



The Columbia Municipal Planning Commission will meet in *Special Session* on Wednesday, December 4, 2024 at 4:00 PM in Council Chambers in the basement of City Hall, 700 N. Garden Street. The Planning Commission will consider the following:

I. Organization

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Welcome of Visitors/Rules of Conduct

II. Discussion Items

1. Request from Development Services for review and recommendation of Zoning Text Amendments concerning Principal Uses, Accessory Uses, Temporary Uses, and Limited Use Standards contained in Article 4.

- Short Term Rentals

Request from

Documents:

1. Draft Zoning Text - Short Term Rentals
2. Draft Use Table Revisions - Short Term Rentals
3. Draft Point of Contact Placard Format

- Home Occupations

Request from

Documents:

1. Draft Zoning Text - Home Occupations
2. Draft Use Table Revisions - Home Occupations

- Bars, Taverns & Nightclubs

Request from

Documents:

1. Draft Zoning Text - Bars, Taverns, & Nightclubs

- Vape, Tobacco & Cannabinoid Retailers

Request from

Documents:

1. Draft Zoning Text - Vape, Tobacco, & Cannabinoid
2. Draft Use Table Revisions - Vape, Tobacco, & Cannabinoid

2. Request from Development Services for review and recommendation of Zoning Text Amendments concerning minor administrative changes and corrections throughout the document.

III. Adjourn

The Planning Commission of the City of Columbia welcomes your presence and participation at this meeting. If you wish to address the Commission regarding any item on the Agenda, please sign the sign-up sheet and indicate which agenda item you would like to comment on. You will have the opportunity to comment on an item when it comes up on the Agenda and before the Commission votes on the item. Once recognized, you may then come to the podium and state your name and address.

Anyone requesting accommodation due to disabilities should contact the ADA Coordinator, Wanda McClain, at 931-560-1570 prior to the meeting. For other questions, please contact the Department of Development Services at 931-560-1560.

Q4 Zoning Text Amendment Limited Use Standards

Project #:	24-0475	Location:	N/A
Applicant:	Kevin C. McCarthy, AICP	Case Type(s):	Text Amendment
Staff Planner:	Kevin C. McCarthy, AICP	Proposed Use:	N/A

SUMMARY

The applicant, the Zoning Administrator, requests to amend the text of Ordinance 4400, the zoning ordinance for the City of Columbia. This is the fifth of five rounds of zoning text amendments staff has presented to the Planning Commission between December 2023 and December 2024. These changes will implement Connect Columbia, better align zoning regulations with community preferences, and calibrate the standards based on “lessons learned” during the first two years administering the Ordinance. This round of proposed amendments is detailed in the attached track changes documents. Specifically the proposal relates to the limited used standards in Article 4 as well as related definition and procedural references in Articles 9 and 8.

- The Planning Commission is a **recommending body** for zoning text amendments. The City Council is the decision-making authority.
- The staff comments section details the proposed changes, which are provided in the agenda packet in ~~striketrough~~ and underlines.
- The specific limited uses impacted by this amendment include: Home Occupations; Bars, Taverns, and Nightclubs; retailers of CBD, Vape, and Tobacco; and Short Term Rentals.
- Planning Commission may recommend adoption of the proposed text, modify the proposal, or decline the request.
- Templates are provided at the end of the report to assist the Planning Commission in crafting properly formatted motions.

CONSISTENCY WITH CONNECT COLUMBIA

The ongoing current process of reviewing and updating the Zoning Ordinance and other regulating documents is part of the implementation of Connect Columbia, the City's comprehensive plan.

REVIEW PROCESS

Section **8.5.18** of the Zoning Ordinance directs the Planning Commission to review and make a recommendation on all proposed changes to the text of the Ordinance. The Planning Commission is the recommending body for text amendments under **§ 8.3.3.B.2** of the Zoning Ordinance.

Section **8.5.18.C** of the Zoning Ordinance requires that Planning Commission determine that the proposed changes are consistent with the comprehensive plan.

8.5.18.G of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the review criteria for approval of all changes to the text of the Ordinance:

- a. The extent to which the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment is consistent with the remainder of this Ordinance, including, specifically, any purpose and intent statements;*
- b. The extent to which the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment represents a new idea not considered in this Ordinance, or represents a revision necessitated by changing circumstances over time;*
- c. Whether or not the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment corrects an error in this Ordinance; and*
- d. Whether or not the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment revises this Ordinance to comply with state or federal statutes or case law.*

The criteria for City Council action on a Zoning Ordinance Amendment at § 8.5.18.J.4 are identical to the criteria for Planning Commission review at 8.5.18.G.3.

COMMENTARY FROM PROFESSIONAL PLANNING STAFF

The City Council adopted the current ordinance on July 14, 2022. The Zoning Ordinance implements the City's comprehensive plan, Connect Columbia. On November 8, 2023, the Planning Commission recommended adoption of a five-year update of the framework, land use, and transportation elements of Connect Columbia. The framework element of the plan directs planning staff to initiate revisions to the ordinance in order to bring it into consistency with changes to the future land use plan. It further directs staff to engage residents and property owners to solicit suggestions for further changes to the ordinance. As mentioned above, this is

the final round of zoning text amendments staff plans to present to the Planning Commission between December 2023 and December 2024.

The proposal includes the following changes:

- Home Occupations
 - Distinguishes between “Major” and “Minor” home occupations;
 - Creates a process to allow major home occupations as a conditional use approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals;
 - Continues to permit minor home occupations administratively; and
 - Modifies definition of Home Occupation and Kennels.
- Bars, Taverns & Nightclubs
 - Removes 500 ft exclusion from residential property;
 - Adds exclusions around schools and parks;
 - Prohibits the use on lots and building sites next to residentially zoned property; and
 - Requires a 50 ft separation from property in single-family use regardless of zoning.
- Vape, Tobacco & Cannabinoid Retailers
 - Creates a use category for Vape, Tobacco & Cannabinoid Retailers;
 - Creates a definition for Vape, Tobacco & Cannabinoid Retailers;
 - Imposes a 500 ft separation requirement;
 - Imposes a 500 ft exclusion around schools, parks, and religious facilities; and
 - Requires 50 ft separation from residentially zoned property.
- Short Term Rental
 - Removes requirement that all Short-Term Rentals be accessory uses in owner-occupied dwellings;
 - Modifies the definition of Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to allow the use of ADUs as short-term rentals;
 - Creates an administrative review and permitting process;



- Removes prohibition on short-term rentals in single-family character districts and allows them as a conditional use approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals;
- Allows short-term rentals by administrative approval in mixed use character districts and special districts;
- Requires a local point of contact for each permitted short-term rental; and
- Removes onerous parking requirements for short-term rentals.

Planning staff will present detailed commentary at the December 4, 2024 meeting of the Planning Commission. The proposal

The Planning Commission may recommend approval of the proposed text amendments, direct staff to prepare an alternative text amendment, or decline to act on the proposed changes.

SAMPLE MOTIONS

Approve:

Move to find, based on the analysis provided by city staff, that the criteria listed in section **8.5.18** of the City of Columbia Zoning Ordinance have been satisfied and recommend approval of the proposed text amendments [**may be subject to modifications proposed by the Planning Commission**].

Deny:

Move to recommend denial of the requested text amendment having found, based on the analysis provided by city staff, that the criteria listed in section **8.5.18** of the City of Columbia Zoning Ordinance are not satisfied [*list specific reasons for denial and provide direction to staff*].

Defer:

Move to find that there is insufficient information to decide, defer the matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission, and direct staff to provide: [*list additional information*] for review at a future meeting.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

§ 4.3.9.E.6 Home Occupation

Limited Use Standards (p. 235)

1 The following standards are intended to ensure that home
2 occupations are compatible with the residential character of
3 neighborhoods where they are located.

*Establishes a two-tiered
review of Home Occupation
permits based on the
potential impact to
neighbors*

4 (1) There are two classes of Home Occupation:

5 a. A Minor Home Occupation shall be permitted upon
6 approval of a Minor Home Occupation permit by the
7 Zoning Administrator. The Zoning Administrator shall
8 establish a process for review and issuance of permits for
9 minor home occupations.

10 b. A Major Home Occupation shall be allowed only with the
11 approval of the Board of Zoning Appeals. Such approval
12 shall follow the process of a conditional use permit. The
13 Zoning Administrator shall review such Major Home
14 Occupation requests and recommend appropriate
15 conditions of approval to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

16 (2) The Zoning Administrator may refer Minor Home
17 Occupations to the Board of Zoning Appeals upon a
18 determination that the proposed home occupation presents a
19 risk to the residential character of the neighborhood or quiet
20 enjoyment of other property owners.

*Insert cross-reference at §
8.5.10*

21 (3) If the Zoning Administrator denies a request for a Minor Home
22 Occupation, or revokes a previously issued permit, the applicant
23 may appeal the decision to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Such a
24 request shall be evaluated as a Conditional Use for a Major Home
25 Occupation permit.

26 (4) The following limitations apply to all Home Occupations:

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

- 27 a. The home occupation shall be clearly incidental and
28 secondary to the use of the property for residential
29 purposes;
- 30 b. A home occupation shall not be established prior to the
31 residents conducting the home occupation taking
32 possession of, and residing in, the dwelling;
- 33 c. Outside storage or display of materials, merchandise, or
34 inventory is prohibited;
- 35 d. Exterior alteration that changes the residential character
36 of the principal building is prohibited;
- 37 e. No exterior building signs shall be permitted except as
38 specifically provided in Article 7 of this ordinance;
- 39 f. Receipt, sale or shipment to and from the premises is
40 permitted by regular U.S. Mail and express shipping
41 service characteristic of residential neighborhoods;
42 large-volume, business-to-business commercial
43 deliveries are prohibited; and
- 44 g. The applicant shall obtain all appropriate licensure
45 required by the State of Tennessee.
- 46 (5) The following limitations apply to Minor Home Occupations:
- 47 a. The Home Occupation must be conducted entirely within
48 the principal structure;
- 49 b. The Home Occupation shall not exceed fifty percent of
50 the total floor area of the principal building;
- 51 c. No person other than a family member residing on the
52 premises shall be employed as part of a minor home
53 occupation unless such employee(s) works off-premises;
- 54 d. There shall be no customers or clients on the premises of
55 a minor home occupation; and

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

- 56 e. No commercial vehicles or trailers, other than ordinary
57 passenger vehicles; shall be permitted on premises.
- 58 (6) The following limitations apply to Major Home Occupations:
- 59 a. A Major Home Occupation may be conducted within an
60 accessory building;
- 61 b. A major home occupation may include two employees
62 who do not reside in the home;
- 63 c. Except in-home childcare licensed by the State of
64 Tennessee, a major home occupation may have no more
65 than two customers or clients on the premises at one
66 time;
- 67 d. Shipment and delivery to and from the premises are
68 prohibited between the hours of 9 pm and 7 am;
- 69 e. No employees, customers, or clients may be on the
70 premises between the hours of 9 pm and 7 am;
- 71 f. Trailers, equipment, and commercial vehicles, when
72 permitted by the Board of Zoning Appeals, must be
73 stored in the Third Layer and screened from view; and
- 74 g. The Board of Zoning Appeals may further restrict the
75 number of employees, hours of operation, deliveries,
76 and parking of commercial vehicles and equipment on
77 site.
- 78 (7) Revocation
- 79 a. The Zoning Administrator may revoke the Home
80 Occupation permit for failure to comply with these
81 limited use standards, conditions imposed by the Board
82 of Zoning Appeals, or other violations of City of Columbia
83 ordinances.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
Deletions are Strikethrough

§ 9.3 Definitions

Updates the definition of Home Occupation to reflect new standards.

