

Town of Brunswick, Maine
Shelter Task Force
Wednesday, August 15, 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 minutes: Councilor Alison Harris moved, Councilor Kathy Wilson seconded, to accept the minutes of the July 25, 2018 and the August 1, 2018 meetings. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Mason: We received final recommendations from staff at the end of last week. We will be discussing those recommendations.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: There are three sections of the zoning ordinance that would be altered by these changes.

- **Definitions, Section 1.7.2:**
 - **Homeless Shelter, Apartment-Style:** The ordinance refers to a three-unit or larger apartment to distinguish it from the smaller, one or two unit shelters, to address the issue of different use.
 - **Homeless Shelter, Apartment-Style, mixed use:** There is language in the current ordinance that states an accessory use may occupy up to 40% of floor area before it's no longer an accessory use.
 - **Homeless Shelter, Non-Apartment-Style**
 - **Homeless Shelter, Non-Apartment-Style, mixed use:** Language was added to explain the 40% accessory use regulation.
- **Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance:**
 - **Use Table:** Uses added to Table 3.2, and, based on more recent discussions, we have a description of the supplementary use standards. There would be a note added to the Table stating for the following supplementary use standards apply. GR6 has been discussed - it allows for hotels as a use within contributing resources of our historic district (Village Review district) provided there are minimal changes, and it has a 20% limit for expansion. Staff's thought is if a smaller inn or hotel is eligible for that, possibly a shelter should be as well.

We have identified several items that are not the purpose of this Task Force, but that we need to re-examine, one being the boarding house definitions that we've been looking at as comparison; another is day shelters - we've been specifically looking at the options for overnight shelters. We talked about assembly at the last meeting, or some sort of open space to prevent the queuing in the right-of-way. I think there is some discussion about open space may be desired, but there's not an understanding of how to best implement that. We would have a recommendation if you're interested.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: That needs a little bit more discussion. We looked at a couple of other places in the country that have looked at or had a standard to avoid queuing in the right-of-way. For zoning purposes, I think the hope would be that they would have the capacity on-site to have people outside, and outside of the right-of-way. We haven't found a great way of dealing with that. We could assign a square footage per person – sort of an assembly space. Ten square feet per person came up quite a bit, but there were other numbers from New York where they required a certain amount of open space on-site. It's something for the group to consider.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: We've talked about how we have existing regulations for that through police enforcement – loitering, etc. – we do have a way to handle it, but are there any alternatives?

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: As far as loitering goes, we don't have much as far as regulations, and it probably wouldn't be prudent to do that. We have obstruction within the public right-of-way regulations – I don't know how often those are enforced – but it is not something that we would do under any sort of zoning code. We are looking at what do we need to have for a particular lot for capacity, to keep people out of the right-of-way, so we don't need to get into issues like obstruction of the public way, which is something the police can enforce.

Chair Mason: I'm going back to definitions. Do we need to have the accessory use specified in it – it's built into the zoning ordinance.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I'm usually advocating for not putting regulations into the definition, but in this circumstance, for clarity's sake, we did, but I agree with you that that isn't necessarily the place to put it.

Chair Mason: Do we need to have a mixed use? Mixed use was a mixed use of apartment-style and non-apartment-style.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: That would be one version of a mixed use – others would be office or retail. The thought at the beginning was to call them apartment-style and non-apartment-style, but we started realizing that there were other such uses that are mixed, and the resource center idea, so instead of straying from the original two definitions, that was a way to make that work. It's certainly something that can be revisited.

Alison Harris: Maybe mixed use is the wrong word?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Maybe something that refers to non-residential uses – commercial, etc.

Kathy Wilson: Waterville had a lot of functions that were non-residential, like the food pantry.

