

## Final DMMA Data Book– Ad Hoc Committee For Rental & Exchange Parameters

### I. Background

- Ad Hoc Committee approved on January 29<sup>th</sup>. Charter: *Identify home rental/exchange community issues, gather factual data related to the issues identified, and offer recommendations to the Directors of the Desert Mountain Master Board and Management Staff.* Composition—12 community members; 2 DMMA Board Members. The committee was composed of a balanced number of individuals in favor and against restrictions, including two homeowners who rent (and are not members of the Club).
- The initial meeting was held on February 8<sup>th</sup> to review draft charter, work plan, interview guides, and data collection projects. The committee had several work streams aimed at defining the pros/cons of a 30-day minimum rental restriction and a 7-day minimum home exchange restriction for DM homeowners and the Club, and what other options, if any, might be considered? Interviewees were solicited through a DMMA eBlast and a mailbox poster on Feb 15 (with very short deadline of Feb. 19<sup>th</sup>).
- The key question that the ad hoc committee collectively agreed to focused on is as follows: *What are the pros/cons of a 30-day minimum rental restriction and a 7-day minimum home exchange restriction for DM property owners and the Club, and what other options, if any, might be considered?* Please note that the ad hoc committee was not formed to support or refute the DMMA's proposed restrictions but rather to identify issues that need to be addressed if the community accepts or rejects the proposal.
- The ad hoc committee agreed to and formed five (5) work streams. Detailed questionnaires were created for each work stream to gather facts and opinions from 174 of the 234 people who self-selected themselves to be interviewed (74%) to date:
  - A. Homeowners that rent/exchange
  - B. Homeowners disrupted by renters, exchange or other owners
  - C. General homeowners
  - D. Realtors
  - E. Club/Board leadership
- Data collection vectors included: Meetings with DMMA Security; research into regulations of local competitive private communities; review of several key online websites advertising Desert Mountain rentals and an internet search regarding towns and cities that have experienced significant STR growth and have enacted ordinances restricting or even banning them.

**Note: The facts from interviews are anecdotal; the committee can verify responses, if required; however, we have assumed answers were made in good faith. Additionally, further efforts can be undertaken if the DMMA believes our sample size (234) is insufficient.**

## **II. Rental/Exchange Population**

- Number of homes for rent in Desert Mountain: To date, the committee estimates that DM has approximately 155 homes for rent or exchange in 31 villages, representing 8.0% of homes in our community. Total homes in Desert Mountain (including under construction) is 1,940 per the DMMA website.
- National growth trend: Looking at national trends, short-term rentals (“STRs”), defined as homes rented for less than thirty (30) days, have grown 120% in the last five years. We do not have trend data specific to Desert Mountain available.
- Below is a table of the estimated homes for rent by village. This estimate was determined by reviewing public websites, reviewing homes currently registered with the DMMA as a rental property and members familiar with nearby rental homes.

## Compilation of Estimated Rental Properties by Village

<u>Village</u>	<u>Estimated No. Rental Properties</u>	<u>Villages with 30 Day Rental Restrictions</u>
1 Apache Cottages I	4	
2 Apache Cottages II	1	
3 Apache Peak	13	
4 Arrowhead	6	
5 Cochise Geronimo	0	30
6 Cochise Ridge	8	
7 Deer Run	0	
8 Desert Fairways	4	
9 Desert Greens	6	
10 Desert Hills	3	
11 Desert Horizons	4	
12 Eagle Feather	6	
13 Gambel Quail	7	
14 Grey Fox	10	
15 Haciendas	3	30
16 Lone Mountain	0	
17 Lone Mountain II	0	30
18 Lookout Ridge	6	
19 Lost Star	0	30
20 Mountain Skyline	4	
21 Painted Sky	6	
22 Renegade Trail	2	
23 Rose Quartz	2	
24 Saguaro Forest	13	30
25 Seven Arrows	0	30
26 Sonoran Cottages	11	
27 Sonoran Cottages Enclave	6	
28 Sonoran Ridge	9	
29 Sunrise	14	
30 Sunset Canyon	2	
31 Turquoise Ridge	5	
Total	155	

