

AGENDA

**The City of Rolla
Planning & Zoning Commission
City Council Chambers, 1st Floor
901 North Elm Street
Tuesday, May 14, 2024 at 5:30 PM**

Commission Members:

**Chairman Russell Schmidt, Secretary/Vice-Chairman Monty Jordan,
City Council Representative Nathan Chirban,
Robert Anderson, Kevin Crider, Janece Martin, Monte Shields, Steve Davis, Don Morris**

- I. **APPROVE MINUTES:** Review of the Minutes from the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held on Tuesday, March 12, 2024
 - II. **REPORT ON RECENT CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS:**
 - 1. **CUP24-01:** Conditional Use Permit to allow an industrial use in the C-C, Center City district for a proposed brewery at 600 N Rolla Street
 - 2. **Old Town Neighborhood Plan**
 - III. **NEW BUSINESS:** NONE
 - IV. **PUBLIC HEARING:**
 - 1. **TXT24-02:** Text Amendment to Sections 42.203 Zoning Use Definitions; 42.209 to establish Shelters, Soup Kitchens, and Transitional Housing; 42.211 – 42.215 Residential Districts; 42.221 – 42.224 Commercial Districts; removing 42.457 Overnight Shelter, Soup Kitchen, and Transitional Uses; and 42.710 amending Zoning Use Table as needed
 - V. **OLD BUSINESS:** NONE
 - VI. **OTHER BUSINESS/REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRPERSON, COMMITTEE, OR STAFF:** NONE
 - VII. **CITIZEN COMMENTS:**
- NEXT MEETING DATE:** **Tuesday, June 11, 2024**

MINUTES
ROLLA PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
ROLLA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2024

Presiding: Russell Schmidt, Chairperson

Commission Members Present: Robert Anderson, Nathan Chirban, Kevin Crider, Steve Davis, Monty Jordan, Janece Martin, Don Morris, Monte Shields

Commission Members Absent: None

I. APPROVE MINUTES: Review of the Minutes from the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held on Tuesday, February 13, 2024. **Chairperson Russell Schmidt approved the minutes as printed and distributed.**

II. REPORT ON RECENT CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS:

1. PUD24-01: Rezoning to apply a Planned Unit Development overlay to property zoned C-2, General Commercial for a mixed-use redevelopment at 127 H-J Drive.

III. NEW BUSINESS: NONE

IV. PUBLIC HEARING:

1. CUP24-01: Conditional Use Permit to allow an industrial use in the C-C, Center City district for a proposed brewery at 600 N Rolla Street.

Coots presents the staff report.

Morris asks if Public House already brews beer onsite, why do we need the CUP? Is it because they are expanding their brewing area? **Coots** states that they are now splitting off into 2 different companies. The brewery will be one company and the Public House will be a separate company. The brewery would be a stand-alone use, rather than being accessory to the restaurant.

Morris asks if the space they are wanting to use for the brewery is 8,000 square feet, why are we stating that the brewing area can only be 8,000 square feet? **Coots** responds that it is to prevent them from expanding the building to more square footage and use that new area for brewing without getting permission from the City.

Chirban asks how close the nearest residential property is to the area for the proposed brewery? **Coots** responds that there is a building across the street to the north.

Chirban asks if the incoming delivery trucks would create a noise nuisance? **Coots** states that this is a commercial area so any business would have trucks coming and going.

Schmidt opens the public hearing.

Josh Stacy, residing at 10660 Baker Drive, Rolla, Missouri. Mr. Stacy presents his plans for moving the brewing facility from St. James to Rolla and the brewing process.

Schmidt closes the public hearing.

Following some discussion **Schmidt** entertains a motion for a roll call vote.

A motion was made by Monte Shields, seconded by Steve Davis, to send the request for approval of the CUP to City Council with the conditions that the brewery use is limited to 8,000 square foot of area, significant expansion would require approval and the CUP is limited to production, manufacturing, packaging and storage of beer or wine. A roll call vote on the motion showed the following: Ayes: Anderson, Chirban, Crider, Davis, Jordan, Martin, Morris and Shields. Nays: None. Absent: None. The motion passes.

2. Site Plan Review: Lease of property owned by Rolla/RMU at 10822 CR 3160 for a data processing operation; zoned P, Public.

Coots presents the staff report.

Chirban asks if the planning & zoning commission does not pass this, does it mean they would not be able to lease this property to this company? **Coots** states that you would defer it to the City Council, you could not outright deny this case.

Chirban asks if this is approved and they want to put more stations at other locations in the future would it require a separate approval? **Coots** responds, yes.

Chirban asks if this is approved and they want to add more to this location would it require separate approval? **Coots** responds, yes.

Morris asks where it states that they are limited to three structures? **Coots** responds that it is limited to the site plan which only shows three containers.

Schmidt opens the public hearing.

Rodney Bourne, General Manager of Rolla Municipal Utilities. States that because of the amount of energy used, this facility will generate a lot of heat. The developer would like to modify the site plan to add a greenhouse next to the containers which can help to divert the hot air generated by the equipment. Mr. Bourne explains the plans for this property, energy usage, rates, provisions for peak alerts and noise level to the commission.

Davis asks if this will be monitored 24 hours a day for any issue or if it needs to be shut down in an emergency situation. **Bourne** states that this is monitored 24 hours a day, RMU is obligated to give a 2 hour notice if they need to shut down. If the customer does not shut down then RMU has the ability to shut them down.

Crider asks if the 140 acres directly west that's still in the city limits were to be developed will RMU still have enough power to supply that area. **Bourne** responds, yes.

Schmidt asks about security at this facility. **Bourne** states that the leased property will be fenced off and have its own entrance. They will not have access to the remainder of the property.

Chirban asks what amount of time the initial term of the lease would be for? **Bourne** responds that it will be a three year initial term with renewals after that.

Josh Vroman – Rolla City Council, residing at 115 Gene Drive, Rolla, Missouri. Mr. Vroman asks if this company receives a reduced rate, or a higher rate? **Bourne** states that they have an interruptible rate which is an energy only rate, they will pay a service availability fee and then .07 cents per kilowatt. He also states that this information should be published on the RMU website.

Vroman states that we just revised Chapter 42 and I don't believe it has anything for crypto mining as a business. Will this company need to have a business license? **Bourne** replies that we have already pointed them in the direction of the Code Department for building permits and the Finance Department to determine if he needs a business license.

Vroman asks if the lessee is paying for the site preparation? **Bourne** responds, yes.

Vroman asks if this facility will be using water to cool its heating power? **Bourne** respond, no.

Schmidt closes the public hearing.

Following some discussion **Schmidt** entertains a motion for a roll call vote.

A motion was made by Janece Martin, seconded by Don Morris, to find that the site plan would not cause significant and unwarranted impact if revised and approved the site plan with the allowance for the greenhouse. A roll call vote on the motion showed the following: Ayes: Anderson, Chirban, Crider, Davis, Jordan, Martin, Morris, and Shields. Nays: None. Absent: None. The motion passes.

3. Old Town Neighborhood Plan: Resolution to adopt the plan as an element of the Comprehensive Plan and recommend adoption by City Council.

Coots presents the staff report.

