

Accessibility and Accommodation Requests

For questions about accessibility or accommodations for persons with disabilities, or to request a translator, interpreter, or other communication aids, please contact Melissa Bisset at 503-856-3412 or bissetm@keizeror.gov. The City of Keizer is committed to providing equal access to all public meetings and information per the requirements of the ADA and Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS). The Keizer Civic Center is wheelchair accessible.

To provide oral comments via electronic means, please contact the City Recorder's Office no later than 2:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting. Most regular City Council meetings are streamed live through www.KeizerTV.com and cable-cast on Comcast Channel 23 within the Keizer City limits.



KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday, June 10, 2026, 6:00 PM

Robert L. Simon Council Chambers

930 Chemawa Road NE

Keizer, Oregon

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 2026

3. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED PERSONS

This time is made available for those who wish to speak about an issue that is not on the agenda.

4. NEW-OLD BUSINESS/STAFF REPORT

a. Discussion on Goats

b. New Policy for Committees, Boards, and Commissions to Apply for Grants

5. COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

6. YOUTH LIAISON REPORT

7. COMMISSIONER REPORTING TO COUNCIL: ROBB WITTERS ON JUNE 15TH AT 6PM

8. NEXT MEETING: JULY 8TH

9. ADJOURNMENT



MINUTES
KEIZER PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, April 8, 2026
Robert L. Simon Council Chambers
930 Chemawa Road NE
Keizer, Oregon

- 1. CALL TO ORDER** **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Matt Lawyer called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

<p>Present: Matt Lawyer, Chair Jeremy Grenz, Vice Chair Larry Scruggs Lindsey King Fernando Lopez Robb Witters</p> <p>Absent: Frank Hostler</p>	<p>Council Liaison Present: Councilor Juran</p> <p>Youth Liaison Present: Talia Mesecar</p> <p>Staff Present: Shane Witham, Planning Director Dina Horner, Assistant Planner Joseph Lindsay, City Attorney Dawn Wilson, Deputy City Recorder</p>
---	---

- 2. ANNUAL VOLUNTEER RECOGNITION ~ by Leslie Risewick** Leslie Risewick, Member of the Volunteer Coordinating Committee, recognized the volunteer Planning Commissioners by thanking them and reading a script from her heart. She handed out Certificates of Appreciation and Pens as a token of appreciation.

- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

 - a. February 2026** Commissioner Grenz moved for approval of the February 2026 Minutes as presented. Commissioner Witters seconded. Motion passed unanimously as follows: Lawyer, King, Grenz, Scruggs, Witters, and Lopez in favor with Hostler absent.

- 4. APPEARANCE OF INTERESTED PERSONS** There were no interested persons present.

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING:**

a. Text Amendment Case 2026-02: Amending Keizer Code Appendix A (multiple sections) pertaining to child care allowances in order to provide consistency with state law. In addition, amending Section 3.101.04 to correct an identified error in the process for alternative design review for a detached ADU located in a front yard.

Chair Lawyer opened a Public Hearing at 6:07 p.m. on Text Amendment Case 2026-02: Amending Keizer Code Appendix A (multiple sections) pertaining to child care allowances in order to provide consistency with state law. In addition, amending Section 3.101.04 to correct an identified error in the process for alternative design review for a detached ADU located in a front yard.

Planning Director Shane Witham summarized the second proposed text amendments in the Code on Section 3.101.04 about the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) process to correct the process with the text amendment by writing what the City thought would be the intended consent.

There was a consensus to move forward with the proposed Code amendments.

Mr. Witham summarized the first proposed text amendments to provide consistency for child care in residential zones.

Mr Witham shared that the State Legislation had required State-licensed facilities for childcare providers. He shared that staff aligned the definitions to align with the State's terminology and definitions. He noted that the rules had changed, such as the requirement that the owner had to live in the facility.

It was noted that some rules have preempted what the City could require or not require. In the residential (single-family) zone, you could have both a Certified family child care home and a Registered family child care home, but the City doesn't have to allow child care centers everywhere.

Mr. Witham shared that the definition for larger care homes having more children could still be held to the conditional use provisions. The City could no longer differentiate between the Certified and Registered use of the residence, but there was a limited number of children that could be cared for per home.

City Attorney Joseph Lindsay suggested striking the number of children and caretakers and instead stating that the numbers would be consistent with State law to avoid having to make future amendments if the numbers may change.

Mr. Witham clarified that the numbers would still be referenced in the definitions. Mr. Lindsay commented that we could add a number to the definitions while also stating the number or as required by State law.

Commissioner King asked about how and why people get registered. Mr. Lindsay shared that they get Registered and Certified through the State of Oregon and that the Certification was a higher level than being Registered.

Discussion ensued about using a residential home for a business when more residential homes were needed.

