



Town of Paonia
214 Grand Avenue
Tuesday, July 7, 2026 5:00 PM
Ad Hoc STR Committee Agenda

Public Participation: Please raise your hand and wait to be recognized by the Facilitator, come to the podium and state your name and whether you live in town or out of town. Time limit is 3 minutes, one time per item, there are instructions at the podium for the timer light. Please direct all comments to the Facilitator. Please be respectful and help to maintain decorum by not engaging in derogatory and/or demeaning statements or public displays.

A) Roll Call

B) Approval of Agenda

1. Welcome to New Members
2. Recording glitch for 6.2.26 meeting
3. Quorums and meeting cancellation
4. Posting of agendas on STR page

D) Actions Items

Public comments must be related to the agenda item, 3-minute time limit.

- 1) Process for Filling Committee Vacancies
- 2) Review the results of the 6.2.26 meeting.
 - a. Executive Summary - general comments? Survey results?
 - b. Definition of Single-Room Short-Term Rental
The Committee suggested further clarification of language previously discussed on 5.5.26 (see Exec Summary).
 - c. Approach for Licensing Single Room Rentals
The Committee affirmed what had previously been discussed.
 - d. Time frame included in the definition for primary residence.
 - e. Owner occupied vs. non-owner-occupied dwelling units as STRs.
- 3) Number of maximum (Dwelling unit/single room) STR licenses offered by the Town and what this number is based on.
- 4) Possibly assigning the number of STR licenses and the associated parking requirements based respectively on the Town Zoning Classifications - C-1, C-2, R-1, R-2, R-3, and E-1 (See zoning classification descriptions and the Town zoning map)
- 5) Establishment of a license waiting list used when all allotted licenses have been issued.

- 6) Establish the agenda and preparation materials needed for the next meeting (relevant sections from the repealed ordinance, the Common Ground proposal, and municipal code). Specific survey questions?

E) Adjournment

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, August 11, 2025 9:25:04 PM
Last Modified: Monday, August 11, 2025 9:31:56 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:52
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Full Name

Julie Ann Bennett

Q2

Phone

[REDACTED]

Q3

Email

[REDACTED]

Q4

Primary Address

[REDACTED] Paonia CO 81428

Q5

In-town or out-of-town

In town

Q6

Why do you want to be on this committee?

I believe Paonia has an opportunity to create a thoughtful, balanced short-term rental policy that reflects our town's values, supports our local economy, and protects neighborhood character. As a local homeowner, STR host, and active community member, I have first-hand experience with both the benefits and challenges of STRs for residents and visitors. My goal is to bring a collaborative, solutions-focused voice to the committee listening to all perspectives and helping craft a policy that works for the entire community.

Q7

Why do you think voters voted to repeal the STR ordinance in the recent election?

From my conversations with community members, the vote to repeal reflected a desire for a more balanced, inclusive, and transparent approach to STR regulation. Many felt the previous ordinance was overly restrictive, treated all STRs the same regardless of size or type, and placed burdens on responsible local hosts without meaningfully addressing housing concerns. The ordinance also failed to recognize the role STRs play in supporting Paonia's economy, especially given the absence of a formal tourism office. Voters want a policy that encourages responsible hosting, protects neighborhood quality of life, and keeps Paonia welcoming for visitors while maintaining fairness for residents.

Q8

The committee is tasked with moving forward recommendations regarding STRs. All members must agree to the following: (initial after each statement is required for application to be deemed complete) I agree to participate in all meetings, either in-person or virtually.

Yes

Q9

I agree to come prepared to each meeting.

Yes

Q10

I agree that this committee will make recommendations via consensus and will do my best to abide by these principles, including seeking to understand another's perspective.

Yes

Q11

I agree that I will approach this committee in the best interest of town, regardless of my own personal circumstances

Yes

Q12

Yes

I plan to give a two-minute presentation at the meeting on 8/19/2025

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, August 14, 2025 12:07:14 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, August 14, 2025 12:47:31 PM
Time Spent: 00:40:16
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Full Name

Stefen Wynn

Q2

Phone

[REDACTED]

Q3

Email

[REDACTED]

Q4

Primary Address

[REDACTED] Paonia, CO 81428

Q5

In-town or out-of-town

In-Town

Q6

Why do you want to be on this committee?

I believe it is important to address the current narrative on social media that portrays me as being vehemently opposed to short-term rentals or as a “not-in-my-backyard” advocate. This characterization is inaccurate. My position has consistently been that short-term rentals can benefit the Town when appropriately regulated, but that unregulated proliferation, particularly by non-resident owners operating multiple income-generating properties has contributed to our housing shortage and driven up home prices. Investors are often able to leverage home purchases as business assets, making it more difficult for local residents to compete in the housing market.

Without regulation, the open market can fundamentally alter neighborhood character, in some cases turning them into high-turnover tourist zones. While I personally use short-term rentals when I travel, most communities I visit both large and small, and urban and rural, have established regulations to protect the quality of life for year-round residents and to mitigate negative impacts.

