

Group Living Advisory Committee

Shelter Subgroup Meeting 3, Phase 3

Date and Time: Tuesday, December 10, 2019, 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM

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

Attendees

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

John Hayden
Chris Conner, HOST
Michael Henry
Terese Howard
Laura Rossbert
Terrell Curtis
Polly Kyle

DENVER STAFF MEMBERS

Andrew Webb
Kyle Dalton
Edson Ibanez
Tina Axelrad
Will Lindsey
James Ginsburg, HOST
Jennifer Biess, HOST

FACILITATOR

Meagan Picard

Meeting Summary

1) MEETING AGENDA, OBJECTIVES AND HOUSEKEEPING

Meagan Picard welcomed everyone and invited a quick round of introductions because there were new people in the room (staff from Denver Department of Housing Stability, or HOST). She shared the meeting goals and agenda and reminded everyone of the agreements and decision-making criteria. The primary goal of the meeting was to either affirm or suggested changes to staff's recommended approach to updating residential care and new community care use definitions and limitations in the DZC.

2) PROJECT UPDATES

Andrew shared the updated project timeline, with committee process ending in early 2020 with a series of public meetings and the public adoption process beginning after that. He also shared project accomplishments to date, including decisions made for addressing committee-identified problems and related accomplishments including an overhaul of residential permit data and the

temporary tiny home village amendment to the DZC with new Community Information Meeting process.

A committee member suggested that the city hold more than one large open house and suggested four separate meetings for better access around the city.

3) SHELTER BACKGROUND AND RECENT PROGRESS

Andrew reminded everyone of the recommendations made by the shelter group, including:

- Update terms to “guests” and “shelters”;
- 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;
- Clarify that multiple shelter or other residential use types are permitted on a single zone lot; and
- Require pre-application Community Information Meeting for all emergency shelter uses to educate and provide opportunity for relationships with neighborhoods

He then reminded everyone that the group last recommended that staff gather input from shelter providers of all types and sizes regarding staff recommendations made at that meeting, and he shared feedback results. Committee members were impressed with the amount of outreach done since the group’s last meeting in March. They also observed the following:

- Residential Shelter model holds a lot of promise for addressing on-the-street impacts of Shelters as well as providing better on-site services to guests.
- Common theme seems to be lack of funding for facilities.

Some discussion ensued about the last comment and whether the city is helping with funding. Staff shared that the city is deeply invested in all housing opportunities and that current funding has allowed the first Residential Shelter model at VOA Women’s Shelter. This is part of efforts to work towards a permanent solution for addressing homelessness.

4) REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED UPDATES TO RESIDENTIAL CARE USES

Andrew shared an overview and details of the staff proposal. Discussion proceeded around a few key issues:

- **Temporary shelter population cap:** Clarified that there is no limit to the number of people that may be sheltered on a temporary basis
- **Residential shelter concept:** Neighborhood and provider representatives both supported this option, as it is better for both guests and neighborhoods. Interest in incentivizing this use was expressed.
- **Residential shelter staffing:** Neighborhood representatives wanted to know that there will be professional staff available at all times, and providers warned against dictating who can and cannot be hired as staff, since it can be beneficial in various ways to hire residents. HOST staff suggested that a reasonable expectation could be set up that a professional staff person is available to supervise guest volunteers/staffing.
- **Distinction between Community Care and Residential Care:** Committee members liked the distinction because public perception is that shelter and community corrections are more dangerous, and they have been identified as having larger external impacts than residential uses. One member also wondered if there is any conflict between the extent

to which shelters can provide oversight for parolees, but participants didn't seem to think so.

- **Definition of medium and large shelters:** It was noted that the group had suggested size distinctions based on how populations can be served best. There was concern that these definitions would result in concentration of medium size shelters in the same stressed communities and that "medium" was really large. This prompted a look at the spacing and density requirements.
- **Spacing and density:** Staff contended that the new requirements would prevent more concentration in areas of concentration now, and some committee members wanted to see how it works more clearly. It was agreed that staff will arrange a separate meeting with John, Michael and Joel to work through a mapping analysis, looking specifically at impacts at Crossroads, Park & Lawrence and 4330 East 48th. If not satisfied with the results of that analysis, another subcommittee meeting may be scheduled. If not, the proposal will be forwarded to the full committee.
- **Impact on non-compliant/non-conforming uses now:**

The group then reviewed the staff's analysis of the overall proposal based on decision-making criteria.

- Concern about equity was expressed due to potential concentration. This will be included in the mapping analysis meeting.
- A copy of the Community Information Meeting section of the DZC was requested.
- The group felt that a CIM would be unnecessary for small/temporary shelters. They suggested that CIMs would still be helpful for small community corrections, since it can serve as an educational and relationship-building opportunity for the community. A suggestion was made that it be a suggested but not required.

5) GRATITUDE, NEXT STEPS AND CLOSE

Andrew shared next steps, including reviewing this same proposal with community corrections and transitional/special care subgroups, combining the refined proposal with the Household definition and other proposals and reviewing with the full GLAC in January before sharing with the public. The meeting was brought to close at about 1:00 p.m.