Alison Harris: I was struck by “operated by a not for profit or public agency”, and in this day and age of privatization, I could see a government agency reaching out to a for-profit agency to

operate a facility. I don't think there's any reason to put in who's operating it. Also, in the definition toward the end, each apartment has sleeping, eating and bathroom facilities – I thought it was not so much eating as cooking – the apartment has the capability to prepare a meal. In the non-apartment, you still are eating in there, it's just not a private kitchen facility. I was wondering about “each apartment provides housing to a housekeeping unit that contains sleeping, cooking and bathroom facilities”. Does that make more sense than eating? Then when you get to the non-apartment-style, it says “the facility does not offer separate sleeping, eating and bathroom” so I would change the eating to cooking there as well. A definition of a kitchen is it had a stove – I think that's in congregate living. Apartments traditionally have stoves.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: That's a dwelling unit – living quarters with independent cooking.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: Should we just pick up the dwelling unit definition in the zoning ordinance? I think it was intended as Alison described it – to be separate cooking or whatever the dwelling unit definition is – in the zoning ordinance. The idea was the apartment-style is a separate dwelling unit consisting of those features of a dwelling unit.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: In interpreting that part of the code, I think Jeff usually does look at if it's got a full stove – he would say that's cooking – whereas a microwave isn't. As far as assisted congregate living, that definition has an exemption in dwelling, multi-family that kicks that out.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: In dwelling unit it says cooking facilities – we should just be consistent.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: It says independent cooking, sleeping and bathroom facilities for one household.

Alison Harris: We have talked about eligibility for living in an apartment – whether you had to have a minor as a member of the household unit, and the issue of not wanting them down the road to be the equivalent of boarding houses, where you just put a lot of singles in there. Even though we don't use the word family, they were intended for family equivalents. Somebody raised the concern that if the single shelter was overwhelmed that the vacant apartments would start being used.

Chair Mason: I think we talked about it but didn't want to get into the micromanagement of telling an organization how to allocate its resources. I would also like to use consistent language that's already in our code. Do we really want to have the existing 40% use language in here? If we're going to take it out, does that mean we're going to go back to two definitions?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: It could be worded “to the extent that such support services remain accessory uses as defined”, without putting the 40% in there, in case somewhere down the road, accessory use gets changed to 35%.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: What is the language of the ordinance when we talk about two principal uses being combined? Is that also where that would be discussed, or would it come under that as well? I remember we did have a conversation about two principal uses put together on the same lot. I believe our zoning ordinance already addresses that outside of the conditional use criteria.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: It's on page 3-1, sec. 3.1.2., Other Restrictions on Permanent Uses. A development may include multiple principal uses listed in tables 3.2 and 3.3, including a combination of residential and non-residential uses provided that each use is either a permitted use or a conditional use in that zoning district, that a conditional use permit is obtained for any conditional use, all supplementary use standards applicable to each are met, the development complies with all applicable density and dimensional standards, and all required approvals are obtained.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Looking at the table, there might be some instances in which the apartment-style is allowed in one, but the non-apartment-style is not. In those cases, you wouldn't be able to do a mixed use. If they're both permitted, it is acceptable. GR8 for example, would not be eligible to do a combined apartment- and non-apartment-style.

Public Comment on Proposed Definitions

John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer: It would be better not to talk about who is operating the facility, but if that stays in, urges the Task Force not to limit it to corporations because there could be other business entities. In definitions, we would like to see staff offices included in the such as list. In terms of the labels, we would like them to be consistently applied. In the two definitions for the non-apartment-style it says the non-apartment-style may minimally offer some units of apartment-style – we would like you to take out the word “minimally” or put in a footnote to note that this does not apply when combining separate uses pursuant to the other section of the code.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: You could take it out, but you wouldn't want to say if you add one unit you would have two principal uses. It's a word you could probably trip over – minimally. You could say you don't offer it. If someone came in with a building of all dormitory-style with one apartment for a special needs individual, whether you would turn around and say that's two uses. Maybe you want to put a number on it like the number defined for apartment-style – don't have more than three of them, for instance.

Alison Harris: The facility does not offer separate units except in the case of accessibility – something like that. I don't want to preclude a shelter from offering that.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: That makes sense to me- to at least work around that minimum.

Jim Bridge, Pasture Way: One concern with the apartment-style facility is that it can be put places the singles cannot be, and heard earlier that they were not going to limit putting singles in apartments if they were open. If we don't define families, we're potentially putting a family unit with some number of apartments in it, in a zone not zoned for singles, and allowing singles. I think it's important to define the families, and that the apartment-style is for families.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: You can't and shouldn't use the word family, but you could in the definition include things such as dependents, minors, or whatever.