Schmidt opens the public hearing.

Jerome Beck, residing at 13850 South Highway 63. Mr. Beck states that he likes that Rolla has so much black history and would like to see the Lincoln School turned into a black history museum. He would also like to see more feedback from the black community on this plan. He is concerned that the plan might "run over" the poor people and would like help from grants or the local government to help the poor people bring their houses up to par. Mr. Beck would also like to see a robust preserving of affordability in this plan.

Schmidt closes the public hearing.

Following some discussion **Schmidt** entertains a motion for a role call vote.

A motion was made by Janece Martin, seconded by Monte Shields, to adopt a resolution to approve the Old Town Neighborhood Plan as an element of the adopted Comprehensive Plan and recommend the plan be adopted by the City Council. A roll call vote on the motion showed the following: Ayes: Anderson, Chirban, Crider, Davis, Jordan, Martin, Morris, and Shields. Nays: None. Absent: None. The motion passes.

V. OLD BUSINESS: NONE

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS/REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRPERSON, COMMITTEE OR STAFF: NONE

IX. CITIZEN COMMENTS: NONE

**Meeting adjourned: 8:02 p.m.
Minutes prepared by: Cindy Brown**

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, April 9, 2024



Report to:

**Planning and Zoning
Commission**

Case No.: TXT24-02

Meeting Date: May 14, 2024

Subject: Text Amendment to Sections 42.203 Zoning Use Definitions; 42.209 to establish Shelters, Soup Kitchens, and Transitional Housing; 42.211 – 42.215 Residential Districts; 42.221 – 42.224 Commercial Districts; removing 42.457 Overnight Shelter, Soup Kitchen, and Transitional Uses; and 42.710 amending Zoning Use Table as needed

Background: The City Council adopted revisions to the zoning code for Overnight Shelters and related uses in 2022. Although no applications have been received for new overnight shelters in that time, discussions regarding the uses have continued since the city hired a new City Attorney. The City Council has directed staff to work with the attorney to draft certain revisions to the zoning codes.

Revisions are proposed to Chapter 42, Planning and Zoning to make changes to the districts in which the uses are allowed, and to relocate the provisions for how they operate to Chapter 20, Housing.

Application and Notice:

Applicant - City of Rolla
Public Notice - Legal ad in the Phelps County Focus; <https://www.rollacity.org/agenda.shtml>
City Council Date - May 20, 2024

Discussion: The proposed amendments to the city codes are recommended by the City Attorney. Staff has worked with the attorney to prepare the necessary revisions.

In Chapter 42 several changes are proposed to the districts in which the overnight shelters and related uses are allowed. The revisions are summarized:

1. The overnight shelters and related uses are to be removed from the definitions section and referred to Chapter 20.
2. Severe Weather Shelters are created as a land use and proposed to be allowed in all zoning districts.
3. Transitional Housing is proposed to be allowed in all residential districts. The codes previously allowed Transitional Housing only in the multi-family districts and the C-C, Center City District.
4. Soup Kitchens are proposed changed from a Conditional Use in the C-2, General Commercial district to be a permitted use. Soup Kitchens remain a Conditional Use in the C-C, Center City district.
5. Overnight Shelters are proposed to be changed from a Conditional Use to a permitted use in the R-3, Multi-family and R-4, Urban Multi-family districts.

6. Overnight Shelters are proposed to be permitted as a Conditional Use in the C-C, Center City district. Overnight Shelters would remain a Conditional Use in the M, Manufacturing district.
7. The section in the zoning code that contained the details about how the uses are allowed to operate are to be removed from Chapter 42 and revised language would be added to Chapter 20, Housing. The revised language will be reviewed by the City Council, as the Planning and Zoning Commission only reviews and makes recommendations on issues pertaining to Chapter 42.

The City Council will review the recommendations from the Planning and Zoning Commission for revisions to Chapter 42; and will also review revisions for Chapter 20, Housing. The proposed revisions to Chapter 42 are attached. In addition, the City Attorney prepared a report to discuss the changes and the necessity. A report on effective homelessness reduction from the US Housing and Urban Affairs Department is also attached.

Findings:

1. The proposed text amendment is needed to better ensure the ability to enforce the city ordinances.
2. The text amendment does make changes to where Overnight Shelters and related uses are allowed.
3. The City Council will discuss the details regarding how the uses operate; the proposed revisions for the Planning and Zoning Commission to consider are only to Chapter 42 pertaining to where the uses may operate.

Alternatives:

1. Find the text amendment is needed and recommend the City Council approve the text amendment as presented or with modifications.
2. Find that the proposed text amendment is not needed and recommend that the City Council take no action.
3. Find that additional information and discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation and table the request to a certain date.

Prepared by: Tom Coots, City Planner

Attachments: Proposed Text Amendment; Memo from City Attorney; Report from US HUD

Relocating regulations for Overnight Shelters and related uses from Chapter 42 to Chapter 20

Sec 42.203 Zoning Use Definitions

The following definitions apply for land uses in this section and chapter. The Community Development Director is empowered to determine how particular uses of land are classified. The Board of Adjustment may hear and decide Appeals to determine if a definition is intended to be applied to a particular use of property.

~~*Domestic Violence Shelter:* Temporary residential facility with the primary purpose of housing survivors of domestic violence and/or sexual violence and their families or household members at no cost or at a charge that is less than the full cost of providing services; and/or as defined by the Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence. A domestic violence shelter is a form of an overnight shelter which is subject to different operational requirements due to the special nature of the use.~~

~~*Overnight Shelter:* A facility, building, or property where overnight housing services are provided temporarily to persons impacted by temporary or chronic homelessness, at no cost or at a charge that is less than the full cost of providing the services, whether or not other related services are provided at the location. Such use shall not include any of the following:~~

- ~~(a) Residential group homes;~~
- ~~(b) Temporary lodging for families of patients, or patients themselves, of state-licensed health facilities within Phelps County;~~
- ~~(c) University or educational institution residence halls;~~
- ~~(d) Fraternity or sorority houses;~~
- ~~(e) State and city licensed nursing homes and day care centers;~~
- ~~(f) Foster homes licensed under Chapter 210, RSMo;~~
- ~~(g) Hospitals, mental institutions, residential care facility or institution that is licensed by the State of Missouri under Chapters 197, 198, and 630, RSMo.;~~
- ~~(h) Emergency shelters related to relocation and are available during or after a fire or natural disaster for a limited duration;~~
- ~~(i) Food pantries and distribution~~
- ~~(j) Hotels, motels, boarding houses, and other similar forms of lodging~~

~~*Soup kitchen:* An establishment where meals are provided to a person or persons at no cost or at a charge that is less than the full cost of providing same and that the provision of such meals and related services is the principal service of the establishment, whether or not additional services are provided. A soup kitchen is differentiated from a restaurant or food service establishment by providing services for no cost or for less than the cost of providing the services and provision of related social services. A soup kitchen does not include the provision of an overnight shelter, temporarily or otherwise.~~

~~*Transitional housing:* Non-emergency temporary housing with supportive services for a length of stay of typically more than six months to individuals and families experiencing homelessness or transitioning into permanent housing from an overnight shelter, domestic violence shelter, drug/alcohol rehabilitation, or from incarceration with the goal of interim stability and support to successfully move to and maintain permanent housing. Transitional housing includes multi-family or dormitory style~~

housing arrangements and does not include housing which meets the definition of a single-family dwelling or group home.

