

Date: July 12, 2023
To: Planning and Zoning Commission Members
From: Patrick R. Zenner, Development Services Manager
Re: Short-term Public Engagement Results Follow-up

Below please find updated information that provides the breakdown of the public engagement responses to the STR questions recently used to gauge public sentiments towards regulation of STRs generally. The attached summary below and attached graphics provide engagement results that are 1) inclusive and 2) exclusive of respondents identified as living outside the city limits of Columbia.

Of the 434 total respondents, 54 identify as living outside City limits, or 12% of the total respondents. The following comparison illustrates very little variance between the two sets of respondents.

- Q1 (Do you presently offer any residence you own or rent as a short-term rental?)
 - Inclusive (resident & non-resident): 20% yes (88), 80% no (346)
 - Exclusive (non-residents removed): 20% yes (76), 80% no (306)
- Q2 (Do you support limitations on the location of short-term rentals?)
 - Inclusive (resident & non-resident): 37% yes (161), 63% no (271)
 - Exclusive (non-residents removed): 40% yes (153), 60% no (225)
- Q3 (Do you support limitations on the number of short-term rental licenses a property owner or authorized tenant may obtain?)
 - Inclusive (resident & non-resident): 40% yes (172), 60% no (261)
 - Exclusive (non-residents removed): 44% yes (166), 56% no (213)
- 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?)
 - Inclusive (resident & non-resident): 59% yes (255), 41% no (177)
 - Exclusive (non-residents removed): 61% yes (232), 39% no (146)
- Q5 (Do you support preservation of affordable housing (owner-occupied or rental) within the City?)
 - Inclusive (resident & non-resident): 74% yes (321), 26% no (110)
 - Exclusive (non-residents removed): 78% (293), 22% no (84)
- Q6 (Do you support limitations on the number of days a dwelling unit can be rented for short-term rental revenue collection?)
 - Inclusive (resident & non-resident): 29% yes (79), 71% no (195)
 - Exclusive (non-residents removed): 32% yes (78), 68% no (165)

Building & Site • CATSO • Housing Programs • Neighborhood Services • Planning • Volunteer Programs

- Q7 (Should such a day limit be established based upon the location of the dwelling used for short-term rental.)
 - Inclusive (resident & non-resident): 24% yes (59), 76% no (186)
 - Exclusive (non-residents removed): 27% yes (59), 73% no (158)

With the exception of Q1, where the percentages did not change when subtracting non-residents, the percentage of respondents indicating yes was 2% to 4% higher with non-residents excluded. This is due to the number of respondents indicating “no” dropping when non-residents are excluded more than those indicating “yes”.

It should be further noted that the total respondents to each of the questions may not total 434 or 378. While questions 1-5 were identified as “required” to be answered, it would appear that the setting to ensure that this be the case was circumvented in some instances. It should also be known that questions 6 & 7 were optional and do not total 434 or 378.

Staff hopes that this information addresses the Commission’s questions regarding the data collected. We look forward to the upcoming discussion on July 20 relating to the regulations and the public engagement results as we prepare for the joint work session between the Commission and Council. The joint session will be held on July 24 @ 5:30 pm in Conference Rooms 1A/1B.

Please let me know if you have questions.