Mr. Lindsay clarified that the Certified home no longer has a requirement for the owner to live there.

There was a consensus to take the text and add the words to be consistent with State law, adding a caveat in the definitions about being subject to State law, and clarifying who the Registration and Certification was through.

Chair Lawyer closed the Hearing at 6:37 p.m.

Commissioner Grenz moved to recommend approval of Section 3.101.04 as presented, and for the multiple sections related to child care, to add in the narrative portions, "subject to State statute," and in the definition portion to add the numbers and a caveat that says "subject to State statute," and then the definitions specifically for Registered and Certified child care and who was doing the certifying. Seconded by Commissioner Scruggs. Motion passed unanimously as follows: Lawyer, King, Grenz, Scruggs, Witters, and Lopez in favor with Hostler absent.

**6. NEW-OLD
BUSINESS/STAFF
REPORT**

Mr. Witham shared that more text amendments and revisions to the Master Plan would be coming before the Planning Commission. He anticipated an application for a Master Plan change. A few new buildings were in the works at Keizer Station. He noted that some easement and lease issues were being reviewed by the City Attorney's Office.

**7. YOUTH LIAISON
REPORT**

Talia Mesecar shared that several sports—tennis, golf, and track—were underway at McNary High School. She mentioned upcoming McNary High School events that included the prom, a math competition, a symphony, band, and an orchestra.

**8. COUNCIL
REPRESENTATIVE
REPORT**

Councilor Juran shared that the Council approved the KeizerFEST permits and commented that the Pedestrian Flag Program wasn't approved. The City had a new police canine who replaced the retired one.

Chair Lawyer shared about the annual Event Center Cleanup that was successful with the help of all the volunteers and having the dumpsters handy that Loren's Sanitation provided. He shared that Soggy Day in the Park would happen again after keizerFEST in May. The Clagget Creek Watershed Council website would have additional information on the event.

**9. COMMISSIONER
REPORTING TO
COUNCIL:**

It was confirmed that Commissioner King would report to the April 20th Council meeting.

**Lindsey King on
April 20th at 6pm**

Commissioner Grenz reminded Commissioners of the Oregon Government Ethics Commission (OGEC) deadline on April 15th to submit their Statements of Economic Interest.

10. NEXT MEETING:
May 13th

11. ADJOURNMENT Meeting adjourned at: 6:52 p.m.

Minutes approved: _____



To: Planning Commission
From: Shane Witham, Planning Director
Subject: Goats

Proposed Motion

No formal motion is required. Staff is asking for consensus from Planning Commission on how to approach the City Council's direction to look into allowances for goats in residential zones.

I. Summary

At the May 18, 2026 City Council meeting, City Council (by consensus) directed staff to have discussions with the Planning Commission in relation to the keeping of goats as emotional support pets, and for Planning Commission to ultimately provide a recommendation to City Council on this matter. Staff is asking Planning Commission for some direction on this issue.

II. Background

- A. This issue is being raised due to testimony provided at the May 18th City Council meeting, along with a letter submitted to the Planning department, which I have attached for your reference. This was born out of a code compliance complaint that we received regarding goats being kept in a residential neighborhood. Monica Njorogoe sent staff a formal written request via email and she also provided public comment at the City Council meeting on May 18, 2026, requesting the City amend its rules to allow for goats to be kept with appropriate regulations.
- B. We have received code enforcement complaints for these specific goats from more than one neighbor in the past. Our case history goes back to 2024 and most recently a citation was issued due to non-compliance. The municipal court has given an extension for this current case due to Ms. Njorogoe seeking to have the development code changed. Ms. Njorogoe initially requested that staff allow the goats through an "emotional support/service animal" type exemption, and provided a doctors note to city staff. Staff requested the legal department to provide guidance, and it was determined that goats are not considered service animals and "emotional support" animals are not categorically defined or protected by ADA standards.
- C. A recent site visit was performed to see the conditions of the yard and surrounding area to attempt to ascertain the impact of the goats being kept on site. Some odors were present but it was uncertain whether it was from the goats or the chickens that were being kept on site. The goats themselves were not too approachable or

friendly, and are the size of a medium to large size dog. According to internet research, Nigerian dwarf goats range in size anywhere from 40-100 lbs depending on sex and overall health. The average size is generally 60-75 pounds.

- D. Staff has performed some limited research into the keeping of goats and has found that a handful of jurisdictions do have allowances and standards for keeping goats. We have attached a brief overview, and if the Planning Commission wishes, staff can further research what other cities do and attempt to provide additional information if desired.