Sec 42.204 – ~~42.208~~ ~~42.209~~ Reserved

42.209 Shelters, Soup Kitchens, and Transitional Housing.

- A. Definitions. The words in this Article shall have the same definitions as provided in Section 20.020 of this Code.
- B. Severe Weather Shelters. Severe Weather Shelters shall be permitted in all districts when properly permitted and operating within the rules of such a permit.
- C. Overnight Shelters.
 - 1. Overnight Shelters shall be permitted in the following districts when properly permitted and operating within the rules of such a permit:
 - a. R-3, Multi-Family Residential District
 - b. R-4, Urban Multi-Family District
 - 2. Overnight Shelters shall be allowed as a conditional use in the following districts:
 - a. C-C, Center-City Commercial District
 - b. M, Manufacturing District
- D. Soup Kitchens
 - 1. Soup Kitchens shall be a permitted use in the C-2, General Commercial District.
 - 2. Soup Kitchens shall be allowed as a conditional use in the following districts:
 - a. C-C, Center-City Commercial District
- E. Transitional Housing. Transitional Housing shall be allowed in any residential district provided that the housing otherwise conforms with the requirements of permitted uses in that district. To assure the aims of transitional housing are met, no transitional housing facility may be located within 450 feet of another transitional housing facility not located on the same lot.

Sec 42.211 R-1, Suburban Residential District

- 1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the R-1, Suburban Residential District:
 - a. Single-family detached dwellings
 - b. Churches and other places of worship on lots less than one acre in size
 - c. Residential group homes
 - d. Family child care homes
 - e. Adult day care home
 - f. Community Center
 - g. Transitional Housing
 - h. Severe Weather Shelter

Sec 42.212 R-2, One and Two-family Residential District

- 1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the R-2, One and Two-family Residential District:
 - a. Detached Single-family Dwellings
 - b. Two-family (Duplex) dwellings
 - c. Churches and other places of worship
 - d. Residential group homes

- e. Family child care homes
- f. Adult day care home
- g. Community Center
- h. Transitional Housing
- i. Severe Weather Shelter

Sec 42.213 U-R, Urban-Residential District

1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the U-R, Urban-Residential District:
 - a. Detached Single-family Dwellings
 - b. Two-family (Duplex) dwellings
 - c. Townhouses
 - d. Multi-family dwelling, up to four (4) units per lot
 - e. Churches and other places of worship
 - f. Residential group homes
 - g. Family child care homes
 - h. Adult day care home
 - i. Community Center
 - j. Civic and Social Organizations (no on-site alcohol sales)
 - k. Transitional Housing
 - l. Severe Weather Shelter

Sec 42.214 R-3, Multi-family Residential District

1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the R-3, Multi-family Residential District:
 - a. Detached Single-family Dwellings
 - b. Two-family (Duplex) dwellings
 - c. Townhouses
 - d. Rooming/Boarding Houses
 - e. Multi-Family up to twenty-six (26) units per acre
 - f. Churches and other places of worship
 - g. Community Center
 - h. Residential group homes
 - i. Family child care homes
 - j. Adult day care home
 - k. Fraternity/sorority houses
 - l. Child care centers
 - m. Parking lots and Garages
 - n. Civic and Social Organizations (no on-site alcohol sales)
 - o. Nursing Homes
 - p. Overnight Shelters
 - q. Transitional Housing
 - r. Severe Weather Shelter

2. The following uses are permitted with approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the R-3, Multi-family Residential District:
 - a. Commercial Use if demonstrated to be compatible with the surrounding area
 - b. Mixed-residential Use
 - c. Civic and Social Organizations (with on-site alcohol sales)

- d. Manufactured Home Park
- e. ~~Transitional Housing~~
- f. ~~Overnight Shelters~~

Sec 42.215 R-4, Urban Multi-family District

1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the R-4, Urban Multi-family District:
 - a. Detached Single-family Dwellings
 - b. Two-family (Duplex) dwellings
 - c. Townhouses
 - d. Rooming/Boarding Houses
 - e. Multi-Family (no maximum density)
 - f. Churches and other places of worship
 - g. Community Center
 - h. Residential group homes
 - i. Family child care homes
 - j. Adult day care home
 - k. Fraternity/sorority houses
 - l. Child care centers
 - m. Parking lots and Garages
 - n. Mixed-residential Use with up to 10,000 total square feet of Commercial Use
 - o. Civic and Social Organizations
 - p. Overnight Shelters
 - q. Transitional Housing
 - r. Severe Weather Shelter

2. The following uses are permitted with approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the R-4, Urban Multi-family District:
 - a. Commercial Use if demonstrated to be compatible with the surrounding area
 - b. Seasonal Sales
 - c. ~~Transitional Housing~~
 - d. ~~Overnight Shelters~~

Sec 42.221 C-1, Neighborhood Commercial District

1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the C-1, Neighborhood Commercial District:
 - a. Child care centers.
 - b. Churches and other places of worship.
 - c. Commercial Use up to 12,000 square feet
 - d. Mixed-residential Use up to two (2) units per lot
 - e. Severe Weather Shelter

2. The following uses are permitted with approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the C-1, Neighborhood Commercial District:
 - a. Commercial Uses over 12,000 square feet
 - b. Seasonal Sales
 - c. Temporary Use
 - d. Mixed-residential Use with more than two (2) units

Sec 42.222 C-2, General Commercial District

1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the C-2, General Commercial District:
 - a. Commercial Use
 - b. Industrial Use up to 15,000 square feet and conducted within a building
 - c. Churches and other places of worship
 - d. Seasonal Sales
 - e. Temporary Use
 - f. Mixed-residential Use up to two units per lot
 - g. Marijuana Dispensary Facility
 - h. Parking Lots and Garages
 - i. Sexually-oriented Business as permitted by Section 42.423
 - j. Severe Weather Shelter
 - k. Soup Kitchens

2. The following uses are permitted with approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the C-2, General Commercial District:
 - a. All other Industrial Uses, if the scale and intensity can be demonstrated to be compatible with surrounding uses
 - b. Marijuana Testing Facility
 - c. Marijuana-Infused Products Facility
 - d. Multi-family up to twenty-six (26) units per acre
 - e. Mixed-residential Use (more than two (2) units per lot)
 - f. ~~Soup Kitchens~~
 - g. Amusement and Recreation Use
 - h. Any other use not listed in any district

Sec 42.223 C-C, Center-City Commercial District

1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the C-C, Center-City Commercial District:
 - a. Commercial Use
 - b. Marijuana Dispensary Facility.
 - c. Churches and religious institutions
 - d. Townhouses
 - e. Detached Single-family Dwelling
 - f. Two-family (Duplex) Dwelling
 - g. Mixed-residential Use
 - h. Parking Lots and Garages
 - i. Severe Weather Shelter

