

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**February 6, 2025**

**Case Number 68-2025**

**A request by Courtney Pulley (Owner), for approval of a Conditional-Use Permit (CUP), to allow 5406 Gemstone Way to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of eight transient guests and up to 210-nights annually pursuant to Section 29-3.3(vv) and 29-6.4(m) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.22-acre subject site is zoned R-1 (Single-family Dwelling), is located south of the intersection of Gemstone Way and Agate Way, and is addressed 5406 Gemstone Way. (This item was tabled at the January 23, 2025 Planning Commission meeting.)**

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, you may, Madam Chair, and may the record reflect that Mr. Walters has returned to the dais.

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to allow 5406 Gemstone Way to be operated as a 210-night STR for a maximum of eight transient guests 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 the most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC), and
3. A maximum of 210-nights of annual usage.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, the applicant is a fraternity brother of mine. We belong to the same fraternal organization. That has no bearing. This is a pretty insane subject for both of us, and I don't care he's my frat brother, I'm going -- I'm going to judge it based on my -- on my position in the criteria established by the short-term rental regulations.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for disclosing. Anyone else, anything to disclose? Seeing none. Questions for staff. Commissioner Wilson and then Commissioner Loe.

MS. WILSON: Actually, I have a couple questions. The first one, and they're more so about how

we proceed with these. So the first question is when I look at the supplemental questions, they don't lend themselves to me -- I don't know how to say this -- so let me just ask what I wrote down. So like, I'm looking specifically at the second part and E, and the applicant notes we've maintained excellent relationships with neighboring property owners. That, to me, can be misleading given the letters that we have of individuals who stated they didn't even know that this was a short-term rental, which tells me either there's no relationship or there's a misstatement of relationship. So how can we better write those questions to get a better answer, I guess, is really what I'm driving at. The next one that I have is are applicants notified of potential concerns and compliance issues like the misaligned description on the promotional website, and I ask that because is that -- are they told that before they come here, like, your description, you can't use that description based upon our regulation. And if they are told that before they come here, then, you know, are we asking them to fix it before they come here; does that make sense? Okay.

MR. ZENNER: Is that all?

MS. WILSON: That is.

MR. ZENNER: So let me -- I'll work in reverse. So until June 1st of 2025, any listing that is out on Vrbo, Expedia, Airbnb can exist. There is no compliance requirement. And so we will not evaluate listing information until after an application is received and put into the queue for review. And as a part of our evaluation, and I am working with Mr. Halligan at this point to ensure that our applicants are made aware, and as you note within the staff report, we make clear disclosure within the staff report, which is provided to the applicant prior to this hearing, that there will be changes needed. And as a part of the compliance component of licensure, we will evaluate that that has been done once a license is issued. If it is not, it is considered a violation of the code, and therefore, we would then have to take effective action to do so. So that is -- that is a component that is up until June 1, it could be lawless, but if you're coming in and you're asking to have a license issued for you, we're letting you know you need to be compliant. And most people, when they're aware of that, they realize they have to make that change. So coming back to the first question then as to how can we make the second page, and I would suggest that both pages of the conditional use questions, the first page which is really more related to the comprehensive -- our evaluation of general conditional uses, the general public probably has no clue how their project or their request may or may not be compliant with any of the Comprehensive Plan without evaluating the Comprehensive Plan from cover to cover. And so really the answers that we typically have received and what you receive in the applications that are provided to you are yes, no, true, false. They are very, very unhelpful. And what we are attempting to do as we evaluate -- pre-evaluate applications is we are evaluating page 2 specifically, more specifically because that is really the page that the applicant needs to display or express how they perceive their short-term rental as impacting the environment in which they're located. Again, it's a little bit of a learning curve for everyone. I think to -- we ask the question, or at least I do, and I think Mr. Halligan is starting to gain insight to this, that if you make a statement that you have great relations with your neighbor, you need to either be providing us documentation of that in

