

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**drstealescmg@gmail.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

drstealescmg@gmail.com

## Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I support the zones but NOT the additional separation, or Block facing, or sandwiching restrictions.

2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

Block-face is too complicated and will likely produce endless confusion, not to mention appeals.

General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

Please respect homeowners rights. Pick a density percentage and go with it.

Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

All the laws within a city should be uniform. It's fair. Unfortunately, many operate on the premise that all STRs are bad, and it's just not true. STRs are also a way buildings get renovated, property values increase, and they provide needed lodging for Hampton. Limiting a neighborhood's homeowners their ability to legally gain income from their similarly zoned home, as compared to another's in a different part of the city, is at it's root unfair. It is potentially a way to attract law suits and potentially seen as racists depending on the neighborhoods picked. My suggestion is to make the limit on STR between 3 and 4 percent. It is unlikely the market would support more anyway.

---

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

Again, limiting one area of the city compared to any other sounds good in terms of maintaining the culture of a neighborhood, but it ignores homeowners rights. It is again very unlikely that 3% of a Historic Neighborhood's houses being STRs would be tantamount to destroying the culture. Assuming you use the zones.

.....

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas.

\*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

See my answers above.

.....

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

Please just pick a percentage everyone is comfortable with and apply it to all the zones, and place much more emphasis on safety, abiding by the law, and paying taxes.

.....

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13



6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

This is really the same question again. City regulation should not be in the business of micromanaging neighborhoods. The questions should be more broad. STRs yes or no, in a residential neighborhood. If the answer is Yes, then its going too far to tell tax paying homeowners where they can be placed base solely on where the last one was placed.

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☒ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should \* be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas.

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☒ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

Don't bother trying to regulate this unless you enjoy endless appeals. And please double the pay of the poor city employee that has to explain the separation regulations to home buyers.

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree with this statement

☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

STRs should be administered the same way throughout the city.

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Part-time or Occupied, it's still a business that should be safe, pay taxes, and follow all the rules that make for good neighbors. I do not feel they should count towards the density percentages.

---

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**shawn.irving@ferguson.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

shawn.irving@ferguson.com

Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

STR Zones seems like a workable mechanism. I do think that the ones that we saw in meeting 6 were pretty broad. That said, if there is some mechanism for administering the STR Zones, such that there is incentive to spread the STRs across the zone vs allowing clustering impact to specific subsets, this could be pretty straightforward. Still support a more limited approach to % allowable within a zone though.

---

2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

STR Zones is simpler, but I do think block-face would be more effective at spreading STRs across a given zone. If blockface, I support a minimum of 5 houses on a block fact for 1st STR with an overall cap of 10% limit.

---

General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

---



Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

3-4%

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

< 1% or preferably 0

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

3-4% - Depends on the objective. If these are areas where we are encouraging reinvestment and revitalization, allowing a higher % of STRs could help spur this investment.

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

Where STR Zones are predominately single family housing with little or no tourism infrastructure (e.g., Wythe and Merrimac Shores areas, would like to see density of < 1%, preferably 0

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

If the density requirements are appropriate for given areas, I thin that adding separation introduces unnecessary complexity to administration.

---

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☒ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

See reply to #6. In areas where higher densities are allowed, it would seem like clustering of the STRs might be advantageous.

---

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should \* be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas.

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

This might be the one separation point that seems reasonable if it can be administered efficiently.

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

None

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Assuming that this is the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central), subject to #11 below.

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

In the spirit of the other responses re density, STRs in these areas should require more direct oversight by Council.

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

None

Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Would not support magnification of an unspecified number of part-time STRs that exceed density and separation requirements.

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Would not support magnification of an unspecified number of Owner-occupied STRs that exceed density and separation requirements.

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

None

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

None

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms



# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**jamiec0202@gmail.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

jamiec0202@gmail.com

## Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

support with the provision that some form of separation be applied.

