

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**June 5, 2025**

**Case Number 215-2025**

**A request by the City of Columbia to amend Sections 29-1.11(a) [Definitions], 29-3.2, Table 29-3.1 [Permitted use Table], 29-3.3 [Use-specific Standards], and 29-6.4(m)(2)(iii)[Conditional Use Permit] of Chapter 29 of the City Code (Unified Development Code) pertaining to the regulation of residential dwellings used for the purposes of short-term rental (STRs), also known as AirBnBs or VRBOs. The amendments propose revisions to definitions specifically tailored to STRs, revisions to the permitted use table indicating what zoning districts allow STRs, and revisions to the STR Tier structure and conditional use permit requirements.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed text change as presented.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. We will go to questions for staff, but I would like to take this opportunity to remind Commissioners that we will get to Commissioner comments at the end of this process. It is very late. Let's stick to questions for staff and speakers as they come up and save any of our concluding thoughts until we get to that portion so we can try to get through this and respect everyone else's time, as well. Are there any questions for staff on these ordinance changes? Seeing none. New Commissioners, this is your chance. I know that this is your probably first time seeing this, unless you've been paying attention to our work sessions. No questions? Okay. We will go to public comment. Who would like to start?

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: And I will ask -- I will ask that -- come on, Mike. I will ask that, like, come forward as the person in front of, if you want to be next, come sit on the front row so we can keep coming. Go ahead, Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commission. As some of you know, I sat where you sat for eight years until about a year ago, and I've been involved with this, as Mr. Zenner said, for seven years. The purpose of me speaking today is to address two issues that Mr. Zenner brought up. One of those is efficiency and why we're not there, and other one is equality. There may be some other comments along the way. In -- Madam Chair can help me -- summer of '23, we had a joint meeting with Council in A and B. During that meeting, I had a nice, wonderful chat with our City Manager, Mr. Seewood, and I said De'Carlon -- sorry a little straightforward there -- we're going to need people to

oversee this, and we're going to need two. And he said I know. Right now we don't have any. And let me tell you how I got to two. While we doing this, Sharon will remember and some of the rest of you will remember, too, we spent a lot of time doing commission research -- other cities, other countries, how it works. There was a wonderful negative example about ten hours south of us, and that's New Orleans. They opened up with 3,000 STRs and five staff, and were overwhelmed immediately. They have many other legal problems also, but we won't get into that. That's how I came out with the number of two. As Mr. Zenner said, we found 300, 400 initially, figured there were 500 or 600, kind of used that in my mind as an operating number. We needed those two staff a year ago. Mr. Zenner needs them now. Two staff are 4,000 hours. Mr. Zenner's people will be doing other things if they had that. I think that's the biggest efficiency problem whether you accept this amendment or not, you're going -- they're still going to have this issue because he's 45 and 75, something like that, Pat. We've got 120. We think there are 400 more. That is the biggest efficiency issue. There is not -- they don't have the time. I get it. And then you guys don't have the time. Another issue on efficiency, I am opposed to this amendment and we can, by right, do a lot of these and enhance communication. But some of this, the staff members need communication, too, because I did a survey of 15 people that I know that have STRs that have not applied yet. Half of them didn't even know about it. Regardless, if we do buy right in Tier 1, and 30 days is insufficient time. We appreciate that. That was a political decision, and do Tier 1 at 120, and that's an admin. That may bring other people in. Are we there? That may bring other people in. The other thing is equality. Not all owners are equal. We have people paid here today that will tell you their view. We also have about a dozen people here who will tell you another view who are not paid. Thank about that. Any questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Actually, did you do the thing that you're supposed to do when you come up to the microphone and state your name and address for the record.

MR. MACMANN: I did not. My name is Michael MacMann, and I live in the Third Ward.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for Mr. MacMann? Seeing none. Thank you for being here.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next?

MS. SPENCER: I am Kitty Spencer; I live at 1713 Ridgemont. And I spent time this afternoon reading the Boone County and City of Columbia housing study that came out in October of '24. And I would strongly encourage those of you who are new to look over that study. It's very telling, and it's a good resource for current trends in housing in Columbia. So the housing study identifies that 36 percent of all residents, and that's, you know, single-family residents, et cetera, and 51 percent of renters are cost burden, meaning spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs. So this study, the same study documents that housing prices and rents have increased in Boone County between 2023, 2024. As a social worker, I'm a volunteer at Love Columbia, and I can tell you this is true. And so our payment goes way up and people have to get multiple jobs or get new --(inaudible) -- to have new jobs,

and it's a real problem. So independent studies have shown that allowing commercial, an investor, in other words, known principal residents in STRs and residential zones lead to increases in housing prices and rents. So I feel like the City Council should be taking steps to create new affordable housing in the City, not passing measures that continue to increase housing costs and reduce housing opportunities for Columbia's permanent residents. And principal residents, I believe, should have the right to operate an STR in their home as an accessory to the residential use without the potential barrier of needing a CUP. So principal resident STRs do not remove housing from available housing stock in a family use -- for family use is what I mean. They don't relieve housing, but commercial STRs, so investor types, they do remove housing from available housing stock for family use, and that's what's happened in our neighborhood -- our neighborhood. A house that would be very affordable, it hasn't gone up above the \$200,000 amount is an STR -- needed to be an STR, and there goes another affordable house for a family. So I just would ask you to think about this proposed ordinance with that in mind.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Ms. Spencer. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here tonight.