Home Occupation: any gainful occupation conducted entirely within a Dwelling solely by the owners- or tenant residents thereof as an Accessory Use, which does not change the character of the Structure as a Residence; There are two types of Home Occupation: provided that

(1) Minor Home Occupations: gainful occupation conducted entirely within a Dwelling which does not generate traffic from employees, customers, clients, or deliveries and bears no said activity shall not occupy more than 50% of the Floor Area of the Dwelling, (2) there shall be external evidence of the accessory commercial use;

(2) Major Home Occupation: gainful occupation conducted on a residential property which

a. generates some traffic from employees, customers, clients or deliveries;

b. bears some external evidence of the accessory commercial use; or

c. occurs within an accessory structure.

~~other than an Identification Sign, (3) no goods shall be kept, and (4) no mechanical or electrical equipment shall be used except customary household equipment; and provided further that the following are not allowed as Home Occupations do not include: Clinics, Hospitals, Home Professional Office, barbershop, beauty shop, Restaurants, Kennels, Auto Repair, antique dealer, Retail sales on the premises, or loading of ammunition.~~

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

108 **Kennel:** Any ~~Structure or premises on~~place where ~~which four (4) or~~
109 ~~more dogs, cats and/or other household pets~~animals ~~over four (4)~~
110 ~~months of age~~ are kept for boarding, breeding, ~~selling,~~ grooming, or
111 training, for compensation, excluding any otherwise conforming or
112 lawfully nonconforming agricultural use, ~~however, any Structure or~~
113 ~~premises on which such animals are kept solely for Retail sale.~~ A Kennel
114 may not be a Home Occupation.

*Revises definition of Kennel
to provide clarity and
improve enforceability.*

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
 Deletions are Strikethrough

TABLE 4.3.9.A-2 BUILDING, LOT & BUILDING SITE ACCESSORY USES

ACCESSORY USE	CD-2	CD-3 L	CD-3	CD-4	CD-4C	CD-5	CD - 5C	SD-MHP	SD-INT	SD-LI	SD-HI	PUD - R	PUD-MU	CV
Minor Home Occupation	RPL	RPL	RPL	RPL	RPL	RPL	RPL	RPL	RPL	RPL	NP	RPL	RPL	NP
Major Home Occupation	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	NP	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>NP</u>

Distinction between Minor and Major Home Occupations in Accessory Use Table. Minor Home Occupations permitted administratively; Major Home Occupations are approved by BZA.

ARTICLE 8: ADMINISTRATION, PROCEDURE, & ENFORCEMENT

I. Historic Zoning Commission Action

1. If the proposed Use is located within a Historic District and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required, the applicant shall obtain the certificate according to the procedure in Section 8.5.13, prior to proceeding.
2. If no Certificate of Appropriateness is required but the proposed use is within a Historic District, the Zoning Administrator shall include comments and recommendations in the report prepared by the Zoning Administrator.

J. Board of Zoning Appeals Action

1. The Board of Zoning Board of Appeals shall conduct a public hearing pursuant to Section 8.5.16.G.
2. After conducting the public hearing, and considering the recommendations of the Zoning Administrator and the requirements listed in Sections 8.5.16K and 8.5.16.L, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall:
 - a. Approve the request;
 - b. Approve the request with conditions;
 - c. Deny the request; or
 - d. Continue the hearing.
3. In acting on an application for a Variance, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall limit its review and action to the specific standard, condition, or requirement from which relief is requested.

K. Conditional Use Permit Specific Requirements

1. A Conditional Use Permit may be granted provided the Board of Zoning Appeals finds that the request conforms to the following requirements:
 - a. The proposed Use is listed as a Conditional Use for the applicable District.
 - b. The proposed Use conforms to all applicable standards listed in Section 4.3.9.D, for the proposed Use;
 - c. The proposed Use is so designed, located, and proposed to be operated that the public health, safety, and welfare will be protected;
 - d. The proposed Use will not adversely affect other property in the area in which it is located;
 - e. The proposed Use conforms to all applicable provisions of this Ordinance for the District in which it is to be located.
2. The Board of Zoning Appeals may impose such other conditions and restrictions upon the premises benefited by a Conditional Use Permit as may be necessary to reduce or minimize the injurious effect of such Conditional Use upon and ensure compatibility with surrounding properties. The Board of Zoning Appeals may establish dates for the expiration of any Conditional Use Permit as a condition of approval.
3. The provisions of Sections 8.5.16.K.3.a-.c following shall apply to all applications for approval of any Conditional Use located within any Floodplain District as indicated on the Floodplain Map available from the Development Services Department during normal business hours:
 - a. Prior to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit application, an approved Floodplain Development Permit shall be required.
 - b. The Board of Zoning Appeals shall determine the specific flood or erosion hazard at the site and shall evaluate the suitability of the proposed use in relation to the flood hazard. Upon consideration of the factors listed herein and the purposes of this Ordinance, the Board of Zoning Appeals may attach such conditions to the granting of the Conditional Use Permit as it deems necessary to further the purposes of this Ordinance.
 - c. In passing upon such applications, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall consider the technical evaluation of the City Engineer, all relevant factors, and standards specified in other sections of this Ordinance, and:
 - (1) The danger that materials may be swept onto the other lands to the injury of others;
 - (2) The danger to life and property due to flooding or erosion damage;

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

§ 4.3.9.E.6 Bar, Tavern, or Nightclub

Bar, Tavern, or Nightclub shall be permitted in accordance with the applicable Use Table, subject to the following:

- (1) With the exception of nightclubs, taverns, or bars located within District CD-5, the applicant shall demonstrate that no pre-existing Place of Worship, Schools, or public park is located within 500 feet of the proposed nightclub or similar establishment.

~~Measurements~~

- a. The distance shall be measured in a straight line from the front door of the building to the front door of the church property line of the proposed night club or similar establishment and from the property line of any separate Parking Lots to be used by the nightclub or similar establishment.
- b. For public parks, said distance shall be measured in a straight line from the front door of the building to the closest point of the park property.
- c. For schools, said distance shall be measured in a straight line from the front door of the building to the front door of the school.

Adds separation requirement from parks and schools. Clarifies method of measurement.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

- 20 (2) No nightclub, tavern, or bar shall be located on a Lot or
21 Building Site Adjoining any property zoned CD-2, CD-3L, CD-
22 3, SD-MHP, or PUD-R~~within 500 feet of a Residentially zoned~~
23 ~~or Residentially used property.~~
- 24 (3) No outside storage ~~or activities~~ shall be located on the site.
- 25 (4) ~~Outdoor activities occupying no more than 400 square feet~~
26 ~~may be permitted by Administrative Adjustment.~~

Modifies the distance requirement to maintain separation from residential areas but allow greater flexibility in the location of drinking establishments.

Does the planning commission prefer buffer from Abutting or Adjoining residential properties?

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

§ 4.3.9.E.6 Tobacco, Vape, and Cannabinoid Retailers

Limited Use Standards (p. 242)

*Standards modeled
on Murfreesboro, TN
and Louisville, KY
(those jurisdictions
use larger exclusion
radius).*

Retailers of Tobacco, Vapes, and Cannabinoids shall be permitted where
the **Building, Lot and Building Site Principal Uses Table** permits Retail
Sales subject to the following limitations:

(1) Tobacco, Vape, and Cannabinoid retailers shall be located no less
than five hundred feet from

- a. An existing Tobacco, Vape, and Cannabinoid retailer;
- b. A School;
- c. A public park;
- d. A Religious Facility.

(2) Tobacco, Vape, and Cannabinoid retailers shall be located no less
than two hundred feet from any property zoned CD-2, CD-3, CD-
3L, SD-MHP, or PUD-R.

(3) Tobacco, Vape, and Cannabinoid retailers shall be located no less
than fifty feet from any property used as a Single-Family or Two-
Family home or Townhouse.

~~(4)~~(4) Required distances shall be measured from Parcel or
Building Site line to Parcel or Building Site line.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
Deletions are Strikethrough

§ 9.3 Definitions

18 **Tobacco, Vape, and Cannabinoid Retailers:** A retail sales operation that

19 (1) Devotes at least fifty-one percent of its floor area to the display,
20 sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of
21 products intended for recreational/non-prescription use
22 including but not limited to cigarettes, e-cigarettes, smokeless
23 tobacco, pipe tobacco, vapes, products made from cannabinoid
24 derivative plants (e.g CBD or THC products), or other nicotine or
25 cannabinoid delivery devices, components, products, liquid
26 nicotine or cannabinoids, or liquid nicotine or cannabinoid
27 containers; or

28 (2) Earns at least fifty-one percent of gross sales from sale
29 distribution, delivery, or marketing of products intended for
30 recreational/non-prescription use including but not limited to
31 cigarettes, e-cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, pipe tobacco, vapes,
32 products made from cannabinoid derivative plants (e.g CBD or
33 THC products), or other nicotine or cannabinoid delivery devices,
34 components, products, liquid nicotine or cannabinoids, or liquid
35 nicotine or cannabinoid containers.

*Definition based on
proportion of space
OR proportion of
sales*

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
Deletions are Strikethrough

TABLE 4.3.9.A-1 BUILDING, LOT & BUILDING SITE PRINCIPAL USE

PRINCIPAL USE	CD-2	CD-3 L	CD-3	CD-4	CD-4C	CD-5	CD - 5C	SD-MHP	SD-INT	SD-LI	SD-HI	PUD - R	PUD-MU	CV
<u>Tobacco, Vape, and Cannabinoid Retailers</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>NP</u>

Vape and CBD retailers subject to limited use standards in mixed use districts (excluding CD-5) and prohibited in single-family residential character districts.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

§ 4.3.9.E.6.KK Short Term Rentals

Limited Use Standards (p. 242)

Short-Term Rental Units shall be permitted in accordance with the applicable Use Table, subject to the following:

~~(1) the Short-Term Rental Unit must be in a Building originally used or designed to be used as an abode or home of a person, family, or household in either a portion of a single family house, or an individual Dwelling Unit in a two family Dwelling, or townhouse, which Short-Term Rental Unit is rented wholly or partially for a period of less than thirty (30) continuous days occupancy for a fee;~~

~~(2) the owner, defined as Single-Family Dwelling, of such Short-Term Rental Unit must reside on the premise;~~

~~(3) each Short-Term Rental Unit must be registered with and licensed by the City.~~

(1) Permit Required

a. No dwelling unit, accessory dwelling unit, or portion thereof shall be offered for rent as a Short-Term Rental unless the Zoning Administrator has first issued a short-term rental permit to the owner.

b. Where the **Building, Lot and Building Site Principal Uses Table** identifies the principal use of a dwelling as a Short-Term Rental as permitted subject to limited use standards (PL), a Short-Term Rental may be established upon approval of a Short-Term Rental permit by the Zoning Administrator. The Zoning Administrator shall establish a process for review and issuance of permits for Short Term Rentals.

*Permit required for
all STRs*

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
Deletions are Strikethrough

27 ~~a.~~c. Where the **Building, Lot and Building Site Principal**

28 **Uses Table** identifies the use of a dwelling, ~~portion of~~
29 ~~a dwelling, or an accessory dwelling unit as a Short-~~
30 ~~Term Rental as a Conditional Use (CU), a Short-Term~~
31 ~~Rental may be established only upon approval by the~~
32 ~~Board of Zoning Appeals. Such approval shall follow~~
33 ~~the process established at Section 8.5.16. The Zoning~~
34 ~~Administrator shall review such Short-Term Rental~~
35 ~~requests and recommend appropriate conditions of~~
36 ~~approval to the Board of Zoning Appeals. The Zoning~~
37 ~~Administrator shall issue a Short-Term Rental Permit~~
38 ~~only upon approval by the Board. The permit shall be~~
39 ~~subject to any unique conditions imposed by the~~
40 ~~Board. Conditional Use approval shall expire one~~
41 ~~year from date of issuance of the subsequent permit.~~
42 ~~The Board may authorize the Zoning Administrator~~
43 ~~to extend the expiration annually up to three years~~
44 ~~and renew the associated Short-Term Rental Permit,~~
45 ~~provided the operator adheres to all conditions of~~
46 ~~approval.~~

47 d. If the Zoning Administrator denies a request for a
48 Short-Term Rental permit, or revokes a previously
49 issued permit, the applicant may appeal the decision
50 to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Such a request shall
51 be evaluated as a Conditional Use.

