

Appendix I


Survey Results

Overall Responses

Yes
No
Total Responses

88
346
434


Q1 (Do you presently offer any residence you own or rent as a short-term rental?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

161
271
432


Q2 (Do you support limitations on the location of short-term rentals?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

172
261
433


Q3 (Do you support limitations on the number of short-term rental licenses a property owner or authorized tenant may obtain?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

255
177
432


Q4 (Do you support minimum registration standards for short-term rentals that may require business licensure, payment of accommodations/lodging taxes, and dwelling unit inspections to ensure health and safety standards are met?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

321
110
431


Q5 (Do you support preservation of affordable housing (owner-occupied or rental) within the City?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

79
195
274


Q6 (Do you support limitations on the number of days a dwelling unit can be rented for short-term rental revenue collection?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

59
186
245

Q7 (Should such a day limit be established based upon the location of the dwelling used for short-term rental.)




Ward One Responses

Yes
No
Total Responses

4
28
32


Q1 (Do you presently offer any residence you own or rent as a short-term rental?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

15
17
32


Q2 (Do you support limitations on the location of short-term rentals?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

16
16
32


Q3 (Do you support limitations on the number of short-term rental licenses a property owner or authorized tenant may obtain?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

23
9
32


Q4 (Do you support minimum registration standards for short-term rentals that may require business licensure, payment of accommodations/lodging taxes, and dwelling unit inspections to ensure health and safety standards are met?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

29
3
32


Q5 (Do you support preservation of affordable housing (owner-occupied or rental) within the City?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

5
12
17


Q6 (Do you support limitations on the number of days a dwelling unit can be rented for short-term rental revenue collection?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

4
13
17


Q7 (Should such a day limit be established based upon the location of the dwelling used for short-term rental.)



Ward Two Responses


Yes
No
Total Responses

6
39
45




Yes
No
Total Responses

17
27
44




Yes
No
Total Responses

22
23
45




Yes
No
Total Responses

28
16
44




Yes
No
Total Responses

35
10
45




Yes
No
Total Responses

8
14
22



Yes
No
Total Responses

11
12
23




Ward Three Responses

Yes
No
Total Responses

6
28
34


Q1 (Do you presently offer any residence you own or rent as a short-term rental?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

14
20
34


Q2 (Do you support limitations on the location of short-term rentals?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

19
15
34


Q3 (Do you support limitations on the number of short-term rental licenses a property owner or authorized tenant may obtain?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

21
13
34


Q4 (Do you support minimum registration standards for short-term rentals that may require business licensure, payment of accommodations/lodging taxes, and dwelling unit inspections to ensure health and safety standards are met?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

28
6
34


Q5 (Do you support preservation of affordable housing (owner-occupied or rental) within the City?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

8
14
22


Q6 (Do you support limitations on the number of days a dwelling unit can be rented for short-term rental revenue collection?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

5
11
16

Q7 (Should such a day limit be established based upon the location of the dwelling used for short-term rental.)




Ward Four Responses

Yes
No
Total Responses

21
71
92


Q1 (Do you presently offer any residence you own or rent as a short-term rental?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

40
51
91


Q2 (Do you support limitations on the location of short-term rentals?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

40
51
91


Q3 (Do you support limitations on the number of short-term rental licenses a property owner or authorized tenant may obtain?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

63
28
91


Q4 (Do you support minimum registration standards for short-term rentals that may require business licensure, payment of accommodations/lodging taxes, and dwelling unit inspections to ensure health and safety standards are met?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

67
23
90


Q5 (Do you support preservation of affordable housing (owner-occupied or rental) within the City?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

17
34
51


Q6 (Do you support limitations on the number of days a dwelling unit can be rented for short-term rental revenue collection?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

15
29
44

Q7 (Should such a day limit be established based upon the location of the dwelling used for short-term rental.)




Ward Five Responses

Yes
No
Total Responses

7
36
43


Q1 (Do you presently offer any residence you own or rent as a short-term rental?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

21
22
43


Q2 (Do you support limitations on the location of short-term rentals?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

19
24
43


Q3 (Do you support limitations on the number of short-term rental licenses a property owner or authorized tenant may obtain?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

28
15
43


Q4 (Do you support minimum registration standards for short-term rentals that may require business licensure, payment of accommodations/lodging taxes, and dwelling unit inspections to ensure health and safety standards are met?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

36
7
43


Q5 (Do you support preservation of affordable housing (owner-occupied or rental) within the City?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

12
20
32


Q6 (Do you support limitations on the number of days a dwelling unit can be rented for short-term rental revenue collection?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

8
24
32


Q7 (Should such a day limit be established based upon the location of the dwelling used for short-term rental.)



Ward Six Responses


Yes
No
Total Responses

2
19
21




Yes
No
Total Responses

16
5
21




Yes
No
Total Responses

16
5
21




Yes
No
Total Responses

16
5
21




Yes
No
Total Responses

19
2
21




Yes
No
Total Responses

8
6
14



Yes
No
Total Responses

6
7
13




Did Not Know Ward/Did Not Answer Responses

Yes
No
Total Responses

42
125
167


Q1 (Do you presently offer any residence you own or rent as a short-term rental?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

38
129
167


Q2 (Do you support limitations on the location of short-term rentals?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

40
127
167


Q3 (Do you support limitations on the number of short-term rental licenses a property owner or authorized tenant may obtain?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

76
91
167


Q4 (Do you support minimum registration standards for short-term rentals that may require business licensure, payment of accommodations/lodging taxes, and dwelling unit inspections to ensure health and safety standards are met?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

107
59
166


Q5 (Do you support preservation of affordable housing (owner-occupied or rental) within the City?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

17
96
113


Q6 (Do you support limitations on the number of days a dwelling unit can be rented for short-term rental revenue collection?)



Yes
No
Total Responses


10
90
100

Q7 (Should such a day limit be established based upon the location of the dwelling used for short-term rental.)




STR Owner Responses


Yes
No
Total Responses




Yes
No
Total Responses



Yes
No
Total Responses




Yes
No
Total Responses



Yes
No
Total Responses



Yes
No
Total Responses




STR Non-Owner Responses

Yes
No
Total Responses

147
199
346


Q2 (Do you support limitations on the location of short-term rentals?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

155
191
346


Q3 (Do you support limitations on the number of short-term rental licenses a property owner or authorized tenant may obtain?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

218
127
345


Q4 (Do you support minimum registration standards for short-term rentals that may require business licensure, payment of accommodations/lodging taxes, and dwelling unit inspections to ensure health and safety standards are met?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

265
79
344


Q5 (Do you support preservation of affordable housing (owner-occupied or rental) within the City?)



Yes
No
Total Responses

77
137
214


Q6 (Do you support limitations on the number of days a dwelling unit can be rented for short-term rental revenue collection? If yes, please answer the next question.)



Yes
No
Total Responses

57
135
192

Q7 (Should such a day limit be established based upon the location of the dwelling used for short-term rental.)



Appendix II

BeHeard Public Comments - Summarized

Summary of responses – BeHeard Survey:

Overall Summary

Based on the public input received, the most common opinion of short-term rentals is that they offer benefits to the community such as providing affordable housing, boosting the local economy, and creating job opportunities. However, there is a lack of consensus on how to regulate them. Some support limited regulations, such as conditional licensing systems and fees to fund city oversight, while others oppose stricter regulations on the number of rental days or limiting the number of properties an owner can have. There are also concerns that regulations may negatively impact affordable housing or unfairly punish all STR operators for the actions of a few. Overall, the opinions expressed suggest that STRs can be beneficial but require careful consideration of the regulations that are put in place.

Individual Summaries

1. The author is in favor of some regulations for short-term rentals but strongly disagrees with the P&Z proposed version, which is overly restrictive, and suggests a conditional licensing system with revocation of licenses based on complaints, eliminating the requirements of commercial zoning districts and the ADA, and implementing a fee structure to fund city staff's oversight.
2. The author, as the president of a condo association, is requesting a provision be included in the ordinance for Tier 3 properties that require conditional use approval in M-C zoning after experiencing issues with a non-compliant short-term rental in their building causing disturbances and taking up parking spaces for owner-occupied units.
3. Short-term rentals (STRs) not only offer more job opportunities to the community but also provide affordable accommodation to families who cannot afford hotels and that current operating STRs should be grandfathered in, as the stress of changing something that has been operating for years is unfair and unethical, and that adding rules around the maximum number of days for renting would add more stress to owners.
4. The speaker disagrees with the city of Columbia's plan to change the regulations around short-term rentals (STRs) and believes that current STRs should be grandfathered in, as they are beneficial for local businesses and people staying in town, and that the draft and survey are one-sided and insufficient.
5. The speaker opposes changing STR restrictions as they bring families together, boost the local economy and provide jobs, and disagrees with regulating the number of days they can be listed, and does not support the draft plan.
6. The speaker disagrees with the draft and prefers to stay in STRs when visiting Columbia due to their amenities.
7. The speaker opposes short-term rentals beyond Tier 1 in Columbia's residential neighborhoods, except for large lot sizes where neighbors are not impacted, but understands their use in special events when there is a shortage of affordable hotels.

8. The feedback questions are limited and biased towards a predetermined outcome, and grouping multiple restrictions into one question does not allow for individual support or feedback.
9. The proposed short-term rental regulations are too strict and would harm the community, as STRs allow more people to visit and spend money in the town, and make it more affordable for families to stay; it would be better to regulate STRs at the association level or place a tax on bookings to offset high building permit and development costs.
10. The speaker values staying in short-term rentals in Columbia during their visits and would be less likely to visit and spend money in the area if they were not available.
11. If regulations are put into place regarding short-term rental as a "business operation", will the City Council then also step in and put regulations in place for all other home-based business operations?
12. What is the intention of limitations on number of STR and length of guest stay? The P&Z comment in December 2022 did not provide any validation for the purpose of such restrictions.
13. The speaker questions whether the proposed STR regulations in Columbia will positively impact affordable housing, stating that there are many factors affecting this issue and that STR owners can also contribute to affordable housing, and suggests that overregulation may hinder this.
14. The author questions the P&Z intro statement that "no taxes are being collected" and suggests that the issue of taxes should be addressed in the regulatory standards, with options such as owners collecting and remitting taxes or partnering with Airbnb to collect and remit taxes as other cities in Missouri have done.
15. The speaker strongly supports limitations on short-term rentals regarding the number of people per rental unit, rental days, and the number of properties that can be rented by an individual, and finds the proposed regulations reasonable and not novel.
16. The speaker supports the proposed draft regulations for short-term rentals, as they believe residential neighborhoods should be for residents and that the proliferation of STRs is contributing to the hollowing out of neighborhoods.
17. I don't think a neighborhood with an HOA should have any residence that is rented out as an Airbnb as we pay yearly to keep our neighborhood quiet and safe.
18. The speaker argues that if the number of days they are allowed to rent out their STR decreases while the demand for lodging remains the same, this would create more STRs to meet the demand, resulting in more homes being taken off the LTR market due to inefficient use.
19. The owner of three full-time short-term rentals in Columbia supports some regulations and restrictions, such as registering and inspecting properties, but opposes a one-property-per-owner restriction, suggesting instead that more effective restrictions would

involve booking restrictions such as screening out low-rated guests, capping total guests, and requiring identity verification.

20. A couple who operates three short-term rentals in Columbia, acknowledges that STRs have drawbacks and can make some residents uncomfortable, but believes they provide an important service to the city by offering safe, comfortable, and private housing to visitors and professionals who need short-term accommodations, and opposes any legislation that restricts the number of STRs an owner can have.
21. The speaker believes that affordable housing and short term rentals are two separate issues, and addressing the cost of city permits and construction fees is necessary to create affordable housing; they also believe that short term rentals offer a way for visitors to immerse themselves in the community and increase tax dollars for the city, and that the city government should make it easier and less expensive for home builders to build affordable housing.
22. The author supports having some regulations in place for STR but believes that the problem lies in the rules and management of the specific property, and suggests creating an "action plan" for those who have had issues with STR rather than punishing everyone, and asks for limitations to be put on those who cause the issues, not everyone.
23. The writer opposes the proposed regulation of short-term rentals in Columbia as they believe the current draft is too restrictive and complicated for operators, short-term rentals are not significantly impacting the availability or affordability of long-term rentals and actually increase home values, regulating them will limit tourism and hurt the local economy, and the affordable housing crisis should be addressed by the city through other means.
24. The writer believes that Airbnbs and VRBOs should only be used for second homes or already-owned properties and not for full-time jobs or buying multiple properties, and they should be regulated to prevent them from reducing the number of available housing units for residents, and that hosts should be licensed and meet standards, but they don't agree with the limit on the number of days one can rent.
25. The writer, who operates three Airbnb's in Columbia, opposes the proposed regulation of short-term rentals as it is viewed as elimination rather than regulation, and raises questions about the impact of short-term rentals on affordable housing, the consideration given to owners of STR's, and the economic benefits of guests to Columbia.
26. The speaker supports short-term rentals when it's part of the home the owner lives in, but is against people buying properties just for short-term rentals and wants to tax short-term rentals at a higher rate based on the distance from the owner's home.
27. The statement opposes licensing short-term rentals in multifamily dwellings due to concerns about the safety and security of families living in close proximity.
28. The proposed ordinance for short-term rentals in Columbia, MO should be simplified by establishing them as a legal use, creating a registration system, allowing lodging tax collection, and conducting inspections, with a 24-month evaluation period for any

necessary tweaks or additional regulation, as the current nuisance ordinances can be used to address any problems, and short-term rentals fill a void in transient guest housing that hotels/motels do not, with most of them being maintained in better condition than long-term rentals and owner-occupied homes.

Appendix III

Planning Email Public Comments - Summarized

Summary of all responses – Public Correspondence:

Overall Summary

The most common opinion expressed in the emails received is that short-term rentals should be regulated, but the proposed regulations should be reasonable and not infringe on property owner rights. Many authors express concern that the proposed regulations are excessive, unnecessarily complicated, and may impact their constitutional rights. They advocate for regulations that treat short-term rentals the same as long-term rentals and do not place undue financial or administrative burdens on property owners or city staff. Some authors also argue that short-term rentals are important for the local economy by providing additional accommodations for visitors. However, there are some differences in opinions on specific aspects of regulations, such as the use of 30 and 120 days to determine the amount of "business" being handled by the property or the need for surcharges on short-term rental conversions.

Individual Summaries

1. The author argues against limiting private party property rights, particularly in the case of Airbnb rentals, and suggests enforcing existing laws instead of eliminating the entire industry, while advocating for reducing regulations for builders to address affordable housing.
2. The author disagrees with the proposed 3-tier regulations for short-term rentals, advocates for the right to operate openly with inspections and taxes, and agrees to shutdowns in response to justified complaints.
3. The author is against proposed short-term rental regulations in Columbia except for the requirement for all involved in the activity to pay the same taxes as hotels or motels, and believes that registration with the city is reasonable for tax collection purposes and enforcement of laws related to loud parties or parking abuse.
4. The author expresses concern that short-term rental conversions by investors decrease the available affordable housing stock for owner-occupied homes in accessible and centrally located neighborhoods, and suggests changes to the UDC that reflect a commitment to owner-occupied homes and affordability and the creation of an ordinance that places a surcharge on short-term rental conversions to benefit building, support, and maintenance of affordable homes and neighborhoods.
5. The writer expresses concerns about short-term rental regulations, stating that while the City has a safety obligation, it does not need to over-regulate and prevent residents from using their assets to generate income and stimulate the local economy, suggesting that existing laws and ordinances can cover many items in the draft regulations.
6. The letter expresses support for the regulation of Short Term Rentals (STR) in Columbia, but expresses concern that previous efforts have been overly complicated and impinged on property owner rights, and urges the Planning and Zoning Commission to develop a simple and easy-to-implement ordinance that treats STR the same as long-term rentals and does not place undue financial or administrative burden on property owners or city staff.
7. The author of the statement has lived in Columbia for 45 years and supports sensible regulation of short-term rentals (STR) to create a better tax collection framework. However, they feel that the proposed new ordinance overreaches and infringes on their constitutional rights as a property owner. They believe that there is a high demand in the

city for comfortable, homey, clean, and safe accommodations, and that the proposed ordinance's limitations are unnecessary. The author has had only positive experiences with their guests and has taken measures to ensure their rental property is respectful of neighbors and follows clear rules and guidelines. They believe that the proposed ordinance is not based on solid evidence and should be reconsidered.

