

MINUTES
City of Glenwood Springs Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting
June 23, 2026
Council Chambers, First Floor
101 W. 8TH STREET 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call

Present: Chairman Peter Waller, Kyle Jones, Patrick Corcoran, Amy Connerton, John Houghton, Connie Geiman.

Also Present: Economic and Community Development Director Trent Hyatt, Senior Planner Emery Ellingson, Permit Technician Joel Asplund, and City Attorney Karl Hanlon.

Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were declared.

2. Receipt of the Minutes

a. May 26, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Councilor Amy Connerton made the motion to approve the meeting minutes for May 26, 2026, and Commissioner Kyle Jones seconded the motion.

Commissioner Comments: None

Outcome: Motion was approved unanimously by digital voting system.

3. Comments from citizens for items not appearing on the agenda

No public comments offered in person or online.

4. New Items

a. APPEAL-000029-2026 319 Park Drive Short Term Rental

Presenter: Applicant **Cindy Svatos** accompanied by her attorney **Sherry Caloia**

Cindy Svatos explained that she applied for and maintained a short-term rental (STR) permit for her property on Park Drive but was denied renewal because she had not rented the unit or paid lodging taxes. She argued that the municipal code did not require an STR to be rented in order to maintain a permit, only that any required taxes be paid which she had filed monthly as zero. Cindy also described significant medical challenges that prevented her from hosting guests during the period in question.

Sherry Caloia clarified the applicant's position that the ordinance does not state any requirement to rent the property, only to pay applicable taxes. She argued that the city's interpretation was incorrect, that Cindy complied with the written ordinance, and that if the

city wishes to require rentals, the ordinance must be amended. She also requested an exception based on Cindy's medical circumstances if the commission found otherwise.

Key points of the presentation:

- Has lived in Glenwood Springs since 1978 at 319 Park Drive for 41 years.
- Described the neighborhood as an older, family-oriented, affordable area with many young families and children playing outside.
- Stated that the seller of the house across the street told her it was being sold as a full-time short-term rental.
- Applied for a short-term rental license immediately after hearing this; did not plan on using it for short-term rental use.
- Completed application requirements, including installing new egress windows, clearing egress window wells, and installing multiple CO and smoke alarms.
- Application was finalized on October 22, 2025.
- Reapplied for renewal by December 21 2025.
- Filed monthly tax forms with a zero amount, as instructed; no one questioned the filings.
- Was notified on February 5 that her renewal was denied because she had not rented the property or paid lodging taxes.
- Learned that other applicants had been told they could rent their property before year-end to avoid denial, but she was not given that information.
- Explained that she has a serious foot injury, has had 15 surgeries since the previous July, and has limited mobility.
- Stated that her condition made it difficult to have guests in the house.
- Read aloud the ordinance language requiring all taxes to be paid to renew and stated it does not say she must rent the property.
- Expressed concerns about the impacts of short-term rentals in her neighborhood, including unknown renters, turnover, traffic, large occupancy, and safety for children.
- Stated that many towns lack affordable housing because of short-term rentals.
- Noted that the commission would be discussing an ordinance change to require rentals in order to renew and stated that the current ordinance does not say that.
- Stated she would be willing to rent the property if required in the future.

Commission Questions & Discussion Included:

- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Given the December 9 email in which staff told you that renewal requires having rented the property and remitted some sales tax, do you believe that message served as notice that you were required to rent it out?
 - **Cindy Svatos:** No, I interpreted that differently. I interpreted it as if I have not rented it out there is nothing to pay.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Now that you know you have to rent out your property in a 2-year period would you rent out your house?
 - **Cindy Svatos:** Yes.

- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** What is the timeline of your medical issue in relation to this permit?
 - **Cindy Svatos:** Starting last July, I underwent multiple surgeries at CU Health, including removing hardware and rebuilding my heel. I then experienced a serious setback when the wound reopened, which led to many more surgeries and weekly wound-clinic visits. In December, amputation was even discussed. I continued with additional procedures, including a complex one in March that lets me stand without putting weight on my heel. Since last July, I've had 15 surgeries, and I still cannot bear weight.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** You previously said you filed for the permit immediately after speaking with the buyers across the street, but also said you never intended to rent your house. Can you clarify on this?
 - **Cindy Svatos:** When the buyers across the street told me their plans, my husband and I checked the rules, and everything we found said I didn't have to actually rent the house to apply. So, I started to get the application in the system. There was a software glitch, so I went to City Hall, and staff helped me complete it in person. The buyers couldn't apply yet because they hadn't closed, and one of them later confronted me about filing first. I told her this is also my retirement home. I want to be clear that I followed all requirements, paid the fees, and made the upgrades. If anyone had told me I had to rent it out, I would have but no one ever told me that.
- **Chairman Peter Waller:** Aside from the email exchanges referenced earlier, did you have any other conversations with Emery or City Staff where they told you that you needed to rent the property, or was all communication limited to email?
 - **Cindy Svatos:** Almost all of my communication with staff was through email. I received monthly reminders to file my taxes, and I always filed zero, but no one ever asked why or told me I needed to have guests. If someone had asked, I would have addressed it. Between October and December, I was going through a very difficult medical period, and I'm not sure I could have had guests then anyway. I also know of others who filed zero taxes for two years and didn't realize they needed renters, yet they were told later to just rent the property once before the end of the year.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** How did you hear about these individuals? Were these other individuals who filled zero part of a Colorado Open Records Act or CORA request?
 - **Staff Response:** There was a CORA request that was not included in the staff report. The contents of this report are similar emails as the December 9th Email stating the applicant to renew and what they would need to do to renew.
 - **Attorney Sherry Caloia:** In the last couple of years there were only two and they did not contest the renewal.
- **Chairman Peter Waller:** How far back did this CORA request go?

- **Attorney Sherry Caloia:** The CORA was left general only asking for permit renewal denials.
- **Tony Svatos:** I've been helping Cindy throughout this process. When she had trouble with the permit application, I went to City Hall to get a hard copy, but Emery told me they didn't have any. I asked him directly whether there was any rental-frequency requirement, and he told me no. Cindy, Sherry, and I had all reviewed the ordinance and found nothing about needing to rent the property, and even an online search showed the same. Everything we saw indicated we didn't need to rent it, which is why I wanted to speak.

Staff presentation

Presenter: Senior Planner **Emery Ellingson**

Senior Planner Emery Ellingson gave a brief overview of the appeal process. He explained that the only action before the commission is to consider the appeal of the administrative decision related to section 070.030.030(E)(9)(f)(6) and staff's interpretation of that section. He noted that staff is not providing a recommendation and that all relevant information is included in the staff report.

He reviewed the appeal procedure, stating that administrative decisions can be appealed to the Planning and Zoning Commission, and their decisions can be further appealed to City Council. He outlined the commission's options: affirm, reverse, modify, or attach conditions to the decision.

Emery also described the criteria the commission must consider, including the facts presented by the applicant, the requirements and intent of the code standards, evidence of past interpretation and administration, and consistency with the comprehensive plan. He concluded his presentation with no further comments.

Commission Questions & Discussion Included:

- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** How many short-term rentals are there currently?
 - **Staff response:** There are currently 119 Active rentals
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** How many have been denied?
 - **Staff response:** This past year there were three that were denied for renewal.
- **Commissioner Patrick Corcoran:** What is the maximum number of short-term rentals that can be issued?
 - **Staff Response:** The city has two types of rental permits. A short-term rental permit, which allows renting an entire home, is capped at about 213 permits citywide and includes a 250-foot spacing requirement between permits. However, the city may not physically be able to reach that full number due to the buffer between permits. The second type, the accessory tourist rental permit, allows renting one bedroom in an owner-occupied home for up to two guests. This permit has no cap and no distance requirements.
- **Commissioner Patrick Corcoran:** What percentage is that of total housing units?

