

Taylorsville-Spencer County
Joint Planning and Zoning Commission

The regular meeting of the Taylorsville-Spencer County Joint Planning and Zoning Commission was held September 5, 2024, in the Fiscal Court meeting room located at 28 East Main Street, Taylorsville, Kentucky.

Chairman Brown called the meeting to order.

Present were Marsha Mudd, Diana Fauve, Paula Wheatley, Cory Osbourne, Anthony Travis, Valerie Hunt, Jacob Brown, and Attorney Dale. Gordon Deapen was absent. Also, present was Administrator Julie Sweazy and Admin. Assistant Angie Helton.

Chairman Brown: In your packets you have a copy of the minutes from the last meeting for August 15, 2024. I will entertain a motion to approve those minutes.

Commissioner Osbourne: Made a motion to approve the minutes for August 15, 2024.

Commissioner Wheatley: Second.

Chairman Brown: Call roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Roll called, motion carries.

Chairman Brown: Any committees?

Administrator Sweazy: None.

Attorney Dale administered the oath of testimony to all wishing to speak.

Chairman Brown: I'll entertain a motion to reverse the order of tonight's meeting and do the new business first and old business last.

Commissioner Fauve: Made the motion.

Commissioner Travis: Second.

Chairman Brown: Call roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Roll called, motion carries.

Chairman Brown: New business.

Administrator Sweazy: We have the application of **Ronald & Deborah Cundiff** requesting AG-1, agricultural to R-1, residential on a one-acre of land located in the 600 block of Akins Road. The comprehensive plan recommended land use map indicates the area should be medium density residential use. No previous action. The Cundiff's are tracking off this acre lot for their daughter to build a home. They have purchased 0.278 acres from Schaefer (Tract 2A) where there is an existing 50' access easement to their land. With this plat it will also create a 20' access easement to serve the new lot. This land sits at the end of the county-maintained Akins Road, the farm beyond them is accessed by a private paved driveway. You can see the little

triangle there on the plat that's what they are purchasing from the Schaefer's so that way they will actually own their 50' easement area and are able to create the other 20' access easement along the other side of that going to the one acre tract going to their daughter.

Chairman Brown: Would the Cundiff's like to come up and speak on the matter?

Ronald & Deborah Cundiff: We don't have anything to say unless you have questions.

Administrator Sweazy: Just let the record show that they are both present.

Chairman Brown: Does anyone have any issues with proceeding with this tonight? Any discussion?

Commissioner Hunt: So, the 50' access easement for Akins Road, that little square box where the property is going to meet, Plat Cabinet 3, Slide 348.

Administrator Sweazy: This here is already put to record for their property next to them.

Commissioner Hunt: Who does this box...

Administrator Sweazy: That still belongs to the Schaefer's. That's part of their drive that keeps going on back.

Commissioner Hunt: They're traveling this road and here's their point of entry to go on this 20' easement.

Administrator Sweazy: They're going to go across this easement, the existing 50' access easement.

Commissioner Hunt: Who has the right to that easement?

Administrator Sweazy: The Cundiff's. So instead of that whole triangle being an easement and belonging to the Schaefer's, they are purchasing the triangle, they will own their easement area and the other parts will be considered a written easement and will also have the other easement going to the other lot.

Commissioner Hunt: Do we have that easement going to tract one written up yet? As far as being able to utilize this box to get to the 20'.

Administrator Sweazy: I'm going to say they don't have anything written up additional than what's written up on this survey.

Chairman Brown: Turn to the other side, Plat Cabinet 2, Slide 202, you're saying they should piggyback off of that one and there needs to be something modified allow the piggyback to occur from that tract.

Commissioner Hunt: Yes, from parent to daughter.

Chairman Brown: That's probably a good idea.

Administrator Sweazy: You want it to say something on here, that they have the right to let their daughter use that part of the easement as well?

Ronald Cundiff: We are actually coming off the county road for that. We're not really going through the fence where you start Schaefer's driveway. Right before the county road ends we're turning up and we're going to use the 50' ROW that the county roads got. So, we're coming off the county road before you get to the fence line.

Commissioner Hunt: But is it still on Schaefer's property?

Administrator Sweazy: That's what he's saying, its going to be ROW and then he will be on his property. That's why they're buying that triangle.

Chairman Brown: I think you still have a gap there on that corner.

