

---

## MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** John Eldridge  
Town Manager

**FROM:** Matt Panfil, AICP CUD, Director of Planning & Development  
Jared Woolston, AICP, Town Planner

**DATE:** July 18, 2018

**SUBJECT:** Shelter Task Force Zoning Review

---

### I. REVIEW OF STAFF ZONING DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS:

At the previous Shelter Task Force meeting on June 27, 2018 staff presented an approach for the potential location of the working definitions of *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* within the Town’s various zoning districts. In order to provide objective recommendations, staff focused on the following factors:

- Proximity to essential services, broadly defined as facilities that provide food, medical care, education and/or career services, public transportation, and public bathroom facilities;
- The intent, purpose, and/or character of each zoning district as expressed in Chapter 2, Zoning Districts, of the Zoning Ordinance;
- The maximum allowable density of each zoning district established in Table 4.2.3, Dimensional and Density Standards for Growth Area Zoning Districts; and
- The review of the status of other uses such as multifamily dwelling, assisted / congregate living facility, and boarding house within Table 3.2, Permitted Use Table for Growth Area Zoning Districts.

The following table (*Table 1.1*) summarizes staff recommendations from the June 27 meeting:

Table 1.1 – Staff Recommendations (6.27.18)

		P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use																									
Land Use	CURRENT ZONE	GR1	GR2 & 10	GR3	GR4	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GC5	GA	GI	GO	GN
	1997 ZONING DISTRICT	RR	R1&8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, I1, I4	MU1, CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1&3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	CU2	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN
Homeless shelter – apartment-style		P	C	C	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	P	C	P	X	P	P	P	P	X	X	P	X	X	C	X	X
Homeless shelter – non-apartment-style		P	C	C	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	P	C	P	X	P	P	P	P	X	X	P	X	X	C	X	X

**Task Force Input:**

In response to staff’s recommendations, the Task Force and members of the general public provided the following feedback:

Approach:

There was a general acceptance of staff’s proposed framework in which to analyze the appropriateness of *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* in each of the Town’s Growth Area Zoning Districts, but there was disagreement regarding some of the specific selection criteria identified on Page 1.

It was widely acknowledged that there is to be a maximum density for both *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*. The proposed definition of *homeless shelter – apartment-style* is compatible with existing density standards (dwelling units per acre) because it is most similar to a multifamily dwelling in which one (1) apartment is the equivalent of one (1) dwelling unit. However, members of the Task Force and general public expressed uncertainty regarding the use of density, particularly staff’s use of a “beds per acre” as a means to identifying potential zoning districts in which to locate *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*.

There was also discussion regarding the appropriate use of proximity to essential services as selection criteria. The Task Force asked staff to provide more detailed information regarding the proximity of essential services and the recommended zoning districts. It was pointed out that the use of proximity to essential services as selection criteria is difficult because the locations of services are always changing. Furthermore, the intent of zoning districts, such as the Growth Mixed-Use 4 (GM4), to be able to provide a pedestrian-oriented mix of uses, may not be reflected in the existing physical conditions. Also, there is not yet a consensus as to the physical distance that is considered proximate.

Finally, a concern was expressed that the Task Force members keep in mind that their recommendations will be applicable to shelters in general and not to any specific proposal at hand.

Specific to Land Use Tables:

Task Force members asked staff to reevaluate the specific zoning district recommendations by considering the following:

1. Review for potential mixed-use (“resource center”) shelters that may incorporate administrative offices, classrooms, etc. beyond what would be considered ancillary uses and rather would be considered additional principal uses;
2. Remove the requirements of a conditional use permit recommendation based solely on a zoning overlapping with the Village Review Overlay (VRO) Zone; and
3. Reconsider the recommendations for the Growth Mixed-Use 5 (GM5) and the Growth Industrial (GI) zoning districts based on their existing physical characteristics, not just on the overall intent of the district.

Other Items:

Other concerns included:

1. The need to evaluate whether each of the two new proposed should be categorized similarly, or if there is enough difference between the two uses to generate different impacts, one affecting a zoning district more than the other;
2. The need for a closer comparison to the zoning district designations for *boarding house* versus *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*; and
3. The need to ensure future ordinance language is inclusive of multi-generational housing and the varying types of household units.

