

Town of Brunswick, Maine
Shelter Task Force
Wednesday, August 1, 2018
4:00 PM
85 Union Street – Council Chambers

Meeting Minutes

Task Force: Councilor James Mason (Chair), Councilor Kathy Wilson, and Councilor Alison Harris

Staff: John Eldridge, Town Manager; Ryan Leighton, Assistant Town Manager; Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development; Jared Woolston, Town Planner; Kristin Collins, Town Attorney

Chair Mason opened the meeting.

Acknowledgement that the meeting was properly noticed: Town Manager Eldridge affirmed that the meeting was properly noticed.

Adjustments to the agenda: None.

Approval of July 18, 2018 minutes: Councilor Kathy Wilson moved, Councilor Alison Harris seconded, to approve the minutes of the July 18, 2018 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Mason: Next meeting will be August 15, 2018.

We are going to begin where we left off at last meeting, going through staff recommendations. Any comments on what we've discussed at the previous two meetings?

Continuation of Discussion of Zoning Districts and Standards

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:

- *On-Site Facilities-* The question here pertains to principal versus accessory use. In our definitions, we allow for support services, so clearly there's a mix of uses going on. At what point does one of those uses become a primary or principal use? This may already be taken care of by our zoning ordinance, which defines an accessory use as "a use customarily incidental and subordinate to the principal use or building, and that occupies no more than 40% of the floor area". If any of the food, hygiene, laundry, etc. were to be over 40%, they are no longer an accessory use by code. The other question we have is, and we've been using the term "resource center", a hypothetical where it's office, housing and maybe some retail component. None of those are over 40%, so we have three accessory uses in that scenario.

Alison Harris: It's common sense that if you have a residence with all of those various uses, that what you really mean is the accumulated square footage of all of those non-residential uses is less than 40%.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I think we would look at it collectively – it's the intent. Maybe it needs some clarification. Staff would probably look at it as three primary uses and try to analyze each one individually, and then combine them. We're looking for direction for if that makes sense or there are any other ideas.

Chair Mason: When we're talking impact of a use, why do we care? Resource center is a term that has been used to talk about a full-service facility, and meaning there's going to be office space, conference space, space for case managers, programs, etc. Aren't all of those uses less impactful?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: The reasoning behind it is you have three principal uses – parking between retail and office might be different, or a classroom environment - do you want to treat them equally or have one set of standards for a resource center that could be any combination of uses percentage-wise.

Alison Harris: I can imagine a resource center could likely draw non-residents – parking could become an issue.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: The sense of accessory use versus principal use is that an accessory use is more for internal support, whereas a principal use is a destination – it draws people from outside as well as the internal support.

Chair Mason: What other things are impacted by having accessory uses, besides parking?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Parking is the main concern.

Chair Mason: Rather than trying to identify auxiliary uses, if we addressed those two issues head-on? We'll discuss the next issue and then take questions or comments.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:

- *Off-Street Parking* – At one of our meetings we had a comment that, at least for Tedford Shelter, about one half of the household may require some form of parking, and maybe 25-33% for individuals. Our research found a variety of different recommended parking standards, anywhere from three to six. A lot of downtown doesn't have an actual parking requirement, so that would come into play in that area, but once we're outside of that, what is that number we're looking for?

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: There's a specific standard for the Downtown/Maine Street/Inner Pleasant Street parking – basically there is no parking requirement for the particular use. Everything else is laid out pretty well in the ordinance for minimum parking requirements for each use.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Staff doesn't have a recommendation on this item, but it seems like 50% for the apartment-style and somewhere in the 30-40% for a requirement for individual might be a starting point. We are open to discussion.

Chair Mason: The bed number does not account for staff.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: You could look at office space or something that is equivalent. Square feet of office space or something like that.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Some regulations would say minimum one space per staff on duty at the time. If they have an office, we have a requirement – it makes sense to treat it that way, instead of making a new requirement. We don't require a 1:1 for employee anywhere else.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: I think you're overcomplicating things by trying to differentiate out the office space. If you have a certain number of beds in a facility, you have an idea of how many staff is needed. I would think we would try to account for that by one space per three beds or whatever.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: The way we do assisted/congregate it's one per three beds. We don't look at staff spaces or office uses.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: Are these variable? Is there any latitude for the Planning Board?