MS. SPENCER: And thank you for being here tonight.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next?

MR. EDMONDSON: Hello. My name is Logan Edmondson; I live at 1728 East Broadway. I'm going to stay on script here and try to be very brief. I was stopped in the lobby on my way out, and asked to come back up and deliver the same set of comments again. But yeah, so I also spent this afternoon reading that October 2024 housing study. I want to point out data from -- that was aggregated from FRED shows skyrocketing housing demand in Boone County, and data collected by the City of Columbia suggests that 37,000 more housing units are needed by 2050 to match growing housing demand. Analyses of the housing gaps in Columbia suggest that at least 208 single-family homes need to be entering the supply pool yearly. And allowing single -- and allowing short-term rentals to operate out of these single-family homes effectively remove multiple potential units from the overall housing supply, and this puts a strain on the City's housing infrastructure which inflates rents and housing costs, especially in areas like East Campus that I mentioned earlier where there's a high concentration of renters. So, yeah, that's -- that's all I have. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you so much for being here tonight. Any speaker -- or any questions for Mr. Edmondson? Oh, sorry. Commissioner Stockton, go ahead.

MS. STOCKTON: I just appreciate you and Kitty both bringing this point up. I am familiar, I run -- I work at the University teaching architectural studies and urban planning. We talk about affordable housing. I've spent a large part of my career working on these sorts of issues, and you're not wrong. It's -- it's a complex issue. There's a lot -- lot that goes into it, and I'm working on research projects for this, but you're on the nose. And I know that if anybody doesn't know this, but Columbia is, like, on this top ten Nasdaq study list, and it's not uncommon for college towns to have this. So you are correct, and we need to be very cognizant about what we allow to be a short-term rental that could be a home for somebody

that desperately needs it. So when I personally have been approving these, please know that I know that in the back of my mind, and I'm trying to strategically -- this is also my first night here. But we hear you, and I -- I deeply understand the balance of supply and demand and how we need to take this responsibility. So I just wanted to thank you both for bringing that up.

MS. EDMONDSON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Next speaker, please come forward.

MR. SPENCER: Yeah. My -- my name is Clay Spencer; I live at 1713 Richmond, as well. I'm very new to this process. I really thought if you lived in a single-family resident zone, it was kind of like set in stone and that was the law. After we bought our home and lived there for several years, I first learned that that wasn't true because a ten-person group home opened up next door to us. And then following that group home, two doors beyond that, another group home opened. So -- but in the last five years, both of those group homes have gone out of business, but on Highridge Circle, which is just a half a block to the east of us, that within the space of a city block, there are two independent living homes. And at the last meeting, the first meeting I ever came to, there was a short-term rental application for somebody right in the middle of those two independent living homes. So I don't really have an issue with a homeowner using their home for a short-term rental, but because that homeowner is -- is my neighbor, and we have shared values for property value, and for also creating a neighborhood to care about each other. But the current ordinance says that if I -- a non-home-owner -- owner wants the short-term rental, the Commission and the Council must consider the approval of neighbors, the neighboring properties. That's being eliminated by this -- changes of these proposals. And I think that's a key element because the people in the neighborhood can understand what's happening to the quality of life in that neighborhood and so I want to speak against the proposals because I think as members of the neighborhood, we should have a voice in the decision that's being made whether or not to allow a commercial interest in a residential neighborhood. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing -- oh. Commissioner Ortiz, yes?

MS. ORTIZ: So just to -- sorry. To wrap my brain around this --

MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MS. ORTIZ: You -- there was a short-term rental in your neighborhood that came before us?

MR. SPENCER: Yes. Just --

MS. ORTIZ: And you liked having the opportunity to speak?

MR. SPENCER: Yes. And -- yes.

MS. ORTIZ: And under this new process, it would not trigger a CUP?

MR. SPENCER: That's correct.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Next

speaker?

