

Short-Term Rental Amendment – Public Input Comments
Report Created: February 20, 2025

Comments

Date	Source	Comment
1/13/2025	Public Input	<p>There is no way to know beforehand that an STR has been granted which has been problematic for our neighborhood, Barton Hills. As well as the local school enrollment. While we can call 311 when there is an issue of loud parties, a giant penis float in the pool for a bachelorette party trash left out etc. It really is disruptive to the residents/neighbors. Please consider this when acting on a short term rental designation. In advance, thank you for your time.</p>
1/13/2025	Public Input	<p>If this: The city's business code would be updated to make it so that to operate a STR on a property that has three or fewer units, the license holder must be an individual — and if that individual wants to operate more than one STR in Austin, they need to have the rentals spaced apart from one another by at least 1,000 feet Means that someone cannot rent both sides of a duplex short term, then I am against that. The days of hysteria over bad STRs are behind us. All those issues didn't need a whole new set of code, they just needed enforcement of existing code. Don't limit the use of someone's property through an unnecessary restriction on personal use like this.</p> <p>As for "require platforms to collect the same tax hotels do" every council member needs to understand that the unnecessary and obstructive requirement that Kathy Tovo set forth on the platforms to provide the physical addresses of STRs (in order for the city to enforce its STR policies) is what cost the city tens of millions of dollars over the years. Drop the city registration of STRs, drop the ridiculously high annual fees and let the platforms collect your 11% HOT and you'll be raking in sooooo much more money than the obstacle method ever could. Then just treat STRs like the homes they are as far as code violations go. The cat is out of the bag and has been for years, you're just losing money and making it harder on residents/owner. Try as you might, you will not get the cat back in the bag nor likely win in any Texas court. Take the money and run.</p> <p>I'm a former STR owner of a small granny flat. Your fees made me switch to long term, but this hasn't necessarily been the best choice for me and my family. The onerous rules and requirements, and the now penalizing annual fee, forced us to do it differently. That's not something the city should be doing--getting into my business so much that it makes it difficult. To get more personal, this was somewhat manageable before my wife died of cancer, but then as a single dad and running my STR the additional requirements from the city were too much. BTW, we were submitting HOT to you and the state prior to the city even having the registration and fee process. We did this voluntarily, something I know most people do not and would not do. But you have VRBO and Airbnb more than willing to do this on your behalf yet you've continually chosen the wrong path. They successfully do this for the state, why don't you think they'd be able to do this for the city too? Get out of the way and let people live their lives in a way that is best for them and legal. Thanks for reading this.</p>
1/13/2025	Public Input	<p>many cities and municipalities both in the state and across the country are taxing short term rentals as commercial properties. It is almost indisputable that this is a commercial use. It seems like Austin should follow suit.</p>

1/14/2025	Public Input	We had a shooting at an unlicensed Airbnb in our neighborhood recently, we submitted 13 affidavits from neighbors and the house was just granted a type 2 license. We have numerous houses for Airbnb in our neighborhood and they are all under business names. Most of them are operating illegally, pose risks to our neighborhood with violence and parties they bring.
1/14/2025	Public Input	<p>None of the changes addresses my concerns as an STR operator for over nine years. I operate a garage apartment from the home my family lives in, a VERY small business, and feel continually SQUEEZED out of every last cent by the city's regulations and fees. First, the very LARGE annual fee of \$400+ (rises every year) just to stay registered. That's almost \$40 a month to....review my insurance document once a YEAR??? It's way too much. Second, the exorbitant 11% rate of our taxes! We're also paying state tax, so fully a quarter of our rental income flies out the door immediately, making it more expensive for tourists and less beneficial to your residents trying to rent out space. Lastly, there's a serious lack of professional administration in the STR office. There are no reminder emails sent about the annual registration, really no communication or community building whatsoever, almost no support for our issues with the incredibly clunky payment site.</p> <p>Is Austin seriously going to continue with an 11% rate PLUS the annual fee of \$430+ per year just to stay registered?</p> <p>I can see the city is trying to disincentivize big STR real estate companies (which I totally get), but what about the families operating garage apartments just trying to survive? We need help with the outdated site, better communication, and most of all LOWER TAXES AND FEES!</p>
1/14/2025	Public Input	I am in favor of limiting the number of STRs in the City. My block in the Barton Hills neighborhood has at least 6 units on it. While these folks for the most part are not causing noise issues and the property owners seem to be (so far) good at keeping up the property, what I am against is allowing housing to be used as hotel spaces in a city where we don't have enough housing. Taking these units out of service for local families means that fewer kids are able to use the great public schools in our district (or if they do, they have to drive in from out of the neighborhood) and we also don't have neighbors we know and can count on in emergencies. The owners of these properties do not live in Austin--I know for a fact that the owner of the STR next door to me lives in San Antonio. My neighbor down the street tells me that the building next to her is owned by a man who lives in India. I have a friend who lives in a one-bedroom condo in East Austin--she tells me that many of the units in her building are used as STRs. In her case, the use of these units as STRs is driving up prices. Lastly, I am a city worker. Many of my co-workers (at least half or more) cannot afford to live in Austin. Having all these units turned into STRs for tourists instead of being available for Austinites is a problem.
1/14/2025	Public Input	The city needs to do a better job of catching and punishing STR that are not properly permitted or registered.
1/15/2025	Public Input	Non owner-occupied str uses are horrible for neighborhood cohesion and identity. I think str uses are ok for secondary structures but the primary structure needs to have someone accountable. Permits for str uses should be visibly posted like New Orleans and should have a clearly posted contact phone number. Neighbor property should be notified in writing and given a contact name and number. Str units with access to a pool, spa or any type of water amenity should have specific rules about occupancy, compliance with pool code/health department regulations, noise or amplified music limitations, etc. pools create a party atmosphere that brings disruption outdoors- particularly annoying for neighbors.

		311 needs a special section for issues related to str and these complaints need to be communicated to neighbor property- including status on code enforcement interaction and resolution of complaints. If people want to run a commercial business in a neighborhood they should at least be accountable to commercial business requirements.
1/15/2025	Public Input	To disincentivize non-owner occupied (ie- full time STRs), is it legal to tier the STR licensing fee and/or hotel occupancy tax rate? For example, higher licensing fees and/or hotel occupancy tax rates for non-owner occupied STRs, or licensing fees/tax rates that scale-up based on the number of day a property is in use as an STR? Or, to encourage more owner-occupied rentals, a rule akin to the IRS "Augusta Rule", allowing homeowners to rent out their primary residence for up to 14 days per year without any tax levy? Encouraging more owner-occupied STRs would help crowd-out full-time STRs, and provide Austin residents with opportunities to generate additional income. Speaking from experience, once you deducted the STR fee and HOT taxes from your rental income, it's hardly worth the hassle and risk of renting out your primary residence for less than 14 days/year, and most homeowners can't feasibly rent out their home more than that.
1/15/2025	Public Input	Where is the Platform Accountability? Will platforms be fined for posting and profiting from illegal listings?
1/15/2025	Public Input	I've had an STR w/o owner by me. Hated it. It was a huge neighborhood issue in general. It was party central. I was so sad to see Abbott stick his nose into Austin's matters on this issue. They may have a place, they don't belong in neighborhoods, and they should be regulated just like a hotel. Actually MORE SO. Hotel's have responsible people in residence all the time.
1/15/2025	Public Input	STRs have ruined our neighborhood, rather than proud owners contributing to the continued improvements and community, investors and manipulative people (airbnb bridging) have no connection or hold any value for the streets and surrounding neighbors, and have no regard for the rules. We had submitted over 60 311 issues, and no change was seen, the owners gave power of attorney to an Airbnb bridger, I was told it is legal and there was nothing they could do to hold the owner accountable for the noise, drugs, parties, trash etc. Ultimately, we moved out of Austin and came to Dallas, because Austin has no control over Airbnb and how it impacts the city or its residents. Austin will lose its culture, and become a city of temporary residents, as prices increase and whole neighborhoods become STRs. The owners next to us who did the STR still claimed HomeStead Exemption, didn't register with the city, and made ~\$10k per month, all while we suffered the trash and noise with little support from Austin City, despite reaching out to council members, 311 and the Police. I hope you control Airbnb for the city's sake, and think of the residents first, not the tourists.
1/15/2025	Public Input	I suggest the short term rental operators be required to collect and pay to the city additional per night fees 1) collect hotel tax, 2) fees to recover the cost to the city of full time code enforcement staff to enforce legal registration and fee collection 3) collect fees to contribute to housing the homeless people in Austin, 4) require short term rental apps to provide a data dump monthly of all rental units in Austin to assist the city to regulate that fees are collected, 5) hefty fines for not registering a short term rental that become tax liens against the property if not paid, 6) publish data online of scofflaw short term rental owners to shame them, 7) to keep elected people's eye on the most important issue: at every city council meeting, open with a state of housing data sentence detailing how many affordable units are needed in the city, and how many units are legal and illegal short term rentals.
1/16/2025	Public Input	Regulation of STR abuse is sorely needed in Austin as millions are lost annually for parks and schools due to widespread mishandling of these harmful rentals in our neighborhoods.

1/16/2025	Public Input	<p>It seems to me that the change in short term rentals could undermined the goal of the HOME ordinances that the City passed. It incentivizes home owners to rent out there property for short term rentals; and in turn creates less housing stock in the central neighborhoods. The "missing middle" housing is still missing. The Owners who can afford it do not sell their property when they move from the neighborhood. Instead of maybe renting out their homes long term they can make more money using the property for a short term rental. So instead of anyone actually living in the neighborhood, the Owner is only using the property as an income producing property. Therefore, the people who can afford having two homes in the neighborhood increase dramatically and the ones that cannot afford to move end up having there quality of life effected. I live in a popular central Austin neighborhood. My kids attend an AISD school that we are zoned to attend. It seems that every trash day, you can clearly tell who rents there houses out to short term rentals; and the trash around the property is clearly made by someone who does not live there. It seems that these short term rentals are a heavier user of the City's trash collection. They also do not contribute to the composting collection program, most of the time their recycling contains plastic bags (or not even recycling at all). My guess is they also contribute to more 311 calls into the city for noise violations. Basically, if the state will not let the city govern, can the City at least get compensated for all the extra work that these properties create for the City. Not to mention the negative impact they have on our community and the enrollment to the local schools that surround the area.</p>
1/17/2025	Public Input	<p>I have been a resident of Austin for the past 8 years, in 2020 my husband and I were fortunate enough to buy a townhome in the Chestnut neighborhood in East Austin. I was drawn to the neighborhood for the walkability and community feel. I loved the community gardens and the baseball field. The neighborhood was a mix of long term renters and owners which was great. But as the years went on more and more rentals switched over to STR. I would notice party vans pulling up to the neighborhood, I would have ride share drivers start every conversation with "where are you visiting from" the moment they knew what neighborhood I lived in. My husband and I are trying to start a family but I breaks my heart that over the last four years in Chestnut I have only seen two families with children. Less then when I lived in central Atlanta, Portland and Philly.</p> <p>I beg the commission to reduce the number of STR by voting for these laws. I don't expect people to stop coming to Austin but I would love the them to be taxed and slightly spaced out.</p> <p>Finally I invite the commission to visit the corner of 13th and Singleton in my neighborhood. Here you will see a neighbor who used to rent a home on my street before it was bulldozed. He now lives in a tent across from two Air BnBs with a pool and a two story mural that says "HOWDY". The house rents for \$700 a night and is according to Air Bnb "sleeps 16+ guests, making it perfect for large groups or family gatherings. "</p>
1/17/2025	Public Input	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the City ensure that the estimated 15,000 unregistered STR's register and comply with local rules? 2. Will Code Enforcement create night and weekend staff to observe, measure, interdict violations? 3. Is it possible for the City to require that Hotel Occupancy Taxes generated from Short Term Rentals be invested in the specific neighborhoods they impact (similar to traffic impact fees or parkland dedication fees)?