When I drafted the Town's first short-term rental ordinance, it was informed by years of research and engagement with community priorities. The intent was to allow short-term rentals to operate while ensuring they did not impose financial or quality-of-life burdens on residents who do not operate them. The associated fees were set to recover the actual costs of regulation, not to generate additional revenue, and to ensure that regulation costs were borne by those benefiting from the activity rather than by the broader tax base.

In my own neighborhood, within a single block, there are five whole-home short-term rentals with no permanent residents and two additional properties that rent rooms. I find it disingenuous when political rhetoric frames regulation as harming the “little guy,” when in reality many local residents struggle to make their mortgage payments, if they are able to purchase a home at all. In one case near me, a multi-property owner who lives outside Town limits but within the Paonia ZIP code has publicly misrepresented his residency during Board of Trustees meetings.

I remain committed to the belief that short-term rentals can coexist with our community's housing needs and neighborhood stability, but only when they are regulated in a way that ensures costs and impacts are borne by operators rather than by residents who do not benefit from them.

Q7

Why do you think voters voted to repeal the STR ordinance in the recent election?

It is my assessment that the opposition to short-term rental regulation organized and executed a well-funded, highly visible political campaign aimed at discrediting the Town and creating the perception that the public broadly supported operating short-term rentals without regulation. While the campaign's organizers repeatedly claimed to have conducted extensive community engagement and received strong feedback on how short-term rentals should be regulated, they provided no substantive evidence of this outreach to municipal officials.

Throughout the campaign, a number of disingenuous statements were made, including the assertion that the Town had illegally bypassed the Planning Commission. This claim was directly refuted by a legal memorandum from the Town Attorney, confirming that the statement was entirely unfounded. Similarly, the narrative that local government opposes short-term rentals out of personal bias or to harm “the little guy” was misleading and did not reflect the facts.

The reality remains that short-term rentals can be an asset to the community when appropriately regulated to ensure that the costs of oversight are borne by operators, rather than by residents who do not benefit from them. Unfortunately, last-minute amendments made during a Board of Trustees meeting, without an opportunity for additional public comment, undermined the process and contributed to the repeal of the ordinance. Going forward, I strongly support allowing additional public comment for any substantive changes proposed by the Board during a public hearing to ensure transparency and community trust in the decision-making process.

Q8

The committee is tasked with moving forward recommendations regarding STRs. All members must agree to the following: (initial after each statement is required for application to be deemed complete)I agree to participate in all meetings, either in-person or virtually.

Yes.

Q9

I agree to come prepared to each meeting.

Yes.

Q10

I agree that this committee will make recommendations via consensus and will do my best to abide by these principles, including seeking to understand another's perspective.

Yes.

Q11

I agree that I will approach this committee in the best interest of town, regardless of my own personal circumstances

Yes.

Q12

No

I plan to give a two-minute presentation at the meeting on
8/19/2025

#3

COMPLETE

Collector:	Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started:	Friday, August 15, 2025 10:38:20 AM
Last Modified:	Friday, August 15, 2025 11:02:54 AM
Time Spent:	00:24:34
IP Address:	

Page 1

Q1

Full Name

Deborah Spiegel

Q2

Phone

[REDACTED]

Q3

Email

[REDACTED]

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

Primary Address

Q5

In-town or out-of-town

Paonia- in town

Q6

Why do you want to be on this committee?

Why I want to be on the committee

I have information from citizens in town and want to see all sides represented. I have experience facilitating groups and always work towards walking the middle path.

In the past research the town did, it does not include contacting STR owners, which is one thing I did.

I contacted all the airbnb hosts I could . Who are these home owners :

locals whose family home has been in their family for generations and they want to keep it, they use it for family, and they supplement their ability to keep the lights on by renting it out during the season

Locals who purchased a house but their parents got sick, or they took a temporary job elsewhere, and they can't get here til the situation changes, so they are short term renting to help cover expenses until the day they are freed up to return

Owners who are sick, can't work, widowed, or just need some extra income to pay expenses to be able to live here, and their house is not setup for long term rent

I want to protect the town from investors taking over in the future, but also want to protect the rights of homeowners. Nobody wants the town to be overrun by investors. I'd like to work together with the town and the other side to reach a system that protects us from that and is fair.

Q7

Why do you think voters voted to repeal the STR ordinance in the recent election?

The STR ordinance was repealed for a number of reasons:

1. The majority of people in town who voted to repeal the ordinance as it was written did not want over-reaching controls exerted on their place of residence. If they felt like hosting a student for a week, they feel it's not the town's business to control that. Or, if they decide to go away for 2 weeks and to rent their house for that 2 week period to cover their vacation, they feel that is their private concern. They also did not like the threat of a \$300/day fine, or to pay high dollars to register - most did not even want to register- and did not like being counted as part of the 30 STR limit.

2. The STR owners

A.