### III. Key Statistics

#### Work Stream A: Homeowners that rent/exchange:

- **Population interviewed:** 44 of 155 rentals—32 members; 12 non-members
- **How many times do you rent per year?** High-16; Low-1; Average-5
- **Shortest rental period:** High-365 days; Low-1 day; Average-9 days (excluded two highs of 365; three lows of 1 day to determine the average)
- **Length of rental:** Of forty (40) responses, the dispersion of length of rental: 13 have rented for 3 days; 21 have rented for 7 days; 16 have rented for 14 days; 25 have rented for >30 days
- **Number of tenants allowed per domicile per rental:** Only twelve (12) respondents would share that information with the ad hoc committee. High—8; Low—2; Average—5.
- **Use of DM amenities:** 87% told us they don't market DM amenities, answers were conflicting. Omitted 5 interviews from the population for this question – response to the question not clear - could impact the % response rate. In addition, a review of the rentals listed on the Desert Mountain Club's public website shows 21 of the 52 homes listed do, in fact, refer to Desert Mountain amenities. Two members of the committee reviewed seventy-nine (79) AirBnB and VRBO listings. The first review concluded 6-11 of homes for rent directly advertised amenities or that the home had close proximity to amenities. The second review concluded 10-24 of homes for rent directly advertised amenities or that the home had close proximity to amenities. Both committee members concluded that four (4) ads advertised the ability to obtain an unaccompanied guest pass from the Club and twenty-nine (29) overtly stated the amenities are for DM members and their guests only.
- **Inquires for unaccompanied guest pass:** Only five (5) responded to this question: High—90%; Low—5%; Average—49%.
- **Inquires regarding Club membership:** High-100%; Low-10%; Average-49%. Only nine (9) responses to this question.
- **Renters purchasing homes in DM:** 45 renters ultimately purchased a home. The period of time over which these homes were purchased is unknown and currently unsubstantiated. Nineteen (19) responses.
- **Number of renters who are DM members:** High-100%; Low-5%; Average-49%. Twenty-four (24) responses.
- **Issues with tenants:** 90% had no issues. Two omitted from the % due to lack of clear response.
- **25 respondents would not have purchased** the home had they known about rental restrictions—18-members; 7 non-members
- **54% (21 responses) indicated they would suffer** some level of financial hardship if the community approves the restrictions. 17 members; 4 non-members

#### Pros

- 25 of 40 respondents have indicated they rent their home > 30 days. No impact from the proposed restriction
- Renters inquire about the Club
- Renters have converted to owners
- Renters who rent their homes to DM members or property owners would not be affected by the proposed restriction. Will positively impact the 3 day; 7 day and 14 day population

### Cons

- Population of STRs will be impacted by proposed restrictions if not rented to Club members or property owners
- Owners would not have purchased if restrictions known or contemplated—could sell.
- Based on 155 rental properties, if rented out an average of six (6) times per year, to an average of six (6) tenants per home and assuming an average of 50% rented to DM members, the community could conservatively have about 2,800 tenants entering the community. This extrapolation could be further reduced if the home is rented >30 days. Assuming about one-half of the homes are >30 days, the estimated range of tenants could be 1,400 to 1,500. The ad hoc committee would suggest that range estimates using different variables be considered if considering communication of these statistics to the community. A model has been developed to assist with different scenarios.

### Constructive Comments

Consistent theme among all interview groups: Code of Conduct – for Owners & Tenants – Develop it and enforce it. The majority of the “renters” interviewed would be willing to follow the code of conduct and rental standards.

- Only allow realtors (trained in the rules of DM) to screen tenants and place rentals. VRBO and AirBnB may not be good for the brand.
- Short-term rentals through approved realtors is an opportunity to identify potential buyers and Club members. Consider a “try and buy” program and build database of viable prospects instead.
- A realtor/rental program might assist owners needing to defray costs of homes (in which they stay only a portion of the year). Might not otherwise be able to afford home.

### Critical Comments

- Exception for members, their family and their “guests” is not enforceable. Only enforceable if members rent on behalf of family or guests. Proposing an amendment that is not enforceable. Ripe for abuse. Note: the proposed restriction

- allows Club members and property owners to rent a home for a period of less than 30 days to accommodate their families, close personal friends
- 30-day restriction on rentals vs. 7 days restriction for exchanges is not equitable. Want same restriction for both.
  - DMMA perceived as not enforcing the use restriction on all homeowners.
    1. Animals
    2. Motor Vehicles
    3. Lights
    4. Garbage
    5. Maintenance of Lawns and Plantings
    6. Repair of Buildings
    7. Leasing Restrictions
    8. Rights of Enjoyment-loud music, profanity, late night patio parties, etc.
  - Individual villages should decide restrictions. Six have them; let the other 25 decide. (However, most of the other villages are not incorporated and cede their policies to the DMMA)
  - Restrictions may decrease property values and membership sales. Club-member owners would consider high deposit to allow renters to use their member number (Although this action is strictly prohibited by the Club and would warrant disciplinary action by that body.)