2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

block face percentage maximum of 2x the overall cap for STR Zone

General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

A sandwiched home between STR homes is unacceptable.

Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

.....

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

.5% historic districts

.....

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

if the goal in the housing venture area is to increase home ownership STR houses will dilute that goal.  
.....

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

The STR zones need to be designed to reduce pressure on certain high probability STR units.  
.....

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I think I agree. Need more information/discussion to know for sure

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

---

### Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---



13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

.....

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

.....

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**peachstapler@gmail.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

peachstapler@gmail.com

Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

## 1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I cannot support STR zones without both blockface separation regulations AND a 0-1% cap in historic districts and housing venture areas. Conservation and preservation always come before economic development. We've done a very, very poor job learning from our past mistakes as a city. Let's not add this to the list.

---

## 2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

## 2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

I support block face with separation regulations, to include: 1) Absolutely and Unequivocally No Sandwiching 2) None Across the Street from Each Other 3) None Diagonal from Each Other 4) None Directly Behind or Directly Behind Diagonal from Each Other, and most importantly, three lots as a minimum spacing between STRs or 250 feet, whichever is greater. The linear feet requirement is essential to protecting our smaller neighborhoods with 25-40 foot frontage from becoming dense with STRs.

---

### General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

The City of Hampton must impose a separation regulation in addition to the lowest possible workable density cap with a 0-1% cap in historic districts. We cannot trust "the market to sort itself out for us". That's happy horsecrap that no one truly believes. We have a responsibility to maintain neighborhoods as places for people to live, know each other, and grow together. That's what's going to drive longterm economic vitality.

---

### Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

Each Master Plan area has its own character and longterm community and economic goals. You could hardly have four more diverse Master Plans. Let the Registered Neighborhood Organizations that walk alongside the residents and businesses who live in those communities tell you what's right for their Master Plans...after all they're the architects of those documents.

---

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts.

\*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

It should be zero. Let's be real -- STRs commodify our housing stock and make neighborhoods less cohesive. I realize you're going to see some feedback in this survey about how historic districts are inherently a tourism driver, and that's not something I'll ever deny. But I've done the research and after losing two dozen registered homes in the Phoebus Historic District since it was first recognized 17 years ago, and two of their replacements confirmed as STRs today, it's clear developers are tearing down historic houses because it's easier and cheaper to build something new. We can allow STRs outside of these irreplaceable areas of significance while maintaining historic districts as homes for our families, and still see that tax revenue everyone wants to cheer for.

Research shows that people who live in an area will financially and emotionally invest in it, even start small businesses there, and that's what Phoebus is and has always been about. In order to keep our status as Hampton's only Main Street community and maintain a strong volunteer base which is essential to the program, we need neighbors... not STRs. You can ramble on and on about how regulations will effect your investment, but my neighborhood is my investment. That's why I'm here.

One final thought I'd ask the visionaries to consider: Historic Phoebus will eventually become a preservation district (with the city's blessing). Maybe not anytime soon, but it'll happen. And it'll be the first neighborhood in the city to do so. We all need to stay cognizant of what that could mean in the context of STRs (if the fad is still around).

---

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas.

\*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Housing venture areas deliver crucial programs aimed at enhancing community revitalization, and like historic districts, should prohibit STRs or be capped at 1%. These areas strategically channel resources towards neighborhoods with higher concentrations of low to moderate income and minority households. Given the existing challenge of affordable housing, it is essential for residents to have access to housing venture areas for both affordable home ownership and rental opportunities, neither of which are in abundance in this current environment. STRs only exacerbate the affordable housing crisis.

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

The myth perpetuated by some in the stakeholder group about the only houses bought up as STRs are bungalows and small family homes is far from accurate. Waterfront homes are being bought up by STR enterprises which are impossible to track. Check for purchases by certain family names, then the transfer soon after to an LLC. They're all along Hampton River and Mill Creek (the same may be happening in Buckroe and Grandview). They pay all cash, without inspection, and turn single family waterfront homes into party houses. The financial cost levied by the courts for an STR violation such as too many occupants and noise will easily be offset by the \$800-900 these homes earn every night. Like wetland violations, they simply don't care because they'll earn that loss back in a weekend.