Marybeth Burbank, Northwest Brunswick Neighborhood Association: In the first definition, the support services do not exceed 40%, but in the second definition they can exceed 40%. How many structures can be allowed on this lot? The second definition – does that mean whatever this style is can be all social services and no homeless persons accommodated? I'm trying to apply this to my neighborhood and understand where or if the limitations are, or if any lot can hold structures.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: If you could meet setbacks and lot coverage, then you could have several buildings. There's a maximum building per structure limit, but no actual buildings per lot limit.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: The 40% is our definition of accessory use. Over that, it becomes principal use. Any lot that is in a zoning district that permits homeless shelters can be in a second building, but it has to meet dimensional standards like setbacks, not exceed lot coverage, and other things like that.

John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer: I like the term housekeeping unit rather than family. We hope you won't limit our ability to let people live together who have been living together before.

Chair Mason: I don't want to go down the road of defining housekeeping unit. I don't want to inhibit providers' ability to care for people.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: It says grouped together as a housekeeping unit – I don't know if that implies they came together. If we went the way you suggested, it's an enforcement issue then?

John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer: I suppose it would always be an enforcement issue no matter what the code says. If we ignored what the code said and just put six unrelated people who just showed up that night in an empty apartment, that's an enforcement issue.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: It doesn't say six unrelated people – we're stumbling a bit with trying to get a number.

Alison Harris: What about to an established single housekeeping unit – each apartment provides housing to groups who have been living as a housekeeping unit?

Kathy Wilson: To me, that's getting into the weeds a little bit. I agree with what he's saying – how it is worded is our only problem. I want people that are dependent on each other, whether it's financially or emotionally, etc.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I'd like to bring up the enforceability issue again – we'd need to send our code officer over asking what everyone's relation is to each other.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: I'm curious if there's agreement among the Task Force in terms of the concept of an established group that arrives as opposed to – I think the concern that some people are expressing is that the apartments don't become the overflow for singles.

Chair Mason: I don't mind adding the word established to the definition. An established housekeeping unit would not be six people who met that night.

Lynne Holland, 13 Lincoln Street: I'd like to go back to the charge for the Task Force to define and regulate the use of homeless shelters. The defining is very difficult. What's concerning me is that, in our rush to be politically correct and recognize the diversity that we have in this town, we've also left things sufficiently vague that the demands for homes by people of all incomes in this town could create a situation where people could abuse these definitions to their own gain. Once such situation would be whether it was an established household or not. By that definition, all the guys from one frat house could end up in an apartment when they're homeless at the end of the school year. We could get all the students from a dormitory-style housing unit in another town that would then be eligible for apartments. One of the things this Task Force has to do is

consider what is best for the community, and not be afraid to define that. It's wonderful to say it could be operated by anyone, but is that really what we want? Is it wrong to say we have a preferred hierarchy of these sorts of facilities? It's a business, and for some people it's a for-profit business. As a citizen, I could be looking at someone coming in and buying four apartment buildings on my street, and my street is mostly multi-family housing, and turn the entire street into homeless shelters – then I wouldn't have a “family” neighborhood anymore. I'm not saying we shouldn't have homeless shelters in neighborhoods - there is a family shelter in my neighborhood now. Definitions – when you have uses other than the residential, you open yourself up for traffic. That has not been addressed anywhere in these definitions. If a building had a commercial kitchen, and there are businesses and commercial kitchens in the neighborhood, they could become a meal site or a pantry, and if you've seen the corner of Union and Pleasant when the Good Food bus is in town, you're talking traffic. Whatever these other uses are, there are other things that need to be addressed around those other uses, because if you're bringing people in from elsewhere to use them – it's not the overnight parking we're worried about – it's the parking during the day and its effect on the current businesses in that neighborhood. I ask this committee to have preferences; to have demands on these definitions that serve the entire community, not just the homeless community, because by serving the homeless community only, we will detract from the neighborhood, and services will be disproportionately used and then not be available to the other members of the community. There are more calls (police, medical) in a typical neighborhood with a homeless shelter than in a regular neighborhood. I want to see something about the community impact in here, and the density of some of our neighborhoods could not afford to have this type of extra use.

Jim Bridge, Pasture Way: Definition of who would use an apartment is probably the hardest piece for this Task Force, but I think it's important to define it without defining morals, but I think we have to define it to set into the zoning who is allowed to be using the apartments.

Chair Mason: I would like to move to the Use Table. As far as the staff's recommendation in the report for why there are no permitted versus conditional uses as a use defined. We talked about it and I have expressed my reservations about it. I'd like to see a little bit of a staff definition supporting why you've made that choice. If we adopt this report as our recommendation, I want it in there that where it is allowed it is only allowed as a conditional use.