## **Work Stream B: Homeowners disturbed by renters/owners:**

- **Population interviewed:** 32—31 members; 1 non-member
- **Disturbed by renters/owners:** 21 experienced problems with renters/owners; 11 did not experience a problem (66%/34%)
- **Length of rental:** Twenty (20) respondents estimated the dispersion of the length of rental as follows: 11 have observed homes rented for 3 days; 8 have observed homes rented for 7 days; 4 have observed homes rented for 14 days; 5 have observed homes rented for >30 days
- **Reported incidents to DMMA security:** Of the 21 respondents, eight (8) contacted security to complain (38%).
- **Types of problems:** The twenty-one (21) respondents experienced:
  1. Screening process poor – a wanted fugitive or police informant was a long-term renter near one respondent
  2. Noise – especially late at night
  3. Cars speeding
  4. Profanity
  5. Illegal lighting
  6. Garbage left out or not conforming with Scottsdale guidelines
  7. Domestic disturbances
  8. Cars parking in the street & driveways
- For the 11 not directly disturbed a nearby rental, the following were noted:
  1. House painting needed
  2. Landscaping not being tended to
  3. Use of Club amenities: Pickleball and Golf (sneaking on the course)
- **Opinion of the proposed rental restriction:** 94% in favor of a restriction; 6% against a restriction
- **Would the opinion change with better enforcement by the DMMA/Club:** 96% still in favor of restriction even if better Use Restriction enforcement deployed. Omitted 6 interviews from the population for this question due to lack of clear response - Could impacted the % response rate.
- **In favor of a limited waiver to proposed rental restrictions:** 63% do not think a limited waiver would be helpful or necessary. Omitted 8 interviews from the population for this question due to lack of clear response - Could impacted the % response rate

### Pros

- This group believes restrictions could reduce or eliminate incidents outlined above
- Home appearance and landscaping maintenance may increase property values

### Cons



- Owners adversely affected by rental properties, unless resolved, could sell and leave DM

### Constructive Comments

- Club/DMMA form a rental property oversight committee to:
  1. Register rentals
  2. Collect information—a) Name; b) Contact information; c) Time period of rental; d) License plate number; e) Create special guest pass for tenants (outside of GateAccess)
  3. Document complaints
  4. Develop penalty regime based on severity of or number of complaints
  5. Club—Monitor website advertising use of amenities as a perk

### Critical Comments

- Security
  1. GateAccess-use of “guests’ list being abused by members (landlords), realtors and property managers
  2. Ability to delegate authority to realtor, property manager, etc. security risk
  3. In the event of an emergency, not understanding who is on property. DMMA has an internal 911 system to contact all owners in the event of an emergency working with the county sheriff.
  4. VRBO, AirBnB perceived lack of screening of tenants – security & brand risk
  5. Cost of handling renters
- Brand – Private & exclusive image is being diminished by STRs
- Private, residential community. DM is not a renters’ community/resort. A rental community is not what they invested in. Property values will decrease if residents decide to sell and leave.
- Other north Scottsdale private communities have restrictions in place and enforcement appears to be increasing. DM needs to do the same.