- **Staff response:** There are approximately 4,300 housing units and 119 permits. The original cap was set at about 5%. Based on the actual numbers we are closer to 2.5%-3%.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Regarding the other individuals mentioned in the CORA request has there been any other appeals from them or do they no longer hold permits?
 - **Staff response:** Of the three individuals referenced, none chose to pursue another full short-term rental permit. Two decided not to continue with vacation rentals at all, and the third allowed their permit to lapse and later applied for an accessory tourist rental for a single bedroom.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Based on the code language if a permit is issued very late in the year, such as December 28, on a renewal year they are still required to rent it. How can the ordinance require renewal when there's almost no time to rent the property before the shared end-of-year deadline?
 - **Staff response:** That is correct if someone applies for a permit late in the year, they still must meet all renewal requirements within the few days remaining because all permits share the same two-year expiration date. Applicants could wait to apply until January 1 to gain more time, but doing so risks someone else applying first within the 250-foot radius and blocking their eligibility. Having a uniform expiration date is intended to keep the system consistent and fair for everyone.
 - **Staff response:** A link to the CORA requests has been forwarded to you. These are available to the public through the city website.
- **Commissioner John Houghton:** What is the renewal process like? Is there a hard deadline?
 - **Staff response:** The renewal period begins on September 1. Current permit holders then have until the end of the year to complete their renewal, which includes submitting the application, paying the fee, passing a building inspection, and providing proof of remitted accommodation taxes. Priority in the renewal process is given to active permit holders.
- **Commissioner Geiman:** Can the permit be transferred with sale?
 - **Staff response:** No, the permit expires with the sale of a building.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** How many times do situations like this occur where applicants are competing for permits in the same area?
 - **Staff response:** That would not be something that we could measure. If a property is within 250 feet of an existing short-term rental permit, the system will not accept an application. There is no waiting list, and applicants in that situation are simply ineligible. If someone attempted to apply while a neighbor already holds a permit, the application would be denied and not processed.
- **Commissioner Patrick Corcoran:** Is that 250' buffer measured from property line or building location?
 - **Staff response:** That is measured 250' from the property line.

- **Commissioner Geiman:** In emails to another applicant, staff explicitly recommended having a guest stay before year-end to remit taxes. Did you give similar guidance to this applicant?
 - **Staff response:** The December 9 email to Cindy conveyed the same intent as the emails sent to other applicants, that she needed to have rented and remitted some amount of sales tax in order to qualify for renewal.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Are these emails the only communication between staff and the applicant?
 - **Staff response:** The renewal process involves extensive communication with permit holders, including many emails and notices that go out during each biannual cycle. While not every message pertains specifically to the rental-frequency standard, the department maintains regular contact with applicants. Staff was also instructed to be especially careful in communicating clearly with Ms. Svatos because an adjacent property owner was also pursuing a permit. Staff was deliberate in informing all parties about the process, requirements, and review standards.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** The code language is mandatory correct?
 - **Staff response:** That is correct the language is mandatory and applicable to all applicants without exception.

Public Comment:

- **James Maguire Co-Owner 322 Park Dr:** Asked the commission to uphold staff's decision to revoke the short-term rental permit at 319 Park Drive and to allow his application for 322 Park Drive to proceed. He stated that the owners of 319 Park Drive never intended to operate a short-term rental, never listed or rented the property, never collected lodging taxes, and obtained the permit solely to block his group's application. He argued that the STR ordinance requires proof of lodging tax collection for renewal and that permits must be used for active, compliant rentals. Maguire said he and his partners purchased 322 Park Drive in good faith after checking eligibility with the city and already operate several compliant STRs in Glenwood Springs. He emphasized that allowing inactive permits undermines the ordinance and can be used against legitimate applicants. He urged the commission to maintain the revocation of the 319 Park Drive permit and allow the 322 Park Drive application to move forward.
- **Jon Lipp Co-Owner 322 park Dr:** Urged the Commission to uphold the City's decision to revoke the short-term rental permit at 319 Park Drive. He stated that the City has an established precedent of cancelling STR permits when no lodging tax is generated and noted three recent examples (400 Pinion St., 1071 Park West, and 1640 Lincolnwood Dr.) where permits were not renewed due to zero rentals and no accommodation tax remitted. He asserted that the permit at 319 Park Drive was never used for rentals, produced no revenue, and functioned only as a placeholder to prevent another application. Mr. Lipp argued that overturning staff's decision

would create an unfair exception and asked the Commission to affirm the revocation so that his application may move forward.