Administrator Sweazy: I guess to make it clear, when they have their deed written up, they can make sure their deed is also giving them that 50' access easement to the daughter as well.

Chairman Brown: But only to that 20' easement line.

Commissioner Hunt: Do we have a copy of Plat Cabinet 3, Slide 348 here?

Administrator Sweazy: No.

Chairman Brown: Now that opens a second point. Plat Cabinet 3, Slide 348, she would actually have to have access to both. You will have to get the surveyor to write up in the deeded easement to get access to the 50' and have to provide access into the 50' ingress/egress easement.

Commissioner Hunt: Can we continue it to the next meeting and have them bring in the actual plat? Plat 3, Slide 348.

Administrator Sweazy: I have it right here.

Attorney Dale: I think all the surveyor needs to do is extend that dash line over to the 50' and something to reflect they have the right to use the 50' ROW up to the 20' access easement. They can either do it on here or in the deed description.

Deborah Cundiff: So, when we go have the deed drawn up do we need to include the 50' easement, the original, to our daughter?

Chairman Brown: They have to deed access; they will have to be named on that access. Both, the 50'x50' box and the other 50'. From the 20' access easement will allow access through these other two portions.

Administrator Sweazy: Plat 3, Slide 348 on the screen. It just says Stalling's 50x50 access easement in that area and then Cundiff 50' access easement. Stalling don't own it anymore.

Chairman Brown: Have the surveyor replat it and we will have to push to next meeting.

Attorney Dale: He can do it on here or in the deed.

Chairman Brown: Explained to Mr. Cundiff on the survey what was needed.

Commissioner Mudd: I make a motion we carry the application of Ronald & Deborah Cundiff in the 600 block of Adkins Road to our next meeting on September 19, 2024.

Commissioner Osbourne: Second.

Chairman Brown: Call roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Roll called, motion carries.

Chairman Brown: Old Business.

Administrator Sweazy: (Handed out what was typed up from what the Board came up with at the last meeting for AG-1 on Class B Craft Distilleries.) Take a quick look and make sure everything is still good before we move along. Page 28-1 is where it starts. One thing I don't think we have in here and I was questioned over the other day. If we are going to require any kind of detention/retention basins. We had that in here at one time so if we want to add that back in we can.

Chairman Brown: Absolutely because I believe it is a Division of Water requirement anyway. Do we want to pin ourselves to just the rickhouses or open that up to have some different building types?

Attorney Dale: That would be a condition of the Board of Adjustments.

Administrator Sweazy: It would be a conditional use.

Administrator Sweazy: That's on page 28-2, 4C, where it says the construction type shall be limited to rack supported structures (pallet storage structures are prohibited). Do we want to leave that or take it out completely?

Chairman Brown: I think take it out or put in there, rack structures as acceptable by Board of Adjustment and have them make the call.

Administrator Sweazy: I would just take it out, then they have the availability to decide which one they want.

Chairman Brown: I entertain a motion to approve the AG-1 zone changes for Craft Distillery, Class B only.

Commissioner Hunt: Question. In (L) it says such facility may include a tasting room or retail space to sell merchandise, and alcoholic products only manufactured on site, unless otherwise allowed by the underlying zone.

Chairman Brown: Just strike unless otherwise allowed by the underlying zone.

Commissioner Wheatley: Only manufactured on site. So you can't sell bottles because it says drinks only.

Commissioner Faue: No, manufactured then later it says you can do by drink.

Administrator Sweazy: I think when we got into discussing that it was so they're not bringing in other alcohol from other places in to sell it. They're only selling what they're making. On L2 we might have that underlying zoning also there. Can we not say by the drink only in accordance with the state and local laws?

Commissioner Wheatley: Right.

Administrator Sweazy: Are we going to stick with the setbacks?

Chairman Brown: I think so for AG-1.

Commissioner Hunt: On number 8, complimentary products. Is that complimentary products they made or produced?

Commissioner Fau: I read that as a coaster, that's what I read it to be.

Administrator Sweazy: Any other questions or are we ready for a recommendation to send these to Fiscal Court to amend the regulations?

Commissioner Fau: I'll make a motion we send these amended AG-1, agricultural zone regulations to Fiscal Court for the Craft Distillery, Class B with changes as discussed during the meeting.

Commissioner Wheatley: Second.

Chairman Brown: Call roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Commissioner Travis.