MR. BENTLEY: Well, again, I'm Clyde Bentley, 1863 Cliff Drive in Old East Campus. I've -- I'm much more articulate in writing than in speaking, so I hope you got my e-mail on my general notes, but I want to address some issues on affordable housing today. I really feel for you because this whole issue of the STRs, I think we've all gone to a bed and breakfast, an Airbnb, and enjoyed it, but there are very few of us want it next door to us. So you're in a quandary that I don't admire you to have to be in. What I want to look at today is -- is the idea of affordable housing. I think, arguably, the most affordable housing in Columbia is in the old central neighborhoods where your houses are small and older, and are also not protected by covenants like the newer subdivisions are. But the -- what we're looking at is the situation where the STRs for these neighborhoods can be something very wonderful, but it also can be something very bad. The bed and breakfast movement came out of England, I believe, with the idea of allowing farmers, villagers and crofters to maintain their home that they couldn't afford by renting out a few rooms here and there, getting enough income to get by, and that -- it also allowed people to express their pride in their home, two people very -- (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sir, could you stay close to the microphone? I appreciate it.

MR. BENTLEY: Excuse me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Just stay close to the microphone, please.

MR. BENTLEY: I -- okay. But when you turned -- instead start converting neighborhoods to distributed motels, you change that situation, you raise the price of property because it becomes commercial property now. You take away the local pride in ownership and make something that is very different from -- from what you started with with the intent of protecting houses. The present ordinance makes the STR process harder for -- excuse me -- the proposed ordinance makes it harder for resident owners and easier for investor owners to go through the process. And I think that's the -- it's wrong, because what we -- if you're looking at the initial idea of a bed and breakfast, you should be supporting the resident owners. You better serve the city that way. I think one of the things that is no surprise, there haven't been a lot of applications because there was no enforcement. You've only had less than a week of -- of enforcement of this rule. And so I -- what I'm going to ask you to do is to either postpone this or reject the ordinance until you can start looking at how to protect and enforce the restrictions on multiple owners and multiple -- and dense ownership.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Bentley. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next?

MS. GARDENER: My name is Christine Gardner; I live at 112 Anderson Avenue. Before she had to leave, Pat Fowler asked me to share these papers with you, her comments, and also the earlier referenced October 24 housing study. I appreciate Clyde saying many people enjoy STRs, staying in them, but they don't want to live next to one. Well, I live next to one, so I thought I would let you know a little bit about what that's like, because it's very interesting and much more difficult than I ever thought it would be. And I knew I was not going to be happy having a short-term rental next to me, but I'm finding

that First Ward where I live, we don't have driveways often, so they're parking in the street. There is a parking place in the alley, but they don't use it. They are out of compliance on the 300 foot area. I know that there is at -- probably two or more short-term rentals on Meadow Lane, which is a half block away. I've had -- it seems to be kind of a -- you know, families get together at these things, and they tend to have sometimes therapy sessions out in the backyard. And that's really not pleasant to have to listen to, and this is all within the reference of these are not my neighbors. It would be different if they were my neighbors, but when they have dogs, it's not my neighbors' dog that's barking, it's some stranger's dog. So in reference to the idea of 1,000 feet from schools that we should eliminate or may conditional use short term rentals, why would you do that when children need to live in housing close to schools? Why would you allow housing to be taken away from them? They will be empty houses instead of homes with the families in them. And I have found that they have completely distorted housing prices, because if you're making money off of a house, you can afford a pretty large mortgage. If you're a family and it is your source of home, it's -- it's an expense. It's not -- it's not an income producer. So prices have gone through the roof.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Ms. Gardner. Do you want to make a final sum up?

MS. GARDNER: Yes. I think just being able to say I want to have short-term -- I mean, I want to have long-term renters or homeowners in my neighborhood should be enough.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Gardner? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next?

MR. HASHEIDER: Good morning. My name is Jay Hasheider, and I think you all deserve a prize for being here. We all deserve a prize for being here at this ungodly hour. I am here to say that I really object to the process that has been the -- the process that's brought this ordinance in front of you tonight. The process that created the ordinance in the first place took years with a lot of feedback, a lot of workshops, a lot of public hearings. This is being crammed in a very short time frame and we're having a public hearing at this time of night. I think that just says enough right there, that we should reconsider how this process is going through. I also want to say that Mr. Zenner has pointed out that everybody is equal, but I live in a neighborhood -- I'm not sure if made my address, which is 1812 Cliff Drive. I lived in East Campus and in Benton Stephens for 45 years. I've seen the importance of long-term residency and that doesn't mean that they can't be renters, but long-term residency, that means that they're going to be there for more than a year. They feel committed to the neighborhood. Those are the kind of neighborhoods that we need, and with that kind of structure, we can have denser neighborhoods because now everybody is in a solidarity type thing, and it's not fragmented and it's not a bad place to live. It's a place you want to live in. So long term residency is extremely important. It seemed to me that the whole process that's going on is for the ease of staff to administer the program that they had two years or better to comment on. And as in many cases, where were they commenting in those two years that they had before this first policy got -- this first ordinance got implemented? So they had a chance to do that. Let's not cram an entire rewrite to it in the matter of two months. And lastly, I want to say that I do own