### Work Stream C: General Homeowners:

- **Population interviewed:** 83—80 members; 3 non-members
- **Number of months they stay at DM:** High-12; Low-0; Average 8
- **Number of years as a member:** High-28; Low-1; Average-13
- **Did you rent at DM prior to your purchase:** 68% of these General Homeowners did not rent in DM prior to purchasing. 7 omitted – lack of response – could impact the % response rate.
- **Are you aware of short-term rentals:** 82% were aware of STRs in DM
- **Are short-term rentals consistent with the DM brand:** 61% felt that STRs were not consistent with the DM brand. 11 did not offer an opinion – could impact the % response rate.
- **Have you had any direct experience with a renter:** 34 respondents had an experience with a renter. 13 of the 34 commented that it was a positive experience. 14 of the 34 commented that it was a negative experience. 7 were neutral on the experience.
- **Have you been inconvenienced by a renter when trying to access DM amenities:** 69% did not experience any inconvenience when trying to access Club amenities. However, most were unaware if any inconvenience they were experiencing was from owners or tenants since they were not aware of the level of tenants in DM. 14 were uncertain and omitted – could impact the % response rate.
- **Are you concerned about the current level and potential growth of rental properties in DM:** 66% were concerned with the level and potential growth of STRs. 9 offered no opinion – could impact the % response rate.
- **Opinion of the proposed rental restriction:** 73% in favor of a restriction; 24% against a restriction; two offered no opinion
- **Would the opinion change with better enforcement by DMMA/Club:** 82% still in favor of restriction or favor no restrictions even if better Use Restriction enforcement deployed. Their opinion did not change with better enforcement. 14 did not offer an opinion – could impact the % response rate.
- **In favor of a limited waiver to proposed rental restrictions:** 52% were not in favor of any “waivers” from a 30-day/7-day exchange restriction. 13 did not offer an opinion – could impact the % response rate.
- 

#### Pros

- Group is sympathetic to property rights issues and potential impact on people who rent for whatever reason

#### Cons

- This group believes the DM brand will be diminished by STRs

- This group wants enforcement but sees challenges
- Restrictions will adversely impact potential members/owners

### Constructive Comments

- Grandfather existing rental properties; must register with HOA and prove rental activity before an effective date. Penalties to be considered if this doesn't occur. Impose restrictions on any further rental properties. If the grandfathered property changes hands, rental restrictions will apply. Cap the population at its current level. Penalty or loss of rental privileges if not registered.
- This group also suggested that Club/DMMA form an oversight committee to register rentals, collect information on renter, document complaints (and apply a penalty regime based on severity and number of complaints). The Club should monitor website advertising to identify properties touting Club amenities.
- Private, residential community. DM is not renters' community/resort. A rental community is not what they invested in. Property values will decrease if residents sell and leave.

### Critical Comments

- No ROI on rentals. Just covering costs. Expensive to rent in DM—effective deterrent
- Effective marketing for the community and club--why shut the door on prospects?
- Rental restrictions are in the CC&Rs. Enforce them:
  1. Owners renting fully responsible for renter's compliance with all HOA rules
  2. Only a dwelling unit may be leased, no portion of a home
  3. Only a single family may occupy a leased property
  4. A rental form identifying the leasing occupants must be submitted to the HOA for every rental transaction
- A respondent inquired about Article 19.4 (Amendments) of CC&Rs which states: *"Developer Consent Required: Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Master Declaration may not be amended at any time, including without limitation any amendment which would diminish the rights of Developer or Club under any Village Declaration or Supplemental Declaration, without written consent of the Developer, as long as Developer owns the Ranch Property or any portion of the Potential Development Parcels, and/or so long as the Developer owns any of the Club facilities."* Inquires have been made with external legal counsel and the ad hoc committee has been told this Article should not have an impact on the proposed rental restrictions. The DMMA has been in discussions with the Club, they are fully aware of the proposed restriction and their rights would not be diminished.

## **Work Stream D: Realtors:**

- **Population interviewed:** 14—12 members; 2 non-members
- **Number of rentals properties offered for rent:** High-30; Low-0
- **Length of rental:** Dispersion of length of rental (total responses – 9): 3 have rented for 3 days; 2 have rented for 7 days; 3 have rented for 14 days; 9 have rented for >30 days
- **Percentage of homes rented to DM members:** High-100%; Low-50%; Average-82%
- **Realtors that own a home in DM:** 11-Yes; 3-No
- **Percentage of potentials buyers inquiring about renting:** High-50%; Low-0%
- **Potential buyers who rented for <30 days and bought:** It was represented that there were 37 purchases over a two-year period.
- **Potential buyers who rented for <30 days and joined the Club:** It was represented that there were 39 memberships sold over a two-year period.
- **Impact of proposed restrictions on property values:** 50% think a restriction will have a positive impact on home values; 50% think it will have a negative impact on property values.
- **Impact of proposed restrictions on the DM brand:** Seven (7) believe that a restriction will have on positive image of the community as exclusive; Seven (7) believe it will be viewed as a negative and make it harder to sell property.