Several things in the ordinance were discriminatory towards short term rentals. These things need to be required by every residence in town if they are being required for STRS

Door sizes and the need for expensive remodeling to accommodate this requirement

Off street parking requirements that nobody else in town has to adhere to

Safety Inspections

B. high fees

C. The way it was written, only one group of STRs would have indefinite permission with no chance for any additional person to apply unless one of them quit. Also, the STR owners agree that owner occupied offerings should not be included in the 30, or at all.

Q8

The committee is tasked with moving forward recommendations regarding STRs. All members must agree to the following: (initial after each statement is required for application to be deemed complete)I agree to participate in all meetings, either in-person or virtually.

DS

Q9

I agree to come prepared to each meeting.

DS

Q10

I agree that this committee will make recommendations via consensus and will do my best to abide by these principles, including seeking to understand another's perspective.

DS

Q11

I agree that I will approach this committee in the best interest of town, regardless of my own personal circumstances

DS

Q12

Yes

I plan to give a two-minute presentation at the meeting on
8/19/2025

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, August 18, 2025 8:14:39 AM
Last Modified: Monday, August 18, 2025 8:18:45 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:05
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Full Name

Kathryn Swartz

Q2

Phone

[REDACTED]

Q3

Email

[REDACTED]

Q4

Primary Address

[REDACTED] Paonia

Q5

In-town or out-of-town

in-town

Q6

Why do you want to be on this committee?

I want to be on this committee because I think we can find a middle path to regulating STRs. I believe most citizens want some kind of regulation so by bringing all sides together and by operating via consensus decision making, I believe we can get there.

Q7

Why do you think voters voted to repeal the STR ordinance in the recent election?

I think voter voted to repeal the STR ordinance because it was a bit too much government overreach. In particular when it comes to primary owners renting out rooms in their home (for example when they travel or to help them cover their mortgage), and the home inspections.

Q8

The committee is tasked with moving forward recommendations regarding STRs. All members must agree to the following: (initial after each statement is required for application to be deemed complete)I agree to participate in all meetings, either in-person or virtually.

KS

Q9

I agree to come prepared to each meeting.

KS

Q10

I agree that this committee will make recommendations via consensus and will do my best to abide by these principles, including seeking to understand another's perspective.

KS

Q11

I agree that I will approach this committee in the best interest of town, regardless of my own personal circumstances

KS

Q12

No

I plan to give a two-minute presentation at the meeting on
8/19/2025

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, August 18, 2025 8:51:39 AM
Last Modified: Monday, August 18, 2025 8:59:55 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:16
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Full Name

Samantha Staley

Q2

Phone

[REDACTED]

Q3

Email

[REDACTED]

Q4

Primary Address

[REDACTED]

Q5

In-town or out-of-town

In-town

Q6

Why do you want to be on this committee?

I am very interested in securing a durable, respected STR policy as soon as possible for the Town. I have followed fairly closely the development of the Master Plan with respect to affordable housing, as well as the debates and repeal of the first STR policy. I have an open mind regarding the various perspectives, from zero regulation to a very tight policy such as that initially enacted the Town Council. I believe strongly that unregulated, whole-home rentals have the potential to ruin the fabric of our community, and rapidly, because the growth and tipping point can happen in an extremely short period of time. Amongst other national news on how communities have been altered by a high proportion of AirBnBs, I hear individual stories consistently. A new neighbor left a small town in UT when it went from a sustainable 5% STR level to over 75% in just two years. The town was gutted, and only tourist-related businesses remain. It was no longer a community. And yet, the ability for residents to rent out portions of their home or backyard ADU-type spaces also contributes to their ability to earn a diverse income stream, that supports affordability of their housing and continued ability to reside here, even as their other jobs may come/go, or Social Security payments don't keep pace with inflation. And on and on. I believe an approach that reins in the downsides of whole-home STRs while retaining the optimized benefits of them - is possible. ***I also think I am a great candidate to generate support and understanding of a new STR policy with friends, neighbors, and networks I am a part of.

Q7

Why do you think voters voted to repeal the STR ordinance in the recent election?

Overall, I think the targeted and well-funded Common Ground campaign was successful in convincing voters that it was an "overreach", and would overall negatively impact the economy and local residents. I don't think most voters understand the nuances of pros/cons of STRs and a lack of any policy; however, I know that a very high percentage of respondents in the Master Plan development discussions rated some STR policy as their #1 issue. I think we can get there.

Q8

The committee is tasked with moving forward recommendations regarding STRs. All members must agree to the following: (initial after each statement is required for application to be deemed complete)I agree to participate in all meetings, either in-person or virtually.

yes

Q9

I agree to come prepared to each meeting.

yes

Q10

I agree that this committee will make recommendations via consensus and will do my best to abide by these principles, including seeking to understand another's perspective.

yes

Q11

I agree that I will approach this committee in the best interest of town, regardless of my own personal circumstances

yes

Q12

Yes

I plan to give a two-minute presentation at the meeting on
8/19/2025

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, August 18, 2025 10:09:11 AM
Last Modified: Monday, August 18, 2025 10:20:20 AM
Time Spent: 00:11:08
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Full Name

Oana Ford

Q2

Phone

[REDACTED]

Q3

Email

[REDACTED]

Q4

Primary Address

[REDACTED] Paonia CO 81428

Q5

In-town or out-of-town

In Town

Q6

Why do you want to be on this committee?