property in Benton-Stephens, and I have the intention of selling the property. It was a rental. I'm hoping to sell that, getting it ready for sale. I would love to have the ability to say you can have the short-term rental as part of the way that you can pay for this -- this house. It gets me some -- the maximum amount for my dollars. It also makes me feel good because I'm selling to an owner occupied house, and that part of it is being taken away because I have some -- somebody that is already a short-term renter that's only two doors down. So they would have to go through the CUP process, which is you don't have to go through if you're an investor-owned person, especially if you pick out the right spots. And so I think that there's a lot of loopholes, there's a lot of inconsistencies, and there's a lot of rationalizations that I think should be hashed out, but not at 2:30 in the morning or whatever time it is. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. And, I'm sorry, sir. Would you stop over here and get the spelling of your name to -- are you good? Okay. Thank you.

MS. DOKKEN: Dee Dokken, First Ward. I just want to echo that I think there's a difference between a long-term resident having an STR in their home, and an investor when you look at it through a housing availability lens. I also think neighborhoods appreciate knowing -- if there's a CUP, there will be sign up saying there will be a hearing or some kind of -- it's good for people in the neighborhood to have some way to get that information that this is an STR. And I'm really glad to hear there's going to be a hotline. That will satisfy a lot of problems. And I really -- is there any other way that you can make your job easier, that would be great.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for MS Dokken? Thank you for being here, Dee. Next?

MS. HAMMEN: Hi. I'm Janet Hammen; I live at 1844 Cliff Drive. Thanks so much for staying up and not falling asleep. As already been mentioned, this -- these proposed changes are very complex, and I would suggest that the ultimate goal maybe should be to enhance the integrity of neighborhoods. Owner-occupied short-term rentals are not the same as non-resident short-term rentals for neighborhoods, and we've heard several comments on that tonight. I acknowledge you're pain, Mr. Zenner, however, the original ordinance took seven years to develop, multiple opportunity for comment, public hearings, lots of attendance at work sessions and so on. And these are major changes being made to this, and it's being frankly sprung on the public. I found out about it this week, and that's not a lot of time to digest all this. And so I -- I would ask you to allow time for discussion and for the public to be involved. And so I would ask you to please don't approve these tonight, and put it off for a time, deny them, and have it be brought up and let people talk about it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Hammen? Seeing none. Thanks, Janet. Next?

MR. TRABUE: Well, good morning, Commissioners. My notes say good evening, but I don't think that's appropriate anymore. My name is Tom Trabue, with Trabue Engineering, offices at 4750 North Boothe Lane. I'm representing the Columbia Board of Realtors, and would like six minutes for my presentation, if I could.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Not tonight, Tom.

MR. TRABUE: I'm going to try to be fast. The Board has been following the adoption and the implementation of the STR ordinance over the last year, and we would like to publicly compliment Pat and his staff for how helpful they have been for the STR operators in trying to navigate this process. It is a complex ordinance, and we're dealing with folks that are not used to dealing with development-type things. And so I really appreciate their help in this process. We appreciate the concerns that have been brought out by the staff, and are generally very supportive of these amendments. We feel like any effort to reduce the requirement for a conditional use permit is a positive outcome for STR operators, as well as for the Community Development Staff. We do have a couple of concerns that we would like to -- to bring forward regarding the triggers outlined in the new Tier 1 category that require conditional use permits, and how they might affect what we're trying to accomplish with this amendment. First, regarding code violations and complaints, the City gets lots of complaints, many of which are not substantive, accurate, or for that matter, compliance issues. We believe that the language in the ordinance should reflect that these should be verified complaints of non-compliance, and that they were not addressed by the owner/operator in a timely manner. We think that's really important. You're going to get lots of complaints on the hotline. I'm in favor of the hotline, but this call center is from some other place with an operator that does not know our local ordinances and is just recording random complaints that come all day, all night. Likewise, it's not uncommon for any property to be subject to a code violation. Even our inspectors do not know every code. A simple code violation of any kind should not trigger -- be a trigger for a conditional use permit. And we believe that the language can be modified slightly to reflect that these are open code violations that have not been addressed in a timely manner by the owner/operator, and I think earlier, Pat kind of addressed that a little bit, but I think the language could be a little more specific there, just to make sure that somebody doesn't get caught in that trap. Again, part of the emphasis of these amendments is to reduce the number of conditional use permits that we bring forward. The last item is with regard to the dwelling units within 1,000 feet of a school triggering the need for a conditional use permit. I did a little bit of map work as well, went at it a little bit different than the staff did, and I identified that 1,000 feet from any school property boundary is approximately 120 acres. That's a lot of area. That's a half a square mile by a half of square mile, and I think Pat kind of alluded to that in the staff report, as well. I was really surprised when I did that exercise, because as we went through the work sessions, the 1,000 foot didn't -- it kind of triggered me a little bit, but not nearly as much when I started to put lines on the paper. We would propose that this number be reduced to 300 feet, which would equate to approximately 19 acres, or 500 feet, which would be approximately 39 acres as being a more appropriate trigger for the conditional use permit. As noted, we're generally in supportive -- supportive of these amendments to the ordinance in addressing the administrative time concerns. We think our comments are complimentary to the goal. I'll wrap up here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thanks, Tom.