The city has to establish means to counter this. Please consider a 1% cap on waterfront across the entire City of Hampton and impose stricter fines for repeat violations, or if that cannot be done because it's in the courts' hands, aggressively revoke the permits of those who are repeat offenders.

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs.

\*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Regardless if you recommend STR zones or blockface as a policy, there must be separation between STRs. As I mentioned previously, my baseline is a three-home separation or 250 feet, whichever is greater. Linear feet separation would only be applied on a block face and not apply across waterways, roadways, etc. This method has been used with success in other municipalities like Morro Bay, CA.

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas.

\*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree with this statement

☐ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Two is not enough, otherwise that statement is agreeable.

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should \* be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas.

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Clustering STRs together like this is insane. It'll create a dead zone where no one will want to live. Do the opposite: keep them spaced out and cluster the families. I still can't believe we have to fight for neighborhoods to be places where people live. It's a bit surreal.

---

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

Separation is essential to retaining the fabric of our neighborhoods, especially those with smaller lot frontages. A three-house separation policy in Fordham, for example, means that linear feet separation would be between 90-110 feet. I don't bring up noise often because I believe STR renters can be (and most often are) good neighbors, but when they're not, this is tantamount to sandwiching. Separation is therefore essential, at least by three houses but also in some cases by linear feet.

---

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13



9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I agree STR permit applications must cease going to Council for approval.

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree with this statement

☐ Disagree with STR Zones

## 10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Again, I really think this depends on the perspective of the stakeholders inside each Master Plan area. Historic Phoebus for example is perfect for a UP (see below), but just outside of the historic district is more suitable for ZAP processing due to its contemporary housing assets.

---

## 11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

## 11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Requiring a UP in historic districts allows the city to strike a balance between promoting tourism and safeguarding the historical integrity of the area. The wear and tear of 10 guests every week in some of our historic homes would literally destroy some of them. Without proper regulation, the waterfront STRs will farm themselves out as wedding venues, graduation parties with 50+ people, etc. I'd even recommend that we require all permitted STRs to place their permit number on the listing for complete transparency and compliance.

The UP also gives leverage to require special property maintenance for historic sites (and our wetlands, which visitors may not have any clue how to interact with in a safe and responsible way). This will ensure STRs contribute positively to the overall upkeep of the historic district and its resources. STRs should require a good neighbor brochure to be stocked on site at all times, informing visitors of the special district they have been lucky enough to lodge themselves up in. I would put the chances at 120% of registered neighborhood organizations within those historic districts committing volunteer hours to publishing said brochure for these extremely fortunate STR owners. We also should add a prohibition for woodburning fire pits at any historic district STR, as the whole idea is to be resilient through conservation, maintaining the character of our historic homes. We do not need them burnt down by careless (drunk) tourists.

---

### General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

I understand being timid about shouldering this process administratively. Hopefully my relentless email campaign to Mary Bunting to increase staff hires for STR administration and enforcement will have some positive impact. :) If we're going to take this thing head on, we cannot move forward with the current level of resources. But I think (hope) most people realize that.

---

### Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

### 12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

If it's going to be an STR in any capacity, then it should count towards the total density and separation requirements.

---

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

If it's going to be an STR in any capacity, then it should count towards the total density and separation requirements. Although I'll gladly advocate for owner-occupied STRs to have their applications moved to the front of the queue in order to actually have full-time neighbors.

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

I highly prefer and have absolutely no problem with owner-occupied STRs. I'm sure the craftiest of STR owners could find a way to get around this requirement, but there'll always be people who feel the need to cheat the system. Send owner-occupied STR permit applications to the front of the queue if you can.

