



**MEETING OF THE
TAYLOR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
ON TUESDAY APRIL 3, 2012
AT 7:00 P.M. AT
TAYLOR TOWN HALL
425 W. PAPER MILL ROAD**

Note: Changes made to the April 3, 2012 minutes noted in the May 1, 2012 minutes.

Commission Members Present: Chairperson Merry Nutter, Vice-Chair Eric Ritz, Jack Babb, Loretta Whitlow, Ralph Schreiber

Commission Members Absent:

Staff Present: Planning & Zoning Director Jeff Johnson, Administrative Assistant Kathy Hancock

Attorney Present:

Visitors: See list.

- 1. Regular Meeting Called to Order:** Chairperson Merry Nutter opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.
- 2. Open Call to the Public:** There was no comment from the public.
- 3. Approval of Minutes: January 3, 2012 Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting.**

Motion made by Ralph Schrieber, seconded by Jack Babb to approve the minutes of the January 3, 2012 Planning & Zoning Commission meeting. Voting was unanimous.

Action; Approve, Deny or Table

- 4. New Business: Elect Chair and Vice-Chair FY 2012.** Eric Ritz nominated Jack Babb as the new Planning and Zoning Chairman. Mr. Babb declined because of his changing schedule which may not allow him to be able to fill this position.

Merry Nutter made a motion to nominate Eric Ritz as the Planning and Zoning Chairman, the motion was seconded by Loretta Whitlow. Eric Ritz addressed the commission saying if they felt strongly about this he would consider being Chairman as long as he understood what is involved. Jeff Johnson explained that the main duty would be to run the meetings; organizing things amongst commissioners could be part of this duty as well. At times Mr. Johnson might call to see if he wanted certain items on an agenda. Mr. Ritz said he would not withdraw his name from considerations.

Voting was unanimous.

The Vice-Chairman's duty is to run the meeting if the Chairman is not there.

Motion made by Jack Babb to nominate Ralph Schreiber as Vice-Chair. Motion seconded by Loretta Whitlow. There were no other nominations. **Voting was unanimous.**

Action; Nominate, Discuss, Elect

5. Old Business: Chapter 18.20. R-1, determine number of animals allowed on Residential zoned lots that are larger than the minimum 20,000 square feet.—

Eric Ritz, acting as the new Chairman conducted the meeting. Jeff Johnson explained the zoning maps he prepared noting what the symbols, etc. mean:

Dark Green	AG-1	Red	COM
Green	AG-2	Dark Grey	MUB
Yellow	R-1	Grey	MU
Orange	R-2	Blue	IND

- A “●” on the property designates that a property could possibly be horse property.
- An “H” indicates the property is between 20,000 sq. ft. and 1 acre and with the code we have now, you could have a large animal on it.
- An “X” confirms existing horses although all properties with existing horses are not marked on these maps.

Mr. Ritz pointed out that this commission has made a recommendation to the council to not expand the large animal access in less than 1 acre, so if council rejects this recommendation, all of the properties marked with an “H” could have horses.

Mr. Johnson believes that there are probably 10 properties now that would potentially be affected by this commission’s recommendation that we move horse privilege’s up from 20,000 sq. ft. to 1 acre. In the Sunridge Subdivision there are two cul-de-sacs that are over 1 acre plus 4 more parcels large enough to be horse properties. There are no CC&R’s in this subdivision.

Mr. Ritz noted that according to the maps, there are approximately 6 properties on the east side of old town that will potentially, in the next sale of ownership be affected by the recommendations we have made so far. But there are many properties that currently don’t have large animals now, but in our current code could if the owner chose to. If all of those current residents chose to take full advantage of the current leniencies in the code, this wouldn’t feel at all like residential neighborhoods/zoning. That illustrates the importance of further defining the codes.

We have already addressed the 20,000sq. ft. to 43,000 sq. ft. and Mr. Ritz wondered if the agenda item should have read larger than 43,000 sq. ft. or one acre. Mr. Johnson agreed that this was a mistake and should have said “over 1 acre”. He apologized and said go ahead and discuss residential lots larger than 20,000 sq. ft. which would be include in properties that are 1 acre or larger.