- **Morgan Walker Owner 323 Park Dr:** Spoke in favor to the appeal and noted concerns about ambiguity in Glenwood Springs' short-term rental regulations. She contrasted them with the City of Aspen's clearer requirement that STR properties be rented at least once per year to qualify for renewal. She expressed that Glenwood's less specific language can disadvantage ordinary homeowners and favor applicants with legal resources. Ms. Walker also shared context regarding the timing of the neighboring application, stating that the previous owner informed her and another neighbor shortly before closing that the buyers intended to operate an STR, which prompted the neighbor's application. She noted that she and her husband would have applied as well if their neighbor Cindy had not.
- **Oliver Obermeyer Owner 323 Park Dr:** stated that he does not interpret the current STR ordinance language as requiring a rental to occur in order for a permit to be renewed, noting that the phrasing is ambiguous and could be clarified with more precise sentence structure. He agreed with prior comments that clearer language, similar to Aspen's approach, would prevent confusion. He asked the Commission to consider whether this ambiguity is material to the appeal. Mr. Obermeer also urged the City to apply a consistent remediation period that allows applicants to clarify intent or correct issues before losing a permit, stating he does not believe such an opportunity was provided in this case. Finally, he requested that the City consider flexibility or deadline extensions for applicants facing medical or mobility-related challenges.
- **Carly Stillman Long time resident:** Stated that she operates multiple short-term rentals, in her experience, the City's communication with Short-Term Rental or STR permit holders is clear and that it is the responsibility of permit holders to understand and follow the rules. She questioned why the regulations would be considered unclear to one applicant when they appear to be understood by the broader group of STR operators. Ms. Stillman added that, based on her conversations with the neighboring permit holder, she believes there was no intent to rent the property and that the permit was used only as a placeholder. She noted that no taxes were remitted and that more than a year had passed without compliance.

Appellant Rebuttal:

- **Sherry Caloia Applicants Attorney:** Ms. Caloia acknowledged that a December 9th staff email referenced a requirement to have rented the property, but stated that staff statements are not legally controlling and that the Commission must rely on the ordinance text itself. She argued that the code requires only tax remittance, not proof of rental activity, and that the language does not support denying renewal based on a lack of rentals. She noted that past non-renewals were not appealed and do not establish binding precedent. Regarding concerns about "blocking," she stated that any applicant effectively blocks others by applying and that her client's actions were permitted under the ordinance. She emphasized that the applicant

intends to comply with whatever future requirements exist and requested that the Commission overturn the denial and reinstate the short-term rental permit.

Motion: Councilor Amy Connerton made the motion to affirm staff decision to deny renewal for 319 Park Drive Short Term Rental and **Commissioner John Houghton** seconded the motion.

Commissioner Comments:

- **Commissioner John Houghton:** The key issue is whether lodging tax was collected, as required by the code. To me the ordinance reads that a permit holder cannot collect zero lodging tax and still be eligible for renewal.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** I agree with Commissioner Houghton's interpretation of the code, and I believe the intent of the STR regulations aligns with how staff applied them. I also think it's important for us to apply these rules consistently and fairly, especially considering others who have been denied under similar circumstances. In my view, the code was applied correctly in this case. I know this is a difficult situation, and I do hope the neighbors can move forward, given that we are a small community.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** I think the code is vague and doesn't clearly require collecting more than zero dollars in tax. If a property isn't rented, it makes sense that no tax would be collected, and the applicant only had the permit for a short time. The email she received wasn't as direct as others, and I believe she should have had a fair chance to rent within the full permit period.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** I understand the concerns, but to me, you can't collect lodging tax unless you've actually generated it, and zero means no activity. While the code doesn't explicitly say you must rent the property, several emails indicated that renting was necessary to comply. Given that, and the applicant's earlier statement that she didn't intend to rent the home, I question whether it would ever have been rented.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** The applicant said she would rent the home if the permit were renewed. I also feel this situation stems from the City's own unclear process, which created confusion and competition over limited permits. I think the ordinance is vague, and we are now having to fix that. I sympathize with both sides, but objectively, the code language is not clear.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** My statement is actually a question for City staff. When did this code go into effect?
 - **City Staff:** The city buffer was established in 2019.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** is the code that we are reviewing today last reviewed in 2009?
 - Staff response: No, there have been many minor alterations to short term rentals. The last major overhaul was in 2019, to include safety inspections and the 250' buffer.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Has there been any other confusion on collecting lodging since this iteration of the code?

- **Staff response:** No this is our first appeal since 2019 on collecting lodging.
- **Commissioner Kyle Jones:** I agree that the language of the code is less than ideal. But would also argue that communication from staff was clear on expectations for renewal with no follow up from the applicant.

Outcome: Motion was approved by a vote of 4-2 with Commissioner Connie Geiman and Chair Peter Waller opposed.

b. CDA-000049-2026 Code Amendment Short Term Rental and Accessory Tourist Rental

Presenter: Senior Planner Emery Ellingson.

Senior Planner Emery Ellingson presented a proposed code amendment intended to clarify renewal requirements for short-term rental and accessory tourist rental permits, specifically regarding lodging-tax collection. The amendment was introduced in response to ambiguity highlighted during the recent appeal.