STRs permitted throughout Columbia in all districts (except Civic and Heavy Industrial). Zoning determines the review process. STRs in mixed-use districts are permitted administratively. STRs in single-family districts are reviewed by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Permits renewed annually. Conditional use approval expires after one year but BZA can authorize staff to extend up to three years.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

- e. A Short-Term Rental Permit shall expire one year from the date of issuance. Failure to renew the permit shall constitute a cessation of the Short-Term Rental and immediate change of use to Household Living.
- f. A Short-Term Rental Permit is granted to a specific operator for a specific dwelling unit or portion thereof and may not be sold or otherwise transferred. Changes in the ownership will result in revocation of the Short-Term Rental permit. A new Short-Term Rental Permit is required when the dwelling unit is sold or conveyed.

(2) Short Term Rental Local Point of Contact Designation

- a. The owner of a short-Term Rental shall designate a permanent local point of contact for each short-term rental property.
- b. If the owner is a natural person, the owner may serve as the local point of contact. Alternatively, the owner may designate another natural person over the age of eighteen as the short-term rental point of contact.
- c. Where Short-Term Rental is the principal use of a dwelling, the name, email, and telephone number of the local point of contact shall be conspicuously posted where it can be seen by guests and law enforcement.
- d. The short-term rental local point of contact must be available to be contacted by the City at all times.
- e. Failure of the local contact person to be available at all times for contact by the City constitutes an

Permit is valid for one-year. Failure to maintain active permit constitutes change of use and loss of "grandfathering" (permit may be easily renewed administratively).

A responsible local contact is required for code enforcement and police issues. Point of contact requirement modeled on Nashville, Savannah, Tulsa and others.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

instance of non-compliance which may result in
revocation of the Short-Term Rental permit

- f. When the local point of contact is notified by phone
or email that the guests at a short-term rental are
violating City ordinances or policies, the local contact
person shall communicate with the owner, and the
owner shall immediately commence remedial action
and cause the violation to cease.

(2) Short-Term Rental operators shall provide a parking plan
demonstrating sufficient parking for guests.

- a. Where Short-Term Rental is the principal use of the
dwelling, the minimum number of parking spaces
shall be equivalent to that required by Table
4.3.12.B-1 Vehicular Parking Requirements for a
Single-Family Detached Dwelling. The Board of
Zoning Appeals may require additional spaces.

- b. Where Short-Term Rental is the accessory use of
dwelling, portion of the dwelling, or accessory
dwelling unit, the minimum number of parking
spaces shall be equivalent to that required by Table
4.3.12.B-1 Vehicular Parking Requirements for the
principal use, plus one.

*Parking is required
but much less than
current standard (1
per bedroom + 1 per
each additional bed,
cot, sofa, or other
sleeping
accommodation).*

(3) Events are not permitted in conjunction with a short-term
rental use. Examples of events include, but are not limited to,
weddings, receptions, anniversaries, private parties,
banquets, and business seminars.

*Event limitation from
Tulsa, OK ordinance*

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

Prohibited alterations include exterior lighting and signage.

- (4) External alterations or site improvements that change the residential character of the Lot or Building Site upon which a Short-Term Rental is located are prohibited.
- (5) Short-Term Rental properties must meet all applicable requirements of the state and local building, fire safety, and property maintenance codes.
- (6) Short-Term Rental operators and their guests shall comply with the laws of the state of Tennessee and all ordinances of the City of Columbia.
- (7) The Zoning Administrator may revoke a Short-Term rental permit for violations of these standards, violation of any City of Columbia Ordinances, or failure to adhere to conditions of approval imposed by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

§ 4.3.9.E.6.a Accessory Dwelling

Limited Use Standards (p. 228)

Accessory Dwelling

- (1) Only one Accessory Dwelling is permitted on any Lot or Building Site.
- (2) The Accessory Dwelling must be accessory to a House or Townhouse used for Household Living.
- (3) If the Accessory Dwelling is not attached to the primary dwelling, it must be separated a minimum of ten (10) feet from the primary dwelling.
- (4) In all districts except CD-2, an Accessory Dwelling may not exceed 600 square feet of habitable space; in a CD-2 Character District, an Accessory Dwelling may not exceed 1,000 square feet of habitable space.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
Deletions are Strikethrough

- (5) ~~An Accessory Dwelling Unit may not be used for Transient accommodations or as a Short-Term Rental Unit.~~
- (6) The Accessory Dwelling must share ownership and utility connections with the primary dwelling.

Eliminates prohibition of STRs in ADUs

§ 9.3 Definitions

Short-Term Rental Unit: A Dwelling Unit ~~in a Building originally used or designed to be used as an abode or home of a person, family, or household in either a portion of a single-family house, or an individual Dwelling Unit in a two-family Dwelling, Townhouse, or multi-family Building having no more than 6 Dwelling Units,~~
or Accessory Dwelling Unit which ~~Short-Term Rental Unit~~ is rented wholly or partially for a period of less than thirty (30) continuous days occupancy for a fee; specifically excluding however a “hotel” as defined in TCA section 68-14-302 or a “bed and breakfast establishment” or a “bed and breakfast homestay” as those terms are defined in TCA section 68-14-502, all as contemplated in TCSA section 13-7-602. A Hotel, Extended Stay Hotel, Motel, Bed and Breakfast, or Inn is not a Short-Term Rental Unit.

Provides for use of ADUs as STRs

Correct scriveners' error

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
Deletions are Strikethrough

TABLE 4.3.9.A-1 BUILDING, LOT & BUILDING SITE PRINCIPAL USE

PRINCIPAL USE	CD-2	CD-3 L	CD-3	CD-4	CD-4C	CD-5	CD-5C	SD-MHP	SD-INT	SD-LI	SD-HI	PUD-R	PUD-MU	CV
Short-Term Rental Unit	<u>CU</u> NP	<u>CU</u> NP	<u>CU</u> NP	PL	PL	PL	PL	<u>CU</u> NP	<u>PL</u> NP	<u>PL</u> NP	NP	<u>CU</u> NP	<u>CU</u> NP	NP

The principal use of a dwelling as an STR becomes a BZA approved Conditional Use in CD-2, CD-3L, CD-3, SD-MHP, PUD-R and PUD-MU (unless modified by Master Plan). Principal use of a dwelling as an STR in CD-4, CD-4C, CD-5, CD-5C, SD-LI and SD-INT is permitted administratively subject to limited use standards.

TABLE 4.3.9.A-2 BUILDING, LOT & BUILDING SITE ACCESSORY USES

ACCESSORY USE	CD-2	CD-3 L	CD-3	CD-4	CD-4C	CD-5	CD-5C	SD-MHP	SD-INT	SD-LI	SD-HI	PUD-R	PUD-MU	CV
<u>Short-Term Rental Unit</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>CU</u>	<u>CU</u>	NP

Accessory use of a dwelling, part of a dwelling, or accessory dwelling unit is permitted administratively in all districts. August 2024 ZA interpretation will be used to determine accessory status.

TABLE 4.3.12.B-1 VEHICULAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS

PRINCIPAL USE	MINIMUM NUMBER OF SPACES OF PARKING AVAILABLE TO LOT PER UNIT OF MEASUREMENT
Short-Term Rental Unit	1 per guest bedroom + 1 per each additional bed, cot, sofa or other sleeping accommodation

Eliminate separate parking requirement.



NOTICE OF LOCAL POINT OF CONTACT FOR SHORT-TERM RENTAL



Property Address	
Property Owner	
Local Point of Contact	

The individual named above is the designated point of contact for all complaints, violations, and emergency situations concerning the registered short-term rental unit. This notice is mandatory for emergency responders and city officials and is provided in strict accordance with the City of Columbia Zoning Ordinance, Section § 4.3.9-E.6.KK(2).

The registered owner of this property has appointed a local point of contact who must be available to the City of Columbia at all times, day or night. Unavailability of the local contact during any critical incident will constitute a breach of compliance, which can lead to the immediate revocation of the short-term rental permit. If the local point of contact receives notification from the City of Columbia regarding any violations of city ordinances or policies—whether by phone or email—they are required to inform the property owner without delay.

The owner must then take swift and decisive action to address and resolve the violation immediately. It is imperative that all parties uphold these responsibilities to ensure ongoing compliance with local regulations.





PLANNING FEE SCHEDULE

Payable upon Submission of Application

Non-refundable Except as Provided in Refund Policy

Comprehensive Plan Amendment¹

Submittal Fee	\$ 300
---------------	--------

Annexation with CD-3L Base Zoning

Submittal Fee (10 acres or less); plus	\$ 300
Next 90 acres or fraction thereof; plus	\$20/acre
All over 100 acres or fraction thereof	\$3/acre

Zoning Map Amendment "Rezoning" (§8.5.19)

Submittal Fee (10 acres or less); plus	\$ 450
Next 90 acres or fraction thereof; plus	\$30/acre
All over 100 acres or fraction thereof	\$5/acre

Planned Unit Development (§8.5.21)

Preliminary Development Plan

Submittal Fee (PUD-R and PUD-MU); plus	\$ 500
PUD-R and PUD-MU; and/or	\$25/dwelling unit
PUD-MU (non-residential acreage)	\$50/acre

Final Development Plan

PUD-R	\$ 250
PUD-MU	\$ 300

Revision of a Master Plan requiring Planning Commission Approval	100% of original fee
--	----------------------

Major Site Development Plan (§8.5.6)

New Multi-Family Residential Sites, Buildings, and Additions

Submittal Fee; plus	\$ 500
Residential Units	\$10/unit

New Non-Residential and/or Mixed-Use Sites, Buildings, and Additions

Submittal Fee; plus	\$ 500
First 10,000 square feet of all floor area; plus	\$0.05/square foot
All floor area over 10,000 square feet	\$0.02/square foot

Development Plan submitted with Preliminary Plat	\$10/unit
--	-----------

Revision of Plan Requiring Planning Commission Approval (§8.5.6.D.3); plus	50% of original fee
--	---------------------

Renewal of Expiring Site Plan without Changes (§8.5.6.D.1-2) ²	100% of original fee
---	----------------------

Alternative Compliance	\$500
------------------------	-------

¹ Must be accompanied by a request for rezoning.

² Paid with building permit or site construction plan review, as applicable.

Minor Site Development Plan (§8.5.6)³

Administrative Development Plan Approval (§8.5.6.R)	\$500
Renewal of Expiring Site Plan without Changes (§8.5.6.D.1-2)	100% of original fee

Heavy Manufacturing Permit (§8.5.22)

Submittal Fee	\$300
---------------	-------

Board of Zoning Appeals (§8.5.16/8.5.17)

Appeal Of Planning Department Determination ⁴	\$ 300
Zoning Variance Owner-Occupied Residential	\$ 200
Zoning Variance	\$ 400
Conditional Use	\$ 300

Architectural Design Reviewe (§8.5.15)

Design Review for Planned Unit Development	\$ 150
Design Review for structures in Special Districts (SD-LI, SD-HI, SD-INT)	\$ 100
Alternative Compliance - ARC	\$500
Alternative Compliance - ZA	\$300
Design Review Appeals	\$50

Historic Zoning Commission (§8.5.13)

Non-Residential/Non-Owner-Occupied Residential/Signs	
Certificate of Appropriateness - Commission; plus	\$ 150
Certificate of Appropriateness - Administrative	\$ 75
Owner-Occupied Residential	
Certificate of Appropriateness - Commission	\$ 25
Certificate of Appropriateness - Administrative	No Charge
After the Fact Request for Certificate of Appropriateness/Multiple Reviews ⁵	\$300

Heavy Manufacturing Permit (§8.5.22)

Submittal Fee	\$ 300
---------------	--------

³ All fees applicable to Major Site Development Plans apply to a Minor Site Development Plans referred to the CMPC by the ZA.