8. I support short-term rentals such as Airbnbs and VRBOs. We love using these when we travel and support the option in Columbia.
9. The author disagrees with the use of 30 and 120 days to determine the amount of "business" being handled by the property, as they do not allow reservations beyond 30 days and most guests stay for only a few nights. The author explains that their guests come for various reasons, including events at local universities and clubs, and that they have never had a negative encounter with a guest. The author also mentions that during the pandemic, there was a peak in interest in short-term rentals as guests trusted the cleaning provisions and adherence to CDC guidelines. The author supports regulations and licensure for short-term rentals but disagrees with the proposed regulations and would like to offer more input and debate. They invite any city official to come and see their business first-hand.
10. The speaker expresses support for the preservation of low-income housing but suggests that lowering taxes would be an easy and effective way to help low-income families in the community. They criticize the high tax rates in COMO and argue that the city should reevaluate its spending and become more efficient with funds. The speaker believes that the proposed restrictions on short-term rentals feel like a money grab and limit what property owners can do with their property. They argue that short-term rentals, such as those offered through Airbnb and VRBO, are often in desirable locations and support licensing but not the proposed restrictions on where they can be located.
11. The speaker is critical of proposed regulations for short-term rentals in Columbia, suggesting that a cost-to-benefit study was not done and the regulations seem to have been "borrowed" from another city without consideration for Columbia's unique demographics and urban geography. They argue that implementing these regulations would require significant resources and potentially create long-term cost liabilities. The speaker also notes that short-term rentals have been an important force in urban renewal in Columbia, providing jobs and improving the condition of blighted properties. They express confusion and concern about the motivation for these regulations.
12. The authors own a 100-year-old 5-unit apartment building in Columbia, Missouri that they renovated and now operate as a small business offering Airbnb rentals. They also have other properties that they offer on Airbnb. Their guests are typically visiting for work or to visit family, but they have also hosted guests from all over the world. They claim their guests are quiet and respectful and have had no issues with parking or noise complaints. They believe that their business has a positive impact on the local economy as guests spend money in local restaurants and shops. They also argue that the proposed regulations could put them and other STR operators out of business and raise rents for long-term tenants. They are not opposed to regulation, but they hope the City Council will work with them to find a more balanced approach. They are willing to meet with Council members and provide tours of their properties.
13. The speaker was invited by their HOA to take a survey regarding short-term property rentals in Columbia and was happy to do so. They believe that it is not the local government's responsibility to regulate short-term property rentals and that the city's property code is sufficient on a case-by-case basis. They suggest improving what is currently in the city's basket of services and eliminating the infringement of privacy of the

citizenry. The speaker believes that government regulations will disrupt the market and greatly limit the potential of property owners to generate income from their properties. They encourage dropping this issue immediately and focusing on reducing needless government interference in the local housing market to encourage growth of the community's safe housing.

14. The writer is addressing a letter to a council regarding the proposed amendments of the Unified Development Code (UDC) that regulate Short Term Rentals (STR) within the City of Columbia. Although the city staff has developed a presentation for the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) that deals directly with the issue of regulating STR in the city, the writer believes that there are some tragic omissions of key information which they hope will impact the council's decision to approve the draft regulations. The writer is concerned that the proposed ordinance will eliminate the vast majority of STR in the city, as well as criminalize a reasonable use of private property. The writer uses the City's data contained in the report to argue their points, stating that only 0.7% of the total housing supply in Columbia is STR, and only 373 homes have been reported as STR by AirDNA. The proposed licensing criteria will prohibit 26% of the current owners who own and operate more than 1 STR, and 74.6% of the STR are not principal residences, which would only be allowed to operate in M-OF, M-N, M-C, and M-DT zoned areas, but unfortunately, only 8% of the STR in the city fall within those zoned areas. From a business standpoint, the potential financial gains are becoming not worth the hassle, and the City is against commercializing residential zones, but only 3 operators have greater than 10 STR under their management. The writer further argues that the effect of STR on housing cost in communities is small, citing a research study, and suggests that taking away a viable income stream for the city's seniors is not desirable.
15. The writer suggests that the City of Columbia should prioritize the establishment of regulations for short term rentals in residential areas (Tier 1 and Tier 2) before addressing short term rentals in commercial properties (Tier 3), which do not seem to be causing controversy. They believe that rules for commercial short term rentals should be discussed separately from residential regulations, as the latter are necessary to protect homeowners and neighborhoods from potential problems, while the former is more focused on collecting taxes and leveling the playing field with hotels.
16. The writer has a rental home in Columbia and enjoys working with short-term rental families. However, the writer is aware that short-term rentals can sometimes be used for parties. The writer is concerned that restrictions on short-term rentals may affect traveling nurses. The writer also wants to ensure their neighborhood remains healthy and safe to maintain property values.
17. The speaker agrees that there should be regulations for short term rentals but is concerned that the extreme measures proposed by P and Z would prevent all existing properties from continuing to operate, and that most properties are owned by entities that provide lower quality rentals and customer service.
18. The author opposes the proposed regulation of short-term rentals in Columbia, arguing that it is too restrictive and complicated, and that short-term rentals are not significantly impacting the availability or affordability of long-term rentals. Additionally, the author contends that short-term rentals benefit the local housing market and the overall value of the community, and that regulating them will ultimately hurt the local economy.
19. The author, who manages short-term rentals in Columbia, opposes the proposed regulations, citing that they are too restrictive and will negatively impact their business, which provides high-quality service and accommodations, employs locals, and generates tax revenue. The author also argues that short-term rentals do not

significantly impact the availability or affordability of long-term rentals and actually increase home values by improving property standards. Finally, the author urges the city to reconsider the proposed ordinance and work with the short-term rental community to find a solution that benefits everyone.

20. The author disagrees with a requirement in the survey that asks for a yearly list of rental platform locations as it seems like an overreach and unmanageable. They suggest changing the wording of the survey to allow for continuous listings throughout the year with limitations on how many times it can be rented instead of having a set number of days to rent out the property.
21. The statement expresses support for the P&Z Recommendation on short-term rentals, with emphasis on specific points. The first point stresses that short-term rentals in R-1 residential neighborhoods must be owner-occupied to maintain the family character and stability of the neighborhood. The second point highlights the potential negative impact of absentee-owned short-term rentals on neighborhood stability and property values. The third point suggests that the economic contribution of a family occupying a property year-round is greater than that of a short-term rental. The statement also raises several questions that were not addressed in the Airbnb report, including who will be responsible for enforcing regulations and handling contracts and fees, and who neighbors should contact in case of problems with adjacent short-term rentals. Finally, the statement calls for adequate off-street parking for short-term rental vehicles to avoid traffic issues in the neighborhood.
22. The author states that they do not support the proposed ordinance in its present form, but they are not opposed to a short-term rental scheme in the City of Columbia. They have concerns about the framework, style, and approach to regulation of this type, intertwined into existing property use, and where administrative processes are not implemented. The author believes that any STR regulation should be subjected to no less scrutiny as to safety and personal protection than existing rental property regulations. They also have concerns about the proposed framework, which shifts enforcement efforts predominately to residents for administrative matters. The author argues that the proposed ordinance should be revised to provide a framework with relief to other property owners should there be STR license violations and if the STR ordinance outcomes prove to be unduly burdensome to property owners.

Appendix IV

Full BeHeard Public Comments

Woodypond posted at 20 Feb 2023, 10:20 PM

Hello, and thanks for the opportunity to provide input on the short-term rental issue.

While I am in favor of some sort of regulations of short term rentals, I strongly feel the P&Z proposed version is much too restrictive and is massive overkill.

The truth is that short term rentals are in great demand. They are a great asset to the City by providing a pleasant place for visitors to stay and enjoy our city. And they provide our citizens the ability to get some much needed extra income. It's also true that the vast majority of them do not cause disruptions to neighbors or neighborhoods, and that most neighbors are not bothered by them. Of course there needs to be a mechanism in place to control the rentals that are a problem, but the present proposal goes far beyond that and puts huge restrictions on or eliminates even the ones that might not be causing any problems at all.

In particular, classifying rentals as a commercial enterprise is a huge leap. There are thousands of homes and apartments in our city that are owned as purely commercial endeavors, that are not considered 'commercial', don't have to be ADA compliant, don't have to be in commercial zoning districts, and have only reasonable health and safety inspections. The Tier 3 concept is a massive over-reach in my opinion.

In conversations I had with a member of P&Z I learned that their concern was essentially the stereotypical loud party house rental that causes disruption to neighbors and changes the character of the neighborhood. I was told that the decision was made to make the regulations as restrictive as possible, and that exceptions could then be made through the variance process. This is a terrible way to make law! It's throwing out the baby with the bath water! Allow people the liberal use of their property, so long as no harm is being done. Only when harm is being done should there be restrictions placed on them - individually. Not vice versa, as the current proposal does.

The argument that short term rentals reduce the amount of affordable housing might have some merit - in some cases. However, there are also numerous cases where short term rental income is the only way people are able to afford to buy the house they live in. There is also a short-term rental cleaning industry that employs numerous people in our city, and gives them the income needed for housing. And, there are numerous houses that are short-term rentals that are frankly luxurious, and would never be part of the affordable housing pool at all - yet the current proposal would eliminate them.

My suggestion is to allow short term rentals based on conditional licensing of each property. If there are complaints from neighbors, the license could be revoked after a reasonable process of warnings, etc. Eliminate the requirements regarding them being located in commercial zoning districts and the ADA requirement - they are completely residential in nature. And, yes, come up with a fee structure where the short term rentals would pay a licensing fee and revenue-based fee similar to a City sales tax, which would fund the required oversight by city staff.

NeonDeone posted at 25 Feb 2023, 09:07 AM

As a president of a condo association. You have not solved an issue with this ordinance. We have property that by your definition is Tier 3. It is in M-C zoning and we (Condo management company has contacted Neighborhood Services numerous times regarding this unit) have numerous violations. Owner (non-occupant) rents unit for weekends mostly lists property as a 30-day rental on portals. All units around property are owner occupied. They are disturbed regularly for toiletries, etc. Parking is taken up by guests. Unit is not in compliance with current rental standards but when we ask we are told there are not any complaints with the city when we know in fact we have made them. This unit would be allowed to exist even though it runs against our C&Rs.

Please put a provision in for tier 3 that would require conditional use approval in M-C.

Morganl89 posted at 27 Feb 2023, 09:34 AM

One side that the city of a columbia failed to think about is how STR's also provide more job opportunities for the community. Operating a STR also comes with additional work for lawn care companies, local handyman businesses, cleaning companies, etc. Properties are better looked after than long term rentals as they need to be attractive to guests. The neighbors of our property praised us for making the house more attractive than previous renters. They also have never had any issues. One neighbor in particular loves having people stay as he a is lonely veteran at home and regularly interacts with guests. I think the fact the city of columbia is now making changes to something that has been operating for years is ridiculous. Some families coming in town can't afford to stay at hotels and need a house that can accommodate more guest and provide a kitchen so they can cook their own food. At the least I think current operating STR's should be grandfathered in. The stress of just changing something is no fair on owners and unethical. Also, I do not think there should be rules around maximum number of days etc, because that doesn't really make sense and would add more stress to owners about what to do with the property for additional days.

Mharri63 posted at 27 Feb 2023, 09:48 AM

I do not agree with just dramatically changing something that has been operating for years. Either grandfather the old ones in or change the entire draft.

STR's have been a great options for people staying in town for work, local entertainment or a family event. People staying in town at a STR are supporting local businesses.

I do not agree with just capping the amount of days, I'm not sure what that would actually benefit. Also, STR helps local businesses by providing jobs via lawn care, cleaners etc.

The draft is very one sided as well as the previous survey. I feel this is a tick a box consultation and something the City of Columbia are doing just to make it look like they're actually doing something.

Lilyjean22 posted at 27 Feb 2023, 01:27 PM

STR restrictions should not be changed . They allow family's to come together, come to the community which boosts the local economy. Also, provides more jobs within the community. Also, not sure why they would think regulating the amount of days it can be listed as a STR would matter. I do not support the draft plan.

Milla58 posted at 27 Feb 2023, 04:40 PM

I do not agree with the draft. When I visit Columbia I always stay at a STR. The ability to have a kitchen and large comfortable house is amazing.

Dave posted at 27 Feb 2023, 01:57 PM

I don't want to see anything beyond Tier 1 in Columbia in residential neighborhoods. The exception might be for lot sizes of about 5 acres or more where neighbors are not adversely impacted so much. I really don't want any of these short term rentals in my neighborhood or Columbia but I understand that it may help with times when there is a shortage of affordable hotels etc for special events. Thank you.

Mspence1290 posted at 27 Feb 2023, 02:24 PM

These survey questions are poorly written to address this issue and get useful feedback.

I believe that some sort of limitation should be made on the number of licenses allowed in the city and it should be based on a percentage of homes in the city.

There should be licensing requirements and taxing requirements as well.

I am ok with limiting the number of units that one owner can operate but it should be a reasonable number of 5 or fewer. Not just one. I currently have 4 and have interest in adding more. One is currently rented furnished to a family for three months while their home is repaired from a fire. One of the others will be rented to my daughter in August. The flexibility of being able to rent them short term is necessary in order to have a property available for families that need a furnished stay less than a year or 6 months. It's the second year in a row we have rented to a family in that situation for several months. Without the STR flexibility I would have to rent it as a LTR and that family ends up in a hotel or apartment for months that does not fit their needs.

You should not make rules that blanket all zoning areas the same. For example, Seven oaks a R1 subdivision is majority non owner occupied and near the campus. The rules governing STR in that area should be different than an area that is majority owner occupied.

There are also HOA's that are able to make rules for themselves. There is no need for the city to make rules where the residents themselves have the ability to handle the issue on a micro level.

I also question whether there is any actual evidence that STR has a meaningful affect on affordable housing. These are a small percentage of homes that are not always operated as STR. It would be smart to get some analysis done on this before proclaiming that.

I have STR's that I use when I'm in town to see my daughters who attend MU. They have lived in my houses full time for several years. I also allow underprivileged kids to stay in them for free to visit campus.

By taking away my ability to use my properties as I want by requiring they all be rented out to long term renters you will limit the amount of time I will spend in Columbia. I will need to cancel my Columbia Country Club national membership because I will not be visiting enough. The rental time limit for second homes does not make financial sense if I am limited to 120 days of availability.

I also question if you will actually solve any problems with the regulations as drafted. It will eliminate a 2nd job for my cleaners who use that money to support their kids traveling hockey. She is a Columbia resident who will be severely affected financially. She is one of many who use cleaning as a second income.

Also, existing properties should be grandfathered. We bought the properties with the right to rent them out as we saw fit. That right should not be removed from current STR owners. The number of STR properties will fall over time as properties change hands and this will not adversely affect current owners.

Graystone9 posted at 27 Feb 07:53 PM

Absolutely opposed to any regulation of STRs

Paul.salierno1 posted at 28 Feb 2023, 07:58 PM

I was told that there is a requirement to register short term rental. I have searched the City of Columbia Missouri web site and I have not been able to find anything that states how or where to register short-term rental.

Paul.salierno1 posted at 03 Mar 2023, 11:40 AM

SRNdive posted at 28 Feb 2023, 02:24 PM

All of the questions are yes or no with no opportunity to give actual feedback.

The questions are still very slanted to point to a desired outcome.

Also grouping multiple restrictions such as licensure, rental compliance, etc into the same question does not give a person an opportunity to give support to some of those without giving support to all of those.

Zgirard posted at 01 Mar 2023, 06:25 AM

The proposed short term rental regulations are far too strict for our community. I believe that the proposed regulation would do far more harm to our community than good.

Short Term Rentals allow more people to visit and spend money in our town. The annual Columbia calendar is full of amazing events and activities that bring people in from all over the county. On our busy weekends there are not enough hotel beds to support the amount of people wanting to visit our town. Short term rentals provide additional capacity for more visitors to attend and spend money at these events.

Short Term rental properties also make it more affordable for families to visit the area. If this regulation is passed it will make it significantly more expensive for a family to visit Columbia. Currently a family can rent a 4 bedroom short term rental for around \$250 per night. If this regulation is passed it will effectively eliminate short term rentals in Columbia and families will then have to book multiple hotel rooms to visit. The cost for the same family to stay in a hotel instead of a short term rental is easily double if not triple because that family then has to book multiple hotel rooms. So instead of having extra funds to spend on our local small businesses these families now have to spend that on hotel rooms which are largely owned by large corporations located outside of our town.

There is already a mechanism in place for residents to regulate short term rentals in their community via Homeowners Associations. This issue should be regulated at the association level. This allows each neighborhood to make a decision that best fits the desires of those residents.

If planning and zoning is concerned about affordable housing then I believe that the community would be far better served by the city placing a tax on short term rental bookings. This tax could be used to help offset extremely high building permit & development costs which could have a far greater impact on housing affordability than regulating an industry in a way that will result in less visitors spending money in our local businesses.

Annah H posted at 02 Mar 2023, 04:21 PM

As a former resident of Columbia who comes back to visit several times a year, I highly value staying in short-term rentals in the city; particularly in areas that I am familiar with and used to reside in. I would be less likely to visit Columbia (and therefore, less likely to spend money at area businesses) if these were not available to me.

Elizabeth.Ball posted at 07 Mar 2023, 07:59 AM

If regulations are put into place regarding short-term rental as a "business operation", will the City Council then also step in and put regulations in place for all other home-based business operations?

Elizabeth.Ball posted at 07 Mar 2023, 08:04 AM

What is the intention of limitations on number of STR and length of guest stay? The P&Z comment in December 2022 did not provide any validation for the purpose of such restrictions.