MR. TRABUE: We're very respectful that the focus of these amendments is to simplify the application process and to minimize the number of CUPs required to make more effective use of the

limited staff time. Thank you for the consideration of our comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Trabue? Seeing none. Thank you so much. Next?

MR. NORGARD: Peter Norgard, 1602 Hinkson Avenue. I just want to say I've been following along this process for the last five to seven years, however long it's been. My wife and I -- Rita in the very back corner there, and, you know, we -- were --were along for the ride because we cared a lot. We own a number -- or she owns a number of properties that we rent long-term, not short-term, and that's a conscious decision. But we want to -- I want to focus primarily on the change away from this conditional use -- the change to require a conditional use -- or not require a conditional use permit for non-resident owner/STR operators, which effectively permits anybody to participate no matter what up to 210 nights per day -- or year. The conditional use process was not established to create a constant workload for the Planning and Zoning staff and you and City Council. It was created to establish neighborhood protective standards or neighborhood protections. It's the -- in fact, it was a key neighborhood protection that we fought very hard for, and it might actually be one of the few neighborhood protections that is built into this particular ordinance. The CUP represents a soft barrier to entry, so the point here is to try and reduce the outsized impact that an STR might have on a neighborhood. And so the Commission who were not engaged in this process over five years ago probably won't remember the amount of animosity and passion that came out. And so it's with great concern that I'm sitting here speaking to you to try and convince you not to adopt these standards because it will eliminate one of the things we fought the hardest for. I would also say on the flip side of this same issue, it's being expanded to all applications -- this 1,000 foot rule, I'll just say that. It's kind of strange to me, I don't know where it comes from, I don't know what the reasoning for it is, but it does have the potential to actually increase your workload, and that's kind of pointless. But I also see it as a -- somewhat discriminatory because in these dense, inner-city neighborhoods where there's lots of schools and very small lots, there's a much greater chance that if you want to apply for an STR, you're going to trigger the threshold. The further out into the city limits you get, the larger the lots are, and the more distributed the school are, and so people out there are less likely to trigger these -- this 1,000 foot rule. And so in that sense, I think it creates a little bit of an unfair bias for those folks. And I'm going to skip a bunch here because people have already said it. The change in definition for an owner/operator and a single-family operator is concerning because it creates this accessibility standard that applies to everybody, so a person in their home who wants to rent out a bedroom now might have to participate in ADA standards that they had no idea. And the wording is pretty vague, and I think that it demands a little bit more clarity before you would accept it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Norgard.

MR. NORGARD: So I would ask you to reject this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Norgard? Seeing none. Thank you for being here. Anyone else to speak? Now is your chance. If you don't stand up, I'm going to close public comment. Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

## **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comment on the text changes? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I've ingested everyone's statements, and you're right. This is probably not the best time to make these comments, but we're here till 2:00. We're here to -- or 1:00, excuse me. We're almost here to 1:00. Staff has been here long -- just as long. And I'm about the efficiency of getting -- if you're following me through this whole process, you know I was big on calling people renegades and not complying, and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Right? We have to get people under the law, and it's very easy to say, well, tough stuff, that's your job, that's your blah, blah, blah. We don't get paid up here. I pour concrete -- commercial concrete for a living. I've been up since 4:00. I've been doing physical construction since 4:00 this morning and came directly to this meeting, after taking a bath, so I wouldn't offend my Commissioners. It is 1:00. I haven't been typing in front of a computer or reading books. I have been physically laboring all day to come here and be here all night. And as you've heard Mr. Zenner say, the next meeting is going to be pretty similar to this meeting, and the meeting after that is going to be pretty similar to that meeting, and that's going to go on and on and on. If this is not a -- if we don't like this process, please suggest a way to make this easier, at least for the paid staff and especially the people that don't get paid. This is going to take a lot of time. I'm all about the transparency. I'm all about all of that, until you've been through a couple of these meeting. I have a pour tomorrow at 4:00, I've got to be up to start ready for work. It is 1:00 now. And I have four to five months of this to do. So please help us find an efficient way, staff wise, to digest 400 applications, or they will continue to operate underground and not be regulated, and cause more harm to our neighborhood because there's no way to know they exist, they live underground, they're working outside the boundaries of the law that we spent seven years trying to craft. So this is not perfect, but just like the ordinance wasn't perfect that we put on the table, I am saying let's throw this out, let's work this, and fine tune. I think the best laws are those that get put out and are easy to pivot. We can put this right back on the table and look at it again. One more statement. The distances that we have determined have been fought for for months. My position, and I can only claim for my position, the 1,000 feet from the schools is consistent with -- imagine, like, sexual predators or people that had to be registered sex offenders. I'm not going to trust an Airbnb person to make sure that that's done. I'm not. So I'm going to guarantee about making 1,000-foot radius around schools, and I'm going to make that a determination and how I determine what Airbnbs or short-term rentals exist around schools. So I'm not in support of shrinking that at all, because I don't support, I don't have the trust in a business entity to make sure that there's not any sexual predators in that area. Just my opinion. Just my opinion on that subject. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Who would like to speak next? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I appreciate -- I appreciate everybody who comes to share and who has concerns and who gives perspective because it helps inform the decisions that we have to make. I arrived on the Commission as the Commission was coming to a close about all of the work that had been done for this process. And I distinctly remember having a conversation about how much time should we give so that