III. Current Situation

- A. The City of Keizer development code currently allows for the keeping of pets in all zones. The definition of a pet according to the Keizer Code is: *A domestic animal customarily kept, and cared for, by the occupants of a dwelling for personal pleasure and which are not raised for food, fur, or monetary gain; typically, dogs, cats, birds and other small mammals and reptiles, but not including fowl, herd animals, pigs, goats or horses of any type or breed.*
- B. Farming, and the keeping of livestock is limited to zones designated for agricultural purposes and is not allowed in the residential single family zone.
- C. The City currently has an allowance for the keeping of chickens and ducks (up to 6 total) in the residential zone. Section 2.203.02 of the development code outlines those standards. The code states the following: *Agricultural uses. Gardens, orchards and crop cultivation primarily for personal use is a permitted use accessory to a dwelling in residential zones, except that the keeping of livestock, poultry (except chickens and ducks) or the sale of such, as well as the selling of produce on site, are prohibited. Chickens and ducks are only permitted consistent with the following standards: (6/20)*
- 1. Chickens and ducks shall only be kept upon property occupied by a detached single-family dwelling or duplex. (6/20)*
 - 2. No more than six hens or ducks in total may be kept on any one parcel or lot. (6/20)*
 - 3. The keeping of roosters is prohibited. (9/11)*
 - 4. Chickens and ducks shall be kept for personal, noncommercial use only. No person shall sell eggs or engage in breeding or fertilizer production for commercial purposes. (6/20)*
 - 5. Chickens and ducks must be kept in a coop and runway, which shall only be located in a side or rear yard. A runway is a fully enclosed fenced area connected to the coop. Chickens and ducks must remain confined to the coop and runway at all times, except when under control of an owner or custodian. (6/20)*
 - 6. Coops shall comply with accessory structure requirements in section 2.313.B, C, D, and F. (6/20)*
 - 7. Coops and runway areas shall be kept clean, dry, free of noticeable odors, and in good repair. (6/20)*
- D. The Code is currently silent on "emotional support animals" and also does not expressly allow or prohibit "service animals" - however the laws surrounding official service animals preempt the provisions of the development code.

E. City Council directed staff to discuss this issue with the Planning Commission and ultimately have the Commission make a recommendation to City Council. Staff is requesting the Planning Commission to provide direction to staff on how they wish to proceed. Some items to consider:

1. Does Planning Commission wish to initiate a text amendment to consider allowing goats or other animals outright, or create standards to regulate? (similar to chickens and ducks)
2. Is there a desire to explore allowing emotional support animals, even though that designation is not something governed by ADA standards? If so, what guidance/standards should be considered?
3. How does Planning Commission wish to move forward in gathering input from neighborhoods and property owners, considering there has been history with code enforcement complaints on goats specifically, as well as several complaints over the years regarding other animals such as chickens and ducks?

IV. **Analysis**

A. **Strategic Impact** - none

B. **Financial** - none

C. **Timing** - City Council directed staff to bring this to Planning Commission, but did not give a specific timeframe.

D. **Policy/Legal** - If amendments are pursued, appropriate notices and process will be followed. At this time, staff is simply providing information and asking for some guidance on how to move forward.

V. **Alternatives**

A. Direct staff to pursue initiating the text amendment process, and provide appropriate guidance and parameters, to how the Commission wishes to pursue that process

B. Choose to pursue no changes to the code and make a formal recommendation to City Council to that effect.

VI. **Recommendation**

Staff recommends Planning Commission discuss this issue and provide direction to staff on how they would like to move forward.

Attachments

1. Goat request
2. GoatInfo

Witham, Shane

From: Monica Njoroge [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2026 3:30 PM
To: Witham, Shane; Witham, Shane
Subject: Request for Municipal Code Amendment Regarding Emotional Support Goats

CAUTION: This email originated from Outside Your Organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or on clicking links from unknown senders. Please contact Information Technology for assistance.

Monica Njoroge

[REDACTED]

Keizer, OR 97305

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

May 10th

To: Planning Department / City Council

Keizer, OR

Subject: Request for Municipal Code Amendment Regarding Emotional Support Goats

Dear Members of the Planning Department and City Council,

I am respectfully requesting consideration of a municipal code amendment regarding the classification of goats kept as emotional support animals within residential zones.

Under the current ordinance, goats are classified solely as livestock and are not recognized in situations involving emotional support animal accommodations, while certain other animals, including horses, may receive consideration

under emotional support provisions. I am requesting that the code be reviewed and amended to allow limited recognition of goats as emotional support animals under reasonable conditions and regulations.

This request is not intended to remove general zoning protections or create unrestricted livestock allowances in residential areas. Rather, I am requesting a narrowly tailored amendment that would allow consideration of goats in documented emotional support situations where the animals are properly maintained, do not create public nuisance conditions, and comply with health and safety standards.