Elizabeth.Ball posted at 07 Mar 2023, 08:38 AM

Is there more information about how STR in Columbia are specifically impacting long-term rental and affordable housing? There are many factors that have impacted affordable housing (material and labor inflation, increase in property taxes, Covid-19, city regulations on new construction and building permits). To say that this is the fix is naive. While I currently have two properties where we accept CHA voucher, at the end of lease term we will no longer work with CHA due to issues with the program and tenants. All properties that I own in the described "areas of concentrated poverty" would not have been leasable at the time of purchase, nor would they have been able to be purchased under any of the regulations or minimum standards for government loans or city programs due to the deteriorated condition of the property. Therefore, I strongly disagree that regulations on STR will make positive changes to affordable housing. And I believe it is imperative that you consider that many STR owners are, in addition to renting a property on ST platform, attempting to also help with affordable housing. In 2022 we added 3 renovated properties into a long-term rental portfolio in Ward 1, all of which meet the CHA affordability standards. In addition, we sold 1 property which met HUD affordability standards and sold a vacant lot (after demolishing a condemned property, which had been a problem house for Neighborhood Services). Lastly, my SRT is not the "cash cow" everyone thinks, but it did allow my rental business to continue to operate in the black while low-income tenants awaited SAFHR approval, or all together did not pay the portion of their rent not covered by CHA, which meant I held off evictions. I understand I am one scenario, but I believe there are other operators doing good for the community, while also operating STRs, and pushing forward with "over" regulating will mean that changes.

Elizabeth.Ball posted at 07 Mar 2023, 09:03 AM

The P&Z intro states ""No taxes are being collected"", though this is not actually ever addressed in the regulatory standards, it is an important aspect of this discussion. I am most familiar with Airbnb, which is the primary platform used by STR owners in Columbia and taxes are collected and remitted to specific sources in MO. This can be resolved by having owners collect and remit taxes as part of the regulation (though that's less likely) OR by partnering with Airbnb platform to collect and remit taxes as St. Louis, St. Charles County, Jefferson City, Independence and Hannibal have done.

Missouri Tax Information: <https://www.airbnb.com/help/article/2312>

burnsr posted at 14 Mar 2023, 10:38 PM

I strongly support limitations on 1) the number of people per rental unit, 2) the number of days the unit can be rented, and 3) the number of properties that can be operated or rented by one individual. The regulatory standards as written are reasonable and provide protection for the existing neighborhoods. These proposed rules are not novel, as many cities across the country are enacting tighter restrictions, not more permissive.

Cory posted at 14 Mar 2023, 03:52 PM

I am in favor of the proposed draft. Residential neighborhoods should be for residents. Here in Benton-Stephens, we already have a whole block of no-resident daycares, and STRs are further hollowing out other parts of the neighborhood. I think we can see at least five owner-absent Airbnbs from our front yard.

Lotta folks want to live in this neighborhood and they can't because of non-residential commercial use. Hope more Columbians can start living here again. Thanks!

Simmons83 posted at 14 Mar 2023, 08:52 PM

I don't think a neighborhood with an HOA should have any residence that is rented out as an Air B&B as we pay yearly to keep our neighborhood quiet and safe.

Jesncar posted at 15 Mar 2023, 11:20 AM

If the demand for lodging does not increase, but the number of days we're allowed to rent out our STR does decrease, wouldn't this create MORE STR in order to meet the demand? In other words, it would take more houses to meet the demand, therefore taking even more homes off the LTR market due to inefficient use.

Kaffie20 posted at 15 Mar 2023, 03:10 PM

As a current short-term rental owner & operator in Columbia, I am in support of placing some regulations & restrictions on short term rentals- namely the requirement to register and have routine inspections performed. I am; however, opposed to placing a restriction of ownership to one short-term property per owner. That is an intensely restrictive ordinance to follow an un-restricted era and doesn't seem to address the primary concerns most residents have regarding STRs. My husband and I have owned and operated 3, full-time STRs for the past 5 years and have maintained the most well-kept properties on the streets where they are located. We have also had excellent relationships with the neighbors, some of which are tenants & some of which are property owners. In my mind, more effective restrictions would look like ensuring that property owners have booking restrictions in place to screen out guests with low ratings & reviews, to not allow parties & events, cap their booking capacity for total # of guests, to not rent to individuals under the age of 21 and to require that all guests have identity verification performed on their profile. We have seen a tremendous increase in the quality of bookings we've had as we've placed more restrictions on our booking requirements on AirBnb.

Mdk989 posted at 17 Mar 2023, 09:18 AM

My wife and I opened our first short term rental in Columbia almost 7 years ago. We now operate 3 STRs (no plans to add any more) in Columbia and we take a lot of pride in offering exceptional quality and service in those rentals. We treat them as a business and in fact the income we make from those 3 properties has allowed my wife to be a stay at home mother while we raise our two daughters (currently aged 1 and 4).

We love Columbia, and we care deeply about the well being of its residents. We recognize that the STR business across the country and in Columbia has contributed, at least in some way, to rising home prices. We also recognize that having strangers coming in and out of a home in your own neighborhood can be uncomfortable for some people.

Short term rentals certainly have some drawbacks, particularly for the home owners who live near them. However, this is also true of long term rentals. I'd like to think that most reasonable people can acknowledge that while long term rentals have their problems, they ultimately provide a very important service to the people of Columbia. That's not to say that we can't improve the quality and fairness of that service, but providing safe, affordable housing to people in Columbia is incredibly important.

I believe equally that short term rentals provide an important service to the people of our city. Here are some of the things we are proud to have provided Columbia citizens with during our time as short term rental owners:

- Countless parents of university students have stayed with us, offered their children home cooked meals and a place to get back together
- Offered comfortable housing for traveling doctors and nurses that need short term housing to work at the university hospital or Boone hospital.
- Hosted numerous professionals interviewing for jobs in Columbia, and giving them a quiet and private area to prepare for those interviews
- Given longer term housing (2 weeks to 2 months) for those isolating to obey Covid protocols, camping out to support loved ones who have long term stays in local hospitals, and even people who are bridging the gap between selling a home elsewhere and moving into a new home in Columbia.

Technically, all these people could be housed in hotels. But a great many of our guests have expressed how grateful they are to have a beautiful, safe, private and quiet home to stay in while they visit or do business in Columbia.

Yes, STRs are not perfect. They affect Columbia residents, sometimes in negative ways. And some STR owners don't run their rentals as professionally and with as much pride and care as my wife and I do. But it's hard to deny that we are offering a service that provides incredible value to the city and people of Columbia. My wife and I sincerely hope that we can continue to run our STR business in the same way we have been for the last 7 years. And we support any legislation that improves the safety and quality of our business without punishing faithful business owners who are hard working citizens of Columbia, like us.

ddaly posted at 17 Mar 2023, 10:30 AM

I am not sure why the Affordable Housing Agenda must accompany this survey in the way it has been asked. They are two separate issues. Unless we address the cost of city permits and construction fees, it will be nearly impossible to create affordable housing. The STR's will not be the reason affordable housing is not available. For a healthy economy for our city, we must acknowledge the fact that we have many reasons for people to come and visit our beautiful community and are looking for a comfortable place to stay outside of the hotel options. The STR's also offer a way for visitors to immerse themselves into our community to increase commerce and the tax dollars for the city. Affordable housing is something our city government could help if they could make it easier and less expensive for home builders to build affordable housing. The city government somehow continues to find the funds for homeless camps and shelters but can't lower the cost of permits to allow for more affordable housing to be built. Seems you could solve your own agenda if it was truly about affordable housing and not the agenda of capitalizing even on the poor of our community.

Melindalucas posted at 17 Mar 2023, 11:14 AM

I have also submitted a survey.

I am not opposed to having some regulations put in place for str. I see the issue they can cause. We have used our own house as an Airbnb and also own another house, that is inside a residential area as an Airbnb. We have only had 5 star reviews and have never had a complaint or problem from the neighborhood or our hoa. Our Airbnb has been a great resource for the neighborhood . For example- grandparents were coming into town for a week long stay. Rather than everyone in one house or in a hotel the grandparents found our house, which was in the same neighborhood as their grandchildren.

The problem with str often lie in the rules/ regulations and personal management of the specific property

1. We screen our guests close before accepting anyone to book.
 2. Send rules for them to accept
 3. Communicate regularly to they know we are involved and will follow thru.
- We own and manage our spaces.
We believe our standards are what makes it successful.

With this being said- str can be run without issue.

I believe flipping the plan would be more appropriate.

Allow those of us who don't have issue to continue, while creating an "action plan" for those who have had issue. Much like a work place, we don't punish everyone for those who aren't performing well.

I'm not sure what this would look like and would be happy to sit on a planning committee to look at this further.

1. Written warning with issue
2. X time frame for property to submit action plan / appeal complaint with evidence
3. Second warning- meeting with board to discuss issues and address
4. Termination of str

Str is a huge part of our income and would put us in a financially unstable place if this is limited. We ask that limitations be put on those who cause the issues not everyone.

Thanks!

Melinda Motter-Lucas

Jesssimp posted at 17 Mar 2023, 12:49 PM

Subject: Opposing the Proposed Regulation of Short-Term Rentals in Columbia

Dear Planning and Zoning Commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed regulation of short-term rentals in Columbia. While I understand the need for sensible regulations to ensure the safety and wellbeing of our community, I believe that the current draft of the proposed ordinance is far too restrictive and complicated for STR operators to understand.

Furthermore, I would like to address the misconception that short-term rentals are disrupting the housing market and impacting affordable housing. In fact, studies have shown that short-term rentals make up only a small percentage of the overall housing market and are not significantly impacting the availability or affordability of long-term rentals.

On the contrary, short-term rentals actually increase home values because operators take good care of these properties by adding landscaping, updating, and maintaining them to a high standard. This benefits the local housing market and the overall value of our community.

It is not fair to penalize responsible property owners who have invested time and money into maintaining their properties and contributing to our local economy. It is also not the responsibility of short-term rental operators to solve the affordable housing crisis, which should be addressed by the city through other means.

Regulating short-term rentals will only hurt our community by limiting tourism, reducing revenue for small business owners, and ultimately hurting our local economy. I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance and work with the short-term rental community to find a solution that benefits everyone.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sara.Simmons posted at 18 Mar 2023, 11:12 AM

Please do your part to keep Airbnbs and VRBOs as what they were meant to be—people renting out their second homes or other already-owned properties for people needing lodging. They should NOT be a full time job for anyone, and hosts should not be buying a bunch of property just to make it into short-term rentals. Our landlords are already predatory enough and should not be allowed to do this for a quick buck. This city NEEDS whatever rent control it can get, considering the volume of college students and low-income people it needs to house. The more apartments and houses are turned into Airbnbs, the fewer housing units residents have to choose from and the higher rent becomes. I think Airbnb/VRBO are fun ideas and great options for this type of rental, but I also think they're in need of serious regulation. I support requiring hosts to be licensed and meet standards, and I definitely think there should be a limit on how many Airbnbs/VRBOs a person/entity can run. I do not really see a point for the limit on days one can rent: short-term rentals are usually just that, and some renters go on long trips or use them as temporary living quarters. (I would not want to take away that option considering cost of living is rising and it can be ridiculously hard to get approved for an apartment here, I would rather someone rent an Airbnb for an annoyingly long time than end up on the street).

Mccollum posted at 18 Mar 2023, 03:12 PM

Hello, my wife and I operate 3 Airbnb's in Columbia. We are not opposed to regulation but that is not what this is. It is elimination. All of our properties have a current certificate of compliance. I have many questions. Did P&Z take any time to get to know the owners of str's, we are not commercial investors, we are small business operators. Was there consideration for the guest that we host and their economic impact on Columbia. What did you glean from the data that shows that we are having an impact on affordable housing and how shutting us down will help with affordable housing. I think there is a misunderstanding of who we are and who are guest are. There is also a hotel problem in Columbia, you have expensive or places that you would not want to stay. We are providing safe affordable accommodations to travelers and families looking for and alternative to hotels. STR's are positive for the city. I hope this gets reconsidered.

Thanks for your time.

Patrick McCollum

Jonathan posted at 20 Mar 2023, 10:14 AM

I'm all for short term rentals when it's people renting out part of the home they actually live in.

I'm not crazy about people buying properties throughout town to turn into short term rentals.

I'm absolutely against companies, hedge funds, or out-of-state billionaires buying up houses and extracting rent from our community in the form of short term rentals.

Let's tax short-term rentals at a higher rate for each mile away that the property owner lives.

Meggie posted at 24 Mar 2023, 04:05 PM

I don't feel that a short term rental should not be licensed for any multifamily dwelling. The families that live in close proximity to each other should not be placed in fear of having unfamiliar persons moving in and out on a weekly basis.

TomT posted at 24 Mar 2023, 04:06 PM

Let's start with a Simple Ordinance and develop our own data about how they work in Columbia, MO:

- 1) Establish STR's as a legal use in the UDC
- 2) Create a Registration of STR's so that the City can track - with a nominal registration/processing fee
 - a) require a local agent with a Boone County, MO address
- 3) Allow Lodging Tax to be collected on STR's to create parity with hotels/motels
- 4) Have inspections similar to current long term rentals

Evaluate ordinance in 24 months to identify any tweaks or additional regulation that may be necessary.

* The breadth of the current ordinance proposal is a solution to a problem that we do not have. The current nuisance ordinances in the City regarding noise, parking, nuisance parties, etc. can, and should be used to address any problem properties that may come up.

* STR's fill an important void in transient guest housing that hotels/motels are not currently filling.

* The # of STR's in our community (based on best available data) has remained relatively consistent pre-pandemic to the current time. The market place will determine how many STR's are viable in our market.

* The majority of STR's are maintained in much better condition than long term rentals and most owner-occupied homes.

Appendix V

Full Planning Email Public Comments

December 21, 2022

City Council Members & Mayor
701 E Broadway, P.O. Box 6015
Columbia, Missouri, 65205

Dear Council Members and Mayor Buffalo:

We are long-term residents of Columbia's Fourth Ward and have our principal residence and secondary residence on several acres of land where we live and operate two short-term rentals. We are writing to accomplish five goals:

1. Explain how we are using STRS to preserve our historic home as an alternative to commercial development.
2. Describe how we struggled to do this given the uncertainties of evolving regulations.
3. Show how "high-value" STRs like ours meet a critical community need for short-term housing suitable for high-end guests, do not compete with affordable housing, and improve neighborhood property values.
4. Identify two key proposed regulations which threaten our continued success.
5. Invite any of you to visit our property so that we can show you a concrete example of how STRs can provide value to both the community and neighborhood.

1. Historic preservation as an alternative to commercial development

In 1981 Dr. Brent purchased nearly four acres of land including the historic Troxell Home (the original farm house on an 80-acre farm, part of which was built before 1830, and recognized by the City of Columbia as a Notable Historic Property in 2021). Dr. Brent lived here since 1981 and raised his children here. After his divorce in 1999, Brent and Rai married in 2013. We lived here until 2015 when we had to move to another home in Smithton Ridge because it had a bedroom on the first floor where we could care for Brent's ailing mother. For almost four years the Troxell Home was vacant.

The Troxell Home is a grand red brick home with white columns and abundant land. But, like all historic homes, it sorely needed updating and maintenance, particularly after being unoccupied for a few years. The upkeep and expenses are significant and ongoing. The forested land was overgrown with dense brush long before Brent purchased it, and, while vacant, it attracted break-ins and vandals. Clearly, we needed to act if we were to preserve this historic home.

A long-term rental did not appear viable because the needed repairs and updates, and the high expenses of the large house and land were beyond most renters. So, we tried unsuccessfully to sell it. When it did not sell as a residence, we reluctantly considered offers that proposed a variety of high density residential or commercial uses. Understandably, some neighbors were very much against it. We too wanted to find a viable way to keep it residential and preserve the historical Troxell Home. Short term rentals were becoming common at that time and appeared to offer a way to make it economically viable to renovate the historic Troxell Home to meet our needs while contributing value to both our neighborhood and community.

2. The costs of regulatory uncertainty

But in 2019 STR regulations were not yet in place. We carefully followed the several years of extensive meetings by P&Z and Council regarding short-term rentals before the pandemic put the process on hold. But final regulations were not approved and COVID shut down deliberations in 2020. We had to act to save our deteriorating and vacant property, even though regulations were not yet finalized. So, we invested much of Brent's retirement funds to hire designers and builders to renovate the Troxell Home extensively and began offering it as an STR in 2019 while we still lived in Smithton Ridge. At that time, draft STR regulations proposed to permit STRs in R-1 neighborhoods if the owner

Short-term Rental Survey UPDATE

Bill Cantin <Bill.Cantin@como.gov>
To: Paul Bunch <paulsbunch@gmail.com>
Bcc: patrick.zenner@como.gov

Mon, Feb 27, 2023 at 9:25 AM

Hi Paul--thanks for email. Your comments have been recorded to our survey results.

Bill Cantin, Neighborhood Communications Coordinator
Pronouns: he, him, his
City of Columbia - Community Development Department
[701 E. Broadway](#)
[Columbia, MO 65201](#)
573.874.7248
Bill.Cantin@CoMo.gov

On Mon, Feb 27, 2023 at 9:21 AM Paul Bunch <paulsbunch@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Bill

The city should not do anything that onerously takes away a private party property rights. This would include such things as making a person get a variance to a zoning law, as this would cost, or could cost quite a bit. I can't agree with limiting 2 airbnbs just because they are close together.