		<p>4. Will the City require real time automated data sharing from the companies profiting from Short-Term Rentals (i.e. Airbnb, VRBO, etc.), to ensure efficient access to information related to personal or corporate liabilities, trends in where and how residential properties are facilitating commercial tourism rather than housing, and public transparency that is aligned with the City's other open data policies?</p> <p>5. Will the City commit to sharing Short Term Rental information with the Travis County Appraisal District to ensure that corporations and Short-Term Rental owners are not underpaying their annual property taxes by claiming false exemptions?</p> <p>6. Does the City think that self-policing is an effective mechanism to protect the general public from potential abuse by multibillion dollar companies whose operations are inherently adverse to housing affordability, accessibility, and sustainability?</p> <p>7. Will the City commit to publishing all communications/meetings/political contributions/conflicts of interest, and other means of influence that may unduly bias or prejudice short term rental regulations?</p>
1/17/2025	Public Input	If there is transition period to allow individuals to apply for permit under new regulation.
1/17/2025	Public Input	Palo Verde will give 3 free months rent to those who want to do airbnb!
1/17/2025	Public Input	The short term rentals in the city of Ausitn are a necessity for the development and growth of several industries, from technology, to medical, to musical events, car raising, and the restaurant and park industry as a whole. During the last 6 years I have hosted many many guests who have retuned as friends as they have loved to be in a home environment rather than in a hotel room. The short term rentals bring families together during holiday vacations of grand parents visiting their children and gives home comfort to the business travelers with need of long term travel to work in their specific industry, and brings business to the many restaurants and coffee shops in the surrounding areas as well as the entretenimiento industry and retail shops. Short term rentals bring are Los of grey benefit for those who are moving to the city and are waiting for a home purchase as well as those who have the need of a temporary home due to their own repairs and remodeling of their homes.
1/18/2025	Public Input	By changing the zoning of STR you will be hurting renters that companies like Greystar allow residents to earn additional income through Airbnb 90 days out of a 12 month period. Any changes to the zoning code will further increase the cost of housing for the citizens of Austin that are savvy to offset their cost of living through short term rental options that most landlords do not offer their residents.
1/20/2025	Public Input	The following questions refer to 4-23-3X : A. an operator must own the short term rental, does this mean that all STR property managers will now be out of business? Does this mean that every current type 1 owner must be responsible for all operations of their rental while they are out of town and renting their home on airbnb? B. does "a short term rental" mean 1 short term rental? C/F: does the 1,000 ft distance pertain to any other STR regardless of who owns it such as the Type 2 commercial requirements or does it only apply to the same owner being unable to operate multiple STR within 1,000 ft of one another? Is the 1,000 ft requirement only applicable to those owning it in the name of an LLC? Is the intention behind this to limit STR permits to one per lot so that an owner with 1-3 units on one lot can not rent out all three at the same time? I feel that clustered

		STRs may not be any worse than 1 large STR listing. In fact, having 3 on one lot may be preferable for community rather than dispersing them every 1,000 ft. I'm also concerned about the feasibility of the proposed amendments with the current landscape. I think the amendment needs to carefully consider the ease of interpretation for the general public. Currently the confusion surrounding condo regimes, properties with ADUs, duplex etc. makes it challenging. Also consider the people house hacking and renting out a portion of their SFH.
1/20/2025	Public Input	<p>Greetings. For context, I have been a licensed operator for the past 8 years and have paid many 10s of thousands of dollars in STR hotel taxes. We have rented our house at times for festival weekends and rent our ADU regularly. I think STRs have an important place in Austin and feel like the current regulations are fair and balanced. What I see as problematic is the lack of enforcement. I am surrounded by unlicensed, uncaring, investor-owned operators. Between myself and my neighbors, I'd estimate that 100 complaints have been registered for one problematic address, and they continue to operate with seeming impunity. Owner-occupied dwellings bring economic vitality to the area and assist with the high cost of ownership in the urban corridor. Non-compliant STRs bring a competitive disadvantage to those who comply, erosion of our urban neighborhoods, drive real-estate prices higher, and often create disturbances as the owners are nowhere to be found.</p> <p>I am hopeful that solutions can be implemented. Thank you.</p>
1/20/2025	Public Input	How can you ensure long time homeowners that loud party houses will be promptly addressed
1/20/2025	Public Input	Will be looking for further details related to business classification especially since home offices can also be classified as business entities.
1/21/2025	Public Input	<p>Since STRs are in fact operating as hotels, should they not be required to meet all state and local laws governing hotels? Fire code? Occupancy rates? Management availability? Parking? Noise abatement?</p> <p>Currently, there is no recourse for complaints against STRs except calling 311 [APD does not have resources to send an officer for noise complaints] or civil lawsuits.</p> <p>HOTEL means a building in which members of the public may obtain sleeping accommodations for consideration.</p> <p>§ 11-2-1 - DEFINITIONS. The term [hotel] includes a hotel, motel, tourist home, tourist house, tourist court, lodging house, inn, rooming house, or other building where a room is furnished for a consideration, but does include a hospital, sanitarium, or nursing home</p> <p>§ 4-18-41 - SOUND ASSESSMENT REQUIRED. Subsection (B), a person who applies for a site plan to develop a new residential use or hotel-motel use must obtain a sound assessment that complies with Section 4-18-42 (Sound Assessment)</p> <p>Code of Ordinances TITLE 6. - ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AND CONSERVATION. CHAPTER 6-5. - WATER QUALITY. ARTICLE 4. - DRINKING WATER</p> <p>§ 25-2-754 - USE REGULATIONS.</p> <p>Texas Sec. 2155.051. DEFINITION. In this subchapter, "hotel" means a business, including an inn or rooming house, that furnishes food, lodging, or both food and lodging to a person applying and paying for the service.</p>
1/21/2025	Public Input	Hi there, I am curious how code compliance will work in this scenario? I have had issues with this as a renter with the unit directly next to mine (a shared wall) being an unlicensed Airbnb. Because of the lack of enforcement, I can't bring them into

		compliance. How will the new code be updated to ensure I can get the neighboring unit into compliance?
1/21/2025	Public Input	Does the 1,000 feet apart apply to multifamily apartment or condo complexes?
1/22/2025	Public Input	These new str regulations are a crystal clear case of violating our constitutional right. You know it and we know it. Being a citizen of Austin Texas, this is very concerning. Our rights are getting stomped on. The city of Austin is already taxing the citizens to death, from the over priced electricity rates to the insane property taxes. Now the city is asking more and more. We need to stand up and stop this city and these people that are taxing us to death. The city and the affiliates that are passing these bills are power hungry, and they will not stop asking for more and more from us . We need to cut the head off of this disease. The city should not have this much control of us... the citizens that are actually paying for this city's bills. We do have rights and we do have power. Stand up and shout back at there people.
1/22/2025	Public Input	As a resident of Austin who attended the first Zoom info session about proposed STR regs, and as a resident who has also engaged Chito Vela and his staff and the City Council innumerable times over the last three years, letting them know how inadequate the City is in promoting responsible STR ownership and management, I am again disappointed. I am disappointed because none of what Daniel Word presented adequately addresses making the City quickly and efficiently address complaints such as STR noise, parties, and trash that beat down the residents who live otherwise peacefully in Austin's neighborhoods. When Daniel Word was asked to clarify procedures for a resident to make a middle of the night noise complaint, his answer is summary is, "...I think that is something we'll have to evaluate as we go forward." Residents are left with no procedure to correct disturbances, particularly party and noise problems except to call 311 or 911, neither of which respond to the problem. Therefore, the City of Austin will remain grossly inadequate in promoting responsible STR ownership by being sure to neglect what residents need which is peace and quiet, but the COA will be sure to collect the Hotel Occupancy Tax. This is a case of the COA putting money before people.
1/22/2025	Public Input	Ban short term rentals, they inflate the cost of long term rentals which is a crisis that is ongoing. We have enough hotel capacity- we need housing capacity.
1/23/2025	Public Input	Under the proposed regulations, will a homesteaded property with a main unit and a guesthouse where there is only one address (no Units) need two separate permits for each unit? Will it be possible for the homeowner to lease both units as one?
1/23/2025	Public Input	<p>Thanks for conducting this week's information session. I have concerns--and I heard concern from others on the Zoom bases on their questions--about the 2-hour response window to an inquiry from the City, particularly on a 24-hour basis. Perhaps you can consider i) making that window longer, and/or ii) no penalty for a first-time failure to respond in the X-hour window.</p> <p>Additionally, as both a long-term Austin resident (30 years) and an STR owner, the lack of enforcement of having an STR license seems crucial to address. Those of us who try to abide by regulations are negatively impacted by those who don't, both as residents and as hospitality providers. I hope that the new provisions provide for greater efficiency in monitoring and correcting this issue.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
1/23/2025	Public Input	The updates may address this, but our community's question is this: When an HOA's CC&R's does not allow STRs, but a homeowner has a license from the city to operate an STR, how can the HOA be effective when there are complaints due to excessive partying, trash, parking violations, etc. Residents of our neighborhood

		look to the HOA to enforce these violations, but as long as the homeowner is licensed by the state, we can't do anything but fine the homeowner - but the fee doesn't even touch the profit they are making from the STR. Many of them simply fold that fee into their rental fee.
1/24/2025	Public Input	I believe short-term rentals are a safety hazard for neighbors. Renters have no implied obligation of safe or courteous behavior toward the neighbors that surround the rented property. There are many instances of unsafe and discourteous behavior taking place at short-term rentals. They enhance the wealth of the STR owner but degrade the value of owner-occupied homes in neighborhoods and should not be allowed.
1/26/2025	Public Input	Hello; I am working from my 2017 Macintosh computer which is old and slow, as am I. I ask that all meetings of import be Zoomed. I would love to meet you in person some morning, over coffee. But for now I decline evening meetings, especially when they involve my pickup truck in parking garages and a deep fear of bollards.
1/26/2025	Public Input	I am an owner and live on the property. I depend on the money made from the STR allows me to pay my taxes and other expenses to maintain the house. People love my place. I agree that owners that never live on premisses should not be part of the program.
1/27/2025	Public Input	You normally think of hotel or STR as some place for a short stay for yourself for work or to visit and area. May of us have probably used apps like AirB&B for that. Rentals like that can be accommodated without changing the character of a neighborhood or being a nuance. However, places that advertise 16 beds, swimming pools, and other outdoor facilities for large gatherings are not that - they are a destination. Large groups of people gather there to have a good time - there are obvious issues with noise, traffic, trash, parking, and having a lot of strangers in the neighborhood. Sure, you can complain. But why force neighbors to have to police this. Many times the inspectors dont come out on weekend nights for safety reasons. If its not safe for inspectors think of how the neighbors feel. The place next door to me actually busses people in for corporate events. Is there anyway to distinguish between places to stay and destinations for large groups to gather?
1/27/2025	Public Input	Are property taxes on STR's handled differently than other residential property? Since the properties are generating revenue are they taxed more like commercial property? I realize this may be more of a county issue, but is there any coordination. It would seem like STRs would use additional government resources such as the STR regulations, trash, police call outs, etc. How about homestead exemptions. If a place is being used as an STR its hard to understand why they can continue to receive property tax exemptions for homestead, age or other qualifiers for a person who is obviously not living there.
1/27/2025	Public Input	Just want to get some infos on the changes.
1/27/2025	Public Input	Yes, please! Your solution seems the only workable and sensible way in light of the courts' and King Greg's edicts.
1/28/2025	Public Input & Email	How will this be communicated to buyers and be disclosed in condo, duplex purchases and messaged in for sale description? This has to be mandatory. If this goes in to effect. You can't tell some people they have STR privileges and other not due to the time of their purchase. I'm strongly against this and will take legal action. I have talk with other owners and they are not aware of what you are doing. You are basically discriminating based on when the property was purchased and registered as a STR. Not to mention taking property rights away. What if they never use it as a STR and it's taking a spot up. I have already advised Texas Attorney General office – Ken Paxton is watching this. You can't take away a owners rights....

1/28/2025	Public Input	I attended the session last night. The onus is entirely on the owner. Many, many municipalities are enacting what they call Good Neighbor Policies. Before a reservation is confirmed, typically the guest (depending on the ordinance) must submit a copy of their drivers license and acknowledge the rules related to noise, trash, parking, etc. If code enforcement is called and there is no form on file, this becomes basis for revoking a license. There are automated systems out there that do all this.
1/28/2025	Public Input	Thank you for soliciting input from Austin citizens regarding these changes to Short Term Housing in our city. I would only suggest a one sentence or two explaining how this STR differs from LTR agreements. Just something short that distinguishes for us.
1/28/2025	Public Input	Short Term Rental properties are businesses that should not be allowed in residential neighborhoods. The City of Austin should enforce the deed restrictions on short term rentals. It is easy for Short Term Rental units to ignore city codes and deprive the city of HOT income. Investors in STR units will always outbid families for houses and thus deprive Austin citizens affordable housing.
1/28/2025	Public Input	Will I be able to convert my garage into a bedroom for extra income 🤔
1/28/2025	Public Input	Please do something about all the illegal STRs in Austin. The one next to me is a complete nuisance and they have multiple bedrooms they're renting out and it is awful. Thank you
1/28/2025	Public Input	Increasing STR use will mostly benefit investors who buy homes to rent and make money. It decreases the quality of life for the people like me who live in the home they own. The City Council seems fixated on increasing density and helping investors at the expense of the people they supposedly represent.
1/28/2025	Public Input	<p>I am submitting these comments as a longtime public transit supporter and 40+ year resident of Austin.</p> <p>I have voted for every light rail initiative to come before Austin voters, but I strongly object to the current proposal to construct a multi-level park-and-ride garage on the northeast corner of 38th and Guadalupe.</p> <p>I have summarized my objections below, which include practical considerations; omissions in the DEIS; and relevant provisions of the Hyde Park Neighborhood Plan, current zoning, and the city's Equitable Transit Oriented Development (ETOD) overlay, none of which support a multi-level garage in this location.</p> <p>Clearly, a better plan would be to extend the light rail line ten blocks north to the Triangle, allowing transit access for the hundreds of state workers and residents in that area. I recognize that funding is an issue, but acquiring land and constructing a multi-level garage is also an expensive proposition. I strongly urge you to conserve those funds and leave the site at 38th & Guadalupe open for a future multifamily housing development to better support public transit.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Issues with Proposed Multi-level Park-and-Ride Garage at 38th & Guadalupe</p> <p>1. Practical Considerations</p> <p>The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) states: "Park-and-ride garage. This site would incorporate three adjacent parcels at 3809 Guadalupe, 504 W 38th, and 558 W 38th Streets. Currently, these properties serve as a car maintenance facility and offices. The total acreage of these sites is 0.88 acre, which could</p>

