

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES**

Minutes of the Augusta Planning Board meeting held on September 13, 2016

Board members present: Justin Poirier, Alison Nichols, Steve Dumont, Pete Pare, Delaine Nye, Bill McKenna, Corey Vose, Tom Connors, Dorean Maines

Board members absent: None

City staff present: Matt Nazar, Lionel Cayer, Betsy Poulin

Guests present: Jim Coffin, Ken Knight, Dave Nadeau, Robin Veilleux, Michael Provencher, Keith Edwards, Melissa Portvander Burg, W. Portvander Burg, Maryann Griffin, David Levitt, Evelyn Levitt, Dan Cummings, Jill Instasi, Joseph Riddick, Sophie Gabrion, Ashley Makbury, Melissa Caswell, Victor McCarty, Cecil Munson

Public Hearing Tabled from July 12, 2016 and August 9, 2016 Meetings: Major Subdivision. Application of W.R. Rhea Associates, LLC for a proposed six lot subdivision on 20.27 acres of land, including five residential house lots and a vacant undeveloped lot. Property is in the Planned Development 2 District (PD2) and includes a Stream Protection 100 Shoreland Overlay District (SP100). Assessor's Map 6, Lot 43. Located on Blair Road.

Matt Nazar gave an overview of the project.

No questions from the Board for Matt.

Applicant: Jim Coffin, E.S. Coffin Engineering & Surveying, representing the applicant. The first lot by the brook has sold. The remaining land, not designated as houselots, could be developed in the future. The houselots meet the frontage and density requirements. Private septic and water are proposed. Another lot has been bought by the applicant and added to the property. Ditching is required by Lionel Cayer, City Engineer, a note is on the plan.

Public Hearing Opened:

Public to Speak in Favor of the Application: None

Public to Speak Against the Application: None

Public to Speak Neither For nor Against the Application: None

Jim Coffin: The current subdivision plat includes the addition of the new lot.

Delaine: Are the former paper streets a non-issue?

Matt: Correct.

Alison: Did we receive a letter from the fire department?

Betsy: Yes.

Alison: Is there a note on the plan about the building floor elevation in relation to the floodplain?

Jim Coffin: Yes.

Alison: This is concerning the application of W. R. Rhea Associates, LLC, for a Major Development Review as per Sections 300-405 and 300-603.E. The applicant proposes to create a six lot subdivision on 20.27 acres of land, including five residential house lots and a vacant undeveloped lot. The project is located on Blair Road in the Planned Development 2 District (PD2) and can be found on Tax Map 6, Lot 43.

I have considered and agree with the Findings of Fact in the staff review and would like to add the following finding:

- The applicant has requested a waiver of the Stormwater Management requirements of the ordinance. As the proposed development is residential house lots and staff has no concerns with this request, this waiver is granted.

I have also considered and agree with the Conclusions of Law as written. I believe the project, as presented to us this evening, is able to meet the standards of our Land Use Ordinance. I move to approve the application.

Seconded by Delaine.

Vote: 8:0. All in Favor. Motion passes.

Public Hearing Tabled from August 9, 2016 Meeting: Conditional Use. Application of Kenneth Knight for a proposed expansion of a non-conforming use, automobile business. Project includes partial demolition of an existing building in the same location of the proposed expansion. Property is in the Rural Ponds District (RPDS). Assessor's Map 4, Lot 107B. Located at 3327 North Belfast Avenue.

Matt Nazar gave an overview of the project.

No questions from the Board for Matt.

Applicant: Ken Knight. Worked with Gary and Betsy to make sure the building complied with the ordinance.

Public Hearing Opened:

Public to Speak in Favor of the Application: None

Public to Speak Against the Application: None

Public to Speak Neither For nor Against the Application: None.

Delaine: Has some concerns about exiting the site due to the speed on the road. Should there be something that clearly directs customers to the driveway on the left of the building?

Lionel: The Planning Board should ask the developer about how customers use the site. This is a high speed road.

Delaine: Any recommendations?

Lionel: Could add a condition to work with the City for safe access.

Alison: Where the sign is located, it seems to direct people to this smaller more difficult location to maneuver. The entrance to the building would seem to be better at the location of the new building expansion. The sign could be moved to the new entrance.

Lionel: Yes, from what you described, this seems to make sense. He recommends talking with the developer about the access.

Ken: Appreciates the comments, the traffic is crazy over there. The new building incorporates the new entrances. Agrees with what the Planning Board says. When the landscaping and site work is completed, it will be more obvious. Most customers come to the left of the building currently.