support, or you need to change that answer to we don't know or we have not received any correspondence supportive of that. That's really, I think, what I'm driving at, and I actually, as an aside, just took an application in earlier this week. That question was answered in such a way that it was an affirmative. I said where is your documentation? Either give me it or change the answer. They changed the answer because they didn't have it. And so I think there's a little bit of -- in our reporting of page 2's responses to the conditional use, what we need to be more, I think, cognizant of as a staff is that these are the applicant's responses. We're not adding value. We don't want to add value to, well, yeah, they've claimed that they have support, and you've probably seen reports that have been prepared that say no documentation has been provided. Now when neighbors provide written comment, that written comment is generally generated off of either the early postcard notifications which come out a week after the application is received, or they are coming at the very last moments after the staff report is prepared. So what we are starting to do is we are providing copies of those comments to the applicants as they are coming in, as we provide them to you as time permits, so if they are in advance of the meeting date, they are receiving them in the same e-mail that you are receiving them. So they are aware that they either need to take effective action to reach out to their neighbors who have concern, or they better be prepared when they come to this venue. And that is something that again is part of an evolution process. The questions that are on the second page of the application -- I think, Ms. Wilson, you probably remember, those were decided by this body. And so if we want to talk about how we need to refine those questions, I think that that's a work session item that we can discuss again if we would like. We are in the final throes of being able to go to a fully electronic submittable applicant through our central permit portal, so I would like to, if we can, we may have to circle back to that at our next work session, which would be on the 20th of February. But that's the answers to the questions. Hopefully, that is sufficient.

MR. CRAIG: And, of course, the Commissioners are free to assign whatever weight they feel to answers to these questions being a lot of weight, some weight, no weight. That's part of your discretion, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, I'm interested in the 2024 renting period, which is covered nicely in the report. You know, it's identified that there was 226 days that it was rented in 2024, but then it's also identified that that's when the long-term rental certificate was issued, due to, as you reported, there being a situation with a long-term rental. So now I'm interested in did that 226, does that include the long-term rental period, or is it 226 short-term plus the long-term, and was this being used. I just rechecked our ordinance and we say no to short-term reservations can be at the same time, but we don't say you can't do long-term and short-term at the same time.

MR. ZENNER: No. And so let me -- let me clarify. When we talk about an illegal rental, which is what was flagged, the illegal rental may be because there is occupancy occurring that is abnormal. And so an illegal rental could be an illegal long-term rental, and in this particular instance, the distinction, I did not mean to imply that the identification of an illegal rental was, it was being used as long-term rental. It

was an illegal rental. So through investigation, it was determined that there was no long-term rental license on it. Again, until June 1st, no one in the City of Columbia is required to have a short-term rental license to rent their home as a short-term rental. And so if they wanted to operate this as a short-term rental under today's -- under the provision of June 1st being the drop-dead date for compliance, they have every right to do that. However, they went through the process because they were operating an illegal rental and got the long-term rental certificate. There is nothing in the Code that prohibits one from operating or obtaining both a long-term rental certificate and a short-term rental license concurrently. And so the days that are being used, you will have to ask Mr. Pulley, the applicant, if he was using it at any point for rental 30 days or greater to a single individual. There is no record that we have that would indicate that was the case, and that would be if he had a long-term tenant that was there for 30 or more days, he'd have to have a legal long-term rental, and therefore, the license would have covered that. So if the home were being occupied 365 days a year with 100 or 226 of it being with short-term occupants, and then a combination of long-term tenants 30 days or greater, it could have been being occupied 365 days a year. That is not the question we ask. We asked how many days in the prior year have you been using it for short-term rental purposes.

MS. LOE: You answered that it was being used for long-term rental, which was part of my question. Sorry, I threw a lot in there. I guess the other part of my question really was whether or not short-term and long-term fully agree we -- we -- I think we've actually stated you can have both licenses, but can you have a long-term tenant and a short-term guest at the same time?

MR. ZENNER: That is not clearly spelled out. I think from a -- from a practical perspective, the way that the intent of the ordinance was, the ability to, in essence, sublet, so to speak, the lower level of this home to one short-term tenant and sublet the upper portion of the home, the bedrooms on the upper level to a short-term tenant, that is clearly and expressly prohibited by our regulations.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: There is no clear or express prohibition that if you have a long-term tenant occupying let's just say the lower level, that the upper level could not be being occupied as short-term. I think the issue here is that was not something that is -- was conceived as something we needed to -- we needed to regulate. It may be.

