



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Thursday, April 10, 2025

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

City Hall  
Council Chambers  
701 E Broadway  
Columbia, MO.

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. STANTON: There's a new sheriff in town this evening. Ms. Jones is absent this evening. I'm calling the City of Columbia Planning and Zoning meeting to order.

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. STANTON: Are there any adjustments to the agenda, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Would you like to call attendance first, sir?

MR. STANTON: Oh, sure. I sure would. Mr. Secretary?

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Brodsky, absent. Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACER: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Geuea Jones, absent. Commissioner Williams, here, Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: That's seven present; we have a quorum.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

**Present:** 7 - Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Peggy Placier, Shannon Wilson, Thomas Williams, Robert Walters and McKenzie Ortiz

**Excused:** 2 - Sharon Geuea Jones and David Brodsky

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. STANTON: And there any adjustments to the agenda, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, there are, sir. Case Number 125-2025, which was a conditional use permit request by Engineering Surveys and Services at 801 College Avenue, has been requested to be withdrawn. I shouldn't say requested to be withdrawn. The applicant has withdrawn the case, so there will be no discussion on that case this evening. It was an advertised public hearing, and if there is anyone here in the audience that came to speak on this item, even though we will not have any discussion on it, you may want to entertain that they have the ability to provide any comment to the public record.

MR. STANTON: That is Case 125-2025?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, sir.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Zenner, just to clarify that's not a tabling motion, that is just withdrawn?

MR. ZENNER: That is a withdrawn request.

MR. STANTON: Any other adjustments, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: No. Those are the only adjustments to the agenda, sir.

MS. LOE: Move to approve the agenda.

MS. ORTIZ: I'll second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Thumbs up approval. All those in favor, thumbs up, those opposed, thumbs down.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

**Move to approve the agenda**

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES****March 20, 2025 Regular Meeting**

MR. STANTON: Everybody should have had time to review the minutes from the previous meeting on March 20th. Are there any adjustments to the minutes?

MS. LOE: If there are no edits to the minutes, I move to approve the minutes from the March 20th meeting.

MS. ORTIZ: I'll second.

MR. STANTON: Moved and properly seconded. All those in favor of approval of the minutes, thumbs up? All opposed, thumbs down.

(Six votes for approval; one abstention.)

MR. WILLIAMS: (Inaudible.)

MR. STANTON: Okay. We have one abstention on those approval of the

minutes. Mr. Williams wasn't here. Okay. We are going into subdivisions.

**Move to approve the minutes from the March 20th meeting**

## **V. SUBDIVISIONS**

### **Case # 23-2025**

A request by Koehler Engineering (agent), on behalf of AG Jones Properties, LLC (owners). for approval of a 2-lot preliminary plat containing 0.48-acres of R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoned property to be known as Walter Miller Subdivision. The subject site is located at 1516 Wilson Avenue.

MR. STANTON: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat of Walter Miller Subdivision, subject to minor technical corrections.

MR. STANTON: Do you have any questions for staff? Do you only open this up for public discussion? Is that better? Open it up for -- oh.

MS. ORTIZ: Actually --

MR. STANTON: Excuse me. Go ahead, Ms. Loe [sic].

MS. ORTIZ: Actually I would just want to disclose that this is in my neighborhood, and there was discussion in a -- like a group, a Google group that I'm in, but I was not, like, engaged in it, but I just wanted to disclose that in case -- yeah.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Ms. Ortiz. Which brings me to the point, Ms. Loe, did we do our disclaimer/disclosure statement yet?

MS. LOE: We had not, so --

MR. STANTON: If there's any Commissioners that have any ex parte information relating to this case, and would like to disclose this at this time so all the Commissioners would be privy to the information that you have, would you please divulge that information now? Ms. Ortiz has done so. Is there any other Commissioners that have any other information? All right. Open for public discussion on this case.

### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Is there anybody in the public who would like to discuss this case? I see none. Closing public discussion.

### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

MR. STANTON: Commission discussion? Seems ripe for a motion. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I was going to say, if no one has any comments, this does seem pretty straightforward, and I will go ahead and make a motion to approve Case 23-2025, the Walter Miller Subdivision preliminary plat to approve the preliminary plat subject to minor

technical corrections.

MS. ORTIZ: I'll second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Mr. Secretary, are you ready?

MR. WILLIAMS: (Inaudible.)

MR. STANTON: On the motion, Commissioners have any saying? I see none.  
Mr. Williams?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters.**

**Motion carries 7-0.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That is seven to zero, the motion carries.

MR. STANTON: This will be forwarded to City Council. All right. Are we good?

MR. WILLIAMS: We still have a quorum.

**Motion to approve Case 23-2025, the Walter Miller Subdivision preliminary plat to approve the preliminary plat subject to minor technical corrections.**

**Yes:** 7 - Loe, Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

## **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS & SUBDIVISIONS**

### **Case # 90-2025**

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Bucky C, LLC (owner), for approval of a design adjustment seeking relief from the provisions of Sec. 29-5.1(f)(1)(iv)(D) of the UDC relating to required minimum lot frontage along collector and arterial streets such that individual driveway access may be permitted and approval of a 1-lot final plat of M-C (Mixed Use - Corridor) zoned property to be known as "Oscar Plat 1". The approximately 0.55-acre subject site is located at the northwest corner of Vandiver Drive and Range Line Street, and includes the address 1901 Range Line Street. **(This case was tabled at the March 6, 2025 meeting to allow the applicant to address review comments and discuss access-related issues with representatives from the City and MoDOT)**

MR. STANTON: Staff, may we have a report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends the following actions are recommended with respect to this request:

- Approve the requested design adjustment to allow direct driveway access to a lot with less than 300 feet of street frontage in a non-residential lot.
- Approve the requested one-lot final plat to be known as "Oscar Plat 1"

subject to technical corrections.

MR. ZENNER: Just for a point of clarification for the Commission, the design adjustment must be approved prior to the recommendation being submitted on the platting action.

MR. STANTON: Two motions, separate?

MR. ZENNER: Two motions. Two motions. Design adjustment first followed by the plat.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for staff?

MR. WILLIAMS: (Inaudible.)

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. If any of my Commissioners have any ex parte information relating to this case and would like to share that information with your fellow Commissioners so that we can benefit from the information that you may share with us, do so at this time. There are none. Okay. Open up for public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name is Jay Gebhardt. I'm a land surveyor and a civil engineer with The Civil Group. I'm here tonight representing Nakhle Asmar and, you know, Nakhle owns this parcel of land, and because the Code changed on the definition of a legal lot, he cannot get a building permit. He can't sell this lot to anyone who could get a building permit, so we have to plat it to correct that. And so we are platting it. We're dedicating quite a significant right-of-way for Vandiver and for Range Line. We're not asking for variances of sidewalks or anything like that, and we're dealing with an existing condition that we did not create. And so, you know, I'm in support what staff has recommended, and because Anthony says we're going to be efficient tonight, I'm going to just ask questions.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Thank you for your efficiency, sir.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other members of the public like to speak on this case? If there are none, I'm closing public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

MR. STANTON: Discussion of my fellow Commissioners? Ms. Peggy?

MS. PLACIER: I'll try to keep this short. There was a delay in developing this lot. Obviously, a lot has happened since 2015, including Dobbs and Starbuck's. We already had Waffle House. And I'm not convinced by the argument that, well, we approved Waffle House, and so we need to do this, because that one also has two accesses. I go through this intersection frequently. It's crowded, it's bad, and adding two driveways to that situation, I realize this presents terrible consequences for the owner, and yet

approving it as sort of a -- for whatever use could come under M-C also seems perilous, and we don't have the benefit of having any traffic information at this point.

MR. GEBHARDT: (Inaudible.)

MS. PLACIER: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. I've got to open hearing again.

MS. PLACIER: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: I'm going to reopen public hearing so that the speaker can adjust that.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED**

MR. GEBHARDT: I'm trying to be efficient, and I -- I missed over something. So we've been in long discussions with Jake Ray, with the City's City Traffic Engineer, and he's made it abundantly clear to us that we are just going to consider the -- all these accesses to be right-in and right-out only. Now, he will allow us to do a traffic impact study, and depending on the use and the intensity of the use, he may allow a left-in, but he will never allow a left out is what he said. So I just thought that should clarify. And so right now, you should -- I mean, the ones on Range Line are right in/right out now because there's a median in Range Line. The one on Vandiver, again, when we come in with whatever development ends up on this, you'll have to do a traffic impact study, and we'll have to prove out that the right in/right out works, and that if we want a left in, that we've got to show that the intensity of the use isn't such. So one of the things we're looking at or what Nakhle is looking at is doing more like a HVAC shop or something like that where it's got a couple of workers that come and go, but there's not constant traffic like a Waffle House or a Starbuck's, or something like that. So we understand the limitations with this, but without this, we can't -- we can't build on that lot at all, so --

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Gephardt. So just to clarify, having two driveways is actually less of an impact because of the limitations that are being put on those driveways, being right in/right out?

MR. GEBHARDT: Correct.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. GEBHARDT: We're also eliminating the third entrance.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker?

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Close public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Comments from Commissioners? Discussion? Feelings? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I understand Commissioner Placier's concerns, but I do feel as if this is probably the least impactful access that they are -- they've gone for the least impactful that they can achieve on this site, and they are mitigating existing conditions looking at current requirements. So unless there are any objections, I would make a motion to approve. Okay. In the case of 90-2025, and first we're going to do the design adjustment. So the first motion is to approve the .55-acre final plot zoned M-C subject to technical corrections. Oops. Sorry. They're in reverse order on here. Got it. Backing up. The first motion is to approve the design adjustment, seeking relief from Section 29-5.1(f), minimum lot frontage for individual driveway access along arterial and collector roadways.

MS. ORTIZ: I'll second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Mr. Secretary?

MR WILLIAMS: Discussion?

MR. STANTON. Oh, discussion on the -- on the motion?

MS. ORTIZ: I intend to support this, as well.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Ortiz. Any other discussion? Mr. Secretary?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters. Voting No: Ms. Placier. Motion carries 6-1.**

Mr. Williams: That's seven -- or sorry, six yeses, and one no. The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Do we have a second, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I'll go ahead with the second motion. In the case of 90-2025, approve -- move to approve the .55-acre final plat zoned M-C, subject to technical corrections regarding specific width and location of new driveway access.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Any discussion about the motion? Seeing none. Mr. Secretary?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval. Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters. Voting No: Ms. Placier. Motion carries 6-1.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That would be six yeses and one no. The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: The motion carries and will be forwarded to City Council.

**Motion # 1 - Approve the design adjustment, seeking relief from Section 29-5.1(f), minimum lot frontage for individual driveway access along arterial and collector roadways. VOTING YES: Ortiz, Stanton, Williams, Loe, Wilson, Walters. Voting No: Placier. Motion carries 6-1.**

**Motion # 2 - In the case of 90-2025, approve -- move to approve the .55-acre final plat zoned M-C, subject to technical corrections regarding specific width and location of new driveway access. VOTING YES: Ortiz, Stanton, Williams, Loe, Wilson, Walters. Voting No: Placier. Motion carries 6-1.**

## **VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **Case # 125-2025**

A request by Engineering Surveys & Services (agent), on behalf of OTA Properties, LLC (owner), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a bar and/or nightclub as a conditional use in the IG (Industrial - General) district; the use is subject to the conditional use standards in Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2). The approximately 0.62-acre subject site is located SW of College Avenue and Wilkes Boulevard, and includes the address 801 College Avenue.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Zenner, how do we address this? Are we still going to open it for public hearing or what are we going to do with the one that is withdrawn.

MR. ZENNER: I would ask if there is anybody present as it relates to Case 125-2025. If so, if you would like to make comments on this withdrawn item, you are more than welcome to approach the podium.

MR. STANTON: I'll open the public hearing.

### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: As recommended by staff, anybody that has come to this meeting to discuss Case 125-2025, you're welcome to come up and voice your opinions. I see none. I'm going to close public hearing.

### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Ready to move to the next case; is this correct, Mr. Zenner.

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, sir.

### **Case # 131-2025**

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Starr Properties LLC (owner), for approval to rezone 1.91 acres from R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) to R-MF (Multi-family Dwelling). The subject site is located at the south terminus of Merideth Drive, on the west side of Scott Boulevard.

MR. STANTON: May we have a staff report, please?



Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone 1.91 acres from R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling) to R-MF (Multi-family Dwelling), pursuant to minor technical corrections.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Rusty. Commissioners, do you have any questions for staff? Seeing none. Commissioners, if there is anybody that has any ex parte information relating to this case and would like to share that information with fellow Commissioners, you can do so at this time. Seeing none. I'm going to open up public hearing then.

#### **OPEN PUBLIC HEARING**

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. Jay Gebhardt, with A Civil Group -- excuse me -- representing the Starr Family who are the owners of this property. I think this is a pretty straightforward request. There's a commercial baseball field on one side of us, and then there's duplexes to the north, so I think this is an appropriate step down. I would like to point out that the densities -- you know, what we're proposing is 24 units, and we did have a layout with 24 units with the duplex layout, but it was -- it covered up everything. And so the owners have looked at doing four six-plexes so that there is more open space on the site, and it has less impact in that way. So having said that, I'll ask if you guys have any questions.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt.

MR. GEPHARDT: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: I haven't been saying this before, but if there's any other additional speakers, if you speak for an organization, you have six minutes. If you're speaking as an individual, you have three. Are there any other speakers on this case? Going once, going twice. Closing public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Commissioners, discussions? Quiet crowd today. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I'll jump in. I think the proposed zoning makes sense in this location. We've looked at some zoning changes of more intense use on Cherry Hill, and in some ways, this is building not just towards Scott Boulevard, but toward that intersection. And I think when we looked at the increased multi-family at Chapel Hill, we were discussing the potential of having transit-oriented development. And if we had the ability to do that, this is the type of intensity we might see building up to create those types of nodes. So I think it falls into place.

MR. STANTON: Any other comments from my fellow Commissioners? I'd entertain

a motion. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I'm happy to make one if no one has any more comments. In the Case of 131-2025, Atkinson Woods rezoning, move to approve -- I'm going to jump back to the report because I think -- yes. Move to approve the requested rezoning 1.91 acres from R-2 to R-MF pursuant to minor technical corrections. Is that still correct?

MR. PALMER: It's -- it's fine, it's not necessary. It was a change to the zoning exhibit, so yeah.

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. PALMER: If you're more comfortable including it, that's fine, but it's not needed.

MS. LOE: I'll leave it in just as a catch-all.

MS. ORTIZ: I'll second.

MR. STANTON: Moved and properly seconded by Ms. Ortiz. Discussion on the motion? No discussion. Mr. Secretary?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.**

**Ortiz,**

**Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters. Motion carries 7-0.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That is seven yeses and zero nos. The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: Recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Moving on to our next public hearing case, we are moving on to 84-2025.

**Move to approve the requested rezoning 1.91 acres from R-2 to R-MF pursuant to minor technical corrections.**

**Yes:** 7 - Loe, Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

### **Case # 84-2025**

A request by Justin Lucas, on behalf Family First Rental & Investments, LLC (owner), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 3411 Goldenwood Drive to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 8 transient guests and up to 210 nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.21-acre subject site is located 150 feet east of the intersection of Arbor Pointe Parkway and Goldenwood Drive and includes the address 3411 Goldenwood Drive. **(This matter was tabled at the Planning and Zoning Commission's March 6, 2025 meeting)**

MR. STANTON: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to allow 3411

Goldenwood Drive to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. Both garage parking spaces within the attached two-car garage and the driveway be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; and,
2. The maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed eight transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC); and
3. A maximum of 210 nights of annual usage.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir. Any questions of staff?

MS. ORTIZ: I have a question.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I see that you said that we have three written objections, but I only have two, I believe. There was one attached to the agenda that we have, and then there's one printed on our desk, but I don't see the third one.

MR. HALLIGAN: There should have been three. I supplied three in the file. It must -- there might have been a --

MS. ORTIZ: It might be my mistake if any other Commissioners can confirm that, but I'm just seeing two. That's supplemental correspondence, but that's not a complaint. So I think it might just be two.

MR. HALLIGAN: I apologize if that is the case. Nonetheless, they were just concerned about any possible adverse effects of the --

MS. ORTIZ: Okay, cool. Thanks.

MR. HALLIGAN: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: I will open the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Anyone wishing to speak upon this case, come forward. Individuals, three minutes; groups six. Please state your name and your address, please.

MS. LUCAS: Melinda and Justin Lucas.

MR. STANTON: She's got to record it. There you go. Thank you.

MS. LUCAS: Better? Okay. Melinda and Justin Lucas, we're the owners of the property on Goldenwood. I just wanted to elaborate a little more about the documents we sent in. A lot of the things that the -- you guys were talking about that would be important to continue to make this an appropriate short-term rental, we were already doing before any of this started. Document one is a screen shot of our check-in

instructions to the guest. We ask them to please park in the garage first, and the driveway next, keep garage closed, and so that they're not inside the street, they're not parking on the street. Document two showing that we are a locally owned company. We main-- and flip the Airbnb ourselves. We're there every time to check and make sure everything looks inside and outside the property. The remaining documents, three, four, and five, are just an example of what we do before we approve a guest. We do not allow anybody to book without us pre-- or looking at their profile first, and we make sure that they have five stars. We look at their reviews. We don't want any trouble with them, either, so -- any questions?

MR. STANTON: Questions? Ms. Peggy?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. Just a couple of little ones.

MS. LUCAS: Sure.

MS. PLACIER: I noticed on your -- it looks like on your listing with Airbnb, I think it is, you had six occupants, and now you're going up to eight. Is there a reason for the increase other than people often ask for eight because it's the maximum?

MS. LUCAS: Most of the time, it is six. If someone asks to sleep on our couch, sure, but most of the time, it's six.

MS. PLACIER: Okay. So there's no extra bedroom tucked away somewhere that -- there are three bedrooms?

MS. LUCAS: Three bedrooms. Correct. Yeah.

MS. PLACIER: Okay. And then my only other concern was that we had one complaint that mentioned the pool -- the neighborhood pool. What's your policy on guests using that pool if that's a concern of the neighbors?

MS. LUCAS: That they use the -- they abide the rules that all of the other guests have there. They return the key when they leave.

Ms. PLACIER: Oh, okay. So they can use the HOA pool?

MS. LUCAS: Correct.

MR. LUCAS: Excuse me. And this is the first we have heard of any complaints whatsoever about the property, whether it's the pool or the house in general.

MS. PLACIER: We're kind of accustomed to that --

MR. LUCAS: Sure.

MS. PLACIER: -- but this brings attention to, oh, there's a short-term rental.

MS. ORTIZ: I have a question. I just noticed in the staff report, it said you lived 26 minutes away from the property. But then in the supplemental correspondence, you say that you live in Columbia. Is that -- do you have, like, a designated agent that lives in Columbia? Like, what is that discrepancy?

MS. LUCAS: So we live in Midway, which is right -- yeah -- right outside of Columbia.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MS. LUCAS: We go to Columbia Schools. I work in Columbia and I am the -- yeah. One of us is the designated agent.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LUCAS: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: Other questions for this speaker? Thank you. Anyone else like to speak upon this case? State your name and address, please?