Delaine: Would you be willing to move the sign west to make the customer parking area more clear?

Ken: Yes, that would be easy to do, but it is a non-conforming sign.

Matt: Is is probably in the right of way currently.

Ken: The sign has been there since 1950. A solution could probably be found, would like to work on this.

Pete: How long have you been associated with the property?

Ken: 1960's.

Pete: Have there been any accidents in front of the property?

Ken: Accidents are down at Lamson Road.

Pete: Would visibility improve due to the addition?

Ken: The taller building will be a more obvious entrance. The state has very large culverts in this area. Wants to work with Gary and Betsy for a solution.

Alison: Where is the main entrance?

Ken: On the new building, on the west side of the building.

Justin: This is a by appointment business, correct?

Ken: Yes, this is a hobby/specialty business.

Delaine: Mr. Reynolds previously owned this building and the house behind it?

Ken: Yes, they did own the house and barn. The house burned about 20 years ago.

Delaine: So, the sign was more centrally located on the property historically.

Delaine: Feels this is a great project, but feels the applicant should work with Code Enforcement and Engineering about the signage. Feels times have changed.

Alison: Feels times have changed. Would like to not rush on this project, could meet again in two weeks. Would like more clarity.

Delaine: Agrees.

Pete: When would the next meeting be?

Justin: September 27th is reserved for a Public Hearing. The next meeting would be in October.

Cory: Would like more information about the customers.

Delaine: Would the other consulting signage be removed?

Ken: Not comfortable removing signage. Wants to keep his grandfathered signage.

Alison: Would like a clearer definition of what the proposed landscaping will be.

Ken: MDOT has been considering clearing some trees.

Alison: Makes a motion to table the discussion of Mr. Knight's application to the first meeting October.

Delaine: Seconded.

Matt: Clarity for signage and landscaping?

Alison: Signage, landscaping, parking, relocation of septic tank.

Vote: 8:0. All in Favor. Motion passes.

Tabled to October 11, 2016.

Public Hearing: Major Development. Application of the State of Maine for a proposed secure forensic rehabilitation facility, for 21 residents, adjacent to the Riverview Psychiatric Recovery Center on the East Campus. Improvements are in the Institutional / Business / Professional Subdistrict (BP). Assessor's Map 10, Lot 8. Located near 250 Arsenal Street.

Tom: He is the program manager for the state's forensic service, works for DHS. His office is in Riverview, but he does not work for the hospital. He has no vested interest in this project. He is willing to recuse himself from this vote.

Justin: Does the Board have any objections with Tom continue to participate in this proceeding?

Delaine: Has no objection.

Justin: Tom, thank you for making this clear. Go ahead Matt.

Matt Nazar gave an overview of the project.

The Board has no questions for Matt at this time.

Applicant: Dave Nadeau, Stantec, representing the applicant. The project is located well into the site and is well buffered from residential properties and Hospital Street. It will not be a large visual impact. The project has undergone MDEP Site Location of Development Review and the department is writing the order. No changes have occurred in the stormwater report submitted to the Planning Board.

Pete: Is this a correctional facility or treatment facility? So people understand, I live in the Mayfair area.

Dave: It is a residential setting, for people found not guilty by reason of mental defect or insanity and requiring additional treatment in a secure facility, but not to the level of needing hospital care. It is a secure facility with locks on the doors and cameras. Staff approval is required for exiting the facility. It is a locked facility with a fenced outside area for residents with a 14 foot fence and razor wire on top.

Pete: What is the makeup of people in this facility?

Dave: These are people who have been found not-guilty. Differing degrees of personality disorders, people who have attempted suicide, this is all he knows.

Pete: Is this a state run facility? Or contracted out?

Dave: Does not know.

Pete: Asking these questions due to neighborhood compatibility. Wants to make sure something like this is safe. He didn't initially see fencing.

Dave: There is only fencing around the recreational patio, the building itself is locked.

Pete: Once you walk out the door, you are out?

Dave: Yes.

Justin: Can you tell us where the patients are coming from?

Dave: Does not know.

Alison: Could this be expanded in the future? Is there an easy way to expand?

Dave: This is currently out for an RPF. The initial documents allow for seven additional beds which could be added in the common areas in the existing floorplan.

Matt: The applicant noted that some patients are currently in the existing Riverview building.

Alison: Is this an autonomous unit? Everything needed is in the building?

Dave: Yes, this is true. It is run separately from Riveriew.