MS. LOE: Except we -- we did talk about remember having situations with landlords that would -- who would require the use of the unit as short-term rental include that, and we really did want to avoid that.

MR. ZENNER: And, again, I think what we're -- the long-term rental license was the vehicle by which to ensure that the home or homes within the City of Columbia were legally -- were inspected for life safety-related issues. That was what prior to the adoption of the short-term rental regulations was being recommended by our Office of Neighborhood Services, but it was -- it was clearly articulated when an individual came in to seek a long-term rental license that that was not potentially going to give you an out to have to have a short-term rental license.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. ZENNER: So a lot of our properties within the City of Columbia obtained long-term rental certificates in advance of their short-term rental application or while they were still using their dwelling in it as a short-term rental. I can't tell you in this particular instance if this was dually -- being dually used at the same time.

MS. LOE: And -- yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, wouldn't it -- I'm trying to pull up the exact wording of our occupancy for short-term rentals, but I thought we did address this because I remember distinctly having conversations about the -- whether or not the primary residence would count in that total occupancy, and I thought the conclusion that we came to was yes. So it would seem to me that, yes, they could have a long-term tenant and a short-term tenant, but they would still not be able to have more than eight occupants if they are using their short-term license.

MS. LOE: But our intent was that the -- in the case where there was a long-term tenant in place, the tenant could get the license, not the owner.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. I understand that, but I -- I am saying that even if we missed something and there's a loophole and that intent is not clearly spelled out, the occupancy limit would prevent them from -- they wouldn't be in a situation where they've got three unrelated upstairs and eight unrelated downstairs, or something. So I see what you're saying, but there is an ambiguity on whether they can operate both licenses at the same time. I think my primary concern in that scenario would be not allowing the long-term tenant use of their space. I don't think that's an issue certainly on this case. But I will make a note to add it to work session.

MR. ZENNER: And I -- you are correct that the long-term resident, if they were a tenant, would have to be the one licensed. So again, if you're not doing a -- if you're doing a 30-day lease to a traveling nurse, they're not going to have the licensure. And so -- and they may be in the lower level, and given the R-1 zoning designation of the property, the R-1 zoning designation on a long-term rental only allows a maximum of three unrelated individuals. Again, compliance with the short-term rental limitations does not become fully enforceable until June 1st. So what's happened in the interim period here, I'm not quite sure we can resolve other than the fact that they got a long-term rental license in September of 2024 as a result of being reported as an illegal rental. That took care of at least the possibility that they were using it for no more than three unrelated individuals under the R-1 classification, and then they're now before us to get the short-term rental license as the owner so they would then have a specific limitation of a maximum of eight. I think we have to clarify that if you are duly registered, your maximal occupancy has to be controlled at something, and I don't know what that is, and I don't want to state that at this point because we need to think about that a little bit more, because you have two conflicting sets of regulations here, one that is more restrictive -- that's the underlying zoning -- and then you have the one that is more permissive, which is the short-term rental.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MR. ZENNER: And I -- that is what is not covered clearly within our regulations, and I think we do need to discuss that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I -- I would ask that we put that on a work session. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Yeah. So I'm just trying to recall everything I think clearly, but if I -- if I think clearly about this, it's -- if you have a long-term tenant, it is the long-term tenant who has to have the license, and there can only be one license. So that sort of resolves the matter.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right. Which is why I'm saying I don't think that for tonight's case, we need to delve into did we accidentally create a loophole, plus I would also like to ask legal to look into it because we're all trying to remember the exact language of all of these various sections without having them in front of us. So I -- I appreciate the discussion. I appreciate, Commission Loe, you bringing it to our attention. I don't think right now tonight is the time to resolve it unless we think it will affect our vote on this particular case. Okay. Moving on. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We'll open the floor to public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward, state your name and address for the record. Six minutes for the applicant or a group. Come on.

MR. PULLEY: Yeah. I just wanted to make sure -- (inaudible)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, no. No. No. Get on up. Name and address for the record.