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: Yes. If they go to the Planning Board and ask for a reduction, it may be granted.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: What about the other direction? If you had a shelter that contained a lot of other resources that required trips per day? I don't know that we'd be able to go beyond the – let's say the ratio is one per three beds, but it shows in the application that there are going to be a lot of other people coming to the facility for day programs. I don't know that there would be latitude to expand it, based on the facts of the situation.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: Again, it goes to a reduction, so something like that I don't think it would be dealt with.

Alison Harris: It's one thing to have something akin to the Cumberland Street shelter, which is really bedrooms, soup kitchen and tiny office space – you could easily do that on a per-bed ratio – but if you had a resource center, where you have programs and invite community members to participate.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: If it really does come down to mostly parking being the issue, I would suggest addressing it in the parking standards, maybe with an asterisk or a separate provision somewhere about adequate parking, to say "if a facility provides services that require additional vehicle trips or parking, standard may be increased by condition".

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: For these multi-use facilities as we're calling them, if you wanted to add an additional parking standard, you could do that to Chapter 3.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: So we'd have a standard that says "the parking standards in Chapter 4 apply, but if inadequate given the types of uses being offered by the facility, it can be expanded by condition".

Chair Mason: But that is only if all facilities are Conditional Use facilities, opposed to Permitted.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: You can do a supplementary standard whether it's Permitted or Conditional.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: But they're handled differently. If it's Permitted, the supplemental will be triggered. If it's Permitted and it's small enough, it's going to go Staff Review Committee (SRC). The Conditional Use would be Planning Board. Those may be both supplemental and/or Conditional Uses.

Public Comments Regarding On-Site Facilities and Off-Site Parking

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: About 25% of the Cumberland Street single residents have a car and about 50% of the families on Federal Street. Distinguishing the resource center from the other on-site services – when we were originally envisioning this center, we were looking at the on-site services being able to support the guests or the clients of the facility, not necessarily making these resources available to people from outside the facility.

Kathy Wilson: I think a resource center that could deal with a little bit more than the in-house guests would be a positive thing because that would be working towards everybody working to find a job, and maybe not end up having to come there.

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: I think that's possible. We don't want to be a resource center for the entire community; we want to be a resource center for

Kathy Wilson: I'm not sure that that's going to be our decision to make, but it's just a thought.

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: We are trying to serve more people who are not in the facility who are homeless, so I guess we'd want to make those services available to those folks as well.

Kathy Wilson: That was the Waterville model.

Chair Mason: If they want to expand services during the day, like we were seeing in Waterville, how do they go about doing that? As part of this collective recommendation, so they come back to the town to suggest any changes?

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: If a building has several primary uses and they change part of it, potentially they could come in for a change of use permit, or if it's more than 10,000 square feet of floor area for the change of use they would have to go to the Planning Board. If they want to expand a part of the facility, it might be a building permit if it's below Development Review thresholds or might require Staff Review Committee. It all depends on scale. For serving more people, it might just be a building permit.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: As long as what they're doing, based on our definition of accessory use is still that 40%, they can go from 25-35% and just go through the normal process.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: Most things that would be done like that would end up being accessory use – it wouldn't trigger any other review unless they were expanding the physical.

Alison Harris: We talked about something on the continuum of licensing to management plan, but we didn't really talk about how we would address a change in their business plan – if they came back wanting to expand it, that would be a change in their business plan. It would be outlined in the application process if there were a business plan.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Part of the requirement that we're recommending is that the management plan include floor plans, so we would be able to do a preliminary check, and if they came back in to add additional services, we'd be able to compare the spaces.

Chair Mason: I don't have a problem with these auxiliary uses and I don't think they need to be defined. I don't see why we would need to change it for this use already set out in the code. Let's just go with that. What Craig said today for parking was consistent with what you were saying.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: The lower number is usually one space for every three beds, so they need to provide 33% of the standard. The apartment-style, one half seems reasonable.

