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### Meeting Agenda - 12/10/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome, agenda review, today’s meeting goals</td>
<td>11:00 – 11:05 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project overview and anticipated timeline</td>
<td>11:05 – 11:15 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Subgroup: Recap, solution progress to-date and provider feedback</td>
<td>11:05 – 11:20 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of Proposed Approach</td>
<td>11:20 – 11:45 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Proposed Approach</td>
<td>11:45 – 12:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap Up and Next Steps</td>
<td>12:50 – 1:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meeting Goal:

- Review proposed Zoning Code updates and confirm subgroup recommendation
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Group Living Project Overview

Timeline + Schedule

- Kickoff: March 2018
- Problem Identification: April – August 2018
- Solutions Development: Oct 2018–present
- Final Strategy Proposals and public outreach:
  - Q1 2020
- Public adoption process:
  - Q2 2020 (Includes Planning Board public hearing, LUTI Committee, City Council public hearing and four notification periods, see slide 9)

Key Issues

- Zoning limits housing for vulnerable populations
- Outdated rules don't acknowledge evolution of residential uses
- Widely varying permit and notification requirements lack predictability
- Current spacing and density requirements have unintended consequences

About the Project

- Advisory Committee: 48 members (clients, providers, RNO reps, designers, etc.)
- Project Website: www.denvergov.org/groupliving
- Relevant Code Sections:
  - Primary Residential Use Definitions (Sec. 11.12-2)
  - Residential Use Limitations (Div. 11.2)
  - Use Tables (by Neighborhood Context)
Solutions Development
12 meetings

Problem Statements
27 meetings + site visits

Project Kickoff
March 2018

Public Open House
August 2018

Public Outreach
Review final strategies and formal zoning code amendments

Project on hold
Temporary Tiny Home Villages

Implementation

Timeline

2018

2019

2020

Public Adoption
Process

Solutions Development Continued
Project Progress to date

Phases I and II (setup and problem identification)

• Identified and invited advisory committee
• More than 35 facilitated meetings, site visits and other events (all open to the public)
• Development of clear problem statements identifying issues with code
• Open House to explain code issues to public
• Extensive peer city/best practices research to build understanding of how these uses are regulated elsewhere and how those regulations are evolving
• Project team overhaul of residential permit data
  o Collaboration with Neighborhood Inspection Services to ground-check status of permitted uses
  o Updated Residential Care map
Phase III Solutions Development

- Committee consensus on:
  - Updated Terminology (e.g. "Shelter for the Homeless" amendment to "Shelter")
  - Changes to parking regulations for Assisted Living
  - Temporary Tiny Home Village zoning regulations
- Complete DZC amendment package for Temporary Tiny Home Villages
  - New pre-application Community Information Meeting requirement developed
  - Expanded stakeholder outreach enabled by acquisition and setup of rental unit mailing address data
- Draft recommendations and committee consensus in development (pending additional stakeholder outreach, etc.) on:
  - Overhauled Shelter types breakdown, permitted zone districts
  - New permitted zone districts, revised buffers for Community Corrections
  - Definition of Household
Progress toward final strategies (early December, 2019)

Group Living Uses
- Housing for 55+ (Assisted Living, etc.)
- Community Corrections Uses
- Shelter Uses
- Transitional/Special Care Uses
- Emerging/Artist/DIY Residential Uses