Delaine: Why is Riverview not having an addition? Understands from the newspaper, that some of these patients are in prison currently, but are not receiving adequate treatment and have been moved to Riverview. These patients were violent to staff and need a separate building?

Dave: He does not know the full history, but this facility will be functioning separately from the Riverview building.

Delaine: So this is a medium security facility?

Dave: No, it is a secure facility, just not high security. It gets down to the definition, what type of security forces do you have on site? It is a treatment facility.

Alison: These people will not be wandering in the neighborhood due to the security of the building?

Dave: Yes, that is true. The typical duration for people staying in this facility is 1-5 years.

Corey: Where is this project in relation to the youth recreation fields and the neighborhood?

Matt: Shows location on the aerial photos. Probably 1,500-2,000 feet to the fields?

Corey: Believes it is less than that distance. Location and neighborhood compatibility is an issue, and matters as part of the conversation.

Justin: Hasn't been in Riverview, is it more or less secure than this new building?

Dave: Hasn't been in Riverview either, cannot speak to this. He only knows what is part of the application package.

Delaine: Not as concerned about the distance from the ballfields, but it does enter her mind. She remembers Sharon Taylor being murdered by a patient from AMHI years ago. Her concern is the level of security.

Dave: He cannot speak to the security of the unit, other than what has been provided in the application.

Tom: There is no longer NGRI (not guilty by reason of insanity). You have to be found guilty, but not responsible for their actions due to mental illness. These are the folks at Riverview. These folks require a level of clinical care but have nowhere to go. This is for 21 beds for people who do not meet the criteria to be at Riverview, but do not meet the court's criteria to leave. Heard it will be privately operated. Mr. Nadeau is not here for clinical reasons, but about the building and site.

Dave: Feels Tom's description is accurate, but can't speak to the last part about how it is operated.

Pete: This feels like the last application we just heard. It has lots of moving parts and he now has more questions than answers. We haven't even heard from the audience. Feels between a rock and a hard place.

Delaine: Agrees that more information is needed.

Corey: Agrees with Pete, needs more answers. From looking at the neighborhood compatibility aspect, more information would be needed.

Matt: Feels this qualifies under the Land Use Ordinance as a hospital. This is a permitted, not a conditional use. From a neighborhood compatibility perspective, he recommends the Board not deny based on this review criteria because it is a permitted use in this district. If is considered a hospital.

Corey: Is unsure whether this is a correctional facility or a hospital. Needs proof that the definition is accurate.

Matt: If the Board disagrees with this being a hospital, they can request more information for clarification.

Public Hearing Opened:

Public to Speak in Favor of the Application: None

Public to Speak Against the Application: None

Public to Speak Neither For Nor Against: None

Ashley Wellsbury, from Maine National Alliance for Mental Illness: Here on the behalf of NAMI. Speaks in opposition. Concerned that the proposed facility will be a locked unit,

operating like a correctional facility, not as a treatment facility. She passes out a handout to the Board.

Closed the Public Hearing.

Pete: Would Ashley return to the podium? Expand on her handout.

Ashley: It has not been indicated that the patients will be given hospital level care, like at Riverview. The level of standard for mental health care is lower.

Pete: If I am at this facility, what type of care would I be receiving?

Ashley: I have no idea.

Sophie Gabrion, Public Relations officer from NAMI: The question is what is the priority? A correctional facility has a different main priority than a hospital. The concern is that there is a lot of conversation about whether this is a hospital vs rehabilitation facility. There seems to be a lot of gray area. There is concern about it if approved and built, what are the allowable interventions if it is a correctional facility?

Delaine: Where will residents housed in this facility be transferred from? From Riverview, prison, out of state?

Sophie: Have heard a lot of theories about who could come in this building. Riverview has an emphasis first on care. A correctional facility is to hold people in. NCR (not criminally responsible) patients could be put in another type of housing which could be more beneficial. References Canadian studies.

Matt: If the Board received more information tonight, and wants more time to consider the application, they can. Hospitals are permitted in the district. Neighborhood compatibility is something to be looked at, but at a very minor level since it is a permitted use. Correctional Institutions are a conditional use in this district, which would require a different level of review. Neighborhood compatibility can be looked at more closely for this type of use, because it is a conditional use. No more information would be provided by the applicant if it is a conditional use. It is important for the Board to be comfortable reviewing the information under the correct criteria. Reads the definition of Correctional Institution.

Delaine: Sounds like a correctional facility to me.

