Group Living Advisory Committee Meeting

Date and Time: Tuesday, June 26, 2018, 5:30 – 8:00 PM
Location: Webb Municipal Building

Attendees

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Paul Bindel
Sarah Wells
Louise Martorano
Shannon Carst
Rose Rodriguez
Kristen Lewis
Kevin Priestly
Rachel Keeven
JR Ronczy
Debra Bustos
Michael Henry
John Hayden
Loretta Koehler
Mimi Florance
Michael Garcia
Joel Noble
Bill Rutherford
Chris Coddington
Lex Papesh
Brice Hancock
Scott Kiger
Paul Scudo
Terese Howard
Mike Malloy

GUESTS
Jesse Parris
Karen Seed

DENVER ELECTED OFFICIALS
Robin Kniech
Deborah Ortega

DENVER PLANNING BOARD MEMBER
Don Elliott

DENVER STAFF
Andrew Webb

Eugene Howard
Will Lindsey
Kyle Dalton
Tina Axelrad

FACILITATOR
Meagan Picard

Agenda

Time	Topic	Objective(s)
5:30 – 5:50	Welcome and Check In	**Connect and appreciate**: greet each other and share learning and what's going well
5:50 – 5:55	Meeting Agenda and Objectives	**Orient to now**: review agenda and meeting objectives
5:55 – 6:10	Success Definition	**Orient to future**: agree to process success indicators and criteria for sound recommendations
6:10 – 6:30	Staff Presentation: Phases 1-2 Updates and Consolidated Problem Statement	**Learn**: get updates on phases 1 and 2 and hear how the consolidated problem statement was developed
6:30 – 7:05	PS Poll and Full Group Discussion	**Consent**: reach consensus on consolidated problem statement
7:05 – 7:40	Subgroup Problem Statement Discussions	**Share**: identify additional learning/ discussion needs
7:45 – 7:55	Public Meeting Planning and Preparations	**Prepare**: understand plans and volunteer to assist
7:55 – 8:00	Gratitude, Next Steps and Close	**Improve**: gather ideas on how we can improve for next phase

Meeting Summary

1. WELCOME AND CHECK-IN

Meagan opened the meeting, welcoming and inviting participants to greet their neighbors and share something they learned or appreciated in the process that has been helpful in the group's deliberations. After some time for discussion, a few people shared interesting learning about their respective group's topics.

2. MEETING AGENDA AND OBJECTIVES

Meagan Picard reviewed the agenda as listed above, along with key objectives, a reminder about group process agreements and a few housekeeping items.

3. SUCCESS DEFINITION

Meagan shared the revised success definition based on input from the first full advisory committee meeting. The process success measures were identified as providing meaningful

opportunities for input in which participants feel heard and reaching consensus or near consensus. The other items previously listed as part of the success definition – developing recommendations that are equitable in terms of neighborhood impact, provide for affordable and attainable housing options and consider potential for unintended consequences – were shifted to evaluation criteria to be applied to the recommendations developed in phase 3 of this project.

4. STAFF PRESENTATION: REVIEW OF PHASES 1 AND 2 AND PROBLEM STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Eugene shared that the 55-member committee – divided into 6 topic-specific subgroups – met 26 times since March to arrive at the final proposed problem statement. He also shared several updates:

- Requested maps continue to be developed carefully to ensure the most reliable information possible.
- Denver staff member, Will Lindsey, has joined the team to assist with best practices research and other work in preparation for phase 3.
- Plans for July include planning for phase 3 and scheduling interim learning opportunities for subgroups. Committee members were invited to share their ideas about needed/desired learning opportunities, including those that they can offer to the group.

Andrew gave an overview of the project timeline and where we are in the process (close of phase 2), and he went on to share highlights of subgroup goals, such as promoting innovative living arrangements and enabling group living arrangements and the neighbors to be good neighbors reciprocally. He then shared the summary problem statement developed based on common themes across the subgroup problem statements (identified below).

5. PROBLEM STATEMENT POLLING

Meagan led an electronic polling process to determine if the group had any concerns with the summary statement, reminding the group that the subgroups had each already arrived at consensus on their respective statements and that the focus here is on the summary of those statements. The group was polled on each element of the statement and discussion followed. The results of this process are:

a. *Evolving Residential Needs: Different ways of living together are desired to meet new challenges, circumstances, and lifestyles. However, outdated or unclear regulations use definitions and building forms in the DZC limit those possibilities.* One question/concern identified: One participant noted that things missing from the code aren't captured in this statement. Andrew noted that that was on oversight in preparing the slide. The following phrase should be included in the statement: "*…or a lack of applicable use definitions…"* Consensus was reached with this clarification.

b. *Difficulty Meeting Rising Demand: Demand for some group living types exceeds current supply, but expansion or establishment of new facilities is constrained by the DZC.* One question/concern identified: One participant raised concerns about whether issues with the code are related to demand and supply. It was clarified that expansion is constrained "in part" by the DZC. Consensus was reached with this clarification.

