



P.O. Box 1749  
Halifax, Nova Scotia  
B3J 3A5 Canada

**Item No. 15.1.5**  
**Halifax Regional Council**  
**July 30, 2019**

**TO:** Mayor Savage and Members of Halifax Regional Council

**SUBMITTED BY:** Original Signed  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Stuebing, Acting Chief Administrative Officer

**DATE:** June 12, 2019

**SUBJECT:** **Case 22227: Amendments to HRM Planning Documents to Enable Egg-laying Hens and/or Chickens in All Residential Zones**

---

### **ORIGIN**

On March 27, 2018, Regional Council passed the following motion:

*That Halifax Regional Council request a staff report to consider adopting, by policy, for the consideration of regional wide amendments to the Regional Municipal Planning Strategy and all Secondary Municipal Planning Strategies and Land Use By-laws regarding the keeping and raising of egg-laying hens/chickens in ALL Residential Zones for the purpose of personal household food supply.*

### **LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY**

*Halifax Regional Municipality Charter (HRM Charter), Part VIII, Planning & Development*

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that Regional Council direct the CAO to:

1. Initiate a process to consider amendments to the Regional Municipal Planning Strategy and all applicable Secondary Municipal Planning Strategies and Land Use By-laws as necessary to permit the keeping and raising of chickens consistent with the proposed policy direction outlined within the Discussion section of this report; and
2. Follow the public participation program as set out in the Community Engagement section of this report.

## **BACKGROUND**

HRM's various municipal planning strategies and land use by-laws currently do not anticipate the keeping of a small number of chickens on residentially zoned properties. When HRM's various land use by-laws were written, it was not anticipated that residents would want to keep chickens in more densely populated residential areas. Some land use by-laws specifically prohibit the keeping of fowl, while other more rural land use by-laws permit agricultural uses, but only in the traditional sense of operating a farm. In this context, on March 27, 2018, Regional Council requested a staff report that considers regional wide amendments regarding the keeping and raising of egg-laying hens/chickens in all residential zones for the purpose of personal household food supply.

For the purposes of this report, the term 'chicken' is used to refer to both 'hens' (female chickens) and 'roosters' (male chickens), with the terms hens and roosters used when distinguishing between the two sexes. The terms 'poultry' and 'fowl' are also used when referencing the agricultural uses permitted in HRM's various LUBs. Both 'poultry' and 'fowl' are broader terms that include all domesticated birds used for eggs and/or meat, such as chickens, turkeys, ducks, and geese.

### **Benefits and Challenges**

Over the past few years, several municipalities across Canada have reviewed and updated their land use regulations and animal control by-laws to permit the keeping of chickens for personal use. Several other municipalities are currently piloting or considering permitting chickens in residential areas.

The rising interest in having chickens for personal use can be attributed to increasing concern about a lack of food security in communities and the detrimental impact of mass-produced and far-travelling food on our environment. The growing popularity of raising chickens for personal use is not unlike the rising interest in community gardens and keeping personal honey-bee hives. In numerous news articles, Canadian residents who are currently raising chickens in their backyards explain that the hobby helps children learn about where food comes from, animal biology, the benefits of composting, and the responsibility of caring for a pet.

While there are several benefits, there is also opposition to keeping chickens in residential areas due to concerns regarding cleanliness, health and safety, and nuisances. To help mitigate concerns, provincial health authorities, veterinarian organizations, academic institutions, and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency have published resources for public use to promote proper handling and sanitary practices. These include regular handwashing and changing footwear, regular cleaning of coops, storing feed in sealed containers, and proper manure management. These practices can help eliminate outbreaks of disease and control the potential to attract vermin. Another common concern with permitting chickens in residential areas is the noise roosters make. A rooster's crow averages over 100 decibels at a distance of one metre, which is roughly the same as a running chainsaw.<sup>1</sup>

### **Municipal Policies and Regulations**

While the Regional Plan does not specifically speak to keeping chickens in residential areas, the Plan supports community food security more broadly. Specifically, the Regional Plan provides direction to plan for communities that promote community food security (Chapter 3: Settlement and Housing, Section 3.1(4)).

