

# Group Living Advisory Committee

## Emerging Uses Subgroup Meeting 2, Phase 3

Date and Time: Tuesday, May 21, 2019, 4:00 – 6:30 PM

Location: Webb Municipal Building, Room 4.I.4

---

### Attendees

#### ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

James Ronzcy  
Rachel Keeven  
Cole Chandler  
Robert Ramirez  
Joel Noble  
Loretta Koehler  
Polly Kyle  
Don Elliott  
Loretta Koehler

#### DENVER STAFF MEMBERS

Andrew Webb  
Kyle Dalton  
Edson Ibanez  
Will Lindsey  
Tina Axelrad

#### FACILITATOR

Meagan Picard

### Meeting Summary

#### 1) WELCOME AND CHECK-IN; MEETING AGENDA, OBJECTIVES AND HOUSEKEEPING

Meagan Picard welcomed everyone, shared the meeting agenda and noted that this is a slightly different kind of meeting (fast-tracking proposal for tiny house village regulations for temporary use out of rest of group living zoning Code update) but will still strive for consensus. Participants checked in, sharing hopes for this meeting:

- Get it all done
- Set replicable standards that other communities can emulate
- Potential to help a lot of people experiencing homelessness
- Identifying major concerns/fatal flaws for CM Kniech
- Clear thinking about different ways this use can manifest
- Make progress for this type of use (more than what we already have)
- General feedback, especially related to the notification requirements
- Affirmation on staff proposal

- Understanding the “edges” – understanding which situations are and are not included
- Where will THV be allowed? How will this impact communities?

## 2) MEETING GOAL AND PROJECT UPDATES

Goal: Gather feedback – preferably consensus – on refined proposal for DZC regulations on Temporary Detached SRO Communities (TDSROC), previously referred to as tiny house/home villages.

Polly shared that this proposal is being fast-tracked in order to address the urgent need to provide shelter/housing options for people experiencing homelessness. She noted that feedback from this meeting and other community members in attendance at June 5 public meeting will be incorporated into the proposal.

Andrew explained that fast-tracking this item requires a break in the committee process and shared the updated schedule.

## 3) REVIEW OF COMMITTEE’S INITIAL INPUT FROM MARCH MEETING AND HOW INTEGRATED INTO THE PROPOSAL

- No vehicle or bicycle parking requirement included in proposal, though need for bicycle parking has come up in internal discussion. Committee members indicated that it shouldn’t be required but should be encouraged and may be possible as a shared public benefit.
- Minimum storage not required in unit, but outdoor storage will be regulated to minimize impacts (i.e. no storage in setback or separation areas. No committee concerns expressed.
- Common use structure (if more than storage or bathrooms) would be required to have an entry feature if within 20 feet of the primary street. A committee member indicated that it would be desirable to have street-facing entry feature, especially in areas that are single and two unit where there might be concerns about being “good” neighbors.
- Temporary is up to maximum of four years. This is based on:
  - Up to 360 days the structures can be truly temporary (no connections to utilities, no foundations, etc.)
  - More than 360 days requires review by Building & Fire to allow for additional tenancy along with connection to utilities.
  - Initial permit for two years and can be renewed for another two.

This issue was explored for what is and is not included:

- Could individual residents have a single TDSROC on their property? Could a single TDSROC be used as a shed on private property? It would have to be on foundations and permitted as an accessory structure as defined by the DZC.
- Public outreach/input: typical ZPIN process which comes up more frequently for more traditional uses didn’t seem appropriate for an entirely new use which will require some trial and error.

A question was also raised about how large the use will be. This has not been defined yet. It was noted that it will be important to know if there are any limits on size of the use for both temporary and permanent uses.