people get used to, hey, this is coming. We're not going to implement this right away. We're going to give a year, and let people know, hey, this is coming. You've got to get it together. You've got to, you know, come in and get your application in. And I heard some individuals say, well, I just learned about this. And for my fellow attorneys, we all know ignorance of the law is no excuse, so you may not have known, and yet the law still is -- it's still enforced. And there has to be a line in the sand. There has to be a starting point. It has to happen. Is it ideal? Probably not. Is it necessary? Absolutely. I just did rough math very quickly because I'm a person about evidence, I'm not about emotion. I'm about evidence. So if we say we believe there are 450 short-term rentals in Columbia and there are about 35,000, 36,000 single-family homes, that's one percent. So I get that it feels painful when it's your neighborhood, but, overall, the arguments that we're making saying that these short-term rentals are influencing the prices of Columbia, that's not realistic. It doesn't make sense that one percent is influencing something to 300 percent of what it was four or five years ago. That's not what's happening. There's something else happening and we should probably actually investigate that so that we can make a difference. Home ownership and housing is extremely important to me and everybody on this Commission knows because I've said it from the beginning. I've been homeless three times in my life, and so it is extremely important to me, and I value when people come and say, hey, I bought a home and I didn't expect that this was going to, you know, show up next to me. I get it. And also, it is important for us to protect the rights of individuals to do with their home what is available for them to do. And I -- as I've said many times, I protect that right for everyone. So if you decide tomorrow, you know, you've got a medical tragedy in your family, you need some money, you've got to go ahead and rent your house out, and you decide this is what I need to do, I'm here for protecting that right for you, just like I'm here for protecting it for the person that we may be upset with today. In many of these cases, in most of the cases, these short-term rentals - - we found out one tonight, it's been going for seven years. Right? And many of these cases, they have been in operation under your nose. You didn't even know. Right? And then you get a notification and it's, like, gosh, darn it, this is crazy. Why is this happening? And it's been happening for seven years. So as I've said from the beginning, let's let the law work. I am supportive of these changes mainly because I'm -- I'm not a nighttime person, so for me, I am suffering right now in ways that I cannot comprehend or explain to you. I am a morning person, and like my co-Commissioner, I get up at 4:00 a.m. regardless, so I will be up at 4:00 a.m., even if I go to sleep at 3:39, I will be up at 4:00 because that's just my life. And I get dings of e-mails at 12:00. This weekend, it came on Saturday or something from Pat, and I've got to be honest with you when I tell you that's not fair. It's not fair that he -- this is not what he signed up for. It is not. He has, you know, a role and a job to perform, and this is not what he signed up for, to have to stay up late at night, work on weekends, spend four hours to eight hours working on something that we're going to vote similarly on every single time. Are we -- I'm not here to eliminate your voice. I'm here to tell you that your voice can still be heard when you complain about somebody has got too many cars parked out front. Okay. Your voice is still heard. You need to tell us that. You need to explain there's stuff going on over there and perhaps we should investigate that. And once you allow the law to work, that

person's license will be revoked, and you can shut it down. But let's let the law work before we say it doesn't work. Okay. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. I'm going to keep it really short, because I -- obviously, it's 1:00 a.m., but also I have a lot of thoughts on that, and I'm pretty torn. But I think what I'm coming down to is that I think that City leadership needs to solve this problem and it's not the resident's responsibility to come up with the solutions. And I also think that it's not the job of this Commission to sacrifice community members and, like, their input just for efficiency of staff time. I'm going to leave it there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: I plan to support this because -- I am sympathetic to all the speakers I heard. I mean, there's a lot of valid points that I haven't thought about, and part of it is that I'm new to this commission and there has been a ton of time put into this. I can tell just from sitting here and, you know, listening to what I have heard, and all the paperwork and the staff report, it seems like there needs to be something. So maybe this isn't the perfect solution, but this -- as Commissioner Stanton said, this is a step in the right direction, I think, so I plan to support it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: So generally, I'm supportive of making some changes to get us away from all these conditional use permit approval processes. I'm not supportive of the changes as they are written currently. I have two main issues: One is the 1,000 feet from a school. So we're saying, if you're within 1,000 feet of a school, we're going to kick you into this conditional use process, but the fact that you're near a school, isn't one of the five things that we even evaluate the conditional use permit process for.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Also part of the amendment.