Overarching Issues
- Household Definition
- Residential Care Spacing and Density

Progress since 11/19
### Anticipated Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Requirement/Timing/Notes</th>
<th>Tentative Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Final Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential Care Spacing and Density</td>
<td>1.5 months</td>
<td>Complete by mid-January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shelter types and spacing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Corrections zone districts, buffers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permanent Tiny Home Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DIY Artist housing/flex spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transitional/Special Care housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Final Strategy Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Complete by mid-February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Office Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to Public Input</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>Throughout February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redline Amendment Public Review Draft</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Begin early February, Complete by Feb 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Requirement/Timing/Notes</td>
<td>Tentative Date(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release public review draft of proposed changes</td>
<td>30 days prior to Planning Board Public Hearing</td>
<td>Feb 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required notice of Planning Board Public Hearing</td>
<td>Required written notification 15 days prior to Planning Board Public Hearing (DZC 12.2.2.3, 12.3.4.4.A.2)</td>
<td>March 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board Public Hearing</td>
<td>Text amendments are required to go before Planning Board prior to submitting to council per DZC 12.4.11.3.E, 12.2.2.3 and DRMC 12-45</td>
<td>March 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public notice of LUTI Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Required written notification 10 business days prior to LUTI Meeting per DRMC 12-96</td>
<td>April 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUTI Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Text amendments are required to go before the LUTI Committee of City Council per DZC 12.4.11.3.F</td>
<td>April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council First Reading of the ordinance</td>
<td>Required to set the date for the public hearing per Charter 3.3.5(F), DRMC 13-11</td>
<td>May 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Public Hearing</td>
<td>Required per 12.4.11.3(G) and City Charter 3.2.9</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Effective</td>
<td>Mayor signs ordinance and Clerk publishes Thursday after the hearing (Charter Sec 3.3.5.G)</td>
<td>June 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shelter: 
Background and Recent Progress
Problem Statements and Confirmed solutions from March 2019

1. The specific use type name of "Shelter for the Homeless" needs to be updated.
   • 12/11/18 Subgroup Recommendation: change to “Shelter”

2. The terms "bed" and "Residents" are used inconsistently, and the use of "beds" as a measure of facility size does not reflect best practices for limiting the size of shelters
   • 12/11/18 Subgroup Recommendation: change to “guests”
Problem Statements and proposed solutions discussed in March 2019

Problem 3: Definitions of shelter types are confusing, have ineffective and inequitable public involvement procedures, and make it difficult to combine a continuum of residential and program options in one facility.

- **Recommended Approaches: Shelter Types**
  - Consolidate shelter types to three categories in the code: Large, Medium, Small/Seasonal
  - Allow residential shelters that operate 24-hours per day, provide assigned beds, storage and additional care

- **Recommended Approaches: Continuum of uses**
  - Clarify that multiple shelter or other residential use types are permitted on a single zone lot.

- **Recommended Approaches: public involvement:**
  - Require pre-application Community Information Meeting for all emergency shelter uses to educate and provide opportunity for relationships with neighborhoods
Problem 4: Current limitations on spacing, density and size for shelters are difficult to administer and have unintended consequences, including overreliance on emergency determinations to expand existing facilities and continued concentration of legacy facilities in certain neighborhoods.

**Recommended Approaches:**

- Consolidate Shelter Types into 3 categories in the code: Large, Medium, Small/Seasonal
- Update current spacing, density and council district “bed limits” to measurements that relate clearly to the geography, neighborhoods and varying densities of the city, and which don’t change regularly (e.g. council districts)
- Replace Council District "bed limit" with new density limit for large shelters
- Increase zoning code limits on maximum size of large shelters to 500 guests to address demand and reduce the need for emergency declarations.

Problem 5: City Council districts are the wrong geographic units for regulating the maximum number of beds for shelters as permanent, primary uses

**Recommended Approaches**

- Consolidate Shelter Types into 3 categories in the code: Large, Medium, Small/Seasonal
- Retain current Large Residential Care spacing requirement for Large and Medium Shelters
- Replace Council District "bed limit" with new density limit for large shelters
March Subgroup meeting review

- **Staff proposed a reworked and consolidated system of shelter types, with a focus on:**
  - Expanding flexible allowance for small and/or temporary shelters to providers that are not religious assembly uses (nonprofits, etc.)
  - Adding a population cap for temporary shelters (proposed to be 100 people, currently unlimited for religious assembly uses)
  - Expanding the permitted population in large, permanent shelters from the current 200 guests, acknowledging the need for capacity and increasing transparency by reducing repeated emergency declarations.
  - Incentivizing medium-sized permanent shelters (<100 guests)