c. *Unintended Results: Current regulations have led to unintended results, including: perceived institutionalization of neighborhoods, ongoing use of legacy residential care facilities, need for extensive transportation services, concentration of vulnerable*

populations away from needed services. One objection identified: use of the word "institutionalization". Significant discussion about this word ensued, with a variety of suggestions about replacing it with saturation or over-concentrations, though some were concerned about the negative connotation of words like "saturation" or "over-concentration". The group agreed to allow further work with these suggestions to arrive at the right meaning that there is a sense that too many service-oriented group living arrangements makes a neighborhood feel less residential. Other than this one word, consensus was reached on this statement.

   d. ***Ineffective Public Outreach Requirements****: Requirements for public outreach and involvement in siting decisions are inconsistent and unclear, leading to frustration for neighborhoods and providers.* One question/concern identified: statement doesn't acknowledge lack of fairness in the process with opposition rallied to inhibit siting of new group living facilities. Another person later noted that "in siting decision" was incomplete and should be removed. The group agreed. Additional recommendations were made to note that the outreach requirements were "missing the benefit of best practices," and to ensure that the processes can't be manipulated to benefit one group of stakeholders over another. The group reached consensus that this problem statement would be sufficient once these changes were made.

   e. ***Unclear Regulations****: Some regulations are unclear or inflexible when considering expansion or siting new or innovative facilities.* One question/concern identified: It was noted that an example would be useful for this one during the public meeting. Consensus was reach on this statement.

   f. ***Unnecessary or outdated language****: Some language in the DZC is redundant, inconsistent or in conflict with state and/or federal regulations and guidelines.* No questions/concerns were identified. Consensus was reached on this problem statement.

6. SUB-GROUP PROBLEM STATEMENT DISCUSSIONS

Meagan shared that the next segment of the agenda is designed for two purposes: 1) to give a preview of the open house portion of the public meeting design and 2) to give them a chance to learn about and weigh in on other groups' topic-focused problem statements. Participants circulated, talked with each other and recorded their feedback on sample surveys, large prints of the problem statements and on paper-covered tables. After 20 minutes, a representative of each group shared highlights of what they heard in their conversations:

- Emerging Trends: Questions were raised about terms, including "co-housing". These need to be addressed in the household definition. They identified that something is missing around residential occupancy.
- DIY/Artist: Significant cross-over with Emerging Trends was identified. Consider combining the groups? It was also noted efforts by residents to formalize live-work use arrangements or otherwise update their occupancy can trigger change-of-use review, requiring adherence to updated building/safety and other requirements which can increase costs beyond the means of applicants,, making creative living arrangements unattainable for many. It was noted – and emphatically agreed by the full group – that building and zoning need to work together more.

- Homeless Shelters: DZC should encourage paths to permanent housing, so barriers to needed services need to be removed. Also, the goal should be inclusive housing options for all in all neighborhoods.
- Community Corrections: We need to anticipate the public meeting and offer learning opportunities.
- 55+/Assisted Living: Opposition to siting facilities was noted, along with the need for education on fair housing laws. Occupancy limits no longer apply over 55 years of age. Boomers don't want to live in assisted living/institutional-type homes.
- Special Care/Transitional Housing: There was significant conversation about the need to define special care and transitional, given wide variety of opinions about what these terms mean. With agreed-upon definitions, requirements need to be defined. A question was raised about whether or not the "housing first" model is used on sober housing (yes, was an answer for some) and if transitional housing for people who have experienced homelessness and not in recovery/treatment program is included here or should be included in the homeless shelter group's work. These options will be explored and resolved for phase 3.

No issues were identified that required any changes to the consolidated problem statement. However, it was noted that cultural factors should be considered in recommendations, and the group agreed to include that as an additional criterion for evaluation of recommendations.

Additional comments were captured in writing:
- General: Fact that any use that's not single-family homes is challenging. Notification is not broad enough. Give notification to HOAs/RNOs? How to build camaraderie to be good neighbors?
- General: What's the vision for Denver? Mixing uses in all neighborhoods could lead to loss of higher income residents that want single-family neighborhoods.
- Transitional/special care: Clarify that folks in sober and other housing that are in a recovery program are treated that way (and protected by FHAA) even if the recovery program does not include medication or medical care (e.g. a lifestyle program).
- Emerging trends: The line between co-housing, cottage development, and tiny house is very thin and will erode in the future. Don't define them too narrowly.
- Emerging trends: Tiny home group is part of group's duty. Tiny home SFD, single home and ADU are not. Need to distinguish among these (define).
- 55+/Assisted Living: Be aware that distinguishing between different types of elderly or transitional housing uses based on the type or level of care provided will lead to confusion down the road. The types of care offered by a given institution may change over time, or the needs of the residents may change to require a mix of types of care. Minimize distinction based on narrow definitions of types or levels of care.
- Community corrections questions/concerns: Important to address: to what extent does the facility change/impact the integrity of the neighborhood? Other questions/concerns: who are parking requirements for (neighborhood or facility), and what are the population density limits/requirements?

7. GRATITUDE AND CLOSE

Meagan acknowledged the hard work of the group to reach consensus and encouraged the group to give themselves a hand. She also invited them to share ideas on how to improve the process for phase 3. No suggestions were made, and the meeting came to a close.