Key points of the presentation included:

- The amendment seeks to clearly state that permit holders must “utilize and collect more than \$0 in lodging taxes” to qualify for renewal.
- The proposed language applies to both STR and accessory tourist rental permits and would take effect for the 2026–2027 permit cycle.
- The intent is to eliminate ambiguity in the existing code, which has been in place since 2019.
- Staff recommended approval and noted no public comment had been submitted for this item.

Commission Questions & Discussion Included:

- **Commissioner Patrick Corcoran:** I’m wondering if this leaves the threshold too low. Could someone just rent their place for a single weekend and still meet the requirement?
 - **Staff response:** The code was intentionally written without a minimum rental threshold because STR permit holders use their properties in many different ways some rent full-time, some only a few months, and others just occasionally while on vacation. Setting a high minimum such as 30 nights would make the permit impractical for owners who primarily live in their homes. Other communities take different approaches, with some requiring many rental nights and others imposing limits. These are things that as commissioners you should consider and what best fits Glenwood Springs’ goals.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** In the proposed amendment why is the word rent not used and did the buffer come into effect before COVID-19?
 - **Chair response:** In the amended language it states requirements to be greater than \$0

- **Staff response:** That is correct there was no buffer before 2019.
- **Commissioner Patrick Corcoran:** How much tax do we collect on a yearly basis from short-term rentals?
 - **Staff response:** Last year it was about \$450,000 in accommodation taxes which is 13% of what the city collects citywide. Hotels and Motels make up around \$2.5 Million.
- **Commissioner Patrick Corcoran:** Do Hotels complain about Short Term Rentals?
 - **Staff response:** Generally no, hotels and short-term rentals serve different markets, and while there is some competition, we generally don't receive pushback from hotels. The main concern hotels raise is that short term rentals are taxed as residential properties rather than commercial ones, which is an issue the legislature revisits each year.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** During the appeal we seemed to think the code was clear as written, so why are we clarifying it now? At the same time if we're changing it because we believe it isn't clear, won't that complicate things for the applicant as she moves on to City Council?
 - **Staff response:** After any appeal, we routinely review the code to see if it can be improved. Refining language is a normal part of code maintenance. City Council will not see this amendment until after they hear the appeal, and to the language of the current code so it won't affect their decision on the current case. It should also be noted that code drafting is an ongoing process that is brought to the commission around 10 times a year.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** I'm generally comfortable with the new language, though adding a clearer word like "rent" might help. I also think "more than zero dollars" is straightforward. One idea I'd like us to consider is giving late applicants a short rolling window to rent before they fall under the fixed two-year cycle.
 - **Staff response:** the permit cycle is intentionally tied to a fixed, predictable calendar. Applicants know when renewals open and close, and they can choose when to apply. From an administrative standpoint, keeping a clear annual schedule is simpler and more consistent, especially given the 250-foot buffer and how it affects applicant decisions.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** Do we need to stick with the word utilize?
 - **Staff response:** Staff is happy to change the word of the code amendment to whatever the commission decides.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Do applicants have to be business owners?
 - **Staff response:** They have to be the property owner of the space being rented.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** I believe there should be a grace period since these are just regular citizens.
 - **Staff response:** This single appeal should not drive policy changes because it involved many months of communication, inspection work, and long gaps in applicant follow-through. The overall process has generally worked well. The Commission should not rewrite code based on an isolated case alone,

consistent issues or repeated variance requests should trigger code revisions. It should also be noted that fixed expiration dates keep the system clear and predictable, whereas rolling deadlines for each permit would create confusion for both staff and the public.

- **Commissioner Kyle Jones:** The code language isn't designed to differentiate between business owner and owner or life circumstances. Applicants have to make those decisions based on their individual circumstances. Having the ability to have variations in the type of rentals we see is a good thing for our community.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** Is there anything in the code that says somebody cannot intentionally block another permit?
 - **Staff response:** All permits block all others from putting in a permit. Under the proposed language, a permit holder would need to rent the property and remit lodging tax at least once during the permit cycle not once every two years. Even a single \$1 rental would meet that requirement.

Public Comment:

- **James Maguire Co-Owner 322 Park Dr:** Short-term rental permits are already difficult to obtain in Glenwood Springs due to the 250-foot buffer and HOA restrictions. If you look at the City map with the 250' buffer on you can see that there is nearly no space already. The commission should adopt stricter code amendment does not allow permits to be "weaponized" to block applicants with genuine intentions. Please consider structuring the language in a way that supports the purpose of short-term rentals, legal business operation, promotes tourism, supplies tax to the city and prevents misuse of the permitting system.