- **Subgroup members requested staff seek input on proposals and key questions from shelter providers of all types and sizes (see next slide)**

- **Subgroup members requested that emergency declarations and bed counts for existing shelters be examined and updated on Residential Care Facility map.**
  - Corrections to Crossroads and Delores Project locations made in April 2019

- **Full summary of March 12 meeting:**
  [https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/646/documents/Zoning/text_amendments/Group_Living/Group_living_Shelter_subgroup_meeting6_summary.pdf](https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/646/documents/Zoning/text_amendments/Group_Living/Group_living_Shelter_subgroup_meeting6_summary.pdf)
Questions that the Group Living team asked providers

Religious Assembly uses vs. other providers:

Code currently incentivizes small (8 or fewer guests) or temporary (120 days or fewer) for shelters operated by a religious assembly use.
• Proposal would extend that incentive to all operators. Do small/temporary shelters work for provider business models?

Currently, only religious assembly uses can operate temporary shelters with no population cap. This proposal would extend incentives to other operators (non-profits, etc.), but cap populations for all uses at 50 to 100 guests.
• Would providers implement this concept?
• Would adding a guest cap impact current religious assembly temporary shelter uses?

Permanent Shelter population cap:

Currently the code only permits up to 200 guests, with some exceptions for facilities open as of January 2005. This results in repeated emergency declarations to exceed population caps, and encourages older, nonconforming facilities to remain because they are able to serve larger numbers of guests.
• Are limitations on the number of guests served in a permanent shelter necessary? If so, is there an ideal number recommended by operators?

Additional Questions:
• Shelter uses are currently permitted in many zone districts, especially along commercial corridors like Colorado, Colfax, Evans and Federal. What keeps providers from opening shelter uses in those areas?
• What do you as providers, and your clients, look for in locating a shelter?
  o Transit/job access?
  o Nearby service providers?
Feedback received

Homeless Leadership Council
- April 19, 2019
- Volunteers of America, 2660 Larimer

Representatives from:
- Catholic Charities of Denver
- Colorado Coalition for the Homeless
- The Delores Project
- Denver Rescue Mission
- The Gathering Place
- St. Francis Center
- The Salvation Army
- Urban Peak
- Volunteers of America

What we learned:
- Some nonprofits or other organizations might be interested in expansion of small shelter allowance currently provided to religious assemblies
- Concern that any size limitations or thresholds in code are arbitrary, decisions made based on provider resources.
- Ensure continuum of services can be provided on a single site/campus; clarify spacing issues
- Providers face budgetary challenges to expansion, no current plans for new facilities.
- Medium sized shelter type (≤ 100) would have similar startup and management cost to larger facility, would not be worth investment at that size.
Feedback received cont.

Religious assembly/faith-based shelter providers
• July 29, 2019
• Wellington Webb Municipal Building

Representatives from:
• Family Promise of Greater Denver
• Womens Homelessness Initiative

What we learned:
• Small shelter providers supported the idea of expanding the zoning/process incentives to organizations that are not religious assemblies
• Current program works very well for these organizations (rotating network of churches providing shelter on a given night), team was cautioned not to make changes that could threaten it.
• Concern about requiring permits – ads additional technical requirement/process with which organizations don't have expertise
• Concern that zoning permit requirement could trigger building fire inspection/review and costly updates.
• Most use the temporary allowance (rather than small permanent ≤ 8 allowance)
• Temporary shelter operators using this allowance in the code shelter fairly small groups, not close to 100, even though there is not currently a limit
Feedback received cont.