If the city wants to tackle issues such as noisy parties, then just enforce the laws that are in place. I am sure the airbnb owners would police this themselves if this is enforced. But trying to eliminate an entire industry just for a small single issue is not needed.

People have bought property in the past several years just to do this industry, and it provides a service to several people. To eliminate their ability to make their money is taking away something of theirs for no compensation.

I do have regular rentals in Columbia, and can see where airbnb's need to go thru the city certificate process for rentals, but that should be all.

If the issue is affordable housing that is needed, then that should be tackled by reducing the rules and regulations for builders. That has been a big culprit over the past several years, not the only thing, but part.

And, if the city does something about eliminating these, then the least it should do is grandfather in the ones that are already operating.

Paul Bunch

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Thanks and best regards.

Paul Bunch



[Click here to search area listings](https://www.midmohomefinder.com/paulbunch)

<https://www.midmohomefinder.com/paulbunch>



Cell: 573-289-8480

email: paulsbunch@gmail.com

Office Phone: 573-777-SOLD (7653)

Missouri Licensed.

This electronic communication is confidential, privileged and intended only for the use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this information to the intended recipient, unauthorized disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please return the original message received and notify the sender immediately at the following email address: paulsbunch@gmail.com or by calling 573-289-8480. Thank you.

[Planning]: short term rentals

k Wayne Fenton <kwnfenton@gmail.com>
To: planning@como.gov

Mon, Mar 20, 2023 at 3:24 PM

I disagree with the confusing 3 tier regulations you are suggesting. As a short term rental owner i think i should have the right to operate openly. I agree to inspections for safety and am willing to pay an occupancy tax, I know that my rental is less expensive than a hotel and i have more value. I agree to any short term operator to be shut down if neighbors have a justified complaint. Please do not adopt the new regulations. Wayne Fenton



Patrick Zenner <patrick.zenner@como.gov>

short term rental

Dan Fischbach <6fisch@gmail.com>
To: Patrick.Zenner@como.gov

Thu, Mar 16, 2023 at 10:16 AM

Patrick

I am against any and all of the proposed regulations of short term rentals in Columbia, with one exception. I agree that all who are involved in this activity should pay the same taxes as other places of public accommodation such as hotels or motels. I strongly disagree with any licensing requirements. My considerable experience with Airbnb and Vrbo literally around the world is that these businesses do an adequate job ensuring the customer gets what is paid for. Registration with the city is reasonable, as this would ensure the city and county could collect taxes owed.

This looks to me like a solution looking for a problem. If loud parties or parking abuse occurs, there are laws on the books for enforcement.

Dan Fischbach

Fwd: Short Term Rentals

Sheela Amin <Sheela.Amin@como.gov>

Tue, Feb 14, 2023 at 3:00 PM

To: Timothy Teddy <Timothy.Teddy@como.gov>, "Zenner, Patrick" <Patrick.Zenner@como.gov>

Cc: De'Carlton Seewood <decarlon.seewood@como.gov>, Mike Griggs <Mike.Griggs@como.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Andrea Waner (Ward 2)** <ward2@como.gov>

Date: Tue, Feb 14, 2023 at 2:57 PM

Subject: Fwd: Short Term Rentals

To: Sheela Amin <sheela.amin@como.gov>

Hi Sheela -

Can you ensure this is given to P&Z and whomever else is reviewing public input on STRs?

THANK YOU!

Be well,
Andrea**Andrea Waner, MPA**

(she/her/hers)

Columbia City Council, 2nd Ward

573.321.9219

[Click here](#) to schedule a meeting with me!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ruth** <ruthfriar@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Feb 14, 2023 at 2:47 PM

Subject: Short Term Rentals

To: Andrea Waner <ward2@como.gov>

Hi Andrea. Appreciate the alternative method for providing thoughts. Not sure how many of these rentals are in the 5th Ward, so my comments would be less relevant than those who from people who live in areas where these rentals are more visible/available.

1. Purchasers of these properties are typically investors. Purchasing single family dwellings and rehabbing them for short term rental purposes decreases available/affordable housing stock for owner occupied homes in neighborhoods that are accessible, walkable, bikeable, and centrally located.

2. This is a business for the owners, designed to turn a profit and maximize occupancy. Thinking of the "Hobbit" house on the corner of Ash and West Blvd... The 3rd home we owned in Columbia was at 22 West Blvd. the area was still a neighborhood, and affordable for young families. With the investment made in this home to convert it to a short term rental, it will never again be an affordable home in an affordable neighborhood. Gentrifying this area via conversion of these homes serves no one but owners looking to have a return on their investment. It makes neighborhoods less attractive to families and existing home owners.

3. If investors/developers want what they want and the City allows them to do what they want because the UDC doesn't prevent it. Create changes to the UDC that reflect a commitment to owner occupied homes, neighborhoods and affordability.

4. If these short term rentals are going to snatch up potentially owner occupied, centrally located homes, create an ordinance that places a 'surcharge' on this kind of conversion that directly benefits the building of, support for, maintenance of neighborhoods and affordable homes.

5. In a personal conversation with someone who owns and is opposed to anything that will interfere with their short term rental properties, the 'threat' made was that investors and builders would go elsewhere if Columbia stops being friendly to them. The narrative includes 'liberal activists' are ruining this town, our community and the ability to make money here.

Hoping some of these thoughts match survey items.

Thanks!

Ruth Friar

Ward 5

[Planning]: Short-term Rental

Amy Gaffney <amygaffney250@gmail.com>
To: planning@como.gov

Thu, Mar 16, 2023 at 9:11 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the short-term rental regulations. I believe that the City of Columbia has a safety obligation to visitors to our town. No one wants to see people hurt. However, I do not think the City needs to regulate short-term rentals beyond that.

The City should not concern itself with how many residents in an area are renting part or all of their homes in this way or how many units in a property can do so. Nor how many such licenses the landlord holds or how many days in a year a rental is occupied. There is no need for governance regarding how the rental is used, so long as it is within the existing laws. Instead of saying weddings are not allowed, say how many people can safely use a space. To avoid substandard living conditions a maximum number of tenants should be allowed based on square footage, rather than an arbitrary number. The usual noise ordinances, drug laws, and so on should cover many of the items in the draft of regulations being considered. This draft can be reduced quite a bit.

By over-regulating short-term rentals, you prevent residents from using their assets to generate income and, therefore, from stimulating local economy. Regulations such as many in the draft largely serve hotel chains. Columbia hosts travelers year round, as stated by the director of the Columbia Convention and Visitors Bureau in the following article: https://www.komu.com/news/midmissourinews/new-hotels-proposed-in-columbia-could-help-increase-tourism/article_89841c80-a8b3-11ed-99e2-9b0752977899.html . If there is a legitimate need for places for visitors to stay, city government should seek to benefit the residents they represent, and the local economy they have an obligation to stimulate, before encouraging out-of-town conglomerates. Some of those residents may even choose to rent their home at times to help meet their mortgage payments, creating more affordable housing.

Respectfully,

Amy Gaffney

Dec 1, 2022

Attn: Mayor of City of Columbia and City Council Members
City of Columbia Missouri
PO Box 6015
Columbia, MO 65202-6015



Re: Amendments to the UDC for Short-Term Rentals

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

I am writing this letter regarding the proposed amending of the Unified Development Code (UDC) to define, establish, and regulate Short Term Rentals (STR) within the City of Columbia.

I am a long-term resident, a property owner, and a real estate investor in Columbia. Further, as an appointed officer of the board, I am representing the CoMo REI, a real estate investing club with a membership of 434 real estate investors whose focus is investing in property in and around Columbia. Our members own both long-term and short-term rentals and as such the proposed changes are of great interest to our organization.

Our organization understands the need for regulation so that safety, fair business practices, and issues impacting the best interest of the public can be accomplished. We also recognize the need for leveling the playing field so that STR do not have an unfair tax advantage when competing for customers visiting Columbia. To that end, we support the City in its efforts to develop a fair mechanism to accomplish this. Having said this, we have been deeply troubled by previous efforts of the city to define and regulate short-term rentals. In short, the past 4 year process of modifying the UDC was wrought with problems and many of the proposed changes, although well intentioned, were arbitrary, capricious, and trampled on the rights of property owners.

Unfortunately, the Planning and Zoning Commission is once again attempting to address STR but instead of starting from scratch, it is in the process of attempting to revamp a failed poorly written ordinance, an ordinance that was overly complicated and unnecessarily impinged on property owner rights. What our community is requesting is quite simple. Develop an ordinance that is simple and easy to implement and is without undue burden to property owners, which unfairly impedes their ability to make a living. What we are asking for is an ordinance that:

1. defines and establishes STR as a legal use in the UDC
2. allows for a mechanism for lodging tax to be collected
3. treats STR the same as long-term rentals, both in compliance and registration
4. does not place undue financial burden on the property owner or their ability to transact business
5. does not prohibit STR operation in R-1 and R-2 zoned neighborhoods
6. does not put a complicated process in place to acquire administrative approval to operate STR
7. does not establish occupancy limits that differ from long-term rentals
8. does not place a large workload burden on city staff

In short, we feel that STR should be treated the same as long-term rentals since the only differentiators are the length of stay and the frequency of use. I would encourage the council members to keep the modifications short and simple with the idea that they can be modified at a later date should there be a need, instead of putting an overreaching ordinance in place. Please feel free to contact me to discuss our position should you have any further questions. I can be reached at (573) 808-4204 or you can contact me by e-mail at JGalen001@gmail.com .

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeff Galen", written over a horizontal line.

Jeff Galen
Board Member CoMo REI
2000 E. Broadway, Suite 223
Columbia, MO 65201

Fwd: Short-term Rentals

Sheela Amin <Sheela.Amin@como.gov>

Tue, Feb 21, 2023 at 9:48 AM

To: Timothy Teddy <Timothy.Teddy@como.gov>, "Zenner, Patrick" <Patrick.Zenner@como.gov>

Cc: De'Carlon Seewood <decarlon.seewood@como.gov>, Mike Griggs <Mike.Griggs@como.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mayor Barbara Buffaloe** <mayor@como.gov>

Date: Tue, Feb 21, 2023 at 9:44 AM

Subject: Fwd: Short-term Rentals

To: Sheela Amin <Sheela.Amin@como.gov>

For staff collecting comments

Barbara Buffaloe
Mayor of Columbia, Missouri

www.CoMo.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Francee Caroline Gordon** <fcgordonalord@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Feb 21, 2023 at 9:42 AM

Subject: Short-term Rentals

To: <Mayor@como.gov>

Dear Mayor Buffaloe,

I have been a resident of Columbia for 45 years, ever since my parents moved back here when I was only 2 years old. I love Columbia. I went to Christian Fellowship School, then Hickman High and then the University of Missouri. I am writing this letter regarding the proposed new ordinance concerning short term rentals.

I support smart, sensible regulation, to create a better tax collection framework and perhaps make things less confusing for everyone. But I think the current proposal far overreaches. Why can I rent my property out for 31 days and not 29 days? Why no more than 120 days per year? I should be able to rent out my home as I please, it's my constitutional right. And aside from the issue of property owners' rights, the fact is that there's a huge demand in our city for comfortable, homey, clean and safe accommodations. I hear from guests routinely – "We prefer staying in homes over hotels".

I have seen some crazy TV news stories about rowdy guests partying in quiet neighborhoods in other cities. This has never happened in my rental. I have had nothing but good experiences with my guests. I screen my guests before booking them and the platform allows you to cancel the guest's stay if you believe that they are going to have a party or do anything illegal. I set very clear rules and guidelines to ensure the guests understand what they can and cannot do in my rental including the importance of being courteous to my neighbors. It seems from some of the things that were said by the city's planning and zoning commission during the December 19th pre-council meeting, that they have never even stayed at a STR before. Some of their comments were very off-base.

My guests LOVE my place. I have decorated the walls and shelves with COLUMBIA! (And maybe just a couple other places, i.e., Cardinals and Chiefs memorabilia.) I have posters from local music venues and local artists bought at local art events. I visit the Columbia Convention and Visitors Bureau to get brochures/handouts and magazines and then set them out all over the place. My rental is an advertisement for all things Columbia – where to eat, play, dance, listen to music, bike, swim, jog, etc. I have many guests that come specifically for an event here in Columbia, but some are just passing through, it's the half-way mark from point A to point B and they have no idea what Columbia is. But perhaps they come back to visit because of learning about all the things our great city has to offer. Families and groups of friends love the opportunity to all stay in one place, instead of having to spread out between two or three hotel rooms. It's way more economical for them as well, my pricing compared to hotel pricing, especially during big event weekends.

Again, I have no issue with reasonable and rational regulation of STRs. But we need to be smart about where we draw the line. I strongly urge you to consider all the consequences of the proposal set before you. We can't afford as a city to take a reactionary, blanket approach to this issue based on limited flimsy and anecdotal evidence.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Francee Caroline "Carrie" Gordon

--

Healthy regards,

Francee "Carrie" Caroline Gordon, RD, LD

Alo Dietitian Consulting, LLC

Mobile: 573-819-6100

Email: FCGordonAloRD@gmail.com

"How far you go in life depends on your being tender with the young, compassionate with the aged, sympathetic with the striving and tolerant of the weak and strong. Because someday in your life you will have been all of these." - George Washington Carver

Fwd: GovOS Short-Term Rental Info

1 message

Sheela Amin <Sheela.Amin@como.gov>

Tue, Dec 20, 2022 at 4:19 PM

To: Timothy Teddy <Timothy.Teddy@como.gov>, "Zenner, Patrick" <Patrick.Zenner@como.gov>

Cc: De'Carlton Seewood <decarlon.seewood@como.gov>, Mike Griggs <Mike.Griggs@como.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mayor Barbara Buffaloe** <mayor@como.gov>

Date: Tue, Dec 20, 2022 at 4:07 PM

Subject: Fwd: GovOS Short-Term Rental Info

To: Sheela Amin <Sheela.Amin@como.gov>

Can you share this to staff working on STR?

Thanks,

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nick Bernardino** <nick.bernardino@govos.com>

Date: Tue, Dec 20, 2022 at 12:07 PM

Subject: GovOS Short-Term Rental Info

To: Mayor@CoMo.gov <Mayor@como.gov>

Hello Mayor Buffaloe,

I was hoping to connect about short-term rentals. Our data shows that there are at least 415 short-term rentals in Columbia. Do you know how many of those are compliant?

How GovOS can help:

- Our platform scrapes in data from over 30 websites like AirBNB and VRBO.
- Our property review team then looks through all of these listings to find parcel and owner information. We have a 99% identification rate, and we provide the tools you need to get them towards compliance.
- Portal for business owners to register their short-term rental
- To reduce calls to your office, we provide a complaint hotline and business owner support hotline
- Tax collection tool

I have availability next Tuesday and Thursday at 11:00 CST. Do you have time for a 10-minute phone call?

Best,



Nick Bernardino

Account Executive



p: 512-900-4059

e: nick.bernardino@GovOS.com | w: www.GovOS.com

a: [8310 N Capital of Texas Hwy, Austin, TX 78731](https://www.google.com/maps/place/8310+N+Capital+of+Texas+Hwy,+Austin,+TX+78731)

--

Barbara Buffaloe
Mayor of Columbia, Missouri

City of Columbia, Missouri
[701 E Broadway](#)
P.O. Box 6015
Columbia, Missouri, 65205

www.CoMo.gov
Mayor@CoMo.gov
573.874.7222



Overview-GovOS-STR-Stats-Overview.pdf
2778K

[Planning]: Short term rental

chuckworstell thehighergood.org <chuckworstell@thehighergood.org>
To: "planning@como.gov" <planning@como.gov>

Mon, Mar 20, 2023 at 7:38 AM

I support short-term rentals such as Airbnbs and VRBOs. We love using these when we travel and support the option in Columbia.

Andi Kelly
[1642 Buchanan Dr](#)
Columbia MO 65203

Short-term Rental Survey UPDATE

Randall Kilgore <rfkilgore55@hotmail.com>

Mon, Feb 27, 2023 at 3:04 PM

To: Bill Cantin <Bill.Cantin@como.gov>, Patrick Zenner <Patrick.Zenner@como.gov>

Cc: "lhutton60@gmail.com" <lhutton60@gmail.com>, Randall Kilgore <rfkilgore55@hotmail.com>, Kip Kendrick <kip.kendrick@gmail.com>, "gdsmith53@hotmail.com" <gdsmith53@hotmail.com>

Attached are the proposed regs for Short-Term rentals as reviewed by me with comments inserted at various points within the overall document. The key place we have strong disagreement is the use of 30 and 120 days to determine the amount of "business" that is being handled by the property. We currently do not allow reservations by Guests for The Fairway Suite, L.L.C. beyond 30 days, and to-date we have only had one Guest (medical resident at MU) stay for exactly 30 days (August-2022). Most of our Guests are staying one (1) night, two (2) nights, three (3) nights and typically no more than 5 to 7 nights. They are reserving the space for a variety of reasons as transients traveling cross-country and Columbia is a midway point in their travel for relocation purposes. We have Guests coming to visit children throughout the calendar year who are students at Stephens, Columbia College, and the University. These reservations are often made based around Greek system events (sororities, fraternities) some designated for fathers or mothers, or legacy events for alumni members of the organization.