### Pros

- 9 of 14 respondents have experienced rentals > 30 days. No impact from the proposed restriction
- High percentage of rentals to DM members. Not affected by the proposed restriction

### Cons

- Proposed rental restriction could impact home sales, membership sales and property values
- DM not embracing the new “sharing” economy by proposing restrictions

### Constructive Comments

- Trend? – Older members selling homes; keeping memberships; renting long-term. Want to be in DM and avoid home maintenance.
- Solution? Demand for rental from members HIGH; supply of rental homes LOW. Could we consider a rental pool to allow existing owners that rent to offer their property for rent? Eliminate or reduce VRBO and AirBnB.
- Brand deterioration – not private; not exclusive; not secure
- Property value deterioration – Investor property owners will hurt value
- VRBO and AirBnB bad for DM brand

### Critical Comments

- STRs bread and butter of real estate & membership sales
- Potential buyers want to stay and experience DM before buy
- Long term rental could be an issue – “pretend” members
- New economy is more “sharing” less ownership—should embrace
- DM harder to sell then Silverleaf; DC Ranch: Troon North because of their proximity to Scottsdale
- A realtor lost two contracts for sale when the rental restriction proposal was introduced in July 2017.

### **Work Stream E: Desert Mountain Club:**

- Population interviewed 1 – Club CEO
- **Impact of proposed restrictions are potential membership sales:** Don't think that a 30-day rental/7day exchange restriction would impact Club since renters are not able to use the facilities. Most Club prospects are friends of Club members who tend to come and stay with the member in their home and utilize the facilities with the member as an "accompanied" guest.
- **What brand is the DM Club trying to project to the community:** The brand the Club is trying to project is that of a premier, exclusive, private Club with tremendous amenities. STRs have a negative impact on image, property values, amenities, and marketing; makes DM appear to be just like any other resort, such as The Boulders, rather than a premier golf club.
- **Use of the unaccompanied guest pass:** The Club has never intended for renters to use the facilities, as "unaccompanied" guests. That approach should never be used as an incentive for sales. Unaccompanied passes are meant for family or close personal friends of members, not strangers.

### **Data Collection: DMMA Security:**

Have there been security issues or incidents reported from properties registered as rental properties? [Note that of the 155 rental properties identified by the committee, only 78 known to the DMMA before this process. Total homes in Desert Mountain are 1,940 (including under construction) as of 2/28/18 per the DMMA website.]

- In the less than five years of May 2013 through January 2018 – 289 calls were dispatched to rental property. Total number of call for this period is 7,021.
- The calls ranged from “routine” (e.g., jump start, snake removal, dead animal removal) to “nuisance” (e.g., noise, parking, trash issues) to “suspicious” (alarms, unsecured residence, drone, suspicious persons), to potentially “criminal” (domestic disturbance, gate strike, phone threat, theft).
- Security identified the calls for service by category and then researched the same categories for each year obtaining a total by category. The following percentages reflects the total number of service call reports to rental properties compared to the total calls by category:
  1. 2013 - 29 out of 1,262 - 2.22%
  2. 2014 - 59 out of 1,584 - 3.72%
  3. 2015 - 69 out of 1,482 - 4.66%
  4. 2016 - 65 out of 1,311 - 4.96%
  5. 2017 - 60 out of 1,213 - 4.95%

DMMA security believes that an upward trend of service calls to rental properties is developing.

- Prior to the 2/28/18 incident report cited above, DMMA security provided the committee a preliminary report that identified 220 incidents related to rental properties. One member of the committee reviewed that report and identified 78 incidents that seemed non-routine (35%). After discussion with the committee, the information identified was deemed too subjective and removed from the preliminary data book. However, that preliminary information made its way into the public domain, so it has been reintroduced in the data book. Here is the composition of the 78 incidents identified:
  - 36 - House or fire alarms
  - 11 - Noise complaints
  - 8 – Suspicious person complaints
  - 8 - Unsecured residence complaints
  - 3 – Gate strike complaints
  - 3 – Theft complaints
  - 2 – 911 hang up complaints
  - 2 - Parking complaints
  - 1 – Drone complaint

- 1 – Telephone threat complaint
- 1 – Domestic disturbance complaint
- 1 - Neighbor taking pictures of them complaint
- 1 – Trash in driveway complaint