Large Shelter Providers
• August 20, 2019
• Wellington Webb Municipal Building

Representatives from:
• Denver Rescue Mission
• Salvation Army Crossroads Center
• Urban Peak
• Catholic Charities

What we learned:
• Large shelter providers/operators did not object to proposals, but highlighted lack of funding within their organizations for expansion or new facilities
• Location decisions driven by costs, proximity to other services, provider networks and transit.
• No plans for changes to existing facilities. Ensure protections for "grandfathered" uses remain.
• Shelter operators' main goal is to house people. Bed count limits by facility or geography complicate this by requiring emergency declarations, etc.
Denver Department of Housing Stability (HOST)

- Multiple meetings with HOST representatives

What we learned:

- Key focus is housing people. Current limits on size of new shelters and expansion of existing shelters, including during emergencies, serves to complicate this work. Shelter sizes should be determined, where appropriate, by occupancy limits related to fire and life safety, rather than zoning.

- City is working with providers to expand residential shelters, where guests have assigned beds, 24-hour access and storage for belongings, which will help reduce external impacts like queuing. Emerging service models will have more residential component, continuum of housing on-site.

- Spacing/density of shelters should be context-sensitive – less spacing in dense areas where shelters would comprise a small proportion of total area residents.
Summary of Proposed Update to Residential Care Regulations
And Impact on Shelter Uses
Summary of Proposal

- Consolidate community corrections and emergency shelter uses into new use category: **Community Care**
  - Regulate by size and intensity, not by population types
  - Highest-intensity overnight and institutional care uses

- Regulate by size and intensity, rather than by specific populations
  - Small/seasonal (1-8 guests)
    - Preserve small/seasonal emergency shelter as accessory use to religious assembly uses
  - Medium (9-200 guests)
  - Large (201-500 guests)
  - 10-day emergency expansion

- Establish standardized use limitations
  - 600’/1,200’ (appr. 1.5 to 3-block) spacing between Large and Medium (depending on intensity of applicable zone district)
  - 1-mile radius density limits for Large
  - 1,200 feet radius density limits for Small
  - Pre-application Community Information Meeting (CIM) required for Large, Medium and Small (Primary Use Only) Community Care Uses.
How this proposal addresses GLAC Shelter Problem Statements

Problem 1: The terms “beds” and “residents” are used inconsistently, and the use of “beds” as a measure of facility size does not reflect best practices for limiting the size of shelters.
➢ This proposal establishes facility capacity in terms of “guests”

Problem 2: Definitions of shelter types are confusing, have ineffective and inequitable public involvement procedures, and make it difficult to combine a continuum of shelter to housing options in one facility.
➢ This proposal consolidates emergency shelter uses into three categories based on capacity; standardizes and clarifies outreach requirements and allows a continuum of service types on a single zone lot in several ways.

Problem 3: Current limitations on spacing, density, and size for shelters are difficult to administer and have unintended consequences, including overreliance on emergency determinations to expand existing facilities and continued concentration of legacy facilities in certain neighborhoods.
➢ This proposal reduces spacing and density requirements and ties them to city geographic patterns and density, expands zoning capacity limits to allow shelter providers to use facilities to the occupancy permitted by fire codes, and incentivizes the establishment of smaller, more distributed facilities and residential (24-hr) shelter by reducing barriers to those types of shelters.

Problem 4: City Council districts are the wrong geographic units for regulating the maximum number of beds for shelters as permanent, primary uses.
➢ This proposal would replace the current council district geography for density with a simpler straight-line radius requirement that would not be impacted by changes to council district or other boundaries.
Proposed Approach
for consolidating and simplifying Residential Care types and use limitations

DRAFT Language for GLAC Review
CURRENT “org-chart” breakdown of defined Group Living Uses

- Group Living In DZC Residential Uses
  - Residential Care
    - Large
      - Shelter for the Homeless (Any Size)
      - Community Corrections (Any Size)
      - Special Care (9+)
    - Small
      - Transitional Housing
      - Assisted Living (≤8)
      - Special Care (≤8)
  - Non-care Group Living uses
    - Assisted Living 9+
    - Rooming and Boarding
    - Assisted Living 9+
    - Nursing/Hospice
    - Housing for 55+
    - Student Housing