Because of our close proximity to downtown Columbia we occasionally get business travelers for one or two night stays. We also get visitors to the Columbia Country Club attending a wedding, a reception for a wedding, or even retirement events held at the Club.

Our neighbors have never had a negative encounter with a Guest, and Guests are limited to two adults. A third Guest (a child, or other traveling companion) may be with the primary Guest and sleep on an inflatable mattress for an extra charge. Otherwise, all reservations are either one or two adult Guests vetted through the Airbnb platform of reservations that includes proper identification, ability to pay by credit card, and meets other requirements of hosts as outline in House Rules for the property listed.

During the height of the pandemic we saw a peak in interest of the short-term rental as Guests trusted the cleaning provisions and the adherence to strict codes of conduct by Airbnb and agreed upon by participating Hosts. This gave Guests a level of assurance that they were staying in a safe, hospitable, and clean space according to current CDC guidelines.

We reside in a primary residence that has a large addition suitable for overnight lodging as an accessory to the property. It has a separate entrance, and designated space for parking. We do allow pet dogs under certain specific provisions of care and treatment for an extra charge. This has been an added amenity and proven to be worthwhile as some Guests travel with support dogs, or well-trained, crate occupied pets that are not allowed in traditional hotel and bed & breakfast accommodations.

We have been supportive in adding regulations and special licensure for such business models. We have participated in the many public meetings hosted by the Convention and Visitors Bureau of Columbia and welcome oversight and review of our property. We, however, do not agree with the days (30 and 120) that are in the current draft regulations. A better, more amenable solution should be forthcoming to consider. Denying our business reservations vetted through the Airbnb platform greater than 120 days or nights is limiting our income, and what we bring to those coming to our community for an array of events such as True/False Film, Roots-N-Blues (new name?), Columbia Art in the Park, and a variety of other reasons. Some of our Guests come especially to enjoy the many nature walks, hiking trails, parks, and area venues for entertainment as well as the history enthusiast who seeks to know more about Boone County and the State of Missouri.

We stand ready to offer more input and debate around these draft regulations. We support the idea of regulations but question some of the data and intent behind the derived rules. In an effort to be fully transparent, open, and forthcoming, we would invite any City official to come and see our business, and experience it first-hand.

Randall F. Kilgore

804 Fairway Drive

Columbia, Missouri 65201

rfkilgore55@hotmail.com

(573) 808-5254

From: Randall Kilgore <rfkilgore55@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 10:54 AM
To: Bill Cantin <Bill.Cantin@como.gov>
Cc: Randall Kilgore <rfkilgore55@hotmail.com>; lhutton60@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Short-term Rental Survey UPDATE
Importance: High

How do you get back to the announcement associated with the engagement process to respond more fully? Mr. Zenner's email (or yours?) does not provide a hyper-link to return to the BeHeard public engagement portal.

From: Bill Cantin <Bill.Cantin@como.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 9:00 AM
To: Bill Cantin <Bill.Cantin@como.gov>
Subject: Short-term Rental Survey UPDATE

Good Morning:

You are receiving this email given your recent response to the City's request for public comment on the topic of **Short-term Rentals** received through the **BeHeard** public engagement portal. Based upon initial public feedback, it became apparent that clarification on the type and purpose of the feedback options on this topic was necessary.

The initial announcement of this engagement process made references to a survey and provided a link to the draft regulatory standards. It was anticipated that participants would **in addition** to taking the 5-question survey avail themselves of reviewing the draft regulatory standards and offer more substantive written comments. Unfortunately, this anticipated participant action was not clearly conveyed and has left many members of the community frustrated that the engagement on this topic is insufficient.

The purpose of the 5-question survey was intended to gain broad public thoughts on resident's attitudes relating to regulating short-term rentals generally and the preservation of affordable housing. These questions were purposefully broad and did not attempt to "dig" deep into the draft regulations. The survey was never intended to be a substitute for more substantive written comments, but rather a quick means to survey public opinion/thoughts.

The initial release of this engagement process also overlooked the ability for the public to provide actual written comments within the BeHeard portal. Staff **assumed** that participants would send written comments, following review of the draft standards, directly to the email address of the project manager. Unfortunately, this assumption has proven to be errant as substantive written comments have not generally been submitted.

To address the above observations and initial public comments, the announcement associated with the engagement process has been modified. The survey has been expanded to 7-questions and Question # 3 has been revised to include all pertinent text that was initially desired, but unfortunately truncated. Additionally, the option for providing written comments on the draft regulatory standards has been added to the BeHeard announcement page directly. Participants can leave written comments by selecting the "Questions" tab next to the one asking participants to take the survey.[\[RFK:\]](#)
[How do you get back to it????](#)

[Quoted text hidden]



PROPOSED REGS for STR COLUMBIA MO 2023.pdf
3264K

The following definitions are to be added to the Unified Development Code (UDC) as a reconstituted Section 29-1.11(g) [Definitions] with existing Section 29-1.11(g) being renumber to Section 29-1.11 (h). All text is new.

(g) *Short-term Rentals*. For the purpose of chapter 29, article 3, section 29-3.3(uu) the following words and terms as used are defined to mean the following:

Owner. Any person, firm, trust, corporation, partnership or any other legal entity who has legal interest in a property as shown within the records of the Boone County Assessor's Office.

Designated Agent. An individual or management company located within the City of Columbia that is available 24-hours per day who accepts full responsibility for addressing matters arising with the operation or use of a dwelling unit licensed as a short-term rental in the absence of the owner/authorized tenant of the property upon which such dwelling is located. The individual or management company is not required to be on-site in the absence of the owner/authorized tenant of the property.

Principal Resident. The owner, or an authorized tenant under a signed lease greater than 30 days, that occupies a dwelling unit that is their true, fixed, and principal residence to which, whenever absent, they return until a new principal residence is established.

Principal Residence. The one dwelling unit in which a principal resident resides that, whenever absent, is the dwelling to which they return until a new principal residence is established. A principal residence shall be documented by motor vehicle or voter registration, driver license, or other such evidence as determined acceptable by the Director of Community Development.

Secondary Residence. A dwelling unit in which an owner, as defined herein, lives temporarily for time intervals less than their principal residence and for which all necessary utilities shall remain in the owner's name.

Short-term Rental. A residential dwelling unit, portion of a dwelling unit or room within a residential dwelling unit rented by a transient guest.

Short-term Rental (Tier 1). An accessory use of a principal residence that is offered, on occasion, in whole or in part, for not more than a total of thirty (30) days in a calendar year as a short-term rental.

Short-term Rental (Tier 2). An accessory use of a principal or secondary residence of an owner that is offered, on occasion, in whole or in part, for not more than a total of one-hundred twenty (120) days in a calendar year as a short-term rental.

Short-term Rental (Tier 3). A residential dwelling unit that is offered, in whole or in part, as a short-term rental that either:

- A) Is not a principal or secondary residence; or
- B) Is offered as a short-term rental for greater than one-hundred twenty (120) days in a calendar year.

Short-term rental intermediary. A marketplace or network that facilitates the listing, marketing, or rental of a short-term rental on a site, also referred to as a platform.

Transient Guest. A person who occupies a room in a hotel, motel or tourist court as well as a bed and breakfast or short-term rental for less than thirty-one (31) consecutive days.

The following existing definitions within Section 29-1.11(a) [Definitions] of the Unified Development Code shall be amended as follows. Strikethrough text to be deleted and underlined text to be added.

Hotel. A building occupied or used as a temporary abiding place of individuals or groups of individuals, with or without meals, in which the typical stay is between one and thirty (30) days. Accessory uses may include restaurants, cafes, swimming pools, meeting rooms, or sports/health facilities. The definition of *hotel* shall exclude bed and breakfast establishments and short-term rentals.

Bed and breakfast. A residential building containing not more than five (5) guest rooms that provides sleeping units and meals for transient guests, and that is managed and occupied by the owner of the property. The definition of bed and breakfast shall exclude hotels and short-term rentals.

The following subsection (uu) is to be added to the section 29-3.3 of the Unified Development Code (UDC) as new “use-specific standards” relating to short-term rentals. All text is new.

Sec. 29-3.3. Use-specific standards.

All uses for which the permitted use table in section 29-3.2 shows use-specific standard(s) shall comply with the applicable standard(s) in this section. In addition, all development shall comply with all other applicable provisions of this chapter.

...

(uu) *Accessory and temporary uses of land and buildings: Short-term Rental.*

A. *Short-term rental types.* Short-term rentals shall be classified as either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 dwelling unit subject to the following provisions:

1. “Tier 1” short-term rental. Shall be an accessory use in zoning districts A, R-1, R-2, R-MF, M-OF, M-N, M-C, and M-DT provided the following criteria are met:
 - i. The dwelling unit is a principal residence; and
 - ii. The dwelling unit or portion of the dwelling unit is made available for occupancy by transient guests no greater than a total of thirty (30) days in a calendar year.
2. “Tier 2” short-term rental.
 - i. Shall be an accessory use in zoning districts A, R-1, R-2, R-MF, M-OF, and M-N, M-C, and M-DT provided the following criteria are met:
 1. The dwelling unit is a principal residence of an owner; and
 2. The dwelling unit or portion of the dwelling unit is made available for occupancy by transient guests for no greater than one-hundred twenty (120) days in a calendar year; and
 3. One (1) off-street parking space for every 2 occupants of the dwelling unit shall be provided. Such parking shall be provided off-street on the site of the short-term rental on a parking surface compliant with the provisions of this Code and shall not result in the displacement of required parking.

ii. Shall be an accessory use in zoning districts M-OF, and M-N, M-C, and M-DT provided the following criteria are met:

1. The dwelling unit is a secondary residence of an owner; and
2. The dwelling unit or portion of the dwelling unit is made available for occupancy by transient guests for no greater than one-hundred twenty (120) days in a calendar year; and
3. One (1) off-street parking space for every 2 occupants of the dwelling unit shall be provided. Such parking shall be provided off-street on the site of the short-term rental on a parking surface compliant with the provisions of this Code and shall not result in the displacement of required parking.

iii. Shall be a conditional accessory use in zoning districts A, R-1, R-2, and R-MF provided the following criteria are met:

1. The dwelling unit is a secondary residence of an owner; and
2. The dwelling unit or portion of the dwelling unit is made available for occupancy by transient guests for no greater than one-hundred twenty (120) days in calendar year; and
3. A conditional use permit is approved by the City Council in accordance with the provisions of section 29-6.4 (conditional use permit); and
4. One (1) off-street parking space for every 2 occupants of the dwelling unit shall be provided. Such parking shall be provided off-street on the site of the short-term rental on a parking surface compliant with the provisions of this Code and shall not result in the displacement of required parking.

3. "Tier 3" short-term rental. Shall be a permitted use in zoning districts M-N, M-C, and MDT and shall be a conditional use in zoning district M-OF provided the following criteria are met:

- i. The dwelling unit is not a principal or secondary residence or the dwelling unit is made available for occupancy by transient guests for a period greater than one-hundred twenty (120) days in a calendar year; and
- ii. A conditional use permit, where required, is approved by the City Council in accordance with section 29-6.4 (conditional use permit); and
- iii. One (1) off-street parking space for every 2 occupants of the dwelling unit shall be provided. Such parking shall be provided off-street on

the site of the short-term rental on a parking surface compliant with the provisions of this Code and shall not result in the displacement of required parking; and

- iv. Short-term rentals in dwelling units not identified as a primary or secondary residence shall comply with Federal, State, and local accessibility requirements as applicable.

B. Supplemental use-specific standards. The following standards shall be applicable to all short-term rentals regardless of their “tier” of designation.

1. Registration and Licensure. The property owner or authorized tenant shall register the short-term rental with the City prior to being granted a certificate of compliance. Such registration shall follow the provisions of chapter 22 (Rental Conversation Law) of the City Code, shall be submitted on forms provided by the City, and shall grant the City the right to inspect the dwelling unit for compliance with the all applicable codes.
2. Limits on Licensure. A maximum of one (1) short-term rental certificate may be issued per owner or authorized tenant.
3. Proof of ownership. Concurrent with submission of registration forms provided by the City, the property owner or authorized tenant shall submit an affidavit affirming the following:
 - i. The dwelling unit to be used as a short-term rental is owned by the applicant or is occupied by a tenant authorized by the property owner to make the application,
 - ii. Whether the dwelling is the applicant’s principal or secondary residence (as defined in section 29-1.11), or is solely an investment property,
 - iii. The total number of days annually that the dwelling is to be used as a short-term rental, and
 - iv. The name, address, and contact number of a designated agent within the City of Columbia and accessible 24 hours per day, seven (7) days a week who shall accept full responsibility for addressing matters arising with the operation or use of the dwelling unit in the absence of the owner/authorized tenant.
4. Conditional use permit. When applicable, a license to operate a short-term rental shall be granted only after the issuance of a conditional use permit in accordance with the provisions of section 29-6.4 (conditional use permit).

5. Maximum occupancy. The maximum number of occupants permitted in a dwelling unit offered and operated as a short-term rental shall be subject to the “occupancy limitations” of the most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC). In no instance, regardless of short-term rental tier designation, shall a dwelling unit be occupied by more than a total of eight (8) occupants.
6. Reservations. Only one rental reservation at a time shall be permissible for each short-term rental. If rented “in part” and additional occupancy is permitted, it shall be unlawful to have a second reservation for the same dwelling.
7. Dwelling unit usage. Dwellings licensed for short-term rental usage shall not be used for special events such as weddings, corporate events, commercial functions, large parties (greater than 8 persons), and other similar events or activities otherwise prohibited by this code.
8. Certificate of Compliance Posting. The certificate of compliance issued by the City shall be conspicuously posted at the entry of the dwelling unit or in a readily available location onsite for review upon the request of a police officer or city inspector investigating a violation of this subsection (uu), chapter 16, article IV (Nuisances), or chapter 22, article V (Rental Conservation Law) of this Code.

In addition to posting the issued certificate, the owner/authorized tenant shall post at the principal entry into the dwelling the following:

- i. The owner’s/authorized tenant’s contact information and that of the designated agent representing the dwelling unit in the absence of the owner;
 - ii. The occupancy limitations as provided within the Certificate of Compliance;
 - iii. An emergency evacuation route map; and
 - iv. Contact information for emergency services (police, fire, and ambulance), and the City of Columbia Community Development Department
9. Rental Platform Identification. It shall be unlawful to list a short-term rental on any website or other media without first obtaining a certificate of compliance from the City. Any website or media listing of the dwelling unit shall include the certificate of compliance licensing number. Concurrent with the application to register a dwelling unit as a short-term rental and annually

thereafter, the owner/authorized tenant shall provide the City with a list of all specific website or other media where the dwelling unit will be advertised for rental purposes.

10. Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) usage. An ADU may be permitted to be utilized as a short-term rental subject to compliance with the provisions of this subsection (uu) and all other applicable provisions of this code, provided not more than one dwelling unit upon the property is registered for use as a short-term rental.
11. Signage. One (1) non-illuminated building-mounted sign no greater than one (1) square foot in area shall be permitted to identify the dwelling unit as a short-term rental. One (1) non-illuminated onsite directional sign no greater than one-half (1/2) square foot in area shall be permitted for guest way-finding purposes.
12. Compliance. It shall be unlawful to offer a dwelling unit, in part or in whole, as a short-term rental without complying with the provision of this subsection (uu) and having obtained a Business License and a Certificate of Compliance pursuant to the provisions of chapter 13 (Business License) and chapter 22, article V (Rental Conservation Law) of this Code within 365 days of the effective date of this ordinance on forms provided by the City.
13. Short-term rental certificate of compliance non-transferable. An active certificate of compliance authorizing the use of a dwelling unit as a short-term rental and, if applicable, any conditional use permit granted under the provisions of section 29-6.4 (conditional use permit), shall be void upon the sale of the property. Application to re-establish the dwelling unit as a short-term rental shall be subject to the all requirements of this Code and shall be submitted in compliance with the provisions of chapter 13 (Business License) and chapter 22, article V (Rental Conservation Law).
14. Revocation of a certificate of compliance – short-term rental. Operation of a short-term rental, regardless of classification, in violation of any of the provisions of this subsection (uu) of this section shall constitute a violation of this Code and shall be subject to any fines and penalties of such. Any property owner or authorized tenant who has had their short-term rental certificate of compliance revoked shall be required to seek a conditional use permit to re-establish the short-term rental.

The following subsection (iv) is to be added to the Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code (UDC) as new conditional use permit (CUP) review criteria relating to short-term rentals. Strikethrough text to be deleted and underlined text to be added.

Section 29-6.4 Specific Regulatory Procedures

29-6.4(a) - Zoning compliance.

