

/O=COS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=

From: JoAnne Stone <davidjoannebrowning@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 7:44 PM
To: Sunderlin, Katie
Subject: Warming Shelter Lighting

Hello Katie,

We met tonight at the Warming Shelter meeting.

I'm writing in concern for the poor lighting on both sides of Weber in front of the proposed Shelter. In the past I have seen the homeless crossing anywhere along Weber to reach the Shelter. This presents a dangerous situation at night where they can't early be seen. Can the city add lighting to improve this situation?

Thank you,
David

Sent from my iPad

From: Lynette Sabin <lyn.sabinchiro@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 27, 2017 9:47 AM
To: Lobato, Elena; Tefertiller, Ryan
Subject: warming shelter

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to share my thoughts about the proposed Salvation Army warming shelter. It is my understanding that this is on the agenda for the meeting on January 3, 2018. I will be unable to attend as that time is during the operating hours of our business.

First of all, I do understand that there is a great need for a warm safe place for the homeless to sleep during the winter in Colorado.

I am concerned that the promises that were made in past years as to notification of the people in the surrounding neighborhoods were not honored. This makes me doubt that we can rely on the additional commitments that are being made. It is very hard to trust the Salvation Army and the city after being promised two years ago that the Salvation Army would NOT operate a shelter at the S. Weber location again.

The last time the shelter was open, we had another winter of cleaning up human feces on our property, theft and a fire at our property. (A transient was arrested for the fire--so it is not just an assumption the it was a homeless individual that was responsible).

At the earlier community meeting, the director of the Salvation Army (David Kaufmaun?) shared many great ideas that would certainly lessen the negative effect of the shelter on the surrounding neighborhoods. However, we have learned that ideas and promises and "carry through" are two very different things.

If the downtown review board approves this shelter, PLEASE hold the Salvation Army to their commitments.

Lynette Sabin
Sabin Chiropractic
611 S. Nevada Ave

/O=COS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=

From: jim spinato <waterworkscwjimspinato@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2017 5:20 PM
To: Phelps, Andrew
Subject: 505 S. WEBER SHELTER
Attachments: img002.jpg; img003.jpg

Andrew & Katie:

I sent you a message earlier Tuesday about the shelter. Attached is the DRB Agenda from September 2, 2015. You will notice that under "overreaching principles" in bullet #3 that it was indicated to the board by Aimee Cox of the City that the intention was not to operate an "emergency cold weather shelter after this season". That is what the board based their decision on and the community agreed too. I am prepared to seek legal action to enforce that commitment.

James Spinato
Water Works Car Washes

December 27, 2017

RE: CPC CU-17-00150

Attn: Andrew Phelps

I am Jim Spinato, the owner of Water Works Car Wash, which is directly across the street from the proposed shelter. During the two years the shelter operated, there was a constant presence of homeless on our property, day and night, that caused a substantial interference with the business. There were instances of theft, graffiti, customers and employees being subjected to aggressive panhandling, trash on the grounds every morning and employees being diverted to address these issues. A major concern was the safety of our employees dealing with homeless people on the premises during operating hours.

While the objective to shelter a portion of the homeless population is commendable, it is not acceptable in light of the Salvation Army's and the City's statement during the last Downtown Review Board "DRB" meeting that the intent was not to operate a shelter after the winter of 2015-16. The DRB also heard that community resources were being directed toward opening permanent beds at the Springs Rescue Mission, which is now open. I believe the prior approval by the DRB was greatly influenced by those statements. Now the City is essentially saying that we didn't anticipate an increase in the homeless so we need to reverse our promise to the neighborhood and this is the easiest solution without jeopardizing funding from HUD. I would like the City and the Salvation Army to honor their word.

The City had every opportunity to ask the community to come forward with shelters throughout the last year but it is my understanding that they didn't seek to secure any additional emergency shelter space. The City has neglected its duty and the neighborhood is paying the price. As a last resort in late November they intended to declare the site an Emergency Shelter and circumvent the zoning process which was strongly opposed by the neighborhood.