Public Comment on the Use Table

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Some of the thought was that instead of one person's interpretation, we would have the Planning Board, which is appointed by the Town Council, and is a democratically elected organization which is more representative of the people and more transparent. There is also the added benefit of notification for people of surrounding properties. There was the concern, I think, that if a shelter was permitted by right, all we needed was our Code Enforcement officer to sign off on it. People may have felt we were trying to be nontransparent by sort of “sneaking it in”. By going through conditional use, it allows people to have a voice in the project more so than just a Code Enforcement officer review.

Alison Harris: The language is going to be a very serious issue. I want to make sure it's framed in a way that states we are trying to help solve the homeless problem rather than making it more difficult for them to find space.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: If this was truly a desire to say no, we would not have gone through this process and recommended it in the districts we have. We will beef up this section as to what the discussion was and how we came to that.

Chair Mason: According to the Use Table, there are five districts that have a mix of being prohibited or only allowed with a conditional use permit. I would like a clarification and the rationale for why these districts are different than the other ones where it is either prohibited or conditional use.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I think that has to do a lot with whether it's mixed use or not. You'll notice GR1 is conditional where it's just residential, and that's the character of the district – it's not supportive of other principal uses that are non-residential. GR7 and GR8 took that thinking a little further in that they contained a lot of apartment-style, but the non-apartment-style was not characteristic of the district.

Chair Mason: Jared had specifically mentioned those and said that certain uses were intended to be excluded in those particular districts.

Jared Woolston, Town Planner: Hotel was specifically not allowed in GM8 – I don't remember about the other R districts, but that sounds right.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Those weren't characteristic of the higher density, large grouping, but did allow maybe for some multi-family to some extent. GM2 is a similar thought, as far as GR7 and GR8 – the apartment-style was okay because there is some multi-family, but the extent of the hotel and other uses we were talking about greater concentrations or densities was not. GM8 I don't recall, but I would suspect we had similar thinking to the GM2 and GR7.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: GR6 has come up before in discussion. It's conditional for any style, and there was talk about why that was. I think there were two reasons; one was the hotel piece of it, but more importantly, it was also the fact that it already exists in that zone. We've had this conversation about other things before about hotels on Water Street that are now nonconforming uses – in part we left it in here because it already exists in that zone, but that's not consistent with other uses throughout the town. We've made existing uses within a zone nonconforming uses. This is one of the districts in which it's allowed, and in part it was allowed because it exists.

Alison Harris: There are a lot of apartment houses in GR6; certainly the apartment-style makes sense. There are also a lot of living like the Independence Association units. I have a problem with the notion of contributing resources because I heard at the last Village Review Board meeting that we may not have contributing resources as a definition any more. We don't want to have it in the zoning code if it doesn't exist anywhere else.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: That was talked about at a very preliminary and broad level. Any change to that would have to review how it impacts the whole zoning ordinance. An easy fix would be “identified as within the Village Review Overlay zone”. Most in the Village Review Overlay zone are listed as contributing. We will keep that in mind.

Courtney Neff, Northwest Brunswick Neighborhood Association: There's only one reason that in GR6 contributing old buildings can be converted to inns where no other districts have this – they didn't have enough time to bring in the other residential districts and address it. It should have been corrected then, and it should be corrected now.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: It is there because it already exists in GR6.

Alison Harris: I'm confused – this is more restrictive. It says that the shelters are limited to buildings identified as contributing resources. In other zones you could put them in any building.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: GR7 and GR8 list it as conditional – is there a particular type of one of the uses you don't think belongs, or just in general, because GR1, GR7 and GR8 all allow some level of shelter.

Alison Harris: And it's not limited to contributing resources – it's any building.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: GR6 is the only one restricting the type of building it can go in. Of the four uses listed, do you think conditional use should not be allowed for any of those, or some? If they were all uniform, we would have one residential zoning district. We've talked about the characteristics of the different districts. The argument seems to be that it would need to be added to 7 and 8 rather than just in 6.

Chair Mason: I think the issue is that there are four uses and it's conditional in GR6 for all four, and not in GR7, GR8 and GR1, and I think your response to that is the analysis based on the characteristics of the zoning in those districts based on the code.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: If the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee (ZORC) had added GR7 and GR8, we possibly would have recommended more conditional for those, but we're operating with what was done within the zoning ordinance, how districts are described and what the intent was.

