

Town of Brunswick, Maine
Shelter Task Force
Wednesday, August 29, 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

Councilor Kathy Wilson opened the meeting for Chair Mason, who is on his way.

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

Adjustments to the agenda: Add approval of minutes from the August 15, 2018 meeting.

Approval of minutes: Councilor Alison Harris moved, Councilor Kathy Wilson seconded, to accept the minutes of August 15, 2018, meeting. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

Discussion of Zoning Districts and Standards

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: The memo has been updated to reflect answers to questions and comments from a previous meeting about whether or not the Fire Department or Police Department had any say in this review. They were consulted at the May 18, 2018 meeting. We've added additional conversation regarding staff's recommendation and the subsequent Task Force recommendation that homeless shelters be permitted conditionally, rather than by right. The definitions have been changed significantly. There was a lot of confusion about the mixed use homeless shelter, so we now have resource center, homeless shelter, which replaces the two previous mixed uses – apartment-style and non-apartment-style. The resource mixed use homeless shelter is now prohibited in GM2, where it was previously conditional for apartment-style mixed use, and already prohibited for the non-apartment-style mixed use. The other change is in GM8 – homeless shelter, mixed use, apartment-style used to be conditional, and now when it's combined with resource center, homeless shelter, it is prohibited. Other changes included in the definitions – removing the operated by and not for profit corporation or public agency. Under apartment-style homeless shelter, we've added the word "established" in front of single housekeeping units. We didn't get rid of the "such as" but we did add "staff offices", as an example of an accessory use in a facility. We also removed the 40% language and are just relying on our already established accessory use – anything that's under 40% of floor area. We did not change anything in the supplementary use standards, as we have not gotten that far yet.

Alison Harris: I was hoping that for the homeless shelter, non-apartment-style, in the second line of the definition we could add “adult”, so that we eliminate any possibility of children being housed in these shelters.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Concern was for a future youth shelter.

Alison Harris: Then we would call it a “youth shelter”.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: We would need a new definition for youth shelter.

Alison Harris: Right, but one of the things the Task Force has felt strongly about is not comingling adults with minors. That’s why I wanted to suggest that. I don’t know if I would be comfortable with the non-apartment-style shelter housing teenagers.

Kathy Wilson: I do agree. That was one of the first issues I had.

Alison Harris: I recall from our visit to Waterville, there are stringent requirements for youth shelters.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: They had strict requirements – I’m not sure if they’re mandatory or their idea. I would suggest that, rather doing it in the definition, we do it through adding a condition in the performance standards. I think the use standards are clearly enforceable.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Supplementary use standards are more enforceable because they always exist. The management plan is a one-time submission.

Alison Harris: On the non-apartment-style shelter, with the phrase “the shelter does not offer, or minimally may offer, separate units”. I want to make sure that the minimally may offer would include the opportunity to have separate bathroom facilities for accessibility reasons or staff privacy.

Kathy Wilson: I’m not sure why that’s included in non-apartment-style.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: The thought was for a mixture of uses – not commercial/residential, but the ability to have four apartment-style units on a top floor, separated enough from dormitory style. We’re open to feedback.

Chair Mason arrived at the meeting.

Chair Mason: I worry about a section being divided, and accessibility issues, in a facility that is considered a non-apartment-style. I don’t want to limit that.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: I would suggest that you look at how we defined apartment-style to be at least three units. Rather than minimally, say up to three units.

Alison Harris: I don't think we want apartments in the non-apartment-style shelters.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I think that's a common practice to have both. We have the separation requirement. Housekeeping units would have to be separated from individual residents.

Alison Harris: I really didn't envision any apartments being included under the non-apartment-style.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: The provision then would be for accessibility?

Alison Harris: Yes, I could see that you might have something, and maybe a staff person would have an apartment. Those were the two instances I could think of where you wouldn't want to have strictly dormitory-style living – for staff staying there and for accessibility reasons.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: It wasn't the minimally, it was the use.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: So the only type of facility that could provide both dormitory-style and apartment-style would be the resource center?