A solution would be to have many smaller shelter spaces so that the impact can be spread throughout the community. I suggest The City start an effort immediately to secure more shelter space for this winter so the impact will not be felt in one neighborhood alone.

I have seen no evidence, based on two year's experience operating the shelter, that the Salvation Army and the City can operate a low barrier (no accountability or responsibility) facility like this without adversely affecting the neighborhood. The operating guidelines put forth this year such as cameras, security, cleanup, and moving people off the property only apply to the site not the neighborhood. Similar vague operation guidelines were put into effect in the past. These guidelines were ineffective, and the surrounding area suffered because of it. The guidelines, as in the past, do not call for consequences if they are not followed. The fact is that the leaders and volunteers in this process have little experience operating a low barrier shelter. They will have to execute the plan from day one to assure that the neighborhood is not affected adversely. It would be like a business having a vague set of processes in place but no experienced personnel in place to execute good results immediately.

The board must find that the project complies with all 3 criteria that must be met to approve the conditional use; Surrounding Neighborhood, Intent of Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan.

The values and quality of the surrounding neighborhood have been substantially injured not only in the past but surely in the future, if the zoning is approved. The many businesses in the area will not only be injured financially but a business model of providing a friendly and safe environment for customers and employees is threatened by this use. Many property owners and residents have observed that large numbers of homeless served in one area leads to an increase in adverse impacts.

The Intent of the Zoning Code is to promote health, safety and general welfare. The impact of allowing the shelter will be detrimental to the thousands of residents and businesses surrounding the shelter. The people using the shelter travel through the neighborhood at all hours and trespass on private property and business's in the area and are a safety concern for the residents. The City will argue that the lives of people are at stake if the use is not approved but the City should devote time and resources to procuring additional shelters if that is the case. Please conclude that at least 2 of the 3 criteria do not warrant approval of the zoning.

Please consider that one property owner should not be allowed to adversely impact the use, enjoyment and value of all the other properties in the neighborhood. Having a "temporary" shelter reapproved is not conducive to long term development of the neighborhood. It seems that this area of downtown is the step child of downtown development. The Lowell Community consisting of condos, apartments and businesses has at its entrance a collection of vacant lots and buildings, with no sign of further development. The unknown future use of this 57,000 square feet vacant building, on which no taxes have been paid in 40 years does not help the area move forward.

If the board approves the shelter then this neighborhood will have hosted the shelter for 3 out of 4 years. The decision the board makes today will impact the neighborhood this year and every year going forward.

Please deny the conditional use, unconditionally!!

December 28, 2017

RE: CPC CU-17-00150

Attn: Andrew Phelps

This letter is written to supplement my prior letter written in opposition to the conditional use application filed by the Salvation Army for the property located at 505 South Weber Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80903 (the “Salvation Army Property”).

First, I have owned or represented the ownership of the property located at 525 South Nevada Avenue, Colorado Springs, CO 80903 (the “Water Works Property”) for over 37 years. I own other properties in the downtown area so I am very familiar with the real estate market in the neighborhood surrounding the Water Works Property. Based on my experience, the value of the Water Works Property will be negatively impacted by the approval of the proposed shelter. As you know, a condition of the 2016 approval of the “temporary” shelter was that the Salvation Army would not seek to operate a shelter after the 2015-2016 winter season. The Salvation Army reiterated this commitment on several occasions. At a community meeting on February 10, 2016, when the shelter was in operation, the Salvation Army represented to the neighborhood that it did not intend to open the shelter for another year. My manager was assured verbally by Major Richard Larson, who operated the shelter for the Salvation Army, that the property would not be used as a shelter in the future. I relied on the assurances of the Salvation Army and so did others in the neighborhood.

The semi-permanent nature of this use makes the Water Works Property and business virtually unmarketable. After 37 years of owning the business and looking forward to retirement, I have been unable to put the business on the market because of the uncertainty related to the Salvation Army Property being used as a shelter during the busiest time of the year for our business.