Commissioner Travis: Is the tractor trailer supposed to stay in here?

Administrator Sweazy: Yes. That's one we've always carried all the way through.

Chairman Brown: For this size distillery I don't think its going to make a difference.

Commissioner Travis: Yes

Administrator Sweazy: Commissioner Mudd.

Commissioner Mudd: Yes.

Administrator Sweazy: Commissioner Hunt.

Commissioner Hunt: I have a question. I just want to make sure that the regulations are for section 403 in the subdivision regulations.

Administrator Sweazy: That's for how they have to do the roads.

Commissioner Hunt: Right.

Administrator Sweazy: If the roads aren't adequate then they have to widen the road as the county requires.

Chairman Brown: They have to extend it, do traffic study, arterials or collector.

Commissioner Hunt: Is that in here and I missed it?

Chairman Brown: The applicant must submit a roadway adequacy analysis identifying the current pavement conditions, curves, and intersections from KYTC designated arterial, or collectors to the site to the appropriate agencies. The applicant must submit evidence of agency review and determination of compliance with applicable road standards and/or identification of any improvements or other mitigation requirements. If improvements or other mitigation is required on county roadway, the applicant shall complete improvements using the same guidelines. My question now after reading that, would you put State Highway as well?

Commissioner Faue: It says or as directed by KYTC.

Chairman Brown: That's right, we covered it by doing it that way. I still think after reading it twice you still have to put County and or State Highways. We can retrack any motion and start over.

Administrator Sweazy: Yes, we were in the middle of roll and then you all start something. Just so the minutes are clear. Here's Article IV, Section 403, number 7. It is the responsibility of the developer to widen the existing county roads that provide access to the subdivision along its physical boundary with said subdivision.

Commissioner Hunt: That's the question I have. Along its physical boundary.

Administrator Sweazy: But when our Road Department and Engineers look at it they can require more.

Commissioner Hunt: But we're saying in this that its going by this or KYTC?

Administrator Sweazy: Right.

Commissioner Hunt: Not to do with anything of the Road Department guy or anything else. This only touches on where the physical boundary is and where it touches the road not the roads leading into it?

Administrator Sweazy: When the Engineer is looking at their plans, for safety, he can say we have to do more. If it's on a State Road KYTC will require them to do whatever. But on the other our Engineers are who would make that determination.

Commissioner Hunt: Or the Engineers or the Spencer County and also would it be the Road Department?

Administrator Sweazy: They work together on the roads. The county Road Forman and the County Engineer is who would make the call as to what they needed to do.

Commissioner Osbourne: Is that verbiage already in 403?

Chairman Brown: Listen to this and see what you think Valerie. If improvements or other mitigation is required on county and/or state roadways, the applicant shall complete

improvements for the entirety of the route of travel, using the same guidelines as outlined in Subdivision Regulations, Article IV, Sections 403, or as directed by authorities having jurisdiction.

Administrator Sweazy: So, do we start the motion over?

Chairman Brown: Yes.

Commissioner Fau: I make a motion to retract my original motion.

Commissioner Wheatley: Second.

Chairman Brown: Call roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Roll called; motion has been retracted.

Commissioner Fau: I make a motion we send the revised AG-1, agricultural, which includes the Craft Distillery, Class B regulations to Fiscal Court for their approval.

Commissioner Hunt: Second.

Chairman Brown: Call roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Roll called, all in favor, motion carries.

Administrator Sweazy: Let's go to I-1. (Handed out a draft.) I did highlight some things. On Industrial I didn't know if you wanted it to continue to say a minimum of 10 acres. Because nothing else has to be on 10 acres in Industrial. I also highlighted that at least 25% of the property shall be dedicated to agricultural use, we don't do that on anything else in Industrial. On Signage, I didn't know if we want to follow that we wrote out for AG or let them use the Industrial Sign Regulations. Then I highlighted the tractor trailer traffic because we don't limit the number of tractor trailers on Industrial for any other use. These are some of the things that stood out to me to question and still add the retention basins in.

Commissioner Fau: All the changes we made on the AG-1 would need to be incorporated in this?

Administrator Sweazy: Correct.

Chairman Brown: All changes that were made in AG-1. Then, ten acres, you're not going to get that. So, strike number 1. Twenty-five percent of the property shall be dedicated to agriculture; I believe you're not going to get that.