MR. PULLEY: All right. Yes. My name is Courtney Pulley; I currently reside at 1903 Lightview Drive, Columbia, Missouri 65202. I've been a resident of Columbia for approximately 27 and a half years. My wife has been a resident of Columbia her entire life. I've owned this property for almost ten years. We resided in that property for approximately seven and a half years, raised two kids there. Have a significant investment in the home. Don't want to sell it. Significant equity in the home. Don't want to sell it. So we wanted to find some ways we could use the home to generate income for myself, my wife, and our family, and also look at developing some income upon retirement. Probably retire in five and a half years, so I would like to have some -- some way to generate income for myself and my family after that -- additional income. A couple things I did want to go over is the website, we'll change anything on the website we need to to comply. I know that the process is new for everyone, and so that's why we're here. Also relationships with the -- our neighbors, I hope I didn't misrepresent anything, Commissioner Wilson. We have had no negative interactions or relationships with our neighbors. And honestly, we've lived there probably -- we probably have been on that street probably some of the longest term residents there, so we know a couple of residents on the neighborhood. Several of the houses across from us and next to us have been rented out many times over, so I don't know who they are. I think several of them are being rented out right now, but we definitely want to make sure we comply with all neighborhood standards. We take very good care of the home, very good care of the home. We get the grass cut weekly, get any repairs that need to be made. Also, I do want to note that for our short-term rentals, we have very strict rules, so we actually appreciate that regulations are going in place. Me and my wife had considered that

before we even were going to do this to say do we want to do this because there are no regulations in place. Now, I will say if you ever want to ask me questions about how to, you know, make it better, I'm more than willing to -- to answer those. Now that we've been doing this, we've learned a lot. What else would I say? Like I said, we take very good -- oh, yes. Also our rules, no parties whatsoever, no guests of guests, so what that means if you stay there, you have to register. We have a registration form that has contact information, e-mail, phone number. We don't allow anyone under 21 to rent the residence. We've turned down many people. No smoking in the residence, no drugs, no pets unless it's like a comfort animal or a -- you know, a support animal, and they have to have papers for that or some kind of documentation, just because we have people that stay there that are allergic to animals, and we just want to be cognizant of that. Let me see. I had a couple of notes, too. Like I said, we have to maintain very good ratings to even do this, so we maintain a 4.89 rating, typically all fives from the people that do stay. And as you noted, we don't have any complaints, no police, because we police it very well. We've -- if there's an issue, we have had to have people leave the residence. If there is an issue, we do that right away. Very few issues because we -- we screen very carefully, okay, for who stays there, and we've denied -- declined people to stay on many occasions. So I just want you to know, you know, we want to do this the right way, and we want you to know there is a right way to do it and a wrong way. And so, if you all have any more questions from me, I'm willing to answer anything, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Thank you for that. First of all, my comments were not necessarily -- it was for process.

MR. PULLEY: Yeah. Absolutely.

MS. WILSON: And, secondly, it actually works in your favor because if people don't know you've been -- you've had a short-term rental, that's actually very positive. Right? So I just want to reassure you and encourage you that it actually is a good thing.

MR. PULLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: You would have two objections to this, so I'm going to say what I said every hearing with these short-term rentals. You guys are the pioneers. You have somebody that's objecting to this. It's your job to be a good neighbor from here on, if you get it. Nothing is guaranteed in life, but if you get this, it's imperative, because if you don't do this as a pioneer, you're going to make it harder in the future. So being a good neighbor, knowing everybody around you there, and I'm sure you have access to the objection letters. If not, I think they're publicly -- are they on the website?

MR. PULLEY: I have one, the new one, you know. I'll definitely go take a look at that.

MR. STANTON: Look it up -- look it up and find out who that is, and work that out -- work it out. Definitely on the website pronto, because we look at that information. When we're doing this analysis, we're looking to see if you're out there, and how you're advertising yourself has a heavy weight on how we -- how we look at this. Staff had put this in the report, so it kind of prepared us for that, but had he not

said anything, and we -- and we're -- we've got two or three computers up here. Everybody is running their mouth, we're looking stuff up as you're speaking, we're looking it up.