2. The following uses are permitted with approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the C-C, Center-City Commercial District:
 - a. Industrial or Outdoor Use, if the scale and intensity can be demonstrated to be compatible with surrounding uses and conducted within a building
 - b. Multi-family
 - c. Fraternity/Sorority House
 - d. Temporary Use
 - e. Marijuana Testing Facility
 - f. Marijuana Infused Products Facility

- g. ~~Transitional Housing~~
- h. Overnight Shelters
- i. ~~Soup Kitchens~~

Sec 42.224 M, Manufacturing District

1. The following uses are permitted “by-right” in the M, Manufacturing District:
 - a. Industrial Uses
 - b. Commercial Uses
 - c. Marijuana Cultivation Facility.
 - d. Marijuana-Infused Products Facility.
 - e. Marijuana Testing Facility
 - f. Temporary Use
 - g. Parking Lots and Garages
 - h. Sexually-oriented Business as permitted by Section 42.423
 - i. Severe Weather Shelter

2. The following uses are permitted with approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the M, Manufacturing District:
 - a. Overnight Shelters

~~Sec. 42.457 Overnight Shelter, Soup Kitchens, and Transitional Housing Uses~~

~~The following requirements for overnight shelters, soup kitchens, and transitional housing uses are intended to help mitigate the impacts of such uses.~~

~~Sec. 42.457.1 Overnight Shelter Uses~~

~~These Overnight Shelter requirements are intended to help mitigate the impacts of an overnight shelter use on public safety services and surrounding properties. Such facilities should generally be located such that clients will have access to jobs, counseling, and other resources for assistance. Any Overnight Shelter use, except shelters which meet the definition of a domestic violence shelter, must adhere to the following requirements:~~

- ~~1. No individual or family shall reside in an overnight shelter for more than thirty (30) days without entering into case management to obtain housing. Clients shall not reside on the premises for more than six (6) months unless extenuating circumstances are present and documented by the facility.~~
- ~~2. A written operations plan must be submitted and approved by the Chief of Police and Community Development Director. The plan must include the following information: contact information for key staff, floorplan, security and exterior lighting plan, health and safety protocols, occupancy policies, intake procedures and tracking outcomes, and an outreach plan for surrounding property owners and residents.~~
- ~~3. A log of each person receiving temporary housing must be kept, including the person’s name, last place of residence, and a photo of the person and/or their government issued identification. Such logs are to be submitted to the Rolla Police Department upon request.~~
- ~~4. The operator must conduct a background check on the MO Sex Offender Registry and MO Casenet before any person may reside at the property overnight.~~

5. ~~Any facility providing overnight shelter services must be located a minimum of one thousand (1,000) feet from any other property operating an overnight shelter facility.~~
6. ~~Overnight shelters must be located a minimum of seven hundred fifty (750) feet from any school, playground, or daycare, as measured from the closest point of the shelter facility to the closest point of such school, playground, or daycare.~~
7. ~~The operator must enforce a policy of prohibiting alcohol or illegal drug use on the property.~~
8. ~~Security cameras are required at a minimum to film any persons using the building entrances, exits and outdoor assembly areas. Such recordings shall be maintained for at least 72 hours and made available for law enforcement if a crime is alleged or committed.~~
9. ~~Adequate off-street parking for employees, volunteers, and any residents with vehicles must be provided or made available through written agreements.~~
10. ~~The operator of such facility must allow the City Administrator, or designee, access to monitor the operation for compliance with the city codes, any conditions of approval, and any other directives to mitigate impact to surrounding properties. If the director finds any deficiencies, the director must notify the operator and provide thirty (30) days to bring the operation into compliance (unless a life safety condition exists in which immediate action is required). If the operator fails to correct the deficiencies, the Community Development Director is authorized to terminate the conditional use permit or occupancy permit. The operator may appeal the termination to the City Council.~~
11. ~~An initial inspection fee of \$300 must be submitted prior to commencing operations and an annual inspection fee of \$100 must be submitted annually thereafter.~~

Sec. 42.457.2 Domestic Violence Shelter Uses

~~These Domestic Violence Shelter requirements are intended to help mitigate the impacts of a domestic violence shelter use on public safety services and surrounding properties. Any overnight shelter which meets the definition of a domestic violence shelter use must adhere to the standards established by the Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence and any other state or federal requirements, or must meet the following requirements:~~

1. ~~No individual or family shall reside in an overnight shelter for more than 30 days without entering into case management to obtain housing. Clients shall not reside on the premises for more than six (6) months unless extenuating circumstances are present and documented by the facility.~~
2. ~~Prior to commencing operation, the operator must submit the following to the Chief of Police and Fire Chief: contact information for key staff, floorplan, and occupancy policies.~~
3. ~~The operator must conduct a background check on the MO Sex Offender Registry and MO Casenet before any person may reside at the property overnight.~~
4. ~~The operator must enforce a policy of prohibiting alcohol or illegal drug use on the property.~~
5. ~~Adequate off-street parking for employees, volunteers, and any residents with vehicles must be provided or made available through written agreements.~~
6. ~~The operator of such facility must allow the City Administrator, or designee, access to monitor the operation for compliance with the city codes, any conditions of approval, and any other directives to mitigate impact to surrounding properties. If the director finds any deficiencies, the director must notify the operator and provide thirty (30) days to bring the operation into compliance (unless a life safety condition exists in which immediate action is required). If the~~

operator fails to correct the deficiencies, the Community Development Director is authorized to terminate the conditional use permit or occupancy permit. The operator may appeal the termination to the City Council.

7. Such shelters are required to maintain confidentiality for their residents.
8. An initial inspection fee of \$300 must be submitted prior to commencing operations and an annual inspection fee of \$100 must be submitted annually thereafter.

Sec 42.457.3 Soup Kitchen Uses

These Soup Kitchen Use requirements are intended to help mitigate the impacts of a soup kitchen use. Such facilities should generally be located such that clients will have easy access by transit or walking. Any Soup Kitchen Use use must adhere to the following requirements:

1. A written operations plan must be submitted and approved by the Chief of Police and Community Development Director. The plan must include the following information: contact information for key staff, floorplan, security and exterior lighting plan, health and safety protocols, occupancy policies, and outreach plan for surrounding property owners and residents.
2. The operator must enforce a policy of prohibiting alcohol or illegal drug use on the property.
3. Security cameras are required at a minimum to film any persons using the building entrances.
4. Adequate off-street parking for employees, volunteers, and any residents with vehicles must be provided or made available through written agreements.
5. The operator of such facility must allow the City Administrator, or designee, access to monitor the operation for compliance with the city codes, any conditions of approval, and any other directives to mitigate impact to surrounding properties. If the director finds any deficiencies, the director must notify the operator and allow 30 days to bring the operation into compliance. If the operator fails to correct the deficiencies, the director is authorized to terminate the conditional use permit or occupancy permit. The operator may appeal the termination to the City Council.

Sec. 42.457.4 Transitional Housing Uses

Such facilities must be located a minimum of five hundred (500) feet from another transitional housing facility located on a separate property.

Sec 42.710 Zoning Use Table

The following table is for reference only. Any errors, omission, or conflicts will be interpreted by deferring to the text of the zoning code.

