

Project: Short-term Rentals draft regulations
Ideas & Comments (10/27/23 to 11/27/23)

No.	Contribution	Author	Posted at	Likes	Comments
1	<p>Idea: If all is short term, what is long term. Everything will now be a hotel Description: Tier 3 rent is 120 and up. That means there is no such thing as long term renting anymore. My other point is that everyone who rents a part of their house needs to run a hotel service, which is not realistic for many. Basically you are pushing the little guys out of the market with the way you set this up. Good on you.</p> <p>Comment: Many airbnb and VRBO hosts are "little guys" who own 1-2 properties. Even more actually LIVE in the home they also rent out for Airbnb. Taking away this income for the little guys could be detrimental to households that rely on that income.</p>	Karen Perez	30 Oct 2023, 01:14 PM	1	1
2	<p>Idea: Stop. Just stop! No short term rentals at all in Columbia.</p>	missouriprofessional	31 Oct 2023, 09:19 PM	1	0
3	<p>Idea: Lobbyists for Real Estate businesses should recuse themselves from voting on this. Description: Nick Knoth's blatant conflict of interest on this (and MANY other city issues) is unethical and unreasonable. Step down sir.</p>	waldondb	01 Nov 2023, 09:34 AM	2	0
4	<p>Idea: We need some comprehensive and forward thinking regulations on non-owner occupied STRs Description: I'm not sure if we can pull off something as strict as what New York City has done, but it will inevitably become necessary. Residential rents for broke normies like me have increased pretty dramatically just in the past few years, something must be done to relieve impact that these STRs have on the rental inventory. I want to continue to afford to work and live in Columbia, but the trajectory we are on right now is not sustainable, and it bums me out man.</p> <p>Comment: I believe that existing short term rentals (STR) should be grandfathered in and then new ones should be regulated or required to jump through proposed hoops. Many Airbnb hosts are little guys with 1-2 properties and, if their ability to host short term rentals is taken away, they would just sell rather than become long term landlords. I agree that the number of airbnbs should be regulated, but don't believe existing airbnb hosts (who made important financial decisions based on the idea of being able to host STRs) should be penalized.</p>	FakeDad	01 Nov 2023, 01:30 PM	1	1
5	<p>Idea: No regulation Description: Property owners should be able to do as they please with their property. Short term rentals great impact city revenue is a great way. People come from all over to experience our great town, don't discourage these visitors</p>	Graystone9	03 Nov 2023, 09:07 PM	1	0
6	<p>Idea: Classify all Air B&B/VRBO as Hotels Description: Limit the total amount in the city, and the total amount private owners can hold at once to not drive the housing market any farther north than it is. Use tax revenue specifically designated for these hotels to fund new housing for the unhoused and those who are living in sub-standard housing.</p>	Kareed3	04 Nov 2023, 09:20 AM	1	0

No.	Contribution	Author	Posted at	Likes	Comments
7	Idea: I think current STR's should be grandfathered. Cap the number in city. No transfers of grandfathered licenses. Relatively simple.	Mspence1290	04 Nov 2023, 09:48 AM	3	2
	Comment: I agree with this thought process! Owners of short term rentals may have made important financial decisions based on the idea of being able to continue making money with their STR. Taking that away could be devastating to the little guys with Airbnbs. I think grandfathering existing ones in and limiting new ones (or heavily regulating them) should be the way to go.	Mandy.Aspey	08 Nov 2023, 02:51 PM		
	Comment: Mandy.Aspey if STR are regulated out of existence owners are not out of luck! They can convert to long term renting providing value to COMO residents or sell their property and invest elsewhere.	AndrewS	10 Nov 2023, 09:01 AM		
8	Idea: Grandfather in AirBnbs (STRs) Already Relying on Income Description: If this is passed, I believe AirBnb's currently relying on the income should be grandfathered in. Taking away someone's existing way to make money, in this economy, could be devastating. I see the point of wanting to reduce Airbnb's overall, but believe existing ones should be grandfathered in as those short term rental owners may have made important financial decisions based on the expectation to continue being able to make a viable income with their short term rental.	Mandy.Aspey	08 Nov 2023, 02:50 PM	2	0
9	Idea: Grandfather current ones in. Don't limit days. Property owners should be able to do what they want with their property. Description: Grandfather current properties in and make the licensed non transferable to new owners.	Morgan189	08 Nov 2023, 02:56 PM	2	0
	Tax them like other cities to give back to the community. Don't limit the amount of days that it can be limited or the properties could be neglected for months at a time and it's not a great look for the community.				