	<p>accommodate approximately 45 vehicles on a surface lot. Given the automobile parking demand at this site, a multi-level parking structure is recommended." (Appendix E-5, Page 12)</p> <p>Due to its proximity to the intersection, left turns in or out of multi-level garage in this location would not be feasible, meaning drivers could only enter from the westbound lane of 38th and exit onto the northbound lane of Guadalupe. This intersection is already rated F for Failing and would continue to be rated F under the light rail plan. The average time for a car to exit a parking garage is typically between 1-3 minutes depending on traffic, driver's skill, and the layout of exit lanes. Because of limited access, many drivers would likely cut through nearby residential streets, including the narrow side street and crosswalk connecting the facilities of the Helping Hand Home for abused and neglected children.</p> <p>The intersection in question is already accessible by six CapMetro bus routes including the 801, 803, 335, 661, 1, and 3, two of which provide rapid frequency service, making it easy for riders to transfer from a bus to light rail at this location should they choose to do so. In fact, a transfer would arguably be faster than trying to access a parking garage with a single entrance during morning rush hour, finding a space, walking or taking the elevator down several levels, and then crossing Guadalupe to wait for a southbound train.</p> <p>Of course, there is no guarantee drivers would always be able to secure a parking space in the garage. After wasting many minutes fruitlessly searching throughout multiple levels, this would leave them looking for parking spots on narrow residential streets potentially many blocks away, then walking to the train. Given these factors, it is unlikely that commuters who had already driven this far wouldn't simply continue in their cars to their ultimate destination.</p> <p>Finally, Project Connect's plans call for a priority extension of the light rail on Guadalupe north of 38th to Lamar as soon as funds are available. This would ultimately strand a large park-and-ride facility in the middle of the line, rather than at its the end where it would make more sense.</p> <p>I realize funding is an issue, but if the initial light rail line could be extended just another ten blocks north to the Triangle, this would allow southbound commuters to use the many existing parking garages already in that area, while providing transit access for the hundreds of residents and state employees who live or work in the vicinity.</p> <p>2. Visual Representation Omitted from DEIS</p> <p>The DEIS does not provide a visual representation of the proposed park-and-ride garage, nor does it specify the height or number of stories anticipated, although it does provide visual representations for virtually every other aspect of the plan.</p> <p>Instead, it states: "The multi-story parking garage proposed at 38th Street is anticipated to be Co-dominant because only one other building within the AVE near 38th Street is over two stories (i.e., the three-story Sunflower Bank Building further west on 38th Street). This change would attract attention and could compete with adjacent landscape scenery or views because of the height of the proposed garage and its proximity to Central Park, a large green space across Guadalupe Street. However, because viewers in this area are primarily office and</p>
--	---

	<p>retail workers or student renters who are transient and have relatively low sensitivity to change, the effect is categorized as Neutral." (Appendix E-5, Page 14).</p> <p>Given that the DEIS provides illustrations for almost every other facet of the plan, one must question whether a visual representation for the garage was intentionally omitted. Further, the notion that "viewers in this area...are transient and have relatively low sensitivity to change" is simply insulting to all of us who make our homes here.</p> <p>In fact, the proposed garage would be in the direct line of sight for many small single-family homes. It would also adjoin the play yard of the Helping Hand Home for abused and neglected children, who certainly deserve better than having an enormous parking garage looming over their outdoor play space.</p> <p>3. Hyde Park Neighborhood Plan Does Not Support a Park-and-Ride in this Location</p> <p>The DEIS states: "The park-and-ride facility would be consistent with recommendations outlined in the Hyde Park Neighborhood Plan." (Appendix E-2, Page 40). This is not true.</p> <p>The language of our Neighborhood Plan clearly does not support a park-and-ride facility in this location. Further, the Hyde Park Neighborhood Plan Contact Team, which is the designated steward of the area's city-approved Neighborhood Plan under Austin LDC Section 25-1-805, was never consulted about this proposal.</p> <p>The full Neighborhood Plan is available at this link, but the relevant sections are provided below.</p> <p>https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Housing_%26_Planning/Adopted%20Neighborhood%20Planning%20Areas/16_HydePark/hydepark-np.pdf</p> <p>The Hyde Park Neighborhood Plan lists eight major goals (page 4) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Goal 3: To promote a neighborhood-friendly system of transportation, and• Goal 5: To preserve and protect the Guadalupe corridor and other commercial areas. <p>Goal 3 includes the following objectives (page 26):</p> <p>Objective 3.3 Traffic congestion in and near Hyde Park should be reduced whenever possible.</p> <p>Objective 3.4 Promote parking designs compatible with neighborhood character and use patterns.</p> <p>Objective 3.5 New traffic laws and patterns should be established to improve safety for pedestrians and bicycles.</p> <p>Clearly, a large faceless multi-story garage that draws hundreds of vehicles from outside the area is incompatible with these goals and objectives.</p> <p>Further, Goal 3 includes two action items (page 33) that call for any park-and-ride facility to be located away from the neighborhood to reduce traffic. These are:</p>
--	--

	<p>Action Item 39. Provide designated parking away from Hyde Park for commuters to decrease parked cars on local streets. (Emphasis added)</p> <p>Action Item 40. Encourage businesses and institutions to utilize park and rides, carpooling, public transit and other alternative transportation methods to reduce traffic and parking problems in the neighborhood. (Emphasis added)</p> <p>Again, given that Item 39 explicitly states that designated commuter parking be located away from Hyde Park and that the stated goal of Item 40 is to reduce traffic in the neighborhood, these action items cannot possibly be interpreted as supporting a facility that would draw hundreds more vehicles to the area simply to be warehoused for the day.</p> <p>In addition, Goal 5 includes the following objectives (page 38), none of which are supported by putting a faceless multi-story parking garage in this location:</p> <p>5.3: Promote a system of transportation along the Guadalupe Corridor which will serve commuter needs, support existing business and reduce negative auto impacts on residential area. [Again, this intersection is already served by six bus lines, making a transfer to light rail more efficient for most commuters, rather than being stacked up in a multi-level garage searching for a parking space they may or may not find.]</p> <p>5.5: Revive the business district in the Guadalupe Corridor as a pedestrian oriented promenade, which functions as a main street for the area.</p> <p>5.6: Protect and enhance the streetscape patterns along the Guadalupe Corridor which are in keeping with the historic patterns, scale, and use patterns of Hyde Park.</p> <p>Chapter 3 of the Neighborhood Plan does anticipate a future light rail line on Guadalupe, but notes that related action items should be revisited as part of any future rail planning effort if and when voters approve a light rail project. The Contact Team would have been more than willing to do this had ATP ever consulted us.</p> <p>Chapter 3's Action Items include the following, none of which support the presence of a faceless multi-story parking garage in this area (pages 39-43):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reinforce desirability of light rail by providing local shuttles.• Design stations and amenities to support a high percentage of bicycle use at stops.• Reduce vehicular traffic to decrease congestion and make Guadalupe a pedestrian friendly zone.• Allow no ground level parking under buildings especially where visible from street.• Provide access for pedestrians and disabled persons.• Encourage human scale and locally owned businesses at ground level, with apartments or offices above.• Create a "main street" providing goods and services to neighborhoods and commuters in a pedestrian-friendly streetscape pattern. <p>In addition, regarding the West 38th District, the Neighborhood Plan states in part:</p>
--	---

"Any new construction shall be of an architectural design to be compatible with general neighborhood standards. Any such new construction shall have appropriate set-back and landscaping requirements so as to enhance the neighborhood concept." (Page 12)

Regarding the Guadalupe District, the Neighborhood Plan states its purpose as: "To maintain Hyde Park's traditional commercial district with the scale and uses compatible with adjacent single family districts." Under suggested zoning code revisions, it states: "Prohibit uses that are not appropriate in this district. Limit the size of some uses. Add a mixed use provision for residential on the second floor." (Page 13)

To summarize, the Hyde Park Neighborhood Plan supports pedestrian use, retail and service uses at ground level with residential uses above, reduced vehicular traffic, and increased support for bicycle use at transit stops in this location. It does not support drawing more cars to a multi-story stand-alone parking garage, then dumping them out into an already congested intersection.

4. Current Zoning Does Not Support a Park-and-Ride in this Location

The DEIS States: "The City, in coordination with ATP and the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority (CapMetro), is currently planning for the implementation of the Project through the ETOD Policy Plan, including the adoption of an ETOD [Equitable Transit Oriented Development] Overlay to enable greater densities along light rail transit while also incentivizing the development of affordable housing." (Appendix E-2, page 24).

Unfortunately, the proposed park-and-ride facility in this location neither enables greater density nor incentivizes affordable housing.

The DEIS further states: "The Project is compatible with local plans to encourage growth in transit-oriented development zones..." (4.2, P. 4-10).

Yet a multi-story parking garage used only by commuters from outside the area is hardly conducive to encouraging the type of growth needed to support public transit.

The zoning for the site in question is controlled by the Hyde Park Neighborhood Conservation Combining District (NCCD), the city's Equitable Transit Oriented Development (ETOD) Overlay, and the city's base zoning where those tools are silent. On this site, the NCCD allows multifamily residential, among other uses, up to a 60' height with 95% impervious and building cover and zero street setbacks. The city's newly enacted Density Bonus Equitable Transit Oriented Development tool (DBETOD) would allow even greater heights for a multifamily project that included affordable units in that location.

The city's ETOD Overlay prohibits new "non-transit supportive uses, such as auto- and storage-related uses." Yet the Austin Transit Partnership inexplicably considers a park-and-ride garage to be "transit-supportive" even though it is clearly an auto-related use that will draw more vehicles from outside the area to an intersection already well served by six bus routes and accessible by pedestrians from existing nearby apartment complexes.

Further, the Hyde Park NCCD does not allow Commercial Off-Street Parking as a Permitted Use in the Guadalupe District, though it is unclear whether a presumably publicly-owned park-and-ride facility would be considered "commercial" if it does not charge for parking. The NCCD does allow Commercial Off-Street Parking as a Conditional Use in the Guadalupe District and on properties zoned CS or GR in the West 38th District, but the process to obtain a Conditional Use Permit would require public hearings at Planning Commission and Council.

The NCCD further states that "if a parking facility is located on the ground floor of a building pedestrian-oriented uses must be located at the front of the building." (Page 11, Part 7, 10.). It also states that "excess parking is prohibited" except for the former Post Office site at 4300 and 4307 Speedway (Page 11).

<https://services.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=127619>

Finally, please note that ETOD/DBETOD zoning allows 90-120' tall buildings in the Hyde Park Local Historic District and other areas eligible for National Register Historic Recognition. In approving the ETOD/DBETO tool, city staff indicated that this zoning was necessary for the city to obtain federal funding for the light rail. However, allowing buildings of this size to encroach up to half a mile into a Local Historic District violates the letter and spirit of the 106 process that addresses impacts to cultural resources, and may potentially undercut the city's application for federal funds.

5. Can ATP Override City Requirements?

In theory, both a Neighborhood Plan amendment and a Conditional Use Permit would be required to allow a multi-story parking garage to be constructed on this site. However, it is unclear whether the Austin Transit Partnership's eminent domain process would automatically override these requirements, allowing the proposed park-and-ride to proceed without them.

DEIS Section 4.2.3 states: "The Project would not adversely affect land use patterns in the Study Areas and is consistent with established plans and policies, therefore, mitigation measures related to land use effects would not be required."

Obviously, it is untrue that the proposed garage is consistent with established plans and policies for the area. But setting that issue aside, does the term "mitigation measures" include amendments and processes that would otherwise be required? It's unclear.

6. Summary

Neither the Hyde Park Neighborhood Plan, current zoning, or the goals of the city's ETOD overlay support a multi-story park-and-ride facility in this location. The intersection, which is already rated Failing for vehicle traffic, is accessible by multiple bus routes, making transfers to light rail arguably faster than hunting for a space in a multi-level garage. The intersection is also a walkable destination for area residents, including those who live in the many multifamily complexes throughout the neighborhood. A DBETOD project providing at least some percentage of affordable housing for potential transit users would be a far better use of the site in question.