⁴ Refunded if the BZA finds in favor of the applicant.

⁵ This fee applies to all requests for approval for work already completed as well as requests which follow a Stop Work order. The fee also applies to second and subsequent requests to revise previous Commission-level approvals. The Zoning Administrator may charge the regular application fee in cases of bona fide hardship.

Subdivision (§8.5.24 and SubRegs)

Minor Subdivisions	
Referred to Planning Commission Approval ⁶	\$ 500
Staff-Approved	\$ 250
Preliminary Plat (Must Accompany a Development Plan)	
Submittal Fee; plus	\$ 500
Per Lot; plus	\$ 25
Final Plat	
Submittal Fee	\$ 500
Per Lot	\$ 25
Circulation of Approved Plat (Optional)	\$35

Zoning Fees

Zoning Verification Letter Basic	\$ 50
Zoning Verification Letter Detailed / Zoning Administrator's Determination	\$ 75
Home Occupation Permit	\$ 25
Mobile Vending Permit	\$ 50
Small Accessory Permit	\$25
Receipt of Plans Conforming to PUD or Site Development Plan	\$ 100
Engineering/Planning Reinspection ⁷	\$ 50
Short Term Rental Permit ⁸	\$300
Zoning Compliance - Residential ⁹	\$ 100
Zoning Compliance - Commercial/Industrial ⁴	\$ 300
Zoning Compliance - Signs ¹⁰	Lesser of 30% of project value or \$300

Public Notice¹¹

Advertising and Processing

Items for which CMPC/ARC is the Decision Making Authority	\$70
Items for which City Council is the Decision Making Authority	\$145
Items for which BZA is the Decision Making Authority	\$70
Items for which HZC is the Decision Making Authority	\$70

Mailing and Processing

Items for which City Council or BZA is the Decision Making Authority	\$9/adjacent parcel
--	---------------------

⁶ Referred at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator or City Engineer. Fee may be reduced to \$250 at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator or City Engineer when minimal additional staff time is required.

⁷ If associated with Preliminary Plat, Site Plan, PUD or other PC, BZA, HZC, Design Review

⁸ Double fees for after the fact permitting after May 13, 2024.

⁹ Paid with building permit.

¹⁰ Signs which require a CoA from the ZA or HZC may be credited \$75 toward the Zoning Compliance fee, provided no revisions are necessary upon first review of the permit application.

¹¹ In addition to the initial fee, advertising and mailing fees must be paid each time an item is deferred at the applicant's request. May be waived at discretion of the Director of Development Services.



Posting of Signs

Items for which City Council, CMPC, BZA, or HZC is the Decision Making Authority \$10

Additional Fees

Pre-application Meeting ¹²	\$ 225
Additional Fees for Multiple Technical Reviews ¹³	50% of original fee
Technology Fee	\$20

Refund Policy

All advertising and processing fees are non-refundable.

All mailing and processing fees are non-refundable.

Fees for Planning Commission items may be refunded, less a \$100 processing fee if the applicant withdraws the application at least twenty-four hours prior to the meeting of the Development Review Committee when the request is scheduled for its first technical review. Fees for Planning Commission items are non-refundable at any later point.

Fees for Board of Zoning Appeals may be refunded, less a \$50 processing fee if the applicant withdraws the application at least seven days prior to the scheduled meeting. Fees for Board of Zoning Appeals items are non-refundable at any later point.

Fees for Historic Zoning Commission items may be refunded if the applicant withdraws the application at least seven days prior to the scheduled meeting. Fees for Historic Zoning Commission items are non-refundable at any later point.

Zoning fees are non-refundable.

Abbreviations

Columbia Municipal Planning Commission (CMPC)
Architectural Design Review Commission (ARC)
Development Review Committee (DRC)
Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA)
Historic Zoning Commission (HZC)
City Council (CC)
Zoning Administrator (ZA)

¹² Only applies to proposed comprehensive plan amendments, zoning map or text amendments, planned unit developments, site plans approved by Planning Commission, and preliminary plats. Fee is only charged when the City Engineer, Fire Marshall, and Zoning Administrator (or their designees) are each in attendance. The fee may be waived at the discretion of the Director of Development Services. The fee may be credited to one subsequent related application for Planning Commission review received within six months of the meeting date.

¹³ Applicable to Planned Unit Developments, Site Development Plan, and Preliminary Plats which the Zoning Administrator deems noncompliant after two reviews by the Development Review Committee (DRC), and to applications referred back to the DRC due to technical deficiencies. May be waived at discretion of the Director of Development Services and/or the Planning Commission.



CITY OF
COLUMBIA
TENNESSEE

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

700 NORTH GARDEN STREET

COLUMBIA, TN 38401

PHONE: (931) 560-1560

FAX: (931) 560-1541

STR Survey Comments

August 13th – November 3rd 2024

1. Short term rentals are an asset to large families when traveling. They are also a benefit to many of our traveling workers who are here to build our infrastructure and to support all our new growth. I do feel that an overlay area around the square is a great compromise.
2. My family and I have been hosting guests in our beloved Airbnb for the past three years, and it's been a true joy to share the charm and warmth of our community with visitors from across the country and around the world. We've put so much love and care into our Riverside Airbnb, and it's wonderful to see how our guests appreciate the unique experience of staying in a home away from home. Recently, one of our guests shared that their daughter chose Columbia as the destination for her 17th birthday, finding it listed as one of the most charming towns to visit. It's moments like these that highlight how special Columbia is to those who come here. Our guests often tell us how much they enjoy the cozy, welcoming atmosphere of staying in a home rather than a hotel. They love being able to walk across the bridge to the town square, visit the farmers market, and support our local businesses. Many have even mentioned that there aren't many hotel options in Columbia that offer the same experience, often resulting in them staying in nearby Springhill instead. Airbnb plays an important role in bringing tourism to Columbia, providing visitors with a truly authentic and accessible way to experience our town. This, in turn, benefits our local businesses and helps to foster a sense of community among those who visit. I hope you'll consider these points as you move forward with the regulations. Our Airbnb is a labor of love, and we believe it adds great value to our town and its tourism industry. Thank you for your time and consideration.
3. When my family and I purchased our home with the intention of transforming it into an Airbnb, we knew we were taking a financial risk. At the time, Columbia was still up-and-coming, but we believed in the charm and potential of this town as a destination that people would grow to love. We saw something special in Columbia—a place with history, character, and a vibrant community. Over the years, we have poured thousands of dollars into making our Airbnb a welcoming and comfortable home for our guests. Whether it's a family waiting for their new house to be built or workers traveling for business, our Airbnb has become a place where people feel at home. For large families, in particular, a hotel room simply isn't suitable. Our guests appreciate the space, comfort, and local flavor that our Airbnb offers. We take pride in not only providing a cozy place to stay but also in supporting Columbia's local businesses. Every guest receives a bag of locally roasted coffee and a gift card to spend on the square, along with personalized recommendations for shops and restaurants. Through this, we aim to contribute to the local tourism industry and showcase all that Columbia has to offer. We took a chance on Columbia because we believed in its potential, and it's been incredible to see how much our guests love this town. The support for local businesses, the positive impact on tourism, and the sense of community that our Airbnb fosters are just a few of the reasons why short-term rentals are so important. As you consider the regulations on short-term rentals, I hope you'll recognize the investment we've made in Columbia's future and the value that Airbnb brings to our community.

4. Airbnb is my family's main source of income! In this economy, I don't know what we will do without it. It was the reason we were able to make sense of buying a home in Columbia back in 2021. So many of the Airbnb hosts have poured so much love and money into their properties and it is absolutely devastating to think of having to shut them down. Please reconsider or at least allow the Airbnb that have been already established continue. We love hosting people in Columbia and would love to be able to keep the wonderful hospitality going!
5. We live next to a sweet young family who owns an Airbnb in our neighborhood. Not only has short term renting provided a great source of income to that young family, but we have loved getting to meet the travelers that they host. We have never had a bad experience, there has never been any loud noise or disruptions. We would love to see Airbnb continue in Columbia as we find there are many benefits to the community.
6. When allowing STRs in a primarily residential area we should limit them to a specified number of units per a square block area. As an example, say 1-3 in a four-block square area. This way they are spread out and not allowed to cluster around the long-term residents' homes.
7. Please review Public Chapter No. 972, House Bill No. 1086, known as the "Short-Term rental Unit Act". Effective 05-17-2018; provides guidance for municipalities on how to regulate short-term rentals. I'm the former Director of our Nation's largest single family, residential leasing entity, I reside in Columbia and manage a 25,000,000 portfolio of long-term rentals in Columbia. I choose not to manage short-term rentals due to a myriad of liability concerns, however, I believe the City of Columbia has been ill-advised on the inevitable litigation that will occur by infringing upon property owner's rights. In order to avoid wasting the City's litigation funds, I encourage the planning commission to enforce penalties only on short-term rental owners that are deemed a nuisance by stated definition and adhere to the Short-Term Rental Unit Act. *Note: Grandfathered Status; Here's a 10min video summarizing the Short Term Rental Unit Act : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5XZzzoZnNkY>
8. Main concern is the code is not clear enough for the common citizen to understand. Reading what your website states right now, it seems like some of the popular listings downtown are not allowed because they are owner occupied.
9. One sole property owner should not be allowed to dominate a community in percentage or have multiple units open as an STR in a square mile. I personally have been removed as a long term renter from a unit because of such domination from the same STR owner that was my landlord. I am not able to buy in my area, due to corporations owning multiple residential properties in the same county. There must be regulations to ease the LTR rental price surging because of such owner/operators.

10. I think each case should be considered. Str have brought 10s of millions of dollars to the Maury County/ Columbia area in grow/home ownership alone. There is still a significant need for short term rentals, hotel options in Columbia are deplorable.
11. Any sound economy needs multiple streams of income! As a Columbia resident I would like nothing more than you purchase more properties locally and rent them to families and visitors wanting to visit our quaint town! Doing away with or limiting this will limit locals from having the opportunity to earn more income and stay here!! Growth is inevitable how great would it be to create more revenue by bringing more visitors in who will shop and spend at our local businesses!!!
12. Individuals investing in the city's growth and future is paramount for success of this community. Unfortunately, this city fails to see that. The old boys club needs to sit back and listen to the future of the community. That means stop listening to the people who's future is limited here or to their "buddies" they're in business with that have ill intentions.
13. I am a longtime Airbnb host (in three cities) who believes homesharing (owner-occupied short-term rentals) benefits both residential neighborhoods as well as the commercial or multi-use districts by fully utilizing existing structures without neighborhood disruption. Specifically, the practice of homesharing: (1) provides cash flow to single homeowners, empty nesters, retirees, etc. allowing residents to STAY in their homes and afford the high cost of repairs and maintenance when they choose or need to share excess space in between occupancy of that space by friends and family, and (2) fills a true need for temporary housing to avoid the unnecessary buildout of hotels. There should be no restrictions on this practice. Some will do it one time to bridge a gap between jobs, or help with a medical expense. Others will share throughout the year as they have time to support it. Sharing owner-occupied (OO) space rarely takes away from LT housing stock. First, I would never lease my extra bedroom or studio in garage to a longterm tenant. Frankly, OO homesharing can actually improve the supply of LT housing stock; if residents are accommodating Columbia visitors for a wedding, a worker in transition to a new job, a couple enjoying vacation time in the town, then a multi-use or commercial lot in town could actually I be used to build an apartment complex rather than a hotel! In London, citizens are given a tax credit for homesharing in the central business district for this reason. It's green! OO homesharing also takes care of nuisance concerns. The host is present. Neighbors with a concern over guest noise or inappropriate parking etc. know who to call. Some of my family/friends who visit are far more annoying than a grateful Airbnb guest who will receive a public review. In residential zoning the answer to non-owner occupied (NOO) should always be NO. Mainly, I didn't sign up to live next door to a business especially one with no onsite management! An NOO is a concierge-free HOTEL. Period. That hotel business should pay commercial property tax rates and not happen in residential zoning. You can see the outcome in Nashville where this practice exploded out of control. Along with disrupting residential neighborhoods, the primary impact of allowing NOO short-term rentals is to reduce supply of homes, and rapidly drive up housing prices. Who can pay more to

purchase, for example, a new furnished 4br/4ba home in Riverside that can be an \$800/night Airbnb business—a business operator located anywhere in the country? Or a homeowner wanting to live in our neighborhood. I looked at such a house and could not pay the asking price for the target buyer: an Airbnb operator. In multi-use zoning, both OO's and NOO's should be welcome and unrestricted. If I choose to live over a business downtown or in the Arts District etc., I know going in that I will have businesses for short, in residential zoning: no on NOO and yes on OO without any restrictions. In multi-use zoning, any and all versions of short-term rentals, OO and NOO should operate without restrictions.

