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Welcome and introductions 5:00-5:15 p.m.
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Overview: options explored in this handout

Parking:
- Change parking category to reduce parking requirements
- Establish new parking category for Community Corrections and similar uses

Population Limits and Facility Expansion
- Raise population cap for conforming uses
- Grant Zoning Administrator or Board of Adjustments power to allow expansion of compliant/non-conforming uses

Siting of Facilities
- Reduce or remove current 1,500’ buffers to residential/schools
- Allow use in all mixed use districts over 3 stories (from current Industrial and Downtown districts)
Problem Statement recap

- Demand exceeds current capacity
- Limited space in applicable districts for new facilities
- Many existing facilities are compliant or nonconforming uses, which have limited allowances for expansion
- Vehicle parking requirements exceed demand and take up space
- Population Density requirements need revision
Decision-Making Criteria:

1. Is consistent with adopted plans (Pass/Fail - Must Pass per Charter 3.2.9(C) and DZC 12.4.11.4.A)

2. Is equitable – not necessarily equal – in terms of neighborhood policies and impact

3. Provides for more affordable and attainable housing options across the full range of resident incomes, considering creative options in the process.

4. Limits potential for unintended consequences perceived as negative or in conflict with community character, economic viability and existing or future plans and policies

5. Is clear to administer and enforce

6. Is clear and predictable to all stakeholders

7. Uses language that is consistent with relevant city, state and federal regulations

8. Is enforceable with minimal entry to properties by Zoning & Neighborhood Inspection Services and other staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY_NAME</th>
<th>FACILITY_STATUS</th>
<th>FACILITY_ADDRESS</th>
<th>NUM_BEDS</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>OPERATOR</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Compliant/Non-Conforming Issues</th>
<th>Parking Required*</th>
<th>Parking Provided*</th>
<th>Zoning Conformance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic - Ulster</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3955 N. ULSTER ST.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Corecivic, inc</td>
<td>I-MX-5, UO-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic -46th Open</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>4511 E. 46TH AVE.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Corecivic, inc</td>
<td>I-B, UO-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic -Columbine</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>4280 N. COLUMBINE ST.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Corecivic, inc</td>
<td>I-A, UO-2</td>
<td>63 feet to Residential District</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic Fox</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>570 W. 44TH AVE.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corecivic, inc</td>
<td>I-B, UO-2</td>
<td>213 Feet to RX District</td>
<td>13 on-site, up to 45 shared/off-site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House Filmore</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1479 N. FILLMORE ST.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Independence House, LLC</td>
<td>U-MS-3</td>
<td>In MS District, Adjacent to RH District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House Pecos</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>4101 N. PECOS ST.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Independence House, LLC</td>
<td>U-TU-C</td>
<td>In TU District</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House South Federal</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2765 S. FEDERAL BLVD.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Independence House, LLC</td>
<td>PUD 632</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 1</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3712 W. PRINCETON CIR.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Colorado Peer 1 program</td>
<td>CMP-H2</td>
<td>In CMP District, 173 Feet to SU District</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Haven</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3630 W. PRINCETON CIR./3852 W. PRINCETON CIR.</td>
<td>20/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Colorado Haven program</td>
<td>CMP-H2</td>
<td>In CMP District, 709 Feet to SU District</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooley Hall</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>4280 N. KEARNEY ST.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geo Care</td>
<td>I-B, UO-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street Center, Inc.</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1776 N. WILLIAMS ST.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Williams Street Center, Inc.</td>
<td>G-RO-5</td>
<td>IN RO District</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates for discussion. Required parking determined by operator-reported # of rooms; provided parking based on aerial survey.
Parking Requirements
How the DZC regulates parking

Base requirement: ratio of vehicle spaces required per unit of measurement, most commonly:
- Per “unit” (A habitable room, which may or may not contain kitchen or bathing facilities, intended for occupancy by a resident in a group living use).
- Per amount of gross floor area (GFA)

Reductions permitted via:
- Off-site vehicle parking (Section 10.4.4.5.B)
- Shared Vehicle Parking (Section 10.4.5.4)
- Vehicle Parking Reductions (Secs. 10.4.2.C.2, 10.4.5.3 and elsewhere in code) (Change of use, On/off-site care sharing, proximity to transit, etc.)