		Obviously, the best plan would be to extend the initial light rail line another ten blocks north to the Triangle, allowing southbound commuters to use existing garages and providing transit access for the many state workers and residents in that area. I recognize that funding is an issue, but acquiring land and constructing a multi-level garage is also an expensive proposition. I strongly urge you to conserve those funds and leave the site at 38th & Guadalupe open for a future multifamily housing development to better support public transit.
1/28/2025	Public Input	In order to have a fact based process and proposal it would be great if a summary of the over 6000 STR complaints that were filed with Code enforcement could be shared with the public. It would be great to see how the individual proposals are connected to those 6000 STR complaints. If there is a proposal but there haven't been any or hardly any complaints in the last 10 years then the question is why do we need this particular proposal?
1/28/2025	Public Input	Quiero participar
1/28/2025	Public Input	Is there a limit on how many short term rentals an individual can have within the City of Austin district/zone? What's stopping major corporations from buying houses all across the city as long as they are 1000ft apart from their individuals dwelling units and short term renting them?
1/28/2025	Public Input	Excelente este servicio , me suena maravilloso. Gracias 🍌
1/29/2025	Public Input	<p>I am glad to have the opportunity to provide comments about the proposed ordinance. I have been a STR host for over 7 years. I have both my main home and a small guest house listed on AirBnb and VRBO. The permits for these units are a Type 1 and Type 1-secondary. I am very concerned about the 1000 ft. separation requirement. People like myself should be denied the opportunity to list both their primary home plus a separate garage apartment or guest house on the same lot. Enforcing this limitation will have the unfortunate affects of lowering the city's tax revenue and limiting a homeowner's ability to earn extra income that I use to help afford my property taxes and home maintenance. I strongly urge the staff to consider revising the ordinance to allow a homeowner's ability to list at least two separate units on the same lot.</p> <p>I am also very concerned about the enforcement procedures. More often than not, my renewed licenses are not provided until long after the current license has expired. I am afraid the process may result in my license being revoked pending approval of a renewal application unless the City makes it clear that no license will be revoked or "delisted" without ample opportunity for the STR Licensee to demonstrate compliance. There must be due process before an overzealous enforcement officer revokes a valuable source of revenue for an otherwise law abiding tax payer and tax revenue for the City. PLEASE revise the proposal to allow Type 1 plus Type 1-secondary or "ancillary dwelling units" on the same lot. The 1000 ft separation requirement should not apply to these types of properties. PLEASE incorporate a "fair warning or appellant procedure before revoking any STR license".</p>
1/29/2025	Public Input	Negative effect already on neighborhood with overgrowth And traffic.
1/29/2025	Public Input	How does this effect large condo units like the Natiivo building on East Ave which was built and designed to operate like a hotel but using STR methods?
1/29/2025	Public Input	For a condo single family home community short term rentals should not be allowed. It will cause congestion and added elements of stress to full time residents
1/30/2025	Public Input & Email	Thanks for the session. I've been traveling and extremely busy, so I'm just now able to follow up. Here are my key points for consideration and feedback:

	<p>\$1M Liability Insurance This is a very positive step, as it forces short-term rental (STR) owners to take responsibility seriously. Airbnb party guests don't just damage the rental property—they also impact the surrounding area. We've seen cases where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Drain their filthy pool water onto neighboring properties• Scatter trash across front yards• Cause general chaos that disrupts the community <p>Beyond property damage, we know that some Airbnb rentals have been the site of shootings and knife fights. Given the serious risks involved, the liability requirement should be -if nothing else - increased to reflect the potential for severe harm caused by reckless, intoxicated guests.</p> <p>License Revocation & Airbnb Delisting for Repeat Nuisance Violations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I highly doubt Airbnb would ever voluntarily remove a listing, regardless of complaints.• We already know from experience that enforcement is weak—similar to how people drive without licenses, STRs continue to operate even after violations.• The current fine structure is laughable: a \$500 penalty per weekend (if enforced) is nothing compared to the \$3,800 revenue an STR can make in the same period. The financial incentive to continue operating outweighs the risk of minor fines. <p>Response Time for STR Owners: 2-Hour Maximum I propose a tiered response system based on the severity of the situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Urgent (20 minutes) – Incidents involving violence, weapons, or extreme disturbances (e.g., fights, shootings, etc.).• High Priority (60 minutes) – Loud, disruptive behavior late at night, disturbing the entire neighborhood.• Standard (2 hours max) – General nuisances such as excessive noise or minor disturbances. <p>Currently, STR owners exploit gaps in enforcement, knowing that 311 shuts down at night and that APD often does not respond to noise complaints. The response system should reflect real-world urgency.</p> <p>Legal Threats Against Neighbors A critical issue that hasn't been addressed is legal intimidation by STR owners against neighbors who report nuisances. STR owners should be prohibited from using legal threats (e.g., "You are disrupting our business") against residents who are simply trying to sleep. If an STR owner is found threatening neighbors with lawsuits for filing legitimate complaints, their license should be immediately revoked.</p> <p>1,000-Foot Rule This is an excellent step forward. It prevents greedy speculators from buying up entire duplexes, fourplexes, or city blocks purely to convert them into party-house resorts—something glamorized by "get rich quick" YouTube influencers. Given how far noise travels, I would support doubling this distance for better community protection.</p> <p>Visible License Number Requirement Completely agree. Airbnb is a powerful tool, but like a car, it has the potential to cause immense damage. And just like a car, it must have insurance and a clearly visible registration number for accountability.</p> <p>Looking forward to the next steps.</p>
--	---

1/30/2025	Public Input	<p>Hi, I find the list of proposed new STR requirements to be a bit hypocritical considering my experiences with other types of uses and their impact on me as a resident. I especially have issues with the liability insurance requirements, the accessory use assignment, the open ended statement "Adhere to mitigation requirements imposed by the director" and the overall overreach of trying to exert control over a public platform such as airbnb, after there has been so much noise over censorship and overreach of government towards social media platforms, I think this trends in that direction. I tried and tried, practically begged for the city to regulate the use of a vacant lot for a food truck park and every person I spoke with tried to come up with a reason why they shouldn't regulate it or why it didn't require regulation. I also have an email directly from city staff that states "Neither the Texas Food Establishment Rules or the City of Austin require insurance for food trucks, food truck parks, bars or restaurants." so then how are you going to require liability insurance from an airbnb? If an airbnb is going to be identified as an accessory use then a food truck park on a vacant lot should also be an accessory use.</p>
1/31/2025	Public Input	<p>Hi, I'd like to submit my thoughts on the proposed changes to short-term rental (STR) regulations.</p> <p>First off, I fully support the idea of regulating STRs more strictly. Housing affordability is a major concern in Austin, and tightening STR rules could help make housing more accessible for residents. Plus, hotels already create good jobs and are subject to stricter regulations, so it only makes sense to have similar rules for STRs.</p> <p>On top of that, reducing STRs would help neighborhoods get back to being true communities, rather than transient spaces. We need places where people can really put down roots, and limiting short-term rentals would go a long way in that.</p> <p>Lastly, the City could also see improvements in tax collection, especially with the new Tourism District tax. The extra 2% for hotels with 100+ rooms is a great step, and I think regulating STRs more would help streamline things even more.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my input!</p>
1/31/2025	Public Input	<p>I believe the City of Austin needs to go all in on a solution. Right now only some STR's comply and pay HOT, I'd argue that it's the minority of them as well. Others operate unlicensed and keep all of their income. That doesn't seem fair...</p> <p>I think Austin should either remove the HOT or implement the proposed solution to have Air BnB collect license #'s and HOT directly and de-list any properties that do not have their STR license currently.</p>
1/31/2025	Public Input	<p>I do not support this proposal. The City should stop trying over-regulate STRs and should stop wasting tax payer's money on lawsuits that infringe on homeowners rights.</p>
1/31/2025	Public Input	<p>While I no longer rent my backyard casita out as a STR, I did so for many years (2010-2020). My casita was one of the first 40 listings in all of Austin on Airbnb! So, I have seen more than a bit of change in how STRs operate in Austin. I diligently followed all the rules as they were created from licensing to tax collection, I even kept my license current for a few years after I stopped hosting. I did these things because Austin is my community.</p> <p>As everyone is aware, many of today's "hosts" are not members of this community and feel no responsibility to be good citizens. I could point out numerous examples</p>

		<p>in my own neighborhood. Because, of the lack of on-site management at most STRs enforcement of good neighbor rules is key. No matter what the state laws are, I strongly agree it will be a huge benefit to collect the city tax from all the STRs, through the rental portals so that no one can evade the taxes (just like the state of Texas has been doing for years).</p> <p>I strongly believe that a very large share of that money should go back into ensuring quality of life for the full-time residents of Austin, rather than in adding to tourist amenities and/or the convention center. I suggest creating a separate pot of "hotel" tax just for STRs so that this money can be allocated to the extra management required when there is no onsite staff.</p> <p>IMO the current "policing" of noise and nuisance at problem properties is a joke. If you have to allow any house, anywhere, to be a de-facto hotel, then you have to be able to shut down parties, enforce cleanliness/trash issues, and just generally ensure the safety of citizens. Period.</p>
2/1/2025 8	Public Input	<p>Would the Hotel Occupancy Taxes collected by property address be publicly available informationn? If not, could Homeowners Associations and/or Condo Associations request information by address to aid in enforcing fines for violators of HOA or COA policies? Thanks!</p>
2/1/2025 8	Public Input	<p>We have shared a back fence with a troublesome STR (unlicensed) in the Zilker neighborhood for years. Calls to APD and Code Enforcement result in being told that "we don't respond to noise complaints - not enough staff". If the CoA is not going to enforce its existing regulations, why even have such regulations at all? Add officers to APD and Code Enforcement so that something will happen when STRs violate these ordinances.</p>
2/1/2025 9	Public Input	<p>Look at Seattle's Short Term rental regulations for example. Seattle only charges \$75 per unit per year. This is a fair license fee, and the reasonable cost of the fee encourages compliance, with more people willing to get licensed. Austin's short term rental fees currently are way too high, reducing compliance. You can also consider making the fees for Owner Occupied short term rental lower than for non-Owner occupied short term rental. Many Owner Occupied short term rental homeowners are simply struggling to pay Austin's exorbitant property taxes and are attempting to generate a small amount of income from short term rental to help pay their property taxes and stay in their homes.</p>
2/1/2025 1	Public Input	<p>I would love more detailed information on limiting corporations on use of STR's. Everything in the presentation and one sheeter was very vague or did not touch on this in more detail.</p>
2/1/2025 2	Public Input	<p>My wife and I own a long-term rental property on Duval Street in Austin, Texas. I am generally opposed to short-term rental units. Based on what I've read in the news, they tend to drive up the cost of housing, in part by reducing the availability of long-term rentals and houses for sale. If the city decides to allow them, it would be wise to limit the number of short-term rentals.</p>
2/1/2025 5	Public Input	<p>████ Ave H and █████ Ave H are STR.</p>
2/1/2025 6	Public Input	<p>I am very much in support of the proposed regulations for STRs. My neighborhood is full of them and they've greatly contributed to gentrification and the visitors are not always respectful.</p>
2/1/2025 9	Public Input	<p>As a general rule, I strongly value property rights. Homeowners should be allowed to do what they want with their property as long as it is within the law and does not significantly inconvenience neighbors. Therefore, I fully support allowing property owners to short-term rent their properties as long as it is done with some oversight and accountability.</p>

2/1/2025 9	Public Input	Additionally, I strongly support the city's engagement with hosting platforms. If the STR/Hotel tax was collected automatically on every reservation, that would significantly increase the revenue collected from the STR/Hotel tax. However, much of that incremental revenue should be earmarked to fund additional resources and staffing to ensure STR compliance with local codes and mitigate potential nuisances.
2/2/2025 8	Public Input	Do not pass, leave short term rental as it is.
2/2/2025 3	Public Input	I support stronger regulation of short-term rentals. I am concerned that "limitations on corporate ownership" and "allowing existing STRs to continue provided that the STR does not become a nuisance..." will not provide strong enough protections against corporate ownership and running of short-term rentals.
2/2/2025 4	Public Input	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the short-term rental (STR) code. While I understand that Austin's rapid growth has made it challenging to regulate the increasing number of STRs, I believe that requiring all neighborhood deed restrictions to be amended is an excessive and unfair approach.</p> <p>I live in a small loop in [REDACTED] (Southwest Austin), consisting of approximately 35 homes with no outlet other than the frontage road. Until recently, I did not anticipate STRs being an issue in our neighborhood. However, just last month, a home at [REDACTED] was purchased by an out-of-state buyer from California and listed on Airbnb within days—without securing the necessary permits or licenses. This situation raises several concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The homeowner has violated deed restrictions, yet enforcement remains lax. 2. The property is being used for commercial purposes by someone who does not reside in or contribute to the local community. 3. Increased short-term rentals in small, enclosed neighborhoods create traffic and safety issues, which are not adequately addressed in the proposed amendments. <p>The broad application of these regulations across all of Austin does not account for the unique challenges of smaller, low-traffic neighborhoods like mine. Encouraging out-of-state investors to buy homes solely for STR income exacerbates Austin's already unaffordable housing market.</p> <p>If enforcement against STR platforms like Airbnb remains inadequate, why not refine the regulation amendments to distinguish between larger, through-neighborhoods with more than 100 homes, rather than applying a blanket policy across all of Austin—potentially putting smaller, limited-access communities at risk of increased traffic and related issues? This approach would allow the city to focus its regulatory efforts on smaller neighborhoods, addressing enforcement challenges more effectively.</p> <p>I urge the city to consider a more nuanced approach to these amendments—one that balances responsible STR management with the needs and concerns of local residents.</p>
2/2/2025 9	Public Input	Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response.
2/3/2025 9	Public Input	Hi there. I would like the city to find a way to encourage/reward resident-owner/operators. I believe that an STR that is operated by an individual homeowner who also lives on the property supports the Council's goals to 1) make