MR. PULLEY: Absolutely. I expected it.

MR. STANTON: We looked up your advertisement and it said party house, 12-15 people, and you're talking about you've got a beautiful relationship with the neighborhood and blah, blah, blah, blah. And we're, like, you're lying right here and I'm looking at it. That has a very strong effect. Fix the advertising.

MR. PULLEY: Oh, go ahead.

MR. STANTON: So you do have a long-term rental now?

MR. PULLEY: A long-term rental certificate.

MR. STANTON: I can see it -- a certificate, yes. Okay. And when the stuff hits the fan, who am I calling and how fast are they getting there?

MR. PULLEY: We live within a mile and a half. Either one of us. We would be considered the designated agent or agents, and have responded. In the past if there is ever an issue, we keep security cameras on the front and back of the residence, so we see who is coming in and out, electronic locks so we can monitor who is coming in and out. So, I mean, we take this very seriously. I mean, you know, we've been doing this for quite a while with no complaints and that's on purpose. That's very deliberate.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I compliment you on your screening of the guests and your security measures. We have debated, a couple of us, on our way home from the meeting, should we have this as part of one of the questions we ask, because it does strengthen the proposal. Another thing that strengthens the proposal, as Commissioner Wilson said, is that people don't even know it exists. They say if this happens, this will be a crisis for our neighborhood. It's already happening, so that means it's kind of invisible. It's, you know, under the radar, and that -- that's a good thing, too.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: But we want you to be lawful and not a renegade, unlawful use of land. You know how to get down.

MR. PULLEY: Yes, sir.

MR. STANTON: So, yeah. We definitely commend you coming out of the shadows, being exposed to the regulations, and -- yes.

MR. PULLEY: I do want to say one more thing. As far -- oh. Go ahead, if somebody else --

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. Please go ahead.

MR. PULLEY: I just wanted to say, as far as the basement, we'll comply with any additional structural inspection or permit that's needed, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. So that was actually was going to be my question. What's -- from the pictures on -- on your ad, it looks nice. I guess my question is, does that mean that you went from a

1,500 square foot house to a 1,300 -- or to a 3,000 square foot house?

MR. PULLEY: No. It's approximately I'd say 2,400 square feet, because some of the basement is not completely finished. It's just like a John Deere room and a storage area.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MS. PULLEY: But the contractor at the time they completed it about eight years ago, it was plumbed, electrical, framed, and they just finished it out. They -- they gave us the impression it didn't need to have a building permit. Now that we know that it does, we would definitely make sure to do that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, the -- the time that you need a building permit goes -- they get more strict when you start renting it out as opposed to living there yourself, which is fine. I'm not -- I'm not trying to beat you up for it. So, yeah. If we put a condition on here that it would only be advertised with the sleeping rooms on the main level or it get fully up to code, you would be okay with that?

MR. PULLEY: That would be fine.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. All right. Commissioner Williams, go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: It sounds like there was a violation. Is it -- can you go more of that with the rental. I got the impression from City's report -- staff's report that the reason that the --

MR. PULLEY: He made -- I'm not sure about that because he made some mention of there being a violation at the property to it being a long-term rental. We actually voluntarily and proactively went out to get that long-term rental compliance certificate, so I'm not sure -- I mean, you know, we would be more than willing to clear up that discrepancy.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Staff, was that related to the basement being an unpermitted finish?

MR. ZENNER: No. I would have to go back and I'd have to look specifically at the code and the application process that came to look at the background information on that. It was my understanding that it did come from -- it was a result, not necessarily of a voluntary compliance. That may have been an error. The bottom line is the structure was inspected according to our housing requirements and was found to be compliant with the exception of some corrected items. So the building permit deficiency that we can't apparently find a building permit, which may not have been Mr. Pulley's fault, it may have been his contractor, again, that's going to require a little bit of additional investigation and coordination with our housing staff as to, well, what did they see and how does it comport with the building standards. Our building regulation supervisor is aware, because we inquired of them as to where the permit may have been. There's a method by which we can address that issue, and hopefully, it will not be an invasive one for Mr. Pulley.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But that wasn't related to whatever the violation may have been?