MR. LUCK: My name is Lawrence Luck; my address is 5815 Sumac Court. I may be one of the two that you see letters written. If there's a third, I hope I'm not it. But I wanted to point out a couple of things, and it wasn't mentioned tonight from the staff report, but in what's posted on the Planning and Zoning website had talks that the owner state the homeowner's association is in support of this. I called the homeowners' association this afternoon, couldn't get ahold of the person who directly would cover Arbor Pointe, but the person who answered the phone said she would relay my concern. I doubt that they made it here tonight, because she said that they were out of the office all afternoon. But I asked her have you heard anything about this, and she said absolutely not. So I don't know of that. I also want to point out that when I look at the Arbor Pointe Facebook page, there's probably six or seven people, and I know that doesn't help here in a public hearing, but six or seven people who strongly spoke out against putting something like this in a single-family neighborhood. I understand they've been doing this for a year or so. That doesn't make it right. And, you know, I doubt that anybody would even know you exist to complain to under the -- before there were rules and ordinances. But this was developed as single family. All of the new things that have been built have been single-family. There is not one duplex in the entire subdivision. It is very close to the school. And I was the person who talked about the pool. And I know the homeowners' association doesn't know that a key is being given randomly to transient guests because their rules are very specific that it's the homeowner and/or a direct guest accompanied by the homeowner who can use the pool, so they're violating that policy. And one last thing that was also in the report that -- not mentioned again tonight, the report said there wasn't a homeowners' association out there. Well, there definitely is, and I definitely pay dues. I think there's two of them may be how it's divided. But I think there's just been some misinformation. And in closing, I would just say this doesn't belong in a single-family neighborhood where there is absolutely nothing but single-family houses.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I don't have a question, per se, but maybe a comment in that this body is not responsible for enforcing the HOA regulations. So we appreciate --

MR. LUCK: I understand.

MS. LOE: -- knowing about them, but we can't really take those under consideration. And if you do have concerns that your HOA regulations are important to you and aren't being enforced, I would encourage you to follow up with your HOA.

MR. LUCK: No. And I will, but, yeah, so it's worth noting, but it was disappointing to see some of those statements in a staff report that weren't true.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Do you have questions for this speaker?

MS. ORTIZ: I'm okay.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Ortiz [sic]?

MS. WILSON: I just am experiencing a little confusion because you're making a statement that this doesn't belong in a single-family home. What is -- I guess I'm trying to understand what the issue is.

MR. LUCK: I'm not arguing that you couldn't rent your property. There are some rentals in Arbor Pointe. I don't know that there's any that attempt to give up to eight unrelated people in a household. Most of them are rented on a probably annual lease basis. There's very few, but there are some, and it's the fact that you're -- you know, it's - it's not stable for a single-family environment. You never know. And, I mean, I trust they are trying to screen applicants. I don't doubt that the owners are trying to screen applicants, but screening is only as good as what people don't lie. So, you know, it -- there's no other house around there that are going to have eight unrelated people that could show up and be there for a weekend, and potentially party, allow an access to the pool and those kind of things. So there's my concern.

MS. WILSON: What's your -- you may have said it already. I apologize if you did. What's your proximity to the property?

MR. LUCK: Probably four blocks at most, and a block from the pool, so --

MS. WILSON: And did you have awareness before this application that they were short-term rental?

MR. LUCK: I became aware of this about two months ago, so I don't know when their application came in.

MS. WILSON: Thank you. And thank you for coming.

MR. LUCK: Okay.

MS. ORTIZ: I -- sorry. I have a question.

MR. LUCK: Sure.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you for being here tonight. Is there a number that you would feel comfortable with? Like, is it because it's eight, is that what makes you uncomfortable, or is it just that it's a short-term rental in general?

MR. LUCK: Well, I'm a little uncomfortable because of the way the ordinance would allow it to be that number. But if I was hearing something like four or five, I'd be somewhat more comfortable. I wouldn't say 100 percent --

MS. ORTIZ: Uh-huh.

MR. LUCK: -- but I probably wouldn't be standing here tonight if it was proposed at four or five. But, you know, I think the ordinance for single-family residential subdivisions that have no other occupancies in them to allow eight to suddenly be in a three-bedroom house is extreme.

MS. ORTIZ: I understand.

MR. LUCK: Yeah. I mean, I probably wouldn't be here if it was four or five. I don't know that I would love it even at four or five, but I probably wouldn't be standing here.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MR. WALTERS: I have a comment.

MR. STANTON: Yes. Mr. Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I think this may be informational for you and for other people tonight with other STRs, and I'm newer to the Commission, so I'm not as well -- have the wealth of knowledge that some of the other Commissioners do, but I think one important distinction is that prior to this, with 198 nights of rental and no complaints, what's happening now that it's regulated and registered, there is a means for property owners to immediately, I'd call into the City and register a concern, a comment, a complaint, and then that would trigger a phone call to the registered agent to respond to that. That's -- that's the gist of it; is that correct?

MR. LUCK: I would think -- and this is a guess. Obviously, I don't have a way to prove my thought, but I would bet 98 percent of the citizens in Columbia aren't even aware that they -- who they could call. Right now, if something happened, it would be call 311 unless there was, like, an emergency, and people would call 911. The last thing they would think about is calling someone overseeing an occupancy thing.

MR. LUCK: But that's -- that's why I'm bringing it up because there's a new regulation and it's going to take some time for the public to get acquainted with it.

MR. WALTERS: No, and I was aware of it. It's not news to me, but --

MR. LUCK: Well, and your HOA should publicize that this is -- this is a tool for

people to utilize in case an out-of-control party or other instances of, you know, neglect should occur.

MR. WALTERS: Sure.

MR. STANTON: Any questions -- any more questions for this speaker?

MR. LUCK: Thank you for listening.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else want to speak on this case? Going once, going twice. Three times. Closing public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Thoughts from the Commissioners? Ripe for a motion. Ms. Loe, would you --

MS. LOE: No. No. No. First -- first a couple of housekeeping comments that I would just like to make generally about the short-term rentals reports, and I did bring this up at the March 20th meeting, but the reports generally include a statement on accessibility, and the speculating whether or not compliance with the accessibility requirements would be required. And I'm a little bit concerned that these could be misleading and I'm wondering if we might be better served by deleting the first two sentences in that paragraph and simply stating that compliance with the accessibility will be determined based on the review and completed prior to the certification. So that was one comment. The other one is simply I wanted to identify -- I have a slightly different take on mixed use, and again, at the March 20th, I gave a lengthier comment on what mixed use might include, and I simply want to clarify that I don't believe approving the short-term rental conditional use permits is necessarily supporting the type of mixed use that I believe the Comprehensive Plan intended in its description to support the daily day-to-day lives of the local residents in that the short-term rentals are more -- their purpose is more to serve visitors to Columbia, not to the local residents. So just those two comments. Also in this case specifically, it is mentioned in the report that the STR is within 1,000 feet of two schools, and that would be Paxton Elementary and Smithton Middle School, and is within a listed school zone. I still have concerns about allowing every use. It's sort of an adaptive use of residential for commercial use in areas closer to certain uses including schools. We spend a lot of time choosing locations for our schools. We spend a lot of money building the infrastructure for our schools, and I don't want to see local families being displaced by commercial uses coming in, and I do think - - we've discussed this in work sessions, and I -- I, for one, would still like to finish that conversation on whether or not we might have a different density around certain uses. So that is a concern to me, and because I feel like we haven't finished that discussion, I'm not sure I can support this application.



MR. STANTON: Well, I'd like to make a comment myself. Ms. Loe, I agree with all the points you made. My thing is this. This one is the one that's coming into the light, and sure would hate to be the next one, because it's going to have more weight on our decision, the densities STRs get in particular areas. So a public service announcement, if you've got an STR, you better get it up there real quick because those things, and I don't think they were out of balance with that, is that as more of these come on board, then where they are and how close they are to each other starts becoming a factor in our decision-making. So, I mean, I definitely support what you're saying.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Stanton, if I may?

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: I believe, Ms. Loe, you are referring to Case Number 127 that is adjacent to Paxton Keely, and the other school, the middle school, if I'm not incorrect. This is adjacent to -- Alpha Hart Lewis Elementary only.

MS. LOE: True.

MR. ZENNER: And then in order -- and to respond to Mr. Luck's commentary that the staff report is inaccurate and there is a homeowners' association, I have reviewed our -- identified homeowners' associate list, as well as our recognized neighborhood association list, and our recognized or existing homeowner's association list that our Office of Neighborhood Services maintain, and neither are on that list and, therefore, were not pulled as a part of the distribution. And if there is a homeowners' association or a property owners' association, we would not have access to that unless it was a registered and recognized entity. Therefore, the staff report is not inaccurate in what it depicted. What the applicant has stated may be not factual that they do have homeowners' association support, but we do not have a recognized homeowners' association to provide distribution of this notice to.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Zenner, thank you for that. And I'm -- I'm just going to say as a public service announcement, if there -- if you're -- your homeowners' association is not recognized, get it registered with the City, because it's not recognized by the City, so definitely do that. Any other comments? Ms. Loe?

MS. PLACIER: And in either case, we do not enforce homeowners' association rules. That's totally up to members of the association. We have nothing to do with it.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I was going to offer to make a motion if there are no further comments. Seeing none. And thank you for the correction, Mr. Zenner. My notes were reversed, so it's the trend for tonight for me, I'm afraid. All right. In the case of 84-2025, 3411 Goldenwood Drive, STR conditional-use permit, move to approve the requested STR

condition-use permit subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, maximum of eight transient guest regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC, and garage made available while in STR use.

MS. ORTIZ: I'll second.

MR. STANTON: Moved and properly seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

MR. WILLIAMS: I just have a --

MR. STANTON: Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: My recollection is that 198 nights -- and I don't have a list of these, but my recollection is that that is about as high as I've seen in any of the existing applications that we've had in terms of actual nights in the prior year. And absent any complaints during those 198 nights, I'm rather comfortable approving this under the conditions that we've been given. I do share Ms. Loe's concern about proximity of schools. That's a challenging issue, but, at this point in time, based upon the criteria the City Council has set before us, I intend to vote in favor of this motion.

MS. ORTIZ: I also intend to support this, although I do have similar concerns to Commissioner Loe. I really appreciate the homeowners' due diligence sending us a supplemental correspondence or the -- the extra documents. I think that was very helpful in making this decision.

MR. STANTON: Peggy?

MS. PLACIER: Well, just in terms of the proximity to a school, that has come up before. We still have not altered our policy, and I don't think that from the -- the platform, or whatever we call this thing up here, we should be creating ad hoc policies just out of thin air.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: If I can respond to that. I am -- I don't feel I'm creating an ad hoc policy. I feel that the proposed conditional use is creating an adverse impact to that neighborhood by displacing families, since it is a school zone. And that adverse impact evaluation is one of our policies in review.

MR. STANTON: Any other comments? I'd just like to close with proximity to schools and other things have always been on our mind throughout the whole discussion about these ordinances. So I plan to support it just because they're probably like the first ones in the gate, you know. I've always been advocating don't wait till the last second, and every time you wait, it impacts your application. So, you know, the next application might have a different impact, but that's always been a factor that we discussed, density around schools, and density in particular neighborhoods has always been a discussion, so -- so I plan to support this one, but we'll see. Any other discussion? Any other

comments of the Commissioners? Ripe -- ripe for a motion.

MR. WILLIAMS: We have a motion.

MR. ZENNER: The motion has been made.

MR. STANTON: Oh, we do already have one.

MR. WILLIAMS: We were discussing the motion.

MR. STANTON: All right. Mr. Secretary, let's get it on then. Let's take a vote.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.**

**Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters. Voting No:**

**Ms. Loe. Motion carries 6-1.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That is six in favor, one against, the motion carries.

MR. STANTON: This will be forwarded to City Council. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

All right. Let's rock and roll. Let me see what time it is. Okay.

**In the case of 84-2025, 3411 Goldenwood Drive, STR conditional-use permit, move to approve the requested STR condition-use permit subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, maximum of eight transient guest regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC, and garage made available while in STR use.**

**Yes:** 6 - Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

**No:** 1 - Loe

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

### **Case # 127-2025**

A request by Marla Battles (agent), on behalf of Battles Holdings LLC (owner), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow to allow the dwelling at 212 Park De Ville Drive to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 8 transient guests for up to 210-nights annually subject to the conditional use standards in Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2). The approximately 0.33-acre subject site is located in the R-1 (One-family Dwelling) district southeast of the intersection of Park De Ville Drive and West Worley Street, and includes the address 212 Park De Ville Drive.

MR. STANTON: May I have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the CUP to allow 212 Park De Ville Drive to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. Both garage parking spaces within the attached two-car garage and the driveway be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; and
2. Maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed eight transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by the most

recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC); and

3. A maximum of 210 nights of annual usage.

MR. STANTON: Questions for staff? If any of my fellow Commissioners have ex parte information relating to this case, and have information they would like to share with us, their fellow Commissioners, that information would be very useful at this time. I see none. Staff questions? I'll opening the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Anybody wish to come up and discuss this case, come up. If you're an individual, three minutes, a group, six. State your name and address clearly in the microphone. Thank you.

MS. BATTLES: Hi. My name is Marla Battles; I -- the house is 212 Park De Ville Drive. I actually live in Seattle, so I flew in for this today. So the house -- I grew up in Columbia. I was born here, raised here, my parents' home that they built in 1965, my sister lives in it still, so we have a lot of -- we have family and connections. And so we -- my husband and I, which is Battles Holdings; it's just my husband and I, this is the only short-term rental we have. We purchased this home for my daughter and her husband, and she was pregnant at the time. My son-in-law was getting his Ph.D. at Mizzou. And so because she was pregnant, we -- we decided to buy this house for them so they would have a home to live in while they were -- Ph.D. students are poor. So we did this, and then they lived in it for -- until he got done with his schooling. And so, at that time, we kind of had a sentimental attachment to the house, didn't really want to sell it. We didn't want to leave it empty because an empty house dies. And so we decided to do this. We haven't -- we didn't want to do a long term, because we do come in and visit family, and so we wanted to have a place where we could stay. And so since we've had the house, we've done many upgrades. We've painted the outside and the shutters, and added -- repaired the driveway and expanded our front porch, and the back patio, and so, anyway, we've made a lot of updates to it and really to make it a much nicer home. So, anyway, that's it. I wanted to talk -- the driveway thing, I was concerned -- I -- we let them use the drive -- the garage, so that's not a problem. It's just a two-car garage, and I'm -- I'm -- I should have measured, and I didn't, and I didn't have much time today when I flew in, but I did take pictures because we have had -- many times, we have had, even when my daughter was living there, we've had two cars, and I took a picture of two cars parked one behind the other, and there's plenty of room. It's a -- it's quite a slope, so I don't know if, like, the picture doesn't show that it angles down quite a bit, but, in any case, I have a two-car garage, so that's fine. It is a fully fenced backyard by the way. It

has two different kinds of fences, but yeah. And that's -- I think that's all I have.

MR. STANTON: So you don't have a problem using the garage. Right?

MS. BATTLES: No. No. I let them use the garage. We actually have a garage-door opener that's sitting inside for them -- their use while they're at the house, yeah. I'm really particular. I don't allow instant books. Again, I'm -- I have a quiet hours specified that they need to be quiet after -- I don't know if I have 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. till 7:00 a.m. I don't -- no parties are allowed, that sort of thing, so I want to be very respectful of the neighbors and that stuff, and I have not had any issues at all. I've just families come in visiting their kids. It's not super busy either, so yeah.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. You probably -- you have to have heard our discussion about schools.

MS. BATTLES: Yeah.

MS. PLACIER: And you are close to two. What do you do to screen your guests?

MS. BATTLES: Like I said, I don't -- so I -- Airbnb has a thing where you can do instant book, or they have to actually request a book. So I don't do instant book because I don't want -- I actually do want to know who wants to stay in the house. They write me something and tell me what their purpose is and who their guests are, and I then have the opportunity to look at all the reviews. And so if I have somebody that -- that requests to stay at the house, and they have any negative reviews, I just deny the request. Like I said, it's not a super busy Airbnb and I'm not trying to make it that. The majority have always been like families traveling with kids because I have the four bedrooms, and it allows families to stay together whereas a hotel room, you know, wouldn't really do that. And so it's also accessible, so I've had a lot of elderly people that, you know, people come and stay with -- bring their elderly parents and -- and that -- it's easy for them to get around. And so I just have not had any issues. And if I feel like it's going to be some sort of a party, I say no. I just have that opportunity, so --

MR. STANTON: Any more questions? Seeing none. Thank you.

MS. BATTLES: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Anyone else want to speak on this case, come up. State your name and address clearly in the microphone. Organizations, six, individuals, three minutes.

MR. STAES: Grant Staes, 207 Orleans Court. I've learned a lot tonight, but I guess my comments are I have direct view of this property out my back door. My initial reaction to getting the letter was I don't want that in my neighborhood. Having found out that she's had this rented out 75 nights last year and has been going since 2023, and I had no idea,

I've changed my mind. The only issue I've ever seen is people parking in front of the property on Park De Ville, and that is not a safe place to park. So I assume whatever she needs to do for the driveway would alleviate that problem. I've never heard any noise. Like I said, I didn't even know it was a rental, so I guess I'm -- I'm for it, as long as it doesn't become a problem. Now if it becomes 210 nights of the year, that might be different, but --

MR. STANTON: There are avenues, number one, where you know her now, so you can get information if there happens to be a problem. Every -- every property has a registering agent, if somebody is supposed to be there likely-split. You see the owner right there. I definitely would get her information so if there's a problem, it can be nipped in the bud.

MR. STAES: I will do that.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker? Going once, going twice. Thank you, sir.

MR. STAES: Sure.

MR. WILLIAMS: (Inaudible.)

MR. STANTON: Do you need to talk to him?

MR. WILLIAMS: I just wanted to thank him.

MR. STANTON: Mr, Speaker, I'm sorry. You have one question.

MR. WILLIAMS: I just wanted to thank you. It takes a lot of courage and integrity to come up having written a concern, and then to have listened to the presentation and come up and just say freely that you've changed your mind. And so I just want to thank you for still coming up and saying that and sharing it with us, and again, just having the integrity to vocalize that to everybody, so thank you.

MR. STANTON: Anybody else want to speak on this case? Going once, going twice, three times.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Discussion with Commissioners?

MR. CRAIG: Mr. Vice Chair, if I could?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

MR. CRAIG: I think it might be appropriate, given the subject has come up twice now, that it is the City Council's position regarding the proximity to the school, that it is not a consideration contemplated in the ordinance as drafted currently, so I just wanted to reiterate that that's legal's position on it.

MR. STANTON: If I may, Counsel, you're going to make me spark a question. That's always been ours. Do we still have the purview to consider that or are you trying to

say we can't use that as consideration?

MR. CRAIG: That's the -- that's the position of the City Councilors that that's not --

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: -- that's not an appropriate consideration.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: And I understand Commissioner Loe's argument that that fits into adverse, but that's not the position of the legal department, so --

MR. STANTON: Okay. That's not the formal position of the Council.

MR. CRAIG: Correct. Yeah. Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Any comments from Commissioners? Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. I appreciate the staff report especially given that this is an area that's like right off of a bus line. I think, yeah, it's really important to use that garage, so that way we're not, like, walking access to -- for pedestrians to get into the -- or onto the bus. So, yeah. I just appreciated that. I do plan on supporting this, although it sounds like a great place to just live, too, if I'm being honest, so yeah. That's my -- that's my position on this one.

MR. STANTON: Any other Commissioner comments, concerns? Sounds ripe for a motion. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Sure. Happy to make a motion. In the Case 127-2025, 212 Park De Ville Drive, move to approve the requested short-term rental conditional use permit subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, maximum of eight transient guests regardless of the allowance permitted by the IPMC, and garage be made available while in STR use.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I appreciate Counsel's clarification, but I do want to simply identify that I believe part of the reason we go through this whole process is that staff brings their recommendation to the floor in their reports, and the Commissioner reviews it and brings their opinion and recommendation to the floor based on our experience and what we hear from the public, and as one of the Commissioners that helped draft the ordinance, I happen to know what was and wasn't considered in the evaluation of the language. So even though I am glad to hear this is an STR that is being run very consciously and the neighbors thought they might object to it, but have come around to realize an STR in the neighborhood is okay, simply on the grounds of the location, since it -- that is something we have been discussing, and I do have some concerns about, I will not be supporting

this application.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe, I agree. This is one thing that was a hot spot in the development -- density. And so, density in one neighborhood was also, and I don't know if Counsel know that, but we do. We are conscious of that, so thank you, Ms. Loe, for bringing that up. Any other -- Ms. Peggy?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I did not object at all to having the issue brought up. My point was that we have had -- this has been brought up, you know, weeks and weeks ago, and for future reference, if we need to go back to the policy and amend it, we would have to do that. We can't do it from the dais.