Matt: Feels the Board needs more information from the applicant, which the agent is not able to provide this evening.

Justin: Feels this is moving toward being tabled. Doesn't want to walk the line about mental policy in the State of Maine. Doesn't want the Board to go off topic and would like some clarification from staff.

Matt: Need someone from the State to help clarify the uses occurring in the building. Reads the definition of Hospital. The DHS folks seem to agree that this fit within the Hospital definition. If it is a permitted use, the Board will be looking at how the site operates. If it is a conditional use, there is additional weight put on the review criteria, in relation to the use itself. Feels the Board should discuss neighborhood compatibility thoroughly.

Corey: Wants the definitions on one sheet. Hospital, correctional institution, rehabilitation facilities, etc.

Matt: It should come down to how this facility is licensed.

Delaine: Is the same department applying and licensing the facility?

Matt: Most likely, yes.

Pete: How will this be funded? Through corrections? Through DHHS? Where in appropriations is the funding coming from?

Tom: Believes funding is from the Department of Health.

Dave Nadeau: Concur.

Justin: Wants someone from the Department to come to answer questions of the Planning Board. Also, per Corey's request, the definitions summary.

Delaine: Wants to know where the residents are coming from? Are they all convicted felons who have behavior which cannot be managed at the prison? Are they violent? Or are they innocent by reason of mental defect? Somebody can hopefully answer these questions

Corey: Motion to table to the first meeting in October.

Delaine: Second

Vote: 7:0:1. Tom abstained. Motion passes.

Public Hearing: Conditional Rezoning. Application of Evelyne Levitt for the use Business and Professional Offices and Services, for a medical office. Property is in the High Density Residential District (RC). Assessor's Map 35, Lot 181. Located at 133 Northern Avenue.

Matt Nazar gave an overview of the project.

Delaine: Do you know what type of office is proposed?

Matt: Would defer to the applicant for this.

Delaine: Why is this not spot zoning?

Matt: Contract and Conditional Zoning is allowed, legally, if it conforms with the Comprehensive Plan. We have a similar example with a contract zone for a doctor's office just up the hill, zoned specifically to be one of the apartments in the building. This is not without precedent in the City of Augusta. It would need to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. A conforming use in this building would be difficult due to its small size.

Delaine: Parking is supposed to be on site for proposed uses.

Corey: Non-residential uses should have design review, per Comprehensive Plan.

Matt: The design review is to make sure the uses are compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood. A single practitioner is expected, so not many people would be waiting.

Alison: A nurse practitioner and doctor would be in the building, per the application

Matt: True, there are two parking spaces along Jefferson Street. Patients would need to be parking on street.

Delaine: During the winter, where will people park?

Matt: This is a difficulty the site has experienced since construction.

Applicant: David Levitt. There would be either a nurse practitioner or an MD in the building at one time. The parking isn't great. There is adequate space for staff.

Delaine: What type of practice?

David: A referral service, no procedures would occur or medication would be dispensed. People would come in with an ailment, and a plan would be developed for treatment.

Pete: Why would a client come to this site?

David: This is for patients with more chronic problems. This would be for medical cannabis. Patients would come from word of mouth or advertisement.

Delaine: If I had chronic pain, would my doctor likely refer me here?

David: It would depend on your physician.

Delaine: This is for pain management?

David: There are 12 certifiable conditions; chronic pain is one of them, for medical cannabis. This helps reduce opiate use.

Alison: Are you serving as the role of a general practitioner?

David: More or less, this is to meet the state certification process for medical cannabis.

Matt: To be clear, David is the doctor who would be practicing here

David: Yes, and overseeing the nurse practitioner.

Delaine: Would you write prescriptions?

David: No prescriptions, it is a state certification for patients meeting the state requirements for medical cannabis use.

Public Hearing Opened:

Public to Speak in Favor of the Application: None

Public to Speak Against the Application: None

Public to Speak Neither For Nor Against: None

Corey: He would like to see the site reused. The design standards which would need to be applied to the site, per the comprehensive plan. Parking is an issue here. Still thinking about the spot zoning.

Matt: It does not create spot zoning. It is the applicant's task to meet the design standards. Any reuse of the site will be an extreme challenge.

Corey: Wants to see something there, but concerned about parking.

Evelyn Levitt: Strict rule of 2 patients per hour. Will have appointments only for a smooth process for the patient. Bangor Street is walk-in only. Any business here will have a parking issue here. There is parking along the streets and near the building. Less than what would be needed for a grocery store.