Alison Harris: It doesn't cover staff. If half of the residents of the family-style have cars and we provide them with parking spaces, there is no parking for any staff, so we are saying that the residents have the spaces and the workers park on the street.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: Why not just treat it the same apartment-style with 50%?

Kathy Wilson: We don't know how many staff a place could have in 10 or 15 years.

Chair Mason: That's why office space has a square footage to make that guess.

Alison Harris: So if the office is accessory, parking would go with 50% of the number of dwelling units for the apartment, and if you have 800 square feet of accessory use dedicated to offices, then you would have the appropriate parking for that 800 square feet added to the 50%?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Since we'll have the floor plans, we would be able to do something like that and separate the uses, like office space for staff. 800 square feet, that gets you two spaces, in addition to the beds per individual residents per space.

Alison Harris: I think we have to take a different approach to the singles. That is based on the number of residents, and we don't want to define now that you can only have two beds to a room, or six beds to a room, etc. That would have to be based on the number of guests and the office space for staffing that singles unit, I assume.

John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer, Brunswick resident: This might be covered in the supplemental standard that the Planning Board can turn to depending on the parking needs of a particular project.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: They're already in here, but as far as the table goes, you have to start somewhere. If you look at the boarding house definition, it says two persons per room, excepting for minor children.

Chair Mason: What if it's a mixed facility?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: You break it out into individual components and then combine. It wouldn't be judged by the most restrictive – we'd combine them.

Jim Bridge, 62 Pleasant Hill Coalition: Likes the approach on a formula for apartments, a formula for singles, and we already have standards for offices. One other concern is when there is a large meeting – please address those surges without making excessive asphalt.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Parking calculation is not an exact science. Planners generally plan for peak and err on the side of caution. It tries to accommodate your 98% of days.

Field Griffith, Tedford Board: How are the accessory uses handled in our ordinance? A hotel or a congregate care facility have uses other than beds – are they measured by uses or lumped into one standard?

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: It's done both ways. Assisted congregate living facility is 1 per 3; boarding house 1 per guest room. Other places, like a municipal facility, where it's one space per 400 square feet of office space, plus one per 1600 feet of maintenance, distribution and storage space. So there are places in the ordinance that do break it out by use. Looking at this, where a lot of these uses can be related to group living facilities, it might be appropriate to look at those specific parts of the building as far as parking standards go.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Hotel is 1 per guest room, 1 per 800 feet of assembly space

Alison Harris: I'm comfortable setting a number for the apartment-style dwelling units, or at least putting in a proposal forth for one car for each two dwelling units in the apartment complex and then looking at assigning a minimum of no less than one office space, and then more if the square footage. After that, the formula that we already have, for 400 square feet. For the non-apartment-style, I would be looking at something like equating beds and residents, and then going with no less than one additional for staff person plus more if there's more office space. If it gets into conference rooms and training facilities, while Tedford doesn't do it or anticipate doing it now, it could happen in the future, you would have a number for that also.

Chair Mason: I would think the one per five beds.

Alison Harris: I think five is too few parking spaces. In the nursing home, the people don't drive, but in the single shelter, they are perfectly capable of driving – they just may not own a car at the moment. I wouldn't want to go lower than one per four, which would be 25%, and I can see an argument for going one per three plus a minimum of one staff.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: They can always go down by talking to the Planning Board; it's hard to get them to go back up.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: Has this group been thinking you would want there to be a minimum for the per bed and then you'd break out the office space somehow and have another number for that? Or would you have one per three beds and then you'd have a supplemental standard that requires the board to look at the conditions of the facility – how many people are there full-time, half-time as staff, events, conference spaces. I think I prefer the latter in terms of something that's more workable.

