



**MEETING OF THE
TAYLOR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
ON TUESDAY MAY 1, 2012
AT 7:00 P.M. AT
TAYLOR TOWN HALL
425 W. PAPER MILL ROAD**

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

Commission Members Absent: Merry Nutter

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

Attorney Present: Sterling Solomon

Visitors: See list.

- 1. Regular Meeting Called to Order:** Chairman Eric Ritz called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.
- 2. Open Call to the Public:** There were no comments from the public.
- 3. Approval of Minutes:** Motion made by Jack Babb, seconded by Loretta Whitlow to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2012 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting.

Mr. Ritz asked that changes be made to Item 5, paragraph 4.

Original: Mr. Ritz noted that according to the maps, there are approximately 6 properties on the east side of old town that would potentially be affected by the recommendations that we have made so far, and approximately 80 properties that would not feel at all like residential zoning if the current owners chose to take advantage of the leniencies we have allowed. This illustrates the importance of further refining the zones.

Changes: 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.

Voting was unanimous.

Action; Approve, Deny or Table

- 4. Old Business: Chapter 18.20.030 R-1, Accessory Uses Part D: Keeping Of Horses, Cattle, Sheep or Goats Provided the Minimum Lot Area is 20,000**

Square Feet. Property set back discussion with Town Attorney Solomon. Mr. Ritz noted that up until this point the commission has decided to recommend to the council a stipulation that allows large animals with restrictions, but we have not addressed setbacks on anything under 1 acre. The setback for keeping animals is currently 20' on 20,000 ft. or less. Once an animal leaves or the property sells at 20,000 ft., the animal goes away. Mr. Schreiber said we are going to a larger lot size, from 20,000 ft. to 1 acre and feels the rest of the guidelines should remain the same. We want to maintain the 20' setback even if the lot size is 1 acre or more. After a question was brought up about holding areas, Mr. Johnson explained that there is a difference between holding pens and pasture and his understanding is that animals can graze up to the lot line; barns, corrals and holding pens require the 20' setbacks.

A motion was made by Ralph Schreiber on Chapter 18.20.030 R-1, that the minimum lot size be changed from 20,000 sq. ft. to 1 acre minimum and the setbacks we have currently will remain in effect. Motion seconded by Loretta Whitlow. Voting was unanimous.

Action; Discuss, Approve, Deny or Table

5. **Old Business: Chapter 18.12, permitted animals in Agriculture One (AG-1)**— Mr. Babb asked why there are 50' setbacks in R-1 and 20' setbacks in AG. Mr. Solomon explained that when he researched 20,000' lots he found that they were usually larger properties that were cut down in size. When zoning first came into place in 1984 everything was zoned AG except the Commercial zoning down Main Street and most of the lots were larger; properties have been split many times since then. Mr. Babb feels that 50' setbacks on larger lots are not that big of a deal, but on smaller properties it can be quite restrictive. If you live in R-1 you expect to be in a residential neighborhood but when you move into an AG neighborhood, you do expect to have more animals. So why are we losing 30' in that setback when you move into AG? Mr. Johnson replied that maybe the reason for the larger setbacks was to try and keep larger animals out of the smaller properties. We don't have very many AG-1 properties right now but any new annexing would probably come in from the county as AG-1. Mr. Ritz suggested that AG-1 should have similar conditions to R-1, partly for consistency. The only change Mr. Babb sees necessary in AG zoning is the change in the setbacks. There was discussion about how many as well as what kinds of animals should be allowed in AG-1 after which the commission decided to use the same restrictions as recommended in R-1 zoning.

Motion made by Eric Ritz relating to item #5 Chapter 18.12, permitted animals in AG-1 that we extend the same restrictions defined in our earlier recommendation in regards to R-1 Zoning to the AG-1 Zone regarding the keeping of large livestock and its density as well as revising the current setback in Ag-1 to the 20' requirement. Motion seconded by Jack Babb. Voting was unanimous.

Action; Discuss, Approve, Deny or Table

6. **New Business: Chapter 18.15, permitted animals in Agriculture Two (AG-2)** Mr. Ritz asked the commission what they thought about making the recommendations that we have heretofore discussed to the council, and highlight for them leaving AG-2

unchanged other than the 50' setbacks and possibly inviting them to do this exercise for themselves or to reassign us to go back and look at AG-2. If the council isn't receptive to the changes we've made so far, they are not going to be receptive to changes we're making in AG-2, so it would be nice to have feedback from them before we go further.

Mr. Johnson said if we are going to take this to the council it will be a public hearing unless we just want feedback or information. Mr. Solomon explained that what you've suggested as far as R-1 and AG-1 could be put into proposed ordinances with public hearings published and given notice, and then place those text amendment's before the council for approval. After they've discussed that, staff can mention that there is more work to be done. This would be posted on the agenda as recommendations from the P&Z regarding setbacks, large animals and a request from P&Z for further direction on defining the minutia of small animals in these areas.

Mr. Ritz added if we were to pursue this, it would require some homework from both staff and the commission. We have been working on this for over a year and we kind of forget the problems and scope of discussion that we first started with. We could put together a graphic presentation saying these are the problems, why we felt they were problems, and these are the resolutions. Commission members would need to bone up and be at that meeting so they can give council members the benefit of that exhaustive discussion so they won't feel the need to start where we were over a year ago.

Motion made by Jack Babb that in Chapter 18.15, permitted animals in Agriculture Two (AG-2) that we recommend the change from 50' setbacks to 20' setbacks. Motion seconded by Ralph Schreiber. Voting was unanimous.

Action; Discuss, Approve, Deny or Table

Eric Ritz made a motion that we table further discussion regarding permitted animals and density in AG-2 until such a time that we can hear council's reactions and recommendations and at that point, we can pick up that discussion. Motion seconded by Loretta Whitlow. Voting was unanimous.

Action; Discuss, Approve, Deny or Table

- 7. Discuss, instruct staff to add items on future agenda**—Mr. Johnson will go through the minutes and get the motions so he can come up with a metric as to what was said. Sterling will write something up and then we will get it to the council as soon possible.

Mr. Ritz suggested putting a metric together with the major points we've made starting with the 4-H Temporary Use Permit (TUP) and continuing through today's discussion. Overlay the R-1 zone lots as they sit today with what you anticipate to become legal non-conforming when someone sells their home. And with an overhead projector we could overlay on top of that, what would happen if there were no changes or if recommendations were not accepted. This would basically show how the R-1 zone could be eliminated if we don't do something. If we had this so we can

really see what could happen, then we can make the recommendation to the council at their next meeting.

Mr. Johnson reported that there could possibility be a site plan review at the commission's next meeting.

- 8. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Jack Babb, seconded by Ralph Schreiber. Voting was unanimous.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 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 May 1, 2012. I further certify that the meeting was duly called to order and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 1st day of May, 2012

Kathy Hancock
Administrative Assistant