Ratios governed by “Parking Categories” section of code
- Residential Uses (Residential Care, Assisted Living, Shelters, CCFs, etc.) fall into various categories:
  - Residential (Low, High, Medium): typ regulated per “unit”
  - Commercial (Low, High, Medium): typ regulated by GFA
    - May be more appropriate for uses where parking is primarily for employees (for example, this parking category is currently used for Shelter uses)
# Parking regulations for Community Corrections Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE CATEGORY</th>
<th>SPECIFIC USE TYPE</th>
<th>APPLICABLE USE LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Parking Requirement</td>
<td>I-MX-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Parking Requirement</td>
<td>I-MX-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Primary Use Classification</th>
<th>Assisted Living Facility</th>
<th>Community Corrections Facility</th>
<th>Group Living</th>
<th>Nursing Home, Hospice</th>
<th>Residence for Older Adults</th>
<th>Residential Care Use: Small or Large</th>
<th>Rooming and Boarding House</th>
<th>Shelter for the Homeless</th>
<th>Student Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-ZP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>L-ZP/ZIP IN</td>
<td>L-ZP/ZIP IN</td>
<td>L-ZP/ZIP IN</td>
<td>L-ZP/ZIP IN</td>
<td>L-ZP/ZIP IN</td>
<td>L-ZP/ZIP IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11.2.6</td>
<td>$11.2.7</td>
<td>$11.2.20</td>
<td>$11.2.9</td>
<td>$11.2.9</td>
<td>$11.2.11</td>
<td>$11.2.11</td>
<td>$11.2.11</td>
<td>$11.2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No minimum vehicle parking required for locations in Downtown zone districts
Parking Options

Flexibility can be gained from redesign to obtain fewer “units,” but is that the best approach?
• Unintentional consequences: incentivizes providers to reduce number of rooms by removing walls (i.e. barracks vs. bedrooms)

Possible alternatives:
• Change from Residential Low Parking Category to Commercial Low (.5 space/1000 ft$^2$ Gross Floor Area in Industrial and other districts)
• Create a new parking category for Community Corrections.
## Analysis: .5 vehicle space/1,000 sq ft GFA (Commercial Low)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY_NAME</th>
<th>FACILITY_ADDRESS</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>OPERATOR</th>
<th>Building Sq (GFA)</th>
<th>Parking Provided*</th>
<th>Required Parking (.5/1000 sf GFA)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic - Ulster</td>
<td>3955 N. ULSTER ST.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Corecivic, inc</td>
<td>12,012</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic -46th</td>
<td>4511 E. 46TH AVE.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Corecivic, inc</td>
<td>20,007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic -Columbine</td>
<td>4280 N. COLUMBINE ST.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Corecivic, inc</td>
<td>13,025</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic Fox</td>
<td>570 W. 44TH AVE.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Corecivic, inc</td>
<td>33,070</td>
<td>~45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House Filmore</td>
<td>1479 N. FILLMORE ST.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Independence House, LLC</td>
<td>7,904</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House Pecos</td>
<td>4101 N. PECOS ST.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Independence House, LLC</td>
<td>7,099</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House South Federal</td>
<td>2765 S. FEDERAL BLVD.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Independence House, LLC</td>
<td>14,475</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer I</td>
<td>3712 W. PRINCETON CIR.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>University of Colorado Peer 1 program</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Haven</td>
<td>3630 W. PRINCETON CIR.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>University of Colorado Haven program</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooley Hall</td>
<td>4280 N. KEARNEY ST.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Geo Care</td>
<td>15,065</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street Center, Inc.</td>
<td>1776 N. WILLIAMS ST.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Williams Street Center, Inc.</td>
<td>4,708</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates for discussion: provided parking based on aerial survey, proposed required parking estimated using GFA information from real estate records.
Application of Decision-Making Criteria and Staff Recommended approaches

Parking:

• Change parking category to reduce parking requirements
  o *Ranks high for clear administration, equitable impact, predictability, reduction of unintended consequences*

• Establish new parking category for Community Corrections and similar uses
  o *Ranks lower for administration (new standard to enforce)*

Note: highlighted options are recommended by staff
Population Limits/Facility Expansion
Population Limits: Current Requirement

11.2.10.1.D. Limits on Number of Residents

1. The proposed number of residents in a facility shall not exceed the following limits:

a. In the I-MX zone district, not to exceed 1 person per 50 square feet of gross floor area in sleeping areas with a maximum of 40 residents. (when adopted, this standard was aligned with state population density requirement, which has since changed to 40 square feet)

b. In the I-A and I-B zone districts, a maximum of 60 residents, provided, however, that if such facility is operated by the Denver Manager of Safety, or under contract to the Manager of Safety, such facility may have up to 120 residents, except that the existing facility located at 570 West 44th Avenue may have up to 90 residents.

c. In the D-C, D-TD, and D-LD zone districts, not to exceed 1 person per 50 square feet of gross floor area in sleeping areas or 40 residents, whichever is less.