Chair Mason: I think a supplemental standard.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: Let's say you take the non-apartment-style and make it one space per three beds – that would account for the 25% of occupants having vehicles plus some staff, but if that facility doesn't need that many spaces, the applicant can try to reduce the standard. But if someone else were to argue that they had events three times a week, we could expand it by going to supplemental standards.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: We would have to have a starting point of an employee requirement somewhere, or else how do we know what they're reducing it from? If we say it's one for every three residents, plus one, plus the square footage, then we have something to know what we're reducing from.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: The one to three is supposed to account for some amount of staff, just like congregate care.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: My concern is that it sounds like we're saying the Planning Board – you determine how many staff spaces they need.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: The one per three beds would be the minimum. If there's some extraordinary amount of staff, or if there's some other thing that can't be accounted for in that minimum, then the Planning Board would have the ability to go – not full discretion – above that.

Chair Mason: I'm more comfortable with one per three if that's including staff.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I haven't done many of our planning reviews here, but to me it's not an uncommon practice to break out a building based on its internal uses to determine parking.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: That is how we do it routinely if there are multiple uses in a building.

Alison Harris: I'm comfortable with one in three as long as there is some discretion for the Planning Board or even the staff.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: We would have to add an extra standard for this, because it's not the typical way of doing it. The Planning Board has the discretion to add parking. They can always ask for a reduction.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: We have some standards that we are contemplating adding that are specific to shelters. We'd have one about parking that says something like you have to meet the minimum parking standards, however, if the shelter provides additional services or staffing levels require additional spaces, the Planning Board may require a reasonable number of additional spaces.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: It's typical and much more straightforward for us to go with some similar use, say a community center common space, just give us a number and then look at spaces per person, and just have that right in here, and have the Planning Board add additional standards. I'd want that clear how far the Planning Board can push before it becomes unreasonable.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: If you have a congregate care facility with 20 beds, you don't add office space - I just don't want to create a distinction in how we approach the two.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: What's being suggested today is that – an additional standard. I don't want it to seem arbitrary. You could find some similar use like a community center, a little more conservative at one per 300 sq. ft., and split it some by dealing with the residential uses one way – for parking – and then you deal with all the common areas and office space at another requirement, say one per 300 sq. ft.

Kathy Wilson: Likes that – the decisions they are making are not just for the Tedford Shelter.

Alison Harris: I wanted to do this too, but I also hear what our legal counsel says, which is not discriminating and not making things more complicated than necessary.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: I don't think what I'm suggesting is too dissimilar to what is in the ordinance currently. It contains language regarding going over the maximum or under the minimum. (Ordinance shown on screen)

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: You'd want to add this piece to the supplementary standard, so the onus would be on the applicant to provide a parking demand study? The only exception is single and two-family uses – everything else needs to meet the Chapter 4 standards.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: Right. Even if someone was just getting a building permit. It might be that as a standalone ordinance change to recommend the parking requirement reduction be changed to requirement modification, and it can go up or down. Maybe that's too broad. The parking demand study is the only reason I would say to not rely on these and put a different standard that's applicable only to shelters, because we don't want to force them to get a parking demand study – we just want the Planning Board to have the authority to recognize that because of the nuances of this plan we're going to go over the standard.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: There's only a max for buildings over 50,000 square feet – that's the only time that applies.

Chair Mason: We're giving authority – can't we have the decision making agent look to the most applicable existing parking parameters?

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: That's perfectly fine. It's good to give them a little more of a standard so it's not vague.

Chair Mason: (to Planning) You can come back with language.

John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer, Brunswick resident: I ask that you use care in the wording of the use of a common space in a shelter so you don't require more parking than needed. It's also used as a gathering space for the residents. The Code Officer will be able to tell if a use has changed or expanded and can issue a violation. We are limited in what sites we can use, especially if we are repurposing an existing building, and the inability to add one extra parking space might make the project impossible.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: My response is that the resolution then is much more difficult for you – you would have to provide more parking.

Continuing with the report, staff does not recommend:

- *Minimum Square Footage Standards*
- *Minimum Plumbing Fixtures*
- *Maximum Length of Occupancy*

We did want to show what other communities are doing. Minimum square footage standards are another approach to density, which gets even more confusing.