Current Defined uses
- Large
- Small
- Residential Care
Current Zoning Regulations: Use-specific and overlapping use limitations in Zoning Code

Use Limitations applicable to all large residential care:

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

Shelter for the Homeless (Any Size)

- 500 feet from a school
- 950 beds/CC District
- Max 200 beds for new facilities
- Variety of process requirements, including committee

Community Corrections (Any Size)

- 1,500 feet from residential zone district
- 1,500 feet from a school
- Max 40-120 residents
- Very few permitted zone districts

Special Care (9+)

Large Residential Care
Proposed Consolidation of defined Residential Care Uses

- Residential Care
  - Large
  - Emergency (overnight) Shelter
  - Community Corrections
  - Special Care
    - Transitional Housing
    - Assisted Living
    - Special Care
  - Nursing/Hospice

- Community Care Facility
  - Large 201-500
  - Medium 9-200
  - Small/Seasonal

- Residential Care Facility
  - Large 41+
  - Medium 9-40
  - Small ≤8

For future, separate discussion

Group Living In D2C Residential Uses

Non-care Group Living uses

DRAFT Language for GLAC Review
Community and Residential Care Details

Community Care Facility

- Moves to **Civic/Public uses** section of Zoning Code
- Definition highlights:
  - Distinguished by non-residential (e.g., emergency shelters not open 24 hrs) or institutional (e.g., community corrections) uses
  - Highest-intensity residential/overnight uses
  - **Staffed at all hours of occupancy**
  - Allows other similar uses as they evolve
  - Large facilities required to have formal relationship with city or state government
- Community Information Meeting required for all (except Small/Temp Community Care as Accessory to Religious Assembly Use)
- Standardized process and use limitations (e.g., spacing and density requirements) for all uses in category.

Residential Care Facility

- Stays in **Residential Uses** of Zoning Code
- Definition Highlights
  - Lower-intensity residential uses
  - Includes nursing, hospice, assisted living
  - Care provided by on-site staff (custodial, medical, etc.)
  - Occupancy is 24-hours
  - Allows residential shelters (24-hr operation, assigned beds, storage, etc.)
  - Allows similar lower-intensity residential care uses as they evolve
- Community Information Meeting required for Medium in low-intensity zone districts
- Standardized process and limitations (e.g., spacing and density requirements) for all uses in category.
Conceptual new org-chart breakdown for current Residential Care uses

Community Care
- In Public/Civic Uses
  - Large 201-500
  - Medium 9-200
  - Small/Seasonal

Group Living
- In DZC Residential Uses
  - Residential
    - Large 41+
    - Medium 9-40
    - Small \(\leq 8\)
  - Non-care Group Living uses

For future, separate discussion

DRAFT Language for INTERNAL Review
### Potential advantages of this approach

- Shifts from regulating by population in facilities toward more equitable approach of regulating by size and intensity

- No specific list of use types (focus on size, intensity) allows flexibility, evolution of uses

- Provides additional flexibility for Community Corrections (small facilities, unique programs, etc.) requested by stakeholders,

- Allows additional flexibility for 24-hour residential shelters (as Residential Care uses).

- Applicant-led Community Information Meeting requirement for most uses allows opportunity for providers/applicants to give details to community, begin relationship, potentially enter into non-city agreements (i.e. good neighbor agreement), fulfills GLAC recommendation to educate community on individual projects

- Addresses many Group Living Advisory Committee problem statements

- Moves high-intensity (shelter, community corrections) uses to Civic/Public uses, per staff recommendations

- Establishes standardized and consistent process, use limitations, etc.