Corey: Would need to be a walk in business to not have a parking issue.

Matt: This would be hard to regulate.

Justin: Is not as concerned about parking, feels this is an urban area and parking on the street is not an issue. If a customer doesn't like the parking, they will go somewhere else.

Corey: We argue about the importance of parking quite frequently.

Delaine: The issue here is not only the size of the lot, but also the shape of the lot, and the fact that it is at the diagonal confluence of two streets. There is a fire hydrant and mailbox here.

Maneuvering out of the spaces will be hard. There are numerous driveways in the area. Parking in the winter will be difficult.

Justin: Many multi-units have people parking on the street.

Matt: There aren't many uses which would require less parking.

Delaine: This building has been on the site for a long time. More foot traffic was occurring historically. It is hard to find a practical use for this building. Would not support this.

Pete: Parking is one of our standards, but struggling with this one. Talked with someone on jury duty who had to park 5 blocks away from the courthouse. If the business was stopped just due to parking, seems like that is obsolescence.

Alison: Can we do something with the zoning to allow it to revert to the original zone?

Matt: No, could restrict to just a medical office, if wanted. If someone wanted to do something else, they would need to come back to the Planning Board for a rezoning.

Corey: Agrees with everything said. Feels this does not meet the Comprehensive Plan's design standard due to parking. Would not support this.

David: Given the residential character of the neighborhood, it is just opposite of the office hours. When residents are at work, the office will be open. This will help alleviate some parking concerns.

Alison: Torn about this. Drives by this spot all the time. In her mind, can make a distinction between the urban lot and rural lot and parking realities.

Delaine: All of us hate empty buildings, but there are other uses which could occur here. A barber shop, beauty shop, etc. with other less intense uses. Can't ignore the standards in the comprehensive plan.

Corey: If the Planning Board gives a negative recommendation, the applicant can still go forward to the City Council?

Matt: Yes this is correct.

Corey: Motion to not recommend to City Council due to Criteria #1.

Delaine: Second

Vote: 7:1. Motion passes. Nay is Pete.

Matt: Feel free to contact either Betsy or I in the morning to sit down and talk about the next steps.

Justin: We are going to take a 5 minute recess.

Workshop: Proposed Land Use Ordinance revisions per City Council request. Meeting topics include definitions and Land Use Chart revisions for group homes, boarding homes, rooming houses, homeless shelters, sober homes, and religious activities & associated uses.

Matt Nazar gave an overview of his memo.

Matt: The City of Augusta land use ordinance definition of dwelling unit does not match the state building code definition or the NFPA definition. He suggests to better match the city of Augusta's definition with the building code and NFPA definition. He reads the definitions.

With respect to group homes, he has provided the current definition and notes the land use table which also includes boarding homes. There are two different definitions in state law for group homes. The Community Living Arrangement definition is read from state statute. Recommendation is to add this definition and allow it in all the zoning districts where single family homes are allowed. This would be 8 or fewer residents under the new definitions. A Group Home is recommended to be more than 8 residents. Staff hasn't recommended any changes as to the land use chart locations for Group Homes.

Justin: What about facilities for 8 or fewer not licensed by the state?

Matt: These are probably rooming houses, he will explain more later.

Matt: The term Boarding Home is recommended to be eliminated from the land use chart, the only location where it is currently in the Land Use Ordinance.

Matt: Rooming House recommended definition is read. Intended as longer term housing. Density is addressed in the definition.

Pete: Who determines the use? A sober house opened in Hallowell. He feels a sober house would fall into the rooming house definition.

Matt: Yes. The proposed definition is very similar to Lewiston's definition.

Religious uses, a handout is in the packet. Municipalities do have the right to regulate. The current definition has been in place since at least 1990 when a major re-write occurred. The LUO was established in 1984. Many changes have occurred legislatively since then. The definition proposed creates two types of uses, neighborhood and larger scale. A religious use is better defined per the RLUPA (Religious Land Use Protection Act). Proposed definitions are read. The date referenced in the definition is the start date of the moratorium. Larger scale facilities would allow more uses; these additional uses would need to be reviewed.

The Land Use Ordinance does not include the definition of homeless shelter. Hard to tell if or where it would fit now.

The language has been reviewed by corporation council, except for homeless shelter at the time of the memo.

Would need to determine which zoning districts a shelter would be placed. The definition is read including a change: *A social service facility providing overnight shelter...* The definition in the memo could have possibly included hostels if social service was not added.

Delaine: Large place of worship, the definition at the end includes any accessory use.