MR. STANTON: Well said.

MS. ORTIZ: I --

MR. STANTON: Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: This is something that staff has been working on and they actually brought this in their staff report to City Council this Monday, and City Council directed staff to bring it to Planning and Zoning, so it will be coming back to us to evaluate on basis of school, or if that's what we decide to do. So thank you to staff for working on this. It's -- it's going to come back to us, but right now, in this moment, I plan -- I intend on supporting this.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Zenner, do you have any comments to operate on that?

MR. ZENNER: I'll provide an overview of what's coming on the upcoming agendas with work session during comments of staff.

MR. STANTON: Anything else, Mr. Secretary? Are we good?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I was just going to remind everyone we have -- this is discussion on a motion. We have a motion on the floor.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think I should just -- for the record, we've had several who have said they're going -- who have had some concerns. I think -- I think at least for my part, I plan on voting for it. I appreciate the information that's been provided by -- by the staff and their analysis, and I also appreciate the presentation by the -- by the applicant and the neighbor's comments. And so for -- for all of those reasons, I intend on supporting this.

MR. STANTON: This is ripe for a motion.

MS. LOE: We have a motion.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Secretary, can we -- can we take a vote, sir?



MR. WILLIAMS: We can.

MR. STANTON: All right.

MR. WILLIAMS: All right.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.**

**Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Voting No:**

**Ms. Loe. Motion carries 6-1.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That is six yeses and one no. The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: A recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Thank you,  
Mr. Secretary. Let's rock on.

**In the Case 127-2025, 212 Park De Ville Drive, move to approve the requested short-term rental conditional use permit subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, maximum of eight transient guests regardless of the allowance permitted by the IPMC, and garage be made available while in STR use.**

**Yes:** 6 - Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

**No:** 1 - Loe

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

### **Case # 132-2025**

A request by Allison Nelson (agent), on behalf of Nelson Property Investments, LLC (owner), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 608 N. West Boulevard to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 6 transient guests and up to 210-nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and 29-6.4(m) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.26-acre subject site is zoned R-2 (Two-family Dwelling), is located southwest of the intersection of West Boulevard and Donnelly Avenue, and is addressed as 608 N. West Boulevard.

MR. STANTON: Staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the CUP to allow 608 N. West Boulevard to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. Both garage parking spaces within the detached two-car garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; and
2. Maximum occupancy not to exceed six transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC), or on-site/off-street parking, and
3. Maximum of 210 nights of annual usage.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for staff? As I've stated before, if any of my fellow

Commissioners have any ex parte information relating to this case, and would like you to share that information with his fellow Commissioners, you can do so at this time. Seeing none. I'll open the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Anybody wishing to discuss this case, come up, say your name and address into the microphone clearly, three minutes for individuals, six for organizations.

MS. NELSON: Good evening. My name is Allison Nelson; this my husband, Ben Nelson, and we're both the only members of Nelson Property Investments, and we both live at 4106 South Wappel Drive here in Columbia. I just had a few quick points I wanted to make. First, I understand that there was one complaint in 2023. I guess that there was an illegal rental. My understanding from reading the staff report was that since we have until June of 2025, that was just dismissed because of the fact that it wasn't an illegal rental. I just wanted to make sure that I was understanding that correctly. Also, we -- Mr. Zenner had e-mailed to clarify that we would offer the garage for parking for the rental, and we will. It's available to be used at any time. And I want to just comment briefly on the location, because a lot has been brought up tonight about homes in neighborhoods, et cetera. So this house is located on West Boulevard North, and it is almost directly across a little bit off of -- from Doug Perry, the gas station/service station. Being on the edge of a neighborhood, too, makes it great both for our guests because they're right in the middle of a residential neighborhood, but also, I think for the neighborhood itself. And that's one of the aspects we really liked about this home when we were considering how to use it. I think that's all I had for comments. I'm not sure if Ben has anything he wanted to add, but we definitely can answer questions, too.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker?

MR. WALTERS: Are you aware of the -- the complaint letter that we received?

MS. NELSON: Are you speaking of the one in '23 or the latter?

MR. WALTERS: Somebody recently sent a letter. I just was going to suggest that if you're not familiar, get a copy and you might reply to her.

MS. NELSON: I was not familiar with it, no.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. NELSON: I haven't seen that.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. I mean, she lives on Hardin Street close by.

MS. NELSON: How would I get a copy of that?

MR. ZENNER: We can provide one to you.

MS. NELSON: Okay. Yes. I'll do that. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: I strongly suggest you do that, too. You guys are the pioneers. I haven't said this speech yet. You screw this up, it screws the process up, and the big thing that we really support is being good with the neighbors.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. We agree.

MR. STANTON: Find that person, work that out, because your success makes the success of our program or its failure, so, yes.

MS. NELSON: We will do that. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions for this speaker? Thank you.

MS. NELSON: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Anyone else want to speak on this case? Going once, going twice, three times. Closing public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Commissioner discussion, ladies, gentlemen? Ms. Peggy?

MS. PLACIER: Well, just as a side comment, moving forward, I've noticed that of the proposals we've had tonight, five are in the First Ward. And we did hear when we were developing the ordinance that about 40 percent of the STRs that we knew of at that time were in the First Ward. And so if we're looking at disparate impact, that is something we are conscious of. I don't know that our ordinance could take care of it, but I just want to keep it on top of mine.

MR. STANTON: That's a good point. I'm -- I'm a First Ward baby, so I like the distribution. They're not, like, clustered on one street, they're not clustered in a particular census tract. I'm -- I'm comfortable with how they're distributing right now. And, you know, my neighborhood is hot. Everybody wants to be there, at least short-term rental wise, so, you know, as long as there are not too many. But thank you. We are keeping an eye on that, and I definitely don't want my neighborhood to be taken advantage of in that fashion. Any other comments from my fellow Commissioners? Mr. Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Well, I was going to give Commissioner Loe a break and make a -- make a recommendation to approve.

MR. STANTON: This is ripe for a motion, sir.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. I make a motion to approve Case Number 132-2025 for 608 N. West Boulevard STR Conditional Use Permit subject to the following recommendations or criteria: one, approve the requested CUP, no less than two parking spaces within the attached two-car garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; 210 nights of rental; three, maximum of six transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC.

MS. LOE: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Any discussion on the motion? Yes, ma'am?

MS. WILSON: The only note that I will make is that even though we have a letter of complaint, this was a previously operated STR, and so the person's complaint is that they feel uncomfortable that this is coming, but it's been there.

MR. STANTON: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: So it's my only note.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. Duly noted. Any other questions, comments, concerns relating to this case from my fellow Commissioners? We do have a motion on the floor, Mr. Secretary. Correct?

MR. WILLIAMS: We are ready to go.

MR. STANTON: Let's get it. Let's take a vote.

MR. CRAIG: I'm sorry. Did we get a second on that? Is it --

MR. STANTON: Yes, sir. It was properly seconded.

MR. CRAIG: Okay. Thank you. Pardon me.

MR. STANTON: Yes, sir. Ms. Loe seconded it, Mr. Walters presented.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters.**  
**Motion carries 7-0.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That's seven yeses, zero nos, the motion carries.

MR. STANTON: Right. The motion will be forwarded to City Council. Mr. Zenner, I would like to take a five-minute break, if that is okay. Is that okay, Ms. Wilson, are you cool, or to you want to rock on?

MS. WILSON: Please and thank you.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. WILSON: Seconded.

MR. STANTON: All right. Five minutes. Be prompt and efficient in the five minutes, please.

(Off the record)

**Motion to approve Case Number 132-2025 for 608 N. West Boulevard STR Conditional Use Permit subject to the following recommendations or criteria: one, approve the requested CUP, no less than two parking spaces within the attached two-car garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; 210 nights of rental; three, maximum of six transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC.**

**Yes:** 7 - Loe, Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

**Case # 133-2025**

A request by Timothy Fox (agent), on behalf of Byron and Beth Critchfield and Caroline and Timothy (owners), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow the dwelling addressed as 310 Sanford Avenue to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 6 transient guests up to 210 nights annually subject to the conditional use standards of Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2) of the UDC. The subject property contains approximately 0.27-acres, is located approximately 600-feet northeast of the intersection of West Ash Street and Sanford Avenue, is zoned R-2 (Two-family Dwelling), and includes the address 310 Sanford Avenue.

MR. STANTON: We are restarting our meeting here. Thank you for your patience when we take a break. As you -- we're going to start at Case 133-2025.

MR. STANTON: Staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and development Department. Staff recommends approval of the CUP to allow 310 Sanford Avenue to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. The applicant extends the existing driveway depth by an additional four feet to ensure the driveway is a minimum of 54-feet deep and capable of supporting three on-site/off street vehicles, and
2. Maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed four transient guests without a driveway expansion, as described in item number one above, regardless of potential occupancy allowed by the most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC), and
3. A maximum of 210 nights of annual usage.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for staff? As stated before, if you have any ex parte information relating to this case, information you would like to share with your fellow Commissioners so that we can impart the same knowledge that you have obtained, do that at this time. Commission, I'm going to open up a public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Anybody want to discuss this case, come up, name, address, speak directly into the microphone. Three minutes individuals, six is group.

MR. FOX: Hi. I'm Timothy Fox; I'm one of the owners. Yeah. So since we've owned this short-term rental, we've had over 120 reviews. All of them have been five stars. My concern is about the parking. We've had no concerns from any of our guests about not having enough parking, and so if you measure from the back of the driveway all the way to the curb, I believe there is enough room for three cars. It's my understanding that it isn't measured that way because of the potential for a sidewalk in the future, and if there's

a sidewalk, it would be impeding within that walkway. However, there isn't a sidewalk at this time, so, I mean, there's also -- I know it's on-street parking, but there is enough room for three cars on street, as well. I know that's not included in it. But like I said, we've never had any complaints about not enough parking, and there is no sidewalk that would impede upon the required length of the driveway, so --

MR. STANTON: We've heard your concerns, but you stepped into this arena. You want to use it for commercial use. You're actually in my neighborhood, and that's -- on-street parking would be a problem. You know that Sanford is a narrow street. It's an old street. So without adjusting your parking, you get four. You're requesting six, so to play the game, you have to extend your driveway or take four transient guests. So you're interacting your -- you're into a business. Right? And it is what we require to play this game.

MR. FOX: Yeah. I understand that. Yeah. I just wanted to ask if there was any consideration for making an exception if there isn't a sidewalk, if there's not at all. Like I said, we would like to have six guests, and we would make the accommodations to extend it. I just wanted to ask.

MR. STANTON: We're just thinking ahead of the City plan, you know, in the future, then we don't have to come and beg you for that easement later on.

MR. FOX: Sure.

MR. STANTON: Questions? Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Oh, excuse me. Is this something you've talked to City staff about?

MR. FOX: I talked to Mr. Zenner, a little. That's -- that's what the --

MS. ORTIZ: Well, he's the expert, so, you know, if he says there's no way, I believe him. So is it your -- sorry. Is it your intention to extend the parking lot then, or the parking spot four feet as indicated on the recommendation?

MR. FOX: I will if that's the only way to -- yes.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions for this speaker? Mr. Secretary, you good? Okay. Thank you, sir. Anyone else want to speak on this case? Going once, going twice, three times.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

MR. STANTON: Commission discussion? Mr. Secretary?

MR. WILLIAMS: I have a question for staff. Could you, just for my benefit, revisit the parking -- the driveway measurement, protocol and --

MR. ZENNER: So the driveway measurement protocol is -- is measured in generally two instances. It is measured from the aerial photography provided on the Boone County

Assessor's records. In most instances, the actual property line of properties does not begin at the curb line, it begins anywhere between -- it could be upwards of 13 feet from the curb line inward, so the return of a driveway is not on the individual's property. It is within the platted public road right-of-way. This particular lot -- and I identified this as a part of the intake of this application with Mr. Fox. Unfortunately, due to an error on my part, we did not follow up with Mr. Fox soon enough to have this application amended to potentially reduce the number of guests in order to not be at this awkward situation. The driveway to what appears to be the edge of the pavement in this particular location on Sanford is about four feet, which is the four feet that Mr. Fox refers to, that if you park in the driveway, all the way to the pavement section would support the three vehicles. Unfortunately, the way that the Code is written, as it relates to parking, and this is the parking general standards, residential development must accommodate all parking on site/off street. When we refer to off street, that means outside of the public road right-of-way. In this particular instance, that is -- that was the decision of the Planning Commission as these regulations were adopted, were developed, and then it was the standard that was established by Council's adoption of these standards. It was discussed at great length as unfortunate as this may be. Some properties may not be able to get the maximum occupancy that they would desire because they do not have adequate parking. There are options to provide parking, and as we have expressed in the staff report, the extension of the driveway four feet is probably the least impactful and least expensive. However, an applicant could choose to widen the driveway to obtain a 17-foot-wide parking pad, provided it met other limitations. So what we have done is we have offered an option here to allow the applicant to achieve the maximum occupancy that they have wanted in the least cost impactful way, and as Mr. Stanton pointed out eloquently, you're in the commercial business now, and therefore, this is a cost of operation. So there's a choice to be made either by the applicant to reduce occupancy, or the Commission to conditionally approve. We would verify that the actual driveway extension has been installed prior to allowing the short-term rental certificate to be issued, and the applicant to proceed to business licensing. If the applicant chooses not to, the short-term rental certificate would be reduced to four as it relates to the parking available.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. My follow-up question for you is because the applicant has made an appeal to this body, if there is any way of approving it as an exception. I'm just asking the question to you or to Counsel whether we have any -- I'm not -- asking generally, do we have any discretion in that area, or is it -- is the code fairly concrete, no pun intended?

MR. ZENNER: Zoning related -- pun well taken. The zoning related regulation that this would fall under is not in the purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission, it is a Board of Adjustment action because this is a zoning standard. If this were a planned zoning district, it would be a slightly different story at which point you would be able to do something. The most expedient path forward for the applicant to have a legally compliant rental property used as a short-term rental is probably to either reduce the amount of occupancy or seek to acquire the services of a concrete contractor to add the extra four feet.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I just wanted to ask, does it need to be paved concrete, or could it be gravel?

MR. ZENNER: We have to keep Mr. Stanton in business, so it must be concrete.

MS. PLACIER: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: But in all seriousness, though we do want to keep Mr. Stanton in business, our ordinance does not allow non-dust resurfaces, so it would generally have to be asphalt. An alternative to asphalt or concrete may be allowed, and that is something that if the applicant wanted to explore those options, such as a chip and seal or something else that is framed and provides adequate surface area to meet the requirement, that is something that the director could approve administratively, and we would be more than welcome to explore those options potentially with the applicant. I think the -- the recommendation here from the staff is to approve this with six, subject to the extension of the driveway, and if we cannot resolve how to work that out, the applicant still has an approval. It's up to six, and then we would be able to take action necessary to be able to at least get him a short-term rental certificate, and then the subsequent business license for a lesser number of occupants.

MR. WALTERS: A quick follow-up. So pavers would -- would qualify as a dust-free surface?

MR. ZENNER: A Grasscrete, potentially. I'm not sure if we would allow just a regular patio paver. We -- again, we haven't been asked that question directly in a while, so I don't have the immediate answer.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: Though I have a lot of them to everything else.

MR. STANTON: I'm just going to say this. This is in my neighborhood. I know the neighbors over there. Don't do no shady stuff in my block. Do the concrete or some good, you know, pervious paving, or something like that. Don't do no cheap stuff. Just my opinion. Keep my neighborhood looking good like everybody else's. Any other



comments from Commissioners? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: If there are no other comments, I'm happy to make a motion.

MR. STANTON: It's ripe.

MS. LOE: In the case of 133-2025, 310 Sanford Avenue, STR conditional use permit, move to approve the requested STR conditional use permit subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, a maximum of six transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC if parking pad extended by four feet of depth, otherwise a maximum of four guest.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Any discussion on this motion? Let's take a vote, Mr. Secretary.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.**

**Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters.**

**Motion carries 7-0.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That's seven yeses, zero nos. The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: The recommendation will be moved to City Council. All right.

**In the case of 133-2025, 310 Sanford Avenue, STR conditional use permit, move to approve the requested STR conditional use permit subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, a maximum of six transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC if parking pad extended by four feet of depth, otherwise a maximum of four guest.**

**Yes:** 7 - Loe, Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

### **Case # 134-2025**

A request by Ashleigh Stundebek (owner) for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 1617 Highridge Circle to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 4 transient guests and up to 210-nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and 29-6.4(m) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.26-acre subject site is zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling), is located west of the intersection of Stadium Boulevard and Forum Boulevard, and is addressed as 1617 Highridge Circle.

MR. STANTON: Could I have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the CUP to allow 1617 Highridge Circle to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. Condition that the parking space within the one-car attached garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; and

2. Maximum occupancy shall not exceed four transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC); and
3. Maximum if 210-nights of annual rental usage.

MR. ZENNER: If I may, before the Commission discusses or asks questions. There is, and I believe as part of the delivery of the verbal report, the staff report, I believe, indicates that the driveway is not sufficient to park but one vehicle. It is too short. So again, it is a similar situation. So the condition of recommended approval is the one-car garage plus one space in the driveway is what equates to the maximum of four requested transient guests. Those are the two parking spaces that would be needed, so -- and the applicant was aware. It originally came in as six guest request, and was reduced once we did the analysis before it was assigned to our staff that it needed to come to four to be able to come before this body in compliance.

MR. STANTON: Questions of staff -- Mr. Zenner? I'm going to open the public hearing. Oh, excuse me. Before I start that, if any Commissioners that have any ex parte information about this case they would like to share with their fellow commissioners, you can do so at this time. I see none.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: If anyone wishes to speak on this case, come up, name, address, into the microphone.

MS. STUNDEBECK: Good evening. My name is Ashley Stundebek; this is my husband, Clint. We reside at 225 East Starla Road here in Columbia. We have operated this Airbnb for a little over two years now. We've had zero complaints from neighbors. We've had zero complaints from Airbnb. We have a 4.9 rating. I have been a super host the last four times. We take pride in how we book people. We do no instant booking. I get the request, and I ask why they are visiting, who is visiting with them, and who will be in the home, and I do require their names, as well. I am very highly involved in the property. I clean. My husband does maintenance, my kids mow the lawn. this is a family business for us. We've taken pride in the home. I think that the curb appeal looks better than what it did when we bought it. We recently renovated the kitchen. We're not there to bring down property values, we're there to raise them and, you know, bring more to the neighborhood. I'm also proud of people that we've had stay there. We're very close to the hospital. We had a lady whose husband was in a horrible wreck. They lived in Rolla. She stayed with us for a month. I've had in the summer, both summers we've had it, we've had families stay there until they can find a home to purchase in Columbia to live. So we're not there to run parties, and it's not allowed. It's in our rules. We have

quiet hours. I even write on there that it's a family neighborhood and they are to respect that.

MR. STUNDEBECK: As Ashleigh said, we have made many improvements to the home. I've done some electrical work, plumbing, installed new appliances, a vapor barrier in the crawl space, and we have fixed termite damage, so we've done nothing but up the value of our home. I did meet a neighbor tonight who addressed some concerns, and we plan on -- I spoke with her. I plan on taking care of anything that comes our way, so --

MR. STANTON: Any questions? Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: That -- sorry. The garage, is it available yet for parking?

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yeah.

MR. STUNDEBECK: Yes.

MS. STUNDEBECK: We -- the family I was telling you about that stayed last summer used it all summer, so, yeah.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MS. STUNDEBECK: I got a garage-door opener for them, so --

MR. STUNDEBECK: Leave the door open for them. Anybody can use it, it's empty, so --

MR. STANTON: Any other questions for this speaker? I have one. So you said there's no complaints. You know we see two here. We have two in front of us.

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yeah. I did not about those.

MR. STUNDEBECK: We didn't know until tonight.

MR. STANTON: Do you have access to those complaints?

MS. STUNDEBECK: I don't know.

MR. STUNDEBECK: We don't know.

