

**MGCA Member Q&A**  
**On Possible Changes to Rule 20**  
**April 24, 2021**

*Note: The responses below were prepared by members of the Property Ownership Committee, which is responsible for administering the rules governing rental properties.*

**Linda Schreiber**  
**407 Sixth Street**

**When rule 20 was implemented, I believe the goal was to achieve a cap of 25% or 60 permits. Currently we are at 26%, not far from our goal. Why would you want to now increase the cap to 33% or 49%? I believe at the time Rule 20 was adopted lots of input from the community and the board were followed. Now you are saying “who” is unhappy with this cap?**

- *The stated goal of the current rule is a reduction to 25% or 60 dwellings. However, a majority of community feedback received in 2019 and to date reflects that most residents want either no limit on the number of rentals or no more rentals than full-time residences, and that long-term rentals should not be limited. There are currently 89 full-time residences. A fixed cap of 72 short-term rentals is the number currently being discussed.*

**How much will the answering service be for the year?**

- *The answering service is not being discussed specifically for rental issues, but as something that would be beneficial to the community as a whole. It could provide a 24/7 means for Members to contact the MGCA for a range of issues, from problems observed at a cottage (e.g., water leaks, sewer backups, downed trees, etc.) to rules violations by owners or tenants. General discussion is underway, and until it is determined what service would be needed, exact costs won't be known.*

**Didn't we add dumpsters primarily for the convenience of the renters for no additional fee to the rental properties? Instead, the cost is absorbed by everyone in the community.**

- *No, the dumpsters were not added primarily for renters. They are useful for weekend disposal of rental property trash, but according to the Building and Grounds Committee, that has not been their primary use. Many owners who use their properties on weekends and aren't here on Mondays for trash pickup use the dumpsters, Members at the north end of the Campmeeting find them convenient to use, and they were heavily used this past winter when mostly permanent residents were present.*

**Are we to do that (the cost being absorbed by everyone in the community) again with the answering service?**

- *As explained above, if adopted, an answering service will benefit all Members.*

**Robin May**  
**507 5<sup>th</sup> Street**

**With regard to permits issued year-round on a first-come basis, I submit there should be a mechanism that protects ongoing rentals and not a race each year to maintain their rental status. Perhaps this is covered elsewhere in the former rule.**

- *That issue is not addressed in the former rule, but is in the proposed rule. The proposed rule would include automatic renewal of permits for existing permit holders and a simple first-come, first-served waiting list (like that already used for MGCA garage and shed rentals) for new permit applicants.*

**Karrie and Ron Hontz**  
**309 7<sup>th</sup> Street**

**How is this new cap being selected? There was a lot of work put into the current rule and there doesn't appear to be any factual justification to making these changes. It is noted that this is what is "desired" by the community. How was that determined? Was there a survey?**

- *The stated goal of the current rule is a reduction to 25% or 60 dwellings. However, a majority of community feedback received in 2019 and to date reflects that most residents want either no limit on the number of rentals or no more rentals than full-time residences, and that long-term rentals should not be limited. There are currently 89 full-time residences. A fixed cap of 72 short-term rentals is the number currently being discussed. No Member survey was conducted specifically for the current or proposed rule. There was a general Member survey conducted in 2018 (results available on the MGCA website), though it was not focused on rentals. 81 Members said they were not concerned about rentals; 71 Members said they were. "Business rentals" were prioritized as 22<sup>nd</sup> out of 33 "most pressing challenges," just below "dog issues." "Restricting rental units" was the 7<sup>th</sup> most commented-on issue, with three Member comments (out of 171 respondents).*

**Why do we need a 24-hour answering service? There is no mention of the cost for this service. How much will this cost us?**

- *An answering service would allow members to know that they can leave messages or receive a response to their call in a timely fashion at any time of day. The answering service is not being discussed specifically for rental issues, but as something that would be beneficial to the community as a whole. Unless and until it is determined what service would be needed, exact costs won't be known.*