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

At times I've been harsh in describing STRs, but I think my beef is mostly with opportunists and outside investors who use the places we live in as just another commodity like lumber or coal, taking what they can as fast as they can, and then moving on. I'm afraid for what that means to our neighborhoods longterm, especially with this being a land-use permit that stays perpetually with the property. So naturally, the ideal balance for me is finding the lowest workable percentage cap for the city (1.5%) while making sure we're doing everything we can to protect our most vulnerable historic districts, our increasingly rare waterfront assets, and the housing venture areas where lower income residents are struggling to find their footing --- and that means a density cap between 0-1% for those areas with separation of at least three houses on a block face and absolutely no sandwiching, please.

.....

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**howard.lynn@gmail.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

howard.lynn@gmail.com

## Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I believe Buckroe and Phoebus particularly should have higher % cap than the rest of Hampton in order to promote family tourism with the least disruption to the adjacent community.

2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

If block face is considered I think it would be appropriate to analyze the likely resulting reduction in short term rentals to determine whether that reduction would be appropriate. New Orleans applied block face and reduced their short term rentals by 50%. With only 428 STRs in operation I don't believe it is in our best interest to cut that number in half

General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

From the beginning I have believed and continue to believe that caps are essential for the best means both to protect and limit short term rentals

Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

5% Buckroe and 5% Phoebus. in order to promote family tourism and to support local retail

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

Historic districts benefit from tourists. Tourist tend to tour closer to where they lodge.



5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

STRs live and die by reviews. Well managed STRs have a vested interest in improving the area where they are planted. City ordinance that weeds out bad operators and the placement of well managed STRs help improve declining neighborhoods.

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

I think the STR zone strategy is a great idea. The short term rentals can cluster where they are most effective without damaging the nature of the overall community

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Clustering STRs allows better compliance. Guests will complain faster about problems in a location and owners will respond faster to guests...or they will go out of business. Clusters can also do more to improve streets with pockets of problem housing.

---

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I disagree with the assumption that STRs diminish are detrimental to their neighbors. At the least they are less detrimental than being sandwiched between bad owners or bad renters.

I also believe there is good evidence that in many cases neighbors do not interact with the people across the street or next door.

---

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should \* be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas.

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☒ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Same as above. Do we have any evidence of how many residents do have meaningful interaction with their neighbors?

---

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

I believe that separation standards will reduce the number of STRs well below the caps. I think we should consider the possibility that too few STRs is detrimental to communities that are in the process of improving.

---

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree with this statement

☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I might be misunderstanding but I think historic districts should be treated the same as all others STR zones

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

.....

Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

By definition these are people who ARE living in the community. The caps are in place to ensure that we do not excessively diminish people living in the community.

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

For the same reason as above...owners living in the home are living in the community.

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

---

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

Mainly a fan letter. I appreciate as a staff the thoughtful and careful way you are leading through a very difficult issue. I don't think anyone in the Commonwealth of Virginia is doing a better job than you are.

---

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**susan@gastongroup.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

susan@gastongroup.com

Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree



1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

While I was not at the meeting, VPAR leadership has had discussions around the important BALANCE of protecting the quality and character of neighborhoods while also allowing STRs. A cap or a percentage on STRs has been discussed multiple times, even going back to the first phase of the work group; there seemed to have been consensus on that policy matter. We just did not know how to get there. In striking the important balance noted above, VPAR would support some sort of limits on the number of STRs and also would support separation.

.....

2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. ★

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

Working off of the answer to No. 1, where striking a balance is important to VPAR, the use of block-face is a potential tool in the toolbox. I just do not know where that tipping point lands on a specific number?

.....

General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

.....

Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

VPAR could agree to that concept of more STRs in those core areas, but there still should be careful consideration to striking an appropriate balance even in those busy areas of the City. Buckroe in particular needs to be treated carefully.