14. Without question, no one wants an unbridled atmosphere at STR like Nashville. As long as STR do not interfere with the normal daily life of respective residential areas they should be allowed, but certainly IF there are problems with noise, parking, excessive crowds or vandalism the STR owner should lose the ability to operate immediately!
15. I live next door to a STR-----it is 712 Maple Ct, Columbia, TN 38401 and I own 714 Maple Ct. We had a few incidents early on but their yard and street party was stopped. Our complex was developed for Seniors and there is limited parking and the street is only 20 feet wide. I believe that James and Holly Dobbs started the Air B & B before July 2022. It does make me uncomfortable about my safety to not know who is in the house for one day or one week. I plan to do a gate to close off my patio and back yard area when I can afford it. There are regular yearly renters in The Maples and the limited parking is always an issue w/them. The area and the parking should be a consideration. Vehicles should be limited as 98% of the homes are only two bedrooms. The Dobbs have a 1 car garage and 1 driveway parking space so you can see that street parking must be limited. I also only have a 1 car garage. Thanks!
16. Short term rentals have been my family's choice for vacations for the past 12 years. Our family of six prefers a residential home rather than a hotel for our travel needs. The properties are typically taken very good care of and are not a blight in the community as some state. Columbia has an incredible opportunity to generate revenue by creating a str rental permit program. These should be allowed throughout the city of Columbia. STR homes are kept at a much higher level than your typical long term rental properties that are prevalent throughout the city.
17. Just as a subdivision can have too many rental homes/duplexes, there can be too many STRs. We live next door to a duplex Airbnb and prefer that to 2 families/too many dogs/storage sheds and too many vehicles. We have never had a disturbance from the short-term rental, and we definitely prefer that to an over occupied property for far longer than you can remain neighborly. I wish duplex/rentals had been restricted before our neighborhood was overwhelmed by them, as all rentals lessen property values of one owner occupied homes.

18. Live at Maple Ct., in Columbia. Have one here, and parking is very limited. We have one car garage. People are parking everywhere here, and can't get in and out of drive way. I have to go tell them move their cars a few times, as I cannot get out. Some get angry. I have people from there in my yard. We are a subdivision. Homes from what I understand was for older couples, senior community. Street is 23 wide.
19. Moved to Columbia from Nashville where I watched the progression of STR's there. I think they are inevitable and have high demand. Definitely think it's advisable to create an area within a special overlay near the square makes the most sense for it. Think the city/county should take applications and provide permits/licenses for those that would apply. I do not support str in all of the city, but maybe within a mile of the courthouse in the square is okay since it's so walkable and it's where travelers would want to stay. Thank you
20. I think STRs should be allowed everywhere in moderation- there should be a certain amount allowed on every street or neighborhood so people can come and experience what it's like to stay in all parts of Columbia. I do realize we need to protect homeowners who want their street to feel like a neighborhood and also to protect locals from having all their housing options bought up and turned into STRs. I think that's why limiting the amount but still allowing them is important. Grandfather in the ones who have already been doing it and have good reviews- this is a small and local business owner who is encouraging tourism in Columbia and bringing in money! Some people can only afford to own and invest in property this way. I also have to say that the nicest house on the junky area of our street is an Airbnb. It is beautiful, well kept, and the owner has turned an otherwise run-down house into the best one on the street. My husband and I love to walk by it and appreciate the transformation it has brought to the whole street. It feels like it's made the neighborhood safer and more beautiful, and it will probably help our property price go up as well! I would love more Airbnb's where the property owner transforms the street like the one nearby us.
21. I am an Airbnb owner in Riverside. I spent \$30k renovating an upstairs guest suite (it has a kitchen, bedroom, bathroom, and living area) in my home, specifically with Airbnb in mind). I live downstairs. It will be some time before I recoup that investment in this sweet little apartment. I have had nothing but lovely, quiet couples stay there. I do not allow events and do not allow more than a few guests to visit them (none have, so far). I have written a house manual with all the downtown and nearby things to do, see, eat, and drink in Columbia. I collected brochures from the Visitor Center (I specifically chose ones to encourage them to explore Columbia rather than other parts of the state). They spend money in our downtown area, the Arts District, the Factory, and other areas of our town. Our little town is a destination with very little traditional accommodation —certainly not enough to accommodate all the visitors (and most are not so great, as I am sure you are aware.) As Airbnb hosts, we pay local and state occupancy taxes, and our guests spend their money here. This has not only contributed to the progress of our downtown area but also supported our local businesses. However, with the current economic challenges, we need all the visitors we can get to keep our local businesses afloat. Without our local Airbnbs,

our town's tourism would undoubtedly suffer, especially during these inflationary times. I think there is a way to please everyone without removing Airbnb from residential neighborhoods: disallow events (in most cases) and limit the number of guests that paying guests can bring in. For example, my apartment comfortably accommodates two adults max. I have a nice patio with a grill, umbrella table, chairs, etc., which is designated for renter use. I don't foresee short-term renters bringing guests, but I could imagine the slight possibility that a renter visiting family in town might have guests, perhaps to have a little cookout on the patio. I think it would be reasonable for my place to allow 2 to 4 guests for such an imaginary setting.

22. I bought my property from someone who was using it as an STR and represented it as such. It was my whole plan to buy now and continue to use the property as an STR until such time as I can retire and move to the area. I for SURE do not want a bunch of crazy disruptive parties messing up the community I eventually want to live in, and I have always taken swift action to deal with any disruptions so I can keep a good relationship with neighbors of my property. There must be a way to grandfather in my rental with very strict rules that will shut me down if I fail to protect the neighborhood from a nuisance. Maybe we owners must notify all the neighbors within a certain distance and give them contact info to reach us right away in the event of any disruption. Then any owner who doesn't answer those calls or take swift action to rectify things could be shut down. When I think of what I would want as a resident, that feels fair.
23. Those who already own and have already been using their property as an str should at least be allowed to continue.
24. Owners should have the right to rent their properties how they like.
25. STR's bring in FAMILIES to spend money and support the local economy. STR's are more comfortable and welcoming than hotels. They are good for the local businesses, and bring up home values.
26. Short term rentals provide many things that hotels can't – spaciousness being the primary thing – room for large families (how many families can afford two or three hotel rooms?); space for multiple families; space to gathering friends/family together with them; the ability to cook, healthy meals, which often restaurants can't provide; a secure backyard for children to play in; a "home" environment for people working out of town and so much more.
27. I have owned short term rentals, both owner-occupied and otherwise, prior to moving to Columbia. In that county, I was part of a complete revamping of the STR ordinance due to some of the same concerns we face here. When moving to Columbia, one thing that really stood out is the complete lack of decent hotel accommodations available in town, so STRs remain the best way for people to visit and experience our city. Any reasonable adult with means will not choose to stay in an owner-occupied STR. They want their own space, and

they want to experience what it would actually be like to live in our amazing town. And again, without any decent/modern hotels available (especially within walking distance of the square), STRs remain the only option. My family and friends continue to stay in places like Franklin, but we could be providing such a magical experience right here in Columbia with more STR availability (along with additional rules, regulations, and enforcement). It is also important to allow STRs in zoning areas like SD-LI where residential homes already exist amongst commercial businesses. This zoning area would be perfect for non-owner occupied STRs as it offers very few (if any) residential neighbors, and easy, walkable access to local businesses. Non owner occupied STRs can be successful in residential areas with better rules, regulations, and enforcement. Limiting the amount of occupants (determined by the size of the house/property), establishing quiet hours, providing neighbors with the name and phone number of the property's responsible party, etc are all ways to ensure that STR guests and property owners are good neighbors, and are held accountable if/when they are not. The reality is that property owner's want two things: they want to be great neighbors in the community, and they want to provide their guests with an amazing experience. Both can be accomplished with the right ordinance and adequate enforcement.

28. Columbia should keep local laws banning short-term rentals in place due to the increase in the lack of affordable long-term housing here in Columbia leading to a rise in homelessness, evidenced by expensive rent increases at local complexes. These same apartment complexes that have experienced high rent increases have only changed in name and who owns the property, with apartments being at a minimum \$1000 per month in Columbia this will logically direct someone to look for a small house to rent for a cheaper rate instead of a \$1k/month apartment that hasn't even been renovated. People in this situation would have an even harder time finding affordable long-term housing if the house they want to live in is being used as an Airbnb or short-term vacation rental despite being perfectly fit for a long-term resident. This letter isn't being written to say that short-term rental bans will end homelessness in Columbia however it is being written to say that an increase in short-term vacation rentals especially in areas where they don't make sense to be (such as neighborhoods not in walking distance of the town square) will contribute to the rise of homelessness.
29. The increase of short-term rentals will make the problem of affordable housing far worse. Short term rentals should be banned outside of walking distance from the Town Square. An increase in short term rentals would contribute to a shortage of affordable housing. Minimum payments on local apartments are \$1000 a month or more. Reducing the amount of properties available for permanent tenants will only drive up the rent of existing properties, and discourage residents/hopeful residents from living in Columbia. The problem of homelessness cannot be solved just by banning STRs, but reducing or banning STRs may keep property prices down and allow more people to find homes they can afford.
30. We should absolutely be allowing STRs. They will bring much needed improvements and opportunities to our communities and citizens.

31. I think it helps bring people to the area. Need to have ramifications that can be enforced for the owners that don't follow the rules. Such as allowing load parties etc. If you can hit them in their pocket book rather than ban everyone, I think that would be better.
32. Our biggest adverse issue in downtown Columbia, is homes in disrepair. from any direction within 1/2 mile to 1 mile of downtown, there is so many homes half falling apart. this leads to crime rates being up in certain sections, streets not safe to walk on, and I think that STR brings capital into Columbia which benefits everyone. there is no feedback process or review for long term tenants, who may not have any incentive to take care of the property they are renting, and yet we allow this. STR's provide an aligned incentive for both the tenant and owner to have a beautiful home, and it also brings tourists to our beautiful city. the other main reason FOR allowing STR's, is there is zero lodging for families or friends who want to stay within walking distance of downtown.
33. Columbia's growth will be hurt by lack of short-term rentals. Columbia is not and will never be Nashville. Columbia is not a party town so therefore renters will not be party renters. Columbia lacks greatly in nice places to stay/ rent. We need short term rentals available
34. There's a time and place for a STR. In established/primarily residential areas, I do not think it's in the public's best interest to allow STRs. In areas where "mixed use" zoning allows for it, then I think it should be allowed. With that said, even in mixed use areas, there is chance of repeated noise complaints as this is not a new issue with Airbnb/STR's. There needs to be proper policing in place for those instances.
35. STRs are a great way to generate income and meet new ppl. They provide a better economy and are especially good for places like The Square and other local establishments that need tourism to thrive.
36. Short term rentals are an important component of a thriving city like ours that has much to offer out of town visitors. These locally owned properties offer a hand of hospitality extended by townsfolk that cannot be achieved by a standard hotel chain. However, in personal travels, we avoid owner-occupied airbnbs because we desire privacy for our stays. In our opinion, many owner-occupied STRs are as undesirable as the common hotel. As an Airbnb owner, we take great care to keep our property in its best condition. Otherwise, the endeavor fails. When we were faced with the decision of whether or not to use our property as a STR or a LTR, we chose the option that best allows us to control the upkeep of the interior, exterior, and surrounding outdoors. This ensures that we can be good neighbors to the beautiful residential and commercial properties with which we connect.
37. STRs are a boon to Columbia's economy. They employ cleaners, maintenance workers, landscapers, roofers, handymen, painters, yard people, etc. STR guests shop, dine out, have

weddings and events here, and generally spend their money creating tourism revenue. They also bring in countless visitors who visit landmark sites, such as the Polk Home.