**How many [Rules] violations have been reported in the last year? How many fines have been levied?**

- *No violations to date in 2021. Two trash violation fines were issued in 2020 (one owner; one long-term renter). One noise violation fine was issued in 2019 (owner). All new violations with fines are reported at Regular Board of Managers meetings and in the MGCA newsletter.*

**How can you propose increasing costs relative to managing rentals, and at the same time propose a decrease to the permit fee? Is a \$25 change in permit fee really all that significant for the landlords?**

- *There is nothing in the currently-proposed changes to the rental rule that would increase administrative costs. Also, while there was some discussion of reducing the permit fee, the Board is aligning with the idea that the fee should remain the same.*

**Mary Kopala**  
**609 Sixth Street**

**I would like to know how a strong commitment to upholding the governing documents, a duty of a board and board member, is overreach. Please explain.**

- *The overreach referred to specifics of Rule 20. Section XI of current Rule 20 reads, "The provisions in these Rules & Regulations shall supersede any other of the rules and regulations of the Campmeeting Association which are inconsistent herewith." For one rule to supersede all others seems like overreach. The current rule also unnecessarily repeats many provisions already contained in the By-Laws and Rules and Regulations. Finally, the rule states, "it shall be unlawful for any person to conduct or operate or cause to be rented, either as owner, responsible agent or contact person, any residential dwelling unit within The Campmeeting without having a residential rental permit." We don't believe the MGCA has the authority to impose "laws," nor to determine that a violation of MGCA rules is "unlawful."*

**The stated "Goal of the New Rule" is, to "support rental property owners to help ensure that rentals are a positive part of the community." Shouldn't the goals of rules be geared to support the residents?**

- *It is the Board's responsibility to represent all MGCA Members. That includes full-time residents, part-time residents, Members who use their cottages only occasionally, and those who choose to rent out their properties some or all of the time. Ensuring that rentals are a positive part of the community will benefit all Members and the community as a whole.*

**Sandy/George Leyh**

**301 6<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Nor do we believe the “Existing rule is overly complex and difficult to administer.” How is it too difficult to administer?**

- *The rule is written in unnecessarily complex language, repeats provisions contained elsewhere in the MGCA By-Laws and Rules and Regulations, and fails to address a variety of circumstances encountered since its implementation such as, providing no mechanism to determine who will be granted permits if the number of applications exceeds the number of available permits, not allowing available permits to be granted throughout the year, and the occasional need for sellers to “rent back” their property, as described below.*

**Why do you believe a “one-month permitting window is too restrictive” and how does it “affect both sellers and buyers?”**

- *Properties are bought and sold throughout the year. A one-month permitting window may require a new owner to wait as long as a full year to receive a rental permit. This has already affected multiple sales and purchases and could also affect current Members who decide outside of the permitting window to rent their property. Also, “rent-back” provisions are sometimes included in a sales agreement to allow a seller to remain in their home for a stated period following the sale of a property. If the one-month rental application window is not open (under the current rental rule) the new buyer cannot obtain a permit to rent the property back to the seller.*

**“The number at which rentals are capped and the continuously reducing cap are inconsistent with desires expressed by Members.” Excuse us, but was there a vote or a survey that we missed? How did you determine what our desires are?**

- *No Member survey was conducted specifically for the current or proposed rule. There was a general Member survey conducted in 2018 (results available on the MGCA website), though it was not focused on rentals. 81 Members said they were not concerned about rentals; 71 Members said they were. “Business rentals” were prioritized as 22<sup>nd</sup> out of 33 “most pressing challenges,” just below “dog issues.” “Restricting rental units” was the 7<sup>th</sup> most commented-on issue, with three Member comments (out of 171 respondents). See previous question/answer for more details.*

**Exceptions to the rule have been made when issuing permits. Why have exceptions been made and who made them? Why is the Board of Managers not dealing with this? Is it not the Board that issues permits?**