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

STRs in historic area call for a balance that may differ from a traditional neighborhood STR balance. Historic areas can fall victim to blight and vacancy issues; having STRs in historic areas could be an economic lifeline to the health of an historic neighborhood. I'm not sure that a blanket percentage could be applied to all historic neighborhoods.

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

See the answer to #6. Housing Venture areas could benefit from STRs. It is difficult to apply a single percentage that could be viewed as "the fix."

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs.

\*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas.

\*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree with this statement

☐ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should \* be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas.

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

---

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree with this statement

☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

.....

Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---



General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**ggdirect@aol.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

ggdirect@aol.com

Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

## 1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

This actually might be the smartest method that anyone has come up with yet. I didn't think of these small sections but it makes so much sense. This way, the fear of all the short-term rentals being in one or two areas of the city could not happen. I do like the idea of a Citywide cap of around 2% or 3%, but this way, short-term rentals would be spread out throughout the city appropriately.

---

## 2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

## 2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

When you look at the way that the city of Hampton is configured, this would probably be a nightmare to administer. Plus, in spite of some opposition to having more than one short-term rental on a block, many times families want to travel together and this is really helpful to bring in more tourism into Hampton. Block face limitations are a bad idea!

---

### General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

Higher densities in some areas, like where you can walk to the beach makes so much sense. Buckroe has historically been a high density area for short-term rentals and this is part of the reason why so many homes have been remodeled in Buckroe. Short-term rentals are one of the best things that ever happened to Buckroe and Phoebus. As I mentioned before, families want to travel together. I just booked two short-term rentals next to each other in a small town in North Carolina for a wedding in May. I will be a guest and we're bringing in families who haven't seen each other in several years so we will be able to live, eat, have coffee etc next to each other for two days.

### Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

I suggest the areas like you're mentioning here would be 3%-5% where the rest of the city should be 2%

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts.

\*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

One of the best things about short-term rentals is that additional revenue is generated and this is a way to preserve historic districts because it's much cheaper for a long-term rental just to tear an old house down and build a new one but it's so much better if a short-term rental host will buy in historic districts and restore the homes. The revenue generated will help justify this and short-term rental guests like staying in historic districts so it's good for tourism. Guests that like historic districts don't want a new house, they want a restored house.

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas.

\*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Any area of our city where we are trying to encourage remodeling needs to encourage short-term rentals because these end up being the prettiest houses on the streets with the right hosts

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

I think what the staff has come up with in terms of these smaller districts is fantastic and this is all that's needed

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs.

\*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Separating of short-term rentals that has been discussed is mitigating a fear that is blown way out of proportion. As I've stated before, clustering short-term rentals close together is good for family tourism why are people want to spend time together. Regulating hosts who don't regulate their guests solves this issue. A responsible host can get rid of a disruptive guest in less than 2 hours.

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☒ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Clusters are good, they're good for family tourism and do not ruin anything as long as the entire neighborhood is still at least 95% non short-term rentals

---

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☒ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I understand why some people would not like being sandwiched in between two short-term rentals

---

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

---

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

To do this with special use permits would be a nightmare with 500 or 1500 special use permits needing to be issued. The staff can handle this and there will be additional tax revenue generated if additional staff is needed.

---



10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

I don't know if I agree or disagree because I really don't understand the question

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

The free enterprise system and the demand for short-term rentals in historic districts are going to really help our historic districts to be restored beautifully

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

I feel like our staff is committed to doing this right and this can definitely be handled administratively.

Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Approximately 80% of short-term rentals Nationwide are whole house rentals and the only way to make economic sense is to allow them to be rented at any time during the year and the best hosts or landlords are the ones who are doing this all year round, not just part-time. But if someone just wants to give a little bit of extra revenue by renting out their owner occupied home or a room in their home, it should not account against the cap set in that neighborhood

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

This is only about 20% of short-term rentals and I agree, even though this doesn't really create the kind of Tourism that we want in Hampton or the kind of tax revenue that can be created. This also does not really Inspire the entrepreneurial spirit for small business people to emerge as successful business people long-term after starting their first short term rental outside of their home.