I have been living in town for over 5 years and my husband and I are settling here for the rest of our lives, and I would like to get involved in town decisions regarding the future of this town.

Q7

Why do you think voters voted to repeal the STR ordinance in the recent election?

It's hard to say , I think this is a very polarizing topic eliciting very strong emotions from different groups in town. I think there was a sense that the regulation was hard on current owners and could affect tourist related economic activity in town in the future.

Q8

The committee is tasked with moving forward recommendations regarding STRs. All members must agree to the following: (initial after each statement is required for application to be deemed complete)I agree to participate in all meetings, either in-person or virtually.

I agree

Q9

I agree to come prepared to each meeting.

I agree

Q10

I agree that this committee will make recommendations via consensus and will do my best to abide by these principles, including seeking to understand another's perspective.

I agree

Q11

I agree that I will approach this committee in the best interest of town, regardless of my own personal circumstances

I agree

Q12

No

I plan to give a two-minute presentation at the meeting on
8/19/2025

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, August 18, 2025 11:03:47 AM
Last Modified: Monday, August 18, 2025 11:31:50 AM
Time Spent: 00:28:02
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Full Name

Jaylene Park

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Phone

Q3

Email

[REDACTED]

Q4

Primary Address

[REDACTED]

Q5

In-town or out-of-town

out-of-town

Q6

Why do you want to be on this committee?

I care deeply about Paonia and it's future! As a former Main Street business owner, I am aware of how dependent we have become on our seasonal tourism dollars, and want to help protect the needed gap in short term housing. I also have experience with both LTRs, STRs and Property Management. I care about affordable housing and attempted to provide a 12+ unit affordable housing development for the Town in 2019, that got shut down due to the impending Water Tap Moratorium.

Q7

Why do you think voters voted to repeal the STR ordinance in the recent election?

The proposed Ordinance was not a good "fit" for Paonia. It was too restrictive, too expensive, cumbersome for Staff to administer, and in many cases, hurt several current STR owners, who were just finding a way to afford their own housing. We do not have an over abundance of STRs that warrants "penalizing" the current Owners.

Q8

The committee is tasked with moving forward recommendations regarding STRs. All members must agree to the following: (initial after each statement is required for application to be deemed complete)I agree to participate in all meetings, either in-person or virtually.

Agree

Q9

I agree to come prepared to each meeting.

Agree

Q10

I agree that this committee will make recommendations via consensus and will do my best to abide by these principles, including seeking to understand another's perspective.

Agree

Q11

I agree that I will approach this committee in the best interest of town, regardless of my own personal circumstances

Agree

Q12

Yes

I plan to give a two-minute presentation at the meeting on 8/19/2025

June 2, 2026
Short-Term Rental Ad Hoc Committee
Executive Summary

The Committee began by recognizing that two members present out of a total of four (four with Hector Mejorado's resignation) did not traditionally represent a quorum. After a good deal of discussion, which included public input, the Committee agreed to continue with the meeting in order to keep the momentum going and take the opportunity to gather public input. All decisions made are advisory until such time as a quorum is present.

Once again, a good deal of public comment was taken during the discussion of action items and not left to the end of the meeting.

Action Items

1. Definition of a Single-Bed Room Short-Term Rental

The committee took another look at this definition and agreed that further refinement/clarification of the language in the original ordinance was needed. The recommendation is that this definition now read:

A privately-owned bedroom within a Primary Residence, or within the Core Commercial District (C-1) that is rented for the purpose of lodging for any period less than thirty (30) consecutive days, where **all** other facilities **are** may be shared with the owner of the dwelling.

2. Approach for Licensing Single Room Rentals

The Committee affirmed the recommendation (from 5.5.26) to stay with the approach outlined in the Common Ground proposal.

3. Time frame included in the definition of Primary Residence

The Committee discussed this topic and took quite a bit of public comment. There was broad agreement within the room as a whole that the definition in the original ordinance be modified to read:

Primary Residence: A privately-owned residential dwelling or property at which the **owner** resident resides for at least **(200)** (183) days per year.

4. Owner occupied vs. non-owner-occupied dwelling units as STRs

The Committee took considerable public comment on this topic and it's unfortunate that the meeting was not recorded so as to more fully be able to capture the input. Three main themes were:

- i.) Shift the focus from owner- to resident-occupied.
- ii.) Non-resident units should be the sole focus of the Town's ordinance.
- iii.) Non-resident occupied units should be regulated in a way that isn't overly burdensome and is consistent with the approach outlined in the Common Ground proposal. Resident occupied units should be more leniently regulated.