P – Permitted C – Conditional Use X – Not Permitted * - w/ restrictions
 - (Commercial Use)

	R-1	R-2	U-R	R-3	R-4	C-1	C-2	C-C	M
Residential Uses									
Detached Single-family Dwelling	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	P	X
Residential Group Home	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X
Modular Home	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X
Mobile Home	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Manufactured Home	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X

Residential-design Manufactured Home	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	P	X
Manufactured Home Park	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	X	X
Two-family (Duplex) Dwelling	X	P	P	P	P	X	X	P	X
Townhouse	X	C	P	P	P	X	X	P	X
Multi-family	X	X	P*	P*	P	X	C*	C	X
Overnight Shelter	X	X	X	P	P	X	X	C	C
Transitional Housing	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X
Severe Weather Shelters	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Fraternity/Sorority House	X	C	X	P	P	X	X	C	X
Rooming and Boarding Houses	X	X	X	P	P	X	X	X	X
Family Child Care Home	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X
Adult Day Care Home	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X
Community Center	P	P	P	P	P	-	-	-	-
Nursing Home	C	C	X	P	X	-	-	-	-
Mixed-residential Use	X	X	C*	C	P*	P*	P*	P	X
	R-1	R-2	U-R	R-3	R-4	C-1	C-2	C-C	M
Commercial Uses									
Commercial Use	X	X	C*	C	C	P*	P	P	P
Industrial Use	X	X	X	X	X	X	P*	C	P
Agriculture Business Use	C	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-
Amusement and Recreation Use	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X
Civic and Social Organizations	X	X	P*	P*	P	-	-	-	-
Child Care Center	X	X	X	P	P	P	P	P	P
Churches and Places of Worship	P*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X
Marijuana Dispensary	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	P	X
Marijuana Testing Facility	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	C	P
Marijuana-infused Products Facility	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	P
Marijuana Cultivation Facility	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P
Mixed-residential Use	X	X	C*	C	P*	P*	P*	P	X
Medical Use	C	C	C	C	C	-	-	-	-
Parking Lots and Garages	X	X	X	P	P	X	P	P	P
Seasonal Sales	X	X	X	X	C	C	P	P	P
Sexually-oriented Business	X	X	X	X	X	X	P*	P*	P*
Soup Kitchen	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	C	X
Temporary Use	C	X	X	X	X	C	P	C	P

Sec. 42.710-799 Reserved



LAUBER MUNICIPAL LAW

Serving those who serve the public

MEMO

To: Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Nathan Nickolaus, City Attorney

Re: Proposed Changes to Homeless Shelter Ordinance

Why the Change?

The original homeless shelter ordinance was written as part of the zoning code. The purpose of a zoning code is to regulate where certain activities can take place (*F.W. Disposal S., LLC v. St. Louis Cty.*, 168 S.W.3d 607, 613 (Mo. App. E.D. 2005) holding that the primary purpose of zoning is to regulate the development of real estate.). Zoning ordinances can, and often do regulate how a particular activity takes place, but it is generally an awkward way to do that. Zoning is generally a one-time thing. Once a property is zoned, the owner does not need to regularly check in to see if his use of the property is still okay. Nor do zoning codes generally, including Rolla's, have a mechanism to monitor how some activity is being carried out. Finally, if a property owner violates the zoning code, the only remedy is to revoke the zoning (conditional use permit) which is a lengthy and difficult process that requires public hearings and city council approval.

The alternative is to regulate activity through a licensing process. For example, Rolla currently regulates massage therapists. These licensees have to follow certain rules, and if they violate the rules, their license is simply revoked. The person is entitled to a hearing, but it is much simpler than revoking a conditional use permit.

How the Ordinance Works.

The ordinance creates four different kinds of homeless facilities, severe weather shelters, overnight shelters, soup kitchens, and transitional housing¹. Dividing the term "homeless shelter" into these different groupings allows the city to more effectively target the needs of each.

¹ A fifth class would be Domestic Violence Shelters, which are exempted from these rules because they have minimal impacts on the surrounding community.

Severe Weather Shelters.

These are not permanent facilities. Rather they are stood up when weather conditions or other emergencies require them. Since they are not permanent and of short duration, they have the fewest requirements. Prior to coming into use, they have to pass an inspection showing that they meet the basic requirements and an adequate safety plan (see below). It is assumed that clients will stay in the shelter for the duration of the event. Severe Weather Shelters simply maintain a list of who is being sheltered. There is no limit as to where Severe Weather Shelters may be located in relation to other facilities. Staff recommends that they be permitted use in all zones.

Overnight Shelters.

These are what are most commonly thought of as ‘homeless shelters.’ They are more or less permanent but require an annual license. Like Severe Weather Shelters, they must meet the basic requirements and have an adequate safety plan. Clients are not allowed to stay in the shelter for more than 14 hours at a time. This is to distinguish them from hotels or apartments and to give the staff a chance to clean and restock. In addition, if a person stays in the shelter for more than 30 days, the shelter must develop a plan for the person to transition from homelessness to some sort of permanent living arrangement. Overnight shelters must not only maintain a list of who is being sheltered but also additional specific information about the client. This information is available to the police.

Overnight Shelters cannot be located within 1000 feet of another overnight shelter. This is to spread them out and thereby minimize their impact at a particular location. Overnight shelters must be located a minimum of seven hundred-fifty (750) feet from any school, playground, or daycare, as measured from the closest point of the shelter facility to the closest point of such school, playground, or daycare. This rule doesn’t apply to Shelters providing facilities solely for women, children, and families.

Overnight Shelters must keep their property free of trash, litter, and cigarette butts. In addition, they must make efforts to clean up trash within one block of their facilities.

Overnight Shelters are required to have parking for their staff, but not their clients.

The City Staff is permitted to inspect Overnight Shelters at any reasonable time.

Soup Kitchens.

Soup Kitchens present issues very different from Shelters because they do not have residents. This means that fire and safety concerns are less. Nevertheless, Soup Kitchens must have an annual permit and a safety plan. They must pass a health inspection. The City Administrator is authorized to impose additional requirements to minimize any impacts on the surrounding community.

Transitional Housing

Clients in transitional housing are treated just like any other apartment dweller. Although they may have free or subsidized housing, there is no staff living with them.

What Are the Basic Requirements and Safety Plans?

Basic Requirements.

The Basic Requirements apply to Severe Weather and Overnight Shelters. These requirements pertain to having adequate size to accommodate clients, basic sanitation such as restrooms, fire safety, and building codes. These are intended to make sure that the residents are safe.

Safety Plans.

Safety Plans are required for Severe Weather and Overnight Shelters as well as Soup Kitchens. The safety plan is worked out by agreement between the operator and the city staff, particularly fire, code enforcement, and police. The police portion is intended to reduce crime both inside and outside of the facility. Fire and building code provisions are obviously focused on life safety issues.

Zoning.

A key component of this ordinance is that every type of shelter is allowed as a permitted use in at least one zone.

Severe Weather Shelters are permitted in all zones.

Overnight Shelters are permitted in the R-3, Multi-Family Residential District and the R-4, Urban Multi-Family District. They are also allowed as a conditional use in the C-C, Center-City Commercial District, and the M, Manufacturing District.

Soup Kitchens are a permitted use in the C-2 district and a conditional use in the C-C, Center-City Commercial District.