Administrator Sweazy: I want to back track for a minute because C-4 says the site may contain a distilled storage facility immediately joining the distillery on an additional minimum of 10 acres; I don't know why we would keep that 10 acres.

Commissioner Fau: Take it out and the same verbiage we put in agriculture for the rack, we just take that construction type out.

Chairman Brown: My problem with the storage facility; I don't think its going to matter, once you start getting smaller its not going to be feasible for them to do both anyway. So, I don't think that matters. You can just scratch that 10-acre minimum.

Administrator Sweazy: Could we say the site may contain a distilled storage facility...

Chairman Brown: Yes, and strike on an additional minimum of 10 acres. Consolidated with the adjoining distillery property, stays.

Commissioner Hunt: So, you're saying the storage facility can be on the same exact tract?

Chairman Brown: It still needs to be continuous; the tracts do.

Commissioner Hunt: They still need a separate tract for a distilled storage facility, correct?

Administrator Sweazy: I don't know that it needs to be a separate tract if their larger tract is big enough for the building to work out and follow these setbacks. I don't know that it would matter.

Chairman Brown: I agree. Now, why were you worried about the signage?

Administrator Sweazy: I was just asking if we wanted to leave it the same as agricultural or let them follow, because the sign regulations for industrial is billboard.

Chairman Brown: I think leave it in there.

Commissioner Faue: The other thing I would be curious about in the industrial is where we're reducing the 10 acres is the setback. We still have to have a few hundred feet.

Chairman Brown: I think you could reduce that in industrial. Why would we want to keep it at 200'? Our industrial doesn't border agriculture.

Administrator Sweazy: It could. There's not a whole lot of industrial out here. They're going to have to buy something to zone it. But if they're going to have to buy it and zone it industrial then they're just going to do it on agricultural.

Chairman Brown: The only time you would have a 200' setback would be if the industrial borders agricultural.

Administrator Sweazy: What if we put all distillery structures shall setback a minimum of 200' from all property lines (including but not limited to mash tun, fermenters, sill or bottling facilities) if adjoining agricultural or residential land.

Chairman Brown: I think we just stick to the normal setbacks.

Administrator Sweazy: What's everybody else's thoughts?

Commissioner Hunt: I personally like the larger setbacks of 200' but that's just me. You can buy a piece of property and zone it industrial. Then instead of doing 10 acres and they want to do 7 acres or 3 acres. That's still a reality thing, then you might be right next to a residential neighborhood.

Commissioner Wheatley: Could that be residential right next to a neighborhood?

Administrator Sweazy: We've got industrial that backs up to Highview at the moment. But there going to have a large piece of property because the maximum lot coverage is 60%. If they go to the maximum building size they're going to go with a large piece of property.

Chairman Brown: Maximum lot size without any setbacks is 1.5 acres. With the setbacks and all you add to it you're every bit of 5 acres. It won't work on anything less than five anyway.

Commissioner Hunt: That's at the maximum size.

Chairman Brown: Do you want to change for distilleries your setbacks from the residential and increase that from 75' to a greater number?

Commissioner Hunt: Like if it met up with residential verses just met up with agricultural?

Chairman Brown: Either or if you want to do something more than 75'. That's probably going to be more of a rear setback. I don't think you're going to border from the front or sides, its probably a back situation.

Commissioner Travis: The rear yard setback is 25'.

Administrator Sweazy: Its 75' if it adjoins a residential.

Commissioner Travis: That's the side setback.

Administrator Sweazy: You're right.

Commissioner Osbourne: Why did they put a 200' setback on all these other ones? Was a safety issue?

Administrator Sweazy: Fires and the stuff that falls on the trees and cars (*baudoinia compniacensis*). Just putting a little distance from them so they're not right on top of someone's home.

Chairman Brown: Maybe on this we do 75' on the sides and rear.

Commissioner Hunt: I wouldn't want to be 75' if I had the ability to be 200'.

Commissioner Travis: If you got an acre, you don't have 75'.

Commissioner Hunt: Well, they have to buy more than an acre to make it work for what they want to do.

Commissioner Wheatley: We can put that in there and if they want something different, they can ask for a variance.

Administrator Sweazy: Put to a vote because all of you don't have to approve. We can't make everybody happy.