Next Meeting: June 16, 2026, 5:00 - 6:30 pm

There are three remaining items the Committee is tasked with addressing. The Committee agreed to address them in this order:

1. Number of maximum (Dwelling unit/single room) STR licenses offered by the Town and what this number is based on.
2. Possibly assigning the number of STR licenses and the associated parking requirements based respectively on the Town Zoning Classifications - C-1, C-2, R-1, R-2, R-3, and E-1 (See zoning classification descriptions and the Town zoning map)
3. Establishment of a license waiting list used when all allotted licenses have been issued.

The Committee asks staff to provide these materials for the next meeting's packet and be prepared to project these items so the public can view: any survey results, the repealed ordinance, the Common Ground proposal, relevant sections of the municipal code, and information relevant to parking requirements (zoning classification descriptions and the Town zoning map).

The "Living Document" should also be included in the packet and ready to be available for projection. This document includes the up-to-date status of all Committee deliberations and recommendations.

Submitted June 7, 2026 by Scott Brown, Facilitator

Q1 The committee would like to know your thoughts on how the Town's regulations/requirements should differentiate between resident occupied vs non-resident occupied STRs. Please be as specific as you can.

Answered: 6 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I'm of the mind that there should be NO regulations on resident occupied STR's and minimal, if any, on non-resident occupied STR's. We are talking about private property! STR's used as a "tool" to increase affordable housing has proven not to be true or work as the town thought, so drop it and choose another "tool"!	6/16/2026 7:25 AM
2	I think resident-occupied STRs within a single dwelling unit should be treated no differently than long-term residential rentals. I think non-resident occupied STRs where the resident lives on the same lot (separate dwelling unit - basement apartment, ADU, attached suite, etc) should require town registration and be permitted in accordance with code 16-11-20, meeting the same requirements as any other home occupation. I think non-owner occupied STRs where the owner does not live on site and the property is commercially advertised for short-term rental (for example, on AirBnB or VRBO) should be treated as what it is - a commercial enterprise. I'd like to see Paonia add a new zoning classification or overlay - C-3, commercially-managed residential/light commercial. This zone would be the minimum requirement for all town lots that have 3+ dwelling units, or for any town lot used for short-term rental or other non-owner-occupied commercial use. It would allow for this type of business, but require the town's careful consideration and consistent oversight required for the re-zoning process and ensure that any business operating in town is paying commercial property tax, commercial utilities, and maintains commercial-level insurance for that business.	6/13/2026 12:25 PM
3	I think resident occupied STRs can be great. I'm thinking specifically of units without kitchens that share the same plot as the occupied structure, or units with kitchens that are only available 40% of the time or less because the town of paonia resident owner lives there the rest of the time. I would suggest 2 sets of rules. The first set should cover these units, perhaps without caps at all. The second type, units on the same lot was the owner that have a kitchen or houses that the owner does not occupy should have must more strict caps.	6/12/2026 11:35 AM
4	Non-resident occupied STRs should be strictly regulated like motels; highly limited in numbers in residential zones; more lenient in business district.	6/11/2026 9:18 PM
5	I don't believe there should be any regulations/requirements regarding STRs as I don't believe there is a problem here in Paonia. I believe the *problem* was manufactured to justify a grant the town was applying for and doesn't reflect an accurate number of STRs.	6/9/2026 3:04 PM
6	Owners of STRs must live here physically.	6/8/2026 7:31 PM

Q2 What is your opinion on the number of STR licenses that should be granted in Paonia? What data do you use in coming up with your number/s?

Answered: 6 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	All existing STR's should be grandfathered in. As from the Spotlight/Shopper of 3/11/25, "the town has determined the need to protect the limited supply of affordable housing by regulating the CONVERSION of long-term residential properties to short-term rentals and the purchase of homes for the purpose of short-term rentals". Those homes that are STR's did not convert, but have already been short-term renting. Regulations should be to control future STR's.	6/16/2026 7:25 AM
2	I don't think a cap is effective. I think using the processes we have in place for home occupation review and registration or rezoning would be a better approach and require less staff time for compliance monitoring.	6/13/2026 12:25 PM
3	I think 20 non owner occupied feels very high to me, but might be manageable if there is no cap on owner occupied. I believe the ordinance the last STR committee proposed (that was changed by the board) suggested a cap of 40 for both. This would allow half of those proposed units to be marked for non owner occupied use. I think 3-5% of the total available houses/ apartments would be a good goal that wouldn't impact housing cost as much. If don't have those numbers. I also think limiting these to one per owner would also be good.	6/12/2026 11:35 AM
4	I just don't want residential areas to be filled nightly like motels. Too much "law enforcement" is then required. Residential zoning is for people who LIVE here.	6/11/2026 9:18 PM
5	I researched and presented to the Board of Trustees an actual representation of number of STRs within the Paonia town borders, but thus-far have received no acknowledgment. I also presented current studies showing the lack of impact STRs on long-term rentals vs other factors, such as: zoning and planning restrictions, water restrictions (like the water moratorium currently in place in Paonia), major destination (Vail, Aspen, Telluride) vs non-destination (Paonia) need for housing. The affordability of housing in Paonia is one shared all throughout the United States, regardless the market availability. Paonia's population has remained fairly stagnant for many years and I cannot see that changing until, or unless, the economy does, if then. Especially, if Paonia remains as difficult to get to as it currently is.	6/9/2026 3:04 PM
6	30 max. Less is better. If you multiply that by avg number of visitors per unit per day, and then look at how many more people are added to the town, it adds up quickly. This doesn't even include out of town STRs and campers at BigBs, etc. We have a hard time accommodating traffic, parking and general services.	6/8/2026 7:31 PM

Q3 Please share your thoughts or comments about the June 2nd meeting.