Motion: **Commissioner Amy Connerton** made the motion to approve Item b. CDA-000049-2026 Code Amendment Short Term Rental and Accessory Tourist Rental with the stipulation that "Utilize" is changed to "Rent" and **Commissioner Kyle Jones** seconded the motion.

Commissioner Comments:

- **Commissioner John Houghton:** I would propose changing the penalty period for a ban from reapplying from a two-year period to a one-year period.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** I agree with Commissioner Houghton, what are staffs thoughts?
 - **Staff response:** Reducing the penalty period for failing to collect lodging tax would likely have limited practical effect. In most recent cases where applicants did not renew, no other neighbors were seeking permits, meaning those applicants could immediately reapply as a new STR under existing rules. Because of this, shortening the non-renewal period generally does not change outcomes most applicants either reapply right away with a new STR permit or, if another neighbor obtains a permit, become ineligible regardless

of timing due to spacing requirements. While there may be rare situations where a shorter penalty period could benefit someone, these would be uncommon. The current system is already “use it or lose it,” the threshold for use is low, and an owner could potentially retain a permit with only a single day of rental activity.

- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** I think that the way that the code read our appellant was well within her rights. I think the proposed amendment is still too vague. The code should read rent at least one night and collect more than \$0 in lodging tax. If the code was worded this way we likely would not have seen an appeal today.
 - **Staff response:** That request is reasonable. Various communities word how that looks differently whether the commission wants it to be one day or some other amount of days is worth looking at.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** The one night in two years and fixed two-year period are worth re-evaluating to me. I think that it is worth a conversation to take some time and define what STR and accessory tourist rental or ATR really are.
 - **Staff response:** It is worth noting that the way the code is written now is not creating a lot of issues. That being said it would be worth it to take some time and define what a STR and ATR are before bringing a recommendation to council.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Does the 250’ buffer apply to the General Improvement District or GID?
 - **Staff response:** The GID is set to 15% of free market units. It used to previously be 18% before that. That percentage puts us at 28 available permits with 28 already existing.
- **Commissioner John Houghton:** Do STR permit applications expire within their two-year cycle?
 - **Staff response:** Applications have a six-month expiration that is not limited to a permit cycle. For example, if a person puts a permit in for a STR in October they block all others from applying and if they complete their permit in November they will have to rent and collect lodging tax. If the same applicant waits and finishes their application in January, they have two years to rent and collect lodging tax.
 - **Staff response:** I think the real question is whether we want to adopt this code language as proposed or re-evaluate the language and requirements first.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** I do not believe that the requirements match the intent of the code. Having a single rental in two years does not match up to me with what can be defined as a rental.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** I agree with our chair that one night doesn’t match the intention of what a short-term rental should be. Because of this, I would like to suggest we revisit this subject before making any recommendations for council.
- **Commissioner John Houghton:** I agree that it warrants further discussion.

Motion:

Motion was withdrawn by **Commissioner Amy Connerton**, and second was withdrawn by **Commissioner Kyle Jones**.

Motion to continue planning item b. CDA-000049-2026 Code Amendment Short Term Rental and Accessory Tourist Rental to Jul 28th, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting was made by **Commissioner Connie Geiman** and Seconded by **Commissioner Patrick Corcoran**.

Outcome: Continuation was approved unanimously by hand vote.

c. CDA-000050-2026 Code Amendments Electric Vehicle Charging Stations**Presenter: Senior Planner Emery Ellingson**

Senior Planner Emery Ellingson presented proposed amendments to Article 070 of the Municipal Code to establish clear definitions, land-use standards, and review procedures for electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. The purpose of the amendments is to fill current regulatory gaps, provide clarity for applicants and staff, and support growing EV demand within Glenwood Springs. While based loosely on the State of Colorado's Model Land Use Code for EV infrastructure, the proposed changes adapt those standards to local conditions and existing code structure.