MR. BRODSKY: I don't think we added anything to it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. BRODSKY: The other issue I have is that, you know, we have -- we have five things that we use to evaluate the conditional use -- just that it's near one. We have five things that we -- that we are -- currently evaluate conditional use permit on. Owner-occupancy, I don't -- I'm not sure we've had one of those. Proximity to an existing STR, I think tonight is the first time we've -- we've denied one based off that. Applicant's STR history, we definitely consider that quite a bit. Impact on properties, whether the STR is going to increase the intensity of property use, I don't think we've ever considered that. And then Neighborhood Support. We have denied -- or recommended denial of a conditional use permit many times, based off the lack of neighborhood support, and we are getting rid of -- you know, they could have 100 percent of their neighbors around them couldn't be in opposition, and they're going to go through an administrative process because they don't have one within 300 feet. So those are my two main issues.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Go ahead, Commissioner Gray.

MS. GRAY: Yeah. I am very empathetic to some of the concerns that have been brought forward. My relationship to this ordinance is quite new, even though I've been following these meetings

for a while. I do have some concerns about the treating things equally, just as Kimberly Crenshaw quote. Sometimes treating different things the same is less equitable, so a little bit of suspicion there, but I'm also equally suspicious of the fear of strangers and what the difference is between a stranger and a neighbor in terms of investment, in terms of imagining a future of living right alongside someone. I say that as a person who lives directly across from two Airbnbs which started this villain origin story for me here. I -- I am curious about what denying or deferring this would entail in terms of the after-effects, looking at -- because, again, new to this, did a lot of my own research and read staff reports. Thank you for that labor. That complex and, like, convoluted ordinances are a massive problem in getting people to -- if you don't have -- if you convoluted ordinances with little enforcement, which, up until this point, we have not because June 1st, less than 10 percent of people are going to apply. So I see this amendment as necessary in the fact that it could create additional labor in terms of incoming applications, but the opportunity to have oversight over folks who may be doing not great things right now seems important.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Commissioner Stanton. I'm sorry. Were you finished, Commissioner Gray?

MS. GRAY: I was.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: To my fellow Commissioners, I look at this from -- the staffing is becoming more and more of an issue to me, especially -- I mean, personally. I am 51 years old, and there is such a shortage of people doing what I do that a 51-year-old with an average finishing crew of about 45, the people -- the professionals I work around, are pouring commercial concrete. We have a young staff of planners over there that we're getting to crash out, and excuse my Ebonics, but crashing out means you're getting ready to overwork them and overburden them to where they're not going to be able to focus on things that are probably more important. I'm not saying this is not important. I, personally, have spent seven years on this topic myself. Seven, myself. We're going to crash out this staff and there's a lot bigger things coming down the road as far as us as a municipality. And if I'm going to crash the staff out, let's crash it on something else, and not on this situation right here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So when we started the last round of this, when we said let's start over from scratch, and -- and build something from the ground up that is custom tailored to Columbia, that is not just take somebody else's ordinance and put it here. We developed a set of guiding principles, and I just want to remind everyone of what those were briefly. I'm not going to read to you all. But basically, encourage homeownership, encourage different types of housing stock, encourage easy use of STRs for the original model, which is, you know, the green book, and essentially, it's people renting out space in their own homes, and allow homeowners to benefit from extra income in their property while balancing that against their neighbors, which also includes not just homeowners, but also tenants, because that was also very important to us, an equitable relationship or treatment of people who need that extra income in order to be able to stay in their homes. To me, these changes do nothing to impact any of those. What these changes do is make it easier if you are a homeowner who wants to rent out your mother-in-law