**II. REVISED STAFF ZONING DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS:**

One of the most notable changes in the updated proposed use table (*Table 2.1*) is that there are no longer any zoning districts in which the proposed uses are permitted by right. Instead, any zoning district in which the proposed uses are permitted, it is only with a conditional use permit. This change in approach is the result of further discussion among staff in which it was determined that requiring a conditional use permit for any of the proposed uses would have the benefit of transparency through the early notification to the surrounding neighborhood and would also allow for a thorough review to ensure no adverse impact to the surrounding neighborhood.

Second, as noted in Footnote No. 3 in *Table 2.1*, staff also revised recommendations based upon a discussion that acknowledged hotels being very similar in nature to mixed-use shelters. The Zoning Ordinance’s definition of hotel is:

*A facility that provides sleeping accommodations for compensation by transient guests, with or without a dining room or restaurant, including a Motel, but excluding Bed and Breakfast, Boarding House, and Residence Hall Facilities.*

The primary difference between the definition of hotel and shelter uses is the compensation requirement, which to staff’s determination does not have any significantly different impact on land use.

Taking into consideration the comments above and the Task Force and general public feedback outlined in Section I, staff incorporated the following changes to the proposed use table (*Table 2.1*):

*Table 2.1 – Revised Staff Recommendations (7.18.18)*

**New Text in Bold Italic Deleted Text in Strikethrough**

		P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use																									
Land Use	CURRENT ZONE	GR1	GR2 & 10	GR3	GR4	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GC5	GA	GI	GO	GN
	1997 ZONING DISTRICT	RR	R1&8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, 11, 14	MU1, CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1&3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	CU2	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN
Homeless shelter – apartment-style (residential use only) <sup>1</sup>		<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>7</sup>	C	C	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	C	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>X</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	X	X	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	X	X	C	X	X
<b>Homeless shelter – apartment-style (mixed-use shelter)<sup>2</sup></b>		X	X	X	X	<del>X</del> <sup>6</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>7</sup>	X	X	X	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	C	C	C	C	C	C	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	X	X	C	X	X
Homeless shelter – non-apartment-style (residential use only) <sup>1</sup>		<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>7</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>C</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>P</sup>	C	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>X</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>P</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	X	X	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	X	X	C	X	X
<b>Homeless shelter – non-apartment-style (mixed-use shelter)<sup>2</sup></b>		X	X	X	X	<del>C</del> <sup>6</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>7</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>6</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>6</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>6</sup>	<del>C</del> <sup>P</sup>	X	C	C	C	C	C	X	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	<del>X</del> <sup>10</sup>	X	X	C	X	X
Boarding House		X	X	X	C	P	C	X	C	C	P	P	P	C	C	C	P	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hotel <sup>3</sup>		X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	X

1. Based on the proposed definitions of *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* some on-site support services such as food, hygiene, laundry, counseling, job training, and referrals may still be conducted as ancillary, but not additional principal uses.

2. The two (2) new rows *homeless shelter – apartment-style (mixed-use shelter)* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style (mixed-use shelter)* are a mixture of more than one (1) principal use, often referred to as “resource centers.”
3. This item was added as a result of staff discussion that one of the most similar uses to a homeless shelter would be a hotel. The principal difference, based on the definition of hotel, is that compensation is required for a hotel.
4. Multifamily dwellings and assisted/congregate living facilities are also permitted within the zoning district.
5. Staff previous recommendation was to permit *homeless shelter – apartment-style* as a conditional use in order to allow for the possibility of a second unit that can serve as a small scale shelter for a household or individual in need. However, upon further discussion, staff is proposing that within the shelter regulations, a *homeless shelter – apartment –style* will be characterized by having at least three (3) dwelling units. Also, *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* is prohibited as it is not in character or consistent with the intent of the underlying zoning district.
6. Non-residential uses are highly restricted within the zoning district.
7. Hotels and other non-residential uses are permitted by conditional use permit within the zoning district.
8. The change from previous recommendation is a result of the decision to require a conditional use permit for all of the proposed new uses.
9. As indicated by members of the Task Force, while the intent of the zoning district is not to encourage residential uses, such uses are characteristic of the existing conditions.
10. The change from previous recommendation is intended to provide more consistency with the existing hotel and boarding house regulations.