#### 4) UPDATED PROPOSAL DETAILS – SECTION BY SECTION REVIEW

##### a) Use Definition – changes recommended without disagreement:

- The group explored whether or not the common building needed to be temporary and if certain facilities that are not temporary/relocatable (i.e. churches, homes, etc.) would be excluded. Staff will explore effects of calling it relocatable or simply removing the modifier instead. This definition is intended to provide a “break” for the structure rather than specifying that the common building must be temporary.
- It was suggested – without disagreement – that “multiple” should be changed to “more than one”.
- The group explored removing the final sentence of the definition that describes “previously homeless persons”. *What if someone wanted to create these for populations who weren’t previously homeless but are seeking alternative housing for safety reasons (such as women currently in abusive homes), or for people who are imminently vulnerable to losing their existing housing?* Suggestions that the definition be expanded to include other at-risk populations in addition to people who are currently experiencing homelessness will be shared with CM Kniech. Through this and a later discussion when exploring whether or not this could be addressed in the operational plan, the group seemed to coalesce around the idea of incorporating a purpose and intent statement at the beginning

##### b) Applicant Requirements – changes recommended without disagreement:

- No changes recommended, except potentially to regarding the non-profit requirement, which could be difficult to administer. Determination should be based on mission, goals, and statement of intent instead of profit status.
- Tina also said that the income restriction is also difficult to administer/enforce.

##### c) Operation Plan requirements – changes recommended with some dissent:

- The conversation continued about the intent and purpose of the operation. The group appeared to agree that this should be included in the DZC definition, as noted above, but two members had concerns about the population served. While some committee members agreed that the purpose is related to an emergency situation around people experiencing of imminently vulnerable to experiencing homelessness.
- The operation plan should be consistent with the intended use, and it should be complete, thorough, consistent (criteria for review of all items listed), and amendments must be approved by the city.
- The emergency contact component should be clarified to explain that it will be provided to the city and the public.
- Clarify that it is not expected that the operator will provide transportation but that the operational plan should identify how resident transportation is expected.

##### d) Zoning and Building Requirements – changes recommended without disagreement:

- The requirements should address short-term rentals in some way to prevent lodging use. This could include identifying that tenancy must be 30 days or more.
- Some operators may want to have a staff person in residence on site, so this should be addressed. This should be addressed above in the operation plan.
- Consider specifying if a bedroom can be included in the common structure. It was noted that this could be used for a staff person.

- Entry features were discussed, with Kyle noting that the requirement as written (“within 20 feet”) would mean that no entry feature would be required in lower density zones. If this is not desirable, “20 feet” should be changed. No clear direction was given on this point.
- e) Permitted Zone Districts – changes recommended without disagreement:
- Discussion focused on the civic uses in SU, TU and RH zone districts and noted that this opens a lot of options while still fitting within the character of the neighborhoods, making it likely more acceptable for neighbors. It was suggested that schools, old code PUDs and detention facilities be removed from the list.
- f) Community Information Meeting – changes recommended without disagreement:
- The group discussed whether or not the City can really source and maintain tenant address data for notification, and Andrew noted that several peer cities do require tenant notification in addition to owners. Staff is working on learning from other cities and resources at Adams County to determine how to obtain the unit data for apartments. It was suggested at the City consider a “best effort” approach if City is unable to get the data.
  - There should be an official record that includes comments from individuals who attended the community meeting and other comments made to the operator. The City does not have a role in this.
  - This approach helps to provide an opportunity for under-represented voices to comment on the project.
  - The group likes that this is done prior to application.
  - One participant asked what happens if things go horribly wrong at the site, such as a pattern of law enforcement activity. It was suggested that this should be included in the operation plan, and it should be clear about what this means. One person asked if the City could pursue a nuisance property abatement approach, and staff said yes but noted that a homeowner wouldn’t be asked to leave their home if police were called to their home frequently.

#### 5) GRATITUDE, NEXT STEPS AND CLOSE

The meeting was brought to close at 6:35 pm, after checking on how well we achieved the hopes identified at the beginning of the meeting. All but two hopes achieved: 1) didn’t get *everything* done (more work to do on permanent use and in addressing concerns about missing an opportunity to adjust these regulations to allow more people to use temporary regulations as interim step for using this as co-housing/intentional community arrangements) and 2) need to do more to clarify the “edges” (desire expressed to see sketch of what is and is not included for temporary use and possibilities for permanent use).