		STRs more compatible with neighborhoods (including the social ecosystem), and 2) avoid further exacerbation of affordability issues. In these circumstances, homeowners are usually trying to address their own financial goals to afford living/property ownership in Austin; and a present owner can often solve compatibility issues before they begin to affect others. While in contrast, absent-owner/operators are not as capable of addressing or noticing issues and it is not clear how this circumstance addresses affordable living in Austin. Thank you
2/3/2025 1	Public Input	What is a reason(s) for an owner of a property to register for STR? Who decides and what criteria is used to accept or reject an application for STR? If a property is rejected for STR what is my legal rights to fight the rejection?
2/4/2025 9	Public Input	I object to allowing short-term rental use in all residential areas of the city. If you look across the country at cities that have allowed this, they are trying to claw it back as it has gotten out of hand. Restricting short-term rental use to specific districts in the city is one sensible option. Homeowners in residential areas should have the expectation that their next door neighbor not be functioning as a quasi-hotel. I am also concerned about the language in the proposal that says short-term rental use cannot be prohibited. Restrictive covenants by homeowners associations should be permitted and, if challenged in the courts, so be it. For the city to impose the prohibition is overreaching.
2/4/2025 1	Public Input	As a single struggling minority female homeowner, I was highly dependent upon short term rental to afford the home I built in 2014. My house is on 13th St and I pay an ungodly amount in taxes while I can't even get 911 on the phone and must clean up human feces every other month. I paid all my Hotel occupancy taxes when I was on Airbnb. I was a super host with absolutely no complaints. The program I paid for through my taxes sought me out for not having a \$500 permit. At the time I was reading several articles of other homeowners suing the city and winning for this very reason. I was already a host so before I found the time to go and get a permit, I thought was going to be obsolete, I was ticketed twice (against code compliance) in the same month without even knowing. I went to court and was assured that I would be "okay". However, I was surprised when I saw that I was penalized to the fullest extent for both citations. I could not afford the penalty and I was paying so much more to the city when I was renting out one of my rooms. I'm about to lose my house now. I have a masters degree from UT but have been hit hard by several uncontrollable circumstances. I can't see how this is beneficial to our Homestead owners when the whole point of the program that my taxes are paying for was to seek out investors that don't actually live in these properties that they're renting out, are disturbing neighborhoods and not paying taxes. I was not guilty of any of these offenses and now I'm being punished by a misdirected policy/program funded by my own limited funds. I just want to be able to afford my home and get back on my feet. If I can do that while giving back MORE to this city, then that is what should happen.
2/5/2025 1	Public Input	I'd like to see regulation put into place that doesn't allow for corporations or hospitality groups to purchase housing in residential neighborhoods that they then run as unstaffed hotels. I currently live next door to an air bnb owned by a 'hospitality group' that is a constant nuisance. The noise, the high volume of strangers in and out of the place, the lack of privacy as their balconies overlook our back yard, the congestion of street parking (this place is often booked by large groups for bachelor/ette parties and the like), it's all too much! It's turned an otherwise residential area into a playground for the rich and it's ridiculous! Please protect our neighborhoods as such and enact common sense STR regulations.
2/5/2025 3	Public Input	I would like to see regulation that prohibits corporations and hospitality groups from purchasing homes in residential neighborhoods. I currently live next door to an AirBnb that is run by a hospitality group, and it has negatively impacted me and

		<p>my family. The AirBnb frequently books large group events, such as bachelor/bachelorette parties, which has resulted in high levels of noise and not respecting quiet hours, high volume of strangers coming and going, and increased congestion of street parking. Additionally, these types of rentals are proven to increase rent and mortgage costs for residents, effectively pushing residents out of Austin and further away from our jobs, schools, and community. The quality of life of Austin residents should be prioritized over tourists and short term visitors.</p>
2/6/2025 1	Public Input	<p>I live in Tarrytown and there is (assuming) an approved STR down the street. The house is no longer occupied by the owner yet the tax records reflect that they still receive their homestead exemption. It seems that an added document should be signed and verified by all STRs. You can't have it both ways - lots of rental income and a tax break!</p> <p>In the same vein, for those homes that are STR and still owner occupied, is there a cap on maximum days of rentals?</p>
2/6/2025 4	Public Input	<p>Strongly in support of these regulations that reduce corporate STRs, but preserve the ability of resident homeowners that operate STR's to continue to affordably live in Austin.</p> <p>I want to share a few concerns:</p> <p>For multi unit buildings allowing up to 25% STR units will likely greatly increase the numbers of STR in those buildings. This may be a dramatic increase in STR for those buildings, which provides lower income apartment renters with less protection from disruptive neighboring STR's and doesn't do anything to effectively prevent the lowest cost units (apartments) from being turned into large numbers of hotels. Consistent with the 1000 foot requirement for smaller buildings, larger buildings should have an STR cap closer to 5 or 10%</p> <p>Regarding the requirement for a local contact to appear within two hours at the rental up upon request of a city staff: a profitable company running these STR's may be able to provide 24/7 local contacts that are available within two hours but a regular Austin resident that is doing this to afford their mortgage and is visiting family for the weekend (or providing childcare, etc) would never be able to do that. It is far too burdensome to require a pre-designated local contacts to never leave Austin. This provision of meeting in person on the command of a city official should at the very least allow the local contact to have a representative meet. Even better just allow city staff to penalize or take down a listing if serious emergency violations occur that are not addressed immediately.</p> <p>The resolution currently calls for property and liability insurance up to 1 million. Staff should make sure to clarify that a standard homeowner insurance policy (which includes both of these) does qualify provided the policy includes short term rental and includes an umbrella policy with liability limits up to the 1 million. As it stands, it appears unclear. Otherwise you may get an increase, not decrease, of corporate STRs that make high profits and can afford extremely costly business liability insurance.</p>
2/6/2025 9	Public Input	<p>Will this change increase my property taxes? It will not benefit me because I cannot afford to build an STR or "casita for a burka" as Mr Vela advertised. So will this mean property values and taxes will get jacked up because corporations will be incentivized to buy more properties around me and rent air BnB? Please explain</p>

2/7/2025 1	Public Input	I strongly oppose making short term rental permitting easier, especially if they are owned by a corporation. The city is doing great work helping to increase housing stock and making the city more livable, and this would be a step backwards.
2/8/2025 7	Public Input	<p>Hello, the STR proposal seems very onerous and burdensome for small Airbnb home owners. For example, the requirement for 1 million dollars in liability insurance. That would make Airbnb cost prohibitive for us to operate.</p> <p>Airbnbs provide more cost effective travel accommodations for large groups than hotels and are often more comfortable for families. This proposal would significantly reduce the number of options available to travelers.</p>
2/8/2025 7	Public Input	Many of the provisions are too burdensome but another that is not practical at all, is the requirement to space strs 1000ft apart. Many properties in Austin are often duplexes or more than one dwelling on a single lot. A single owner of this common type would be prohibited from renting both limiting their ability to pay for high mortgages and taxes in the city. Who can afford these properties without STR income? And what about those who rent out multiple rooms in a single dwelling? This also serves another set of individuals who need budget friendly travel accommodations, but with this proposal, owners would not be able to rent out by the room. Where did this provision even come from? What purpose is it trying to serve and is there a more precise and effective way to achieve that purpose without unintended consequences as explained above?
2/9/2025 2	Public Input	Short term rentals do not create a sense of community in Austin and lead to low-quality development in the area. There are plenty of hotels and apartments in Austin for short-term rental needs.
2/9/2025 3	Public Input	<p>Why are you allowing unlimited STR's? Do we need MORE?</p> <p>These homes could be rented full time or sold to Austinites, helping out our housing problem. This is going to make things worse by inviting investors to buy or build more home that aren't available to locals.</p>
2/9/2025 1	Public Input	<p>The city is overstepping. The limiting of corporate renting is wonderful, the inclusion of a HOT fee is reasonable...the rest is outright obnoxious. It reads as if the city has a few examples in mind they are trying to punish/prevent but haven't given consideration to the broader impacts to hosts renting out units on their existing property.</p> <p>Please spend more time on refining what is being requested. The spirit of the request is probably coming from the right place, but this reads as something that would also quickly get shot down in the courts.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	I live next to an STR it is by far the worst experience. I have a home I cannot be comfortable in due to the noise and the constant disrespect given by both the owners and the flood of people in and out of the hotel next door. Both the owners and short-term renters have no vested interest in the neighborhood so there is nothing to keep them in check or to make them respect the neighborhood or neighbors. It's depressing and frankly I am tired of it.
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>I have concerns about the proposed City Council action to allow all STRs in all residential areas. Some recent Council actions wrt to increased residential density have been concerning for me because, while I approve of increased housing, I think that developers will maximize profit at the expense of existing residents. My family has owned our home in central Austin for 25 years. STRs remove housing stock.</p> <p>I believe that there should be reasonable limits on the number of STRs in neighborhoods across the city and that the licensing and non-disturbance requirements should be strictly and fully enforced. If the Council approves increased STRs, they need to fully support increased budget for oversight.</p>

2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>Hello, writing to express my firsthand experience with living in a neighborhood surrounded by unregistered and unregulated STRs. First and foremost, the city MUST enforce city ordinances already in-place by providing enough staff to regulate these BUSINESSES. Disruptive travels who treat my neighborhood as some sort of adult playground is not the Austin I have lived in, my entire life. Austin leaders constantly claim they want to add more housing for families, yet my neighborhood which once was full of families and kids is now full of empty homes awaiting their next group of visiting out of towners that would historically inhabit a local hotel. I encourage you all to limit the number of allowed STRs in this city and not expand any rights or permissions. Unregistered STRs have operated for far too long with no oversight and have not been contributing enough tax revenue to the city in which they have destroyed a large part of its character. The time is now to regulate STRs and make them pay their fair share for turning single family neighborhoods into businesses. I also encourage my city council member, Jose Velasquez to open his eyes and realize how drastically changed the neighborhood he grew up in now looks and yet he sits by watching it all squander away as STRs continue to replace FAMILIES!</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>The City of Austin / City Council and staff needs to redraft the STR proposal to limit or eliminate the number of future STRs to preserve available housing for purchase and to preserve REAL NEIGHBORHOODS and QUALITY OF LIFE, as well as to commit sufficient money and staffing to enforce the licensing and non-disturbance requirements of the ordinance.</p> <p>A few years ago an STR opened across the street, let me tell you what I witnessed: 25 males in their 20s parking 25 cars on our street, staying at a 4 bedroom home, drinking in the front yard late at night into the morning, reported to me by a neighbor to be smoking pot down by the mailboxes, driving their cars recklessly turning the corner at high speed in controlled skids down by a home that had children living in it. Subsequent to them there was a bachelorette party with lewd comments written on their cars, having a party at a time when the management company had an "official" policy against parties on the property. When I complained to the manager of the property he insulted me and said the company was taking over the world, get with the program or get run over by it, in essence. I've lived in Austin my entire life, since 1956. If you'd been here alive that long you'd know for certain that Austinites USED TO turn down economic "opportunities" for rampant business development to preserve QUALITY OF LIFE, the ACTUAL POINT OF BEING ALIVE!!</p> <p>The Councils "H.O.M.E." initiatives and this new STR proposal are misguided and DESTROY NEIGHBORHOODS, turning the ENTIRE CITY into a COMMERCIAL ZONE. The Council's "do-gooding" has NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES for Austinites who have lived in this city longer than most or ALL of you have been alive. MOVE TO LAGOS if you want Austin to DYSFUNCTION as Lagos (Nigeria) does. SAD that you need lifetime residents to even send you emails making these points. Pathetic, actually.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>Short Term Rentals are a huge part of the housing affordability crisis; both here in Austin, and across the country. City council claims to want to work on this issue, but an across-the-board mandate to allow STRs on any property will continue to drive gentrification and erode the cohesion of our neighborhoods. Instead of capitulating to these corporate interests, council should get creative about how to limit STRs in the city limits.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>Why penalize neighbors next to an STR, when they may be old and needing peace and quite around them or young families trying to get their children to bed at a decent time. We invest much time and money into our neighborhoods only to have inconsiderate people rent STR's and do as they please and party late into the</p>