MR. STANTON: Okay. You need to get those. One thing that people are concerned with was the lack of, like, supervision of the property, like, immediate addressing of issues, trash, things of that nature. I implore you to get these --

MS. STUNDEBECK: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: -- complaints and address them. You've heard before, you've been here all evening, you guys are the failure or success. I mean, if you guys screw this up, the next people after you, it's going to be harder and harder and harder, and you guys have to set the tone. So get with the neighbors, fix it.

MR. STUNDEBECK: That's understood.

MS. STUNDEBECK: I will say, too. I am at every turnover. As soon as the house is turned over, I go in and inspect it to see if there's something wrong. This is our home and our property. We own it. We don't want bad things to happen to it, either.

MR. STUNDEBECK: And going forward, if a neighbor, like, they should have -- do they have our numbers now. Was that on that card? But I would hope to hear from the neighbors if there's a complaint.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. We can get you the access to the letters, so --

MR. STUNDEBECK: Okay. That would be great.

MR. STANTON: -- just -- you know, address that.

MS. STUNDEBECK: Sure.

MR. STUNDEBECK: And now knowing that there's been a complaint, I might consider installing a camera in the front yard so I can monitor something like that.

MS. STUNDEBECK: I will say our neighborhood is a lot of rentals, too. So we say neighbors, but they're moving in and out yearly, as well, so --

MR. STANTON: You guys are setting the tone for this use.

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yeah.

MR. STUNDEBECK: Understood.

MR. STANTON: So you guys have to lead the way. Any other questions for this speaker?

Ms. Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Thank you. Not a question, but a comment. Because this regulation is not being enforced yet, you may not have seen complaints, and that makes sense. The complaints that we are talking about are specifically associated with this application, which, again, you may not have seen because of them being associated with the application. But thank you for addressing them, and thank you for showing up and allowing us to ask you our questions. We appreciate it.

MR. STUNDEBECK: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Questions? Thank you. Anyone else want to speak upon this case? Full name, address, into the microphone.

MS. BRADFIELD: My name is Gail Bradfield; I live down the street at 1801 Ridgmont. I own the property adjacent to this property. I have driven by it once or twice a day, and noticed an increase of maybe five to eight cars in the -- in front of the -- in the area of the house off and on. I did not know for sure whose house they were associated with, but they were in front of the house, near the house, and increased trash and clutter in the yard, and people lingering outside. So I had meant, once I got the notice, to contact my renter. She contacted me first. She said she could not be here tonight, so I'll just read you her text. And this would be Emily and her sister. I have to work, or I would come. I definitively don't love it. They've been renting it as an Airbnb for, like, a year now. Only issue we've had so far is late night traffic, lots of litter. A couple of

weeks ago, a guy was staying there, was working on his truck and draining antifreeze onto the street, so that was lovely. She's a very kind person, very patient, but she has lost a lot of sleep and I'm afraid of losing her. So basically, that would be Emily and her sister, and myself. There are another couple, Lee -- Ron Lee lives at 1629 and Aaron Lee lives across the street and behind on the circle. He says that he sees eight or nine people living there on a regular basis, construction people mostly. More recently, they'll park cars, trucks, and trailers in the yard because there's not enough spaces to park, so trucks and trailers -- one full truck and trailer in the yard, and another one where there might be one of the wheels on the street. So there -- there's no parking in that area. The density is close. You can hear everything that's going on with your neighbor. There is no sidewalks, and there's not a lot of places to park. It's -- I had planned when I bought the house 35 years ago, if I needed to or if a family member needed to, to have that as a place I could live when I simplified my life. You know, I wasn't working, but I had gotten the feeling in the last year or two that I wouldn't feel comfortable with that because of all of the density and just closeness. You know, when people start parking cars all in front your house and around, and out in front of the lawn, you lose some of your sense of your home, your space. So I've lived in the neighborhood 35 years. I've owned that house for 34 years. I lived there for a while, and it's a quiet family neighborhood, and I take it -- I usually take a month or two before I pick a new person to live there, and they usually live there four or five years, so we do not have a lot of turnover in renters there. It's kind of beginning to start because it's a little bit crowded right now, and personally, I don't like to be woken up in the middle of the night, so I'm afraid of losing a good renter, and I know when people live in a place, they can monitor it, and I don't feel like when this is a repeated problem we should have to do all that monitoring and take that space when someone is not doing it. And I didn't know who to go to. Maybe you guys know who to go to. I -- you hate to call the police on your neighbor when there's partying in the front yard. I don't think cameras are sufficient. And basically, I was told there's construction workers renting the house sometimes and putting as many people as can sleep in it. So that's what I've been told by people who work with those construction workers. So anyway, I'm just a little uncomfortable after being so careful and we've got families and we would watch them grow. That is an area that needs to be monitored on an ongoing basis. There's a group home in the neighborhood. The Grasslands bought a house next to me for a while, and had a kind of a recovery -- unmonitored recovery place, so we've been taken advantage of a lot in that neighborhood, and the wrestling team moved in next door. I had a group home, a recovery home on both sides of me for a while, and it just -- there's times I haven't felt safe staying in my own home because the City has allowed these

things to happen. And so, I'm sorry that other issues have overlapped, but this neighborhood has been through a lot. It's had a lot of difficult things happen. We had a real trauma in the spring that we all shared in and we just need to feel safe. We need to get our sleep at night, and we need to have stable people in -- in our neighborhood who are considerate of their neighbors because when you live that close together, you can't just be inconsiderate like that.

MR. STANTON: Questions? Ms. Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Thank you. Thank you for -- no. No. Please stay.

MS. BRADFIELD: Okay.

MS. WILSON: Thank you for coming and thank you for sharing and your concerns are heard. What I would ask is do you now understand and are aware that because they have requested this application, now there is a means that you can complain and something can be done, as opposed to the past. There wasn't anything, so --

MS. BRADFIELD: And that's a full-time -- that can become a full-time job when you've got that much property -- that many problems.

MS. WILSON: Sure. No. What I'm saying, though, is that --

MS. BRADFIELD: But I --

MS. WILSON: -- even with just the observations that you're making about parking. Right? So you're saying today I saw parking. This was something I observed. Just go ahead and report that. And you now have a way to do so, and something can be done about it, compared to the past when we couldn't do anything about it. Okay? So I just want you to feel some comfort in -- in that. Hopefully, you do.

MS. BRADFIELD: Yeah. This is pretty -- it's pretty much ongoing, and it's hard to monitor someone else's property for them when they're not monitoring it themselves.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: I defer to Commissioner Loe.

MS. LOE: Oh, no. You go.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. All right. So I guess my question for you is if the fact that this is reduced to -- well, let me back up and say, before, this was not regulated and in such a specific way. It would have been subject to other general requirements in the City code, but not necessarily the specific requirements that it is now. And so one of those requirements is that as to this particular property, it would be limited to four guests, and I'm wondering if that provides you with any comfort compared to -- you know, I'm hearing your concerns about a lot of people. Now they're going to be obligated to keep it to four. And so I'm curious about your thoughts on that, and how that influences the concerns

you have?

MS. BRADFIELD: I know that the fellow that works with these people --

MS. ORTIZ: Can you speak into the microphone? Thank you.

MS. BRADFIELD: Yeah. It doesn't matter what the limit is, if people are going to keep putting people in, you have to watch. If people are -- it's a problem when, yes, you can tell only four, but if you're not there, you don't know -- you don't see all those cars. If you don't live there, I go by it twice a day, I see it. But they don't live there, so they're not -- it's -- it's my renters, the people around that are imposed upon, and their quality of life, and the desirability of the neighborhood goes down, but even having to make those calls shouldn't be happening -- the needs, and what's keeping eight people from being there? I mean, it's going on.

MR. WILLIAMS: So, right now, it's not restricted to four, but after the CUP is issued, assuming it is -- I'm not going to speak for the -- what's going to happen, but it would be limited to four, and at that point, you would have a mechanism of redress through the City because they would be -- especially if they're given a license, and --

MS. BRADFIELD: What is the cut-off now? Could they have unlimited people, because I live in the neighborhood --

MR. WILLIAMS: So --

MS. BRADFIELD: -- that's R-3, which is typically three unrelated people, and sometimes there are -- I'm hearing there are four people there. So, I mean, they're saying that maybe four people can live in a house that is -- where you're only supposed to have three unrelated people because -- it's just strange.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm going to defer to the City staff on exactly what the -- what the limitation would be on a short-term rental right now.

MS. BRADFIELD: What was the limitation that they --

MR. WILLIAMS: But --

MS. BRADFIELD: What limit did they have, because --

MR. ZENNER: So as Commissioner Williams is trying to explain, ma'am, there are no regulations governing short-term rentals today.

MS. BRADFIELD: But don't they have to follow the zoning laws, or are those zoning laws --

MR. ZENNER: The -- as a short-term rental, which does not have laws associated to it without --until June 1st of this year, a short-term rental is not considered the same as a long-term rental. It is not regulated by the zoning classification in which it is located, and that was by design that the ordinance, when it was adopted in February of 2024 allowed short-term rental operators one year to become compliant. They are not obligated to

have a long-term rental license at this point; however, if these owners had a long-term rental license, they would be limited to a maximum of three unrelated individuals. Over occupancy complaints is something that is required to be reported by those that are impacted by that to our Office of Neighborhood Services. The City of Columbia cannot go out and enforce its regulations either as current long-term rentals or as a future short-term rental without the assistance of its residents. We are not omnipotent, and we are not omnipresent. We rely on the assistance of our citizens to help us. And so I think what Mr. Williams is suggesting, and what other Commissioners have stated is these applicants are seeking a license which is going to obligate them to remain compliant. The current enforcement standards that exist within our rental conservation code that would apply to short-term rentals indicates that two verified complaints within a 12-month period is grounds for the revocation of an issued short-term rental license. And so if you are impacted by this short-term rental, you do not have to live next door, you can report it even though you live down the road from this on Ridgemont. And our staff is obligated to go out and inspect or to react to that complaint, and if it's a verified complaint that we have vehicles parking in the front yard, we have more vehicles than are -- that are in the public street, those are verified complaints, but we -- we -- those begin generally with an aggrieved citizen having to report them. And that is -- so the standards right now, an over-occupancy complaint within our Code, as I said, relies on the impacted party, and then a case must be mounted by which to take that to the City prosecutor, and that requires that we have evidence, so a telephone call, backed up with either photographic evidence of that at that period of time, that does help, and it will help greatly in either a long-term rental situation or short. And I realize you would prefer to not have to do that, but in order to have effective regulations in our community, it does require participation by both affected residents and our city staff.

MS. BRADFIELD: So it's my job to monitor their property; is that what you're saying?

MR. ZENNER: Ma'am, it's your job, if you are impacted, to report violations that you believe exist. The City of Columbia has 1,200 employees of which about 25 work with our Office of Neighborhood Services, and therefore, we do not have an unlimited amount of resources. We have citizens that, if they are concerned, such as yourself, we avail them an opportunity to report their concerns, and that process does not -- has not presently existed for short-term rentals. It is now in place, and we do have a means by which to address that. As I said, two verified complaints in a 12-month period is grounds for revocation.

MS. BRADFIELD: Now, I will say the postcard I got told me this was April 26th, and



that we were going to meet on April 26th, so I tried to get in touch with the City Planner to find out --

MR. CRAIG: Ma'am, if we could have step back towards the mic. Thank you.

MS. BRADFIELD: Okay. Yeah. But the postcards they sent out told us this meeting was going to be on April 26th, so I reached out to the City Planner. I know that Aaron Lee wanted to be here, and he said that you could -- that there were still tire marks from the trucks being parked in the front yard, if you wanted to check. I know they've probably got time to deal with that, but it's -- I just want to say it's been a problem, and I'll try to get you or get others to report more directly to you so you can take care of it, if I can. I tried talking to the people tonight, and maybe that will be all it will take.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. STANTON: Now, before you leave, number one, is there any more -- Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. I want to thank you so much for being here, and especially for speaking on behalf of your renter who couldn't make it. I don't know a lot of landlords that would reach out to their -- you know, tenant, in that case, so I really appreciate it and I can tell you have a lot of empathy for the people that live in your home. And it's -- I really thank you for that. That's all.

MS. BRADFIELD: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: I know you're trying to get out of here. You're still in the hot seat. You're still there.

MS. BRADFIELD: And that's okay.

MR. STANTON: Okay. So I hear everything you're saying, so I'm going to be that guy. How can we make this a win -- how can this be a win-win, because he's essentially in the same boat you are. He has a right to the use of his property, just like you do as a landlord, he has the same. Now at this point, and he's not going to like this language, but I've been dying to use it for a long time. He is illegal right now. He is a renegade. He has the illegal use of land right now because we do not have a short-term rental policy before then. Now we do so, and J-1, January 1, or what is it?

MS. LOE: June 1.

MR. STANTON: June 1. Excuse me. June 1, he'll be a lawful citizen. Right now, he's unlawful. Anybody that has a short-term renter that has not got our blessing is unlawful. It's the wild, wild west. There's no regulation. That's why we're having these people come forward and do this, because he is volunteering to now become compliant and now be responsible. Yes, you've got the short end of the stick. Yes, it's up to you as a citizen. There's a lot of stuff I don't want to do as a citizen, and one of them is complain. I get it. Now, like I told everybody else that's come forward with a short-term

rental, we heard you. We need to get together so that you can make this work. And he has a right to rent like you have a right to rent, he's doing it illegally right now, but he's trying to come into the light. I would implore you to work with him. He's not guaranteed to get it because we're taking all this information in, so he's not good yet. But if you were him, how would you fix this? He has the same right as you as the property owner. You don't live in your spot; he doesn't live in his. You just happen to be long-term, and he's short-term. In our eyes, that's a check on a piece of paper. That's the only difference between you and him. So how can we make this a win-win? How would -- how could he --

MS. BRADFIELD: There needs to be background checks. There needs to be monitoring for parties. There needs to be consideration for the neighbors. It's not happening. We have a lot of kids in the neighborhood. It's a walking neighborhood without sidewalks. The cars block the view of the people walking their dogs, and it gets more dangerous to walk. When the cars are on both sides of the street, you can hardly get a car through. So it's very -- and people who don't live in the neighborhood tend to speed through the neighborhood, not realizing that there's people -- there's no sidewalks. So I think that, yes, he needs to think about things, but the City of Columbia needs to think about things, too, because this neighborhood has -- I mean, it's got a group home in it. It's got a lot of vulnerable people, elderly people. There's a person I talk to in hospice, and you have people -- so many people in a house that they have to go outside to drink and party. It's -- it's not the kind of hospice experience that we would pray for this person to have, you know.

MR. STANTON: What he's -- what he's going for is only four registered people to be in the house now.

MS. BRADFIELD: And I tell you the truth, it's crowded.

MR. STANTON: Well, let me -- let me paint the picture. So he could have one in the garage, and one in the driveway. Am I on the right page? Okay. These are the regulations that he is going to be into. Are you willing to give him a chance to be compliant because he has a right to be a landlord like you. The only difference between you and him is he's the renegade right now, but on the application, it's just a check, either long-term or short-term rental. And then all the things that comply like you have to comply with, you know. So if the things that he is subjecting himself to right now, there should be two cars, one in the garage. I mean, you know, I understand.

MS. BRADFIELD: There's not enough room in front of the house for the two cars.

MR. STANTON: I get it. I get it. I get it.

MS. BRADFIELD: So he's going to be parked partially in front of somebody else's

house.

MR. STANTON: We're making -- we're making assumptions until we see.

MS. BRADFIELD: Yeah. It's a very tight, close space.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. So if we -- you can work with him if you get him -- get in touch with him, you all communicate, you know. And like -- like staff said, hey, if he doesn't play ball, he could lose the license. But I don't want to set him up for -- for the set-up. Like you're -- you don't like it anyway, so you're just waiting to complain and cause a problem. Are you willing -- are you going to work with him? He's hearing all this, so I'm really expecting the applicant to do what he's got to do.

MS. BRADFIELD: It's very difficult to live next to what's been going on. It better be -- better. He knows what to do to make it better, but you need to be there when you're got a party town, and people are coming. Oh, it's near campus, I can party, I can walk from the football stadium, or, you know, after working construction all day, people want to cut lose.

MR. STANTON: And you simply don't agree, so he's -- you simply do not support his right to do what he's doing?

MS. BRADFIELD: I don't support someone's right to ignore the proximity and disturb their neighbors -- allow people to disturb their neighbors. That has to stop. It does. I mean, it has to stop.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I just want to make it clear that you've shared quite a bit with us this evening in terms of things that are dissatisfactory for you. And thank you for sharing that. In the future, I want you to realize that now you have an avenue to share. If you observe other behavior that is problematic, you have an avenue to share that behavior. I just want to make that clear, because you're saying I don't want to have to monitor, but you've given us a plethora of information tonight, so you have been monitoring. So as we move forward, you should share that monitored information in the correct manner so that something can be done about it, because we can't do anything about what you're sharing with us tonight. Does that make sense?

MS. BRADFIELD: Okay. And there are three other people here, so I would like to give them some time, also.

MS. WILSON: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other speakers on this case, please come forward. Full name, address, into the microphone. Three minutes for individuals, six for organizations.

MR. MCDOWELL: Matt McDowell, 1701 Ridgemont. Ridgemont is not a long way away, it's just a little bit up the street, about six houses or something. I've lived there for

35 years. I know most of the people in the neighborhood, and some of them are renters, but when they rent, they become a part of the neighborhood, and after a while, you see them acting the same way. They take care of each other. We have a very, very good community. I don't want somebody's profitability to describe -- to drag that down. And all we're talking about here tonight, over and over again, is profitability. That's not what I'm here for. What I'm here for is my neighbors. There was two young women walking the street, because there are no sidewalks, pushing strollers down with babies in them. Every once in a while, I see cars coming down that street 90 to nothing. Now I'll admit, I go the speed limit all the time everywhere. I don't drive fast, but it upsets me when my neighbors once came out and said slow down, you're going to hit a kid. I don't know if it's them or somebody else, but I know most of the people in the neighborhood, and I don't recognize these people. And it's up to your people to make this stop. This is profitability. You can rent the long-term way, and live up to the rules and put no more than three unrelated people in there. And if it's a problem, then they'll know about it and they'll have to fix it, and then you'll know about it. This is my neighborhood. I care. I care about the people around me, and I care about Gail. She's my friend. She is a very, very busy woman. She can't monitor everything. She -- I know those renters up there. I helped her the day she found them. These are good people. They're all good people in that neighborhood. You need to stop this short-term rental crap because it's not working for the people. Thank you very much.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker?

MS. WILSON: It's not a question, just a note. We're starting it.

MR. MCDOWELL: I understand.

MS. WILSON: No. You're saying we need to stop it. Essentially, it hasn't existed, so we are starting it. So we have to actually allow the law to work --

MR. MCDOWELL: Or we could pull the plug on the law and say no short-term rentals.

MS. WILSON: Pull the plug is something that doesn't exist?

MR. MCDOWELL: Yeah. Well, they do that all the time in the federal government. Let's just pull the plug on it, and let it deflate. Put in regular renters. It's not that hard, you know. You have to do the work and you have to take care of things.

MS. WILSON: I understand what you're saying, and I understand that that's something you would do. I also would like to share that people have choices of how they can utilize their property, and this is one of them, and we respect that.

MR. MCDOWELL: I have rented property before, and I have owned several properties that I rented. Nobody ever moved out of my -- my homes. I rented to them, because

instead of raising rent every time, if they were good people and not giving me a lot of problems, I'd go over there and lower their rent by \$50 a month. I did that numerous years for people. I know what it's like on both sides of the thing. We're talking about profitability, and that's all we're talking about. And you need to see that the money does not rule this world. These neighbors of mine are good people and I -- there's not a lot of room there. There's people acting a fool now and again, and I can't do anything about it, but I can pull the plug on it if I could, and if I had, that would be that. Are we good?

MR. STANTON: I've got a question for you, sir.

MR. MCDOWELL: Okay, man.

MR. STANTON: Did you know this was a short-term rental?