Chair Mason: I think what I'm hearing is if you're having a staff facility, for accessibility reasons there is a separate unit of bathroom facilities, but that shouldn't kick you into the resource center definition by just having those minimal uses. By the fact that we have this dormitory-style in the definition, do we need to have: the facility does not offer – that sentence?

John Eldridge, Town Manager: No, we don't. The idea when that came up was to say if you had one or two in a facility, it was probably okay. For one or two, we said minimally. The other way to get at minimally is to say per beds you could have so many apartment units additional. Otherwise, I would just take it out. If someone comes in and makes the case for accessibility, I don't know that there would be a big problem with that. Take that whole minimally out.

Chair Mason: The facility...through...bathroom facilities.

Alison Harris: At the end of the parking section, with the parking demand study, shouldn't that be may not be required instead of shall?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: This was discussed at the meeting when Kristin was here – I think it could be either. The thought was, based on their use, it may be onerous to require a parking study. We can go either way – maybe we leave it to the Planning Board.

Chair Mason: I think that would give certain flexibility- some of the comments have talked about the fluctuation in parking for other uses – and that would give the applicant the opportunity to address that, if they’re looking to get below the density.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I think allowing them that flexibility is okay.

Chair Mason: We were going to talk about how the density numbers play out when it comes to the zoning. It’s where we left off at last meeting, and there were a lot of questions. Could you give an analysis of how density is calculated, how it plays out in this context, and how it plays out in the context of zoning?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I think there has always been unanimous support for a unit within a homeless shelter, apartment-style that translates to one dwelling unit, which is regulated in our Zoning Ordinance, just like a regular apartment would be. Some examples from the growth area standards – the lowest permitted densities are in GR2 – that’s 4. If it’s a GR2 property of one acre, then the maximum units would be four for the apartment-style - we’ve used the number four for individual residents, and I’ll explain where we came up with that in a bit – for the equivalency of one dwelling unit. In the case of GR2, where four dwelling units are permitted per acre, if you had a one-acre site, you would be allowed sixteen individual residents. GM4 allows fifteen individual dwelling units per acre, so that’s obviously intended to be a denser development area. For the same one-acre site, you would be allowed fifteen apartment-style units, and 15×4 would be 60 individual residents. It was intended to provide some level of equivalency – it wasn’t pulled out of thin air. We looked at how several communities handled this. When it comes to density, you have four options: let the building envelope decide and once you’re at maximum capacity based on life safety codes, that would be one extreme; establishing a hard cap – no facility can have over 50 guests – I’m not sure where they come up with that number and it was avoided because it seems arbitrary, a random number; restrict based on a minimum square footage per resident or guest – it was harder for staff to get a real number that we felt was reflective of a normal density in comparison to anything else; the last option is what we’ve done, which is creating an equivalency and taking the existing density standard of dwelling units per acre and making a certain number of individual residents the equivalent of one dwelling unit. A lot of research into other communities that use this method put the range at 3-6, some as high as 8 or 10 individuals counting as one dwelling unit; more were in that 3-6 range. Other towns simply went with beds per acre – some of those towns ranged between 20 and 50 beds per acre – if you divide by 4, on the low end 20 beds per acre would be 5 dwelling units per acre, which is one of the lows we have here. Fifty would be about 12-13.5 dwelling units per acre. Our highest outside of the GM7 is 15. Other towns, when we converted it, generally range from 4 to 15 or 16 dwelling units per acre as an equivalency. That’s kind of where we’re set up with everything but GM7 – being the high extreme of 24 dwelling units per acre.

Chair Mason: Can you give us concrete examples on our code through the range we’re talking about?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: Within GR1, with a site of one acre, you would have up to 32 individual residents. Four residents per dwelling unit. GR6, which is 10, there would be up to 40 – if you have ½ acre site, only 20. GM7 (Brunswick Landing), where it's a conditional use, $24 \times 4 = 96$ as your maximum. 24 is pretty high to begin with dwelling unit for a per acre maximum for a town like this. GR7 is 5 dwelling units per acre, so 20. GR8 is 6, so 24 residents. GM4 (Cook's Corner) is 15 dwelling units per acre. GI does not have an established dwelling units per acre. The other uses we have that are close to that are more medical-type uses that were based on beds and staff. That, I think, would be subject to Planning Board review. I suspect that the parking availability would be the biggest restraint, because you still have to be able to provide the parking for what is allowed.