### III. INFORMATION ON PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

The concept of incorporating performance standards into zoning regulations pertaining to *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* was introduced to the Task Force at the June 13, 2018 meeting. For staff, the most important consideration is that any proposed standard is both administrable and enforceable. Based on said criteria, staff has reviewed the previously discussed performance standards, as well as additional standards identified in staff’s research. Staff has either provided a recommendation or requested additional direction for each of the standards:

#### ***Potential Performance Standards Discussed on June 13, 2018:***

- *Size / Density:*

Suggested options included:

1. Establish a strict number of maximum beds for either one or both of the uses, *homeless shelter – apartment-style* or *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*;

2. Limit the number of *homeless shelter – apartment-style* units to the same number of multifamily dwelling units per acre by the underlying zoning district as established in Table 4.2.3, Growth Area Dimensional and Density Standards; and
3. If *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* are to be permitted within the same building, establish a combined calculation which treats *homeless shelter – apartment-style* units as one (1) dwelling unit and a specific number of beds (undetermined at the time) as one (1) dwelling unit. At the June 27, 2018 meeting, staff recommended for consideration that 2.19 beds shall be considered one (1) dwelling unit as that is the average size of dwelling units within the Town.

***Staff Recommendation:***

***Staff finds that the treatment of one (1) homeless shelter – apartment-style unit as the equivalent of one (1) dwelling unit is a logical and consistent approach in regards to establishing a maximum allowable density.***

Staff previously recommended that every 2.19 individual residents in a *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* is the equivalent of one (1) dwelling unit. This recommendation was based on the Town’s average household size established in the Recreation Facilities Impact Fee. Staff’s research of other communities revealed that this number may be low in comparison. Boulder, CO, for example may count anywhere between four (4) to ten (10) individual residents as the equivalent of one (1) dwelling unit, depending on the underlying zoning district in which the shelter is located.

***Staff asks that the Task Force establishes a maximum density / number of beds for homeless shelter – non-apartment-style and either:***

- a. Accept 2.19 individual residents as an equivalent to one (1) dwelling unit; or***
- b. Direct staff to perform additional research to determine a different individual resident to dwelling unit equivalency.***

- *Physical Separation of Homeless Shelter – Apartment-Style and Homeless Shelter – Non-Apartment-Style:*

It was suggested that *homeless shelter – apartment-style*, which is primarily intended for occupancy by households and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*, which is primarily intended for occupancy by individuals could be required to be in

physically separate shelters. It was not discussed whether or not an interior physical separation could be required or realistically achieved within the same shelter.

***Staff Recommendation:***

Staff finds the physical separation of *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* to be a reasonable approach to promote public safety. However, staff is uncertain that requiring each use to be located in an entirely different structure is feasible for potential applicants.

***Staff does not recommend the requirement of a detached structure standard, but does recommend the requirement of an interior separation standard.***

- *On-Site Management:*

It was suggested that on-site management be required for both *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* of a specific size. A possible occupancy number or density that would trigger the on-site management requirement was not discussed.

Other management-related standard suggestions included:

1. Design the shelter to provide sight lines from the management/office area into all sleeping areas;
2. Submit a “Management Plan” that identifies the management procedures for resident supervision, response to neighborhood concerns, access restrictions, safety measures, etc.; and
3. Require the shelter have a “turn-away” policy wherein upon maximum occupancy, any additional person seeking shelter would have to be referred, and possibly provided transportation, to another facility with available accommodations.

***Staff Recommendation:***

***Due to their functioning more similarly to a multifamily dwelling unit, staff does not find it necessary for a homeless shelter – apartment-style to provide on-site management during all hours of operation, but should, at a minimum, have off-site management resources available to residents.***

***Staff finds that, regardless of the shelter size, it is in the general public interest and the interest of any homeless shelter – non-apartment-style or mixed-use***

***shelter to provide on-site management and supervision during all hours of operation.***

In regards to other on-site management standards described in Section II:

1. Design the shelter to provide sight lines from the management/office area into all sleeping areas;

Staff finds that this standard could be prohibitive in the reuse of existing structures that were not designed for such uses. This standard is also unclear as to whether or not it would require sight lines into a *homeless shelter – apartment-style*, which presumably has a higher expectation of privacy.