Mr. Ritz believes that once we get larger than one acre, the nature of these properties lend themselves to the protection of that lifestyle and the accommodation of larger animals. He would like the commission to address how many and which animals

would be allowed. Merry Nutter wants to go by square footage to determine how many animals would be allowed above 1 acre. Mr. Johnson wondered if the commission is concerned about enclosure sizes rather than property size. The current setbacks for livestock enclosures are for a 20,000 sq. ft. property and the enclosure must be 20' from the property line. In AG your property line fence can be used as a pasture, but if you're doing a stable or holding pen, the setback needs to be 50'.

Mr. Ritz feels that the commission should determine in R-1 how many animals are allowed per parcel size and leave it at that. One suggestion is 1 large animal per acre. If your property is 1 1/4 acres you could have two large animals, 1 1/2 acres three animals, etc. This would give more enforceability and make it easier to control. If you're going to have a pasture you would need more room than if you have a penned animal that you are feeding. What should be allowed when there is tight confinement? Where does crowding and odor become an issue? Is one large animal per-acre enough? If we went with 1 horse for the first acre and 1 for every quarter acre thereafter, and if you had 2 acres, you would be able to have 5 large animals. This would give a baseline for council to look at and then send back to the commission with recommendation's if they don't like this.

Jack Babb made a motion to recommend to the Council to allow one large livestock per first acre and the addition of one large livestock for each additional quarter-acre in R-1 Zoning. Motion seconded by Merry Nutter.

Voting was unanimous.

Action; Discuss, Approve, Deny or Table

- 6. Chapter 18.12, permitted animals in Agriculture One Acre (AG-1).** –Mr. Ritz said the definitional treatment for AG-1 might be very close to what we just discussed in Item #5. The setbacks are 50' to the pen or stable, but you could have animals graze up to the property line.

The livestock count restrictions will be grandfathered in as these recommendations are accepted. At that time, Mr. Johnson will count the animals that are on these properties, and that would be the amount grandfathered until the property is sold. Mr. Ritz would not like to see any kind of commercial operation in AG-1 but our code says if you have 10 acres you would be able to have a feed lot. We don't have very many AG lots today, but this could change in the future.

Mr. Babb would like to address the 50' setbacks in AG-1 when in R-1 the setback is only 20' which seems insufficient for AG use because it is less than in R-1. Why is 30' being denied in AG as opposed to R-1? Mr. Johnson said the setback wasn't for a large parcel, it was meant for 20,000 ft. properties. He explained that we would be getting rid of the 20 ft. setbacks in R zoning. Our code says: "Accessory Uses. Keeping of horses, cattle, sheep and goats provided that a minimum lot area of 20,000 ft. in size, and the corral or holding pen is setback a least 20ft." Since the footing would be changed, you would be getting rid of this whole line if we change the lots from 20,000 ft. to 1 acre. The commission's intent in the wording of the motion was so it only changed the size. Mr. Johnson will talk with the attorney but this seems like it is saying that this would be an exception in 20,000 sq. ft. zoning.

Motion made by Jack Babb, seconded by Merry Nutter to table this until the next meeting to be able to do more research and bring it back to the next meeting. Voting was unanimous.

Action; Discuss, Approve, Deny or Table

7. Chapter 18.15, permitted animals in Agriculture Two (AG-2).

Motion made by Eric Ritz, seconded by Jack Babb to table item # 7 until the next meeting. Voting was unanimous.

Action; Discuss, Approve, Deny or Table

8. Items for future agendas:

- a) Mr. Ritz asked to have on the next agenda that legal counsel specifically address any setback issues or the motion that was made as it relates to parcels smaller than 1 acre regarding language loose ends, the intent being to just change the size of the parcel, nothing more.
- b) Mr. Babb's suggestion of addressing setbacks in AG zones.
- c) Item # 7 permitted animals in Ag-2

Action; Discuss, add items on future agenda

9. Adjournment: Motion by Jack Babb seconded by Loretta Whitlow to adjourn the meeting. Voting was unanimous.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Certification of Minutes: I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the Taylor Planning/Zoning Commission Public Hearings and Meeting held April 3, 2012. I further certify that the meeting was duly called to order and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 3rd day of April, 2012

Kathy Hancock
Administrative Assistant