Each application under this chapter that does not require one or more of the specific regulatory procedures in subsections (b) through (q) below shall be reviewed for zoning compliance. Zoning compliance checks shall be conducted by the department, and applications shall be approved if they comply with this chapter. The department's decision may be appealed to the board pursuant to section 29-6.3(f).

...

29-6.4(m) - Conditional use permit.

(1) *Procedure.*

- (i) Except as otherwise specifically provided elsewhere in this chapter, the department shall review the application and shall forward a recommendation to commission based on the criteria listed in subsection below.

....


- (2) *Criteria for approval.* After giving due consideration to the following criteria, the commission may recommend and the council may grant a conditional use permit which may include any conditions deemed necessary to carry out the provisions and intent of this chapter.

(i) *General criteria.*

....

- (ii) *Criteria for communication antennas and towers.* When considering a conditional use permit application for a communications antenna or tower, the application shall be submitted to the board and the board shall consider the following criteria in addition to those listed in subsection (i) above, and its decision shall be based on substantial evidence in the written record:

Conditional Use Permit



....

(iv) Criteria for short-term rentals. When considering a conditional use permit application for a short-term rental (STR), the Commission and Council shall consider the following criteria in addition to those listed in subsection (i) above:

1. Whether the proposed STR is used for any part of the year by the owner as a residence. If so, for how long?
2. Whether or not there are established STRs within 300 feet of the proposed STR measured in all directions from property lines “as the crow fly’s”.
3. Whether the applicant has previously operated an STR and if such operation has resulted in a history of complaints, a denied certificate, or revocation of an issued STR certificate.
4. Whether the STR will increase the intensity of the use of the property and cause increased traffic or noise coming from the property.
5. Whether there is support for the establishment of the proposed STR from adjoining property owners.

Table 29-3.1: COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, PERMITTED USE TABLE P=Permitted use C=Conditional use A=Accessory use CA=Conditional Accessory use T=Temporary use														
Zoning District	Residential				Mixed Use					Special Purpose				Use-Specific Standards, in Section 29-3.3
	R-1	R-2	R-MF	R-MH	M-OF	M-N	M-C	M-DT	M-BP	IG	A	O	PD	
LAND USE CATEGORY														
RESIDENTIAL USES														
Household Living														
Dwelling, One-family Detached	P	P	P	P	P	P					P		Per PD Approval	(a)
Dwelling, One-family Attached		P	P		P	P								(b)
Dwelling, Two-family		P	P		P	P								
Dwelling, Live-work			C		P	P	P	P						(c)
Dwelling, Multi-family			P		P	P	P	P						(d)
Manufactured Home Park				P										
Second Primary Dwelling Unit											C		(e)	
Group Living														
Boarding House			P		P	P	P	P					Per PD Approval	
Continuing Care Retirement Community			P		P	P	P	P						(f)
Dormitory/Fraternity/Sorority			P		P	P	P	P						
Group Home, Large			P		P	P	P	P						(g)
Group Home, Small	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			P			(g)
Halfway House			C		C	C	C	C						(h)
Residential Care Facility			C		P	P	P	P						
Temporary Shelter			C		C	C	C	C					(i)	
PUBLIC and INSTITUTIONAL USES														
Adult and Child Care														
Adult Day Care Center		P	P		P	P	P	P	P				Per PD Approval	
Family Day Care Center	A	A/C	P	A	P	P	P	P	P		A			(j)
Community Service														
Assembly or Lodge Hall						C	P	P		P			Per PD Approval	
Cemetery or Mausoleum	C	C	C	C							P			
Community/Recreation Center	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P	C	P			
Community Garden	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		(hh)
Elementary/Secondary School	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Funeral Home or Mortuary					C	C	P	C		P				(k)
Higher Education Institution			P		P	P	P	P	P	C				(l)

Table 29-3.1: COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, PERMITTED USE TABLE P=Permitted use C=Conditional use A=Accessory use CA=Conditional Accessory use T=Temporary use														
Zoning District	Residential				Mixed Use					Special Purpose				Use-Specific Standards, in Section 29-3.3
	R-1	R-2	R-MF	R-MH	M-OF	M-N	M-C	M-DT	M-BP	IG	A	O	PD	
LAND USE CATEGORY														
Hospital					P	P	P	C	P	P			Per PD Approval	
Museum or Library	C	C	C		P	P	P	P	P	C	P			
Police or Fire Station	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C	P			
Public Service Facility	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			
Public Park, Playground, or Golf Course	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	P		
Religious Institution	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Reuse of Place of Public Assembly	C	C	C	C									(m)	
Utilities and Communications														
Communication Antenna or Tower as a Principal Use	See section 29-3.3(n)												Per PD Approval	(n)
Public Utility Services, Major	C	C	C	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		
Public Utility Services, Minor	C	C	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			
Wind Energy Conversion System (WECS) as a Principal Use	See section 29-3.3(o)													(o)
COMMERCIAL USES														
Agriculture & Animal-Related														
Agriculture											P		Per PD Approval	
Farmer's Market	T	T	T		T	P	P	T	T	P	P	P		
Greenhouse or Plant Nursery							P			P	P			
Medical Marijuana Cultivation Facility										P	P			(qq)
Pet Store or Pet Grooming						P	P	P	C	C				
Urban Agriculture			C		P	P	C	C			P			(p)
Veterinary Hospital					C	C	P	P	P	P			(q)	
Food & Beverage Service														
Bar or Nightclub						C	P	P		C			Per PD Approval	
Restaurant						P	P	P	P	P				(r)
Guest Accommodations														
Bed and Breakfast		C	C		C	P	P	P					Per PD Approval	(s)
Hotel							P	P	P	P				
Travel Trailer Park							C				C			

Table 29-3.1: COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, PERMITTED USE TABLE P=Permitted use C=Conditional use A=Accessory use CA=Conditional Accessory use T=Temporary use														
Zoning District	Residential				Mixed Use					Special Purpose				Use-Specific Standards, in Section 29-3.3
	R-1	R-2	R-MF	R-MH	M-OF	M-N	M-C	M-DT	M-BP	IG	A	O	PD	
LAND USE CATEGORY														
<u>Short-term Rental (Tier 1)</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>		<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>			<u>A</u>		Per PD Approval	<u>uu</u>
<u>Short-term Rental (Tier 2)</u>	<u>A/CA</u>	<u>A/CA</u>	<u>A/CA</u>		<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>A</u>			<u>A/CA</u>			<u>uu</u>
<u>Short-term Rental (Tier 3)</u>					<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>						<u>uu</u>
Office														
Bank and Financial Institution					P	P	P	P	P	P			Per PD Approval	
Commercial or Trade School					P	P	P	P	P	P				(t)
Consumer Lending Institution					P	P	P	P	P	P				
Medical Marijuana Testing Facility							P		P	P				(qq)
Office					P	P	P	P	P	P				
Research and Development Laboratory					P	P	P	P	P	P				(u)
Wholesale Sales Office or Sample Room							P	P	P	P				
Personal Services														
Personal Services, General					P/C	P	P	P	P	P			Per PD Approval	(v)
Self-service Storage Facilities							P	C		P				(w)
Tree or Landscaping Service							P		P	P				(oo)
Recreation & Entertainment														
Indoor Recreation or Entertainment						P	P	P	P	P			Per PD Approval	
Indoor Entertainment, Adult							C			C				(x)
Outdoor Recreation or Entertainment							P		C	P	C	C		(y)
Physical Fitness Center						P	P	P	P	P				
Theatre, Drive-In							C			P				
Retail														
Alcoholic Beverage Sale						P	P	P	P	P			Per PD Approval	(z)
Medical Marijuana Dispensary Facility							P	P		P				(qq)
Pawn Shop						P	P	P		P				(rr)
Retail, Adult							P	P		P				(x)

Table 29-3.1: COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, PERMITTED USE TABLE P=Permitted use C=Conditional use A=Accessory use CA=Conditional Accessory use T=Temporary use														
Zoning District	Residential				Mixed Use					Special Purpose				Use-Specific Standards, in Section 29-3.3
	R-1	R-2	R-MF	R-MH	M-OF	M-N	M-C	M-DT	M-BP	IG	A	O	PD	
LAND USE CATEGORY														
Retail, General						P	P	P		P				(aa)
Vehicles & Equipment														
Car Wash						C	P	P	P	P			Per PD Approval	
Heavy Vehicle and Equipment Sales, Rental, and Servicing										P				
Light Vehicle Sales or Rental							P	P	P	P				(bb)
Light Vehicle Service or Repair						C	P	P	P	P				(cc)
Major Vehicle Repair and Service							P		P	P				(cc)
Parking Lot, Commercial							P	P	P	P				
Parking Structure, Commercial							P	P	P	P				
INDUSTRIAL USES														
Commercial Services														
Heavy Commercial Services							P	P		P			Per PD Approval	
Mechanical and Construction Contractors							C			P				
Storage and Wholesale Distribution									P	P				(dd)
Manufacturing, Production and Extraction														
Artisan Industry						C/P	C/P	C/P	C/P	P			Per PD Approval	(tt)
Bakery						C	P	P	P	P				
Heavy Industry										C				
Light Industry									C	P				(ee)
Machine Shop							C			P				
Medical Marijuana-Infused Products Manufacturing Facility									P	P				(qq)
Mine or Quarry										C	C			
Transportation														
Airport											C		Per PD Approval	
Bus Barn or Lot							P			P				

Table 29-3.1: COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, PERMITTED USE TABLE P=Permitted use C=Conditional use A=Accessory use CA=Conditional Accessory use T=Temporary use															
Zoning District	Residential				Mixed Use					Special Purpose				Use-Specific Standards, in Section 29-3.3	
	R-1	R-2	R-MF	R-MH	M-OF	M-N	M-C	M-DT	M-BP	IG	A	O	PD		
LAND USE CATEGORY															
Bus Station							P	P		P			Per PD Approval		
Rail or Truck Freight Terminal									C	P					
Waste & Salvage															
Sanitary Landfill											C		Per PD Approval		
Vehicle Wrecking or Junkyard										C					(ff)
ACCESSORY USES															
Office															
Accessory/Commercial Kitchen	A	A	A	A									Per PD Approval	(ss)	
Accessory Dwelling Units	C	A	A												(gg)
Backyard or Rooftop Garden	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		A				(hh)
Communication Antenna or Tower as an Accessory Use	See section 29-3.3(n)													(n)	
Customary Accessory Uses and Related Structures	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	Per PD Approval	(ii)	
Drive-Up Facility					CA	CA	A	CA	A	A					(jj)
Home Occupation	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		A				(kk)
Home Occupation with Non-Resident Employees	CA	CA	CA	CA											(ll)
Outdoor Storage in Residential Districts	A	A	A	A											(mm)
Wind Energy Conversion System (WECS) as a Principal Use	See section 29-3.3(o)													(o)	
TEMPORARY USES															
Temporary Construction Office or Yard	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	Per PD Approval		
Temporary Parking Lot					T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T			
Temporary Real Estate Sales/Leasing Office	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T		T				(nn)
Temporary/Seasonal Sales or Event, Other	T	T	T		T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T			

[Planning]: Short Term Rental

Denver Lybarger <lybargerdenver@gmail.com>
To: Planning@como.gov

Thu, Mar 2, 2023 at 10:36 AM

I just wanted to add a couple things after filling out the survey.

I do support the preservation of low income housing, but if COMO really wanted to help low income families it could do something unspeakable and easy...lower taxes. Como has some of the highest tax rates in the state, and yet our infrastructure is neglected. I think COMO should reevaluate it's spending and become more efficient with the funds it has. These restrictions feel like a money grab for the city, and a way to limit what property owners can do with their property. When I travel I stay at VRBO and Airbnb's, because of convenience, privacy, and price. Speaking only from my experiences Airbnb rentals are usually in nicer more secluded spots, or are in the heart of entertainment sites. I support licensing, but not the restrictions on where these short term rentals reside. Thank you for your time.

Sent from my iPhone

[Planning]: Short Term Rental Regulations

'm m' via Planning <planning@como.gov>

Fri, Mar 3, 2023 at 1:20 PM

Reply-To: m m <silvertrailer@yahoo.com>

To: "\"Planning@como.gov\""" <Planning@como.gov>

My first comment is I don't see that a Cost-To-Benefit Study was done that would have instigated the drafting of these draconian regulations. The cost to implement these regulation (if it were even possible) as written is enormous as they would create a new department or many new city positions which, as you may know, are difficult to fill and have huge long term cost liabilities.

Secondly, it says that these regulations were created by the City of Columbia's Planning and Zoning commission but they read like a boiler plate "borrowed" from some city that does not share Columbia's unique demographics and urban geography. It makes me question if they were drafted by anyone that lives in downtown Columbia and knows the recent history of Columbia. They don't seem to recognized the difference in the zoning districts. They don't address the actual as-built standards of the older neighborhoods. A recent survey of Alexander Ave. shows that of the 48 houses only 14 have driveways or driveways that are paved so that can't comply with the proposed regulations. This is typical of the bungalow neighborhoods with narrow lots that never had other than on street parking.

Prior to the shared housing concept Columbia's demographics had "hollowed"out. That is a dwelling unit that housed a family of five had hollowed out to one or no occupants. The majority of the older neighborhoods in Columbia were severely blighted with poorly maintained houses or houses that had been abandoned because the cost of maintenance, utilities, taxes etc exceeded the market rental rate.

The City did not have a plan for urban renewal of the blighted properties other than to condemn the properties which often resulted in the demolition of the unit. Empty lots throughout the older neighborhood are testament to the lost housing.

Short term shared housing was the most important force in Urban Renewal that Columbia has seen. In a short time the downtown neighborhoods and the dreadful blight along the West Worley Corridor have been improved. And that improvement has instigated interest in the old neighbors and the building of new homes to replace those that were lost.

Each Short Term housing opportunity provides jobs to Mother's and that could not otherwise work because the cost of daycare exceeds wages. Contractors, trades people, service industries now depend on Short Term rentals for their livelihood. The city has seen a flourishing retail and food service revival because the transient population far exceeds the resident population and is the backbone of the Columbia Economy.

I would definitely like to know what instigated this attack against Short Term rentals when it has been a Godsend to Columbia.

Mark J. Marcinik Architect

407 Circus Avenue Columbia, Mo

Fwd: STR Regulations

Sheela Amin <Sheela.Amin@como.gov>

Thu, Mar 23, 2023 at 3:28 PM

To: Timothy Teddy <Timothy.Teddy@como.gov>, Patrick Zenner <Patrick.Zenner@como.gov>

Cc: De'Carlton Seewood <decarlon.seewood@como.gov>, Mike Griggs <Mike.Griggs@como.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mayor Barbara Buffaloe** <mayor@como.gov>

Date: Thu, Mar 23, 2023 at 3:22 PM

Subject: Fwd: STR Regulations

To: Sheela Amin <Sheela.Amin@como.gov>

for Planning staff collecting feedback on short-term rentals

Barbara Buffaloe
Mayor of Columbia, Missouri

www.CoMo.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Patrick McCollum** <mccollumone@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 21, 2023 at 1:15 PM

Subject: STR Regulations

To: mayor@como.gov <mayor@como.gov>

Open letter to Columbia City Council

- Who we are and what we do

We are Patrick & Teresa McCollum and reside at 1409 Windsor st in the Benton Stephens

neighborhood. Our home is a little over 100 years old and was operated as a 5 unit apartment

building since the 1950's. We purchased the home in 2015 and immediately started renovations

and continue to this day. In 2017 we decided to make it our home and moved in and now occupy 2 of the units. As tenants moved out we decided to offer the apartments on Airbnb. Many things went into this decision, one is that we did not want full time tenants living above us and it allows us to have space for family and friends when they are in town. That aspect has been very nice. The building now has our residence and office, one Airbnb on the top floor and one on the second floor. We do have a full time tenant living in the basement apartment. These apartments all have their own kitchen and bath and entrances from the front foyer and back staircase. We have been operating the Airbnb's since 2019. We also have a 2 bedroom 2 bath home that is 1 block away from our home that we offer on Airbnb and we have 1 other house with a long term tenant. Basically we are small business.

- Who are our Guest

Our guest are coming to Columbia for work, visiting family, special events, healthcare, vet school, weddings, vendors for local events, relocating to the area and sometimes just random travel. I would say that most of our guest are coming for work or to visit family. We have had parents stay with us that have kids that live next door or very close. Last June our neighbors got married and the brides Mother and best friend were able to stay with us. They had a great weekend and got to have their own space. I had never put much thought into where travelers in Columbia come from, we have had guest from all over the world. We recently hosted a family from Brazil visiting their daughter that goes to Mizzou. There are a few things that our guest have in common. One is that they are bringing their dollars to Columbia and spending them. Our places have full kitchens but they are rarely used, they are frequenting our restaurants and many prefer local over chain restaurants. The other is that this is their

preferred accommodations when traveling. Several of our guest comment that they always stay in Airbnb's when traveling. I think that they love the experience that they get over staying in a hotel.