		nights. Story after story in our news organizations show the abuse committed by folks who rent STR's, why does city council constantly go against the will of the people. We do not want STR's! Please consider those whom you serve and the wishes of those who invest a lot to not only afford where they live, but to make it a safe place to be.
2/10/2025	Public Input	A good way to ruin neighborhoods and community. I lived near a STR- there were parties there every weekend- noise, trash, cars. The owners could care less. They lived out of town and had no interest in our neighborhood. We finally had to move. This is a very very bad idea. You all continue to put your constituents last with all your awful policies. People are all getting fed up and will soon start voting you all out if you don't turn things around.
2/10/2025	Public Input	Our street can't take STRs. It's jammed with too many cars and blocking sidewalks already. We are also a quiet working middle class neighborhood and want to stay that way. Are you all trying to drive out families from Austin? For once, take care of the middle-class tax base and NOT the developers.
2/10/2025	Public Input	Neighborhoods currently zoned for residential use cannot legally allow commercial use. Hotel operation in the form of STR is a commercial use, not a residential use. To allow STR use, areas must first be re-zoned using a legitimate, legal process. Also, all areas within Austin that have valid Neighborhood Plans with Future Land Use requirements that prohibit commercial use cannot allow STRs. Changing the Neighborhood Plan requires a lawful, regulated procedure be followed. The Neighborhood Plans have been established by ordinance. STRs cannot be authorized unless the Plan is changed using a lawful procedure that would allow a change from residential to commercial use.
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>The police already do not enforce ordinances that are on the books designed to keep our neighborhoods safe and maintain the peace such as enforcing the residential city sound ordinance.</p> <p>Allowing this proposal to become ordinance will increase this recognized health issue and city council still does not hold the APD accountable for enforcing the sound ordinance. We certainly can't trust that APD will respond to incidents where these STR's disturb the peace since police already disregard these calls, leading to residents to take it upon themselves which leads to violence.</p> <p>City Council and APD have already been neglectful in their duties of maintaining the peace in our neighborhoods, and passing this ordinance will only make those issues worse.</p> <p>It is time for City Council and APD to be accountable</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed changes to City ordinances which would increase—in number and scope— the designation of residential properties as SRT 's (short term rentals.)</p> <p>Our city is not simply a national playground or carnival ground for excited visitors; it is a HOME TOWN for each of your constituents and their families, each of whom pays taxes—and have done so long before the recent arrival of the multitudes. I would love to know why the mayor and at least eight Council members are so desperately determined to ruin our city's heretofore idyllic fabric.</p> <p>I'm guessing it is the instruction and wish of many lobbyists and investors in real property, but I would hope that the local taxpayers, citizens, voters, and residents could still have at least an equal influence as that of outside interests and/or non-resident owners within our neighborhoods and city at large.</p> <p>I'm afraid I'm not very impressed with the Mayor Plus Ten system which, coupled with term limits, had such laudable intentions, but has seemed to result in a</p>

		<p>transient group of Council members, always new to their jobs and overly reliant on very seasoned and well-backed lobbyists. The result is that there's no city wide advocacy, nor any feeling of neighborhood cohesion—just a panic to maximize hotel tax dollars.</p> <p>The citizens of Austin ARE your employers, and your bosses !! It is WE, and not outside investors and consortiums, who have entrusted you with keeping the faith and running the city, and amending its codes in a manner which benefits us in our chosen HOME (which is not just a big hotel for festival-goers du jour!)</p> <p>Thank you very much—especially to the two of you who continue to do good work while your colleagues and our once-great mayor apparently strive to sell us out.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>Re: Allowing STRs on ALL lots. I purchased a condo in a small group of 13 on Judge's Hill in 2018, planning to downsize from my house in a quiet neighborhood. I spent days there as I did repairs on the home I was planning to sell. One unit had an STR licence. At least once a week I would encounter strangers standing with luggage or relaxing on the community couches near my condo door. Sometimes men would make comments. This was not the safe environment I expected, and I chose to sell the condo at a loss rather than move into a community with a rotating cast of strangers. Passing an "every lot" ordinance could do the same for many people. An "all lot" STR could raise the noise level in older neighborhoods (as where I live) with outdoor parties in warm weather (our lots are large). Where would one find peace in this town? And where would lower-income residents who might have found housing in the properties the "all lot" ordinance would bring about going to live? How would this benefit the resident community that already needs more housing? Allowing more density for residential ADUs is complicated. This new STR proposal is a city-wide blow to Austin's quality of life, a bow to tourists. Who will monitor the hotel tax collection, enforce STR mandates? Those issues are already prevalent, with thefts and all-night parties. Treat your residents better or you'll lose us. I'm a retired UT prof, a writer now, and I chose a neighborhood that was affordable at the time for its quiet streets and silent nights. Should this be out of reach for anyone?</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>In my opinion, the biggest problem is enforcing the laws that are there and making sure to make any new laws in order to keep the residence, including the student residence from having to deal with loud parties and other nuisances that are brought about by people who are not respectful of their neighbors. Right now the police do not shut down loud parties. I live in the Heritage Neighborhood that's on 30th St and they treat our neighborhood like they treat West campus. They do not shut down large parties and they shame you for calling to get help on 911.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>The Barton Ridge apartment complex in the Silker neighborhood has transformed into a disaster zone. Management's decision to prioritize short-term rentals over long-term residents has led to a complete breakdown in community cohesion. Each weekend, a new influx of guests arrives, leaving behind trash, disregarding pet policies, and showing blatant disregard for the long-term residents who still call this place home. One previous STR guest who was on drugs broke into a neighbor's apt and literally assaulted him. All of these units are unlicensed and many belong to the same person who is a STR flipper. This situation has not only pulled 25 affordable units off the market but is also creating a dangerous living situation for the few long term residents that remain.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>STRs are undermining the quality of my neighborhood. I live at [REDACTED] and it is a wonderful street and we have friendly neighbors, many of whom rent homes due to the affordability of houses here. There are two STRs across the street from me, both owned by a wealthy person from California who is never here. For the most part, the renters have been respectful, but on one occasion we had renters who partied all night in the street and it was hugely disruptive. My main</p>

		concern is the take over of homes in Travis Heights by absentee landlords who are making money and driving up prices in this neighborhood as well as making it more like temporary housing and not a real neighborhood. I really regret that more people cannot afford homes in Austin and IMO STRs like the ones across the street are making this even more prevalent.
2/10/2025	Public Input	1) I live in Tarrytown and there's a home that is not owner occupied and, allegedly, an approved short-term rental. Yet, the owner still receives a Homestead exemption on their taxes. There should be a mechanism in place that people do not receive this benefit if they are not living in their home. 2) I think we should look towards Santa Fe, New Mexico. They have a limited amount of short-term permits and have found out a successful solution.
2/10/2025	Public Input	I forgot to mention the future liability. The renters are not vetted as if they were renting an Apartment unit. Yet, they live they may rent next-door to small children. I wonder what the city council and planning commission member's liability is if something happens. Obviously, the more permits, the less control.
2/10/2025	Public Input	I support broad legalization of STRs on all lots throughout the city. No house is inherently a long-term rental, a short-term rental, or an owner-occupied residence. Allowing property owners flexibility in how they use a house at any particular time gives them confidence that they will get a return on their investment if they choose to build it. Restricting the use of homes as STRs disincentivizes some property owners from building new homes. To address larger problems with housing supply, city council should dramatically simplify the code while legalizing the full diversity of housing types throughout our neighborhoods.
2/10/2025	Public Input	STRs should be limited to certain areas of the city. Existing single family neighborhoods need to be protected. Several reasons families made the decision to live in a quiet location are: less traffic, pollution, crime, larger lot sizes and better place to raise children. Parties need to be regulated with time limits, damage and confined to certain areas within Austin.
2/10/2025	Public Input	Please do not pass this ordinance. It will devastate neighborhoods.
2/10/2025	Public Input	Honorable Mayor, Council, planning Commission and Staff, One short term rental one block from my house disrupted the lives of 4 families with young children for about 3 years. The renters were intent on partying as late (always until 2:00am), as long, loudly and as crudely as possible. Their drinking companions appeared under-aged. The neighborhood appealed to the absent owner, Code Enforcement and had meetings with the police. The short term rental agreement instructed the party renters to not open the door which prevented any enforcement. The renters had the Sober-Up Van come to the Short term rental house several times. STRs bring profit to a few at the expense and suffering of the many.
2/10/2025	Public Input	When an STR in our neighborhood was occupied, drunk people staying in the STR flagged down neighbors and asked for a ride to a music concert downtown. Neighbors were alarmed by this aggressive and dangerous behavior.
2/10/2025	Public Input	The current short term rental proposal will reduce available housing in Austin. Please reject the current proposal.
2/10/2025	Public Input	What is the purpose of the 1,000 foot rule regarding STR's owned by the same individual? Why shouldn't an individual be able to short term rent more than one home on their property? Doesn't this violate an individual's property rights? Hasn't the City been sued and lost over other property right's issues like this?

2/10/2025	Public Input	I am against expanding the authorization for short-term rentals (STRs) to “all residential uses in all zoning districts with a valid STR license”. This STR proposal will reduce available housing in Austin.
2/10/2025	Public Input	How does this help reduce the cost of housing and address infrastructure that is already overwhelmed?
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>I support the City of Austin’s efforts to require all Short Term Rentals (STRs)4 that wish to advertise on platforms such as Homeway and Airbnb to provide their license number in order to obtain a listing. This will bring those who are operating illegally to light and require them to obtain a license in order to continue advertising their operations on these sights and will also bring in hundreds of thousands of dollars in hotel occupancy taxes, which are currently not being collected by these unlicensed operators.</p> <p>Any efforts to continue to make short term rentals illegal, will only result in having bad operators run under the radar without any oversight or collection of required HOT tax dollars.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>The proposal to relax STR regulations appears to be at odds with and to the detriment of the goal of creating more affordable housing for residents. I have no issue with owner-occupied properties operating as STRs but there is still a massive glut of non-owner-occupied investment properties being run as small hotels all over the city. Who benefits from this? Speculative real estate developers. The HOTs they pay are all being sucked up into this dumb convention center rebuild rather than invested in the parks and pools that tourists visit while here. The City does not appear to want to regulate STRs at all or else they would get creative about how to do it rather than just opening the floodgates that will further restrict the ability of long term tenants to find housing. This also impacts our public school enrollment.</p> <p>Why not raise the HOT? Or work with Airbnb to identify and send fines to noncompliant properties? Figure it out.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>I am support of the City of Austin’s efforts to require all Short Term Rental (STR) owners/operators to provide their STR license number to any and all STR platforms such as Homeway and Airbnb. There are currently thousands of unlicensed operators who are both breaking the law by not being licensed as well as not collecting hotel occupancy (HOT) taxes.</p> <p>Austin has many struggling nonprofit arts organizations that have a tremendous impact on Austin’s arts culture scene, and its place as a tourist destination . These organizations more than ever can use the benefit of additional HOT tax dollars to further their respective missions.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>Parking is becoming an issue in my neighborhood. There needs to be some regulations how many cars can park on the street by house. Some houses tend to take up more than thier share of street parking.STR rental parking needs to be limited. We also have a number of bollards that take up parking spaces.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>I feel that the city needs to redraft the proposal to limit the number of future STRs to preserve housing and commit sufficient money and staffing to enforce the licensing and non-disturbance requirements of the ordinance. I personally live in a cul-de-sac where a home is being used as an air bnb. It is a part of the high end residential firm called Wander and has a placard prominently announcing this. Directly to the left of the sign is a smattering of trash that extends at least 50 feet. It never gets picked up and is often worse than the usual. Also, the home is rather large but has no garage and so the street is constantly filled with extra cars. At times, there have been at least 8-10 scooters left in front of it for days, some knocked over. It's an eye sore and we are unable to get anything done about it.</p>