John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer: The first and the third in the use column contain a parenthetical that says "residential use only". That doesn't match the definition, and I think it should be taken out.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: That is for descriptive purposes in the beginning that's been carried over. So noted. That will definitely go away.

John Cunningham, Tedford lawyer: Please don't use "residential use only" because then someone will say I can't have that ancillary use in there because it doesn't count.

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: In earlier discussion, boarding homes were being linked with shelters, and I'd like to point out that there are some districts where boarding homes are permitted, where shelters are being prohibited or being conditionally prohibitive, so you might look at that. Also, by the time we get to an application process, we're going to have three or four public comment processes, not including the zoning ordinance process, and we've stated several times the implications for securing property, the cost to the provider and how long this process has stretched out.

Lynne Holland, 13 Lincoln Street: Matt, did you agree with Courtney's comments that if ZORC had said it should be this way in these other zones, you would have put it that way, but because they didn't, you didn't?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: We would have had to look at it, but we were looking at what currently existed. As it is right now, the decision was not to do that. I don't know if that was a shortcut, so I'm not going to comment on that. I know what we were given; I don't know how we got there.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: It was for two reasons in my recollection. It was because of the hotel part that came up, because staff looked at hotel and boarding houses in the various districts to see compatibility or consistency, but it also was recognition of the fact that a facility already existed within GR6.

Lynne Holland, 13 Lincoln Street: When the process comes to the Zoning Board, there will be public comment. If you live in a neighborhood and you think your neighborhood is one way, and you get there and find out these other uses, it's really putting the onus on the neighborhood and how much money they can raise or lawyer they can get in order to have their needs spoken for. I think that's a disservice to the community. I don't want a situation in my neighborhood where multiple houses are bought up and maybe not all by the same people because you've opened it up for any sort of group – limited corporations, non-profits, for profit corporations. That's the charge of this group – to make sure this doesn't happen to any neighborhood – not just GR6. That's not residential – that's business – and that's something this town hasn't and doesn't address very well. This could become the next Airbnb.

Marybeth Burbank, Northwest Brunswick Neighborhood Association: You are getting near the time limit for this group, and it reaches a point where we begin to see the impact of your recommendations and we begin to see the impact on the total zoning of the town of Brunswick. The proportion becomes the question. The town of Brunswick is providing shelter for many other towns that are not providing homeless shelters. One of the charges of this group is to consider total shelter beds available in Brunswick and the number of clients that can be accommodated. It will take a consideration of exactly what the Town's role is. Portland has considered a percentage of their population in a number that they are attempting to address. The director of the Waterville shelter clearly told you if they had had the money, they would never have put single people and families in one building. We in the town cannot become the homeless shelter for Topsham, West Bath, Harpswell, etc. We must decide what can we accommodate, and what is reasonable for us to accommodate? That is something that has limits. What kind of a building? How many buildings? Where? In which zone? It has to come to some number that we feel comfortable with. Only then do we look to how fairly to provide those accommodations to those who need help, and to help those who are giving help.

Kathy Wilson: That is a very good point, and I think as we go along we are going to get more of those questions and concerns. I also asked at the beginning if any other towns contributed, because I think it was around 1/3 of the people in shelters that were supposedly Brunswick residents. I asked if any of these other towns contributed money and I think they said Harpswell and Woolwich were the only two towns. We were asked what does Brunswick contribute, and we do contribute police, fire, ambulance, etc. I believe we need to find an answer. We do need to have a decent homeless shelter – I also understand the concerns of others that say “are we an area shelter – what is the deal”, and I know we're going to get a lot of pushback from people saying we just don't need to be that big – why in Brunswick? We have so many issues we have to address, but I think we also have to keep in mind that this is where we're going to get the pushback. The three of us won't be deciding – we take it to Council and see where it goes there.

Alison Harris: I'd like to remind everyone that we are charged with three things: to develop definitions of shelter housing, to determine appropriate zones for the location of shelter housing, and to develop performance standards and other appropriate regulations to govern the operation of shelters. I don't see that you have to be a Brunswick resident. We have to bring this phase to a close and look at those three narrow things.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: My initial thought during the comments is it's worth considering, but it's very hard to tie that to some sort of zoning performance, with

fluctuation in need of housing. Shelter housing, I'm sure, is tied to the economy and different things that we would need to be continually monitoring to have that number.