- Neighborhood Impact

We have been operating for 3 ½ years with no issues. Our guest are quiet and respectful, they are not here to party. We always give clear instructions on parking. In fact our neighborhood has more issues with parking because of the Stephens College dorms just down the street. We are not a 365 night a year operation and we do not allow guest if we are not home. Other times we will block off dates to keep up with cleaning or just to take a break or go on vacation.

- Affordable Housing Impact

Planning and Zoning has identified approximately 300 STR's currently in operation. That is less than .6 percent of the total housing units. That low of a number is not having a significant impact on affordable housing. I do understand that city leadership does not want to see this number have dramatic growth and currently it does not seem to be growing in our city. One reason is that this business is not for everybody, it is very time consuming as opposed to a long term rental. Another reason is that Columbia is not a regular tourist destination like Lake Ozark or Nashville.

- Proposed Regulation Impact

If this gets adopted as proposed it basically puts most of the STR's out of business. I do realize that this is the goal of some people but it does come with a cost. We and other operators also have long term rentals, the way I look at it is the extra revenue we get from Airbnb allows us to keep the rents of our tenants low. We rarely have rent increases. If the revenue from our STR is cut we will have no choice but to raise the rents of our tenants. I am sure other operators are in the same position. When there are large events in town there is not enough hotel space for everyone coming to town, currently many of these folks are staying with us and spending their money in Columbia, eliminating STR's will push these people to surrounding towns. There is also a loss of potential tax revenue for the city.

- Our Plea to City Council

Please get to know us and understand we are running very small business's. Please get to know our guest and why they are visiting. I hope the Council will see that our guest and our business has value to the City of Columbia. We are not opposed to regulations, we just do not want to be shut down. I also hope that the Council will look for a more rounded approach that will allow us to operate and keep further growth of this industry in check. We would be happy to meet with any or all Council members and would be more than happy to give tours of our 2 Airbnb properties and answer any questions you might have. We are proud of the work that we do. Feel free to text, call or email.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Patrick & Teresa McCollum

1409 Windsor St.

573-819-6292

mccollumone@gmail.com



Patrick Zenner <patrick.zenner@como.gov>

Regulating Rentals

Jim McNeely <drjimbomac@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2023 at 12:54 PM

To: "Patrick.Zenner@CoMo.gov" <Patrick.Zenner@como.gov>

Mr. Zenner,

My HOA invited me to take the survey regarding short-term property rentals in Columbia. I was happy to do so.

To be to the point, it is NOT the local government's business to regulate short-term property rentals. And given the City of Columbia's long and established history of mismanagement and incompetence in handling matters outside its necessary responsibility, I suggest improving what is currently in the City's basket of services and eliminating the infringement of privacy of the citizenry.

The city's property code is a sufficient regulatory instrument on a case-by-case basis. The temptation on the part of government is to impose a "one size fits all" set of regulations that will disrupt the market and greatly limit the potential of property owners to generate income from their properties. And while I do not offer my home for short-term rental, I believe my neighbors have every right to do so without the interference of government regulations.

I encourage you to drop this issue immediately and focus on reducing the weight of needless government interference in our local housing market to encourage growth of our community's safe housing.

Cordially,

Dr Jim McNeely

201 Copper Mountain Drive

Columbia, MO



Patrick Zenner <patrick.zenner@como.gov>

VBRO, RENTAL in Arbor Pointe

Marilyn Means <m2themarilyn@yahoo.com>

Tue, Mar 14, 2023 at 6:35 PM

To: Patrick.Zenner@como.gov

NO, NO, ABSOLUTELY NO!!!

3702 Delwood Drive

NO

Sent from my iPhone



December 18, 2022

Attn: Mayor of City of Columbia and City Council Members
City of Columbia Missouri
PO Box 6015
Columbia, MO 65202-6015

Re: Amendments to the UDC for Short-Term Rentals

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

I am writing this letter regarding the proposed amending of the Unified Development Code (UDC) to define, establish, and regulate Short Term Rentals (STR) within the City of Columbia.

I am not writing this letter on behalf of any organization, but instead I am writing it as a long-term resident, a property owner, and a real estate investor in Columbia who owns both long term and short term rentals.

On Monday December 19th you will be having a Council meeting during which you will be reviewing a presentation developed by the city staff for the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z) that deals directly with the issue of regulating short term rentals (STR) in the city. Although all of the information contained within the presentation is factually accurate, there are some tragic omissions of key information which I hope would impact your decision to approve the draft regulations. As the staff will explain, the principle of the ordinance will be to 1. Protect availability and affordability of housing, 2. Provide easy access to license homeowners and tenants for occasional use, 3. Minimize impact on neighborhoods, 4. Prevent commercial activity in residential zones, and 5. Provide equitable treatment of all residential zones.

Unfortunately the real impact of this ordinance will be to eliminate the vast majority of STR in the city as well as criminalize a reasonable use of private property. Let me expand on this using the City's data that was contained in the report but was not discussed.

Of the 53746 homes in Columbia, only 373 (roughly 0.7% of the total housing supply) have been reported as STR by AirDNA (a company that mines data from STR rental companies)(the city noted somewhere close to 300 homes). This 3 year process of spending endless hours focused on fixing a problem that has not yet been validated, only impacts 373 houses. Should P&Z pass their ordinance as written the impacts will be devastating to those homeowners. P&Z in their comment section of the draft proposal states "This ordinance does not prevent STRs from operating in Columbia nor does it prevent someone from using an STR as an income stream. What it does do is encourage STRs as an option for homeowners rather than investors."


This is just wrong. Here is the reality (information coming from the data the City provided in their PowerPoint), to start, 26% of the current owners own/operate more than 1 STR, an activity that would be prohibited under the proposed licensing criteria. If this ordinance was enacted, this would immediately eliminate roughly 145 units (38.9%) from the STR rental pool. The next item is that 74.6% of the STR are not principal residences. Under the ordinance, they would only be allowed to operate in M-OF, M-N, M-C, and M-DT zoned areas. Unfortunately, only 8% of the STR in the City fall within those zoned areas. So now we are left with 25.4% of the remaining 228 STR that are principal residences (60 homes) plus 8% of the 74.6% non-principal residences (14 homes) which happen to fall in the correctly zoned areas. This leaves us with a total of 74 homes available for STR, or only 19.8% of the original pool. But wait, it gets better. For those who operate non-principal residences, you have to go through a conditional use/permitted use process which makes the timely cost prohibitive process onerous, so this will most likely eliminate the 14 homes from that category. For the lucky 74 homes that are going to still be in business, they now have their rentable nights capped at either 30 days or 120 days. According to AirDNA, the typical rental home in Columbia is in service an average of 245 days. Essentially, the City will have just killed 50% to 80% of those homeowners business. From a business standpoint, the potential financial gains are becoming not worth the hassle.

There is another really important point that gets glossed over in the report. The City is against commercializing residential zones. Per the City's data, there are only 3 operators who have greater than 10 STR under their management. In short we are killing hundreds of Mom and Pop businesses across the City in order to stop 3 companies.

Unfortunately, there are other impacts of STR that are worth noting that were not discussed in the presentation. A common argument against STR is that it drives rents up and it increases housing costs in communities where they exist. This is a common statement that you see in the literature, but rarely is the magnitude of this problem given. In a research study looking at 1,097,697 Airbnb listings and 682,803 hosts over a period of nine years from 2008-2016, as well as Zillow data from 110 million homes from those same areas, Barron et.al. found that for every 1% increase in Airbnb listing in a neighborhood, there was only a 0.018% increase in rents 0.026% increase in home prices. ("The Effect of Home-Sharing on House Prices and Rents: Evidence from Airbnb" Kyle Barron, Edward Kung, Davide Proserpio, SSRN March 4, 2020). That's an increase of roughly \$3-\$9 per year, not really a major impact. Meanwhile an average host earns \$13,800 annually of which seniors are the fastest growing demographic with over 400,000 senior hosts nationally ("Airbnb Statistics", IProperty Management, Aug 3, 2022). Do we really want to take away a viable income stream for our City's seniors?

In short, STR should be treated the same as long-term rentals since the only differentiators are the length of stay and the frequency of use. I would encourage the council members to keep the modifications short and simple with the idea that they can be modified at a later date should there be a need, instead of putting an overreaching ordinance in place. Please feel free to contact me to discuss our position should you have any further questions. I can be reached at (573) 808-4204 or you can contact me by e-mail at JGalen001@gmail.com .

Sincerely,



Jeff Galen
Owner Mid Missouri Housing, LLC
3603 Topanga Dr.
Columbia, MO 65202

STR Thoughts

Randy Minchew <randy@minchews.com>
To: Patrick Zenner <patrick.zenner@como.gov>

Wed, Jan 18, 2023 at 9:22 AM

Dear Mr Zenner,

It is my opinion and suggestion that the City of Columbia set aside the conversation about short term rentals for commercial properties (tier 3) until the rules for short term rentals in our residential areas,(Tier1, Tier2) are in place.

Commercial property owners have made an investment in buildings and properties here in Columbia with the intent of providing goods and services to our community. The commercial spaces that are being used for short term rentals are not what's causing controversy with the public although we do need to put some rules in place for Tier 3.

It appears to me the reason for setting new guidelines with commercial (Tier 3) short term rentals is more focused around the need to collect the hotel and visitors tax. This can be done in a separate conversation, apart from the rules and regulations that need to be put in place to protect our homeowners (Tier1, Tier2).

I believe we need the Tier1, Tier2 regulations in place to protect our homeowners and their neighborhoods from the issues that can arise from short term rentals, like parking and extra traffic etc..

Obviously, the concern in the residential areas is to not allow the short term rental market to create an environment where our neighborhoods lose value because of the problems or issues that could cause.

Conversely, the reason for rules and regulations in the commercial short term rental space is more about the need to level the playing field with our hotels, and to have these entities contribute their fair share of visitor related taxes.

Randy Minchew
randy@minchews.com
573-881-9080

[Planning]: Short term rentals

denise denisepayne.net <denise@denisepayne.net>
To: "planning@como.gov" <planning@como.gov>

Wed, Mar 15, 2023 at 1:13 PM

Hello,

I have one home that I rent out to families who are visiting Columbia. I've rented this house out for long term rentals in the past as well.

I enjoy working with the short-term rental families that come to my house. I've helped a family whose parent had stage 4 cancer have a nice family dinner in my rental home where it was so much more relaxing than a busy, noisy restaurant. I've had many families in town for sport tournaments and they like the feeling that they can relax in my house and spread out.

I understand that some people who come to Columbia use the short-term rental as a party place but that has not been my experience. The family who was having the dinner party actually asked if that was OK before they rented as I have NO Parties checked on my listing.

If Columbia decides to restrict the short term rentals they may also affect visiting/traveling nurses. I have considered putting my house on the Furnished Finders website to help those health care workers who are here helping our local citizens with their health care needs.

I am only one person but I wanted you to know that I enjoy working with the people who come visit and I want to also make sure my neighborhood stays healthy and safe so my property values stay put and my neighborhood doesn't go down in value with a lot of loud parties.

Denise Payne

Fwd: Proposed ordinance regarding short term rentals

Sheela Amin <Sheela.Amin@como.gov>

Tue, Jan 3, 2023 at 11:25 AM

To: Timothy Teddy <Timothy.Teddy@como.gov>, "Zenner, Patrick" <Patrick.Zenner@como.gov>

Cc: De'Carlton Seewood <decarlon.seewood@como.gov>, Mike Griggs <Mike.Griggs@como.gov>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Andrea Waner (Ward 2)** <ward2@como.gov>

Date: Tue, Jan 3, 2023 at 11:10 AM

Subject: Fwd: Proposed ordinance regarding short term rentals

To: Sheela Amin <sheela.amin@como.gov>

For P&Z

Be well,
Andrea

Andrea Waner, MPA

(she/her/hers)

Columbia City Council, 2nd Ward

573.321.9219

[Click here](#) to schedule a meeting with me!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **judy schermer** <judyschermer@hotmail.com>

Date: Tue, Jan 3, 2023 at 10:00 AM

Subject: Proposed ordinance regarding short term rentals

To: mayor@como.gov <mayor@como.gov>, city council <ward1@gocolumbiamo.com>, city council <ward2@gocolumbiamo.com>, city council <ward3@gocolumbiamo.com>, city council <ward4@gocolumbiamo.com>, city council <ward5@gocolumbiamo.com>, city council <ward6@gocolumbiamo.com>

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

I am a homeowner and 30+ year resident of Columbia. I am retired and my husband is a semi-retired physician who provides care at Truman Veterans Hospital.

I have read the proposed regulations for short term rentals in Columbia and I wanted to voice my concerns over the extreme nature of them.

My husband and I own a 3 bedroom single family home at 107 Parkview. In August we listed it on Airbnb for short term rentals. The nightly rate fluctuates from about \$75 to \$245 a night, depending on events taking place in the city. In the short time we have been active on Airbnb, I'd like to give you a few examples of our guests:

1. A young family from Iowa (mom and dad with 3 very young children and a grandmother) stayed for 12 nights for one of their children to receive intensive therapy. They would have not been able to stay at Ronald McDonald House because their family group is too large, so their only alternative would have been a couple of hotel rooms. They were able to cook at our Airbnb and have a grandparent

accompany them to help with the many demands they face. The Airbnb was a far superior option for them financially and psychologically, providing them with a home away from home in their difficult circumstances. They have just rebooked a stay in April for further treatment, and I gave them a generous discount in light of their medical expenses.

2. A couple is staying at the Airbnb in February for about a month. The husband is having major surgery and will need to rehab here for that period. His wife will be able to cook for him and they will be in a homelike environment to ease his recovery.
3. A medical student stayed with us in December for a 3 week rotation at University Hospital, hoping to get placement as a resident in Orthopedics. Three weeks in a hotel would have been cost-prohibitive. I gave him a generous student discount.

These three examples are from just 6 months of being a host on Airbnb. This is the only property we have as a short term rental and don't plan to have any others. The advantages to our guests are obvious. Hosting on Airbnb has also been good for our family. It has given me a way to earn a small income in retirement, and allowed me to offer hospitality to people visiting Columbia, something I truly enjoy.

I am in complete agreement that there should be regulations for short term rentals. But the extreme measures that P and Z are proposing would effectively prevent all existing properties from continuing to operate. I am concerned that the majority of properties are owned by entities that have many rentals. That is not in keeping with the original spirit of this concept, and in my experience as a guest they provide lower quality rentals and customer service.

I hope you will take these concerns into consideration when the time comes to consider new regulations for short term rentals.

Thank you,

Judy Schermer

Judy
268-8910

Before Enlightenment, chop wood, carry water. After Enlightenment, chop wood, carry water.

Zen Proverb

[Planning]: Short Term Rentals

Jessica Simpson <jessica@livelovecomo.com>
To: "planning@como.gov" <planning@como.gov>

Fri, Mar 17, 2023 at 12:41 PM

Subject: Opposing the Proposed Regulation of Short-Term Rentals in Columbia

Dear Planning and Zoning Commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed regulation of short-term rentals in Columbia. While I understand the need for sensible regulations to ensure the safety and wellbeing of our community, I believe that the current draft of the proposed ordinance is far too restrictive and complicated for STR operators to understand.

Furthermore, I would like to address the misconception that short-term rentals are disrupting the housing market and impacting affordable housing. In fact, studies have shown that short-term rentals make up only a small percentage of the overall housing market and are not significantly impacting the availability or affordability of long-term rentals.

On the contrary, short-term rentals actually increase home values because operators take good care of these properties by adding landscaping, updating, and maintaining them to a high standard. This benefits the local housing market and the overall value of our community.

It is not fair to penalize responsible property owners who have invested time and money into maintaining their properties and contributing to our local economy. It is also not the responsibility of short-term rental operators to solve the affordable housing crisis, which should be addressed by the city through other means.

Regulating short-term rentals will only hurt our community by limiting tourism, reducing revenue for small business owners, and ultimately hurting our local economy. I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance and work with the short-term rental community to find a solution that benefits everyone.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jessica Simpson
REALTOR®

 Jessica@LiveLoveCoMo.com
 **573.355.0660**  573.510.2050
 23 N 10th St, Columbia, MO 65201
 www.LiveLoveCoMo.com





RUSSELLBOYTT
REAL ESTATE GROUP
www.LiveLoveCoMo.com

SEARCH HOMES NOW

FIND YOUR HOME'S VALUE

BOOK A CONSULTATION



IMPORTANT NOTICE: Never trust wiring instructions sent via email. Cyber criminals are hacking email accounts and sending emails with fake wiring instructions. These emails are convincing and sophisticated. Always independently confirm wiring instructions in person or via a telephone call to a trusted and verified phone number. Never wire money without double-checking that the wiring instructions are correct.

[Planning]: Short-term Rentals

Kristen Smith <kscomoleasing@gmail.com>
To: planning@como.gov

Tue, Mar 21, 2023 at 1:13 PM

Dear Planning and Zoning Commission,

I manage several short term rentals in Columbia and I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed regulations. While I understand the need for sensible regulations to ensure the safety and wellbeing of our community, I believe that the current draft of the proposed ordinance is far too restrictive and complicated for STR operators to understand. I take great pride in the rentals that I manage and offer wonderful properties and top notch service. I fear that managers (and owners) will lose our small businesses. There is nothing proposed that will allow Managing Hosts like myself to continue to operate.