Chairman Brown: I just think if you're going to ever get anything to go on industrial, you won't get if with a 200' setback. Most distilleries downtown are almost on the property lines now. I

don't think it's so much fire danger there as much as it might be just the buffer that's necessary to keep in line with the surroundings. I think AG-1 is a no brainer. I think if you're on industrial or commercial in a city I think there's a better opportunity to come off of those.

Commissioner Travis: Is there anything here in Taylorsville that's I-1?

Administrator Sweazy: Not right in town, no.

Commissioner Travis: The old Southern States building, is that I-1?

Administrator Sweazy: It is an industrial zone. I forgot about it.

Commissioner Wheatley: I guess we just need to vote on it. We keep it the same or change.

Administrator Sweazy: As we are going down the line on page 64-2, number 11, all loading and unloading areas shall be oriented away from public streets, whenever feasible. I think we just need to duplicate or not put anything, and they would have to follow on page 65, number 5d, already talks about loading and unloading.

Chairman Brown: We can scratch number 11.

Administrator Sweazy: Are we leaving C, c on page 64 or taking it out and follow what the others do? If so, we can strike b about height requirements because that is the height requirement in the back.

Chairman Brown: You can strike b regardless. I'd like to see c be at least 75' for the rear and side.

Administrator Sweazy: It says a minimum setback of all lines. Do we want to follow the 50' on the front yard?

Chairman Brown: I think you follow the 50'.

Administrator Sweazy: Minimum side yard is 50' unless adjoining residential, then goes to 75'?

Chairman Brown: Yes.

Administrator Sweazy: Now we need a rear yard.

Chairman Brown: I think 25' is to close, I think we up it to 75'.

Commissioner Hunt: Say they buy a piece of property, in a subdivision and then they change it to Industrial zone. So, going from residential to industrial. In my subdivision I have 100' setback for my front building line. Now everybody's houses are back at 100', they get this zoned as industrial they could come build one at 50' off the road.

Administrator Sweazy: I don't think you're going to see anybody come in and try to change in the middle of a development. In every other class is 50'.

Commissioner Wheatley: We would probably deny it and say you're in this neighborhood and its 100', we want you to be 100'.

Commissioner Travis: If someone's got a piece and there's homes next to it, they got an uphill battle if they think of redoing that to I-1.

Commissioner Wheatley: I say we keep the industrial the same and if they want a variance then they will have to ask for it.

Commissioner Hunt: You're saying keep it at 50' and 25'.

Commissioner Wheatley: In the particular section keep it consistent, its industrial.

Administrator Sweazy: Again, we're not going to make everybody happy. You just have to make a motion, if it passes it passes, if it fails, we start all over.

Chairman Brown: It would still have the 75' setback on the sides and 50' on the front.

Commissioner Osbourne: On a fire prevention side. We're bringing in a highly volatile concentration in an industrial setting. For better protection, there is a reason why these buildings are setback. If a situation happens this close to residential, the bigger the setback the better. The way you look at a distillery is no different than looking at a gas plant. A distillery has a very viable, fast moving, high heat, hard to control, even with a sprinkler system. You're going to have a major mess on your hands. If you're 75' from the next property that heats going to radiate to the houses and surrounding properties. So, I feel like if you're going to have a Marathon come in and set up for gas storage are we going to keep them at 25'? I think the setbacks need to be fairly strict when it comes to this stuff. You need to look at the burn factors, fire hazards, and the chemical dangers. That's my thought on it.

Chairman Brown: I still think what I'm hearing is we make it 75', 75', and 75' and still keep the front at 50'. Anytime you're talking safety, and this is a prime candidate for this discussion.

Administrator Sweazy: So, it sounds like we propose the 75' no matter what the adjoining property is.

Chairman Brown: And the front yard setback remain the same at 50'.

Administrator Sweazy: I think we can change, all distillery structures shall setback a minimum of 75' from side and rear yard property lines.

Commissioner Hunt: What makes industrial any different from what we just proposed for agricultural that we have a 200' setback?

Chairman Brown: More property.

Commissioner Hunt: Okay. So they have more property and because we're not requiring 10 acres here, we're saying it's not as viable 75' verses 200'.

Administrator Sweazy: I think you have to look at the aesthetics of it also. If you're on industrial you're probably in an industrial park. With agriculture you want that to fit in with agriculture and residential.

Chairman Brown: I'm pretty sure this is the last one we will get through tonight.

Administrator Sweazy: I can pass off some to you all if you will take it home and do your homework.