2. The expansion of any existing community corrections facility to more than 60 residents shall be reviewed according to Section 12.4.2, Zoning Permit Review with Informational Notice
Option 1: Increasing Per Facility Cap

- Research into an industry standard has shown that a per facility cap of 150 is the preferred cap, with feedback from the sub-group indicating that more than 150 guests/residents contributes to a perception of institutionalization within the facilities themselves.
- Increase in DZC limit would allow expansion of 3 existing facilities, plus new facilities (see table below)
- Should be considered alongside additional recommendations in following pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number of Beds</th>
<th>Expansion Possible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic - Ulster</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic - 46th (Dahlia)</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic - Columbine</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreCivic - Fox</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House Fillmore</td>
<td>Non-Conforming*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House Pecos</td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence House South Federal</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer I</td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Haven</td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooley Hall</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>73 (104 with Expansion)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>Non-Conforming</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Would become Compliant if use was permitted in MX, MS, and CC (3 stories and up)
Option 2: Expansion of Compliant/Non-Conforming Uses

Currently permitted in unique situations:
• Zoning Administrator authority (to enable compliance with legal requirements for the use, or when vacation changes a zone lot)
• Board of Adjustments for Zoning authority (use in a floor area in existing facility, via Variance procedure and criteria (DZC Sec. 12.4.7)

Options:
• Expand BOA authority to allow expansion of compliant/non-conforming structures
• Expand ZA authority to allow expansion of compliant/non-conforming uses and/or structures
Application of Decision-Making Criteria and Staff Recommended approaches

Population Limits and Facility Expansion

• Raise population cap for conforming uses to up to 150 beds, tied to state density requirements
  o *Ranks high for consistency with relevant city, state and federal regulations (industry standards), clarity and predictability (compared to current highly-specific standards)*

• Grant Zoning Administrator additional power to allow expansion of compliant/non-conforming uses
  o *Ranks high for clarity and predictability.*

• Board of Adjustments power to allow expansion of compliant/non-conforming uses
  o *Ranks lower for predictability (not typical role of BOA, long process)*

Note: highlighted options are recommended by staff
Siting Community Corrections Facilities
Limitations on new facilities: Current Regulations

11.2.10.C. Permitted Location Community corrections facilities (for purposes of this subsection, hereinafter “facilities” or “facility”) shall be allowed in any I-MX, I-A, I-B, D-C, D-TD, and D-LD Zone Districts, and shall be located more than:

1. 1,500 feet from a school meeting all requirements of the compulsory education laws of the state; and
2. 1,500 feet from a Residential Zone District.

Additional Large Residential Care Facility spacing and (location) density limitations (11.2.9.1.D.3.d):

Spacing and density regulations:
1. A Large Residential Care use shall be a minimum of 2,000 feet from another such use; and
2. No more than two other such uses shall exist within a 4,000 foot radius measured from the proposed use.

Note: these requirements impact all Large Residential Care Facilities and will be evaluated separately in context with other Group Living uses they impact.
## Peer City CCF Zoning Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Spacing between facilities</th>
<th>Spacing from Schools</th>
<th>Spacing from Residential</th>
<th>Spacing: other</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
<th>Size limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>2,000 feet, no more than 2 facilities within 4,000-foot radius</td>
<td>1,500 feet</td>
<td>1,500 feet</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>I-MX-: 0.125 spaces/unit All other permitted districts: 0.25 spaces/unit</td>
<td>I-MX-, Downtown Districts: 40 residents I-A, I-B: 120 residents (with exceptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>1,500 feet</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Liquor establishments prohibited within 500 feet of Community Corrections or other residential facilities</td>
<td>1 space/4 persons design capacity</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>2,640 feet</td>
<td>2,640 feet (also from parks, churches, daycares)</td>
<td>2,640 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space per 4 residents, 1 space per 2 employees</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>1,000 feet</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA – determined by manager</td>
<td>Max occupancy 75 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1,500 feet</td>
<td>500 feet (may be waived in case of major thoroughfare, waterway or other barrier)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Determined by manager</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,320 feet from any group living; 5,280 feet from other CCF</td>
<td>1,000 feet</td>
<td>600 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/4 beds (25&lt; residents) 1 space/5 beds (25+ residents)</td>
<td>64 beds per sleeping area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,320 feet</td>
<td>NA (see Spacing: other)</td>
<td>NA (see Spacing: other)</td>
<td>300 feet from any non-industrial zone district</td>
<td>1 space/bed</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>600 feet</td>
<td>600 feet</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space/4 beds</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>2,640 feet</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Determined by director</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map of current CCF locations and areas where new CCFs could be established
Analysis of Options
Map 1 illustrates the following:

- Permitted land area that could be added by permitting the use in Mixed Use, Main Street and Commercial Corridor (MX, MS, and CC) zoning permitting 3 stories and up (in addition to where use is already permitted)

- Amount of that land area where use would still be prohibited due to buffer requirements (hashed area).
Map 2 illustrates the following:

- Permitted land area that could be added by permitting the use in Mixed Use, Main Street and Commercial Corridor (MX, MS, and CC) zoning permitting 3 stories and up (in addition to where use is already permitted)

- Permitted land area that could be added by reducing the buffers from schools and residential zone districts (1,500'–750')
# Options for Increasing Available Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Acres Added</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>Total Available Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Standards</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting in MX, MS, and CC (3 stories and up)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing All Buffers to 1,000’ AND Permitting in MX, MS, and CC (3 stories and up)</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing All Buffers to 750’ AND Permitting in MX, MS, and CC (3 stories and up)</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>6,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove 1,500’ Buffers from Residential and Schools AND Permit in MX, MS, and CC (3 stories and up)</td>
<td>9,720</td>
<td>308%</td>
<td>13,258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application of Decision-Making Criteria and Staff Recommended approaches

Siting of Facilities

• Reduce or remove current 1,500’ buffers to residential/schools
  o *Ranks in middle for adoptability and equitable neighborhood impact*
  o *Ranks high for allowing more affordable/attainable housing (makes use possible in more places); clarity and predictability.*

• Allow use in all mixed use districts over 3 stories (from current Industrial and Downtown districts)
  o *Ranks high for equitable impact, predictability, provision of affordable options. Ranks in middle for adoptability.*

Note: highlighted options are recommended by staff
Additional Considerations and Options

Reduction or removals of 1,500’ buffers opens new areas along corridors and expand areas of some industrial nodes where use is permitted.
• Can’t assume real estate is available/structures appropriate
• Reduction of buffers may raise concerns

Additional Options for discussion:
• **Larger** facilities in Industrial and Downtown districts (per current)
• **Smaller** (50-60 bed) facilities only in MX, MS, CC, possibly even RO and MU.
  o Reduced buffers for smaller facilities?
  o Could address existing challenges with non-conforming/compliant uses where operator changes
Potential impact of buffer reduction, new zone districts: property analysis

Overview: Slides 29-40 contain information about areas of Denver where Community Corrections uses could be established if the use were to be permitted in Mixed Use, Main Street and Commercial Corridor zone districts exceeding 3 stories and existing 1,500’ buffer requirements from schools and residential zone districts were reduced or removed. They are intended to give basic information about the types of existing development and land uses in these areas as well as a baseline feel for what types and sizes of structures are available for sale or lease. These slides are intended to give the Group Living Advisory Committee some on-the-ground context for decision-making and are not intended to be exhaustive reviews of available properties or recommendations for siting new facilities. Sources include the City and County of Denver’s Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data and Loopnet, an online commercial property marketing website.
Zoning and Land Use

- Reducing or removing 1,500’ buffers could make new land with existing Industrial (I-A, I-B on map) zoning available in this area.

- Adding Mixed Use, Main Street and Commercial Corridor (MX, MS, CC) zone districts would make this use possible in additional pockets of land, as well as properties abutting the Broadway corridor in this area.

- Land Use is primarily industrial, with commercial uses along Broadway and Santa Fe. Some single-unit residential uses are interspersed.
Built Environment and Available Properties

• This area has several industrial properties currently for sale or lease ranging from around 5,000 to 15,000 sq ft.

• There are not currently other Residential Care Facilities in this area
Zoning and Land Use

- Reducing or removing 1,500’ buffers could make new land with existing Industrial (I-A, I-B, I-MX on map) zoning available in this area.

- Adding Mixed Use, Main Street and Commercial Corridor (MS on map) zone districts would make this use possible on properties abutting Santa Fe in this area and nearby.

- Land Use is primarily industrial, with commercial and residential uses along Kalamath and Santa Fe.
Built Environment and Available Properties

- This area has several industrial, commercial and multipurpose properties currently for sale or lease ranging from around 5,000 to 15,000 sq ft.

- Properties along and east of Kalamath are smaller and primarily retail.

- There are not currently other Residential Care Facilities in this area.

For sale
For lease
Zoning and Land Use

- Reducing or removing 1,500' buffers could make some new land with existing Industrial (I-A, I-MX on map) zoning available in this area west of the South Platte.

- Adding Mixed Use, Main Street and Commercial Corridor (MX on map) zone districts would make this use possible on additional properties along Santa Fe and other small pockets in this area.