Chair Mason: I'm prepared to accept those recommendations, should the Task Force agree. Any further discussion?

Alison Harris: I'm okay with the staff recommendations. I don't feel strongly one way or the other about this part.

Kathy Wilson: I agree.

Chair Mason: We will accept these recommendations.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development:

- Staff's take was we have procedures for that already (responding to Alison's assertion that Brunswick has had problems with #4. On-site waiting/queueing areas to prevent blockage of public right-of-way), as far as trespassing and the public right-of-way are concerned. He understands Alison's concern and they are open to discussion.

Alison Harris: The shelter on Cumberland Street created a sitting garden, and there is a lot less of a problem now with blocking the sidewalk, but it is an issue with the Gathering Place, so I think we should consider perhaps residents' social space outside as well as inside.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Requiring some common or open space for that is certainly within the land use purview, but the actual queueing in line and where people choose to queue in line we don't have as much control over. As part of the planning process to require or have some sort of design standard for open space is worth considering.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: New York requires 50 square feet of open space per person.

Clark Labbe, 62 Pleasant Hill Coalition: I agree that providing some outside space would be nice. A previous comment I sent to the Task Force addressed smoking and whether or not it's permitted on the property. If it is, it's up to them if they want to provide a smoking area or allow it in general. If it's not permitted, another provider might not agree to have a smoke-free campus. If you have a smoke-free campus, the cigarettes end up on the other side of the street. I think if they want to restrict smoking, they should provide a smoking area on their property.

Kathy Wilson: I agree. I used to live across from the shelter, and I couldn't use my front porch due to the cigarette smoke. I would like to see some control over it.

Alison Harris: Clark's point is well taken. When you're in a residential neighborhood, you want to control the smoking in a way that is respectful of the neighbors. Waterville got special permission on their island to make theirs a smoking facility because their residents were typically

under so much stress that to deprive them of smoking with all of their other challenges seemed unfair.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: For clarification, are we recommending no smoking or that there is to be a designed smoking area?

Kathy Wilson: I would love it to be non-smoking, but if not, I do think there should be a smoking area that needs to be managed.

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: A shelter should not be required to do something above and beyond what other similar uses are required to do. The design that we started out with does have accommodations for smoking.

Giff Jamison, Tedford staff member: One of the reasons we developed that area outside was for people to congregate, both smokers and non-smokers. We also have a smoking area at the Federal Street location. Smoking certainly contributes to health impacts and a shorter life expectancy for the homeless.

Alison Harris: Provided with Portland language by Attorney Collins: “An outdoor area for guests’ use shall be provided on-site with adequate screening to protect privacy of guests.” This is the spirit of what I was suggesting.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I don’t think it’s written too well. There should be two components: one being an outdoor space requirement as part of a design – that is definitely a land use thing; then the actual enforcement of right-of-way encroachment.

Chair Mason: Could you give us a proposal that we can discuss next time?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Something similar to Portland’s seems pretty reasonable. I think we should avoid specific size requirement and leave it to the review powers of the Planning Board.

Chair Mason: In the time we have left, I would like to discuss Conditional versus Permitted Use. The current recommendation is for a Conditional Use in permitted districts. I’d like to ask Planning what they think of this concept, and I believe the reason for that is so that it will go to the Planning Board.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: That was it. John Eldridge did champion this idea; to have it go in front of the Board was more comprehensive than to have staff review it.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I agree. Instead of it being a one-person approval, which might give the appearance of sliding through, it would move to the Planning Board, which would introduce some transparency to the decision and how it’s made.

Ryan Leighton, Assistant Town Manager: The other reason was to introduce the public process component that goes with the Planning Board review, with its notification of abutters and higher prominence that comes with that, as opposed to being reviewed internally.

Chair Mason: I did look at the use table when this first came up and wondered if we did this for anything else. Why are we asking for requirements that we don’t ask of others?