***Staff recommends the Task Force either:***

***a. Not require such a policy; or***

***b. If a high level of supervision of sleeping areas is desired, allow for the use of electronic surveillance equipment in lieu of physical sight lines.***

2. Submission of a “Management Plan” that identifies the management procedures for resident supervision, response to neighborhood concerns, access restrictions, safety measures, etc.; and

Staff finds that a Management Plan may be a helpful tool for identifying the Town’s expectations in regards to the performance and operation of any *homeless shelter – apartment-style* or *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*. Such a plan may alleviate initial concerns as well as provide for a method of solving future issues between the public, the Town, and a shelter.

In addition to the elements of a Management Plan described at the June 13, 2018 meeting, other common elements include:

- Maintenance and/or Litter Control Program: Establish standards for regular building and site maintenance. Provide a minimum number of trash/recycling receptacles and conduct daily on-site litter patrols.
- Communications Plan: Establish policies for how a shelter will communicate with neighbors and/or municipal government, including police.
- Emergency Response Plan: Consult with local emergency services to establish a plan for various emergency situations.



- Rules of Conduct and Registration Process for Residents: Provide sex offender screening, a policy for the physical separation of *homeless shelter – apartment-style* residents and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* residents, etc.
- Interior Floor Plan: Depict sleeping areas and anticipated maximum occupancies, common areas, emergency exits, restroom facilities, etc.
- School Safety Plan: Boulder, CO, for example requires any facility that admits intoxicated residents and is within 600 feet of a school to develop a safety plan in consultation with the local school district.

***Staff recommends the Task Force require a Management Plan that, at a minimum, includes the following elements:***

- ***Communications Plan;***
- ***Emergency Response Plan;***
- ***Rules of Conduct and Registration Process for Residents;***
- ***Maintenance and/or Litter Control Plan;***
- ***Interior Floor Plan;***
- ***Exterior Lighting Plan;***
- ***School Safety Plan;***
- ***Transportation Plan (as necessary, see the below “Location / Proximity” Recommendation).***
- ***Turn-Away Plan (recommendations for alternative accommodations when at full occupancy, see below Item No. 3)***

3. Require the shelter have a “turn-away” policy that requires, upon maximum occupancy, any additional person seeking shelter be referred, and possibly provided transportation, to another facility with available accommodations.

Staff finds that this standard would be near impossible to administer and enforce as it would require nightly monitoring of the occupancy of the shelter to ensure no one is turned away without alternative accommodations. Furthermore, it seems an unfair burden to require a shelter to essentially be responsible for finding accommodations for all the

Town's homeless.

***Staff recommends the Task Force not require such a policy, but does recommend that a shelter develop a policy of how they will provide guidance to additional guests when at full occupancy.***

- Hours of Operation:

It was suggested that *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* must provide twenty-four (24) hour, seven (7) days per week accommodations, or contract with a separate facility able to accommodate all residents during any time in which the shelter is closed.

***Staff Recommendation:***

Staff finds that this standard may be easily accommodated by a *homeless shelter – apartment-style*. However, except for domestic violence shelters in St. Petersburg, FL, staff did not identify any other community with such a requirement for facilities similar to *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*.

In lieu of providing on-going accommodations, it was also suggested that a *homeless shelter – apartment-style* or *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* could contract with a different facility that would be able to provide accommodations to residents when said shelter is closed to residents.

***Staff asks the Task Force to either:***

- a. Provided review by legal counsel, require twenty-four (24) hour operations, seven (7) days per week;***
- b. Consider a requirement that residents be able to, at a minimum, contact someone employed by the shelter twenty-four (24) hours per day, seven (7) days per week; or***
- c. Be more specific in regards to the option of contracting with different facilities for the provision of accommodations when the shelter is closed to residents.***

- Location / Proximity:

Standards suggested based on the proximity of a *homeless shelter – apartment-style* or *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* to a specific service included:

1. Transportation: Shelters of a specific size shall be located within one-quarter ( $\frac{1}{4}$ ) mile, or some other distance, of public transportation or the shelter must provide their own transportation services. It was not discussed as to the size of a shelter that would trigger the transportation requirement; and
2. Essential Services: Shelters shall provide access to services such as commercial shopping, medical facilities, and fire and police protection. Neither the acceptable distance to, or list of, essential services was discussed.