38. There should be no ban on short-term rentals in any area of Columbia. There should be no permitting. The community already is struggling to bring income in by you banning any short-term rentals Will stop influx of income. A downturn of income will be a ripple effect towards the local restaurants, local businesses and all self-employed Including but not limited to lawncare Maintenance, Self-employed electricians and plumbers, House cleaning staff, etc. I completely reject any oversight by the City to cut off or deny operation of Str's in any capacity. This is an assault on income for those self-employed people and the local businesses and comes across as a very shortsighted for such a small community where work is already hard to come by.
39. One way to bring more dollars into the city and circulating within our city is tourism. Columbia being close to Franklin is now on travelers' radars. There are insufficient hotels within the city to support visitors, especially those with larger families. I believe that enabling STRs, especially closer to the Town Square, will bring foot traffic and dollars to our town. This business will support revitalization of the area with both income and a demand for goods and services for example, cleaning services to clean homes for guests, eateries, and retailers.
40. I live next to an Airbnb that sleeps 14! Different cars every weekend, no privacy fence, at times have had to tell people to quiet down. Cameras on their ring doorbell point right at my house. My dog never gets use to new neighbors and barks more since Airbnb started. I am ok with owner occupied airbnbs in tourist areas. Not residential! You lose a sense of community with short term rentals.
41. STR's attract revenue to the city. If no longer permitted, potential guests will simply stay in STR's in neighboring cities which will take revenue away from local businesses and hurt the local economy
42. Short-term rentals should only be allowed in commercial zones or in residential areas where properties are primarily owner-occupied. Homeowners with a genuine investment in their neighborhood's well-being should be able to rent their occupied residences for supplemental income. This connection to the community is essential. Allowing short-term rentals that operate solely as commercial businesses undermines the integrity of residential districts, and this loophole must be closed.
43. I live in the west end district near the split of west 7th and Trotwood Avenue. I would like to see short term rentals banned as much as possible from this area and especially from designated historic districts. I can already tell that existing rule regarding STRs are not being followed, at multiple homes nearby. Short term rentals limit the amount of long term housing available in the community for real residents who need roofs over Their heads .

Many of the owners are wealthy people who do not need the income but instead are buying property to hold it in the hopes that prices will rise in the future. They are creating scarcity to drive up prices which in effect forces lower income people from the community, as we've seen in Nashville. We have already seen in this are the disregard many of these investors have for the long-term residents or even for existing city codes. This seems likely to continue if more investors flood the area. It would be naive to think otherwise.

44. While I do understand some of the concerns about having strangers in a neighborhood, I also think short term rentals that are well maintained actually make Columbia feel safer and give people cool places to stay and experience our city. I don't think parties should be allowed or crazy guests, but I don't feel like those kinds of people are visiting Columbia anyways. I love staying in airbnbs when I travel and it allows me a chance to get to experience a place so much better than staying at a hotel or just in the downtown -- so I think it's great if Columbia offers that for people coming to visit.
45. If the host is going through a reputable site there are many regulations they must follow and are more highly regulated than long term or someone not using a reputable site. The host and guests are vetted and are following guidelines if they want to be successful with their business. These guidelines cover safety, health and noise control concerns in depth. There is a lot more emphasis put on running a very professional business as the property and host must be reviewed after each guest and make any changes or corrections noted to continue to provide top notch accommodations. I'm all for regulations and feel like the regulations on STR are much easier to manage than in long term rentals. This is one of many reasons hosts choose to STR so the property stays top notch and the host can live in their home in between guests. They can manage the quality of guests for no disturbances to the neighbors and are not stuck with a long eviction process of poor tenants. Some choose to live in the dwelling at the same time and not allow using the entire home. Both are in my opinion highly regulated. There could also be a manager living within a certain distance and reporting to the owner if any issues arise. This could be from immediate maintenance or any violation of tenant rules.
46. Having operated STRs both in Columbia and elsewhere I know first hand both the need and value these bring to the area. We have hosted traveling nurses supporting our communities medical infrastructure, traveling specialty construction and other workers supporting important facilities such as the GM plant, grieving families coming to bury loved ones and families looking to relocate to our beautiful area. THIS IS GOOD FOR THIS COMMUNITY. These people have all been respectful and contribute greatly to the economic engine of the area. Options for these guests are LIMITED. While there are bad apples amongst guests, so too are there those in long term tenancy. We have a system for limiting this possibility - something hotels and even longer-term rentals struggle with. We respectfully ask that you consider carefully both the loss of tax revenue and the loss of available space in making these decision.

47. Having traveled with my family and pets for the past decade, we prefer to stay in STR's. They provide the amenities and accommodation's that a Motel/Hotel cannot offer. Additionally, with the expense of food it is much more affordable to cook vs having to eat out while in a hotel.
- Living in the City of Columbia, the STR's are obvious to the eye. Most, if not all, are extremely well maintained, quiet, and aesthetically pleasing to the community. Personally knowing several STR owners, guests are vetted, rated and forced to comply with rules, ordinances, etc. (No Parties, No loud music, No parking on the street, quiet hours, etc)
- That said, there are several LTR or owned homes that are NOT pleasing. For example, there is a dilapidated single wide trailer on 5th and Conant which should be condemned, yet the city opts to turn a blind eye. Additionally, there is a triplex immediately across the street owned by Poling. This LTR is a total eyesore and does not provide the curb appeal WE the Citizens want withing our city limits.
- If the STR owners are willing and have offered to obtain a permit, pay additional taxes and comply with guidelines why remove or restrict them from pursuing what is needed? Also, why isn't those same set of guidelines and restrictions applied to Long Term Rentals and/or its owners? This is a complete hypocrisy to those directly involved and a disservice to those wanting to stay OUTSIDE the city square and in a quiet residential community. Lets use common sense!
48. As I travel around the state and nation, I often have stayed at Airbnb's. As a Columbia resident and native, I am not opposed to STR's. I believe they serve a vital need and give our city's visitors a 'taste' of the community. As for hotels/motels, there are very limited options within the city limits; most of the nicer hotels are located at the interstate. Our city is flourishing like never before. The city heavily promotes downtown and the Arts District. I would like to see more emphasis given to the Riverside area. Airbnb has 'stepped up' it's prohibition on "weekend parties" and has taken numerous measures to combat that issue.
49. Most home owners are legitimate and follow rules and if they are fortunate enough to have two homes, they should be able to do as they please. But no let's tax them twice!!!everyone wants their share of someone else's pie!!!!
50. If there is no issue with noise or mess, we should have the right to have our private property occupied as we see fit.
51. It boosts tourism to our town and therefore revenue is boosted to smaller local businesses in the area.
52. The Airbnb's that we have stayed in, and that have been in our neighborhoods, have always been clean, quiet, and a beautiful addition to the neighborhood and community. We love traveling with our family when visiting cities and towns, so that we can comfortably stay in a home, bring our pets if needed, and "live" or experience living in that community that we are visiting. Other perks are making dinner at home if needed, and enjoying a cup of coffee

in my pjs before starting my day. Also, most Airbnb's that we have stayed in always suggest local eateries, shopping, entertainment, etc. so that our dollars go to supporting that community, and we usually stay longer! Airbnb's also do the vetting of guests, and it is in everyone's best interest that the host/home owner continues to upgrade and beautify the home and always have it looking amazing with great curb appeal, etc. It is to everyone's interest (owner, guest, Airbnb and neighbors) that a short-term rental option be available in areas that the city would like to promote tourism. In our area, the long term rentals are the issues: lack of curb appeal, some crime activity, trash left outside, cars in the yard, etc... We hope the City can come up with an agreement to keep everyone happy. Thank you!

53. As an STR owner (owner occupied), I would like for them to be allowed but I see the issue and certainly wouldn't want them to take over. However, I do think they can provide a nice stay and experience for a visitor to the town. What about limiting the number of permits? Or possibly only allowing them to be run by someone who lives in the area? (So that out of town moguls don't just put them everywhere without a connection to our community)
54. This is a great option with our current limited hotel offerings in this community. I prefer them to hotels in certain communities. I have one next to me and there have been zero issues!!! I enjoy having visitors to our community.
55. There should only allow a certain amount of permits per year for STR that is on a lottery based system. If the property is zoned commercial than it should not fall under this stipulation
56. We don't have enough hotels and within a good distance of town. So let people make money on their homes.
57. The less local govt control over STR. Obviously an owner should not have to live in the place they are renting. Who owns Hyatt? Do they live there? No. There's many restrictions and rules to follow when owning and listing a STR through ABB or VRBO. Counsel should physically drive to every single one in question and look for themselves at the conditions of the properties and see the life and commerce STR brings simply by beautifying a home/house/condo/townhouse/farm etc.
58. I believe that a great compromise for all would be having approved STR zoning in a certain distance to the square, albeit encompassing neighborhoods as well. I think this would include riverside (or a portion), Idlewild, arts district rolling fields etc. I think that to say all other areas is disallowed isn't the answer and there should be an option in those areas for blanket owner occupied permitting and use with a special use permit in which a sign should be posted for x days like we do in historic and zoning appeals situations.
59. I think that we have a housing shortage and people from out of town are purchasing homes to rent as airbnbs in neighborhoods where families could live.

However, if a person can prove they live at the residence, and they have space to rent, they should be able to do so. The homeowner in that situation has a stake in keeping their home and

neighborhood

safe.

I think it might be helpful to look at Nashville and see what has happened there and how they are managing it. The truth is that we don't have the manpower to police this.

60. A limit on how many one entity can own and operate in a square mile, would help overbearing ownership.
61. Allow short term rentals everywhere by right. No zoning restrictions.
62. We don't have good hotels here. Visiting family have often stayed in STRS. Our community needs them. And people have the right to rent them within reason. If we need to enforce quiet hours for them that is reasonable, but they are an asset to the community overall.
63. Why would you regulate where an STR can operate and not regulate where long term rentals can? Similar issues can arise from both and are generally worse with a long term rental since the occupants will not be gone in a short time.
64. As someone who works in Columbia, but can't afford to live here because of the high price and low availability of quality rentals, I would be fine with less STR and more long term SFH rentals. Thank you.
65. I feel if you own your property you should be able to do what you want with it, without the government telling you what you can and can't do. The government is there to protect its citizens, not run their life.
66. There should not be any zoning restrictions on STR. The state and local governments get a share for tourism and provides the owners an extra income stream.
67. Rental property decreases the stability of established, historic neighborhoods. Further, allowing our homes to be divided into apartments has been forbidden, and even cause for being fined, in Riverside, which has been zoned for single family residence or duplex only. Please, just leave us alone.
68. Build codes! Change them or enforce them. Residential is just that. It's not businesses! This is simple. Your killing the hotels by allowing these entities to skirt laws. After all that's all it is. Putting a weight on the community making it pay for people's greed. Ick
69. Short term rentals are a drain on the residence of any given city. Increased tourism income is entirely pointless if the people who have lived here their entire lives can't afford to stay. STRs increase rent prices and home prices. Both are already out of control in Columbia and allowing this to continue WILL have long term negative consequences.
70. My name is Nichole Nace and I own Elia day spa on the Square. I do not own any STRs and would like to share my thoughts. I was at the meeting on Oct 23rd and I believe the overwhelming opinion in the room was to allow residents the freedom to do with one's property what they so with. I 100% completely agree with this belief. The only time that I

believe would be the exception is when a neighborhood has an HOA in place and the HOA has guidelines for their specific neighborhood. As a local small business owner, we are so grateful for the local STRs. Many of them promote our business and we also receive business from the ones on the Square. As a downtown business owner who is open 6 days a week since 2017, we have not had one issues with STRs on the Square. I have several friends who own local STRs and have used their STR for family and friends visiting. With the lack of hotels in the area it's absolutely disgraceful to not offer other accommodations that homeowners are willing to offer. I have 4 children and when we travel, we only stay in a hotel if that is our only option. STRs are perfect for our family of 6 and we always stay in STRs. Even when Columbia eventually gets hotels there will still be a large demographic that will choose STRs for their own reasons.