Public Comments:

John Cunningham, lawyer for Tedford Housing: Going back to the change in the proposed definition – the Task Force may have overlooked reasons for having separate units in the non-apartment-style shelter, such as access issues, minors or segregation. Making the change says we can't do that, and the Planning Board will not be able to approve a plan for a non-apartment-style facility that houses people in anything other than dormitory-style or barracks-style beds.

Chair Mason: I don't believe our reasons for wanting limits on that language are actually to limit that.

John Cunningham, lawyer for Tedford Housing: It would be hard to limit it by purpose because there are so many special purposes that may arise. Perhaps put in a minimum number or a percentage of the overall number of residents.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: On the apartment-style, we've said that it's not even considered an apartment-style homeless shelter if it doesn't have more than 3 units, so I would suggest that that's minimal and that's the number to put in the definition.

Alison Harris: What if you're in a district where the density is 5 – does that mean that 3 of those are used up by the apartments and that only leaves 2 for the dormitory residents?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: That would be our interpretation. The idea behind getting everything into a standard dwelling unit is so we can do those kinds of calculations.

Alison Harris: So we have a facility in a district where the density is 6 dwelling units – 3 of them are taken up by the apartments and 3 of them are taken up by single adults – and our rule is (it isn't a rule yet, but I think there has to be one) to define how they're going to be segregated.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: One of the things you could look at in those cases, because I think you'll only find that on the smaller scale ones, would be the 40% accessory use rule. If it were split down the middle, you have 2 uses that are more than 40% - that would be a resource center.

Kathy Wilson: I don't have a problem putting a number in. I don't mind putting the definition back in. I think minimally is open to interpretation. I'm all for being fairly specific where that's what we really want.

Chair Mason: The facility may offer up to two separate units consisting of separate sleeping, cooking and bathroom facilities? In these smaller areas, that's not going to kick it into the 40% for resource center.

Alison Harris: I don't think the resource center speaks to apartment-style and no-apartment-style anymore, which is what I had hoped. It just says it's a refuge for the homeless, and then talks about the facilities.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: The third line says "in apartments of dormitory- or barrack-style arrangements". Resource center is any combination of non-apartment-style/apartment-style.

Alison Harris: I guess it would be clearer to me if it said "or both". As far as "minimally", I hear my colleagues say you have to put a number in, and I don't feel strongly either way.

Chair Mason: I would prefer a number over "minimally".

Kathy Wilson: I think according to the definition and what could come up for its use, it sounded quite minimal, even though I don't want that word in there, which is why I feel comfortable with two.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: We've made a distinction elsewhere in here for the definition to say that apartment-style is at least three units, so I would just say "fewer than three units", which is two.

Chair Mason: I kind of agree with that.

John Cunningham, lawyer for Tedford Housing: W 1 on density – typographical error in A. In B, might be helpful to put in that the four individual residents, not housed within a separate unit, count as another dwelling unit, otherwise someone will say every 4 residents constitute a dwelling unit, even if there's a family of six living in an apartment.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: It makes sense to me. It's clearly intended that if you have six people in an apartment-style unit, it counts as one.

Clark Labbe, Pleasant Hill Coalition and resident: The homeless shelter, non-apartment-style is a barracks- or dormitory-style shelter, and what I hear the argument for separate space is for handicap access, for impairment or disability or someone that needs to be separated. It sounds like a separate sleeping space, not an apartment. I didn't hear any argument for cooking in that space. I'm thinking you ought to look at, from a density standpoint, the number of people that are permitted in the homeless shelter, non-

apartment-style and allow 1%, 5%, 10% - to be in a separate sleeping room rather than in the dormitory or the barracks. Take the apartment out – not have apartments in the non-apartment-style shelter.

Alison Harris: I was also thinking of bathrooms. I agree with you – it takes out the cooking – but I can imagine situations where you want to have private bathrooms.

Kathy Wilson: I agree. I question why it would need cooking.

Chair Mason: We've said there could be a reason for a staff apartment.