---

**Diagram:**

- **Community Care**
  - In Public/Civic Uses
  - Large: 201-500
  - Medium: 9-300
  - Small/Seasonal

- **Group Living**
  - In DZO Residential Uses
  - Large: 11+
  - Medium: 9-40
  - Small: 8

---

**DRAFT Language for GLAC Review**

30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Permitted Districts</th>
<th>Spacing and Buffers</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community Care Large     | • Zoning Permit (ZP) with pre-application Community Information Meeting (CIM) | • Permitted in all zone districts, except the SU, TU, RH, E-MU-2.5, MS/MX-2x, MS/MX-2, MX-2A, CMP-ENT, OS-B, OS-A and OS-C zone districts. | • 1,200 feet between any Large or Medium Community Care facilities and a subject site in MU, RO and RX districts  
• 600 feet between any Large or Medium Community Care Facility and a subject site in CC, MS, MX (8 stories or less) zone districts.  
• No spacing required in D, I-A, I-B and MX 12, 16 and 20 zone districts.  
• Possible 500-foot buffer for Community Corrections uses in this category  
• Additional Community or Residential Care uses permitted on same zone lot.  
  o Cumulative maximum guests: 500 | • No more than three Large or Medium Community Care within a one-mile radius  
• Additional Community or Residential Care uses permitted on same zone lot.  
  o Cumulative maximum guests: 500 |
| Community Care Medium    | • ZP with CIM                                    | • Permitted in all zone districts, except the SU, TU, RH, E-MU-2.5, MS/MX-2x, MS/MX-2, MX-2A, CMP-ENT, OS-B, OS-A and OS-C zone districts. | • 1,200 feet between any Large or Medium Community Care facilities and a subject site in MU, RO and RX districts  
• 600 feet between any Large or Medium Community Care Facility and a subject site in CC, MS, MX (8 stories or less) zone districts.  
• No spacing required in D, I-A, I-B and MX 12, 16 and 20 zone districts.  
• Possible 500-foot buffer for Community Corrections uses in this category  
• Additional Residential Care uses permitted on same zone lot.  
  o Cumulative maximum guests: 200 | • None |

DRAFT Language for GLAC Review
## Proposed Permitted Zone Districts & Use Limitations: Community Care Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Permitted Districts</th>
<th>Spacing and Buffers</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Community Care Small/Seasonal** | • ZP with CIM | • All except OS-B, OS-A and OS-C  
• Same as current small shelter | • None | • No more than three Small Community or Residential Care Facilities within a 1,200’ radius of a subject site in SU, TU, RH zone districts only. |
| • Permanent Small  
  o 8 or fewer guests  
  o A facility intended to house up to 8 non-paroled individuals under correctional supervision shall have a formal, written agreement with the Denver Manager of Safety | | | |
| • Permanent Seasonal  
  o Up to 100 guests  
  o Operation up to 130 days/year | | | |
| **Community Care Emergency Shelter as Accessory to a Religious Assembly Use** | • No ZP when accessory to Religious Assembly Use | • All except OS-B, OS-A and OS-C  
• Same as current small shelter, preserves existing allowance for small shelters operated by religious assembly uses | • None | • None |
| • Permanent Small  
  o 8 or fewer guests  
  o Permanent Seasonal  
  o Up to 100 guests  
  o Operation up to 130 days/year | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Permitted Districts</th>
<th>Spacing</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Care Large</strong></td>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>• Permitted in all zone districts, except the SU, TU, RH, MU (2.5, 3, 5, 8), RO, MS/MX-2x, MS/MX-2, MX-2A, CMP-ENT, OS-B, OS-A and OS-C zone districts.</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 41 – unlimited guests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes uses like current Assisted Living, Hospice/Nursing, Transitional Housing, Special Care uses; residential shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 10-day expansion permitted during emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Care Use Medium</strong></td>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>• Permitted in all zone districts, except the OS-B, OS-A and OS-C zone districts.</td>
<td>• 1,200 feet between facilities in SU, TU, RH only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZP with CIM in SU, TU, RH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 9 – 40 guests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 10-day expansion permitted during emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Type</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Permitted Districts</td>
<td>Spacing and Buffers</td>
<td>Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care Small</td>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>• Permitted in all zone districts, except OS-B, OS-A and OS-C</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• No more than three Small Community or Residential Care Facilities within a 1,200’ radius of a subject site in SU, TU, RH zone districts only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8 or fewer guests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Community Care Emergency Shelter as Accessory to a Residential Care Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Permitted for Medium and Large Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of beds offered for emergency (overnight) shelter may not exceed more than 20% of the total guests served. To provide more than this amount of emergency/overnight shelter, refer to Community Care uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No ZP when accessory to Large or Medium Residential Care Facility</td>
<td>• NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total guests cumulatively served by primary and accessory use may not exceed the Medium or Large maximum guest threshold, as applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Permitted accessory to Large or Medium Residential Care Facility, in districts where those uses are permitted.</td>
<td>• NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Type</td>
<td>Permitted in all zone districts</td>
<td>Permitted only in higher-intensity zone districts</td>
<td>Density 3 within 1 mile radius</td>
<td>1200’ spacing all districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care Small/Seasonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Residential Care Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Residential Care Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Residential Care Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLAC 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
Application of 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)