Answered: 4 Skipped: 2

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I was unable to watch the June 2 meeting, unfortunately, because of the lack of video recording. I hope this is corrected moving forward. I appreciate the time and effort the town and community are putting toward this process.	6/13/2026 12:25 PM
2	I think moving from resident to owner based legislation is a bad idea. Sites like air BnB require ownership of the property for participation. Owners need to give permission for utilities to go in renters names. I think our legislation needs to match these processes. The town could get sued for approving STRs otherwise.	6/12/2026 11:35 AM
3	I attended the June 2, 2026 STR meeting. The meeting was already underway when I arrived at 6:07. There were only 2 committee members and the moderator in attendance. I raised my hand, was recognized by the moderator, whereby I pointed out that according to Colorado State law there was not a quorum. Therefore, there shouldn't be any decisions made regarding changes to the proposed ordinance the committee is entrusted to formulate by the Board of Trustees. One of the committee members then stated that she was 1 minute early to the meeting, wasn't being paid to be there and felt personally attacked by my comment. I resent the implication that because I was (unavoidably) 7 minutes late & simply pointed out state law that my comment should be less valid. A community member then suggested by calling the meeting a workshop by law the meeting would then be permitted. Not following the law the committee weakens its legitimacy. The STR committee is already working on erroneous information on the number of STRs in Paonia. Additionally: * As far as the survey from the previous meeting (& on the current agenda), I don't believe all the comments were positive—mine weren't; projecting everything is hunky dory according to the discussion undertaken by the committee members and moderator regarding reviewing the survey, is disingenuous. * That, again, delegitimizes your committee. * I want this committee to succeed & not waste any more taxpayer's money, but just saying you are a quorum doesn't make it correct & you are doing a disservice to the community by not following the law. * Having a *public comment* listed on the agenda, then denying public comment when a community member wants to speak is deceitful, underhanded, & duplicitous. * Not having the video, moderator's summary, or survey posted on the town's website after such a debacle of a meeting is dissembling and two-handed. Do better.	6/9/2026 3:04 PM
4	I wasn't there but want to add that there MUST be an added lodging tax to providers/hosts	6/8/2026 7:31 PM

Ad Hoc STR Committee Meeting

Date: May 5, 2026

Executive Summary

The Short-Term Rental (STR) Committee convened to continue discussions regarding recommendations for future STR regulations within the Town of Paonia. It was my (Scott Brown's) first meeting in the role of facilitator, and Trustee Fisher's first meeting as well. I took the opportunity to make an opening statement to support everyone being on the same page.

I stressed the importance of respectful dialogue, constructive participation, and maintaining focus on the topic of the moment. It was acknowledged that while STR regulation has been a contentious issue, the town is moving forward with regulation and the committee's task is to determine reasonable and workable approaches. The committee's advisory role was also emphasized.

Topic Discussion Summaries

1. Committee Process and Public Engagement

The committee reviewed expectations for meeting conduct, public engagement, and committee process. Discussion included:

- Maintaining respectful and concise public participation,
- Avoiding off-topic exchanges,
- Using post-meeting surveys for written public input,
- The importance of transparency and accessibility of meeting materials,
- The need for advance packets and projected materials during meetings.

Future meetings should organize supporting documents and have key items projected to allow committee members and the public more effective participation.

2. Clarification of Committee Scope

The seven topics assigned by the Board of Trustees for review and recommendation were highlighted. It was noted that previous community work, including the "Common Ground" proposal, addressed STR regulations more comprehensively than the narrower direction currently assigned by the Board.

It was clarified that:

- The Board of Trustees has directed the committee to focus on the identified topics;

Ad Hoc STR Committee Meeting

Date: May 5, 2026

Executive Summary

- Existing materials, including the repealed ordinance and Common Ground recommendations, will be used as reference materials, as appropriate;
- The committee's responsibility is to recommend workable approaches rather than debate whether STRs should exist.

3. Prioritization of Discussion Topics

The committee agreed to begin with:

- Definitions related to single-room rentals, and
- Licensing approaches for those rentals.

Members felt these topics were manageable starting points.

The town administrator explained that any future STR recommendations must remain consistent with existing zoning definitions and municipal code structure.