Alison Harris: You could have a hot plate, a refrigerator or a microwave and not have a kitchen.

Giff Jamison, Tedford Housing Staff: I can't recall a time in the past 18 months where our handicap unit in our current shelter has not been occupied. We are required to provide reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities, and we do so to the best of our ability. In the last few months, that unit has been occupied by two people, and I feel it would be forward thinking to consider increasing the number of potential handicap accessible units in a future shelter.

Courtney Neff, NorthWest Brunswick Neighborhood Association: Concerned about GR6 – the Task Force has looked at shelter regulations in Waterville, Westbrook and Portland - where else in Maine have they singled out a residential area for homeless shelters?

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: It might take a while, but we did look at shelter regulations for the twenty largest cities in Maine.

Courtney Neff, NorthWest Brunswick Neighborhood Association: It wasn't in any of the cities we've addressed, least of all Portland, where the group spent the most time studying their situation. The follow-up question I have is could you give a reference on how it was that hotels became equivalent to homeless shelters in terms of zoning.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: It was a staff discussion based on the definition of hotel. It was based on reviewing the definition of hotel and seeing the similarities between the shelter and hotel, not checking with other towns. We didn't use it fully, but used it as a framework for developing standards.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: It was used as a filter, but that was not the final basis. One of the other factors is that it already exists in that zone. We've had the conversation, staff wise, whether or not the dormitory-style or the non-apartment-style should be permitted in any purely residential zone – any of the GR zones. It wasn't because anyone thought it was analogous to a hotel – we thought in some ways the traffic pattern might be similar – but it was just as much the fact that it already existed in GR6 as to why it was left here on the table. Going forward, to have the discussion that you want to have,

is whether or not the dormitory or non-apartment-style should be permitted in any residential district, is a discussion that can be had.

Alison Harris: GR6 does include a lot of commercial on Cushing Street and Union Street – restaurants and offices – it’s got an R in its name but it’s not only residential.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: That’s true, but there are other GRs that also have more than purely residential. We did have the discussion about whether or not as a matter of policy the Task Force wanted to consider only mixed use zones and solely non-residential use zones. Some of the other uses that we have in other residential zones exist because they continue to exist as non-conforming uses, so you sometimes have to separate the zone and what could be allowed there now versus what is there now.

Jim Bridge, Pleasant Hill Coalition and 14 Pasture Way: Definitions - Where the resource center allows dormitory-style or apartments, in the 4th line up where it says “such facility provides”, I would suggest that if you just put “such facility may provide” then they’re not boxed in to having a strictly homeless dormitory-style and you’ve permitted the flexibility to have dormitory and apartments together without requiring that the people would have to have services there. On the apartment-style definition, an established single household has to be defined; otherwise you have given up control to manage what is going to be done.

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I think we need to consult with the attorney on this.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: Staff did have a conversation about this – whether or not we could at least minimally say the housekeeping unit has to be established prior to arrival at the facility, not come to the facility and then make a housekeeping unit. I believe the discussion of established came up, and many of us thought that was before you got there. The concern that was raised was you wouldn’t be an established unit after you arrived.

Chair Mason: Why do we want to get into the business of this at all? If people are declaring themselves a household unit, who are we to question them?

Alison Harris: I’m comfortable with adding “prior to their arrival at the facility”. I’m not comfortable putting in times.

Kathy Wilson: I agree, and I don’t see how we can put a time on that. I like “prior to”.

Jim Bridge, Pleasant Hill Coalition and 14 Pasture Way: Segregation of families and singles – last meeting we talked about the importance of having an outdoor area – what I’d like to see is something that assures that if you have a facility with singles and families in it, that the kids aren’t playing in the smoking area and that they’re separated. I’d like to see separate facilities – I understand the economy of scale makes it better to have it all in one building.

Kathy Wilson: Going to Waterville was one of the best things because they are very strict about the separation of children from the individuals. I've lived across from the shelter and things happen. The job, besides providing a place for the homeless, is to keep the kids safe.