No.	Contribution	Author	Posted at	Likes	Comments
	<p>Idea: Grandfathering in would be the way to go Description: Current STR owners who are invested in their neighborhoods and have incredible reviews are an asset to the community and keep several people employed. Most good owners have the nicest well kept properties and can improve home values in the neighborhood unlike most traditional long term rentals. The number of sort term rentals will regulate itself so the extensive regulations on number of licenses is not necessary. Also I feel like restricting days in unneeded and would be hard to regulate.</p>	como1	08 Nov 2023, 03:13 PM	3	3
	<p>Comment: Yes STR make property a higher return investment which is good for investors but not normal Columbians (especially those currently looking to purchase their first home or those who cannot an must rent long term.) Long term rentals are arguably better for communities as they serve como residents and not just tourists/visitors. Non-owner occupied STRs are many times starter homes squeezing the already tight market for starter homes.</p>	AndrewS	10 Nov 2023, 09:20 AM		
10	<p>Comment: The property owners currently running STR's bought their properties with no rules against renting them as STR's. So you shouldn't change the laws on those owners. There should be regulation to balance both visitors and businesses that benefit from people staying in STR's and making sure there are not too many STR's. The free market does a lot to control the number of STR's. They are much more expensive to run than a long term rentals. If there are too many they won't be profitable and they will disappear. I would also argue that many STR's aren't in the same neighborhoods as the affordable housing developments.</p>	Mspence1290	10 Nov 2023, 10:11 AM		
	<p>Comment: I agree with the concept that STR owners, who take great care and pride in their properties, typically bring value to their neighborhoods. I also agree with the concept that the number of short term rentals will regulate itself and that extensive licensing isn't necessary. Thanks for that added insight! I want to say that I fully understand why there is a need to begin limiting STRs. Grandfathering in the existing ones and regulating new ones will foster an easier transition that won't financially burden those who have existing STRs while limiting new one from popping up.</p>	Mandy.Aspey	10 Nov 2023, 03:39 PM		
11	<p>Idea: I'm a STR owner who has invested in my neighborhood, serving over 300 guests without issue. Not so college housing in our neighborhood Description: No regulation, Grandfather if you must</p>	Saharris6	08 Nov 2023, 08:43 PM	2	1
	<p>Comment: That's amazing that you've hosted 300 guests without issue. I'm sure your property is bringing up the value of your neighborhood and contributing to a positive STR experience for those visiting Columbia. I agree that grandfathering in is a good way to go, while ensuring new STRs are limited.</p>	Mandy.Aspey	10 Nov 2023, 03:41 PM		
	<p>Idea: Limit investors who only bought to STR, but some of us have been renting spare rooms in own home for 10+ years without a single complaint</p>	eric	09 Nov 2023, 12:57 PM	2	2
12	<p>Comment: It capped my comment to 140 characters. Feel like homeowners should be able to rent out an extra room or suite in their own home without needing to adhere to a bunch of guidelines. That's what AirBnb was originally for and those owners tend to keep a close eye on their place. I do see the value in limiting the amount of STRs as those houses and apts bought up for that reason are taking away from the rental supply for locals.</p>	eric	09 Nov 2023, 01:06 PM		
	<p>Comment: I align with this view exactly. Well said!</p>	Mandy.Aspey	10 Nov 2023, 03:47 PM		