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

Hampton really does have the opportunity to create an ordinance that's going to be win win win win, for neighborhoods, for city tax revenues, for tourism, for hosts and for guests. I believe that we're going in the right direction if we don't put too many complicated limits on short-term rentals here in Hampton.

# Google Forms

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**stay@maghousehampton.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

stay@maghousehampton.com

## Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

1 STR for every 10 properties.

General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

Neighborhood character of the different zones should be considered. To encourage neighborhood cohesiveness and sense of community, some zones should only be allowed host-occupied STRs. We need to strongly consider our communities and neighbors. There was much "push" about STRs being necessary for tourism. It is interesting that most Short Term Rental hosts are not Credentialed Hospitality Managers and are not Tourism partners.

STR hosts are solely motivated by income. Visitors found adequate lodging long before STR's were listed on the websites. It is sincerely hoped that the integrity of our neighborhoods are not compromised with the ordinances for STRs. A large % of hosts do not live in close proximity to their property listings of STRs and are not invested in the things that make a livable community exceptional.

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

.....

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

.....

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

.....

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree



6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

The Zoning Application process should remain with City Council, with Public Hearings. I know there are downsides to this, but please consider that consistence will be needed to keep the process fair and equitable for applicants. The ZAP process will work for the time the Administrators who are onboard at this time are with the City. As employee changes occur, this process can evolve into one that is subjective, inconsistent, with increased liability for the City of Hampton.

---

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

All the same with Use Permit.

---

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

All the same with Use Permit.

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

More emphasis on Property Safety is needed and cannot be streamlined for the income of STR Hosts. The Use Permit is assuring the general public that the property is deemed suitable and is permitted by the City of Hampton to be approved for STR use. There is potential for increased Liability for the City if safety measures are not inspected at least annually (structure, fire, health) under the Use Permit requirements. We must strongly consider our neighbors and the guests to occupy the properties, not just the STR owners.

Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

All the same.

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

All the same.

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

All should be permitted the same.

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

For the additional staff and time to administer the STR Ordinance, STR owners should be paying Lodging Tax, Sales Tax, and Business Property Tax. If STRs want to be a part of Tourism, there are two additional City Surcharges that are collected from Hotel stays, as well. This revenue should go a long way in funding a consistent and effective STR program for the long-run.

Recently, read an article regarding how AirBnB is not quantifying tax revenue being paid to Virginia cities. Strongly recommend City Council freeze applications for STRs at this point, until the Commissioner of the Revenue can research and strategize how this revenue can be collected properly for the City of Hampton.

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**farmingtonhptva@gmail.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

farmingtonhptva@gmail.com

## Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

.....  
This seems like it would be more labor intensive for staff than STR zones

General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

.....

Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13



3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

3%

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

0

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

0

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

---

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

---

Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

180 max days

---

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

.....

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

.....

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms

# Short Term Rental Phase 2 Stakeholder Survey

## Background:

This form is designed to receive feedback on potential regulations related to short-term rental (STR) use in Hampton.

Once feedback is received, staff will compile the results for presentation and discussion during the upcoming STR stakeholder meeting.

**Please indicate if you support, don't support, or have suggested changes to the questions provided below.**

The respondent's email (**glendon.barron@gmail.com**) was recorded on submission of this form.

Email \*

glendon.barron@gmail.com

## Question 1 and 2 of 13

1. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using STR Zones similar to those shown in meeting 6. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

1. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....



2. Density of STRs within the city should be limited by using a block-face approach. \*

If you indicate agreement, please provide the minimum number of houses on a block to qualify for an STR, and the maximum rate (X# of STRs per Y# of houses) as a comment below.

Note: If you agree with using block-face and also support additional regulations (like separation), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

2. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the block-face rate and minimum houses):

---

General feedback about density methodology:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density methodology.