MR. ZENNER: No. And it is very possible that maybe I, not having directly been involved in preparing all of the documentation for this, just delivering the report, I may have conflated an illegal rental with a voluntary request for an application and the identified violations of that inspection being the illegal rental. But let me -- I want to just clarify that. I don't mean to throw him under the bus.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, no. No. Mr. Pulley, you don't remember getting a no-no letter?

MR. PULLEY: No. No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. STANTON: My understanding, it was like you rent the house, and then go and get a rental certificate; is that where the problem started kind of?

MR. PULLEY: No. No. It's been a short-term rental, it's not been a long-term rental --

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. PULLEY: -- but we just wanted to make sure we -- since there was no short-term, we went ahead and got a long-term rental application just to make sure everything was structurally sound and safe. You know, we have fire extinguishers, we've got all -- all the things.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: It looks like the designated agent is your wife. Correct?

MR. PULLEY: Yeah. Myself and my wife. She's right there.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. So if the two of you are renting it out, are you committing to not go out of town, or do you have a separate designated agent who you may not be traveling outside of the county with?

MR. PULLEY: Well, we do have additional family members who can respond, if need be, but, I mean, we're rarely gone out of town. Let's just say that, and if we are, we make sure there is somebody designated to take care of that situation.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think that's been a big concern of the Commission is making sure that someone is there. And so with respect to a married couple being one and two on that, I'm just not sure how --

MS. GEUEA JONES: We've never required more than one designated agent on any of the others, though. All right. Any other -- go ahead, Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Just to the applicant, make sure if you two, somebody is on the phone 30 minutes or whatever is there if you guys are not --

MR. PULLEY: And there are response rates if you operate a short-term rental that you have to respond in a certain amount of time, or you could be removed from the site and you won't be able to maintain the five-star rating, so -- first of all, I want to say thank you all for your time, and I also want to thank City staff for this meticulous report. Just thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Anyone else before I let you go? Thank you very much for being here.

MR. PULLEY: Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward. Seeing none. We will close the floor for public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: And go to Commissioner comment. Any Commissioner comments? Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: This just goes more to our broader discussion. I don't have any concerns here, it's just I think the intention of the designated agent has been really not so much -- I appreciate that I think probably from the perspective of a Vrbo or Airbnb, the response rate is they're concerned about the renters response -- response to the renter, and the designated agent has really been more about does the -- do the neighbors have someone that they can call if something is going wrong. And so, you know, just add to the log of things we're trying to -- to figure out.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm writing it down. Any other Commissioner comments? Anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Loe, go ahead.

MS. LOE: Yeah. This is comment. Just concurring with comments that have been already shared, that we have received two letters about this application, but since you have been in operation since the end of 2022, and one neighbor is not aware -- actually neither one is aware that it's operating as an STR, and the fact that you are operating as an STR prior to Ms. Splinter buying the property, her -- that house, I think is indicative that their concerns -- you've already addressed their concerns, so to speak. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone like -- Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: This is more a question, but with these conditional uses -- use permits on short-term rentals, do they go with the property or do they go with the owner? With the owner?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Both. If either changes, then they are not transferable. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: My esteemed colleague, Ms. Loe, brought up a great point. Number one, if you've already got a record of renting as a short-term rental, and your neighbors didn't even know about it until they got this notice, that, you know, has weight. It also -- we read all of them and we take all of them in consideration, but, yeah, I think we really need to really dig into them and really see is this a call in response or, you know, do we really need to dig into these complaints. I still suggest that the applicant look into whoever has a problem and work that out. Like I said, these are the first ones, you guys are important to the success of the program, and definitely getting people out of the shadows so they're not illegal renegades in land-use policies.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Is there any other discussion or a motion? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: I'll make a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MS. LOE: In the case of 68-2025, 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 allowance permitted by IPMC, and as restricted by bedrooms on the main floor until the basement bedroom is permitted, and the two parking spaces within the attached garage be made available when dwelling is in use as STR.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: There has been a motion made by Commissioner Loe, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, when you're ready.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. WILLIAMS: Nine yeses and zero nos.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Our last case of the evening.