Matt: This could be pulled out, but any accessory use is allowed with a primary use anywhere in the city. For the smaller facilities, the accessory uses need to be allowed in the zone.

Delaine: Shouldn't the definitions be the same for accessory uses?

Matt: Would recommend removing accessory uses, as this is already built into the ordinance. Larger worship facilities aren't expected to arrive in Augusta.

Delaine: Feels we shouldn't not expect these changes in the future.

Matt: End the definition at “people.”

Tom: The shelter on Hospital Street, how does this exist?

Matt: It was established prior to zoning. An adjacent parcel was bought to move the offices onto this parcel. It would be hard to determine if this would be allowed there today.

Tom: Some group homes have a primary residence on the property as well.

Matt: It would be classified by how the facility is licensed at the state level. There are problems at the state level with definitions, which the state needs to address.

Corey: Feels staff did a good job with the memo.

Matt: If the Board is satisfied with the definitions, the locations should be addressed.

Alison: Feels good with the definitions of Group Homes and Community Living Arrangements. Single family homes are allowed everywhere other than GS. Group Homes would not be allowed in RA, RB1, RB2, RC, RD, KBD2, RR, RRES, RPDS, RV and RR2. They would be allowed in BP, KBD1, CB, CC, CD and as a Conditional Use in IA, PD, PD2, MED and KL.

Delaine: Appreciates Alison’s interpretation of where these uses go, will need to consider her input.

Matt: Have already advertised September 27th as a public hearing. Another Public Hearing can be held after this meeting if necessary.

Delaine: Likes this idea, feels the Board will get some good feedback on the 27th for thought.

Corey: Wants some time to look through all these districts and consider what the impacts will be. Doesn’t want a not in my backyard situation going into someone else’s backyard.

Alison: Feels good about dwelling unit definition.

Matt: Are there any concerns about other definitions?

Alison: Shelter definition, additional words?

Matt: Want to capture beyond homeless folks, people who may need assistance for other reasons. Adding social services helps.

Delaine: Feels staff did a good job with the intensity of use with religious uses. A shelter could be very small or large, should intensity be addressed here?

Matt: If the thought with smaller scale is to allow it in more zoning districts, the intensity of uses should be thought about. Also, want to think about whether something is simply permitted, or a conditional use?

Corey: Safehaven facilities, where do they fall?

Matt: Could be a shelter or rooming house, depending on how long someone stays there. None of these uses would sunset any existing uses. The existing uses will be grandfathered.

Delaine: Wants to make sure all needs can be addressed somewhere in the city.

Justin: Let’s discuss rooming houses.

Alison: Looked through where rooming houses are allowed RA, RB1, BP. Will need to be looked at more as some are residential and some are commercial. Feels good about the new definition.

Matt: Will leave the existing locations as allowed, the Board can consider changes to the locations.

Justin: Small and large religious institutions. For larger facilities, a location like Civic Center Drive would probably be appropriate.

Matt: Religious activities are allowed in the following areas (per chart). Larger facilities could be at CC, CD, IA and maybe PD or PD2?

Delaine: All of these definitions, will be run by Corporation Council?

Matt: Yes, they have been.

Justin: Where should larger institutions be located?

Corey: Maybe not PD or PD2?

Delaine: Maybe they should be in these zones for discussion, and can be changed later.

Justin: Have the smaller ones in most zones.

Tom: Thinks of licensed, when social services are described.

Matt: Would not recommend adding licensed. The use could be split into two, for size, at 8 or smaller or more than 8.

Alison: Where are social services allowed?

Matt: RD, BP, KBD1, KBD2, CB, CC, CD, PD (conditional use), PD2, RV, KL

Corey: Civic Center Drive and Whitten Road area.

Justin: Walkability to services should be considered.

Alison: Put it in where social services are allowed currently?

Matt: Can bring a map to the next meeting.

Corey: The current social services area is too large. Should consider keeping the shelters as one definition and limit the scope.

Matt: Split definitions?

Corey: Where would the Family Violence Project be in our current definitions? Clear up for the next meeting.

Matt: Can take a shot at where it would be located.

Motion by Alison to accept the minutes with the noted modifications.

Seconded by Steve.

Vote: 8:0. All in Favor. Motion passes.

Adjourn:

Motion Tom to adjourn at 10:34 pm.

Seconded by Steve.

Further Discussion. None.

Vote: 8:0. All in Favor. Motion Passed.

Minutes by Betsy Poulin, Assistant Planner.