MR. MCDOWELL: Well, yeah, I found out recently.

MR. STANTON: When did you find out that it was a short-term rental?

MR. MCDOWELL: Not long ago. But I knew there was problems, but I didn't know that was the situation that was happening. I understand trying to make as much money as you can. Everybody tries to do that, for crying out loud. We're trying to survive in America, and I know that we believe in God, but we love money. So let's just try to take care of the people first, and think about the rest second. Are we good now?

MR. STANTON: I don't know. I'll see.

MS. ORTIZ: I --

MR. STANTON: Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: This isn't exactly what you're asking for, but if speeding is a problem in your neighborhood, I would look into, like, petitioning for a traffic calming in your neighborhood because that's come up multiple times.

MR. MCDOWELL: That is -- we have -- we've got a speed bump down the road.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MR. MCDOWELL: We've got one down there, one at the very base, and that has helped.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MR. MCDOWELL: But they come out of that area up the street 90 to nothing all the time. Not everybody, but a few.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MR. MCDOWELL: And I kept thinking what in the world is their hurry, because I know I'm old as dirt, but what is the hurry?

MS. ORTIZ: No. And I understand, and I'm really sympathetic to -- to that issue, especially with there not being sidewalks and families there.

MR. MCDOWELL: I raised two kids in that house, and I had my father and mother

came a few years back and Dad wound up with terminal cancer, and he and Mom lived there, and I took care of them. What I got -- you have to take care of this family, and someday one of my children or grandchildren, or I have two great-grandchildren, might live in that house. I want this neighborhood to still be good. I don't care what the politics are, I want this neighborhood and this town and this state and this country to still be good. It's up to you guys. You start here and you build up. I'm sorry about profitability. Maybe it will be less profitable to have long-term renters. I'm sure it's a pain. I've done it. But you take care of it.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir.

MR. MCDOWELL: Are we good?

MR. STANTON: Any other questions? Thank you.

MR. MCDOWELL: Thank you very much.

MR. STANTON: Anyone else want to speak on this case? We need your name, address, into the microphone.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: My name is Seth Christensen; I'm the owner of 1648 Highridge Circle. You know, I don't want to take up too much time because a lot of my points are similar. I bought in the neighborhood about a year and a half ago, so this was after they had already started. So what I was seeing was -- was kind of just -- I didn't have anything to compare that to, but what I was seeing is that, no, there's not a lot of room. It -- it says on here that the lot is about a quarter of an acre, and that -- that may be the case, but I -- you know, that might be more of a front to back type situation because side to side, it's really quite narrow, and my own lot is only 7,000 square feet, and I think they're all about the same width. So he might be getting the quarter acre, but that's, you know, up next to Stadium, the back end. It really is quite, quite dense. The letter that I received also stated that this was zoned as R-2. This whole discussion tonight has been saying that it was zoned R-1, and that's not what I received in my letter, which I have right here. So --

MR. ORENDORFF: Just to confirm, it is R-1. That was an error on that letter. Yeah.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. Well, then that's -- you know, if that's the way it is, that's the way it is. But I would also bring up the point, so parking has been brought up, density, it's very close together. I would encourage you to look at what happened in this neighborhood just about a year ago. There's a reason why people are concerned about safety. I have three young kids. I prefer being able to take them for walks. The trail is just at the bottom of a hill. It is concerning to have strangers in the neighborhood. You don't know where they're from. We make an effort to get to know all of our neighbors.

That's difficult when you've got short-term going on. I understand the City's position of wanting to try this out. How can we regulate this and allow for property rights? I'm an attorney. I get it. That being said, I think it needs to be under consideration in this particular neighborhood. You were considering before proximity to schools. I think given the history of the neighborhood, density of the neighborhood, these are factors that should be taken under consideration, and I would urge you to consider them because I do not feel that, while they may have that -- that feeling that they have this right to do that, it just does not seem appropriate for this particular neighborhood. And given the history that my neighbor has shared, I have doubts whether, you know, the responsibility is there to do it effectively. I'll leave it at that.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker? Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Christensen. Were you aware that this was a short-term rental prior to getting the notification?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I was not. As I said, I moved in. The cars I see are the cars I see, and there's not -- there's not space to park. Everyone has a single-car garage with one -- you know, one spot in the driveway. There's a duplex down the street from me, so there's multi -- multi-family buildings right there. There's just -- there's not room. So, no, I did not know.

MS. LOE: So you may have noticed a lot of cars, but you didn't realize the reason for all those cars?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Exactly. Exactly.

MS. LOE: Did you notice anything else that --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: So I live on the -- around the corner, essentially.

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: So I drive by there frequently. And when we go on walks, we drive by, but that's typically during the day, which I presume is when they're -- they don't have people typically there, it's not night. You know, I'm not out walking around at night typically, so --

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. ORTIZ: I -- sorry. Maybe because it's 10:00 p.m., but what were you talking about the history?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yeah. Ms. Ortiz, there was a murder just around the corner a year ago.

MS. ORTIZ: Oh, okay.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: A woman was murdered in her home, and wasn't found for over a month.

MS. ORTIZ: I'm really sorry to hear that.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker?

MR. WALTERS: A quick comment. Just the -- it's 70 feet wide. The lots are 70 feet wide. That's all.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? I have one. So I hear everything, and I kind of have a bias because I live right down the street. I live, like, two blocks from here. Talk about neighborhood change, and we talk about -- I'm just not the one that really hears because my neighborhood has just been slammed. I live in a block from the -- (inaudible) -- if know what that means. My neighborhood goes through all of that. I've got two group homes, I've got -- well, actually, three. I've got two group homes and a recovery -- like a recovering addict group home at the corner. So it's hard for me to be sympathetic because I go through these changes myself. But the short-term rental thing is a big problem in my neighborhood because I don't want a whole bunch of those in my neighborhood, either; you know what I mean? The density is what I'm worried about, but the right to do so is a whole other thing. And I'm just trying to find a middle ground to make this work or not work. I feel like the things are in place because everybody that's come up here, I've heard you're a homeowner. Right? And then I've heard from a landlord. And I wasn't big on this earlier, but property rights, the right to do what you can legally, because he's illegal right now. He's a renegade right now. He's illegal as heck right now till he goes through this process. But until he becomes legal, if we allow him to become legal, he falls under the same responsibilities that you do as a homeowner that the previous speaker had, is he's a landlord, because you have a right to do that. I'm a homeowner. I don't necessarily care for a whole bunch of renters around me, but that's the owner's right to rent their space. It's their right. It's their land. As long as this is a legal use of land, you have a right to do that. So how do we help this landowner, like you, use his land legally even though he's illegal right now, but he hopefully will be legal soon or not. If you were him, how would you make it whole, and still use your right as a property owner? I'm trying to get a compromise. I mean, if this -- if what he's -- and what we're -- what he applied for doesn't work for you, how can he make that right with a neighbor? How can he make that right for you that he can still do what he has a right to do. Soon. He's illegal right now, but soon he will, hopefully.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Sure. I appreciate your question. I get it. Property rights are a thing. As a homeowner, I get it. I will say that I think that the City of Columbia should consider the fact that this particular neighborhood has the specific kinds of homes that are in very short supply in this city. And I think that is a distinguishing factor here, because I've lived in Columbia since 2017. I came here to go to school, finished, got my



degree, took a job here, and it was very difficult to find a home in a price range that I could afford for my family. This neighborhood is one of the very few where that exists. People have rights to use their property however they want. However, when the City has a strategic plan, they're trying to bring in more people, grow, make affordable housing an option that actually exists for people, allowing this type of behavior, has an adverse effect on that goal, which I believe is a goal of the City, to expand affordable housing to its citizens. This type of action, allowing this behavior, makes that much more difficult, and I guess that is my point here. You know, as a matter of principle, I don't -- I'm not a fan of the short-term rentals, but I get it. That's your property. You can do it. However, I think the City should consider does this align with affordable housing goals. This type of neighborhood is in short supply. There's just -- there's just a real shortage of affordable housing. This is one of the few areas where it is, so if we're allowing those to be eaten up for short-term rentals, you know, we're putting ourselves in a bind. Where do people live?

MR. STANTON: Mr. Walters?

MR. WALTERS: You know the fact that, you know, these people are registering their property, two things are going to happen. One, if they're as bad as you say, or as people say, they can be out -- they can be revoked in a week or two weeks. If they're -- if these are responsible people like they seem to be, they will take even greater care in screening their -- screening their renters or their short-term people, and paying more -- even more attention to their property. So, I mean, to look at this is like you're taking on a year-long or the rest of your life -- lifetime of just inappropriate behavior is just, I think, is out of there. I mean, you can -- this is going to be taken care of. Either they're good people and take care of it, or they're bad people and they're going to get revoked, and you're going to know that. This brings additional attention, regulatory rules and supervision that doesn't exist now. So, I don't know. I'm not saying just relax, it'll go away, but, I mean, it's not an infinite thing that's going to be troubling you forever. It shouldn't be, if our criteria and our regulations mean anything.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Sure. I get that. It's -- ultimately, it's up to you whether you believe those who live there and see it on a day-to-day basis, or what they're telling you who don't live there, and that's your choice.

MR. WALTERS: Well, and we're going to know that here --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: And you'll know that decision --

MR. WALTERS: -- we're going to know that here within a couple weeks, I would assume. If people that legitimate complaints and the City checks it out and confirms it, they'll be revoking their license, is what I think. Anyway --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: "Does the City have -- does the City have an interest in

granting these licenses? Is there a monetary fee paid? Okay.

MR. WALTERS: I'm not --

MR. STANTON: I mean, you want to answer that? I mean, I -- I could do it, but maybe --

MR. ZENNER: The City does not -- I mean, the City, through licensure, does collect a fee. The City would, as a part of commercial operation, which is what these have been classified as, would collect accommodation fees for every night that the unit is rented. That is -- that is not uncommon practice in any municipality in the United States that allows the --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I'm not saying it's uncommon, I'm saying let's recognize there's an interest.

MR. ZENNER: There is an interest to ensure that the residences that are being used for this particular activity are inspected, meet requirements, and as a part of that, are treated no differently than hoteliers that offer accommodations in their facilities, and that is the impetus of why this ordinance was created when it was originally conceived as a discussion topic in 2017. It was to create a level playing field for all homeowners that were operating their dwellings as a hotel. And so the hoteliers were the ones that originally forwarded a concern to the City and then the City Council requested that this ordinance be developed. So that is -- there is -- while there is a monetary benefit associated with that, if we would care to use it that way, that is the -- that's the back story behind why these regulations exist. The criteria for a conditional use as adopted by our City Council, prepared by this body for Council's consideration, was to evaluate these types of requests on a case-by-case basis based on the concerns that had been expressed. So I think as you all have acknowledged, the final decision here lies with this body of people who have spent an inordinate amount of time, through research, and then through applications that we have received, rendering decisions, and then, ultimately, Council. This is a recommendation of this body. Council ultimately has final authority to approve or deny. And so you will have the ability to further present your concerns to the City Council, should you so desire, if you do not feel as though you've been adequately heard here.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I feel like I've been heard, I'm just responding and answering questions.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Two comments. First, there is -- at this dais, we often discuss the right to use your property to its fullest extent, and I just want to observe that we are the Planning and Zoning Commission, and zoning defines how you can use your property.

You cannot do anything you want. And I often point out that everyone who purchases land should be aware of the zoning of their property and what they are allowed to do. And if we're seeing them at -- in this room, it's because they want to change that zoning. But they are allowed to do what the zoning permits. At this time, short-term rental is not permitted to the extent they want to use it on their property as a non-primary residence for 210 nights. So, no, they can't use it, which is why we are here tonight, because they are asking for permission to use it for that use. So I just wanted to make it clear that we are -- that's what we're discussing. The other thing, though, Mr. Christensen, and Mr. Zenner did just allude this, is that several of the concerns you've brought up are very much informed our discussion and development of the ordinance. And we definitely had some Commissioners who would have preferred not to have any STRs in residential areas. But we are a community, and there does have to be compromise, but some of the restrictions that were put in place, such as only one per owner were just to address some of the issues you've brought up. So I hope you can take some comfort that affordability and density were indeed part of the conversation.

MR. WILLIAMS: The first question is whether or not prior to coming here tonight you had had discussions with anyone else who has spoken on this issue?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I have met with my neighbor just right here just now, just here tonight. Just -- I thought I recognized them. I was, like, I know I've seen you around. Are you here for that? Yeah. I mean, that's -- that's the conversation.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. But before you --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: But before I came here tonight, no.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you. It's helpful to me to understand whether people are coming because they know one another and -- and so it's kind of a group thing, or if it's individuals coming separately and independently from one another.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I mean, full disclosure, the company I work for imports things, so you might get an idea of how busy my life has been the last couple weeks. I would have loved the opportunity to go visit with my neighbors about this, but I just frankly have not had the brain space to -- to do it. I -- you know, I plan on submitting some written response, and I just have not had the time to do that. So I made it here tonight, wasn't sure if I was going to make it on time, I'm on the Library Board. Came here directly after that, so, no, I haven't been in cahoots with -- with my neighbors to -- to, you know, gang this thing. I just made it here tonight.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm not sure that I -- the intention of my question was not to -- not inflammatory. I really was interested in whether or not there was multiple individuals who

independently decided that there was a concern versus people who already are at regular conversation discussing a concern with one another. That independence creates additional credibility to me.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Sure.

MR. WILLIAMS: So it is certainly not intended to be an inflammatory question. The other thing I guess I should address just so it's clear is that we do not work for the City. We are all volunteers. We do not get compensated, and we have no real interest in whether the City collects tax revenue for this or not, other than anybody else would who is a citizen of the city of Columbia. So I appreciate your concern about conflicts, but as to the people who are sitting up here, that is -- there is no conflict for us about whether the City has any revenue interest.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I appreciate that.

MR. STANTON: Hey, man. I do concrete. I've been up since 5:00 this morning. So, yeah. We don't -- and we don't have to agree with staff's recommendations. Yeah. I want you to think, we're not on the take. If anybody said, we've got -- we're going to have a problem. We're not on the take. We don't care about any of those interests the City may have. We're kind of our own advocates for whatever that we're bringing to this Commission. But that's why there's a conditional use, which is another layer, which I want people to understand. Because for real, this could just be a simple technical matter, like Ms. Loe said. This is a use that's allowed.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: This could really just be technical. Does he meet the requirements and move on, just like building your house. You didn't have to come before us and say can I build a house. Your house was zoned properly. Did you have the right easements set up. That's technical, tick, tick tick, tick, tick, and down the pipe it goes. So us spending our time, and I've been at work since 5:00 this morning, I may say, concrete, I don't sit at a desk -- concrete, to listen to these cases, case by case on a conditional use so we can hear this. So these are the layers that we have done to make sure that this is right for the citizens. I'm one of those veterans four years, four, to get to this point. We have done every kind of research, heard every kind of public hearing, every protest, every lobbyist, every everything for the last four years to get here. And I think that, you know, like I said, I'm trying to make a win-win because the system is in place that if he screws up, he's out of there, as long as it's done lawfully. You know, I don't want to set him up or, yeah, I just don't like him anyway, and as soon as he leaves here, you're going to hit him with four complaints just so he doesn't get his -- I don't want to set him up, because I protect all citizens, you and him, and the property rights of everybody

that sits in this room. And I want you guys to consider the same. What if you were him, how could you make this better? And if someone was telling you what to do with your property, how would you consider that and how would you feel with the shoe on the other foot? And that's kind of where I'm at with this whole discussion. I'm still on the fence with it, you know. But just to say I don't like him, I don't like this, because I've been through all this myself. So --

MR. CHRISTENSEN: And I get that, and, Mr. Stanton, just to be clear, my -- my question regarding the City's interest was not directed at the Commissioners. I understand you all are volunteers. I've served on a Commission in the past. I'm on the Library Board. I do -- like, I get it. You're a volunteer. It's more a reflection of the fact that I don't know how many of these we've done tonight, but the City has a recommended approval for each and every one. I think that should just be something we notice. That's - - that's really all of the point I'm trying to -- to make with that.

MR. STANTON: But they have to come through here, and I think we've 40 on deck, Mr. Zenner? How many, if that?

MR. ZENNER: Forty-two applications have been received in total.

MR. STANTON: Forty-two applications, that we've got to go through this. It's not like we're just writing them off.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I understand.

MR. STANTON: It just happens that, you know, the applications kind of -- they get it, you know what I mean, you know, as far as what we're looking for. And like I said, the first ones are easier. The more and more these applications come in, the tougher it's going to be, because you hear what we're looking at, and what we're saying, and what you're saying and what your neighbors are saying is valuable to use, because we're -- because this is not just a technical matter.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Right.

MR. STANTON: We're here to listen to the community, and weigh both the technical and the community impact. So, yeah. It does seem like we're just -- but we're not.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Yes.

MS. ORTIZ: I also just wanted to add that the applicants work with the City prior to it coming here, so it's not like the City is just, like, throwing everything at us willy-nilly. Like, they go through a process and work -- work with the applicant. So it's -- it might look like everything is getting a recommendation, but we're -- they've been working on this behind the scenes.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Right. And I don't want to -- I don't want that issue to distract from my other points.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Really, that's a minor -- just a consideration I wanted to bring up.

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Again, that's not a main -- that's not a main concern here.

MS. ORTIZ: No.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: I just think it's something -- it should be part of the calculation. Right? If we don't acknowledge, yeah, there is -- there is an interest there.

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. No. I appreciate that.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: And you can't -- you can't guess at it, but you can't -- you can't say that there's not one there, I guess is my point. For you, no. But for the City, is there -- is there an interest to have more? Well, yeah, there is.

MR. STANTON: It's accountability, taxability, and density, I mean, would be the three things I would think of, but --

MS. ORTIZ: We'll -- and maybe this is definitely a discussion for another time, but I -- I would wonder -- I mean, the upfront administrative costs are probably huge for this whole undertaking, so I don't know -- I know you may very well be right.

MR. STANTON: (Inaudible.)

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. I don't think -- but, regardless, that's not what I wanted to say anyway. I wanted to thank you for being here because although people that are sitting up here have heard the same things over and over again, this is your first time being here. And so I think we should keep that in mind that he is worried about his neighborhood, and he's a single human being -- or not -- I mean, not single like that, but, like, you're one person. And I think that sometimes when we're up here, we talk to the public as if they represent the whole public, but you're representing your interest and I appreciate you being here tonight.

MS. WILSON: One thing that I haven't heard, first, before I go there, we -- I think to be fair, your comment about everything that's come through has been approved, we don't see what doesn't come through, and we don't see the difficulty and the work that they go through all day to prepare those applications for this process to be fair. Just putting that out there. You know, I personally have concern about the number of hours that they work. I get up at 4:00, but, you know, they're here all day and don't leave until way after we're gone, so just to be fair. But what I haven't heard this evening is if anybody actually spoke to those individuals personally to say I have a problem with what's going on at your house.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: They don't live in the neighborhood. I didn't know who they were until tonight.

MS. WILSON: So you spoke to those neighbors because you recognized them tonight. Have you had an opportunity, or perhaps maybe have you considered speaking with them this evening?

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Of course. Yeah. Afterwards, I would love -- I would love an opportunity to speak with them.

MS. WILSON: That would -- that would, I think, make for good neighbors.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: To be clear, they don't live in the neighborhood, so --

MS. WILSON: They still own the home in the neighborhood, so -- okay. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions, comments for this speaker? Thank you, sir.

MR. CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Commissioners.

MR. STANTON: Anybody else want to speak on this case? I'm going to count fast. Going once, going twice, going three times.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Commissioners, any discussion on this case? I'm moving quick here, but speak up real quick.

MR. WILLIAMS: So I have a feeling we're going to have some discussion on the case, so I'll just start the -- I'll just start the conversation.

MR. STANTON: Let's get it. Let's get it.