Committee members also discussed the importance of having future meeting packets include:

- Relevant municipal code sections,
- Copies of the repealed ordinance,
- Copies of the Common Ground proposal,
- Other supporting reference materials as needed.

4. Definition of a Single-Room Short-Term Rental

The committee reviewed prior ordinance language defining a "single bedroom short-term rental." Discussion focused on:

- Whether the phrase "primary residence" should remain in the definition,
- Clarifying the meaning of "shared facilities,"
- Distinguishing room rentals from separate dwelling units,
- Determining whether separate bathrooms or basement spaces still qualify as room rentals,

Ad Hoc STR Committee Meeting

Date: May 5, 2026

Executive Summary

- Clarifying that separate kitchens generally create separate dwelling units under zoning standards.

The Committee considered other existing information including the Common Ground proposal, and existing municipal code. Public comment was included in the discussion, along with input from Town staff. It was agreed that the existing language found in the repealed ordinance was a good starting point. Several committee members supported simplifying the language and making the definition flexible enough to reflect real-world room-rental situations.

The committee proposed modifying language requiring that: “*all other facilities are shared*” to wording such as: “**facilities may be shared.**”

Members acknowledged the definition may require future refinement as additional STR topics are addressed.

5. Licensing and Registration Approaches

The committee reviewed licensing concepts contained in:

- The repealed STR ordinance, and
- The Common Ground proposal.

Discussion generally favored a simplified registration system rather than a heavily layered permitting process.

The Common Ground proposal included:

- Town-issued registration requirements,
- Multi-year registration periods,
- Complaint-driven enforcement,
- Cost-recovery fee structures,
- Basic application information,
- Self-certification of safety compliance.

Committee members and the public emphasized the importance of:

- Keeping regulations simple,
- Minimizing administrative burden,
- Maintaining affordability for operators,

Ad Hoc STR Committee Meeting

Date: May 5, 2026

Executive Summary

- Ensuring regulations are manageable for town staff.

Several participants expressed concern that the repealed ordinance was overly complicated and burdensome, particularly for residents renting rooms within owner-occupied homes.

6. Registration Terms, Renewal Cycles, and Administrative Considerations

The committee discussed possible registration renewal cycles, including:

- Annual renewals,
- Two-year cycles,
- Three-year cycles.

Discussion included:

- Potential benefits of reducing staff workload through longer renewal periods,
- Concerns about tracking multi-year licenses,
- Establishing common renewal dates,
- Using prorated fees for mid-cycle applicants.

Public comment was also included in this discussion, along with input from Town staff. It was agreed that the language in the Common Ground proposal for the most part outlined a workable approach. The recommended three-year registration period had a lot of support. The concept of complaint-driven enforcement was repeatedly referenced as a way to reduce administrative complexity.

The committee also discussed whether STR registrations should be transferable upon sale of a property. Members discussed the possibility of a transfer process requiring new owners to complete compliance review while preserving existing reservations. It was pointed out that transferability could happen along the lines of the process used for liquor licenses. It was agreed to park transferability for further discussion in the future.

7. Future Meeting Topics

Ad Hoc STR Committee Meeting

Date: May 5, 2026

Executive Summary

The Committee established the agenda for the next meeting (5.19.26), agreeing to review the results of this meeting and then consider items 6 and 4 from the original list of items provided by the Board of Trustees:

6) Discuss the time frame included in the definition for *primary residence*

4) Owner occupied vs. non-owner-occupied dwelling units as STRs

The Committee outlined the materials needed in preparation: relevant sections from the repealed ordinance, the Common Ground proposal, and municipal code. Committee members also requested that future packets include written summaries of prior discussions and working recommendations.

Public Comment Summary

Public comments and audience participation primarily focused on simplifying the proposed short-term rental framework, clarifying definitions, and reducing administrative burden for residents renting rooms within their homes.

Several commenters expressed concern regarding the proposed definition of a “single bedroom short-term rental,” particularly the phrase requiring that “all other facilities are shared.” Speakers noted that many room-rental arrangements include partially separate living areas, such as basement bedrooms and bathrooms, while still functioning as part of a shared residence. Commenters recommended simplifying or clarifying the language to better reflect real-world housing arrangements.

Multiple participants supported a streamlined registration or licensing process rather than a highly complex permitting structure. Commenters generally favored:

- Simple registration requirements,
- Lower fees,
- Longer renewal cycles,
- Complaint-driven enforcement, and
- Minimal administrative burden on both residents and town staff.

Several speakers discussed the practicality of multi-year registration periods, noting that longer licensing cycles could reduce workload for both STR operators and town administration if implemented with a consistent renewal schedule.

Ad Hoc STR Committee Meeting

Date: May 5, 2026

Executive Summary

Questions were raised regarding transferability of STR registrations when a property is sold. Commenters suggested the town consider a transfer or continuation process to avoid disrupting existing reservations while still requiring new owners to complete compliance review and approval.