   This proposal implements many adopted plan policies for expanding affordable, equitable and flexible housing options, especially for Denver’s most vulnerable populations, as set forth in Blueprint Denver, Housing an Inclusive Denver, etc.

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

   This proposal is equitable in that it moves away from regulating and excluding residential uses by population type, incentivizes smaller, more distributed facilities and increases opportunities for housing the city’s most vulnerable residents. It provides additional flexibility for providers to offer affordable and attainable options. It limits unintended consequences by establishing clear, predictable use limitations and criteria and by requiring pre-application community meetings for the highest-intensity uses to enable relationship-building between providers and neighbors.
This proposal has been developed in close collaboration with review and provider agencies to ensure it would establish clear and predictable regulations that are enforceable and consistent. It is consistent with relevant city, state and federal regulations as it provides the flexibility for uses to operate per those regulations where they apply.

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
Details and proposal background

600/1,200-foot spacing standard
• Replaces current 2,000' spacing requirement
• Distance based on length of typical Denver blocks (1.5 block spacing in mid-intensity districts, 3 in lowest-intensity districts)
• Common peer city spacing approach (LA, Austin, etc.)
• Addresses concentration of facilities and services in neighborhoods, per multiple problem statements

1-mile density standard (3 within radius, including subject site)
• Replaces current Council District bed count limit
• Based generally on size of typical Denver neighborhoods (proposed instead of trying to identify a specific geography like statistical neighborhood boundary, council district, etc.)
• Prevents overconcentration of large facilities in neighborhoods
• Addresses multiple problem statements regarding ineffectiveness of current Council District system, overconcentration, etc.

1,200-foot density standard (3 within radius, including subject site)
• Replaces current 4,000' density requirements
• Based on length of 3 typical Denver blocks
• Provides specific standard for Small Res Care, replaces current vague "avoid institutionalization" language per problem statements.
• Proposed for lower-intensity uses, in lower-intensity residential districts

Community Information Meeting:
• New pre-application public meeting requirement
• Includes expanded outreach, including mailed outreach to renters, community organizations that are not officially Registered Neighborhood Organizations.
• Provides opportunity for operators to begin relationship with community, education on uses and populations served.
• Addresses multiple problem statements regarding unclear or inequitable community involvement processes
Illustration of 1-mile density requirements

Scale is approximate

DRAFT Language for GLAC Review
Illustration of 1200' Density/1200' Spacing Requirements
Scale is approximate

DRAFT Language for GLAC Review
Next Steps

• Review with Community Corrections and Special/Transitional Care subgroups

• Combine with Household definition and other proposals

• Review with full GLAC (January)

• Public Outreach