gerard, Jim Schlegel, Bob Barto, Kelly Owens, Steve Fischer, Mike Hessel, Devon O'Neil, Abbey Browne, Dick Carleton, Michelle Zimmerman

Town Staff: Rick Holman, Shannon Haynes, Mark Truckey, Julia Puester, Bela Del Valle, Brad LaRochelle, Sarah Crump

**Summary of Discussion**

**Background Information**

Introduction from Mayor, Eric Mamula. The Planning Commission has weighed and chosen several land use districts that could fit within the tourism overlay district. Land use districts are the zoning guidelines for the town. The majority of exempt properties are within the Planning Commission's recommendation for an overlay district. Two-thirds of STR licenses are captured within the Planning Commission recommended overlay district.

Some districts list only residential or multi-family for structural type within the Land Use Guidelines, while some described with lodging as well in the structural type. The thought process behind why the guidelines were written in this way is not well known, as they were written over 30 years ago, but the patterns of development they describe should drive development.

**General Ideas on STRs in Town and the Future STR Administrative Process**

How should land use districts that do not contain language about lodging or bed-base, but have high short-term license percentages, be treated compared to LUDs that do have this language?

Saying an area has a "high percentage" of STRs is subjective. High for one neighborhood where STRs are less tolerated could be a lesser percentage than in districts where lodging is the focus.

More information on history of long-term rentals and historical vacancy rate is needed for this committee to compare districts, subdivisions, and units that are not STRs in order to determine which areas should be exempt or subject to any cap.

On adding areas to the overlay district- the more short-term licenses that are allowed in the overlay area could create areas where licenses go away completely.

This group can later discuss whether some areas are capped at a percentage of STR or capped by "block." Geography, topography, and neighborhood layouts present problems for capping by block in Breckenridge as other municipalities have done.

Is there a way to legitimize STR licenses that were quickly applied for during this process simply for fear that they would not be able to get them in the future? What about a "use it or lose it"

process where STRs that are not used go away? Maybe there is a process to identify underutilized STRs and steer them toward projects like “landing locals” instead of forcing people to STR? Some in the room disagree with the idea of requiring STR licenses to be used rather than the property being vacant.

Some STR ordinances in other municipalities, Summit County for example, carve out use for a certain number of days, 30, 60, or 90 days for example.

There could be a time limitation on application for STR when a property changes hands.

Should the STR process require a property management company? Professionally managed STRs should be the ones to consider carving out. Not all STRs that are individually managed are “problems,” this process shouldn’t discriminate against property owners who don’t use property management companies. A large part of the STR problem is a lack of “local contact” for STRs with no property management company. The group distinguishes between HOA managers versus rental property managers. This discussion should be a part of the administrative rules.

A program for long-term rental monitoring could help encourage property owners to long-term rent. Local program “lease to locals” could overcome some problems which discourage owners from long-term renting units.

Should there be implementation of rules to limit STRs within certain distances of one another? Idea to carve out STRs by location for example limit them from distance to a school etc.

Consider that this committee is shaping the visitor experience by limiting STRs in certain areas.

There is now high number of STRs in the historic district. No longer an area to have a family. This is the area some feel that the town should try to preserve by limiting STRs.

## **Comments on Individual LUDs**

### **LUD 10**

The description and intent of LUD 10 is different than other districts in the recommended overlay district. Overall, the Planning Commission thought this area could be included in the overlay district with the caveats of Grandview and Gold Camp. There could be carve outs in this district for those subdivisions which were historically permanent residents and workforce housing.

### **LUD 6**

Highlands neighborhood is perhaps impetus for this whole discussion. Residents could not vote as an HOA on a cap and are looking toward the Town to cap STRs. Highlands is a mixed bag, some exclusively second homes, non-rentals, who are there for the neighborhood. Others are exclusively STRs.

### **LUD 9.2**

Claimjumper Condos now has a 38% STR rate, used to be local workforce housing.

## **LUD 12**

Weishorn. This is a changing neighborhood which used to be all local/permanent residents.

## **LUD 17**

Longbranch subdivision should be flagged for further discussion.

## **LUD 19**

Planning Commission carved out of certain areas on Main Street. Why not carve out all multi-family on Main St? Historically, Tannhauser was always workforce housing. Edelweiss is another example for workforce housing.

## **LUD 20 (S Park Ave)**

South Park Avenue has high rate of STR. Only a portion was recommended by the Planning Commission for overlay. This area includes the future BGV development at the North Gondola lot. Flag for revisiting.

## **LUDs 30.1-30.8**

Warrior's Mark. Exception is Sunrise Point- which doesn't allow STRs. Is this area intended to be a high rate of STR? This area should be flagged and talked about later. Especially flag LUD 30.2, which is not included in the current recommendation but the group feels should likely be part of the exempt area.

## **LUD 40 (Timber Trail)**

Yes, this district should be included in the tourism overlay. This area has access to amenities at One Ski Hill place and some properties were built specifically for short-term rental. The location next to the ski hill makes this area appropriate for inclusion in the overlay district. There is a very low number of permanent residents who live here year-round or part time. Consideration of number of permanent residents was made by the Planning Commission when including this district in the overlay area.

### **What information should staff prepare for next meeting?**

- Research available data on vacancy and long-term rental rates
- Table by LUD of total units, STRs, and percentage
- Large paper map of town for delineating future overlay area
- Staff recommendation for area to be included

### **Future Meeting Date**

Tuesday, Nov 16<sup>th</sup> 9:00am-11:00am, is chosen as the next meeting date.