



2019-03-18 4:22 PM
Killingly Agriculture Commission



Killingly Agriculture Commission
MONDAY – MARCH 18, 2019

SPECIAL WORKSHOP MEETING WITH PLANNING ZONING COMMISSION

7:00 pm

**Killingly Town Hall, 172 Main Street, Killingly, CT
Second Floor, Town Meeting Room**

SPECIAL MEETING / WORKSHOP MINUTES

NOTE: This workshop took place as part of the regular meeting of the Planning Zoning Commission.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Frank Anastasio and Virginia Keith

II. Regulations – review / revisions / discussion / action

A) Town of Killingly Zoning Regulations Section 585 "Agriculture"

- 1. Discussion / Workshop** – Revisions to Agricultural Regulations for the Town of Killingly, and the Boro of Danielson. **At end of the workshop the commission should either schedule another workshop for MONDAY, APRIL 15, 2019 or schedule a public hearing; suggested hearing date MONDAY, MAY 20, 2019 at 7:00 PM, due to notification requirements.**

Public Hearing for the Town of Killingly Agricultural Regulations is scheduled for April 15, 2019.

Included in packets to the Commission Members, were copies of the amended Draft of the Town of Killingly Agricultural Regulations, which included revisions that the Commission had approved last month. Also included in packets to the Commission Members were copies of revisions to the Draft of the Boro of Danielson Agricultural Regulations, which Mr. Card stated were very similar to those done to the Town Agricultural Regulations.

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to open the floor for public comment on the Borough of Danielson Agricultural Regulations. Second by Matthew Wendorf. Motion carried unanimously (4-0-0).

Frank Anastasio and Virginia Keith represented the Killingly Agricultural Commission.

Mr. Anastasio explained that, essentially, the proposed revisions to the Boro Agricultural Regulations mirror the Town's, except that the Boro has a few more restrictions (e.g. keeping of backyard chickens due to the size of properties – proposing a limit of six chickens with no roosters if property is .25 acre or less). He explained that there are some (although not many) properties with more than .25 acre and they didn't want to restrict those property owners from doing something that is farm-related. He stated that property size makes a big difference and that is why there is a differentiation between .25-acre properties and larger properties in the Boro.

Ms. Aubrey explained that they did try to mirror the Town and Boro Agricultural Regulations, but that there are different aspects. She said that the two main things were: the backyard chickens; and the temporary 4-H/school projects for students (if the project does not meet the zoning requirements, at the end of the project it must be removed within 30 days). She asked Lynn LaBerge (Member of the Boro Council) if this would be acceptable to the Boro Council. Ms. LaBerge stated that the problem is with knowing when the project is done. Ms. Aubrey explained that a project plan is required to be submitted to her office and that students must be supervised by a teacher. Projects for the classroom typically end at the end of the

school year and would need to be removed within 30 days of that date. Ms. LaBerge stated that that would be fine and she also expressed thanks for putting a limit on the number of chickens as those were the concerns.

Mr. Anastasio noted that the chickens would also be restricted to the rear yard. There was discussion regarding projects that could run for all four years that a student is in high school. Ms. Aubrey explained that the plan would need to be revised every year. Mr. Anastasio explained that the project would continue through the summer in those cases.

Virginia Keith had reviewed the Draft and suggests grammatical corrections and some for consistency which she submitted to Ms. Aubrey to incorporate.

John Sarantopoulos, 37 Tunk City Road, commented on the Draft Boro Agricultural Regulations which he stated he has had for some time (he was not sure if it was the latest Draft):

- Buffers - He feels the Draft only refers to the amount of room that a building has to be back from the property line. In his experience, he had animals come up to his property line.
- He referred to a publication called the *Hartford Foundation, Planning for Agriculture: A Guide for Connecticut Municipalities*.
- He commented that it is left up to the communities to determine the number of animals people can have.
- He commented about animals (pigs and chickens) being slaughtered and health issues.
- He commented that there is no limitation on animals on lots over five acres.
- He stated that the Right to Farms is to make harmony between residential and farming and he feels that the Draft Regulations does the opposite.
- He feels that ten horses on an 80,000 square foot property are too many.
- He stated that the Agricultural Commission is made up of farmers and there is a bias which is reflected throughout the document.
- Mr. Sarantopoulos commented that Generally Accepted Agricultural Practices is a document that does not exist and was put in to allow for more animals at the discretion of the Agricultural Commission and the PZC at will.
- The language, "to accommodate said livestock" is arbitrary and capricious.
- He commented that the Right to Farm is for existing farms that have not been substantially changed within one year. The law protects both sides and regulations should be adopted that are fair to both sides.
- He commented about money that the Conservation Commission has which he feels should be used for a farmland preservation program.
- He said that there should be regulations that are not forcing the issue.
- He commented on a neighbor of his that runs a rescue program for horses in the summer. He said that half-way through the summer, the property is stripped. How much can the land support?

Mr. Card suggested that Mr. Sarantopoulos review the most current Draft and submit his specific comments either verbally or in writing. Ms. Aubrey explained the procedure for complaints which get referred to the Department of Agriculture to determine if the farmer is following Generally Accepted Agricultural Practices. Mr. Sarantopoulos disagreed and commented about when a neighbor has 340 chickens with their odor and noise. He said that the Boro had regulations for six chickens, but eliminated it, but now they are proposing to put six chickens back in. Mr. Card stated that the Boro Council had been asked for their comments for these proposed Draft Regulations. Mr. Card offered that Mr. Sarantopoulos come to the public hearing. Mr. Sarantopoulos stated that common sense should prevail.

Mr. Card recommended that comments that may be received be reviewed in relation to the Boro at another Workshop next month (April 15, 2019). He also stated that any comments that may be received regarding the Town of Killingly Agricultural Regulations may be taken into account before the public hearing.

Motion was made by Virge Lorents to close public comment during the Workshop discussion of Revisions to Borough of Danielson Agricultural Regulations. Second by Sheila Roddy. Motion carried unanimously (4-0-0).

XIII. Adjournment