MR. WILLIAMS: I said before one of the things I find most regrettable about this process is that it's -- it creates conflict. And -- and I say that only because -- and, again, I really appreciate Commissioner Ortiz your perspective there, and that was refreshing for

me that, you know, we may have sat through 20 or 30 of these, and so we do hear a lot of perspectives. None of these cases are unique. I'll be honest, there's -- there's very few of these that come with -- with as much opposition as we've heard tonight. I can only think of one. I haven't been at every meeting, but -- but I can only think of one. And -- and so part of the challenge is is that when you -- when, you know, we send out the notices and things, sometimes it creates conflict where there wasn't really any known issue going on, but it's just people don't like the idea of it. This is a little different because I'm hearing some specific instances that are brought up. So I guess my comments are really more directed -- I haven't decided. I really want to hear what the rest of you have to say, because I haven't decided what I want to do with this. The last -- you know, the only one of these that we voted down before that I was here for, there were some really specific comments, very specific instances that were cited. And the owner did not show up for the hearing, and they did send an agent, but they did not show up. And that was a challenge to sort of get a sense of what they were going to do to address the issues. Here we had owners show up and -- and I felt like they presented themselves well, and as people who -- who want to -- to provide this. They want to use their property in this way in a responsible manner. That is the impression of what I got from the homeowners. So I was surprised to hear then from the neighbors that there's a difference of opinion about whether that's actually been happening, and that disconnect is what makes this challenging. So I don't think this is -- this is harder for me than the last one I voted no on. So I'm just here to tee this up because I don't have -- I mean, I don't have a position yet that I want to advocate for, but we're all just staring at each other and we want to have an efficient conversation. So thank you everyone who spoke to us about this. We really, really do make every case that comes before us, whether it be a short-term rental or rezoning, really seriously because we understand that it affects the lives of people in this city on both sides of the issue, and so we appreciate when you show up and -- and help us with that.

MR. STANTON: Are there some -- Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I plan -- I do not plan on supporting this, given the testimony from the neighbors this evening. I also find it troubling that the letter given to one of the residents said that it was R-2, which I felt like just adds unfair confusion for parties that already -- it's already a confusing process. I think that the -- I think that the intensity of the Airbnb right now is causing a problem, and I think that parking could continue to be a problem. And I don't know -- I don't think the intensity is right for this neighborhood, and it -- given its history and the issues that were brought forward.

MS. WILSON: I -- I hear you. My issue is that although I have heard some things that have been disconcerting, I don't feel personally that it's fair for me to make a decision on could have, would have, should have, maybe kind of sort of. I need to make decisions based upon what the law is and what their rights are. And so for me, although I am very disturbed by what was shared, and I hear you, I also support the rights of the property owner, and I would support them if this were your application the same way. So to the point that was made by my fellow Commissioner, you have every opportunity to share what's going on, and that license can be revoked. That is what we are putting in place. That is what law should do, and I need us to understand that, and enforce the law once that opportunity becomes available. Right now, that is not available, so I can understand your frustration. June 1st, it's available, so let's enforce the law. But I -- I can't, in good conscience, punish them for a possibility. That's -- that doesn't make sense for me, so --

MR. STANTON: I have a comment.

MS. BRADFIELD: (Inaudible.)

MR. STANTON: The public hearing is closed, so I would have to reopen it. And it had -- yeah. This -- okay. I'm on the fence, but this is where I'm at. Technically, he meets all the requirements. I hope he's hearing this because my thing is give him a

chance to screw up, because if he doesn't take this information in and he looks like he's coming from the same cloth I am. I see the fire resistant Carhartt shirt on, so it means -- you know, the construction workers staying at the house. I get it. If it were me, I probably would revisit my business model because it takes one or two of them guys to be there, and these -- and these neighbors say something about it, there's your license. So I would probably rethink my business model. I probably wouldn't -- you know, I would just rethink my business model as far as my -- who I have with my space. Parking has been addressed. Occupancy numbers have been addressed. He meets all the other requirements. Beforehand, he didn't have those. He's still a renegade now. He's still illegal right now. Right? He's still illegal. He's still a renegade. So until he has the regulation, which we have right in front of us, and if it were me, I'd be getting on this like right now. I'd be on my phone changing my profile and everything. It would be air tight before we took this vote, because we might be up here looking at it right now. Get it together, and I think he at least has the right to be compliant first, and then let's test it out and see if, hey, if he screws up, we'll get him out of there. That's the system. I'm willing to take a chance on this application. You're right. The other ones we had before, the applicants -- you know, the owners didn't come, or it was just overwhelming, you know, that we just didn't agree with what was going on. But with this case, I would give him a chance to screw it up.

MS. ORTIZ: Real quick. I believe the applicant is actually a woman, just -- I don't want to be -- I just --

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Give her a chance for her to screw it up then.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Any other comments from Commissioners? This is really, really ripe for a motion.

MR. WALTERS: I'd like to make a motion. I make a motion to -- in the Case of 134-2025, for an STR conditional use permit at 1617 Highridge Circle, recommend to approve, subject to the following: No less than two parking spaces within the attached one-car garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; 210 nights of rental, maximum of four transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by IPMC.

MS. WILSON: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Discussion on the motion?

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Yes, sir.



MR. ZENNER: The first condition of the recommendation should be no less than one parking space within the one-car attached garage be made available, not two.

MR. STANTON: Do you accept that correction, Mr. Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Yes.

MR. STANTON: That property, we do have what I restated or --

MR. CRAIG: That's fine. We'll -- we'll get another second on it, as well.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. WILSON: I accept. Second.

MR. CRAIG: Okay.

MR. STANTON: That amendment has been moved and properly seconded. We have a motion on the table. Any more discussion? Any discussion? Mr. Secretary, vote on this thing.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.**

**Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters. Voting No:**

**Ms. Ortiz, Motion carries 6-1.**

MR. WILLIAMS: Six yeses and one no. The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. We're almost there, ladies and gentlemen. I see the end of the paper. Okay.

**In the Case of 134-2025, for an STR conditional use permit at 1617 Highridge Circle, recommend to approve, subject to the following: No less than two parking spaces within the attached one-car garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; 210 nights of rental, maximum of four transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by IPMC.**

**Yes:** 6 - Loe, Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams and Walters

**No:** 1 - Ortiz

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

### **Case # 135-2025**

A request by Francee Gordon (owner) to allow 9 McBaine Avenue to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 8 transient guests and up to 210-nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The 0.37-acre, R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling) zoned, subject site is located approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of West Broadway and McBaine Avenue.

MR. STANTON: Can we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and development Department. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to allow 9 McBaine Avenue to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. The maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed eight transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by the most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC).
2. A maximum of 210 nights of annual usage.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for staff? I see none. Does anybody have any ex parte information they would like to share with their fellow Commissioners about said case? I see none.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Open it up for public hearing. Making sure you all are awake. Anybody to speak on this case, come forward, full name and address into the microphone, please.

MS. GORDON: Hello. My name is Francee Caroline Gordon, and I live at 1119 Lakeshore Drive. I wrote my stuff because I'm nervous, so I want to make sure I get all my points across. Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight. I've lived in Columbia since I was two years old. I went to Hickman High School and then the University of Missouri. I love Columbia and I want Columbia to continue to prosper and grow. I am a certified tourism ambassador with the City, and I love promoting all things Columbia. Somebody recently posted a picture of my house on Facebook calling it such a beautiful home on McBaine, and I couldn't agree more. It is a beautiful home. It's mine, and I made it that way. When I purchased it in 2021, it was unlivable. There was drug paraphernalia inside the house and in the backyard. I put my hard-earned money into cleaning it up and updating everything. It was an absolute mess. I think I did a great job and my immediate neighbors think the same. I love that I can offer families a place to stay in my beautiful home during happy times and in times of sorrow. I value being together as a family, and I am pleased that I can provide this home away from home for others to do the same. I feel like I am helping the City providing a need to the community. I think having options for lodging is a good thing for any city to have, and the gratitude that is received from phone calls, messages, and reviews from my guests is overwhelmingly positive. They go on and on about how grateful they were to be able to stay together in a home and have an option to do so. My next-door neighbors approached me when I was looking at the house, when I was walking around in the backyard. They wanted to know if I was going to live there or rent it out. I said that if I bought it, I was going to fix it up and rent it out as an Airbnb. They were thrilled. They said that 5 McBaine on the other side of them was going to be an Airbnb. 11 McBaine immediately to the north of me had been and still is vacant for many, many years, and

they were happy that number 9 wasn't going to stay that way. They thought it might be demolished. The way it is zoned, a developer could have very well bought it and tore down the house and put up an apartment complex in its place. And I guess I could have done the same especially with it being on that large double lot, but I saw the potential of that ratty little house, and I wanted to make it whole again. They were overjoyed that I was going to restore it and make an investment in the character of that neighborhood. I love being a host. It's in my spirit, my mother used to always say whenever I had friends and family over. It sounds silly, but I love setting everything out, the coffee pods, the water, the snacks, having the pillows and the bath towels just so. I want people to feel welcomed. I have local magazines, maps, brochures gathered from the Columbia Convention and Visitor Center laid out in my listing. I show off local art and display other local places and establishments. In my binder, along with the house rules, I have compiled two pages of local places to eat and fun things to do while visiting Columbia. As other applicants have stated before, Airbnb has a rigorous process of vetting individuals when they are signing up to be guests on the platform, and then I also screen my guests very carefully, having instant book turned off, meaning the potential guests must ask permission to stay and let me know the purpose of their visit. I can thoroughly read their reviews to see if any other hosts had had any problems or issues with them. And then I can choose to accept or decline their request based on that information. I have declined many people. Also, as other applicants have mentioned, an Airbnb listing runs on ratings. You want everything to be safe and clean and perfect, and you don't want any riffraff in your home messing anything up, especially after all of the hard work that was put into it. I have a smart lock with a camera on the exterior of the house so I can see how many people are coming in, and if it matches up with those all that had booked. I live one point one miles away down the road and can be at the listing within three to four minutes. I'm actually the designated agent. The other one was one of my many backups that I have in case I have to be out of town or go somewhere I'm not available. In fact, last year, I went on a float trip, and basically everybody that I trusted came with me, friends and family, and so I just blocked the calendar off. I said, okay, well I'm not going to have fun on this float trip if I'm down here in south Missouri with shoddy cell phone reception, and somebody might need something. Again, we run on ratings. Even though you leave 12 towels for four people, if they call you and want extra towels, you bring them extra towels. You've got to keep your guests happy. My immediate neighbors have my phone number in case they should have any issues with anything or anyone. I have plenty of off-street parking, which was mentioned, and can easily fit five cars in the driveway. In my years of being a host, I have had the most

respectful, delightful, clean and responsible guests 99.9 percent of the time. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you for your time and consideration, and I also have -- I don't know if you care -- a picture of the before and after of the exterior of my house, if you would like to pass it around. I just brought one.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker? Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I -- I don't know if you saw this, but there -- on the staff report, there is six violations?

MS. GORDON: Yes.

MS. ORTIZ: Is that before you --

MS. GORDON: No.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GORDON: Yeah, I read that, and I'm, like, wait, what? I didn't -- and then I read where it said that was before I owned it.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Cool.

MS. GORDON: Yeah. Mr. Zenner said he was very familiar with that home.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions for this speaker? Going once, going twice. Thank you, ma'am.

MS. GORDON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Anybody else want to speak on this case? I like your speed, ma'am. I like your speed.

MS. GOUDIE: It's ripe.

MR. STANTON: Name and address, please?

MS. GOUDIE: My name is Susan Goudie, and I live next door to Francee's Airbnb at 7 McBaine. Our part of McBaine between Broadway and Ash, especially in the middle section, is very, very quiet. We are quiet people. Many of us in that middle section are homeowner occupied, mid-century, and older homes. We take great pride in being welcoming, creating a little micro neighborhood, with several homeowners interested in gardening, socializing, keeping our homes repaired and interesting. My husband and I have owned our home since 2014, many years before Francee purchased Number 9, and I'm not surprised at how many violations were -- were included in your report, because we quickly discovered that this 9 McBaine before Francee, a rental home, was actually a disaster zone, literally. The property and house were in disrepair. You're seeing a picture maybe. That worsened every year. There were multiple families coming and going. At one time, there were three families with children. Several neighbors had to call the City. We didn't really know who actually had the lease. The owner lived far away and did not respond to us. As Francee mentioned, there were drug needles in the yard -- our

boys couldn't go over there -- left by different tenants and strangers hanging out on the property. And one day the lovely arts and craft style front porch that you see in your picture suddenly and bizarrely became completely wrapped in several brightly colored sea creature shower curtains, and this decor lasted for about four years, and some of the neighbors, we were joking about, well, at least we have a sea view on McBaine. It's funny now. When you drive down McBaine today, you'll see the house in the picture there that has been restored. Many families looked at this house when it was for sale. I know that's a point of contention of people in the West Ash neighborhood. Many people looked at it. It was going to require not only the sale price, but probably half of that in repairs, which is common in West Ash. We have old homes. And we were the neighbors that Francee talked about that asked about, you know, are you going to be living here? We were excited. You know, you have a moment of, oh, Airbnb. We didn't hold that concern more than five minutes after talking with her. She -- she has taken the house back, I think, to a little delightful cottage that probable looked like originally. I believe it's the oldest house on our street. It was a doctor's home, had a little carriage house. We couldn't be happier, and we look at it as a neighborhood success story because of the condition that the home was in. We did think it was going to be torn down. The home on the other side had been abandoned well before we had moved in. I will say that the key to a successful Airbnb in an established quiet neighborhood is communication with homeowners. In the time that Francee has had 9 McBaine as an Airbnb, we have only had one noise issue, and that is because people invited a party of guests for a football game, which can happen. We alerted Francee because she gave us her cell phone number when we met her for the first time, and she was in -- she was in the house under 30 minutes reminding the tenants of the no-party rules, possibly to her cost. She may have gotten a negative review for that, but she did it because she cares about the vibe of our neighborhood. I guess in summary I would say maybe we look at neighbors a little differently. Maybe we expand our viewpoint of neighbors in our little section. I think we might consider Francee's guests as just other neighbors. We've had them come -- we had a garage sale. They come over and hang out, and it's really -- I feel like it's been an asset to the neighborhood. This all works because of her excellence as a business owner and care as a host, which is what this process is about. Right? Ensuring that short-term rental hosts are running to Francee's high standards and continuing to honor our unique beloved neighborhoods. Any questions of you --

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Ms. Wilson?

MS. WILSON: No questions, just thank you.

MR. STANTON: Comments for this speaker?

MS. LOE: I have a question.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Do you have an Airbnb on the other side of you, as well?

MS. GOUDIE: Yes, I do.

MS. LOE: And you're comfortable with having short-term resident, transient guests on that -- on both sides?

MS. GOUDIE: I prepared a statement for number 9 because Francee made us aware that she was doing this process. I didn't know Tia also was going to be doing that. Tia lived in her home when we first moved in, so we know Tia. And so she has been our neighbor. And when she moved, she transitioned into an Airbnb, let us know, and we have had literally no issues with that. We are pleased with both. I know that sounds shocking, but we are pleased with both of these women owners of these Airbnbs. And, you know, it's just -- I understand the concerns of the others. We're lucky. But the thing is, and I think it's good, I believe that Ms. Wilson pointed out that communication is key. If you're having problems, I know I can call Tia, and I can call Francee, and they're going to be right on it. And if they weren't, I still would be over there talking to them about it before I got upset about it, and brought it, you know, to these type of meetings before you even talked to the owner. That's -- I don't understand that, but I think that is important. And these -- these discussions, when you're doing these Airbnbs is to ask that question, have you talked to them? Talk to them. We need to work together if we're going to, you know, go through this process. It's going to be hard if we don't.

MS. LOE: Thank you. It was probably unfair to tap you with that question, but --

MS. GOUDIE: Not at all.

MS. LOE: I was interested in your perspective, and I wasn't sure you were going to stick around for the next case, so --

MS. GOUDIE: No. I didn't know Tia's. I would have also prepared a statement for Tia's, but we got Tia's postcard second. I also would like to share my happiness and excitement for Tia, as well.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions of this speaker? Okay. Ms. Placier?

MS. PLACIER: I did have a question for you. Where is the tipping point for a neighborhood? I mean, how many -- when does it -- when is it not a neighborhood anymore when you have --

MS. GOUDIE: That's a good question.

MS. PLACIER: -- mostly short-term rentals.

MS. GOUDIE: That's a good question.

MS. PLACIER: I live on a block where there are two, and it's changed the neighborhood a lot.

MS. GOUDIE: Of course it does, and we live in a walkable area. We, you know -- we can just walk down here to meetings. We can walk downtown, and it's a popular area for rentals probably because it is so costly to get these places into regulation. I don't know how much Francee spent on hers, but it's a lot. Like I said, it was open for families to -- to buy. Many people -- I don't how many people looked at it. Many people did, and they were scared away by the cost. Like, Francee said, the house on the other side, Number 11, has been vacant, I think, for almost 20 years. There's homes available, it's -- it's just so costly to restore some of these old bungalows that are going to require new plumbing, new electrical. So, yeah. I think it's a question of, yes, the smaller family homes in West Ash are ideal for new starter homes for people ten years ago. Now, they're becoming so costly because they're all in need of -- and don't get me started on the storm water. They're all in need of all of these repairs, and it's scary for people to buy a starter home when they're going to have to pay half again or maybe more. So, yeah, it's a good question. We have a lot of rentals on our street. I guess it's -- it's kind of like who do you call your neighbor, and I think that we look in our neighborhood, at least our section of the neighborhood, as we have a wide view of who our neighbor is.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker? Thank you, ma'am. Anyone else want to speak upon this case? State your name and your address.

MS. BROWN: My name is Tia Brown, and I live at 4707 McMickle Drive in Columbia. I am the owner of 5 McBaine, which is two doors down from Francee's place. I made some notes so that I would -- I am a born and raised Columbia resident, lived here my whole live. I've owned McBaine since 2011 when I moved into it post-divorce with my two kids, solo. I then purchased the house two years later from the previous owner. I raised my kids there. They went to Grant School down the street, and I have nothing but love for my house, my street. We moved out because we grew out, so what do you do with a house when you grow out of it, and your kids want to keep it, to hopefully hand it down to them? So I know that my hearing is next, but I wanted to just state that. My Airbnb is only seeking occupancy for 120 nights, with a six-guest maximum. I'm rated as a super host with a 4.76 rating.'

MR. CRAIG: Ma'am, I'm sorry. I'm going to have to -- I'm going to stop you there. I think we should keep the testimony related to the case at hand.

MS. BROWN: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: If you want to do that at your -- you know, for your case --

MR. STANTON: I was going to -- I was hoping it was going to turn the corner, but --

MS. BROWN: I am turning on -- yeah. A sharp left.

MR. STANTON: -- yeah. Turn it sharp back to this case.

MS. BROWN: Anyway, if that sways P & Z's vote at all, I know that you're only allowing so many per hundreds of feet. Obviously, our neighbors kind of all don't have a problem with it, and I plan on keeping this house in my family and handing it down to my kids probably within the next four years, so that they actually have an affordable house to live in in Columbia. I'm grateful for what Francee -- Carrie has done with her house because it was in really bad shape for many years. If it matters at all that occupancy and less traffic is an issue on whether or not you're approving ones in close proximity, I would say that we're basically renting out house out, the bare minimum so that I can, in turn, keep the house in our family and hand it down to the next gen, so -- thanks for listing. See you on the next one.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker, as it relates to 9 McBaine?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: Any other speakers? Like your pace, sir. Like your pace. Name and address.

