

Commissioners,

My name is Scott Shoemaker;

I oppose Bill 2007-13 as currently written.

This bill was originally intended to address the issue of kennels in residential areas, due to one dog rescue operation with noise complaints, which has since closed. This ordinance has gone from zoning kennels to zoning bees.

It seems that this amendment has failed to achieve the low standard that was set for it, which I'll quote from last year "an appropriate location for the particular business" referring to kennels/rescues.

The only change to the current zoning code is the removal of kennel as a permissive use in Neighborhood Commercial, unless it is an indoor facility. Otherwise it requires a conditional use permit, in residential to commercial zones. Seems like there is no appropriate location or zone for kennels, rescues operations or sanctuaries, or the RPC is partial to requiring Conditional Use Permits.

The bill should provide some zones where a commercial kennel is a permissive use on the property. Thus providing an incentive for kennels to locate in those appropriate zones, not requiring a conditional use permit and prevent the planning board from making the same mistake twice.

It seems someone has the great idea of trying to fix animal issues with zoning rather than in Title 6, which is specifically for Animal Control. Which the guidance from the BOCC concerning amending Title 6 last year was and I quote "to only regulate the things that were a real problem".

This bill is a ban on "Animal Special Conditions" (in other words, exotic animals) on property less than two acres and requiring a conditional use permit for such animals on residences two acres or greater, on top of the required registration and inspection of the animal facilities.

I provided a copy of what we proposed when asked to speak to the adhoc committee **AFTER** the bill was passed by the RPC.

I walked away from that meeting with the impression that it is okay to be killed by a horse, bull, or dog, just as long as one of the "Animal Special Conditions" doesn't get out.

I agree with the registration, the inspection....is there a checklist of what is expected?

Remove Conditional Use Permit for Animal Special Conditions, if you are requiring registering and inspection of facility, why should someone have to pay 350 dollars and a 65 day process for something they “have a right to own and enjoy”.

In addition to this, since at least 1990 no one has ever been killed by a captive kept big cat at large, but we do live in an area populated with wild cougars. The only human deaths attributed to cougars are from wild ones.

The definition has the term ‘includes but not limited to’ and list animals from an elephant to hybrid cats that are smaller than the average house cat. What is it limited to? Are horses and cattle included? They meet the size requirement according to the definition.

(Address the item given time)

Inspection requirements are mentioned for Animal Rescue, Sanctuary, Special Conditions, Commercial Stables and Kennels, add the applicable check list. (you can’t inspect something if you don’t know what to look for)

If the inspection/caging requirements are going to be part of Title 6, then table this bill until the Title 6 revision is ready. Unless this is done, this bill will be unenforceable

Conditional use specifics for bee keeping?

(10/24/2007)