No.	Contribution	Author	Posted at	Likes	Comments
13	<p>Idea: Require host/owner to live in unit otherwise fully restrict/ require commercial use permit of STR's</p> <p>Description: I am okay with lived in short term rentals of an extra 1-2 bedrooms or an ADU but many times short term rentals would normally be a long term rental which a resident of Columbia could live in. Short Term Rentals inflate the value of housing (decreases risk of buying investments properties) reducing affordable for Columbians looking to buy or rent to live in. Short term rentals are not beneficial to the average resident of Columbia without the means to buy multiple properties.</p>	AndrewS	10 Nov 2023, 12:41 AM	1	4
	<p>Comment: I would prefer no grandfathering of any STR out of compliance so this regulations has immediate impact and forces investor types/non-owners occupied to sell. Worse case for an STR owner is they have to sell their extra property or convert to Long term rental increasing supply for normal COMO residents. It should be noted many non-owners occupied STR invest properties are smaller starter homes!</p>	AndrewS	10 Nov 2023, 08:55 AM		
	<p>Comment: I believe this approach would be problematic for the "little guys", because not all short term rental owners are in a position to rent out their entire home long-term. For example, I live in my Airbnb part time and rent it out for Columbia events like games, BlueNote concerts, etc. The money I make from renting my property short term is significant to the household. Plus, with so many Missouri laws protecting squatters, many STR owners aren't willing to entertain the idea of becoming long-term landlords. Plus, smaller STR owners can make more money than if they are forced to put their property up for long-term renting. If a plan is out into motion, I think existing STR "little guy" owners who have been relying on this income need to be considered as well. I would hope the city takes a look at the situation with a wide lense that considers all rather than a fast-fix approach.</p>	Mandy.Aspey	10 Nov 2023, 09:09 AM		
	<p>Comment: Mandy.Aspey Most long-term tenants are not squatters; they just want a place to live and don't have the means to purchase. Squatter Rights are not applicable in this conversation as it requires 10 years of continuous residences on a vacant, abandoned or foreclosed property in Missouri. Applicable Missouri laws are quite favorable to landlords over tenant protections, please do your homework on this. In your situation, you are still living on the property so I would not be against the new regulations still allowing it. I am mostly against anyone buying a second property to use solely for short term renting and not living in it. Most sensible regulation might be to set a maximum number of days properties can be rented out short term to 30-60 days per year.</p>	AndrewS	10 Nov 2023, 03:25 PM		
<p>Comment: Thanks for the insight! I don't remember saying that "most" long-term tenants are squatters, though. I simply stated that it is a prominent reason why many steer away from being long-term landlords. Just making sure we're sticking to the facts of what is actually said/typed. :) I would hope that, once a decision is made, that the existing STR owners are considered in the decision. After all, many (even ones who have second properties) made financial decisions based on the expectation to be able to rent out their property as a profitable STR (not a less profitable long-term rental). I have trust that this will be reviewed with a wide lense and approached fairly rather than some of the other unfair, rapid-fix approaches.</p>	Mandy.Aspey	10 Nov 2023, 03:36 PM			

No.	Contribution	Author	Posted at	Likes	Comments
	<p>Idea: Owner-unoccupied STRs remove much-needed affordable housing and deprive neighborhoods of political voice by limiting voter numbers.</p> <p>Description: Residential neighborhoods should be primarily for residents. I support the proposed ordinance. Regulate them like any other business is regulated, with zoning restrictions, permitting, and inspections. Central-city neighborhoods are in danger of being hollowed out to create a new kind of business district. You're hearing the loudest complaints now from STR owners. I imagine a lot of residents haven't considered the threat STRs pose to their neighborhoods. And they might not realize it until whole blocks become self-check-in motels. We're almost halfway there in some parts of Benton-Stephens.</p>	Cory	10 Nov 2023, 02:58 PM	1	2
14	<p>Comment: I understand wanting to limit the growing number of STRs, but I cannot support the idea of undercutting individual citizens who may be relying on the income brought in by their existing short term rental. Would love to hear some more "middle ground" ideas that support limiting the growing number of short term rentals without harshly undercutting the income of people who own existing short term rentals.</p> <p>Comment: I feel like the proposed ordinance is the middle-ground option. Yeah, you can usually make more money running an illegal business (which STRs are under the current codes) than a legit one, but these folks running unoccupied airbnbs can rent their properties out to residents and still make money. "Well, Jimmy's been running a roll-your-own cigarette shop out of his shed and making all the kids real happy ... guess we gotta make that legal." Now, maybe Jimmy has a friend on council... Smoke up, kiddos. :)</p>	Mandy.Aspey	10 Nov 2023, 03:46 PM		
	<p>Comment: I feel like the proposed ordinance is the middle-ground option. Yeah, you can usually make more money running an illegal business (which STRs are under the current codes) than a legit one, but these folks running unoccupied airbnbs can rent their properties out to residents and still make money. "Well, Jimmy's been running a roll-your-own cigarette shop out of his shed and making all the kids real happy ... guess we gotta make that legal." Now, maybe Jimmy has a friend on council... Smoke up, kiddos. :)</p>	Cory	10 Nov 2023, 06:00 PM		
15	<p>Idea: Too Much Regulation</p> <p>Description: The revised format of the regulations is still much too restrictive. For a city that often describes itself as democratic this regulation does not reflect democratic beliefs. I do believe in STR regulation but with a focus on safety and taxation not on restricting the use of personal property by citizens. However, if this restriction regulation is passed I believe properties should be grandfathered in in order to ensure the financial stability of those already deeply invested in STR properties.</p>	cgwalke2	11 Nov 2023, 10:54 AM	0	0
16	<p>Idea: Great for community</p> <p>Description: STR's are typically looked after better and make neighborhoods looked more presentable for the town. The current proposal is way too strict. Running a STR is very expensive and most will not be able to stay in business running only a few months a year. They provide more employment opportunities to the community. As well as allow visitors to stay together in one house. It would be fair to grandfather current ones in and add some regulations to new ones. Why should someone be told what they can do with their property if it's an ethical business?</p>	Mharri63	13 Nov 2023, 03:26 PM	0	0
17	<p>Idea: STR are great for the community and visitors</p> <p>Description: Surely columbia is more progressive than this. STR are great for the community and well looked after otherwise reviews weed out the bad ones and they go out of business anyways. Grandfather the current ones, those owners would have spent a lot of time and money making them great. Don't limit days, imagine someone telling you you could only run your business xx amount of days. Also, the primary residence is ridiculous, some people don't want to live in the house they run a business out of, who cares. The current guidelines need a massive review.</p>	Ewing_monica7	13 Nov 2023, 07:27 PM	0	0