MR. MURPHY: I'll try to keep it short. Commissioners, Kevin Murphy, 1119 Lakeshore Drive. This -- one thing that was brought up in the staff report with there being five short-term rentals within the area. I think, you know, Tia's, Francee's, I believe we have another neighbor. I think there's three actually, maybe a couple of others that might be more mid-term rentals that might have been gotten off of the VRBO or Furnished Finders, or something of that nature, one of the platforms I think staff looks at. But it just goes to show that there is a mix of housing in this neighborhood. There's an apartment complex across the street, 17 of 28 rental properties, obviously, several homeowners. It's a unique street, as close as you can get to downtown, basically, for a rental. It's -- it is popular with families visiting their loved ones at Mizzou, at Columbia College, at Stephens College. Again, it's a -- I think you know what I do. This is a multi-family lot that, you know, this could have been torn down and eight two-bedroom apartment buildings could have been -- or two apartment buildings with eight two-bedroom units could have been put in here, but it's -- it's a larger lot compared to the other lots in the neighborhood, and this is just Francee's dream to do this, and this property is driven by at least once a day by either of us, and, you know, the neighbors keep an eye on it and we keep in communication what then Francee does, and, I guess, that's all I have.

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker? Thank you, sir.



MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any more speakers on this case? Going once, going twice, going three times.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

MR. STANTON: Any comments from the Commissioners? Mr. Williams, I like your speed there, son.

MR. WILLIAMS: I -- she used the word shocking, I found it refreshing. I wish we could have the City create a little, like, you know, three- or five-minute infomercial for people who are doing short-term rentals on how to make this work with happy neighbors. So I'm just grateful for this and thank you for -- for coming and supporting and sharing that with us, because what you saw before you is more common than what we saw in this case, so --

MR. STANTON: Comments? I do have a comment. I go down this section of McBaine, because this is getting closer and closer to my neighborhood when I need inspiration from some of the drama I deal with here. So I go down McBaine and I get inspired by the bungalow style housing and all that, so it was very refreshing to hear that, because I thought we were getting ready to have a problem. We still might, but it's -- I like to hear upfront that the neighbors are cool. We're still considering density. It's still a problem. I live a block up from you guys. You guys are getting closer and closer to me. I come from you on LaSalle, so yeah. This is still an issue. We're still going to think about it, but it's refreshing to hear at least on this side of McBaine that you guys are conscious of that and have addressed it already. Any other comments from my fellow Commissioners? Peggy?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I -- I think we have a problem with having two in such proximity and it's difficult to decide on one without, you know, considering the other. We do not want neighborhoods to be taken over by STRs so that it becomes like a decentralized hotel, you know, that a whole lot of the houses are just occupied by people passing through. But I understand the point of -- I bought a fixer-upper. It took years to fix it up, but we did it and we stayed there. Now that might not have been the case in our current climate because the house was very cheap to buy at that time -- 1990. So like I said, we're still fixing it up. Everything that you did, we had to do. But you lived in it, and, to me, that is -- that is more of my vision of a neighborhood, whether they're rental or owner-occupied, that you have some kind of neighborhood feeling that maybe even organize events or something like that. When you have a lot of transient people, I do think that's -- that's an issue despite the very positive view even given of this because I know you want us to make an exception and to make McBaine more dense. And once

we do that, we could set off a whole cascade of these requests because we know they're out there, and probably coming down the pike. So -- and I am worried about the First Ward being overly taken over by short-term rentals. So I am in a dilemma, very positive presentation, but I still am considering the principle that we began with.

MR. STANTON: I agree with you. But the thing about these two are, and I'm not projecting any, but if they are, they are the first to come to the table. It's been my mantra from the beginning, get your application in. Get it in, because every time one is added, it becomes part of the matrix that we have to look at. And schools, if you ain't heard, schools, density, parking are big for us, period. So I don't to -- you know, hey, these -- they're lucky. They got to the table first. I had a problem until I didn't hear the problem. And this is in my -- I mean, directly in my neighborhood. I could walk to these homes right here, and I am very concerned with density, but I'm more concerned when they don't communicate which is not the problem here. You see what I'm saying? Now, I don't know about everybody else after these two, but these two got to the gate first, and like I said, the pioneers, you know, hey -- the bird gets the worm.

MS. PLACIER: Okay. Let me ask you this, Commissioner Stanton. What if a couple of more houses on this block flip?

MR. STANTON: They're going to have a problem with me personally. I can't speak for the rest of the Commission. My matrix is going to be density, school, communication with the neighbors, you know, that's all -- my -- my rubric has not changed. It would not have -- I mean, this right here, and if I hadn't heard that testimony, this was going to be a problem for me. It was. But it's not yet. And like I said, these are the first applications, and I'm always, hey, you guys came. There's a lot of renegade -- there's still renegades now. Let me -- when we get in there, we're talking Kumbaya right now, but there's still illegal. There's still illegal use of this property right now, they are outlaws right now still, and this is -- I'm going to keep it real. STRs are illegal at this point because it is not a designated use of land until June 1, still outlaws right now. So it's not -- I love saying that because it's true until June 1. But --

MS. LOE: It's -- they're not illegal at this time.

MR. STANTON: They're not illegal?

MS. LOE: No.

MR. STANTON: You're illegal until you come before us and get it -- a blessing.

MS. LOE: But there's no -- the ordinance effective until June 1st, so there's nothing to be illegal from.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. Because there is no designated -- you're not -- it's not designated use yet. So you can't use the land -- you can't use a piece of land --

MS. LOE: There's no legal reason --

MR. STANTON: -- if there's no designated use for it. Well, that's -- you can stand on there. I'm standing on my statement. But that's where I stand. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I appreciate Commissioner Placier bringing up the next case, even though I realize that it's the next case, simply because I do think it is hard to evaluate this one in a vacuum given one of the conditions is the fact that we're looking at other STRs within 300 feet, and no one is coming up. A couple of things I'm considering as part of that. One -- one is, as the speaker mentioned, they are not asking for the full 210 nights or all eight guests. And one of the things we were considering when we did the distance was the impact on the neighborhood. So in my mind, reducing the use helps reduce the impact on the neighborhood, so that is favorable. The other part of the equation, though, and I think this is something you were commenting on, Commissioner Placier, is that by allowing the STR, we are pulling a long-term resident out of the neighborhood. I no longer have the opportunity to have that household as a neighbor. And it brings up the question of how many long-term neighbors can you lose before you don't really have a neighborhood, and I fully agree with that. This -- this isn't addressing that except that, in this case, we are getting testimony that both of the owners are present in the neighborhood. One has lived there, one intends to come back to it, and one is in communication with and neighborly with the neighbors despite the fact that she doesn't live there. So this is a conditional use hearing. It's a case by case, and I do think we are allowed to consider what is brought forward. And so even though that second factor, I think it's being addressed at some level. I haven't fully come around, but that's what I'm thinking about.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: I very much consider what the -- the neighborhood -- like I said before tonight, one of the regrettable things about this is it creates conflict. And I think if we were to look at this and say -- and, one, we have -- we have the right, it's a -- 300 feet is a consideration, it's not a mandate. We just have to consider it. But we would be creating conflict if we didn't -- if both of these -- we haven't had the second one yet, but if both of these would be -- would be otherwise independently ones we would approve, I think we would be creating conflict in the neighborhood to -- to pick one and not the other. So I think it would be really achieving the opposite of what we're -- we're trying to do. It's working for this community. I think this -- and I say community in a very small sense -- this neighborhood, this street, it's working for. And it's not like this is a -- this is -- and this is very personal to the owner of these properties, this is not like we're changing the zoning to something where it lasts, you know, if they move, they could sell it and

someone else can do something with it, and we always wonder what's going to happen in the future. This is very personal to the applicant, so it's not as though we're making a decision that runs in perpetuity. We're making a decision as to these particular owners operating and these houses. And so I think in that context tonight, that these two -- I personally do -- not only do I not have a problem with it, I actually support it. And, in particular, because the -- the alternative on this particular street seems to be an abandoned house. And I think a well-run short-term rental is much preferable to an abandoned house. So -- now, I recognize that that's not the only two options, but that was the option at the time, at least as to the current case, and still is what happens across the street.

MS. ORTIZ: I -- I was -- I agree with what you said, especially we're not depriving -- in my opinion, I don't think this would be depriving the neighborhood of a long-term resident because there wasn't one in this -- in this home. It was dilapidated and they put in a lot of work and effort to make it better for the neighborhood. I also think that we're doing the applicant a disservice by looking at the next case. I personally am only going to be looking or I'm going to keep my opinion on this to 9 McBaine because I do think it's a disservice to lump these two in together, when 9 McBaine is first on the agenda, and that is what we're looking at, and that's how I'm going to proceed.

MR. STANTON: Comments from the Commissioners?

MR. CRAIG: Mr. Vice Chair, if I -- three matters I'd like to touch on before a motion is made on this, if I may. First -- first off, STR owners have until June 1st to become compliant, so characterization of an illegality I think might be -- I don't -- (A) I don't think anyone on the Commission is prejudiced by that or would think the applicant -- you know, that that would color your decision at all, that characterization. I just wanted to make that clear and sort of a curative instruction. Secondly, Case 136 and 135, 5 McBaine and 9 McBaine, although it's difficult to talk about -- not talk about them sort of as one, they are discrete cases. So -- and we will have to make discrete cases and records for each one, so we may have to be -- get repetitive and hit the same topics on the next case. So just remember we have -- you know, it has to be talked about again discretely in that -- in the next case for 5 McBaine. Number three, I'll remind the Commission that all of the considerations, including the one regarding 300 feet perimeter, no single one of those are determinative. They're all cumulative and to be considered as a totality, so there's no one factor that is completely dispositive. So I just wanted to address that before we went on, went to a vote on this, and went on to the next case, as well, just to clarify. That's all for me.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Counsel. All right. This is ripe for a motion. Unless the

Commissioners have anything else to say, this is ripe for a motion.

MS. LOE: I'll jump in.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe. Thank you.

MS. LOE: No one else is raising their hand. In the case of 135-2025, 9 McBaine, short-term rental conditional use permit, move to approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, maximum of eight transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded by Ms. Ortiz. Any discussion on this motion? Going once, going twice, three times. Mr. Secretary, let's get it on the books.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters.**

**Motion carries 7-0.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That is seven yeses and zero nos. The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: Recommendation will be forwarded to City Council, Mr. Secretary. Ladies and gentlemen, we are on the last case. Efficiency, dedication to this last case would be great. As it relates to case -- oh, excuse me. I'm jumping -- I'm making motions already.

**In the case of 135-2025, 9 McBaine, short-term rental conditional use permit, move to approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, maximum of eight transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC.**

**Yes:** 7 - Loe, Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

### **Case # 136-2025**

A request by Tia Brown (owner) to allow 5 McBaine Avenue to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 6 transient guest and up to 120-nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The 0.21-acre, R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoned, subject site is located approximately 200 feet north of the intersection of West Broadway and McBaine Avenue.

MR. STANTON: Can we have a staff report -- our final staff report of the evening, sir?

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to allow 5 McBaine Avenue to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. A condition that the maximum annual usage of the dwelling for STR

purposes shall exceed 120 nights; and

2. The maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed six transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC).

MR. STANTON: Any questions for staff? Does anybody have something to say about this that they may want to share with their fellow Commissioners? I see none.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Anyone wish to speak on this case, come forward. State your name and address in the mic.

MS. BROWN: I am Tia Brown; I own 5 McBaine Avenue. I live at 4707 McMickle Drive in Columbia. I just think that if there was going to be special consideration taken by P & Z to allow more than one per 300 feet, this might set the precedent that neighbors can get along, people can run successful businesses, and not negatively impact other residents and, you know, working streets of Columbia. As stated, too, there's several rental complexes adjacent to our street, and I think every neighbor except for Owen and Susan on all sides of my property are all rentals -- long-term rentals, even the one south of us, which, I guess, we're not seeking the maximum amount of occupancy because I don't want to negatively impact that neighborhood because I love it and I love our neighbors. So I think if there was sort of special consideration given to our residences, I would say it would be great for all of us because I don't plan to keep it as a STR forever. I mean, I plan to move back into the neighborhood some day or have my sons move back there, but yeah. Love the neighborhood, and I want to still make it beautiful and operate it, you know, a successful business at the minimum, so as not to cause consternation between neighbors. And, you know, I heard the case before both of ours, and there's a lot of people opposed to this, and there are a lot of people opposed to it on, like, the West Ash Neighborhood Association Facebook page because of the limited amount of affordable housing, and I get that. I was a struggling person trying to afford a house in that neighborhood when it came up, and I was grateful for it. But I want to keep it as a -- you know, an owner-occupied dwelling at some point, and this is just a means to an end for me, so --

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: I feel obligated to ask as we typically do when there's been a violation, if you can tell us --

MS. BROWN: For the weeds?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. Tell us just what happened there and past that.

MS. BROWN: That was last summer. The one notice I received was when our -- I

had someone mow it, a company. He ended up quitting, and I think there was, like, a week and a half, maybe two, between mows when I had to find a different mower to come, and they took care of it almost immediately. But that's the only known violation I've ever had. I've never had any noise. I have very strict instructions on my Airbnb page, too, about the City's noise ordinance times. I also have a very strict check-in and vetting process because I don't want -- I want to keep it nice. I love that house, you know. That's the whole idea is I want to -- I want to have the bare minimum, so there's less wear and tear on the house, so it stays beautiful. I've also had it updated with new HVAC, new plumbing, electrical, and it's going to be getting a new roof, hopefully in the next few weeks, so --

MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Thank you. That was actually going to be one of my questions, why you were limiting it to the 120 nights because that application identifies that you're not using it yourself. So it's strictly wear and tear on the house? You --

MS. BROWN: Ultimately, we're trying to just minimize the use on the house, but still, you know, pay the note to keep it.

MS. LOE: So you're renting it just enough to get the funds to cover the costs?

MS. BROWN: To keep it in our -- yeah. I cover the costs, keep it in our family.

MS. LOE: Okay. My other question, unlike like the case just before you, you're zoned R-1?

MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: And in this neighborhood, that typically takes an action by the owner to down-zone it. Did you do that, or was it that when you --

MS. BROWN: When I purchased it, I want to say it was R-2, but I think someone else had it -- or had several other properties rezoned because you could have, like, there were people in our neighborhood who were upset that people were turning their detached garages into, you know, dwellings, and renting those out. So it was not me, but --

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. BROWN: No problem.

MS. LOE: So it's spot zoning now, sort of in that neighborhood, so it's interesting.

MS. BROWN: Yes.

MS. LOE: And I was just wondering if that influenced your thinking about the house and how you wanted to use it.

MS. BROWN: Well, I lived in it prior to -- wanted to hold onto it because one of my -- well, both of my sons would be very upset if I sold it and got rid of it because they want to live in it one day, so --

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Further questions for this speaker? No. Thank you, ma'am. Any discussion of the Commission?

MS. PLACIER: Oh, wait. We have another --

MR. STANTON: Oh, sorry.

MS. LOE: Yeah. We're still in public hearing.

MR. STANTON: Sorry. All right. Yeah. I like that speed.

DR. GRAY: Hi. I'm Dr. Les Gray; I live at 14 McBaine. I'm one of the people that cannot afford to buy home, and I also live on the side of the street where people park, so if there are concerns about density, I am deeply nosy and curious, and I would articulate those now. I received two postcards for this case and the previous one. I know my neighbors; they help me whenever I need to shovel snow. They tell me whenever my trash can is overflowing. I am not concerned about either of these rentals, and if I were, I know how to file a complaint. I am so deeply appreciative of your thoughtfulness and your concern, and what the work that you have done and continue to do, and I hope that you get more cases with delightful people that appreciate the work that you're doing.

MR. WALTERS: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Don't leave now.

MS. LOE: I just can't -- I can't believe how chipper you are at this time of the night. Thank you. Thank you for coming forward. That's really useful information.

MR. STANTON: Questions for the speaker? Thank you, ma'am.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MS. GOUDIE: Susan, 7 McBaine. Talking about the other side. I would have prepared some remarks had I known, but I guess my general remarks are with us knowing Tia for so long, and I can recommend that she takes care of things. We didn't know about the weeds. I don't know what that was about, but she takes care of the property. She cares about the property. The bottom line is having an Airbnb on either side doesn't concern us, I think mostly because Number 9 is going to be a busier Airbnb, and we've seen Francee run that that way. Number 5 that we're talking about now, it seems like a lot of Tia's guests are coming along the times of some of the big Columbia events, like True/False and some of the -- it's not necessarily football games, but kind of more family events. And so we have seen that run really well. I didn't realize that it was even the amount of nights that it said on the screen. I thought it was less nights than that. So obviously, she's vetting her -- her tenants well, because sometimes we didn't even realize they were there. And I would just like to give an even -- even testimony for both sides of my neighbors.



MR. STANTON: Questions for this speaker?

MS. LOE: Thank you. Thank you for sticking around.

MR. STANTON: Any other speakers? State your name and address.

MS. GORDON: Francee Gordon, 1119 Lakeshore Drive. So you guys would think that I would be in opposition of this, and she's my competition. But I am not. I went to high school with her. And anyway, I am in support of both of us being able to operate our short-term rentals there next to each other -- well, almost next to each other. So -- any questions?

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Thank you, ma'am.

MS. GORDON: Okay. Thanks.

MR. MURPHY: Kevin Murphy, 1119 Lakeshore Drive. I would also like to express my support for Tia's request, and just one -- quickly, one other thing. So both of these requests went out. That is a very dense neighborhood, went out to 60-plus postcards, went to the West Ash Neighborhood Association, a very active neighborhood association, and I just want you guys to be cognizant of, you know, like if the crowds that may have not shown up tonight with all that publicity and advertisement, so thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for the speaker? Anybody else wish to speak?  
Going once, going twice, going three times.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Any discussion with Commissioners?

MR. WALTERS: I have a comment.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Walters?

MR. WALTERS: We could only dream that all future STRs would have participants who are as attentive and conscientious and cooperative as those we have just witnessed tonight -- in the last two occasions tonight.

MR. STANTON: I thought I was delirious or might have been dreaming, but I agree. This is like -- yeah. I'm trying to make sure I was awake, but yeah. I agree.

MR. WALTERS: I'd like to make a motion.

MR. WILLIAMS: I just want to -- in the spirit of counsel's advice, I just want to reiterate that I do view the 300 foot as a -- a consideration, but not a mandate, and that given the comments that we've heard on this case and the support from the neighbors, I -- I think, in fact, that these licenses, these STRs are -- are specific to the individual owners of the property, that I don't have a concern with the proximity issue here and otherwise. This just seems like a test case for really what we should be -- be hoping for, and that neighbors can come together and without trying to sound like I'm being too cute, I feel like I'm at a block party for -- at City Hall.

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: And for this case record, I would like to reiterate that the fact that this second one is coming in with a crafted, it feels like, application for the number of nights and for the number of guests, they're not just maxing out. The quantity tells me that this is a sensitive request, and it does address some of the concern that we had with distancing which was just the impact on the neighbors and the neighborhood overall. So we've gotten the neighbors' comments or lack of them that this arrangement is working, and I -- I appreciate the crafted request. Thank you.

MR. WALTERS: I'd like to make a motion.

MR. STANTON: It is ripe for a motion.

MR. WALTERS: In the case -- in the matter of Case Number 136-2025, an STR Conditional Use Permit for 5 McBaine Avenue, I move that we approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following: Condition that maximum usage shall not exceed 120 days annually, and that the maximum of six transient guests, regardless of allowance permitted by IPMC.

MS. LOE: Second.

MR. STANTON: Moved and properly seconded. Is there any discussion on this motion? Going once, going twice. Very good. Let's get it on the books, Mr. Secretary. We are ready when you are.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters.**  
**Motion carries 7-0.**

MR. WILLIAMS: That is seven yeses, zero nos. The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

**In the matter of Case Number 136-2025, an STR Conditional Use Permit for 5 McBaine Avenue, I move that we approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following: Condition that maximum usage shall not exceed 120 days annually, and that the maximum of six transient guests, regardless of allowance permitted by IPMC.**

**Yes:** 7 - Loe, Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

**Excused:** 2 - Geuea Jones and Brodsky

## VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MR. STANTON: Any comments from staff -- I mean, excuse me -- from the public?

MR. MURPHY: Will this go on the consent agenda?

MR. CRAIG: This -- Mr. Zenner will back me up here, This will likely go to consent

agenda.

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. The consent agenda items, there will be that -- the final action will be considered at the second meeting of Council in May.