Alison Harris: I read a New York Times article about language that people use to avoid having homeless shelters in their neighborhoods, and I worry that by making it all conditional and having only mixed-use conditional, we're sending the signal that this is a worrisome land use. On the other hand, shelters are different from other multi-family dwelling units – people tend to be transient, they don't sign leases, they stay anywhere from a month to six months, they're not hotels or motels, and they also tend to have staff.

Kathy Wilson: I'm okay with making them all conditional.

Chair Mason: I'm thinking about the two Brunswick Landing districts, and I don't see any reason to single those districts out as being appropriate for permitted. If we're going to have it as a permitted use in a district, I think there needs to be more of a basis in our zoning ordinance for doing it. Why is this particular use only available as a conditional use? I understand the rationale, and I probably support it with reservations, as long as it's clear in the recommendation that the basis of it is so that it goes to the Planning Board.

Alison Harris: Also, the more supplementary standards we have, the more important it is to go to the Planning Board for public discussion and comment. I would much rather have the Board handle those areas where we have some discretion rather than a few staff members.

Chair Mason: We are supporting the concept of conditional use for the reasons you have stated. We want public input and transparency, and I want to make sure we are giving ways to the Planning Board to approve an applicant for this use rather than find ways to turn it down.

Public Comment on Conditional Use

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: This issue is at the core of this development, and how any community responds to this group of citizens who find themselves to be homeless. We will wait to see what the draft ordinance looks like, to see if it's constructive for a potential provider as well as addressing the use of the community. If, in the end, there are extraordinary requirements that aren't being asked of others, then we really have to take a serious look at that.

Field Griffith, Tedford Board: This is a threshold issue. The problem with homelessness is not likely to get smaller, so if we make it difficult for any shelter operator to operate in our community, as the problem gets bigger, more of the problem is going to fall to the town. This creates a burdensome requirement on anyone who is trying to help with this problem – to say that a shelter is not a permitted use anywhere in town – and the other micromanagement provisions, any one of which could become an impediment to an approval.

Chair Mason: The way that it's being set out is not that it would be a homeless shelter is not a permitted use anywhere in the town. It is a permitted use that requires a conditional use permit. We all talked about how we have a need, and we want to make it available for people who are going to help serve those of us who are Brunswick residents who are temporarily homeless.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I'm not sure where that falls into our land use considerations – is the ability for someone to secure a property.

Chair Mason: If it is a permitted use, it will still be subject to review by town staff – so either way it will be subject to review; it's just a matter of what process.

Alison Harris: In our final report that goes to Council, I will be asking that it include a footnote that I recognize that the lack of affordable housing in Brunswick is a major contributing factor to this, and one of the reasons that people have to stay longer than anyone would like at homeless shelters. This is something that Council should acknowledge and revisit.

Chair Mason: I agree. It's come up multiple times and we recognize it.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: We will note that. We've started doing some affordable housing research. There was one thing I wasn't clear on as far as recommendations – did we get a size or density recommendation, at least in regards to an individual residence for the non-apartment-style?

Ryan Leighton, Assistant Town Manager: The deadline for the moratorium is September 21, 2018, and I think that Jared was working on a timeline from the time the report goes to Council.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Based on the Planning Board schedule right now, I'm not sure that could happen.

Chair Mason: That's fair. We've been discussing the fact that we're going to be running into a deadline. I think it is likely that when we put forward a recommendation to the Council, we will have to ask for an extension of the moratorium for the shortest amount of time possible.

Kristin Collins, Town Attorney: It doesn't have to be for the full 180 days – it could be for 60 days or whatever. We might want to have the processes go on at the same time, so there's a first read with the Council at the same time as it's in front of the Planning Board, and then it would go back to a second read or final.

Chair Mason: That may be something we can do. We can address that at the next meeting.

Alison Harris: I've found the section on density. Are we talking about the 2.19?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: That was a number staff threw out a while ago, and the only thought behind that was average household size. Looking at other communities, that 2.19 number is on the low side.

Chair Mason: I would like you to put together a recommendation for next time with a number, and whether that number is still the number you recommend, and we will address that number.

The meeting was adjourned.