I understand that municipal codes evolve over time to reflect changing community needs and standards. I was informed that previous ordinance amendments involving animals such as chickens and ducks have been considered in the past, and I respectfully ask that similar consideration be given to emotional support goats.

Goats are increasingly used in therapeutic, educational, and emotional support settings due to their social behavior, intelligence, and calming interaction with humans. In some cases, they serve meaningful emotional and psychological support functions comparable to other recognized support animals.

I would appreciate the opportunity for this request to be reviewed through the appropriate planning and council process. I also intend to attend an upcoming City Council meeting to speak further on this matter and answer any questions.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Respectfully,

Monica Njoroge

I found 4 city's that allow goats in some shape...there are more that have "grazing" programs ...Salem does.

Amity: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/amityor/latest/amity_or/0-0-0-2986

Portland: <https://www.portland.gov/code/13/40/020>

Eugene: <https://eugene.municipal.codes/EC/9.5250>

Ashland: <https://ashland.municipal.codes/LandUse/18.2.3.160>

Jurisdiction	What is Allowed	Key Limits/Standards	Overall Approach
Portland	Miniature goats allowed on standard residential lots; standard goats allowed on larger lots	Up to 3 miniature goats on most lots; up to 5 on 10,000+ sq. ft. lots; standard goats allowed on 20,000+ sq. ft. lots; detailed shelter/setback rules	Most permissive and comprehensive "urban livestock" model in Oregon
Amity	Miniature livestock including goats allowed within city limits	2 miniature livestock animals per 0.75 acre; no uncastrated males; breeding and commercial sales prohibited	Small-town residential livestock allowance focused on nuisance prevention
Eugene	Urban animal keeping standards allow some farm/miniature animals	Regulates through "Urban Animal Keeping Standards" with care and nuisance provisions	Allows urban livestock with operational standards rather than broad open allowance
Ashland	Livestock including miniature goats addressed in municipal and land use code	Livestock regulated through zoning and animal keeping standards	More zoning-based approach tied to lot suitability and compatibility

Key takeaways:

- Portland is the strongest example of allowing goats on relatively typical urban residential lots.
- Amity explicitly allows miniature livestock but requires larger lot areas than Portland.
- Eugene and Ashland regulate goats more through urban animal/livestock standards and zoning compatibility.
- All four jurisdictions focus heavily on nuisance prevention, lot size, sanitation, and limiting impacts on neighbors.

1 CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF KEIZER, STATE OF OREGON

2
3 Resolution R2026-3669

4
5
6 ADOPTING POLICY FOR KEIZER COMMITTEES, BOARDS, AND
7 COMMISSIONS DESIRING TO APPLY FOR GRANTS
8

9
10 WHEREAS, the Keizer City Council adopted Resolution R93-684 on November
11 1, 1993 adopting policy statement governing the application for grant funds;

12 WHEREAS, occasionally, Keizer Committees, Boards, and Commissions desire
13 to apply for grants;

14 WHEREAS, Keizer Committees, Boards, and Commissions are advisory to the
15 Keizer City Council;

16 WHEREAS, there is a need for a policy on how Keizer Committees, Boards, and
17 Commissions can apply for grants to stay in line with Council adopted policy;

18 NOW, THEREFORE,

19 BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Keizer that the attached
20 grant application policies for the Keizer Committees, Boards, and Commissions are
21 hereby adopted.
22
23
24
25

1 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall take effect immediately
2 upon the date of its passage.

3 PASSED this 18th day of May, 2026.

4
5 SIGNED this 18th day of May, 2026.

6
7 
8 _____
Mayor

9
10 
11 _____
City Recorder

POLICY FOR
KEIZER COMMITTEES, BOARDS, AND COMMISSIONS
DESIRING TO APPLY FOR GRANTS

Purpose.

The purpose of this policy is to align with the Keizer City Council policy statement governing the application for grant funds. It is to provide guidance to Keizer committees, boards, and commissions desiring to apply for grants.

Process.

Keizer Committees, Boards, and Commission desiring to apply for grants must take the following steps prior to the submittal of a grant application:

1. The advisory Committee, Board or Commission shall meet to discuss the proposed grant application. A motion and vote must be made prior to the grant application being moved forward to the next step.
2. If the motion passes, the grant application is to be reviewed by the Department Director for appropriateness for the City.
3. If the Department Director believes it is appropriate, the Department Director shall place the matter on the next City Council meeting agenda for the Council's consideration. Such consideration shall include the financial information.
4. If the City Council approves the application, the Department Director shall sign the grant application on behalf of the City and submit it. Council has the sole right to deny the authorization to sign the grant application.

Monitoring.

The Department Director shall be responsible for monitoring the project to ensure that the project is being completed as required under the terms of the grant agreement. The Committee, Board and/or Commission shall be responsible for the day-to-day activities connected with the project and shall report to the Department Director.