Transitional Housing is permitted wherever their particular type of housing is permitted. For example, if it is an apartment, then in multi-family zones.

Conclusion

I am attaching an article on the impact of homeless shelters on the surrounding community that I would like to add to the record. Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.



The Evidence Behind Approaches that Drive an End to Homelessness



We know that the only true end to homelessness is a safe and stable place to call home, and that together we are making progress by using best practices and building coordinated responses to end homelessness across America. Our understanding of the solutions that work is informed by evidence from research, improved capacity for data collection and interpretation, and the perspectives and voices of people who have experienced homelessness.

Evidence from all of these sources guides the strategies in *Home, Together: The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*.¹ Further, USICH has explored research and data regarding the characteristics and risks for homelessness among different population groups in our *Homelessness in America* series.²



The purpose of this brief is to share highlights of the evidence that informs the key strategies for preventing and ending homelessness and guides investments in cost-effective solutions. This brief builds on a 2017 fact sheet, *The Evidence Behind Approaches that Drive an End to Homelessness*.³

This brief summarizes the importance of housing stability and the evidence base for approaches such as prioritizing people for new and existing housing that is affordable, providing rapid re-housing to families and individuals, and providing supportive

housing opportunities to people with the most intense needs.

This brief also provides citations to additional resources that provide more comprehensive reviews of published research, and in-depth studies that provide more information about promising programs and the people they serve.

The Importance of Housing Stability

Housing stability is essential to strong and healthy communities and for people to address their challenges and pursue their goals. Substantial evidence indicates that when people experience homelessness or other forms of housing instability, their prospects for future educational attainment, employment growth, health stability, and family preservation are significantly reduced.⁴

For many people in our country, the lack of a safe and stable home also results in increased use of crisis services, such as shelter, emergency departments, jails, prisons, detox programs, and psychiatric institutions, as well as

¹ U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (2018). *Home, Together: The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*. Available at https://www.usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/Home-Together-Federal-Strategic-Plan-to-Prevent-and-End-Homelessness.pdf.

² U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (2018). *Homelessness in America*. Available at <https://www.usich.gov/tools-for-action/homelessness-in-america>.

³ U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (2017). *The Evidence Behind Approaches that Drive an End to Homelessness Fact Sheet*. Available at <https://www.usich.gov/tools-for-action/the-evidence-behind-approaches-that-drive-an-end-to-homelessness>.

⁴ U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (2019). *The Importance of Housing Affordability and Stability for Preventing and Ending Homelessness*. Available at <https://www.usich.gov/tools-for-action/the-importance-of-housing-affordability-and-stability-for-preventing-and-ending-homelessness>.

greater engagement with other costly systems like child welfare and criminal/juvenile justice.⁵ For families with children and youth experiencing homelessness and housing instability, the result is often poor performance in school and reduced likelihood of educational and employment success.⁶

Informed by this understanding of the profound impact of housing instability on both the lives of individuals and families and on local and state budgets, communities have increasingly focused on creating strong permanent housing outcomes, ending people's experience of homelessness as quickly and efficiently as possible, and providing them with the appropriate level of tailored services to support their long-term stability in housing. This shift in focus has helped drive implementation of Housing First approaches across the country, removing as many barriers, obstacles, and unnecessary requirements as possible for accessing a range of permanent housing options.

There are multiple strategies and models for fostering housing stability, and interventions should be tailored to the needs and strengths of people who experience homelessness. Many communities are striving to drive progress by prioritizing people experiencing homelessness for existing and new affordable housing opportunities and by expanding the availability of shorter-term interventions, such as rapid re-housing, that connect families and individuals to private market housing they can afford with short-term financial assistance and services to ensure their stability.

For many people who experience homelessness, mainstream systems play critical roles in facilitating connections to jobs, work supports, educational opportunities, physical health care, behavioral health services, and other services that can support continued stability.



Communities are also improving targeting and increasingly dedicating more expensive and intensive models, like **supportive housing with longer-term, more-intensive services for people with the most significant needs**, such as people with disabilities exiting or at risk of chronic homelessness.

In their efforts to better tailor and target housing and services interventions, to use available resources as efficiently as possible, and to ensure

that those with the greatest needs are prioritized for the most intensive assistance, communities are **developing coordinated systems with multiple points of access and standardized approaches to assessment** that streamline connections to resources and programs.

⁵ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018). Permanent Supportive Housing: Evaluating the Evidence for Improving Health Outcomes Among People Experiencing Chronic Homelessness. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

⁶ MacArthur Foundation (2017). Housing: Why Educators, Health Professionals and Those Focused on Economic Mobility Should Care About It – Lessons Learned from the MacArthur Foundation's Investment in Housing Research.

The Evidence Base for These Approaches

There is a significant body of research and evidence that documents the positive impacts of housing stability—and the negative impacts of housing instability—on families and individuals. Accordingly, effective responses to homelessness focus on helping people get and keep housing, and to use housing as a foundation for accessing services, supports, and opportunities in their communities.

Housing First approaches help ensure that people experiencing homelessness are connected to permanent housing swiftly with as few obstacles as possible. This approach requires eliminating or reducing the use of treatment preconditions, behavioral contingencies, and other barriers or requirements prior to housing or as a condition for continued tenancy in housing.

Housing First is not housing only. Rather, these approaches are based on a substantial and growing body of evidence that people experiencing homelessness can achieve stability in permanent housing when they are provided the appropriate level of tailored services and supports. These approaches are both cost effective and create stronger outcomes.⁷

Studies of programs using Housing First approaches for people experiencing homelessness have included a variety of program configurations serving people with serious mental illness, people with severe alcohol use disorders and other substance use disorders, Veterans, and people experiencing chronic homelessness, as well as programs that specifically target the highest cost users of public services.

As summarized in a recent review of the research literature, costs for emergency shelter, and visits to hospital emergency rooms, are significantly lower for people who receive an intervention offered using Housing First approaches.⁸ The effects of Housing First approaches on

hospitalizations, for both medical and psychiatric care, are more ambiguous, with most studies showing decreases in utilization and costs for inpatient care. In some studies, including those that include a comparison group and programs that serve persons with more moderate needs, inpatient costs increased for persons served by Housing First approaches. This may be because the Housing First approaches offered support that led people to receive needed care for health conditions that had been neglected when they were experiencing homelessness. Most studies documented decreased criminal justice system costs, associated with fewer arrests and days of incarceration.⁹



⁷ Culhane, D. and Byrne, T. (2010) Ending Chronic Homelessness: Cost-Effective Opportunities for Interagency Collaboration. *University of Pennsylvania ScholarlyCommons*.

⁸ Ly, A. and Latimer, E. (2015). Housing First Impact on Costs and Associated Cost Offsets: A Review of the Literature. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 60(11) 475-487.

⁹ Ibid.

