

City of Taylor

**Taylor Comprehensive Plan and
Land Development Code**

Digital Infrastructure Feedback Summary

Prepared by:



Overview

This summary documents feedback received on the digital infrastructure and Phase 1B engagement boards presented at the City of Taylor community meeting. Comments were organized by topic to identify recurring concerns, questions, and suggestions for consideration as the draft standards are refined.

Overall takeaway: The strongest theme was a desire for greater protection of residential areas, particularly through larger setbacks and buffers, stricter noise controls, clearer monitoring requirements, and stronger enforcement. Several comments indicated that the proposed standards may not go far enough.

Key Themes by Topic

1. Site Standards / Setbacks

- Consider increasing the residential setback or buffer from 500 feet to 1,000 feet.
- One comment suggested a setback of 1,000 feet or more, particularly for taller facilities.
- Consider whether setback requirements should vary based on building height, size, or number of stories.
- Concern that landscaping alone may not adequately mitigate low-frequency sound because of the distance that low-frequency noise can travel.
- Request to clarify or strengthen data center zoning requirements.
- Support for screening and buffering, with interest in more substantial measures than landscaping alone.
- One comment suggested reviewing standards used in Loudoun County, Virginia.

2. Operational Standards

- Support for the proposed restrictions on diesel generators.
- Concern about potential air-quality impacts associated with diesel backup generators.
- Questions about who would enforce the regulations and how enforcement would occur.
- Request for independent code audits or independent enforcement verification.
- Interest in clearer monitoring requirements, including possible ongoing or quarterly reporting.
- Questions about reporting water use, emissions, and other environmental impacts.
- Questions about how wastewater discharge or pollution would be addressed.

3. Data Center Separation / Location

- Concern about data centers expanding into areas outside the intended Employment Center areas.
- Suggestion to consider whether immersive or liquid cooling should be specifically addressed.
- Support for maintaining clear geographic limitations on where data centers may be located.

4. Comparison With Other Communities

- Increase Taylor's residential buffer to 1,000 feet to reduce potential noise impacts on nearby residents.
- Consider Loudoun County as a possible benchmark for stronger standards.
- Maintain ambient or pre-development noise conditions or consider more protective noise standards.
- Consider requirements related to on-site power generation and emergency power.
- Ensure that standards include realistic and enforceable compliance measures.
- Consider whether limits on the total number or concentration of data centers are appropriate.

5. Noise Standards

- Clarify the differences between dB, dBA, and dBC for the public.
- Concern that noise standards should account for continuous 24-hour operations rather than only short-term noise exposure.
- Interest in regulating low-frequency noise through dBC standards.

- One comment suggested reviewing low-frequency noise approaches used for EPA or wind-energy applications.
- Suggestion to examine whether stricter night-time or sleeping-hour limits are appropriate.
- One comment referenced approximately 30 dB as a desirable sleep environment for consideration.
- General concern that the illustrated noise levels may still be too high for nearby homes.

6. Phase 1B Priority Amendments

- Digital infrastructure: Concern that requirements should not create unnecessary barriers to access or future upgrades.
- Neighborhood infill: Comments emphasized maintaining compatibility with existing neighborhoods.
- Home-based businesses: Concern about potential impacts from noise, deliveries, traffic, and operating hours; one comment suggested limiting certain activities to approximately 8 a.m. to 8 p.m.
- Compatibility and height: Suggestion to maintain approximately three-story limits in some contexts.
- ADUs and STRs: Concern about enforcement and potential neighborhood impacts.
- Parking: Interest in maintaining downtown accessibility, including additional accessible or ADA parking.
- Nonconforming uses: Strong emphasis on enforcement where safety is involved.
- Employment Center: Suggestion to provide greater separation between employment or industrial uses and sensitive uses or infrastructure.

Comment Card Feedback

Feedback submitted through the written comment cards generally reflected concern that the proposed regulations may not be strong enough to protect residents and Taylor's long-term quality of life. Several comments focused on data centers and industrial development, while others addressed broader planning priorities.

- Data centers and industrial uses: Multiple commenters called for stronger restrictions on data centers, including larger buffers, stricter zoning, and, in some cases, a moratorium or ban. One comment suggested establishing a dedicated heavy industrial area away from residential neighborhoods.
- Noise and low-frequency sound: Comments raised concern about continuous noise exposure and requested stronger standards for low-frequency noise, including dBC measurements and consideration of EPA-related low-frequency standards. One respondent suggested approximately 30 dB at the property line.
- Generators, emissions, and air quality: Several comments opposed reliance on onsite generators for regular power and raised concerns about diesel emissions. One respondent requested continuous emissions monitoring and quarterly reporting for generators operating more than 500 hours per year.
- Monitoring and enforcement: Commenters requested more frequent monitoring of air quality, water use, wastewater, and emissions, along with stronger enforcement and clearer accountability. Questions were also raised about whether standards would remain enforceable if a project were to change ownership in the future.
- Infrastructure and development costs: One comment asked that major industrial users pay for the roads, water, wastewater, and other infrastructure required to support their development rather than shifting those costs to the broader community.
- Public process and transparency: Several comments asked for more opportunities for public input, clearer communication about project impacts, and broader outreach to residents. One respondent felt the presentation was difficult for the public to understand and asked for more information about potential negative impacts.

- Parks, trails, and community planning: One respondent requested a stronger comprehensive plan focusing on parks, pathways, shared-use lanes, interconnected trails, health, and wellness.
- ADUs and infill: One comment expressed the opposite perspective from some earlier feedback, suggesting ADU and infill regulations should be less restrictive to support affordable housing and help reduce displacement pressures.
- Overall concern: A recurring sentiment was that the proposed standards were “not strong enough,” with several respondents asking the City to place greater emphasis on residential protection, long-term accountability, and quality of life.