The conditions placed on the prior approval of the Salvation Army Property’s use as a temporary shelter were either not met or were enforced in a manner that were detrimental to the neighborhood. For example, the shelter committed to “ensure that the area is clear of shelter users” within 30 minutes of the shelter closing at 9:00 AM. However, compliance with this condition simply meant that the shelter users were ejected from the shelter. The users stayed in the neighborhood and interfered with the businesses in the neighborhood. Loitering around my business and the surrounding neighborhood was a daily occurrence for many hours prior to queuing into the shelter. There were abandoned items left all over the neighborhood, and the cameras were not monitored as promised. If RJ Montgomery was called to report a problem the response was to see someone at the shelter, which was not staffed continually. Security was never provided during the day time hours as promised. There were many times that the shelter exceeded the maximum occupancy allowed. Water Works employees had the cell phone numbers of the officers assigned to the area as a result of the interference with business. This interference included theft and aggressive panhandling toward customers. There were safety and insurance concerns as shelter users moved between vehicles that were being serviced; we had to change our operating procedure to insure that keys were not left in vehicles being serviced for threat of the vehicle being stolen or items being stolen from the vehicle; windows were broken

after hours several times to gain entry to the property; employees' tip boxes were stolen from their work carts; people that were not allowed in the shelter often slept in our back entryway; graffiti was a constant problem probably from people being removed from our property; our vacuum systems were broken into and damaged several times by people looking for coins that might have been vacuumed from customer cars; and a significant increase in trash and waste (including the removal of feces) had to be handled. While the shelter was in operation my employees' attention was often devoted to addressing such issues rather than customer service. We had to put procedures in place to alert staff that a homeless person was harassing a customer or employee. During those encounters, we always feared for the safety of those involved.

This not an area of town conducive to hosting a large low barrier shelter because of the close proximity of businesses, Lowell Community residences, and senior homes.

There were many letters that opposed the shelter, included in the DRB agenda of September 2, 2015. Please read these again, because the same issues that were present then occurred during the 2015-16 winter. The concerns in those letters are relevant to the current proposal.

According to City Code, failure to comply with the conditions placed on the approval of a conditional use constitute grounds for revocation of the approval of the use. Here, the past experience of the neighborhood should warrant a denial of this application.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
James Spinato
Water Works Car Wash

From: Sunderlin, Katie
Sent: Wednesday, December 27, 2017 10:14 AM
To: Phelps, Andrew; Tefertiller, Ryan; Lobato, Elena
Subject: RE: CPU CU 17-00150

Elena,
There is another opposing email below for the warming shelter.

Ryan just an FYI for you.

Katie Sunderlin
LEED AP BD+C, Assoc. AIA
Neighborhood Development Outreach Specialist
City of Colorado Springs
Neighborhood Services
719-385-5773
sunderka@springsgov.com



From: Kayla Jacks [mailto:kayla2287@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, December 22, 2017 12:39 PM
To: Phelps, Andrew
Cc: Sunderlin, Katie
Subject: CPU CU 17-00150

Hello Andrew and Katie,

I am unable to attend the upcoming meeting, but would like to share my thoughts regardless. As a resident (and owner) of a home in the Westwood Townhomes on south Weber, we have experienced this shelter for the past two years now. Each year we have endured unwarranted foot traffic through our townhomes at all times of the day, into the night. Certain individuals even sit and sleep between our townhomes to utilize the outlets around our homes. Our trash bins are dug through and **our packages stolen**. Furthermore, driving past the location each year at this time we see a tremendous amount of filth and garbage left behind along Weber St, and though it may be a "low" comment, it's an eye-sore for the downtown area.

Though the individual situations are rough and that is unfortunate, they also cause disturbance in and around our place of safety - which we feel is violated when this shelter is open. This is the most important concern.

If there are solutions to these concerns, this shelter might not be of such concern to me, my family and my neighbors. However, controlling human behavior can be difficult - as we all know.

Though I doubt any objections to this shelter make any bit of a difference, I think it is important that the people involved in supporting it are aware of what goes on in the surrounding areas. This shelter DOES affect us. Hand outs do not help the homeless population; it enables many of them even further.

I request that this year and thereafter you seek an alternate location for sheltering the homeless if this be your mission.

Sincerely,

Kayla - Westwood Townhome Owner