- *The Board has made exceptions in cases when they were deemed reasonable. There were multiple exceptions due to circumstances that the current rule did not anticipate. Some examples are that the rental application requires grandfathered applicants to produce evidence of rentals to exercise priority over others in the application process. Due to the pandemic, some were unable to do so, and the Property Ownership Committee allowed exceptions to this provision so those applicants could maintain their grandfathered status. Transfer of a permit was also allowed due to unique circumstances surrounding the sale of a property.*

**Ensure that the MGCA is aware of all properties that are being regularly rented. How will this work? MGCA is aware of who has rental permits. Is the key word “regularly”? Is your next step to put those properties that are not “regularly” rented in a different category in order to increase the number of rental permits?**

- *The “regularly” to which you refer had to do with an initial discussion of allowing rentals of one to 14 days in a given year without a permit. The Board has since abandoned this provision.*

**You want to allow properties to be rented without a permit, for a limited number of days. If this is implemented, who could ever know what properties are being rented and for how long? And who would be in charge of policing these properties that are renting without a permit?**

- *Again, the “limited number of days” rental provision has been abandoned. Your questions regarding policing of rentals applies to many things in the Campmeeting. As with many rules in the Campmeeting, we largely rely upon the personal integrity of our Members.*

**Replace variable cap with a fixed cap ▪ Based on what criteria? The current cap was based on figures and statistics. This one is based on what?**

- *A fixed cap is consistent with Member feedback and will be easier to administer. A majority of community feedback received in 2019 and to date reflects that most residents want either no limit on the number of rentals or no more rentals than full-time residences, and that long-term rentals should not be limited. There are currently 89 full-time residences. A fixed cap of 72 short-term rentals is the number currently being discussed.*

**Why would you want to reduce the cost of the permit?**

- *The current permit fee significantly exceeds actual administrative costs. However, the Board is inclined to keep the permit cost the same.*

**MGCA will provide a 24-hour answering service. Who will pay for this? This is another way to charge residents for things that benefit only the renters.**

- *The answering service is not being discussed specifically for rental issues, but as something that would be beneficial to the community as a whole. It could provide a 24/7 means for Members to contact the MGCA for a range of issues, from problems observed at a cottage (e.g., water leaks, sewer backups, downed trees, etc.) to rules violations by owners or tenants. There are no services provided by the MGCA and assessed to all Members that benefit only renters.*

***Paula Deppen***

***511 5<sup>th</sup> Street***

**I love the idea of the proposed toll-free [answering service] number... however, who will pay for this number?**

- *The answering service is not being discussed specifically for rental issues, but as something that would be beneficial to the community as a whole. It could provide a 24/7 means for Members to contact the MGCA for a range of issues, from problems observed at a cottage (e.g., water leaks, sewer backups, downed trees, etc.) to rules violations by owners or tenants.*

**Will the community be able to review the landlord orientation material before it is presented to the landlords?**

- *The Property Ownership Committee plans to post it on the MGCA website and will welcome any feedback or suggestions from Members.*

**Brenda Martin**

**205 4<sup>th</sup> Street**

**I'm not in the rental business nor do I intend to get into the rental business where I would offer my cottage as a rental on the open market [but might consider renting on a less formal basis]. How does that fit in the current rule? In the proposed rule, would this be part of the 14-day allowable rentals or would this not be counted toward the 14-days?**

- *The current rule would require you to obtain a permit. In regard to the proposed rule, the Board discussed allowing rentals of up to 14 days in a given year without a permit, but is now aligning around removing this proposed provision. Under the proposed rule, rentals of any duration would require a permit. In your comments, you noted that the existing permit application includes a requirement to provide evidence of past rentals, which you could not, since you didn't already hold a permit to rent. It is not stated on the application, but this requirement should have applied to permit renewals only, not new applications. The proposed rule contains no such requirement for proof of rental.*

**James/Linda Campbell**

**402 Glossbrenner Avenue**

**How would the calculation of rental days [for a 14 or less day rental] be monitored and who would do this monitoring?**

- *The Board had initial discussions about allowing rentals of up to 14 days in a given year without a permit, but is now aligning around removing this proposed provision. Under the proposed rule, rentals of any duration would require a permit.*

# # # # #