While most of the evidence for the impact of Housing First comes from evaluations of programs that offer permanent supportive housing to persons with behavioral health disorders who experience chronic homelessness, there is growing recognition of the value of Housing First approaches and practices as the basis for a community- or systems-level framework to ending homelessness. A systems-level approach organizes diverse stakeholders across multiple systems to use principles of Housing First to work together toward the shared goal of reducing and preventing homelessness. The approach focuses on first moving people from homelessness into housing as quickly as possible, and then providing the supports they need to maintain stability.¹⁰

This framework recognizes that housing provides a secure platform that supports recovery from trauma and homelessness. When communities offer a range of housing options that have varying levels of tolerance for substance use, this provides a safer environment for people experiencing homelessness who are often marginalized, stigmatized, and vulnerable because of poverty and behavioral health disorders.¹¹

In addition to offering permanent housing using Housing First program models, a systems-level Housing First approach offers safe, flexible, interim housing options for vulnerable people who need a place to stay because of delays in finding permanent housing, or during gaps in housing when they relocate from one place to another for reasons that might include problems with landlords or roommates.¹²

Prioritizing People Experiencing Homelessness for New and Existing Housing That Is Affordable

With support of federal and national partners, many communities are focusing greater attention on targeting and prioritizing people experiencing homelessness for existing and new affordable housing opportunities. In addition to addressing a need for housing for those exiting homelessness, access to housing that is affordable across all levels of the economic spectrum is also critical for preventing homelessness from occurring in the first place. Many communities are implementing multiple strategies to better align affordable housing efforts with work to end homelessness.¹³

These efforts are informed by evidence that safe and affordable housing provides a **wide range of positive impacts for adults and children.**

- HUD's large-scale Family Options Study demonstrated that access to permanent housing subsidy leads to substantial benefits in reducing food insecurity and school mobility and improving adult and child well-being and long-term housing stability.¹⁴

¹⁰ Turner, A. (2014). Beyond Housing First: Essential Elements of a System-Planning Approach to Ending Homelessness. University of Calgary, The School of Public Policy.

¹¹ Pauly, B., Reist, D., Belle-Isle, L. and Schactman, C. (2013). Housing and Harm Reduction: What is the Role of Harm Reduction in Addressing Homelessness? *International Journal of Drug Policy* 24 284-290.

¹² Zenger, S., et al. (2014). The Role and Meaning of Interim Housing in Housing First Programs for People Experiencing Homelessness and Mental Illness. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 84(4) 431-437.

¹³ U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (2019). Aligning Affordable Housing Efforts with Actions to End Homelessness. Available at https://www.usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/Aligning-Affordable-Housing-Efforts-with-Actions-to-End-Homelessness.pdf

¹⁴ Gubits, D, et al. (2016). Family Options Study: 3-Year Impacts of Housing and Services Interventions for Homeless Families. Available at <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/Family-Options-Study-Full-Report.pdf>.

- In another study, children living in subsidized housing were more likely to be food secure, less likely to be seriously underweight, and more likely to be classified as “well” on a composite indicator of child health, compared to their peers whose families were on the wait list for subsidized housing.¹⁵
- Research also demonstrates that housing strengthens family well-being and reduces violence and insecurity. Providing families experiencing homelessness with access to a permanent subsidy leads to significant spillover effects, including dramatic reductions in child separations, domestic violence, and psychological distress – all of which have powerful impacts on child well-being.¹⁶



Providing Rapid Re-housing to Families and Individuals

Rapid re-housing is designed to help individuals and families experiencing homelessness return to permanent housing as quickly as possible, through three primary components: housing identification, rent and move-in assistance, and case management and services to support housing stability. Implementation of rapid re-housing interventions emphasizes shortening the length of time that people experience homelessness, minimizing the negative impacts of homelessness that intensify over time, and preventing future returns to homelessness.

The research and emerging evidence on rapid re-housing thus far suggests cost-effectiveness and outcome improvements, as summarized below.

- **Low costs compared to other housing interventions.** In the Family Options Study, rapid re-housing had the lowest per family monthly cost of any intervention studied, as well as the lowest cost for an average stay. The cost for an average stay for a family in each type of program was \$6,578 for rapid re-housing, compared with \$16,829 for emergency shelter, \$18,821 for a permanent subsidy, and \$32,557 for transitional housing.¹⁷
- **High rates of placement into permanent housing.** Eighty percent (80%) of households receiving rapid re-housing services through the VA’s Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program had permanent housing upon program exit. Veterans with no income and those with less than \$500 in monthly income at program entry still achieved a high rate of success in getting and keeping permanent

¹⁵ Children’s HealthWatch Medical-Legal Partnership (2009) “Rx for Hunger: Affordable Housing.” Available at https://childrenshealthwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/rxforhunger_report_dec09-1.pdf.

¹⁶ Gubits, D., et al. (2016). Family Options Study: 3-Year Impacts.

¹⁷ Gubits, D., et al. (2016). Family Options Study: 3-Year Impacts.

housing at program exit.¹⁸ An even higher proportion (90%) of families in the Rapid Re-housing for Homeless Families Demonstration evaluation exited the program with a housing placement.¹⁹

- **Modest increases in measures of family self-sufficiency.** For households participating in the SSVF program, the median monthly income increased from \$251 at program entry to \$450 at exit.²⁰

The rapid re-housing program model was initially designed for families with children, and it has frequently been implemented to assist households with moderate barriers to housing stability.²¹ Today, however, it is increasingly being used to serve individuals and persons with greater barriers to housing stability.

In FY 2017, 60,567 Veterans participated in rapid re-housing services funded through the VA's SSVF program. As noted above, this program is evidenced to have high rates of placement into permanent housing.



- More than two-thirds (69%) of persons served were Veterans in households without children.
- Nearly half (49%) of the literally homeless Veterans who received rapid re-housing services were living in unsheltered situations, including vehicles or other outdoor locations, prior to program entry.
- More than three in five (62%) of the Veteran participants in the SSVF program had a disabling condition.
- Nearly half (47%) of Veterans who successfully exited from SSVF rapid re-housing programs to permanent housing were in unsubsidized rental housing, while a little less than half (44%) were using a long-term rental subsidy (most frequently HUD-VASH).²²

The strategic expansion of rapid re-housing opportunities also recognizes that some models of time-limited assistance or bridge housing can also facilitate connections to permanent housing effectively and efficiently, especially for some subpopulations.

¹⁸ U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (2018). Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF): FY 2017 Annual Report. Available at https://www.va.gov/homeless/ssvf/docs/SSVF_FY2017_AnnualReport_508.pdf.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2016). Rapid Re-housing for Homeless Families Demonstration Report Part II: Demonstration Findings – Outcomes Evaluation. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development: Washington, D.C.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Cunningham, M., Gillespie, S., and Anderson, J. (2015). Rapid Re-housing: What the Research Says. Urban Institute: Washington D.C. Available at <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/54201/2000265-Rapid-Re-housing-What-the-Research-Says.pdf>.

²² U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (2017). Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF): FY 2016 Annual Report. Available at www.va.gov/HOMELESS/ssvf/docs/SSVF_FY2016_Annual_Report_508c.pdf.

Providing Supportive Housing Opportunities to People with Most Intense Needs

Supportive housing is a proven, cost-saving intervention that combines non-time-limited housing assistance with wrap-around supportive services for individuals and families with the longest histories of homelessness and most complex care needs. The supportive housing model incorporates a range of approaches that are tailored to the household's unique preferences and needs. Supportive housing is designed to offer housing support with no time limitation or preconditions, such as sobriety, absence of criminal record, medication adherence, or participation in services. While participation in services is encouraged, often as part of a comprehensive client-centered case management model, it is not a condition of living in the housing.