---

Questions 3, 4, and 5 of 13

3. STR Zones for the Master Plan core areas (Downtown, Phoebus, Buckroe, and Coliseum Central) should have a higher percentage of STRs than other STR Zones. \*

If you agree, please provide your recommended percentage for within those Master Plan Zones and the percentage outside of them as a comment below.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using STR Zones

3. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the suggested percentages) :

Max 3% across all zones  
.....

4. There should be fewer STRs in historic districts. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

4. Additional feedback either in support or opposition (including the percentage):

Permits should be issued on a case-by-case basis and does not exceed the maximum percentage allowed within other zones.  
.....

5. There should be fewer STRs in Housing Venture areas. \*

If you agree, indicate the percentage (which can be 0) as a comment below.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

5. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

The only restriction for housing venture areas should be that none of the housing built by grants could be used as an STR

---

General feedback about density variations:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to density variations.

---

Questions 6, 7, and 8 of 13

6. There should be a separation requirement for STRs. \*

Note: If you agree with this statement and also support additional regulations (like STR Zones), please indicate agreement for this statement. There are additional questions regarding other regulations, and further questions focusing on how separation should be done.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

6. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

7. STRs should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street and not directly fronting another STR across the street, when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched". Also, there are other options for separation in the following questions.

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

7. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

8. STRs may be directly adjacent to other STRs including across the street, but otherwise should be separated by at least two houses on the same side of the street when located in residential areas. \*

Note: This means that no home could be "sandwiched" but STRs could be next to each other.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with using separation

8. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

General feedback about separation:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of STRs related to separation.

No home should ever be sandwiched between two STR's.

Questions 9, 10, and 11 of 13

9. All STRs should be approved administratively via the Zoning Administrator Permit (ZAP) when they meet the standard set of conditions. \*

STRs which propose to exceed those conditions (such as by hosting events, or having more than 10 overnight guests or 5 bedrooms for lodging) would require approval of a Use Permit (UP) with appropriate conditions.

Note: This would not permit exceeding any density or separation regulations. The standard set of conditions was provided in previous meetings, but includes requirements about capacity, parking, advertisement, posting the floor plan with emergency exit route, maintaining a responsible local person with contact information to handle issues, and compliance with all other laws. Revocation would be possible if convicted of a violation of one of the conditions.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

9. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

10. STRs outside of the Master Plan STR Zones should require a UP, while those within the Master Plan STR Zones should require a ZAP. \*

Note: The ZAPs would have the standard set of conditions, while the UP conditions could be tailored to the specific application as appropriate.

- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Disagree with this statement
- ☐ Disagree with STR Zones

10. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

Some permit process should be used for all zones.

11. STRs within historic districts should require a UP. \*

- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Disagree

11. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

General feedback about administration:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the administration of STRs.

---

Question 12 and 13 of 13

12. "Part-time" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "full-time" STRs. \*

Note: The "part-time" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. If you agree, please indicate in the comment below the maximum number of days available for booking to qualify as a "part-time" STR. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☐ Agree

☒ Disagree

12. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

This would be too hard to enforce. The old regulation for STR in Hampton required the owner to live in the STR for 6 months out of the year and was impossible to enforce.

---

13. "Owner-occupied" STRs should be exempt from and not count towards any density or separation requirements that apply to "whole-house" STRs. \*

Note: The "owner-occupied" STRs would still be subject to the standard conditions. By "owner-occupied", we mean that the owner would need to be present during the stay. If you believe they should be treated the same, select that you disagree.

☒ Agree

☐ Disagree

13. Additional feedback either in support or opposition:

.....

General feedback about types of STRs:

Please provide any additional thoughts, concerns, or suggestions about the regulation of different types of STRs.

.....

Thank you!

Please provide any additional thoughts related to STRs that haven't been addressed.

All permits should have to be renewed within a set time period and be reinspected at renewal.

.....

This form was created inside of cddhampton.net.

Google Forms