		<p>Hi. I've previously submitted my opinion on this, but I have a few of other thoughts and questions to add that don't seem to be considered.</p> <p>We rent out our apartment long term--30 nights or longer. Since long-term rentals do not require a license, how are we not going to end up getting swept up with the bathwater when you go an enforce your new policies? I have an old license number that's lapsed since we changed. What are we supposed to put into the "license number" field? It's like you're assuming EVERY single rental listed on sites like Airbnb is short term. Many of them are not. I'm assuming this stuff will get passed even though it's not well thought out and does not factor in all situations.</p> <p>The license fee being so high is a barrier. What if I came to you with a proposal and said, "City Council Member, your license fee for doing such-and-such is going to be half of one month's paycheck"? That's what you're saying to me by having a license fee that is nearly \$800. You're probably seeing all the rentals out there charging hundreds of dollars a night and think, "Oh, \$800 is nothing to them." But to a small place like mine, this is half one month's income. For the renters out there that are sharing a room, this could be even a full month's income. It's a pretty regressive position to take when setting the licensing barrier so high. I suggest you get rid of it entirely, or make it \$50, and you'll get a ton of people that'll sign up. By seeking such a high licensing fee AND now wanting the platforms to collect the HOT, you're double dipping. If you'd just let the platforms collect on the city's behalf year ago you'd have made so many more millions that running the enforcement depart would not have needed to collect a fee.</p> <p>To reiterate my original input: You do not need to keep adding rules and making this unnecessarily complicated. You can't put the toothpaste back in the tube. Let the platforms collect the HOT. Rake in those millions and disband the STR enforcers. Let homeowners make the best choices for themselves and their situations--Texas courts will keep stopping your overreach. Treat all nuisance and code violations equally whether it's an STR, a frat party or a house with too tall grass. The city already has laws that address all of this. Arbitrary 1000' buffers, requiring someone associated to a property 2 hours to answer a call (quick, how many situations can you think of when you have been unavailable for 2 hours?), twisting the arms of corporations to do your bidding, regressive and punishingly-high license fees are not effective. Just look at what hasn't worked for the past dozen years. More and tweaking the rules isn't the answer in a free market economy. You're classifying all STR owners and managers as bad and forcing them to do things that ordinary Austinites are not subject to, all the in name of stopping a few bad apples and raking in millions more in HOT. Stop labeling people and just collect the HOT through the platforms. This solution has been in front of you for more than a decade.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	
		<p>STR disrupts the fabric of our neighborhood. While trying to build and enjoy a sense of community, the existence of an STR is a hole, a vacancy in our connections. If my elderly neighbor falls and needs help, I'm not going to the short term renters for aid. If there is a suspicious character in my yard, I'm not calling the ST renters to discuss it. If we plan a block party to reinforce our neighborhood watch and a cohesive community, we are not inviting the STR occupants. In a close neighborhood, the presence of an STR is a constant unknown intrusion into the feeling of security and inter-dependence.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	Too many STRs and there are no affordable rental houses. Only with strict

		enforcement of hotel taxes and rules is there any benefit to the city. If we must allow STRs, do it with enough resources to oversee them.
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>Important For Primary Residence Hosts</p> <p>In the past the City has said that AirBnB hosts who live in their own home as a primary residence can only rent out one bedroom -</p> <p>Meanwhile an non-resident owner of an AirBnB house can rent out a multi bedroom home - 3, 4, 5 bedrooms.</p> <p>This is inequitable and totally wrong.</p> <p>Additionally, primary resident hosts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -have far fewer complaints from neighbors because they are able to supervise the guests. -don't cause property prices because they are taking homes and apartments that should be residences off the market. <p>Many primary residence hosts are senior citizens, disabled people, single parents, regular "working people" - who rent out more than one bedroom.</p> <p>Most of these hosts need the money to pay for skyrocketing property taxes (which can go up 10% per year!), high interest rate mortgage and higher energy bills.</p> <p>If the City insists on limiting the number of bedrooms a primary residence AirBnB host can rent out it will cause forced home sales, bankruptcies and foreclosures.</p> <p>Thanks for reading.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>It is past time to make the city of Austin require Airbnb and VRBO have a dedicated space for a license number.</p> <p>This would enable them to know where the property was and level the playing field for legal owners like us who have dutifully paid our fees for over a decade including paying all taxes! It is time to insist it happen.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>Please lower the license fee to rent a single bedroom on airbnb. It is \$650 to submit paperwork to rent my spare bedroom and this is more than I can make in a weekend. There should be no license fee since the city hotel tax covers the cost to the city.</p>
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>I would like to suggest staff, City Council, and Planning Commission to consider using the new Short-Term Rental Code Amendments opportunity for better incentivizing the preservation bonus more effectively. Apparently, increasing the interior square footage allowed for two new housing units if an existing housing unit is preserved, has not been a persuasive enough argument for directing homeowners/builders toward more preservation focused development choices. Increasing such preservation bonus from 55% to 65% in April could still make very little impact on saving the older and more affordable housing units once again unless we introduce certain STR benefits to these newer units as long as they are build without demolishing the older unit(s) on a lot. I believe rather than sole benefit of FAR increases, adding STR related income generation benefits for homeowners who could add newer units for keeping themselves in place affordably with extra income would give better results in keeping more of the existing units on a lot as well. Thank you for your related debates and valuable considerations.</p>

2/10/2025	Public Input	I would like to suggest staff, City Council, and Planning Commission to consider using the new Short-Term Rental Code Amendments opportunity for better incentivizing the preservation bonus more effectively. Apparently, increasing the interior square footage allowed for two new housing units if an existing housing unit is preserved, has not been a persuasive enough argument for directing homeowners/builders toward more preservation focused development choices. Increasing such preservation bonus from 55% to 65% in April could still make very little impact on saving the older and more affordable housing units once again unless we introduce certain STR benefits to these newer units as long as they are build without demolishing the older unit(s) on a lot. I believe rather than sole benefit of FAR increases, adding STR related income generation benefits for homeowners who could add newer units for keeping themselves in place affordably with extra income would give better results in keeping more of the existing units on a lot as well. Thank you for your related debates and valuable considerations.
2/10/2025	Public Input	I believe that the City Council's proposal for STR's will make things worse than they already are. It will make the developers and the unregistered STR owners richer and it doesn't address the current issues that neighbors are complaining about. The City Council needs to listen to the citizens.
2/10/2025	Public Input	Council members claim they want to increase housing in the city of Austin. Yet, this STR proposal will reduce available housing in Austin. Every STR takes a home available for a family off of the market. It's time to start considering those that live here and not tourists!
2/10/2025	Public Input	Can we please consider limiting the days per year a rental can be used like they do in other popular destinations like London. This would help with the general wear and tear of some neighborhoods that get a lot of Airbnb traffic, a.k.a. the party homes!
2/10/2025	Public Input	Why does Austin continue to ignore the people when they loudly say they don't want this? Usually that indicates financial corruption.
2/10/2025	Public Input	Do NOT allow STRs on all lots. STRs are the primary cause of incredible housing inflation here and in other tourist cities. Every STR is a unit of housing lost to the people of Austin, it's actual residents, your actual constituents. Adopt the policy that Paris has - each unit can be rented short term only by its permanent resident (owner or long term tenant) for a maximum of two months per year. This allows people to make some money from their property without decimating the housing market in the city. Paris is doing just fine, still has lots of tourist, and the average rent there is lower than in Austin. Most importantly, you should disallow STRs run by real estate investment groups or corporations. Stop this runaway train. It's ruining the city.
2/10/2025	Public Input	<p>Short-term rentals are an important part to the Austin tourism economy. Visitors have the opportunity to stay in parts of town not served by hotels, often at a lower cost. Short-term rentals (STRs) appeal to some guests because they offer a unique setting or experience and an opportunity to interact with their hosts.</p> <p>City staff have managed the STR program for over ten years, giving our visitors the opportunity to rent a safe and predictable space. Because STRs have not been a significant disruptive aspect of the tourist economy, or threat to neighborhood peace, there has to been little sense of urgency on the part of the Council for regulation and enforcement. Only a portion of STRs are compliant and pay the City hotel tax. Noncompliant STRs represent a significant unrealized revenue source for the city. As a licensed and compliant STR owner here in central Austin, I would appreciate the fairness of having all city STRs and hotels paying the occupancy tax and license fees.</p> <p>Enforcement challenges faced by the city staff are created by the lack of</p>

		<p>identifying STR information available on the listing platforms. The success for enforcing the COA regulations and collection of the hotel tax will be entirely dependent on a cooperative agreement with the STR platforms. The council should provide maximum support to the staff in pursuing this cooperation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requiring the platforms to provide STR addresses and other identifying information is reasonable, considering the success this has brought in other cities. - Requiring the platforms to collect the hotel tax on behalf of the city can mirror this service currently provided for the State of Texas taxes. - Requiring the platforms to delist unlicensed STRs will be the most effective enforcement tool for the city staff. <p>Short-term rentals are really a business and just like a hotel, they should be regulated and managed as a business in the COA.</p>
2/11/2025	Public Input	<p>No more STRs!!!! Austin city council please do not repeat this big mistake! We already have a housing shortage! How can you promote density and affordability and then turn around and do this? 30 percent of our housing is owned by investors. Not residents. Per NPR. Unless you are cutting property taxes in half for everyone do not do this.</p>
2/11/2025	Public Input	<p>I don't want STR houses in my neighborhood. I don't want the beautiful, residential and quiet housing community ruined by loud and noisy parties. I live in Jester Estates, a community known as a wonderful place to raise children and nurture families. STRs will ruin that.</p>
2/11/2025	Public Input	<p>NO. Do not want our single family neighborhood, or anyone else;s turned into AirBNBs or Hotel Avenues. No, to deciding that mmeasure for our entire city.</p>
2/11/2025	Public Input	<p>I have grave concerns about the proposed move to allow all residential properties to be be possible short-term rentals. We must preserve housing for our Austin residents.</p>
2/12/2025	Public Input	<p>I find most of the proposed changes acceptable, but I take issue with the following proposed clause in chapter 25-2: "Short-term rental use cannot be prohibited."</p> <p>I feel strongly that managed communities and homeowner's associations should be able to decide whether to allow short term rentals. Short term rentals can make life worse for the residents surrounding them. Adding this clause would take control away from the people most affected by the negative effects of short term rentals.</p>
2/12/2025	Public Input	<p>There should be reasonable limits on the number of STRs in neighborhoods across the city, and the licensing and non-disturbance requirements should be strictly and fully enforced.</p>
2/12/2025	Public Input	<p>I have reviewed the proposed amendments to the STR ordinance and regulations and while I like much of what is proposed, I have the following concerns: As a former STR owner/operator and resident of an old neighborhood in Austin - the number of STR should be limited within a specific range within residential areas - such as only 10% of the addresses in a given block, 1/4 square mile or some other delineation be licensed STRS. This helps keep residential neighborhoods as neighborhoods. In addition, converting a significant portion of a neighborhood to STR, takes away opportunities for affordable rental housing to the people who want to live in Austin but can't afford it. Lastly, I really like the noise and other restrictions in the proposed rules and would like to add another - owner/operator of STR must provide adequate parking for the number of people allowed to rent the dwelling. This should not include consuming all the street parking typically used by other residents in the neighborhood. This is a continual problem where many houses were built without garages or driveways. Many thanks for your consideration.</p>

2/13/2025	Public Input	<p>we have many new apartment complexes being built all over the city. we don't need more STRs. Citizens managed for years w/o these options, the alternate is a motel or extended stay facility. We need some zoning restrictions. It is unfair to those that live next to the STR that they should be subjected to unwanted disturbances of noise and congestion.</p> <p>IF this unfortunately does pass and add to the ruin of Austin, at least institute fines to the owners of the STRs such as for noise, mess & illegal activity</p>
2/16/2025	Public Input	It would be more beneficial if you actually established enforcement before expanding the STR program into an unlimited unregulated program. Quit pushing to commercialize ALL of Austin. This does not help ANYONE except the developers and drives the family home owners out of Austin. Or is that your plan?
2/16/2025	Public Input	I am in favor of STR amendments...
2/16/2025	Public Input	Any amendment to the STR regulations will be a disaster. There isn't enough housing, including affordable housing available in the City as it is. This will only increase the already intolerable pain threshold ~ and the City will have to increase it's budget just to pay the attorney fees required to ensure compliance with platforms.
2/18/2025	Public Input	<p>There are many negative externalities caused by STRs in neighborhoods with public schools. AISD is losing funding due to the displacement and profit motives of STRs, since state funding is tied to attendance.</p> <p>I highly recommend an amendment to phase out or ban STRs within a two mile radius of schools. Or at least an additional tax where the STR operator needs to make up for the per pupil funding lost by displacing a family that would send kids to the AISD school.</p>
2/20/2025	Public Input	Hi I would like to ask that the short term rentals not be allowed near schools, since we cannot confirm there are not sexual criminals staying there (like how people with a record are not allowed to rent houses near schools). I would also like to ask that in rings farther outside the city than a week minimum be put in place.
1/21/2025	Email	This transition and new requirements could be extremely involved and time-consuming for short-term rental host and platforms. Do you have a timeline when you expect these new policies to go in effect. We would encourage it not go into policy until the beginning of 2026 to give us at least one year to gear up thank you.
1/27/2025	Email	<p>I'm a 20+ year owner in 78749 living in a Single Family Home. I appreciate the pressure you are getting and also Austin's interested in always prioritizing business income.</p> <p>I've lived in New England, and I just visited Baltimore. I DO NOT WANT you making a buck in a neighborhood that was marketed and sold to me as a SF-2. The fact is, AISD, the Governor, and the Real Estate market have all but gentrified me out of my home in the long term. I purchased my home for \$134,000. Now you're taxing me on a value of half a million dollars. Are you serious?</p> <p>i spoke to Councilwoman Kathy Tovar when I was in line voting and I told her about this gentrification. We are exhausted and already beyond our original budget due market and government abuse.</p> <p>The next part of this is AISD and their complete snowing of the Travis County population of taxpayers who misrepresented the value of the deal to pay teachers raises. Complete BS.</p> <p>Greg Abbott should be arrested for mishandling our tax dollars that were collected</p>