apartment, or a room in your house, now you're not limited to 30 days. You get up to 120 days without having to add any extra parking, you get up to 210 days without having to do anything else if you've got adequate parking. It does nothing to prevent those original Tier 1 30-day administrative approval folks from not only going through that same process they would have had to otherwise, but getting more days with still not having to come before us. This makes it easier on those original model folks, not harder. This does nothing to make them come and get a CUP unless they're in a sensitive area where we are concerned about neighborhood impacts because of a lack of parking, which will impact your neighborhood, because of complaints against them, which means you're an impact on your neighborhood, because of being within a school, which means you're an impact on the neighborhood. Because we do want to prioritize kids being able to live close to a school and areas around schools being more sensitive to, you know, guest turnover. All of these things are not only things that will have an impact on your neighborhood, but are also reasons that we have denied things or discussed denying or, you know, had tied votes on -- on STRs. When we developed these amendments with staff, staff developed them, but staff did those triggers based on what we were denying, based on what our concerns were, not pulling them out of the air. And I appreciate the fact that we've had a year where we've seen case after case after case, and generally approved them unless there's massive neighborhood opposition including filing regular complaints with the City, unless they are literally right next door to another STR, unless they are a owner who never even showed up, and who also had a bunch of complaints against them. So I understand that there is some concern that now you're not going to hear about every single STR application. I also think it's not going to make a difference on which ones would have been approved, because the ones that would have been denied are still going to be here in front of us. The neighbors are still going to be able to show up and say I've called five times on that guy, he never mows his law. We're not touching the fact that each person gets one, which means we're not increasing the total number across the city. We aren't changing the fact that if you are close to one, you know, if you've got density in a particular neighborhood, they're going to be here, and we can deny them, because density in the First Ward is a serious concern. They're all going to have to be here. They are not getting approved with -- with administrative approval, and we're not changing the fact that if you are a long-term tenant or a homeowner who wants to make a little bit of extra income so you can stay in your home, you could do that. In fact, you can do that easier and more efficiently and -- not efficiently, and make more money so that you can do that, because you're not limited to 30 days anymore. So I -- I just want everyone listening and City Council eventually when they read this, to know that we have not abandoned those principles. Those principles are still what we are following. I truly believe that these changes will allow those principles to stand without continuing to put us here at 1:15, 1:20, 1:30, 2:00 a.m. week after -- or month after month, week after week, with all of you all having to come out time and time again. I -- I truly believe that this is a step in the right direction, and I also trust the people in this room, most of whom I know and have worked with on other community projects or have seen here time and time again, you're keeping an eye on things. And while it's not your job to come up with solutions, it

is your job as community activists and leaders to tell us when problems exist. So if we get down this road in another six months, and you come to us and say, hey, for whatever reason, administrative staff is really messing this up and we have a whole street of them over here in the First Ward, tell us. If there's an STR that is having party after party after party, tell us. We can amend this again if this doesn't work. But I can tell you right now, what we've been doing for the last year has been an interesting exercise, but not a great use of our time because 95 percent have been approved. And that is weeks of not just staff time, but Commission time, at an average of 45 minutes per case with almost all of them getting approved. So I -- I'm going to stop pontificating, but when I look at this, the core issue is how many are there going to be across the city. We haven't changed that. Are we going to do something about density in particular neighborhoods. We haven't changed that. And if someone is a bad neighbor and a problem, can we stop them from operating an STR. We haven't changed that, so I'm -- I'm in favor of these changes. Anybody else? Seeing none. Would anyone like to make a motion?

MS. STOCKTON: I was just going to say that we might need to have a short-term rental for this room here pretty soon. I don't know how that process works

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think you have to stay 24 hours before that, which -- so Pat?

MR. ZENNER: I'm close, but, you know.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would someone like to make a motion?

MS. WILSON: Sure. I'll do it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: In the matter of Case Number 110-2024 --

MR. ZENNER: That's the wrong case number. Forgot to change that slide. It's 215-2025.

MS. WILSON: Oh, okay. Let's start over. In the matter of Case Number -- you tried to trick me -  
- 215-2025, is -- that is -- why is that up there?

MS. ORTIZ: I think the heading wasn't changed.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. The heading -- the heading. I apologize. The heading didn't get changed.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you just read the recommendation sentence; will that work?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: She doesn't have to read all the sections, or does she?

MS. WILSON: I will get -- I will get to it. I will get to that. Oh, okay. Okay. Thank you.

MR. CRAIG: Just the recommendation will be fine.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. Is that correct? Okay. Let's try it again. In the matter of Case Number  
202-2025.

MS. GEUEA JONES: 215-2025.

MS. WILSON: Maybe I'm not the one. I'm tired. I'm going to try it one more time. Give me one  
more chance.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You can do it, Shannon.

MS. WILSON: All right. In the matter of Case Number 215-2025, a request by the City of Columbia to amend Sections 29-1.11(a)[Definitions], 29-3.2, Table 29-3.1 [Permitted Use Table] -- uh-huh, all of the things. In the matter of all of those -- those things, I recommend approval of the proposed revisions to the regulations pertaining to STRs.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Wilson, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there further discussion on the motion? Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I just want to say I respect everyone on -- on our -- here and out there, but I am not going to support this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further discussion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray. Voting No: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Walters. Motion carries 6-3.**

MR. BRODSKY: Motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. By your vote of 7 to 2 --

MR. ZENNER: Six to three.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Six to three. I'm sorry.

MR. ZENNER: Six to three.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Missed that one. Sorry. Six to three, that recommendation for approval will be sent to City Council. No further cases coming before us.