- Land Use is primarily industrial west of the South Platte River with residential and mixed uses to the east.
Example Real Estate

Built Environment and Available Properties

• This area has minimal currently available properties that would potentially be large enough for this use.

• There are not currently other Residential Care Facilities in this area.

For sale
For lease

498 W Iliff Ave
Denver, CO
$1,750,000
8,776sf Industrial Building
Built in 1958

2401 S Delaware St
Stainless Fabricating Co.
Denver, CO
Built in 1967
7,108sf Industrial Space
$8.00 - $12.00 sf/yr

2350 S Jason St
Denver, CO
Built in 1973
6,500sf Industrial Space
$9.25 sf/yr
Globeville
I-25 & I-70

Zoning and Land Use

- Reducing or removing 1,500’ buffers could make new land with existing Industrial (I-A, I-B and I-MX on map) zoning available in this area.

- Adding Mixed Use, Main Street and Commercial Corridor would not impact this area.

- Land Use is primarily warehousing and distribution (industrial) with diverse smaller uses interspersed.
Built Environment and Available Properties

- This area has minimal currently available properties. Examples shown at right include offerings adjacent to the subject area.

- There is a Community Corrections facility south of I-70 in this area, Large Residential Care Facility spacing and density regulations would apply.
Montbello & Stapleton
I-70 & Havana

Zoning and Land Use

- Reducing or removing 1,500’ buffers could make new land with Industrial zoning (I-A, I-B, I-MX on map) available for this use.
- Adding Mixed Use, Main Street, and Commercial Corridor would not impact this area.
- Land use in this area is primarily industrial.
Montbello & Stapleton
I-70 & Havana

Built Environment and Available Properties

• There are currently several newer industrial properties available for lease in this area, ranging from 10,000 sf to more than 100,000 sf.

• This area is identified by Blueprint Denver as a high-value manufacturing area where continued employment and production of goods is encouraged.

• There are no residential care facilities in this area.
Zoning and Land Use

- Reducing or removing 1,500’ buffers could make new land with existing Industrial (I-MX on map) zoning available in this area.

- Adding Mixed Use, Main Street and Commercial Corridor (MX, CC and MS on map) zone districts would make this use possible on many properties in this area, if the 1,500’ buffers were removed or reduced.

- Land Use is a mix of industrial, office and retail.
Built Environment and Available Properties

- There are several retail, office and medical buildings in this area, ranging from 1,500 sf to larger than 20,000 sf.

- There is one nearby Large Residential Care facility, east of the unincorporated area.
Recap: Application of Decision-Making Criteria and Staff Recommended approaches

Parking:
- **Change parking category to reduce parking requirements**
  - Ranks high for clear administration, equitable impact, predictability, reduction of unintended consequences
- **Establish new parking category for Community Corrections and similar uses**
  - Ranks lower for administration (new standard to enforce)

Population Limits and Facility Expansion
- **Raise population cap for conforming uses to 150 beds**
  - Ranks high for consistency with relevant city, state and federal regulations (industry standards), clarity and predictability (compared to current highly-specific standards)
- **Grant Zoning Administrator additional power to allow expansion of compliant/non-conforming uses**
  - Ranks high for clarity and predictability.
- **Board of Adjustments power to allow expansion of compliant/non-conforming uses**
  - Ranks lower for predictability (not typical role of BOA, long process)

Siting of Facilities
- **Reduce or remove current 1,500’ buffers to residential/schools**
  - Ranks in middle for adoptability and equitable neighborhood impact
  - Ranks high for allowing more affordable/attainable housing (makes use possible in more places); clarity and predictability.
- **Allow use in all mixed use districts over 3 stories (from current Industrial and Downtown districts)**
  - Ranks high for equitable impact, predictability, provision of affordable options. Ranks in middle for adoptability.

Note: highlighted options are recommended by staff
Next Steps

CPD Group Living team will:

• Refine recommended approaches based on 9/25 meeting input

• Collaborate with an emerging stakeholder task force being assembled by the city’s Community Corrections Program to ensure that any proposed regulatory changes support the evolution of this service in Denver
  o For example: recent City Council action to end contracts with large operators may necessitate a discussion about the current definition and use limitations for Community Corrections Facilities, which specify placement in the city’s Community Corrections Program and govt. supervision of resident transition to less-structured living environments.

• Vet any proposed zoning updates with potential new operators identified by the City.

GLAC Community Corrections subgroup will meet again later this fall to confirm refined strategies based on outcomes of 9/25 meeting and consider spacing/density for larger umbrella of residential care uses.