I do not agree with owner occupied STRs. But, if there are guidelines in place for STRs to keep Columbia with its small town charm I can stand behind that. ie: follow the same noise ordinance as the city, get a permit so the city knows how many STRs are in Columbia (this includes the weekly rentals some landlords have been running for decades), this will also help to ensure that the hospitality tax is being received. I don't think there needs to be a vehicle limit unless the house has street parking. I have a few other ideas and suggestions, but I believe that if the city was listening in the meeting and takes the actions that the majority of the citizens that took the time to show up for the meeting then it will be a success for the community.

On a slightly different note, there were two residents from a North Columbia community at the meeting. They voiced their concerns about large companies coming in and purchasing single family homes and then using them as housing for temporary employees for the new plant. We lived in Spring Hill (Maury County) for 12 years prior to moving to Columbia. We had a very similar situation in our neighborhood and it was terrible. Houses were like revolving doors. Eventually, the HOA limited the rentals to a max of 20% of the total homes in the neighborhood. We didn't know what we were buying into and when we were able we moved to the most amazing neighborhood in Columbia, Columbia Gardens. We do not have an HOA and I would be completely fine with having STRs in our current neighborhood. We have wonderful neighbors and I believe having them would help our neighbors who aren't from here when friends and family come to visit.

This incredible town has grown so much and tourism continues to a huge asset to this community. The city government needs to allow private citizens to easily accommodate for this and all of the current regulations do not match our growth and tourism.

Thank you for taking the time to read and listen to another invested citizen and business owner in Columbia. Should you need anyone to come and voice this side at any meeting please let me know. I'd be happy to come and join the conversation.

Thank
Nichole Nace

you,

71. Our residential properties should not be allowed to be purchased just to be turned into STRs and never have the owner or LTR resident living in them. That would make them commercial property and should be designated as such & taxed & regulated accordingly.
72. Short-term rentals can be great for travelers but distort the residential real estate market. We gave a serious problem with a lack of affordable housing and I worry that STRs will put more upward pressure on home prices and lead to more homes being snatched up by absentee landlords and speculators.
73. People should be able to do whatever they want with their property.
74. It has been my experience that long-term rental properties provide many more problems than short term rentals. We have both close to our personal home and the police are constantly called to the long term rental but the STR is the nicest house on the street and have never had any problems.

STR encourages tourism to Columbia! People will not come here if they don't have a place to stay. Also, STR are owned primarily by Columbia residents and should be supported and encouraged by the City of Columbia.

The city tourism department is getting paid significantly higher than other markets for short term rentals. Columbia is getting a large amount of revenue though the hospitality taxes paid by STR.

Properties are fixed up all around the city due to real estate investors pouring money into STR, improving neighborhoods all across Columbia significantly. STR are typically the nicest house on the street and yards are typically the most manicured.

Airbnb and VRBO are self-regulating if you follow the flow a 4.7 out of 5 rating you can be kicked off the platform. Unlike long-term rentals. There are several slumlords in town who rent houses I wouldn't keep my dog in. If long term rentals are not regulated, and are in horrible condition why would/should STR properties be regulated when they are an improvement to the Columbia landscape and whose tenets are positive additions to our community?

75. 1.5-mile radius of square for sure.
76. Riverside, CAB, Square, these type areas at minimum,
77. Regardless of whether there are hotels or not, STRs offer an option for people.

78. Commercial or residential areas would be acceptable but should be capped at some point deemed by the city. Owner occupied property - opens up for owners to rent a portion of their home not the entire home. Also unoccupied properties should be accepted as STR. I think it's more of the number of homes allowed in this areas as opposed to just the area.
79. As an 18-year resident of W 6th Street, my primary concern is keeping STRs OUT of historic residential districts such as ours. STRs are essentially hotels - commercial enterprises- and thus shouldn't be allowed in residential zones where other commercial uses are prohibited- ESPECIALLY historic zones. The concept floated by STR owners in the public forum that STRs should be completely devoid of regulations is preposterous. We already have innumerable regulations around what we can and can't do on or with our homes. Those advocating for zero restrictions on what they can do with a dwelling they own are only thinking of themselves and their bank accounts. The bottom line is STRs have an impact on the intangibles that we call "quality of life" - we cannot allow STRs to sacrifice the character of our neighborhoods on the altar of capitalism and tourism dollars. Lastly, we have to be sure to look at data, expert analysis, and real-life experience of other communities when crafting our policies. THANK YOU! Anthony Petrochko rpetrochko@hotmail.com
80. The city should not regulate STRs.
81. STRs could be allowed within a mile of courthouse not in residential neighborhoods. They are disruptive to lifelong neighbors opens them up to higher risks of thefts and disruption. When you buy your forever home, you shouldn't have to worry that a STR could be on each side and across the street.
82. STRs are already regulated by Airbnb and VRBO. Owners are not allowing parties to take place, as they're already against the rules. We do not need or want any more city oversight. STRs are a huge draw for visitors to our areas. Many come for medical treatments, weddings, tourism and to visit family. It is wrong to try to portray them as party places. STR owners and their neighbors do not permit or want that. The exception would be ones that claim to be Airbnbs but are more like event venues. An event venue with rooms is different than a regular STR and should be treated as such.
83. Airbnb is well managed. Those property owners on the Airbnb platform have to maintain strict standards. Guests review the rental properties and most maintain 4.8 ratings. Airbnb owners also review guests. If there is a problem like parties and disruption of neighbors, the guests are reported. This results in Airbnb denying future rentals. There are many tourists now visiting Columbia for many wholesome reasons like family weddings and holidays. Softball tournaments, community festivals, and other reasons has created a demand for rentals that offer better accommodations than local hotels. Airbnb's bring in lots of tourist income for local restaurants and businesses.
84. Airbnb's must follow strict standards with the company. Airbnb collects all taxes. The way to deal with this is to require permitting. If properties are not on Airbnb or VRBO, then the city can deny requests. Most Airbnb's put limits on the number of days in the rental. Six weeks would be a good policy. Columbia should embrace Airbnb's as a asset to the city since it serves tourists and

brings in dollars to the local economy. The percentage of short term rentals that are a problem is likely minimal. If 98% are being operated responsibly, why penalize them for the 2% that might be considered a problem. I imagine that a few citizens who have a problem whether real or perceived are likely few in number in the big picture.

85. They are good for the local economy in countless ways. They provide tourists better places to stay and in turn are promoting the tourism industry in Columbia.

From: [George Vrailas](#)
To: [Kevin McCarthy](#); [George Vrailas](#)
Cc: [Helena Vrailas](#)
Subject: [Caution External Email] - Short term rentals Top 12
Date: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 10:28:42 AM

Hi Kevin,

In case you wanted to pass this along or if I can not make it please see my list of reasons to keep short-term rentals.

Top 12 reasons why short-term rentals are good for Columbia.

1. Allows for large families to visit Columbia for ball tournaments, sporting events, hospital stays, vacations, and holidays.
2. They are nicer and more accommodating than a hotel and adds more value and space for our guests.
3. Most hotels are not owned by residents so the money does not stay within our community.
4. Less impact than monthly rentals on noise, domestic violence, or drug activities.
5. Encourages visiting Columbia.
6. Creates a better family environment for our guests.
7. They add to the charm of a friendly community.
8. They are naturally allowed by federal and state laws unless restricted by local government.
9. It helps give our guests more options to live in different parts of our community and encourages different places to eat and shop locally.
10. They make good investment and retirement plans for our homeowners.
11. If there is a noisy tenant they will be out of there a lot faster than you can get someone out of a monthly rental.
12. They are usually better maintained than monthly rentals.

Thank you for reading the comments.

George

From: [Tina Seago](#)
To: [Kevin McCarthy](#); [Austin Brass](#); [Paul Keltner](#); [Charlie Goatz](#)
Cc: [Mark and Tina Seago](#)
Subject: [External - USE CAUTION] Citizen input on Columbia STR's
Date: Monday, November 4, 2024 9:37:01 PM

Hi Kevin et al!

Mark and I would like to express our appreciation for the meeting the city hosted regarding short term rentals. It has been, undeniably, a good thing to allow for questions and comments as changes are being considered. The ultimate decision regarding the new zoning ordinance in regards to STRs will of course be a balance of many competing factors and stakeholders and we'd like to give our comments out of respect for the process you initiated given that we did not offer any thoughts during the meeting. We don't necessarily have anything revolutionary to add, but as the owners of a frequently reserved STR within a few blocks of the heart of the city, we felt it important to share our thoughts and perspective. Some of these have been mentioned already, so please forgive the repetition.

First, we would agree with and emphasize the general sentiment expressed in the open forum meeting that owner-occupied short term rentals are far less desirable to the demographic looking for accommodations through platforms such as AirBNB. If the current zoning ordinance stands, and is enforced, downtown Columbia will continue to provide few options to visitors seeking a "private" short term rental within walking distance of our town square. Other than a couple of STRs that operate under the guise of a "hotel", there would be few other options if owner-occupancy is required. Visitors and tourists will thus be forced to pursue hotel chains primarily located at the Bear Creek/I-65 interchange. Having guests stay so far from our downtown seems to undermine Columbia's desire for a vibrant, lively, walkable downtown. They might just as easily hop on the interstate and head to Spring Hill, Thompson Station, Franklin, etc. for dinner and shopping. Therefore, we feel the owner-occupied restriction needs to be abolished in areas in close proximity to downtown in particular. (As an aside, we also think the new Justice Center should be treated as a downtown center if one of the strategies is to implement zoning "overlays" or perimeters as we hope that part of downtown becomes intricately connected to our current square.)

The more challenging question is whether owner-occupied should be a consideration in some of our areas that are residential in nature and on the outskirts of the city. We agree that this might deter unwanted STRs in neighborhoods where they might be viewed as "uncharacteristic", especially by neighbors. Perhaps a grandfathering consideration would be prudent in this particular situation. We don't have strong sentiments one way or the other on this question. We've rented AirBNBs in Austin and Atlanta that are non-owner occupied and in purely residential areas and, according to family who reside in those areas, there have been few problems and very little push-back from permanent residents. We would lean towards this approach in general.

Another point we've pondered is permitting. We anticipate this as a part of the process in some way or another, but we would favor more of a "registration" rather than a "permitting" in our zones with commercial allowance. We think it is potential useful information for the city to know what properties are STRs should there ever be issues that require law enforcement or other existing city codes and regulations enforcement mechanisms to intervene. Another benefit could be that potential buyers of a property in the vicinity of STR properties have a reference database if they're interested in the information.

Perhaps properties in other zones should be subjected to an application/permitting process. This might allow the city greater nuance for now and in the future based on problems that arise. Applicants could be screened and approved or denied based on criteria specific to those zones such as limiting the density of STRs in a given zone.

To summarize, our strongest feeling is that our downtown and the perimeter needs non owner-occupied STRs in order to maintain and enhance Columbia's tourism industry and reputation for warm hospitality, which happens to be one of our town's greatest attributes. It's been the central idea that has animated our joint efforts at creating something good for Columbia.