Chair Mason: The way they managed the Waterville shelter for smoking – a staff member went out with the person - it's not that Waterville had required them to have a separate facility for smoking or a separate facility for smoking and children – it was simply managed. I'm reluctant to add on cost-increasing features that prices out of having a facility here. The separation was a policy thing that took place inside the facility, as opposed to requiring physical infrastructure.

Alison Harris: We have a whole section that we haven't addressed yet – the management plan. In that, we do speak to this issue.

Andrée Appel, Tedford Housing Board and resident: Conditional use proposal – these comments were provided to the Task Force in a recent Tedford Housing response to discussion. We would argue that hotel uses constitute a more impactful land use than a shelter – more cars, more traffic, more guest turnover, and hotel guests are not screened for suitability. They are a permitted use in all of the GM sections, and hotels are not required to submit outdoor space plans, location, proximity, transportation plans or a business plan. We feel our population is being treated as though they represented a homogeneous population that warranted particular scrutiny, when the characteristic they share is homelessness. The HUD Fair Housing standards, which do not specifically apply to shelters, say that when enacting or applying zoning or land use laws, State and local governments may not act because of fears, prejudices, stereotypes or unsubstantiated assumptions.

Lynne Holland, 13 Lincoln Street: I live in GR6. There are more pressures on a neighborhood that includes a homeless shelter, and more pressure on denser neighborhoods – fire calls, police calls, and the percentage of people who are experiencing drug addiction, mental illness and domestic abuse. I challenge this Task Force to decide what we want in a given neighborhood – to have a vision. If that neighborhood has maxed out on its density, making it able to hold more makes no sense. You could put an acre together pretty easily if you bought four houses, especially in the neighborhoods of older housing stock – is that what we want? How many people can the town of Brunswick support in the way of homelessness? If we build it, they will come. Waterville's management plan is based on a huge amount of input from the people using the facilities, living in the neighborhoods – they do it based on what the people using the facility are looking for. They have problems with cars and parking on pantry days. If we go on fear alone, the neighborhood with the least involved people or the one who can least afford to hire a lawyer – that's where it's going to be. If that's what we want as a town, I'm disappointed.

Courtney Neff, NorthWest Brunswick Neighborhood Association: Comparing a hotel to a homeless shelter is ridiculous. Information from Mr. Jamison indicated that approximately 30% of their population is mental illness, compared with 20% of the

general population. Tedford House statistics say that over 54% of their population has symptoms of mental illness. Based on the National Institute of Health data, homeless adults have an estimated, combining their addiction with serious mental illness, 46%, where the general population is 18%. Drug or alcohol abuse in the general population is 8%. I'd like us to deal with realistic numbers and go from there.

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: The vision that Tedford has, as a participating member of the community and region, is to find solutions to prevent homelessness, as well as to address the situations that arise when individuals become homeless, and to do so in a way that's based upon proven models.

Kathy Wilson: Craig, you corrected me about numbers a few weeks ago when I discussed the number of Brunswick residents at the shelter. I said 30%, and you said more like 70-75% - I got the numbers from your memo and 30% is what you said. That was from 2014 – 2017, and for single adults it was 25% from Brunswick. I felt like I didn't know what I was talking about, so I want it noted that I had your correct numbers.

Chair Mason: I'm appreciative of the idea that we need to have a vision, but we are just a portion of the Council that has been tasked to do this, and we are going to give our input as part of any recommendation. There is also some limitation to our task, in that we're trying to address holes in our current zoning standards. I don't disagree with the idea, and we certainly can talk about our vision of what we want to see happen and how that's reflected in the proposal that we're going to make to the Council.

As we think about density, I do believe that there needs to be a fairness and equity to it. Coming up with a number that then can be applied to each of the districts I think is fair. When I look at some of the specific...when we apply that 4 to the one acre and we start looking at those specific numbers we're talking about a shelter that can have 20 beds, or 24 beds, or 40 beds. GR6 is the maximum likely to be available for the GRs - 40. I have some reservations of the possibility of having a 40-bed in this dense area, at the same time I think we've got a need greater than that. We have a homeless problem. We need to have facilities that will house those of us who are residents, however that's defined, who are currently without housing.