***Staff Recommendation:***

There was a strong preference at both the June 13, and June 27, 2018 meetings for *homeless shelter – apartment-style* or *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* to be located within a close proximity to essential services. Staff finds that the intent of a location / proximity standard is in the interest of both the general public and the homeless, but there are several issues for consideration:

1. Public transportation services such as bus routes, schedules, etc. are often altered to meet shifting demand;
2. An underlying assumption of requiring *homeless shelter – apartment-style* or *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* to be in close proximity to essential services is that the homeless will be able, and willing, to walk to such services. Factors such as age, health, climate, pedestrian connections such as sidewalks and crosswalks, vehicular traffic and speed limits, etc. all affect an individual's willingness to walk to different destinations. Such factors should be considered if a proximity standard is to be required;
3. Essential services are widely distributed throughout the Town. Certain zoning districts may encourage a concentration of uses and appear to be desirable for locating either a *homeless shelter – apartment-style* or *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*, however the existing concentration of uses may not reflect the desired diversity or density of uses; and
4. Shelters may comply with the proximity standard at time of approval, but the relocation of an essential service outside of the required minimum distance risks rendering shelters nonconforming through no fault of their own.

In regards to the proximity criteria, staff notes that one-half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) mile is a commonly used standard by the planning profession for transit-oriented development (TOD), as it is considered to be the maximum distance an average person is willing to walk to a destination (approximately ten minutes).

**Staff asks the Task Force to:**

- a. Further discuss and establish a list of qualifying essential services and the proximity criteria by which proposed shelters can be evaluated;**
- b. Consider requiring a Transportation Plan as a component of a Management Plan to provide an opportunity to allow for shelters that may not meet the minimum proximity criteria; and**
- c. Consider prohibiting the location of any shelter within 1,000 feet of schools.**

○ On-Site Facilities:

It was suggested that shelters shall provide on-site support services such as case management, life skills training, counseling, employment and educational services, housing assistance, etc. Whether or not support services should be considered an ancillary use to a principally residential use, or considered part of a mix of residential and non-residential principal uses was not discussed.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The working definitions of *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style* allow for support services such as food, hygiene, laundry, counseling, job training, and referrals to other agencies. Staff finds that there are two (2) unresolved questions regarding on-site facilities:

1. Is there a size limit, either by percentage or overall square footage, where on-site facilities become additional principal uses?
2. Does a specific mixture of on-site facilities, such as administrative office space and classrooms, necessitate the creation of a new definition, such as “resource center” for mixed-use shelters?

**Staff asks the Task Force to discuss and provide direction in regards to the two (2) above questions.**

● Minimum Separation from Similar Uses:

It was suggested that a minimum physical separation from similar uses would promote neighborhood compatibility and prevent congestion of shelters. Examples cited ranged from a 1,000 foot to 1,500 foot minimum distance between any *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and/or *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*. It

was not discussed if this separation: a.) applies to shelters only within the Town's boundaries, or any shelter or similar facility regardless of municipal boundaries; and b.) is calculated with a simple radius or is calculated by travel distance, that incorporates block shape and length, pedestrian connections, etc.).

***Staff Recommendation:***

Staff finds that a minimum separation from similar uses is a common standard in the regulation of uses such as *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*. The minimum separation distance varies from community to community, but the underlying intent is that not more than one (1) such facility be permitted on an individual block. The zoning ordinance establishes a 1,000 foot (straight line) separation requirement for adult entertainment established. While the uses are not in any way related, the method of separation is from similar uses is applicable.

***Staff recommends the Task Force require a minimum 1,000 foot (straight line) separation standard, but staff also asks the Task Force to provide direction as to whether or not the minimum separation distance shall ignore municipal boundaries.***

o *Off-Street Parking:*

Shelters shall provide off-street parking for staff and a certain amount of residents. The provided range of off-street parking required for residents was between one (1) parking space for every (3) beds to one (1) parking space for every six (6) beds. At the June 13, 2018 meeting, it was estimated that approximately one-half (½) of households and twenty-five to thirty-three percent (25%-33%) of individuals require parking. Existing parking standards for uses such as multifamily dwelling, assisted/congregate living facility, and boarding house were examined.