Commissioner Wheatley: Are we good with the changes we made here.

Commissioner Faue: We will have the changes we made in agriculture that carry over plus the changes we made here.

Commissioner Wheatley: Before a motion is made, does anyone have anymore questions?

Commissioner Osbourne: Did we talk about the construction type where its not rack supported?

Commissioner Faue: We took it out in agricultural.

Commissioner Wheatley: So, the changes we made there will move forward as well.

Commissioner Wheatley: I make a motion to incorporate the changes we made in the discussion for agricultural into the industrial section with the other changes we've made for the Craft Distillery, Class B section.

Commissioner Faue: Second.

Chairman Brown: Call roll.

Administrator Sweazy: Roll called, Commissioner Osbourne, Travis and Hunt were opposed, Commissioner's Wheatley, Faue and Mudd were in favor, causing a tie vote. Chairman Brown voted in favor and motion passes.

Commissioner Mudd: If Fiscal Court doesn't like it, they will send it back with their changes, right?

Attorney Dale: They can make changes without sending it back.

Commissioner Mudd: With recommendations.

Attorney Dale: No. They might but don't have to. They have the final says in this and can change what ever they want to without sending it back.

Administrator Sweazy: So, are we going to continue on or do the commercial next meeting.

Chairman Brown: Yes, please.

Administrator Sweazy: I have two other things. Hadrotes Property Series LLC is Vicki Yates Glisson and her husband. They are currently growing their grapes and preparing for their small farm winery out on Hwy. 155. Originally, she came in talking about what she could and could not do. So, I drafted a letter for her at her request. (see exhibit A) By Status small farm wineries can be 250 gallon up to 500,000 gallons. To keep her license, she has to do at least the 250 gallons. Where I put the 250 threshold on her here to allow her to play round with this as someone new learning. She's asking me now to draft a new letter, but I told her I wasn't comfortable or sure about giving her permission to proceed because I've checked in other counties, the ABC Licensing, The Winery Association and one other. But in most other counties,

even if you're on agricultural and the KRS says you can do this, they still require the Conditional Use Permit if you're doing the tasting room, retail sales, events or tours. I think she's about to get there. She already has a room in the existing home set up and ready to go like a tasting room. Only thing is, if we don't have our guidelines, the only option I have is to send it to the BOA and for them to make a determination.

Chairman Brown: We can push it to the top of the list for the next meeting. I don't know what her timeline is looking like but if she beats the timeline, send it to BOA.

Commissioner Fau: But she still just growing?

Administrator Sweazy: No, she's processing. She's already almost at her 250 gallons. Because she has to in order to keep her State License.

Commissioner Mudd: She has more than what you see from the road because what you see is not a lot of grapes.

Administrator Sweazy: What she has explained to me, she's got a lot of fruit wines. So, I asked her what fruits. She's not growing it all on her property. She's not raising all her fruits. You don't have to grow your own. Out of like 79 wineries in the state only 20% grow their own stuff. I'm trying to figure out where I can go with this letter or leave it as it is and say when you get ready to open your tasting room, you're going to have to go to the BOA.

Commissioner Wheatley: If we push that to the top of the agenda at the next meeting, I don't think she will be ready within the next 2 weeks.

Chairman Brown: I think we're fine.

Commissioner Travis: How long are the wineries?

Administrator Sweazy: Three pages.

Chairman Brown: I think push that off until next meeting and come in with a fresh mind.

Commissioner Wheatley: Send that home with us.

Administrator Sweazy: We'll do the wineries next meeting and if time allows, we'll work on the commercial distilleries part and sit on the microbreweries.

Commissioner Wheatley: Why don't you send the commercial with us too so we can at least look at them if we have questions.

Administrator Sweazy: At the Fiscal Court meeting yesterday morning they voted on a resolution for us to look at the storage containers. Like shipping containers because they feel like its cost effective and practical solution for storage needs of a property owner without compromising the astatic and safety standards of our county. They're also asking for us to consider them in agricultural. They think it would be good for storage of equipment, supplies and products related to farming operations. They want that bumped up too. Right now, regulations say they're not allowed at all. So, kind of be thinking on that one.

Chairman Brown: Any general questions or discussion?

Next meeting is September 19, 2024.

Commissioner Travis: Motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Osbourne: Second.

Chairman Brown: All in favor, meeting adjourned.

Attest:

Secretary

Chairman