A very substantial body of research and evidence has consistently demonstrated both the cost savings created through supportive housing and its effectiveness in ending homelessness for those with the most complex needs and most significant challenges, as summarized below.



- **Cost offsets and savings.** Over more than a decade, dozens of studies conducted across the country demonstrate that the costs of delivering supportive housing are offset in large part by reductions in the use of crisis services, including shelters, jails, ambulances, and hospitals. Cost offsets are generally higher for higher-need tenants who have higher rates of utilization of these crisis services.²³ Key studies include:
 - In the Chicago Housing and Health Partnership, individuals experiencing homelessness who were receiving inpatient hospital care for chronic medical conditions were randomly assigned to receive usual care or access to recuperative care (respite) and supportive housing. The intervention group had 29% fewer hospitalizations, 24% fewer emergency room visits, and 24% fewer days in nursing homes. Compared to usual care, annual cost savings for the intervention group averaged \$6,307 per person.²⁴
 - Cost savings have also been demonstrated in New York City, where Medicaid costs decreased by about one-third for individuals who participated in a supportive housing program for adults with active substance use disorders, compared to similar people experiencing homelessness who did not receive supportive housing.²⁵

²³ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018) and National Alliance to End Homelessness (2015). Permanent Supportive Housing Cost Study Map. Available at <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/permanent-supportive-housing-cost-study-map>.

²⁴ Sadowski, L., et al. (2009). "Effect of a Housing and Case Management Program on Emergency Department Visits and Hospitalizations Among Chronically Homeless Adults." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 301 (17), 1771-1778; Basu A., et al. (2012). "Comparative Cost Analysis of Housing and Case Management Program for Chronically Ill Homeless Adults Compared to Usual Care." *Journal of Health Services Research*. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-6773.2011.01350.x.

²⁵ Hall, G., et al. (2014). Public Service Use and Costs Associated with NY/NY III's Supportive Housing for Active Substance Users. Columbia University, The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse.

- New York City’s FUSE II Initiative provided supportive housing to individuals who had been frequent users of jail and shelter services. After one year, over 91% of participants were housed in permanent housing. Relative to a comparison group, FUSE II participants’ use of emergency shelters was reduced by 70%, and they had 40% fewer days incarcerated. Participants were also much less likely to use other crisis services, including ambulance rides and psychiatric hospitalizations.²⁶
- The evaluation of the Los Angeles Housing for Health Program found that costs for public services consumed in the year after participants moved into supportive housing declined by nearly 60%, from an average of \$38,146 in the year prior to housing, to \$15,358 in the year after housing. These cost reductions reflected fewer emergency room visits and arrests, and shorter inpatient hospital stays.²⁷
- **Participants were much less likely to return to homelessness.** Even tenants with the longest histories of homelessness and most complex needs remain stably housed once connected with supportive housing.²⁸ Evaluations of supportive housing programs using a Housing First approach generally show housing retention rates between 75-85% for single adults and between 80-90% for families.²⁹
 - An evaluation of the Los Angeles Housing for Health program, which provided supportive housing for people with complex health needs and frequent users of hospital care who were experiencing homelessness, found that more than 96% of those who entered housing remained stably housed for at least one year. Nearly all (83%) of the people served in this housing program were experiencing chronic homelessness.³⁰
 - People move out of supportive housing for a variety of reasons; some may leave because they have achieved stability and no longer need assistance, while others may leave because of eviction. An analysis of data from the HUD-VA Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program found that only one in ten Veterans who left HUD-VASH housing exited due to eviction. Veterans who left because of eviction were more likely to be male and significantly more likely to have a serious mental illness or substance use disorder, as compared to Veterans who exited because they had accomplished their goals.³¹

²⁶ Aidala, A., McAllister, W., Yomogida, M. and Shubert, V. (2013). Frequent Users Service Enhancement “FUSE” Initiative: New York City FUSE II Evaluation Report. Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health.

²⁷ Hunter, S., Harvey, M., Briscoe, B. and Celafu, M. (2017). Evaluation of Housing for Health Permanent Supportive Housing Program. RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, CA.

²⁸ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018). Permanent Supportive Housing: Evaluating the Evidence for Improving Health Outcomes Among People Experiencing Chronic Homelessness. The National Academies Press: Washington, D.C.

²⁹ Corporation for Supportive Housing (2006). “Supportive Housing Research FAQs: Are Housing First Models Effective?” Available at <http://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/HousingFirstFAQFINAL.pdf>; and “Supportive Housing Research FAQs: How Long Do People Stay in Supportive Housing and What Happens When They Leave?” Available at <https://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/HousingRetentionFAQFINAL.pdf>.

Pearson, C., Locke, G., Montgomery, A. and Buron, L. (2007). The Applicability of Housing First Models to Homeless Persons with Serious Mental Illness: Final Report. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research.

³⁰ Hunter, S., et al. (2017). Evaluation of Housing for Health Permanent Supportive Housing Program. RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, CA.

³¹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research (2017). HUD-VASH Exit Study Final Report. Available at <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/HUD-VASH-Exit-Study.pdf>.

Conclusion

As detailed in this summary, evidence from extant research underpins the strategies in *Home, Together: The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, and has expanded our understanding of the solutions for ending homelessness. However, as we strive to expand and strengthen our knowledge base, there are still many areas where research is needed to inform the policy-making process as well as to better understand best practices in the field.

Specifically, more research is needed to help answer the following questions:

- What are the key determinants of returns to homelessness following housing through rapid re-housing and/or permanent supportive housing? What are best practices for reducing such returns to homelessness?
- What are best practices for targeting homelessness prevention to households at the highest risk of experiencing homelessness? What works best to prevent future housing crises for this population?
- What are best practices for diverting households from homelessness? For those diverted, what are the determinants of returns to the crisis response system, and what are best practices for reducing such returns?
- What are the primary determinants of housing stability following move-on from supportive housing into housing with less intense services? What are best practices for assessing whether households will remain stably housed following move-on?
- What are the key determinants of success in preserving and increasing the supply of housing that is affordable and accessible for households exiting or at highest risk of homelessness?
- In rapid re-housing, what does the evidence tell us about the most effective and efficient level and duration of financial and services assistance for households with varying levels of needs to support housing stability in different economic environments?
- What types of housing assistance and program models (e.g., time-limited rental assistance, host homes, shared housing, transitional housing, non-time-limited supportive housing, etc.) have the greatest impact on youth-level outcomes associated with stable housing, permanent connections, education, employment, and well-being, and community-level outcomes, including reducing the number of youth experiencing homelessness?
- What are the patterns of housing instability and homelessness among families with children, including characteristics and patterns of service utilization and outcomes, that inform interventions to identify and more effectively serve those at greatest risk for homelessness and housing instability?
- What are the costs associated with episodes of sheltered or unsheltered homelessness for people who do not have chronic patterns of homelessness, as well as the costs and effectiveness of time-limited interventions, such as rapid re-housing, treatment, and/or employment supports for individuals who experience homelessness?