MR. STANTON: If there are any more comments from the public, please step up to the podium and make your comments.

MR. VEROS: I just wanted to say.

MR. STANTON: Name, address, and all that good stuff.

MR. VEROS: Steve Veros, I belong to her, Tia Brown, 4707 McMickle. I appreciate the open-mindedness of the panel and in looking out for the neighborhood, and both the ladies that were trying to set something aside for their families. A lot of hard work went in to one, and a lot of love in the other one, so thank you very much for what you did tonight. Appreciate it.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir. Any other public comments?

## IX. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. STANTON: Comments from staff? Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: So after almost five hours, I'm going to try and make this short. The next meeting is on the 24th of April. It will be a much shorter meeting, hopefully. We have a PD plan, so it may not be -- actually, two. So our next meeting will be on the 24th. We have our regular work session. We will have several topics on that work session, as we discussed this evening. The discussion of our potential revisions to the definition of family, and the occupancy standards associated with that will not be coming back at the April 24th meeting. Those will come back at your first meeting in May. Based upon the conversation that Ms. Ortiz brought up this evening as it related to the topic on Monday night's City Council meeting, staff prepared a report at the request of Council after the short-term regulations were adopted in February of last year. Contained within that report were observations from the Peanut Gallery staff with progress made in the way of compliance. As many of you are aware, I think I have mentioned this previously, the last update we had from one of our vendors that we have been discussing potential services with ran an update of the number of short-term rentals within the City. Approximately 475 were active as of the end of March. Of that, as I indicated earlier this evening, we have received a total of 42 applications. We've got a lot of work in front of us. As Ms. Ortiz is probably well aware and some of you may have read the correspondence that was presented to Council under the report section, the average time that it takes to process a short-term rental application is approximately 12 hours. Of the 42 applications we have received, nine have been for administrative approvals by choice of the applicant for 120 days, and they were their principal residents. The remaining applications we have

received have only seen one denial, one withdrawal, and the rest have all been approved. That is not without significant consideration by this body. One of the recommended actions for the City Council that they have redirected for us to come back to you with an actual text change to the existing regulations is designed to enhance the overall efficiency of administration, and the ability then to free up our staff time, this body's time, and City Council's time to deal with issues that are of greater potential pressing need; i.e., our small lots, text amendments that we have deferred as a result of having to spend significant resources and time discussing this topic. So we have recommended to City Council and they have asked us to come back to the Planning Commission with several amendments. One of those amendments is designed to eliminate with the exception of three situations, all conditional-use permit applications to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Those three conditions are you are within 300 feet of another licensed short-term rental, you are within 1,000 feet of a school, or you are with -- you have open code violations associated with the dwelling being sought to be licensed. That does not address the issues that were discussed this evening with our Highridge site, where you have neighbors that have complaints. They potentially have been negatively impacted, however, I think the discussion this evening as to how that gets resolved, it will self-resolve itself based on the way that the regulations are structured. On the public understanding that there is an opportunity for them to report, regardless if they want to or not, we have afforded residents that have not had the opportunity. We are looking at with a vendor the easiest method of a 24/7 call center. It is not coming through the City of Columbia. It is basically the vendor's call center, manned in the United States to reach out directly to the registered contact. There is and will be a discussion with that vendor, the vendor we choose, what the parameters are for how long that designated agent has to resolve that issue. And it is our understanding through the vendor interviews that we have done, they will follow up with the vendor within that specified and established time of the City of Columbia to determine if it has been. If it has not been, as we pointed out this evening, the current rental compliance regulations say two verified complaints in a given 12-month period of time constitutes the right for the director of the Housing and Neighborhood Services Division to revoke the short-term rental license. So for those that may be watching or those that may come forward to us, try us, you may or you may not get away, but the City of Columbia and this process has been designed such that we can actively provide protection to our residents and go through a process by which we're inspecting properties for life safety, and we're addressing other related issues. That is not to say that the proposed revisions that we will come forward with may be agreed upon by this body, and that is part of what the discussion is going to be about. How do we

structure how we may make revisions. We are also recommending that the elimination of Tier One come out of the entire ordinance for simplification purposes. Tier One is the 30-night or less. It has not been applied for since the ordinance was adopted. And if somebody chooses to either seek a greater number of rental nights, but then self-chooses to only use for 30 nights a year, that is their choice. And so there is no real value in the complicated nature of having multiple tiers when a tier is not being used. The second suggestion relates to simplification which will be as challenging maybe as it relates to the elimination of the conditional use permit coming before this body except for the three exceptions, will be to potentially eliminate 120-night category. As you know, we have had almost every single short-term rental application that has come through and there have been very few that have been by owner occupants, but every short-term rental application that has come through has been for 210 nights. Again, there is a necessity in our mind, from an administrative perspective, that the ordinance be simplified to encourage people to apply. Now what you have not heard me say, but you have in prior settings, there is no change to the maximum number of licenses. We are not proposing, and we will not propose any change beyond the current one license per entity. Now all of us have had the discussion previously that a husband and a wife, and we had this at our last meeting, could establish two LLCs. They are two individuals and they have a right to own property separately. And that is still going to be the potential workaround for a couple to have two. But we are not proposing any increase in the total number at this point. So we are still also open and willing to do conditional use approvals under certain conditions, but given the time that I spend between an application being submitted to being assigned, I am probably in the range of about four hours. And it is an absurd amount of time for us to be spending to get the results that we have had presented to us. So the changes that we are offering aren't undermining the intent of the regulation, they are to assist in being able to augment its efficiency. We are not at a point -- after talking with our business licensing office manager today, we are not at a point that of the great majority of our licenses that -- or short-term rental certificates or CUPs that have gone through, we do not have more than 50 percent of those licensed at this point -- fully licensed through the process, meaning they have not yet obtained their business license. That is something that I will have better numbers on when we come back to you all, so we have an understanding of where that is. That's not necessarily relevant at this level for you, it is more relevant for us from an administrative perspective, but it is also making very big in the rearview mirror for me a concern as it relates to actual enforcement after June 1st. And so what we need to be able to do is we need to be able to create processes that are going to be able to be more effectively and efficiently administered on

the back end of this. I know you all love spending four hours talking about short-term rentals, however, we believe that this change, if agreed to, will definitely enhance our effectiveness. It does not undermine what the ordinance had within it. We will not be able to make everyone happy, and I think that's to Mr. Williams' point. When a neighbor is notified, they either are upset because they're now made aware of something that they were never aware of. So the flip side to this is, is if they're not going to be informed of a conditional use needing to be sought, but an individual operating a short-term rental fulfills the obligations of the short-term rental process from a zoning perspective, they need all of what we need, and then they comply with all of the regulatory steps, they still may not be informed. And I think that that is another thing that we will have to discuss -- how do we do information on licensure or upon application. But I think what we have seen here over the course of the last nine -- almost ten months is really a process that we maybe needed to go through that has not necessarily yielded, I think, some of the thoughts that we originally conceived would evolve. We don't get much in the way of opposition, and that that we do often, while it is very thoughtfully considered by this body, normally doesn't affect the outcome, and that I don't -- I -- I -- that's just an observation and I don't mean that in any negative fashion. We will bring to you, if I can get to that, and I'm getting to a point where, hopefully, I only have six items I need to review for the agenda for the next meeting, I will hopefully be able to get you some proposed text to review at our April 24th meeting. I will also endeavor to get text as it relates to our more pressing issue, and that is the small lot integration so we can start working through Article V and Appendix A, and continue to move that project on concurrently. Council has directed the Commission to consider the amendments, and based upon that direction, it would come too once we are hopefully in agreement or we have presented what we believe from a staff perspective to be appropriate. We will schedule a public hearing accordingly. As I have previously indicated, staff is going to present proposed changes that effectively address from an administrative perspective what we believe to be appropriate. We respect the Commission's input to the process, but the text amendments that are going to be presented are staff's. We are not going to sit and endlessly debate and discuss proposed revisions. We cannot -- we cannot afford to do that. I will ask the Commission to respectfully, if you disagree, when we get to a public hearing, vote as you feel appropriate, but we need to move these items forward. And so that is my request. We will spend two work sessions discussing these text changes for short-term rental. That is what was asked of me, how long would it take. I have estimated it would take probably two meetings, and that may be two full meetings. So depending on what topics we want to try to sandwich in, it may take more than two work sessions, but I'm going to give us

probably about three hours, hopefully. These changes aren't that cataclysmic, but we need to have an opportunity to be able to present to you all what we believe from a staff perspective is appropriate. You, as a Commission, have the right to vote up or down for those, and then Council ultimately makes that decision of their own. I just want to give you fair warning that that is the approach that I am going to take here. It is not to be mean or trying to upstage you all, it's a matter of efficiency in the way that we should be developing ordinances. So with that being said as a recap to what was discussed on Monday night and what is forthcoming on your work session agendas, these are the following seven items that will show up on your agenda for April 24th. As I often refer to the first two, are a two-for. It is a rezoning of property that is off of Clark Lane immediately west of the Schnuck's Shopping Center site that is on the corner of Clark and St. Charles. This would be the piece that is all the way on the western side of the Schnuck's building, and adjoins The Links, a residential and multi-family development there, seeking M-N, going from M-N to M-C to allow for the development of a hotel, as well as other more auto-oriented uses along that property. The hotel would be the anchor piece to a future development. The preliminary plat shows the lot layout of that future development. We have two general public hearings then, and these, of course, are in our favorite place, down in Discovery. So, Mr. Stanton, I would imagine you may need to be recusing yourself from these, based on your work down there. What I will tell you is 9225, as you remember, was tabled. There were a number of technical issues associated with that. Those technical issues are very technical, and they have everything to do with the limitations associated with the Discovery Park development. I will ask the Commission at this point, please maintain an open mind as we discuss the proposed development plan for Discovery Park Apartments. It is going to take a little bit of a stretch maybe for you all to get to the point that staff, based on the information we've had provided to us, and what I believe the applicant will present to you as a part of their presentation that certain issues within this project, unfortunately, because it's evolved over 20 years, got out of control. We have now been able to get the data we need in order to make a salient recommendation and establish a path forward. The applicant has discussed with us that path forward, but they are also in a need to receive the approval that they are seeking at this point. What I can tell you is, 16 years ago when I joined the staff, Discovery Park was one of my first projects. It was the one I managed. And so I am a little bit shocked at what I saw when we had this project originally come in, and the data that I asked for, and then got the data that I needed in order to help Ross do the evaluation. Very, very concerning to me. But we have an opportunity here and we have to look at what 20 years of development has produced. The second project that is down

in Discovery is an existing building that is part of a project that we have revised previously, so this will fall right into Ms. Geuea Jones' wheel house of not being very happy that we have planned development, but it is an existing single-story building that has the ability to have a second story added to it. And that second story is proposed to be improved with more residential second-story residential units, but it needs a plan revision in order to do that. It is part of a three-lot PD plan, and therefore, the way that this overall project is functioning, PD zoning on it is probably the more appropriate route. We can't just up and rezone this one lot, and therefore, that's why that PD revision is still believed appropriate by staff. We fully support the Commission's position, however, on not trying to approve planned development moving forward. And the last three cases are our short-term rental CUPs that are on the agenda. And one off of 115 Clinton, 1010 West Broadway, this is basically catty-corner from D&H Drug, and then one on Brenda Lane, which is off of West Walnut and backs up to the Columbia Country Club. So just to be able to familiarize yourself, and I need to look at why the mapping is different between 154 and 155, and I believe it should be the same parcel. We will confirm that before we come before this body on the 24th. The far right-hand slide is our Discovery Apartments. This is the one that we will have two parcels out of the five shown with development, and the remaining three are lots for future development, but those lots for future development will make much more sense to you once you have all of the details unpacked, and it is very possible I may be giving that report for you, just because of the complexity associated with the overall project. We have our other PD revision down at Discovery. That is the existing building that is constructed on Artemis that would have second story added to it, and ten one-bedroom units placed on that second story. Clinton is there on your right-hand side, just south of Ash Street, so probably another West Ash neighborhood request. And then the last two is 1010 Broadway, and 321 Brenda Lane. Those are the cases. Those are the issues that we have becoming before us. I would like to extend my appreciation for the amount of time that you all spent tonight, the deliberation on the cases, and I would also like to extend my apologies for some of the obvious errors that were made in several of our cases this evening. We will improve our attention to detail. We have got a lot of things that we have been dealing with here, and my staff, as you obviously can probably tell, has been slightly overwhelmed by the volume. And when you become overwhelmed, as you all probably well know, the propensity to make mistakes rises. I can't crack the whip all the time, but I will crack it after tomorrow. I've got to be careful about it being cracked on me. Ultimately, that is all we have tonight. Five hours in, the computer crashed for me, so, hopefully, the video was able to be produced. Thank you all.



MR. STANTON: I do have a question. I know -- Commissioner Comments.

## **X. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

MR. STANTON: I've got to get this off my chest. What is the status of someone running an STR at this time, because I think a lot of the issue about people coming forward, they're not scared, they're not nervous. Like, they feel like so what, and I feel like that's why I say this stuff I do. When we went through this process, my understanding was if you do not have a defined use of that land, I'm in R-1, and I have a list of things I can do in R-1. If it is not in that list of things I can do in R-1, and I do that, that's an illegal use of that land. I can't have a concrete plant in the back of my yard because it is not a permitted use in R-1, and if I do have concrete plant in my backyard, that is illegal, thus I'm a criminal because I'm illegally using that land. So the point I'm trying to get to is, because people -- because now I feel like you're softening what I'm saying and people -- and I fight it all the time. People feel, well, it's not criminal, it's -- it's -- it's like a little white crime.

MS. WILSON: That's not the point. (Inaudible) -- the law begins on June 1st.

MR. CRAIG: Right. Right. Right.

MR. ZENNER: And, I think what, Mr. Stanton, you need to understand is in February of 2024, the permitted use table in the UDC was amended to add short-term rental tiers, tier one, tier two, and tier three. And at the same time that ordinance was adopted, the effective date was delayed until June 1st of 2024 to start receiving applications and then full effectiveness of the ordinance and its provisions was -- was in the ordinance as it was adopted, was given one full year. So from June 1st, 2024 to June 1st of 2025, if you're operating a short-term rental in any of the zoning districts where it is identified in the permitted use table, it is an allowed use. You are not obligated until June 1st to have CUP, a short-term rental certificate, and a business license. That is what the ordinance says. So they are operating out of compliance, they are not operating illegally because we have adopted in the UDC and acknowledged a short-term rental can function in about five different zoning districts subject to fulfilling and meeting all of the regulatory requirements which were delayed -- full compliance was delayed until June 1st of 2025. And so we -- I understand and I -- I -- trust me, I see applications come in every day, and these people don't seem very concerned that when I send comments out, I need to get them back immediately. It's -- you know, and when I ask for certain things that are regulatorily required, it's, like, oh, well, you know, I'll give him what he wants and make him search. And quite honestly, a lot of folks have told me, well, you don't need to be so accommodating, and you don't need to be so helpful. Well, part of what I end up doing in my job is is you try to bring people into compliance, not by vinegar, but you have to be

polite, you have to continue to work with them. And that is what I have defined my career as a public servant. I go beyond what any public servant generally would in order to ensure we get to the end objection. Maybe that's taking -- I'm letting people take advantage of me, but they are not. And I think your observation is very correct. They are not concerned that, oh, well, you know, whatever. If I don't get -- if I don't get listed by June 1st, it's not that big a deal. Try us. That's all I have to say is try the City --

MR. STANTON: So what's the difference in language between being noncompliant and illegal? But -- I'm still not seeing the difference.

MR. ZENNER: You're making an assertion by telling them that they are illegal because they are not identified or acknowledged as a permissible use in the Code. I think that that's the difference. They're acknowledged as a use in the Code. They were not previously acknowledged until February of 2024. And because they were never previously acknowledged in the Code, the use theoretically shouldn't have even been occurring within the city of Columbia, but there were no regulations by which to define what they were. And so now that we have defined what they are, we have defined where they are allowed and by what means, you're operating out of compliance. If you ran a concrete batch plant in your backyard, but you had it before we adopted zoning regulations, you were a legal non-conforming concrete batch plant, and you could continue to exist until you decided to discontinue the use of that concrete batch plant in your backyard. However, if you established it after we said that you couldn't, you would be illegal.

MS. LOE: But they're not in compliance because we've said you don't need to be in compliance until June 1st.

MR. ZENNER: But to the point that Mr. Stanton is trying to convince these people you are not -- you need to become compliant if you want to continue to operate.

MS. LOE: Correct.

MR. STANTON: I'm not operating legally. I've gotten what I want.

MS. LOE: That's why -- so right now -- but right now is like this --

MR. ZENNER: Right now, there -- nobody is under the -- nobody, and I think part of why we have such a lack of applications is because everybody is waiting -- everybody is waiting, and this is human nature and I think, you know, we evaluated this as a part of the regulatory adoption process. Originally, we said six months before you had to be fully licensed. And I think I probably maybe had a -- had a -- had a vein pop out of my neck because I knew what that was going to create. We also acknowledge that in order for people to make a transition because we decided to reduce the number of licenses so significantly, it was concluded that we needed to give them at least a year to make a

decision on what to do with their property. So what I would tell you is, you have people, by human nature, that are going to wait till the very last moment. Well, I'm sorry. March 3rd was the last application deadline that one could make to ensure that you at least got through the conditional use process of the Planning Commission and City Council to ensure that you were already in queue to be able to come -- to have a legally compliant short-term rental. Right now, everybody is on borrowed time. And so you're not going to be approved by June 1st through the CUP process if you require it. So mind you, what we just -- what I just discussed about a revision to the Code, if we take out the conditional use process, you also have some imbalance that potentially gets created about when the effective date of the ordinance is, or the requirement that you be compliant. Maybe not, because we're going to basically say it probably becomes effective then immediately is what I would say because we have simplified the process. So there's no reason at that point, once you are identified as not having a license, that we're going to probably take -- we're probably going to just slap your hand. We're probably going to take a more -- possibly a more aggressive action to get them compliant.

MR. STANTON: So I've got to hold my statement until after June 1st, then I can say what I'm saying?

MR. ZENNER: No.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: If -- if -- if -- if we still require at the rate that we're requiring folks to come in for conditional uses. And I think what's going to start happening, and I think we all see the handwriting on the wall, as more people become comfortable in registering, and we have more short-term rentals coming out of the woodwork, you're going to trip, without doubt, you're going to trip the 300 foot criterion and if we add in the 1,000 feet from a school, you are going to have several that will trip that. And so I think the trifecta of possible action in the future, open violations, school, and being within 300 feet. That is going to be what we will probably have to then start to wrestle with, and I think part of what this whole discussion needs to be as we move forward with the process is we're going to have to figure how do we want to try to address what may be coming. And I -- you know, again, it's -- this -- this is an evolving -- it's an evolving issue as it rates regulatorily and, you know, we're all hopping on the train and trying to figure out where we're heading. And I, at this point, tell you is there's 425 more short-term rentals potentially that need to be licensed. Leigh Kottwitz, our manager for our Office of Neighborhood Services, her contacts with a number of people that she does know that are running short-term rentals have basically said after June 1st, I'm not longer going to

run it. And so there are a number of people, and I think what the vendor services will provide us as we require them to sweep sites is we will find if that actual conveyance to Ms. Kottwitz has been correct and the total number is being reduced. But we will also have more information as to about where we do need to focus our attention on enforcement and compliance. And so we need to get the regulatory house in order first to create efficiency. We also need to concurrently be getting our vendor secured in order to be able to assist us in compliance moving forward. And we are desperately trying to get there from a staff perspective. We do hope to present to Council at its April 21st meeting a report that requests authorization to do contract negotiation for a vendor. So -- which will hopefully then result in having that vendor on -- on call or under contract by June 1.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

**XI. NEXT MEETING DATE - April 24, 2025 @ 7 pm (tentative)**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

MR. WALTERS: I make a motion to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: I move -- yeah. I second that

MS. LOE: I second.

MR. STANTON: The meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 12:21 a.m.)

(Off the record.)

**Motion to adjourn**