Additional public comments addressed the broader context of affordable housing. Some speakers questioned whether owner-occupied room rentals meaningfully affect affordable housing availability and suggested that small-scale room rentals differ significantly from whole-house STR operations. Commenters also encouraged the committee to use clear, easy-to-understand language and to keep regulations practical, locally tailored, and manageable for the community.

Next Meeting

Tuesday, May 19, 2026 at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott Brown, facilitator

This document based on an AI-generated meeting summary, first edited by Deputy Clerk Santiago

ARTICLE 2. - ZONING DISTRICTS

- **Sec. 16-2-10. - Establishment.**

In order to carry out the purpose and provisions of this Chapter, the Town is hereby divided into the following zoning districts:

E-1	Estate Residential District
R-1	Low-Density Residential District
R-2	Medium-Density Residential District
R-3	Higher-Density Residential District
MH	Mobile Home Park Subdivision District
MH1	Mobile Home Parks Subdistrict
MH2	Mobile Home Subdivisions Subdistrict
C-1	Core Commercial District
C-2	Community Commercial District
I-1	Light Industrial District
I-2	Industrial District
DR	Developing Resource District
P	Public District

The intent of each zoning district is as described in the following sections.

(Ord. No. 83-116, Art. IX, 1983; Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000)

ARTICLE 2. - ZONING DISTRICTS

- **Sec. 16-2-20. - E-1, Estate Residential District.**

It is the intent of this District to provide for orderly development of single-family residential areas on three- to ten-acre lots. Farm-type animals, including horses, sheep, llamas, cattle and goats, will be allowed. Other animals will require approval of the Town. This District requires adequate irrigation water rights if the property to be improved has been previously irrigated and water rights were utilized, and must have a plan for distribution (see [Section 16-3-110](#) of this Chapter).

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-30. - R-1, Low-Density Residential District.**

It is the intent of the this District to provide for the orderly development of single-family residential site-built or manufactured built homes, depending on covenants for the area.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-40. - R-2, Medium-Density Residential District.**

It is the intent of this District to allow for the orderly and creative development of attached and detached single-family, two-family and multiple-family dwellings at moderate densities. Such areas are intended to serve as a transition between the lower-density zoning districts and the higher-density residential areas and commercially zoned areas.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-50. - R-3, Higher Density Residential District.**

It is the intent of this District to provide for the orderly and creative development of residential areas with density substantially higher than the Low-Density or Medium-Density Districts yet compatible with the present scale and character of the Town. Higher density residential areas may be appropriately located as a part of planned developments, adjacent to medium-density residential areas, commercially zoned areas, adjacent to the core commercial area or downtown and within close proximity to major collector or arterial streets.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-60. - MH, Mobile Home Park Subdivision District.**

It is the intent of this District to be composed of two (2) subdistricts, Mobile Home Parks (MH1) and Mobile Home Subdivisions (MH2). Mobile homes will be restricted to this District except as specified in Article 8 of this Chapter. This District is designed to provide orderly development of single-family residential mobile home parks having rented lots and subdivisions having homeowner lots. These subdistricts may require appropriate screening and/or buffer zones from other districts and zones. (See Article 8 of this Chapter for regulations.)

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

ARTICLE 2. - ZONING DISTRICTS

- **Sec. 16-2-70. - C-1, Core Commercial District.**

It is the intent of this District to provide for the orderly development of those commercial and business uses, government, educational and cultural facilities that are characteristic of downtown areas and promote comparison shopping and pedestrian activity in the core area. This District is not intended for businesses and commercial uses that are oriented to the automobile and require extensive ground-level floor area.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-80. - C-2, Community Commercial District.**

It is the intent of this District to augment the commercial and business needs of the community by providing for the orderly development of commercial facilities that, because of their specific nature, require closer access to arterial routes or immediate access to large parking areas or require generally larger ground-level floor areas than the smaller retail shops as encouraged in the core commercial areas.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-90. - I-1, Light Industrial District.**

It is the intent of this District to provide for the development of industrial uses that will enhance the economy of the Town and be designed and planned in a manner that will be compatible with the character of the community and not add pollution or other undesirable effects to the adjoining properties or to the community as a whole.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-100. - I-2, Industrial District.**

The intent of this District is to allow for basic or primary industries which are generally not compatible with residential and/or commercial activity. Certain extremely obnoxious, hazardous and noisy uses will require special permission to locate in this District.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-110. - DR, Developing Resource District.**

It is the intent of this District to provide for the zoning of those areas to be annexed that are eligible for annexation and are designated in the Comprehensive Plan as potentially suitable for urban development but not in the immediate future because of lack of utilities or other public services. DR District zoning should be applied to existing agricultural or open space areas with minimal present development.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)

- **Sec. 16-2-120. - P, Public District.**

ARTICLE 2. - ZONING DISTRICTS

It is the intent of this District to provide a special district for those lands that are dedicated for public use for recreational or educational purposes or for other public facilities or services. New construction and development will require special review.

(Ord. No. 2000-02, Art. IX, 2000; Ord. No. 2014-04, § 1, 1-13-2015)