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: There are five or six towns in the region that support Tedford Shelter, as well as hundreds of individuals and many foundations. It's really impractical to consider building shelters in every little town. I feel confident in saying that around 2/3 of the numbers come from the Brunswick area.

Lynne Holland, 13 Lincoln Street: There are ways in zoning that you can communicate policy, such as density, percentage of the land used for certain uses, or regulations that refer to neighborhood character. Anything could be offered up - the onus is on the local community to fight it each time. Keep that in mind as you make these recommendations. If 50% of a small neighborhood becomes a homeless shelter, that's going to affect the neighborhood and the town.

Chair Mason: I am hearing the concerns, but the reality is that 50% of any district is not going to become a homeless shelter because there is not enough money for that to happen. Character exists in a neighborhood, and I think that's what Matt was trying to accomplish when they went through zone by zone. Their recommendation was keeping in mind the inherent nature of the neighborhood. I appreciate the comments and I appreciate the staff trying to stay consistent with what is already in place with the zoning.

Marybeth Burbank, Northwest Brunswick Neighborhood Association: Read a section of the Task Force's charge stating they shall consider compliance with the town's Comprehensive Plan, the impact on established neighborhoods, appropriate size and scale and type of housing provided, whether the shelter is single use or mixed use, total shelter beds available in Brunswick and number of clients that can be accommodated. It is not outside of your purveyance.

Alison Harris: We did consider total shelter beds available - there are 16 at Cumberland Street and around 6 apartments for x number of people. Those are the total beds available in Brunswick. As terms of projecting into the future, I interpreted this as looking at what we have now, not as capping them in the future. I may have misinterpreted the intent, but I think we did consider the services that are currently provided.

Chair Mason: In talking with people including our current provider, if they went forward with the facility, there's likely to be some consolidation. It's not assured that there's going to be a complete addition to the number of beds by any new facility. We've talked about the general nature of zoning in each district, but I don't think we have shown any interest in saying we will have no more than 200 beds in the Town of Brunswick.

Kathy Wilson: I thought we did talk about it.

Chair Mason: When we get into the density requirements, I'll have some questions about how those requirements are applied in the zones.

Marybeth Burbank, Northwest Brunswick Neighborhood Association: I don't want to hear you talking about things in light of a backlash. I want you to make your decisions to the best of your ability with the big picture in mind - what do you think the Town of Brunswick ought to be thinking about and ought to be addressing.

Chair Mason: I'd like to talk about the next part, which is calculating density. We've had this discussion now which has sort of danced around the idea of density, but we haven't specifically spelled out a recommendation. Can we have a discussion about density in four or five minutes - if we can't, we'll need to schedule another meeting. I would like to get an explanation of how the

density calculations and density requirements that are part of your next recommendations play out – and maybe an explanation of the affect it will have on controlling size.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Would you want to see some of the definitions revised in that time as well? There were ideas, but I don't know if I got a full sense of what we want.

Alison Harris: My suggestions: In definitions, I would take out who is operating them, I would add the word established to “an established single housekeeping unit”, I would change eating to cooking, and John's suggestion about going to the whole dwelling unit definition as opposed to dealing with the 40%.

Kathy Wilson: I think there needs to be discussion about the who (nonprofit, business) – I'm sure that will come up.

Chair Mason: The idea is – is there a difference between a for profit versus a nonprofit or a low profit?

Alison Harris: I'm not sure what the concern is because I don't know how you're going to profit off the homeless unless you're sponsored by a government agency or someone is paying you to do it.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: Let us think about it a little bit. If it mattered, you could say owned and not operated by, but I'm not sure it makes a difference. It came from other ordinances where they specifically talked about nonprofits or a governmental agency. They weren't thinking about a governmental agency contract with a profit-making agency to provide it.

Alison Harris: I would also like to beef up final comment – I think lack of affordable housing is the major contributing factor – not just an element.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: We're directed to add something – if you have certain feelings on how that should be – it says it's coming from the Shelter Task Force – please feel free to write your own and send it to me.

Chair Mason: I would like to schedule another meeting for Wednesday, the 29th from 4-6.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: We can edit this memo a little bit with some definition tweaking.

The meeting was adjourned.