We understand the complexity of your decisions and appreciate what you do,

Tina and Mark Seago

From: David Esslinger <esslingerdav@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2024 7:19:20 PM
To: kmccarthy@columbiatn.gov <kmccarthy@columbiatn.gov>
Subject: [External - USE CAUTION] Fwd: Short Term Rental Regulations Update

Good Evening Mr. McCarthy,

I meant to copy you on this email I sent to my councilperson Debbie Wiles earlier today.

Thank you,

David Esslinger

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

From: David Esslinger <esslingerdav@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 25, 2024 at 11:59 AM
Subject: Short Term Rental Regulations Update
To: <dwiles@columbiatn.gov>
Cc: <dhardison@columbiatn.gov>, <tgreene@columbiatn.gov>, <kmarshall@columbiatn.gov>, <dcoleman@columbiatn.gov>, <chaz.molder@columbiatn.gov>, <randy.mcbroom@columbiatn.gov>

Good Day Ms. Wiles,

First, I want to thank you and the city council for organizing an opportunity for the community to share input on this issue at the open meeting held on Wednesday, November 23, 2024. The turnout was strong, with the vast majority of attendees expressing support for permitting STRs in residential areas without restrictions. I am reaching out to express my support for allowing short-term rentals in all residential areas of Columbia without restrictions.

In the opening paragraph of the survey released by the city, it states, "*residents have become concerned about the impact of transient accommodations in established residential neighborhoods. Excessive revelry by out-of-town guests occasionally disrupts long-term residents' quiet enjoyment of their homes.*" The individuals that voiced concerns about incidents in their neighborhood were not describing short term rentals (STRs). The situations they described were long term tenants not short term. They described tenants who moved into long term rentals (LTRs) to work for the battery plant. It has been my experience that LTR properties cause many more problems than STRs in residential neighborhoods. We have both LTRs and STRs in our neighborhood and the police are constantly called to the LTRs but the STR is the nicest, best kept house on the street and the tenants have never been a problem. It is important for all to recognize that it's not the term of the rental that causes problems in a neighborhood, but the quality of the

tenant. It has been my experience that STR tenants are high quality tenants who are respectful and responsible.

Additionally, STR hosts have the ability to see previous reviews of potential guests and are able to deny guests who do not have a high rating on the platform. This vetting process provides an added layer of security and confidence that STR guests will be well behaved with no disruption to the neighborhood. This rating system also holds the guest accountable for their behavior and treatment of the property during their stay. Should there be a rare incident where a STR guest behaves poorly and disrupts the peace of a neighborhood, it can be handled the same way as situations that arise daily with LTRs across Columbia.

Many LTRs in Columbia are in horrible condition, while STRs are some of the best-maintained properties on their streets. If so many LTRs throughout our city remain unregulated despite their deteriorated state, why should STRs—which are generally the most well-kept properties, attracting responsible tenants who contribute positively to local businesses—face regulations? Furthermore, rundown properties across Columbia are being renovated by local investors focused on STRs, significantly boosting neighborhood property values and overall landscape of Columbia.

Most STRs in Columbia are owned by local residents, and I believe the City of Columbia should support and encourage them. STR owners and hosts play a vital role in promoting our wonderful city, driving tourism and business. Through platforms like Airbnb and VRBO, they actively showcase Columbia's events and unique charm to visitors worldwide. Thanks to STR hosts, many people are introduced to our city for the first time, and they play a key role in attracting these visitors through the information found on their STR listing. Most STR listings provide guests with a detailed guide recommending local restaurants and businesses. Additionally, guests often return to Columbia because of the outstanding accommodations and hospitality they receive from STR hosts.

Columbia's tourism department benefits from substantial revenue generated through occupancy taxes paid by STR owners via platforms like Airbnb. Columbia's occupancy tax rate for short-term rentals is notably higher than in many other markets. My research shows that Airbnb typically collects occupancy taxes between 7% and 11% in most areas, which are then remitted to the local government on behalf of STR owners. However, in Columbia, the occupancy tax is 16.13% on each STR stay, indicating a significant revenue stream for the tourism department. This is revenue the city does not receive from long-term rentals.

These are just a few of the reasons I support allowing short term rentals in residential neighborhoods without restriction. I welcome the opportunity to discuss this issue further with you.

Respectfully,

David Esslinger
927 W. 7th St.
Columbia, Tn. 38401

ARTICLE 8: ADMINISTRATION, PROCEDURE, & ENFORCEMENT

I. Historic Zoning Commission Action

1. If the proposed Use is located within a Historic District and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required, the applicant shall obtain the certificate according to the procedure in Section 8.5.13, prior to proceeding.
2. If no Certificate of Appropriateness is required but the proposed use is within a Historic District, the Zoning Administrator shall include comments and recommendations in the report prepared by the Zoning Administrator.

J. Board of Zoning Appeals Action

1. The Board of Zoning Board of Appeals shall conduct a public hearing pursuant to Section 8.5.16.G.
2. After conducting the public hearing, and considering the recommendations of the Zoning Administrator and the requirements listed in Sections 8.5.16K and 8.5.16.L, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall:
 - a. Approve the request;
 - b. Approve the request with conditions;
 - c. Deny the request; or
 - d. Continue the hearing.
3. In acting on an application for a Variance, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall limit its review and action to the specific standard, condition, or requirement from which relief is requested.

K. Conditional Use Permit Specific Requirements

1. A Conditional Use Permit may be granted provided the Board of Zoning Appeals finds that the request conforms to the following requirements:
 - a. The proposed Use is listed as a Conditional Use for the applicable District.
 - b. The proposed Use conforms to all applicable standards listed in Section 4.3.9.D, for the proposed Use;
 - c. The proposed Use is so designed, located, and proposed to be operated that the public health, safety, and welfare will be protected;
 - d. The proposed Use will not adversely affect other property in the area in which it is located;
 - e. The proposed Use conforms to all applicable provisions of this Ordinance for the District in which it is to be located.
2. The Board of Zoning Appeals may impose such other conditions and restrictions upon the premises benefited by a Conditional Use Permit as may be necessary to reduce or minimize the injurious effect of such Conditional Use upon and ensure compatibility with surrounding properties. The Board of Zoning Appeals may establish dates for the expiration of any Conditional Use Permit as a condition of approval.
3. The provisions of Sections 8.5.16.K.3.a-.c following shall apply to all applications for approval of any Conditional Use located within any Floodplain District as indicated on the Floodplain Map available from the Development Services Department during normal business hours:
 - a. Prior to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit application, an approved Floodplain Development Permit shall be required.
 - b. The Board of Zoning Appeals shall determine the specific flood or erosion hazard at the site and shall evaluate the suitability of the proposed use in relation to the flood hazard. Upon consideration of the factors listed herein and the purposes of this Ordinance, the Board of Zoning Appeals may attach such conditions to the granting of the Conditional Use Permit as it deems necessary to further the purposes of this Ordinance.
 - c. In passing upon such applications, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall consider the technical evaluation of the City Engineer, all relevant factors, and standards specified in other sections of this Ordinance, and:
 - (1) The danger that materials may be swept onto the other lands to the injury of others;
 - (2) The danger to life and property due to flooding or erosion damage;



Q4 Zoning Text Amendment Housekeeping Corrections

Project #:	24-0476	Location:	N/A
Applicant:	Kevin C. McCarthy, AICP	Case Type(s):	Text Amendment
Staff Planner:	Kevin C. McCarthy, AICP	Proposed Use:	N/A

SUMMARY

The applicant, the Zoning Administrator, requests to amend the text of Ordinance 4400, the zoning ordinance for the City of Columbia. This is the fifth of five rounds of zoning text amendments staff has presented to the Planning Commission between December 2023 and December 2024. These changes will implement Connect Columbia, better align zoning regulations with community preferences, and calibrate the standards based on “lessons learned” during the first two years administering the Ordinance. This round of proposed amendments is detailed in the attached track changes documents. Specifically, the proposal relates the clarification of the lot width standard for the CD-3 Neighborhood Character District as well as corrections of scrivener errors and other minor formatting corrections.

- The Planning Commission is a **recommending body** for zoning text amendments. The City Council is the decision-making authority.
- The staff comments section details the proposed changes, which are provided in the agenda packet in ~~striketrough~~ and underlines.
- Planning Commission may recommend adoption of the proposed text, modify the proposal, or decline the request.
- Templates are provided at the end of the report to assist the Planning Commission in crafting properly formatted motions.

CONSISTENCY WITH CONNECT COLUMBIA

The ongoing current process of reviewing and updating the Zoning Ordinance and other regulating documents is part of the implementation of Connect Columbia, the City's comprehensive plan.

REVIEW PROCESS

Section **8.5.18** of the Zoning Ordinance directs the Planning Commission to review and make a recommendation on all proposed changes to the text of the Ordinance. The Planning Commission is the recommending body for text amendments under **§ 8.3.3.B.2** of the Zoning Ordinance.

Section **8.5.18.C** of the Zoning Ordinance requires that Planning Commission determine that the proposed changes are consistent with the comprehensive plan.

8.5.18.G of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the review criteria for approval of all changes to the text of the Ordinance:

- a. The extent to which the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment is consistent with the remainder of this Ordinance, including, specifically, any purpose and intent statements;*
- b. The extent to which the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment represents a new idea not considered in this Ordinance, or represents a revision necessitated by changing circumstances over time;*
- c. Whether or not the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment corrects an error in this Ordinance; and*
- d. Whether or not the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment revises this Ordinance to comply with state or federal statutes or case law.*

The criteria for City Council action on a Zoning Ordinance Amendment at § 8.5.18.J.4 are identical to the criteria for Planning Commission review at 8.5.18.G.3.

COMMENTARY FROM PROFESSIONAL PLANNING STAFF

The City Council adopted the current ordinance on July 14, 2022. The Zoning Ordinance implements the City's comprehensive plan, Connect Columbia. On November 8, 2023, the Planning Commission recommended adoption of a five-year update of the framework, land use, and transportation elements of Connect Columbia. The framework element of the plan directs planning staff to initiate revisions to the ordinance in order to bring it into consistency with changes to the future land use plan. It further directs staff to engage residents and property owners to solicit suggestions for further changes to the ordinance. As mentioned above, this is

the final round of zoning text amendments staff plans to present to the Planning Commission between December 2023 and December 2024.

The proposal includes the following changes:

- Removes the word “garage” from the width standard for alley-loaded CD-3 lots.
- Directs the Zoning Administrator to compile list of typos, cross-references, and other formatting corrections for consideration by the City Council.

Planning staff will present detailed commentary at the December 4, 2024 meeting of the Planning Commission. The proposal

The Planning Commission may recommend approval of the proposed text amendments, direct staff to prepare an alternative text amendment, or decline to act on the proposed changes.

SAMPLE MOTIONS

Approve:

Move to find, based on the analysis provided by city staff, that the criteria listed in section **8.5.18** of the City of Columbia Zoning Ordinance have been satisfied and recommend approval of the proposed text amendments [**may be subject to modifications proposed by the Planning Commission**].

Deny:

Move to recommend denial of the requested text amendment having found, based on the analysis provided by city staff, that the criteria listed in section **8.5.18** of the City of Columbia Zoning Ordinance are not satisfied [*list specific reasons for denial and provide direction to staff*].

Defer:

Move to find that there is insufficient information to decide, defer the matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission, and direct staff to provide: [*list additional information*] for review at a future meeting.

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

Additions are Underlined
~~Deletions are Strikethrough~~

TABLE 4.3.1-C

Neighborhood Character District

Revise current table with as follows:

Lot Occupation	
Lot/ Building Site Width	House: 40 ft. min if Alley loaded Garage at rear, otherwise 65 ft. min Duplex: 50 ft. min for each unit of Duplex Civic: 50 ft. min

Allow reduced width alley loaded lots with or without garages.

Various Corrections

Direct the Zoning Administrator to prepare corrections of typos, misspellings, formatting, word placement, and cross-references throughout the ordinance for consideration by the City Council. All such changes shall corrections to scrivener errors and shall not change the meaning or regulatory effect of the text.

Placeholder for correction of typos throughout the document.