***Staff Recommendation:***

Staff's research indicates that it is general practice to reduce the amount of parking required for facilities similar to *homeless shelter – apartment-style* and *homeless shelter – non-apartment-style*. However, a mixed-use shelter is more complex in that staff, guests, etc. require sufficient parking spaces.

***Staff recommends the Task Force direct staff to develop a formula for a mixed-use shelter that reduces the amount of parking required per individual resident or dwelling unit, but maintains the minimum parking requirements for other uses such as office, retail, or school.***

***Additional Performance Standards:***

The American Planning Association (APA) provides ongoing research into the regulation of social services, including homeless shelters. Included within their research is a list of twenty (20) communities throughout the United States that recently (2015-2017) updated their respective zoning ordinances to address homeless shelters and similar uses. Staff reviewed several of these municipalities’ new regulations (Appendix A) in an attempt to identify best practices and trends in zoning for shelters.

There is no discernable trend among the communities in choosing the appropriate zoning district for such uses. Some communities group social services broadly and allow them in a broad range of districts, while others focus on identifying and differentiating specific social service uses and/or allowing them only in higher intensity districts.

In regards to performance standards, in addition to the standards previously discussed and listed above, staff has identified the following additional standards in use by other communities:

- ***Minimum Square Footage Standards:***

Some communities require a minimum square footage for bedrooms, interior common areas, and exterior open space. These size standards are established either on a minimum square foot per occupant or an overall building and/or site square footage basis. Exterior open space standards generally require various methods of screening.

<b><i>Staff Recommendation:</i></b>
Minimum square footage standards are in essence, density controls. Staff finds that any minimum square footage standards would be redundant to the maximum density controls already recommended herein.
<b><i>Staff recommends the Task Force not require this standard.</i></b>

- ***Minimum Plumbing Fixtures:***

Some communities require a minimum number of toilets, sinks, and/or showers per resident. These standards ranged from one (1) of each fixture per between ten (10) to fifteen (15) residents.

<b><i>Staff Recommendation:</i></b>
Staff finds that requirements such as this are best left to be regulated by the Town’s Building Code.

***Staff recommends the Task Force not require this standard.***

- Maximum Length of Occupancy:

Two (2) of the communities reviewed by staff established a maximum length an individual is allowed to stay at a facility. In both cases, the maximum length of occupancy was six (6) months.

***Staff Recommendation:***

Staff finds that this standard would be difficult to administer and enforce as it would require staff to continually monitor a shelter’s registration log. Furthermore, the maximum length of occupancy for any individual seems best left to be determined by the operator.

***Staff recommends the Task Force not require this standard.***

- Building / Site Design Standards:

Common building and/or site design standards include:

1. Submission of a Lighting Plan (with review by local police department);
2. Landscape Buffers and/or Privacy Fencing;
3. Clearly Defined Building Entrances;
4. On-Site Waiting/Queueing Areas to Prevent Blockage of Public Right-of-Way;
5. Recreation Areas and Parking Lots with High-Visibility for Staff; and
6. Architectural Compatibility with Surrounding Neighborhood.

***Staff Recommendation:***

Of the previously referenced common building and/or site design standards:

1. Submission of an Exterior Lighting Plan (with review by local police department);

***Staff recommends an Exterior Lighting Plan be a required component of the Management Plan described herein and also a component of any***

***supplementary use standards to be added to Section 3.4, Supplementary Use Standards.***

2. Landscape Buffers and/or Privacy Fencing;

***Staff recommends landscape buffers and/or privacy fencing be a component of any supplementary use standards to be added to Section 3.4, Supplementary Use Standards.***

3. Clearly Defined Building Entrances;

***Staff recommends the Task Force not require such a standard as this standard can best be addressed through the staff, Planning Board, or Village Review Board review processes.***

4. On-Site Waiting/Queueing Areas to Prevent Blockage of Public Right-of-Way;

***Staff recommends the Task Force not require such a standard as there are existing regulations regarding the use of public right-of-way.***

5. Recreation Areas and Parking Lots with High-Visibility for Staff; and

***Staff recommends landscape buffers and/or privacy fencing be a component of any supplementary use standards to be added to Section 3.4, Supplementary Use Standards.***

6. Architectural Compatibility with Surrounding Neighborhood.

***Staff recommends the Task Force not require such a standard as this standard can best be addressed through the staff, Planning Board, or Village Review Board review processes.***