Kathy Wilson: Yes, we have a homeless issue, but I don't see it as Brunswick's responsibility to take care of the Midcoast. We are being used as a resource for other towns that are not doing their part. They are not paying for any of this. We are a great town and we are centered, but I don't think it is our responsibility to make sure that we have enough beds for all the other towns who don't help pay for them. Some may be government money or donations, but I don't feel that Brunswick needs to be responsible for all of the homeless up and down the coast.

Phil Studwell, Board Chair of the Gathering Place, social worker and resident: Thinks it's wonderful that Brunswick has stepped up. Works in Portland and sees kids stuck in the Oxford Street shelter. Any community that can muster enough for a 2 or 3 bed shelter should be doing it. We have to control the size of it and keep the families separated, judging from the kids he sees coming in sleepless and not able to work. It's

tough being a kid in a shelter, but it's better than living in the car or a tent. I hope we can come up with something sooner rather than later, because the buildings are falling apart.

John Cunningham, lawyer for Tedford Housing: I live in the GR6 district, and I certainly would be concerned if somebody could take my house and turn it into a 40-bed shelter. The proposal is not to allow 10 units per lot or site – it's 10 units per acre. There aren't a lot of places in GR6 where you could buy an acre of land.

Chair Mason: How big a parcel is the Cumberland Street facility?

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: 0.15 – somewhere in that area.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: 0.16.

Craig Phillips, Executive Director of Tedford Housing: Cumberland Street has four dormitories with four beds – 16.

Chair Mason: We are going to have to schedule another meeting, and we are going to run into the end of the moratorium. We can extend for up to six months, and at any time during that six months Council can say they no longer need to use the full six months. Even if we do not have a recommendation that we can give yet to the town, we need to give a recommendation for a moratorium extension. I expect the Council would like to see us do another 6-month moratorium, but I'm a little uncomfortable with that. I'd like to see if there is a consensus on the Task Force for a recommendation to put forth to the Council.

Kathy Wilson: I think six months because clearly we're in a quagmire of stuff that has to happen. I don't think we've pushed it out because we had the time to do it; clearly there's just so much involved with this.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: Because this is a zoning ordinance amendment, it has to both go through the Council process and the Planning Board process. It goes from here to the Council – the Council will then forward it to the Planning Board. The Planning Board has a process in which it takes public comment through a public hearing process, turns around and makes a recommendation back to the Council. To put that in place, the Council has an ordinance process that requires public hearing and adoption, and on a regular basis any ordinance amendment is not effective until 30 days following adoption. Between those two processes, you're probably talking three months.

Alison Harris: I don't support recommending a six month extension. Whatever we produce as a Task Force is going to be considered by six other colleagues on the Council, it's going to go to Planning Board, it's going to have a public hearing at the Planning Board, it's going to come back to the Council and have another public hearing. My guess is whatever we recommend, it will be altered, and I just don't want a quest for perfection to stand in the way of moving this along. If we did a four month moratorium extension,

when does it have to leave here to get into a packet for the earliest Council meeting? I think the risk is we have to extend the moratorium again.

John Perreault, Town Council Chair: I understand the willingness to go less than six months, but this is also an important issue for the Town of Brunswick, and it needs to run its course. There was supposed to be a recommendation coming out of this meeting tonight, but that's obviously not going to happen. In my opinion, to go the six months just gives it that little bit of extra time, whether you use it or not. The four months would be if everything ran smoothly, and unfortunately, it doesn't always. I would support the six months and if it gets done earlier, it gets done earlier.

Chair Mason: There are some portions of the process that could overlap. One of the things we could do is a workshop with the Planning Board and the Town Council together. We don't control either schedule. You can't overlap the whole process with the Town Council and the Planning Board.

I would like to have another meeting in two weeks, Wednesday, September 12.

John Eldridge, Town Manager: A question we posed to the Town Attorney is whether the two public hearings can be combined.

Kathy Wilson made a motion to request the Town Council extend the homeless shelter moratorium for six months or less. Alison Harris seconded. The motion carried with 3 (three) yeas.

Chair Mason: At the next Task Force meeting we will finalize our recommendation

Matt Panfil, Director of Planning & Development: I think I have a good idea of the minor changes needed.

The meeting was adjourned.