78 - Total



## Data Collection: Competing Community Restrictions:

- Redacted
  1. Six (6) month minimum; 2 Occupancies per year.
  2. \$1,000 fine for breaking advertising rules
  3. “Realtor in Good Standing” – mandatory training program for realtors (held twice a year) regarding rental policy. If realtor does not adhere, they will not be given access to the community.
- Redacted
  1. No CC&R change for STRs yet. In process but need to educate community
  2. Proposed fines are high - \$5,000
- Redacted
  1. 30-day minimum rental passed in the 1990s
  2. Fines set at \$1,000 per violation
  3. Proactively notified the community of the rental policy; laid out the enforcement policy and related consequences (i.e., Will file a formal complaint with City of Scottsdale Code Enforcement Department)
- Redacted – Existing CC&Rs did not anticipate STRs. 4,000 homes; 2,700 members
  1. Working with county to create an ordinance limiting rentals to a minimum of 30 days.
  2. Tightening enforcement – must present city license to rent and proof that they are paying the hotel/motel nightly bed tax.
  3. Changing software (from Capture to Dwelling Live) to better process visitors
  4. Issues key fobs and member cards to gain access to amenities. Control non-member access to facilities and reduce, what they call, the “compaction” issue. Overcrowding in the facilities.
- Redacted – 1,700 homes
  1. Monroe County has a 30-day minimum rental restriction where they are located. Redacted is exempt from that ordinance because they own a 140-room inn; 30 townhouses; and manages about 100 vacation rentals for their member/owners. Redacted is trying to convince renters to use their Club to secure rentals for better screening, better utilization of their property. They have tried to prevent VRBO and AirBnB from using the Redacted name in their advertisement with little success. They feel it is hurting their brand. Finally, the Club is requiring advance notification of potential tenants to perform inform background checks (i.e., Google searches of names, potential criminal records, etc.). They have been considering

formal background searches but no decision has been made at this time.

2. Five (5) local real estate firms also handle vacation rentals for member/owners.
3. Redacted has a Club; Community Association (HOA) and each condo unit have its own building association.
4. The HOA has institute a “three strike” rule. Any property for rent must have a property manager available 24/7 in the community to deal with noise, safety, etc. If rental violations accumulate to three, the owner will no longer be able to rent their property in Redacted.
5. Each condo and their related associations have their own set of rules. Some require background checks of potential tenants; some require at least one week notice of a proposed rental; some have hired building security (24/7) to restrict access to owners or approved tenants only.
6. The Club does allowed unaccompanied guest cards. Members are allowed to get two cards in five years. The member must represent if they know the person for whom they are requesting the guest card. If they misrepresent their relationship with the person, the member could lose his or her Club privileges.
7. The Club uses a system called M-Tack. Allows security to communicate with the Club system to obtain member data.

## Data Collection: Website Searches

- Desert Mountain Public-facing website: 52 properties advertised for rent. Of that number 24 advertise STRs; 21 tout amenities of Desert Mountain including golf, Sonoran fitness, community pool access and restaurants.
- AirBnB, VRBO and HomeAway for next season list > 100 properties, almost all as STRs according to the advertisement. More research would need to be done on the length of stay since some website automatically calculate the length of stay. Only a small % mentions that amenities are for Desert Mountain members only. Most cite golf, hiking, fitness and privacy/gated community.
- Articles: Recent communities experiencing significant growth of STRs and introducing restrictions or bans on STRs in *residential communities* includes: Atlanta, Denver, Fort Worth, Fresno, Jacksonville, Kansas City, MO; New Orleans, Palm Springs, Portland, San Francisco, Santa Barbara and Washington D.C.
- Articles pointing to rapid growth of STRs value the market at \$100 billion annually.

#### **IV. Observations to Consider**

##### **A. Implementation challenges of 30-day rental restriction/7-day exchange restriction:**

- Robust rental registration process needed.
- Internet site regulation.
- Education re: Code of Conduct (for renters AND community at large).
- Changes may be needed to the security processes for access and enforcement.
- Laddered disciplinary process (enforcement likely to occur after the incident).
- Need separate process for realtors, so sales process is supported rather than negatively affected.
- Use of Club amenities by tenants and unaccompanied guests appears to be an issue. The Club is aware and addressing it.
- Identifying areas ripe for abuse and work closer with the Club.

##### **B. Opportunities identified:**

- Grandfather and/or sunset existing rentals properties to mitigate property owners impacted.
- Rental pool developed and controlled by HOA, realtors and the Club.
- Creation of a “concierge service” for members/property owners requiring a shorter term rental for close personal friends and family.
- Creation of a robust homes sales and membership marketing program by capturing data captured through rental registration process, concierge rental service and an innovative sales program.