No.	Contribution	Author	Posted at	Likes	Comments
18	<p>Idea: STR are good Description: STR allow families to come together at an affordable cost, give businesses employment and have the potential to provide funding to the community. These are particularly great for when large groups of people come into town.</p> <p>Godfather current ones in, don't limit days and who cares if it's their primary residence.</p> <p>Let's move forward COMO not backwards!</p>	Kenzpage	13 Nov 2023, 07:31 PM	0	0
19	<p>Idea: It directly and indirectly addresses issues that permanent neighbors are concerned about, including occupancy, noise, traffic, and parking. Description: I support the current draft addressing STRs.</p>	tigerfan	20 Nov 2023, 11:15 AM	0	0
20	<p>Idea: I feel the plan submitted by the Columbia Board of Realtors is the best option . It provides a manageable and fair framework for regulation Comment: I agree with Jwyankee28 in her support of the plan submitted by CBOR. It is an excellent option, easier to read, understand, and implement. It is a very fair representation of what STR Owners and Hosts are seeking. Regulation, if too heavy-handed, will be a deterrent and difficulties will abound.</p>	Jwyankee28 Randall Kilgore	24 Nov 2023, 11:19 AM 24 Nov 2023, 01:33 PM	0	1
21	<p>Idea: CBOR Version: https://drive.google.com/.../1QNHBWa1gSEMCONDSD.../view... is more easily read, far less difficult to follow. Description: The Columbia Board of Realtors has provided an excellent alternative plan to what has been presented by the Staff to the Development Department and the Planning and Zoning Commission. The restrictive nature of the DRAFT is a strong deterrent to this Owner/Host, and while we support changes to the Uniform Code, it should be done in a fair and equitable manner and presented in less structured or "tiered" language. Our business model seeks to provide a safe, secure, private environment (space) that is attached but separate from our primary residence or home. We endeavor to be open to Guests who are coming to Columbia to attend a variety of event venues, as well as the business traveler coming to town for a meeting, conference, or some matter that allows them a different level of experience than they might get in a hotel. We have hosted persons from all over the world and shown hospitality to these persons who might otherwise have never experienced the privacy and comfort of someone's primary residence in such a short-term rental. For families in our neighborhood who had visiting relatives, our short-term rental has provided the convenience of extra accommodation without having them stay elsewhere and afar from their loved ones. Our central location provides excellent access to the many different venues in Columbia, and easy access to and from major roads in and around the City. We favor and support the alternative plan submitted by the Columbia Board of Realtors. We find it to be the best option. It is manageable, and fair within a framework amenable to all Owners / Hosts regardless of the platform used to manage the short term rental. We support manageable regulation and will cooperate with City governance to continue our business in the least restrictive manner. - The Fairway Suite, L.L.C.</p>	Randall Kilgore	24 Nov 2023, 01:49 PM	0	0
22	<p>Idea: We travel to Columbia 3 to 4 times a year and prefer staying in Airbnb's . The accommodation's are always more comfortable than a hotel</p>	Dale	24 Nov 2023, 06:57 PM	0	0
23	<p>Idea: STR guidelines are needed for Columbia. I support the draft addressing STRs.</p>	sharon schneeberger	27 Nov 2023, 02:16 PM	0	0