I employ a local cleaner and pay her \$45 an hour. I have a local handyman that makes \$50 an hour. I myself am a local Columbian running a small business providing a great service to people visiting our wonderful town. I provide local magazines and even crafted a guest book that highlights all the wonderful restaurants and local places for people to visit. I promote this town and take great pride in providing visitors with nothing but high quality service, accommodations and recommendations. I get rave reviews and several repeat customers. I am also very aware and courteous to any neighbors and never have any complaints – I've even had several neighbors rent my properties for visiting family members.

The types of guests that rent my homes are – contract workers that want a comfortable place to stay while working weeks at a time, families coming to visit students at the colleges, families coming to town with their young children for various sporting events, MU football fans (and out of town fans coming to support their own teams), people coming to town for procedures at the hospitals – all of these people choose a comfortable, adorable rental rather than a hotel room. A couple weeks ago, I had the privilege of renting to a family while their Veteran father was in the hospital in a coma. They didn't want to stay in a hotel – they wanted a home surrounded by their family. All of these bookings not only provided a safe, comfortable stay for the guests, but also provided work for my cleaner, my maintenance, myself and tax revenue for the City of Columbia. All bookings are charged an occupancy tax and that is remitted directly to the city, county and state.

Furthermore, I would like to address the misconception that short-term rentals are disrupting the housing market and impacting affordable housing. In fact, studies have shown that short-term rentals make up only a small percentage of the overall housing market and are not significantly impacting the availability or affordability of long-term rentals. The 1500 square foot slab homes in my neighborhood that are listed for over \$300k are far more problematic to affordable housing than any short term rentals I manage.

Short-term rentals actually increase home values because operators take good care of these properties by adding landscaping, updating, and maintaining them to a high standard. This benefits the local housing market and the overall value of our community.

It is not fair to penalize responsible property owners and managers who have invested time and money into maintaining their properties and contributing to our local economy. It is also not the responsibility of short-term rental operators to solve the affordable housing crisis, which should be addressed by the city through other means – again, home prices are skyrocketing and that is NOT due to short term rentals.

Regulating short-term rentals will only hurt our community by limiting tourism, reducing revenue for small business owners, and ultimately hurting our local economy. I urge you to reconsider the proposed ordinance and work with the short-term rental community to find a solution that benefits everyone.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kristen Smith

[Planning]: Short-term Rental

Bryan Stockton <bryan.j.stockton@gmail.com>
To: Plannning <planning@como.gov>

Mon, Feb 27, 2023 at 9:26 AM

I had already filled out the rental survey but I wanted to add some additional comments the additional survey didn't allow.

Sec. 29-3.3 Part B. Item 9: Rental Platform Identification - Requirement to send a complete list (yearly) of the locations online of your rental listing. I think this requirement is a tad bit of overreach without additional information behind the backstory on why this was included. I would even find it unmanageable to monitor or regulate as the lists will be rather large. If I had rental property, I would list as many places as possible, even if I didn't intend on listing in those locations. The frequency of the requirement also seems short and could be better on a multi-year cycle.

Terminology regarding "dwelling unit is made available for occupancy for no greater than" 120 days or 30 days (based on tier). This wording implies that you are allowed to list the rental for a set number of days rather than having it rented out a set number of days. I think this wording should be changed to the latter to allow for a continuous listing throughout the calendar year and put limitations on how many times during that year it can be rented. The wording could be changed to "dwelling unit rented for occupancy for no more than (XXX) days in a calendar year"

Bryan Stockton, AIA
913.669.4119
bryan.j.stockton@gmail.com

Short-term Rentals - Columbia

Veum, Trygve L. <VeumT@missouri.edu>

Tue, Mar 21, 2023 at 10:41 AM

To: "patrick.zenner@como.gov" <patrick.zenner@como.gov>, "bill.cantin@como.gov" <bill.cantin@como.gov>

Cc: "mayor@CoMo.gov" <mayor@como.gov>, City of Columbia Ward4 <ward4@como.gov>

Residential Short-term Rentals:

To whom it may concern:

We are homeowners and residents of [Columbia \(916 W. Lathrop Road\)](#). We have completed and submitted the City questionnaire (7 questions) on short-term residential rentals:

In general, we support the P&Z Recommendation on short-term rentals. Below we emphasize specific points:

1. **Ownership:** Short-term rentals in R-1 residential neighborhoods must be owner occupied. In other words, the R-1 property owner must have their primary residence on the same property as the secondary short-term rental. We believe this requirement will be essential to maintain the family character, stability, and quality of life expected in R-1 residential neighborhoods.
2. **Neighborhood stability:** Absentee-owned and operated short-term rentals will diminish neighborhood stability, and the families who have purchased homes and who are living in these neighborhoods will be the losers. When neighbors know and support each other, it contributes to a safer Columbia community. Absentee owners do not maintain properties in the same manner as a homeowner who resides on that property. Rental neighborhoods decline in appearance as well as value.
3. **Economic contribution to Columbia:** A short-term rental will only be used a few weeks or months annually. However, a home occupied by a family annually (owned or long-term rental) will make a much greater contribution to the Columbia economy than that of any short-term rental with occasional occupancy.

The following questions did not seem to be adequately addressed in the Airbnb report:

- 1 What City office will be responsible for handling the short-term rental contracts, collecting fees to cover all costs, and keeping the records?
2. Who will have the legal authority to enforce the short-term rental regulations?
3. Who will we as neighbors contact (other than our Councilman) if there are problems that occur with an adjacent short-term rental?
4. Will the city provide residential homeowners with contact information for short-term rental owners in their neighborhood?
5. Adequate off-street parking should be required for all short-term rental vehicles on the rental property, and not on the street. Parking short-term rental vehicles on the street in R-1 residential neighborhoods will create traffic issues for the neighborhood.

We thank Planning and Zoning and City Council for their service and consideration.

Sincerely,

Trygve and Marge Veum

916 W. Lathrop Road

Columbia, MO 65203-2728

Janet E. Wheeler, Esq.
4105 Meadow View Drive
Columbia, MO 65201
janet@janetwheeler.com
573-356-4777

March 24, 2023

City of Columbia Missouri
701 Broadway
Columbia, MO 65205

Attn: Planning and Zoning Commission Planning@CoMo.gov
Attn: Sixth Ward Councilwoman Betsy Peters Ward6@CoMo.gov
Attn: Patrick Zenner, Development Service Manager Patrick.Zenner@CoMo.gov

RE: SHORT TERM RENTAL DRAFT PROPOSAL COMMENTS

To Whom it May Concern:

Please accept my comments regarding the Short Term Rental Ordinance proposal. In preparation I have reviewed the information located on the City of Columbia website page “Short-Term Rental Regulation Discussion” page along with the linked materials. Additionally, I have reached out to City Staff, Pat Zenner, and Sixth Ward Councilwoman Betsy Peters to ask questions and provide input on this matter.

For the purpose of making my position clear -- *at this point in time*; I do not support the proposed ordinance in its present form. I am not opposed to a short term rental (STR) scheme in the City of Columbia, but I have serious concerns about the framework, style and approach to regulation of this type intertwined into existing property use and where administrative processes are not also implemented and actual studies which support the anticipated impacts. I also believe that any STR regulation should be subjected to no less scrutiny as to safety and personal protection than existing rental property regulations. And, I believe that R-1 zoning should have less STR impact than that which is set out in the draft proposal, as I discuss below.

My detailed concerns are collectively listed below and absolutely must be addressed before this ordinance is presented to the City Council for adoption. While the proposal may mirror ordinances in other jurisdictions, I remain committed to the understanding that the City of Columbia is unique, and as such a one size fits all recommendation does not fairly address the uniqueness of our great City.

I understand that the STR matter has as at its genesis concerns raised by Columbia hotels and motels and the disparity between the visitor tax placed on their establishments and its impact in competing with short term rentals, not subject to this tax, such as AirBnB, and VRBO. I was surprised to find little to nothing in the staff materials or other input which in my opinion focuses on increasing

revenue to the City from regulation of the short term rental market, how this alleged imbalance between businesses is leveled, or how the City intends to finance the increased regulatory oversight, enforcement, and administrative hearings associated with the proposed STR ordinance.

Currently there is a structure for zoning in Columbia that is well established and has formed the basis for property owners expectations about the type of land use that is associated with a zoning designation, along with how the City will enforce compliance with that designation. The proposed STR ordinance fundamentally turns the current zoning structure on its head by creating a zoning “overlay” to selected zoning classifications by allowing designated STR’s to expand the land use associated with already established zoning. The “overlay” creates a use exception primarily denoted by the “number of nights” a property can exercise the benefits of the STR license. This change in zoning is contrary to the expectations of land owners and their reliance on their underlying zoning classification. While the City may alter zoning schemes, this proposed alteration is one of the most comprehensive changes I have seen in the 25 years I have lived in this City that represents grand consequences throughout the community.

This “number of nights” framework is clever, in that it mutates each selected zoning designation, into a new hybrid – that is clearly beyond the original use intended by the zoning ordinance, and by using the “number of nights” framework it erodes what has been fundamentally embedded in the City of Columbia’s zoning ordinances. For example, R-1 zoned residences do not expect commercial activity, such as an STR in their neighborhood, just as they do not expect a day care or farmer’s market.

The proposed framework shifts enforcement efforts predominately to residents for administrative matters. The simple fact is the City has a poor track record on zoning enforcement due to staff shortages and budget. It is reasonable to conclude that the citizenry will likewise be on the hook to ensure the STR ordinance is upheld. If the City is serious about this ordinance, it must fully fund the resources necessary to eliminate this burden shift. Matters such as noise ordinance violations, parking matters, as well as open container fires are all within the purview of the police (if they are available), but a STR that exceeds the “number of nights,” or is otherwise non-compliant, is an administrative matter that will require staff time, as well as dedicated adjudicatory staff.

If a property owner suspects a STR license violation, a call to the police would be futile to remedy the situation since police do not address administrative matters set out in ordinances. A property owner would be left collecting evidence on their own to present to the City staff for evaluation and action. Whether the question is an STR exceeding the allotted “nights” or having more occupants than permitted by ordinance, asking citizens to be the front-line tool for ordinance enforcement is imprudent and could even place the property owner in harm’s way. Because STR residents are transient, violations may also be transient, and elude documentation and ultimately City enforcement. This all will leave frustrated homeowners empty handed by way of City support. This is a serious concern as the benefit of an STR does not flow to other property owners, it flows to the STR licensee. The burdens, however, will be in the laps of the neighbors.

A review of the proposed ordinance focuses on the STR licensee and the City. In my opinion it should be revised to provide a framework with relief to other property owners should there be STR license violations and if the STR ordinance outcomes prove to be unduly burdensome to property owners.

Approval of an STR can bring grief to surrounding neighbors, and the proposed ordinance fails to consider these impacts on the STR neighbors.

A revised STR proposal should require the City to notify all property owners within a reasonable geographic range when an STR license is granted by the City. Knowing you have an STR in your neighborhood seems rather simple, and doesn't mean that a property owner must guess if a property is licensed and used as a STR. Rather than keeping STR licensee holders properties buried in recording documents and City paperwork, actual notice to other property owners is reasonable. The notice should be at the application stage through the granting of any STR. Additionally notification should include information on the standards the STR must adhere to, where complaints can be directed, including breaking down what issues can be directed to law enforcement and which are to be directed to the City. And, lastly the notification should clearly outline the remedies that may be available.

Another thing that is absent from the proposed ordinance is it fails to incorporate any record keeping requirements by the City or reporting requirements by the STR to ensure adherence by the STR to the requirements of the license, including "nights limits" as well as reporting criminal activity at the STR. The City should not accept any ordinance that fails to address a method for accounting for nights, and the penalties, including licensure surrender, for exceeding the limitations.

The proposed ordinance focuses on the "limited nights" overlay to existing zoning but gives little attention to the actual harm that is embedded when this standard is put together with occupancy limits. This comes into play when a single STR is grouped with other STR's in a neighborhood or area. This clumping together of STR's raises concerns for safety and security as each STR presents numerous transient residents in a community. A stable community would reasonably be concerned if a sudden influx of strangers arrived, and then that influx turned over, week after week after week. Additionally, I am unaware of any safety measures that would limit registered sex offenders from using STR's and neighbors being notified of their presence. The transient nature of STR guests is part and parcel of the STR proposition, but the burden on communities will also be impacted by the sheer volume of transient guests at STR's.

The volume of guests in a neighborhood is best explained by way of an example combined with the "limited nights" standard. R-1 zoning would allow 30 nights per year of rental. That is but one factor. The other factor is the occupancy that each night of rental represents; that is the number of people. With a cap of eight guests drafted in the proposed ordinance, a math exercise demonstrates what these two components can mean to a neighborhood.

When one R-1 home is surrounded by three R-1 STR homes - the impacts are staggering, and untenable. While mathematically the below illustrated calculation is a "worst case" scenario, a homeowner would ultimately find redress through an underfunded and understaffed City, and in most cases after waiting a full year to perfect their complaint.

One R-1 home, surrounded by three R-1 STR homes can look forward to 720 non resident visitors in total to the neighborhood in one year. Six STR properties in the neighborhood, would increase the exposure to 1,440 transient strangers in only one year.

While it is easy to see how the “number of nights” overlay is a simple approach to addressing STR with intact zoning, it however fails to take into consideration the interplay with other factors like occupancy numbers. What is absent in the number of transient guests is that transient guests are considered overnight guests – it does not take into account the 15-20 additional guests that come to the STR for a cook out, or other visitors at the STR that are not overnight. I saw nowhere that the time necessary to commence a complaint was addressed but since many of the highlighted issues require accrual of time to become a viable issue – as a homeowner, that’s a painful period of time to endure.

Another short coming of the proposal is that The Certificate of Compliance Posting section of the proposal (Section 8) only requires posting on the STR property “onsite for review upon the request of a police officer or city inspector investigating a violation.” This provision overlooks two important stakeholders; nearby property owners as well as transient guests of the STR. If a guest in the STR finds that the property is not safe, fails to provide necessary fire protection like working smoke detectors, and unobstructed egress, the posting requirement is inadequate. We are living in a day and age of electronic communication, which belies the fact that information can be jam packed into a small 8 ½ x 11 piece of paper by providing a QR code. The City should consider taking advantage of these tools to communicate to all parties that may be involved with an STR.

I would be remiss if I did not comment that I believe at the R-1 level, thirty nights is a level that is in my opinion excessive. R-1 zoning is not contemplated to be transient, or at high occupancy limits. It is residential. **The overlay of 30 nights in R-1 is excessive and overlooks the impacts that transient guests can have on the overall neighborhood, especially when a neighborhood has multiple STR’s present. 30 nights signals a business use, and will diminish the residential style that R-1 zoning is known for in this community.** The number of nights which I would consider suitable would be less than thirty. In addition, I would propose a one strike for R-1 zoning STR’s – if a violation of the ordinance is determined, a penalty period should apply before renewal can be sought.

As I wrap up my comments I would like to address the “Criteria for short-term rentals” proposed in the draft ordinance. The items which the City and Commission shall consider fail to take into account adjacent property owners. If you are an adjacent property, your property is not a criteria in the consideration. The criteria outlines identifying properties “300 feet” from the STR - - but the purpose of that criteria is not elaborated on. How is the criteria applied to the STR application? Or is it just an identification of properties – which honestly is a waste of time and energy if its just for recording but no investigation or action.

The criteria also inquires as to applicants with a “history of complaints” – but the criteria basically suggests this will be noted, not that it is a criteria for denial. Another criteria that reached out to me was the increase in the intensity of the use of the property. What was most peculiar is that the proposal only considers traffic and noise to be “intensity” concerns. I would disagree that “intensity” of use is limited to these two factors.

And, in the last criteria, I am astonished that the proposal only measures “support for the establishment of the proposed STR ...” any opposition to the STR is not a criteria; meaning the voice of the citizenry is irrelevant in the criteria unless they provide “support”. I couldn’t disagree more. I have pointed out throughout these comments that stakeholders other than the City and the STR applicant are

the center of the ordinance proposal. The fact that only support for an STR is a criteria for establishing an STR in Columbia, speaks volumes to the work that is needed in revising and redrafting this ordinance.

Yes, there will be those saying that it is time the City moved on this matter but moving on a bad proposal is not the answer. It is clear from the time that this matter first came before the City, and now – that the world has not collapsed or ended in Columbia as to STR's. The Staff cites no crisis, and no other stakeholders have sounded no fire alarm. I urge you to step back, and consider my comments as well as others and table this drafted ordinance, and send it back for further review, and revision.

I urge the Planning and Zoning Commission, as well as the City Council, to defer this matter until the draft ordinance can be revised to address my concerns, and rebuilt to incorporate consumer protections for non-STR property owners, limit impacts on R-1 zoning properties, incorporate notice provisions to properties located near STR's, define administrative versus criminal provisions of the ordinance for purposes of ordinance enforcement,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Janet E. Wheeler", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Janet E. Wheeler