		<p>for the school district. It caused AISD to freak out about the gap in their budget. That brought me a \$600 tax increase that was completely unexpected. The fact that we gave the state 75% of \$177 million dollars and the AISD just 25% of that is robbery. Hays County took our lead and now they're asking their taxpayers for \$900million. There are no teacher raises. The taxes take up any raise.</p> <p>The bottom line is that AISD, Travis County and the State are abusing the taxpayer. They are forcing us to break the qualifying terms of our mortgage PITI equation.</p> <p>This request to change the code is an infringement on our neighborhood. My daughter in Baltimore moved into an apartment where 60% of the apartments became Air BnBs. It introduced a major security problem because the STR people leave doors open, show up en masse and smoke so much marijuana that my daughter can smell it in her apartment. Strangers replace families because the taxes rise because STR's have to be upgraded which is beyond the pace of a normal family.</p> <p>So, my answer to this inquiry is a hard no. Businesses and STRs are intrusive, they were not part of the original purchase decision and therefor another abuse of taxpayers.</p>
1/28/2025	Email	<p>I'm hoping that the council will keep in mind the single family households who don't want weekly renters ruining their solitude. I also think the council and Mayor are out of touch with reality on the issue of increasing density with our current transit system. I would be all in their plans if I could take a train down Barton Springs to places on Lamar but that's not reality and the bus service isn't going to solve the problem. If you keep increasing density in current infrastructure it will soon become total gridlock. That's just the laws of physics. Imagine New York with no subway and everyone had a car. That's the reality you're creating. Start representing the people that live here. Fix our terrible roads and stop the building madness.</p> <p></p> <p>Ps I'm hoping to enjoy 78704 in my retirement days ahead as I worked for 30 years to enjoy this. Please don't ruin it 🙏🙏</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>What platforms will comply? Which won't? What's heir incentive to comply? How will unlicensed STRs be shut down? What is the penalty for being unlicensed? What incentive is there to have a license other than platform exclusion?</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>multi-family complexes – can we reduce he 25% STR minimum to 10%? What are the details for affordable units? Do we prevent all potential affordable units from being STRs?</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>How do we safeguard our resident's ability to live in Austin?</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>Do we require liability insurance now? How much more will his increase he upfront costs to operate/own a STR?</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>How could this work wi/a temporary solution for people who are trying to recover from harm?</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>Who is verifying that new STR safety requirements are being followed?</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>We need clarity on SFH (1-3 units on lot is not sufficient). His should be based on zoning, i.e., if it starts with SF, it's residential</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>What is working best for other cities & why? How might we learn from other's learnings?</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>Where is online training?</p>
1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>Confused about condo rules again</p>

1/30/2025	Engagement	How much additional HOT taxes does the city think it will collect from this?
1/30/2025	Engagement	Why 1000' separation? That seems arbitrary and also favors those who are already grandfathered.
1/30/2025	Engagement	Requiring the spacing requirements for the same owner prevents developers from purchasing a whole block and flipping them into STRs & hurting neighborhoods.
1/30/2025	Engagement	Thrilled to hear that we may get required license box!
1/30/2025	Engagement	Compliance + increased HOT
1/30/2025	Engagement	Can't wait for AIRBnb and VRBO to collect HOT tax
1/30/2025	Engagement	Will platforms cooperate? Can you pitch this as favorable due to ability to make \$ off interest from HOT?
1/30/2025	Engagement	The platforms will not "play ball" and do what they need to do/no being able to enforce the regulations with the platforms.
1/30/2025	Engagement	What will happen to current STRs that are < 1,000 ft apart? How will this be enforced? What incentive will there be to get a license if you already violate the ordinance?
1/30/2025	Engagement	Sanity and safety within our communities. Corporations do not care about the neighborhoods nor the neighbors of their tenants. – From an apartment tenant
1/30/2025	Engagement	The liability insurance requirement is too high. Is this standard practical?
1/30/2025	Engagement	It might be more considerate to individual landowners to categorize between non-serious/serious contact requests so landlords may have more time than 2 hours to respond to issues, especially if they may not be as serious
1/30/2025	Engagement	\$1m policy= arbitrary and unfair to STR owners long-term; they have never been required to provide
1/30/2025	Engagement	Why should STR owners have 2 hour response, and do other long term rental owners have that requirement?
1/30/2025	Engagement	Is an unintended consequence of the \$1m liability insurance minimum > the folks who need an STR to afford to stay here won't be able to operate STR anymore. This is widening the wealth gap...
1/30/2025	Engagement	1k foot rule: Seems unconstitutional, unfair, arbitrary, questionable
1/30/2025	Engagement	People don't understand the 1,000 ft in regard to one owner
1/30/2025	Engagement	The biggest benefit of this is reducing corporate pricing power
1/30/2025	Engagement	Thank you!
1/30/2025	Engagement	Revenue stream accountability!! Celebrate the GOOD actors!
1/30/2025	Engagement	The entire city will be one big STR city and nobody else can afford to live here
1/30/2025	Engagement	The city should create a team dedicated to helping platform operators create the needed code/process for compliance
1/30/2025	Engagement	The need to put the police funding for mental health into a special unit: mental, sexual assault, trafficking, domestic violence
1/30/2025	Engagement	Please figure out a way to catch people using illegal or other people's licenses numbers.
1/30/2025	Engagement	My biggest concern is that the STR requirements seem cumbersome (a lot of things do) but could potentially be addressed if it is incorporated into the platform registration
1/30/2025	Engagement	I'd be concerned about a non-elected official being able to impose regulation on an owner. Otherwise, I'm completely on board with the new license structure pressure on platforms, and efficient collection of taxes.
1/30/2025	Engagement	Making it difficult for corporations to purchase properties to do STR. Hopefully this will have some impact on housing availability for future homeowners
1/30/2025	Engagement	I think the ordinance should be more about getting permits and paying HOT tax & abiding by <u>current</u> regulations not adding special conditions on STR owner
1/30/2025	Engagement	We return to square one & unable to enforce due to capacity constraints

1/30/2025	Engagement	<p>Thank you for taking a considered look at Austin’s short-term rental (STR) regulations. The draft ordinance represents significant progress toward collecting Hotel Occupancy Taxes and making STRs more compatible with residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the draft falls short on maintaining housing for Austin residents, allowing even more units to be kept off the market as full-time tourist accommodations than current regulations do. The database <i>Inside Airbnb</i> estimates there are at least 15,000 active STR listings in Austin today, only about 2,200 of which are licensed. If even a portion of these listings were returned to housing stock for Austin residents, it could make a serious dent in the city’s ongoing housing shortage, while still enabling owners and investors to turn a profit by renting or selling their units by renting or selling their units to local residents.</p> <p>This submittal contains five questions about the current draft, followed by five constructive recommendations to lessen the impact of full-time STRs on Austin’s housing supply, ensure the program pays for itself, and clarify rules for denial or non-renewal of a license.</p> <p>Questions About Current Draft</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the city auditor evaluated licensing fees, which are not listed in the draft, and the proposed \$500 a day fine for violations to ensure that these revenues will be sufficient to cover all administrative and enforcement costs to the city? 2. The draft ordinance appears to do away with the current classifications of owner-occupied commercial Types 2 and 3. Is this correct? If so, I strongly encourage you to maintain a separate category for full-time commercial STRs, as opposed to owner occupied ones, for reasons outlined n the below recommendations. 3. A common complaint about problem STRs is that a city staff person has to witness a violation themselves to take action, yet many violations offer after city work hours when no staff is available. How will the proposed changes address this issue? 4. Regarding appeals (page 3, draft ordinance), will affected neighbors be entitled to attend appeals hearings and/or present evidence? 5. Regarding notice to neighbors (page 11, draft ordinance), has there been any discussion about expanding the notice distance? The proposed 100’ is less than a third of a city block and the spillover impacts of a problem STR may well exceed that distance. The city typically provides notice to residents within 500’ for a zoning or rezoning change. I strongly urge you to increase the notice distance for STRs to at least 200’ so that residents within that area will have access to the contact information for STR operators and their local contact. <p>Recommendations</p> <p>Due to state law and various court rulings, the City of Austin is currently prohibited from banning full-time commercial STRs (currently Types 3 and 3) in order to free up additional housing for Austin residents. However, there are still actions the city can take to ensure that as much housing as possible remains available for residents and that penalties for non-compliance are sufficient to pay for the costs of monitoring and enforcing STR requirements.</p>
-----------	------------	--

		<p>1. Reduce the allowed percentage of full-time commercial STRs to no more than 3% of a site or a multifamily building's total units, with an exception for owner-occupied sites. The city's current STR ordinance limits Type 2 and 3 STRs to 3% per census tract in residential zoning districts, but allows up to 25% of units in multifamily projects located in commercially zoned districts to be reserved for full-time tourist accommodations, removing housing options for Austin residents. <u>Unfortunately, the draft ordinance only perpetuates the 25% allowance for multifamily projects in commercial districts, but actually expands it to allow any site in any zoning district with four or more units to operate a quarter of the units as full-time STRs.</u> If we are serious about increasing and maintaining our housing supply for Austin residents, full-time commercial STRs in any zoning district should be limited to 3% across the board, with an exception for owner occupied sites. Why on earth would we knowingly give away up to a quarter of our housing for full-time tourist rentals? Please note that current owners commercial STRs would still be able to make a profit by renting or selling their existing units to Austin residents.</p> <p>I realize the current draft prohibits an owner from owning more than one full-time commercial STR within 1000' of another, which is clearly intended to provide some limits. But has anyone done the math to determine how much housing this could potentially remove citywide? 3%? 25% More? Less? It's important to know that figure before approving this change.</p> <p>2. Prohibit full-time commercial STRs in all projects using any type of city density bonus program, with an exception for owner-occupied units. Density bonus programs provide increased entitlements for developers in exchange for a modest number of affordable units, generally pegged at 60% to 80% Median Family Income, with the overall goal of increasing Austin's housing supply. To ensure all units remain available to Austin residents, commercial STRs owned by absentee investors should be prohibited in these projects. To be clear, this would not prohibit resident renters or owners from renting out their own units on a short-term basis, as long as the building's regulations allow this. Again, current owners of commercial STRs would still be able to make a profit by renting or selling their existing units to Austin residents.</p> <p>3. Prohibit full-time commercial STRs in units constructed under HOME Phases 1 and 2, with an exception for owner-occupied sites. Home 1 and 2 significantly increased entitlements for developers with the expressed intent of creating more housing options for Austin residents. To ensure as many units as possible remain available to Austin residents, commercial STRs owned by absentee investors should be prohibited in all projects built under these newly expanded entitlements. An exception for resident owners would allow them to use additional units created under Home 1 and 2 as full-time STRs to generate income and help them remain in their homes as property taxes continue to rise. And, again, current owners of commercial STRs would still be able to make a profit by renting or selling their existing units to Austin residents.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>4. Ensure licensing fees, fines, and penalties are sufficient to cover all administrative and enforcement costs. Unfortunately, the draft is silent on the subject of licensing fees. But given that full-time commercial STRs operate solely as for-profit businesses that effectively remove housing for Austin residents, it seems only fair that they should pay higher licensing fees than individual mom-and-pop homeowners who are renting out one or at most two units on their property to make ends meet.</p> <p>LDC Section 25-2-798(C) currently states that non-compliance fees for STRs shall be “based on the City’s costs to enforce the licensing requirements.” Similarly, Section 25-7-798 (B) requires that a person renewing an STR license “shall pay an additional fee if the request is submitted after the director sends a notice of violation or cites the person for operating with an expired short-term rental license.”</p> <p>The draft ordinance would impose a \$500 fine for each day a violation occurs, which seems like a step in the right direction. But has the city auditor evaluated this to ensure those fines are sufficient to cover the city’s costs?</p> <p>In 2022, the Austin Monitor reported that enforcement funds for STRs come from the city’s Clean Community Fee, a surcharge on city utility bills. If true, the non-complying STR owners themselves as required under 25-2-798 (C).</p> <p>See: https://www.austinmonitor.com/stories/2022/09/majority-of-austins-short-term-rentals-operating-illegally/</p> <p>Given the number of complaints related to problem STRs, it appears current enforcement efforts are severely underfunded. A 2022 city staff presentation found that there were an estimated 11,000 ads for the STRs in Austin, but only 1,975 active licenses, meaning illegal operators were shorting the city on a huge amount of licensing fees and Hotel Occupancy Taxes. More recently, the STR database <i>Inside Airbnb</i> reports that there are more than 15,000 active STR listings across the city, with only about 2,200 actually licensed.</p> <p>Given these facts, an audit of city expenses and revenue related to STRs is clearly long overdue.</p> <p>5. Change “may” to “must” in draft section B on page 11, regarding denials after failure to comply. Under current code, Section 25-2-797 states that the director “may” deny an application to operate or renew an STR license for a period of 12 months after failure to comply with STR requirements at least twice in 12 months, but does not require denial. <u>The current draft perpetuates this problem stating only that the director “may” deny an STR application or renewal, but does not require it even if he or she finds that the STR poses a hazard to life, health, or public safety</u> (page 11). To establish consequences that are clear to all, the “may” should be changed to “must.” Please note that an STR owner would still retain the right to appeal a denial under this change.</p>
--	--