Key points of the presentation included:

- The city currently lacks clear regulations for EV charging stations, and recent applications highlight the need for defined use categories and review procedures
- The State's Model Land Use Code was used as a template, but staff tailored the proposed standards to local needs; adoption of the state model is not required.
- New definitions clarify primary versus accessory charging uses and distinguish Levels 1, 2, and 3 chargers.
- EV charging facilities will use existing land-use review processes
 - Primary charging uses allowed by right in most commercial and industrial zones, with a special use permit required in low-density residential areas, and prohibited in the M2 downtown district.
 - Accessory chargers allowed in all zoning districts when paired with a primary use.
 - • Existing parking, ADA, lighting, and signage requirements will apply; staff does not recommend adopting the model code's double-counting parking provision.
 - • Screening requirements for mechanical/electrical equipment would extend to EV charging infrastructure, consistent with current practices.

Commission Questions & Discussion Included:

- **Commissioner John Houghton:** If you have a parking lot as principal use in the M2 zoning district can you have Electric Vehicle or EV charging as accessory use, and what is the threshold where parking is no longer the primary use?
 - **Staff response:** You make a good point, it can be difficult to determine when a large number of accessory chargers effectively turns a site into a primary charging use, and no clear threshold has been established. Allowing EV chargers as a primary use with a Special Use Permit could add more flexibility in these scenarios and allow the commission an opportunity to evaluate these on a case-by-case basis.
- **Commissioner Amy Connerton:** Can you elaborate more on screening?
 - **Staff response:** Screening requirements apply only to the supporting electrical equipment such as transformers or generators not the charging units themselves. Charging stations must remain visible for users, while associated equipment can be screened with fencing or landscaping where appropriate
 - **Staff response:** It is also worth noting that we work closely with our utility department on these types of permits. With some of these charging stations, estimated to draw as much as 50% of what is generally used by the entire city when used at a full capacity.
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Are these uses only limited to private property, and how would parking in these spaces be enforced?
 - **Staff response:** No, if the city wanted to put in charging stations these uses in zoning district would still apply. As for enforcement these spots are treated in a similar way as handicap parking in limitations and fees; if a vehicle is not actively charging, it can be ticketed.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** How do drivers find and distinguish between primary and accessory chargers on charging maps?
 - **Staff response:** modern EVs and charging apps categorize chargers by level, distance, availability, and whether they are in use, allowing drivers to select the type they need.
- **Chair Peter Waller:** Would lighting or digital displays on chargers be regulated, especially if they include bright screens or advertisements?
 - **Staff response:** Sign and lighting codes would apply. While the state's model code discourages regulating "out-of-the-box" equipment, the city will still regulate anything that functions as signage or excessive lighting. Large video boards or promotional screens would be subject to these rules as well.

Public Comment: None

Motion: Commissioner John Houghton made the motion to approve CDA-000050-2026 Code Amendment Electric Vehicle Charging Stations with the amendment to allow EV charging as a primary use with a Special Use Permit in the M2 Zoning district and Commissioner Patrick Corcoran seconded the motion.

Commissioner Comments: None

Outcome: Motion was approved unanimously.

5. Commissioner Comments:

- **Commissioner Kyle Jones:** Is there any interest in discussing the use of E-Bikes?
 - **Staff response:** It would likely be reviewed by council and not this commission since it doesn't touch the scope of the development code.
- **Commissioner John Houghton:** I would like to hear from the director during his comments how the discussion of parking minimums went during the last work session, and if any projects will be starting soon?
- **Commissioner Connie Geiman:** Can we require or improve education for short-term rental guests about properly using bear-proof trash cans and local trash rules? I keep seeing STR visitors putting trash out early or not locking bear cans correctly because they don't know our local requirements.
 - **Staff Response:** This is a recurring issue, especially during peak wildlife season. The most effective approach is letting us know the specific address when it happens. We then contact the property owner who is responsible for their guests and warn them that continued violations will result in fines issued to them, not the renters. Owners typically correct the problem quickly once fines are involved.

6. Director Comments

Community Development Director Trent Hyatt:

- The Mountain Goat has been issued a certificate of occupancy or CO and is not waiting on any actions from the building department for business to start.
- Mi Mexico was issued a temporary certificate of occupancy or TCO and has opened to the public.
- Coloradough gets a weekly list from the building department on what is needed to keep their permit moving forward. We want them to open and are doing what we can inside our control.
- The parking discussion mostly revolved around the GID. Would any commissioners be interested in joining a sub-committee of the transportation commission and the downtown development authority or DDA?
 - Commissioner John Houghton agreed to join
- Canyon Vista no new news which can be discouraging
- Next meeting we will revisit STRs and a variance application

7. Adjournment Meeting adjourned at 8:41PM.