Staff have reviewed all 21 secondary municipal planning strategies (SMPs) and 22 land use by-laws (LUBs) and generally found that the documents do not contemplate the keeping of chickens for personal use in residential areas. See Attachment A for details of the LUBs and zones that permit agricultural uses.

---

<sup>1</sup> Raf Claes, Pieter G.G. Muyschondt, Joris J.J. Dirckx, and Peter Aerts, "Do high sound pressure levels of crowing in roosters necessitate passive mechanisms for protection against self-vocalization?" *Zoology* 126 (2018): 65-70.

The following outlines the general approaches used throughout HRM's LUBs affecting the keeping of chickens.

- Specifically prohibited: The Downtown Dartmouth, Dartmouth, and Sackville Drive LUBs specifically prohibit the keeping of domestic fowl anywhere in the plan areas.
- Silent on use: The Bedford, Halifax Peninsula, and Halifax Mainland LUBs are silent on the topic, which has led to confusion in how to deal with compliance cases regarding keeping chickens in those areas and a general lack of direction for regulators.
- Only permitted where agricultural uses are permitted: The remaining LUBs prohibit the keeping of chickens on lots used for residential uses, unless a property owner lives in an area that permits agricultural uses. This requires residents to meet the requirements applied to agricultural uses, such as large lot size and large setbacks from wells, watercourses, and property lines. Agricultural uses are typically only permitted in rural, mixed-use, and resource zones. Some limited agricultural uses are also permitted in rural residential zones in some LUBs.

Package A of the proposed Centre Plan permits "Keeping of chickens as an accessory use" in the Downtown (D), Centre 1 (CEN-1), Centre 2 (CEN-2), Corridor (COR), High Order Residential 1 (HR-1), and High Order Residential 2 (HR-2) Zones. As amended by Regional Council on June 25, 2019, Section 64 of the Draft Centre Plan specifies that where permitted, the keeping of chickens is limited to a maximum of 10 hens per lot, and all hens shall be kept within a fenced area or structure that: a) is within a rear yard; and b) meets the size and location requirements of Sections 105-109: accessory structure requirements. While Package A deals with only higher density areas of the Regional Centre, the approach to the keeping of chickens is expected to also apply to the remaining areas included in Package B.

### **Public Inquiries and Complaints**

Keeping chickens as a hobby in residential areas has grown in popularity in recent years in cities across Canada and the United States. Consistent with this trend, HRM has received an increasing number of inquiries regarding chickens in residential areas. Between January 1, 2009 and May 1, 2019, HRM's Customer Service Request line received 659 inquiries regarding chickens, as summarized below:

- 155 customer service calls concerned complaints about chickens-at-large and nuisances (unsightliness and smell) from neighbours with many chickens, often in conjunction with other farm animals;
- 252 inquiries were residents simply asking if keeping backyard chickens is a permitted use in the zone, but not alluding to whether the caller supports the idea of having backyard chickens; and
- 280 inquiries were from residents who indicated that they wanted to keep chickens.

In February of 2009, Council received an information report entitled "Keeping of Fowl (Chickens)" based on a motion on February 11, 2008, from Peninsula Community Council. The request from Community Council responded to a complaint of a Peninsula resident having three hens for egg-laying. At that time, staff concluded that because there had only been one complaint, the Halifax Peninsula LUB still met the needs of Peninsula residents, thus not requiring any amendments to the Halifax Peninsula LUB at that time. The information report suggested, however, that if Council requested further action, it would be appropriate to undertake the exercise on a regional rather than local scale.

### **DISCUSSION**

Given the direction from the Regional Plan to support food security, the growing public interest in keeping chickens for personal use, and the Centre Plan's proposal to accommodate the keeping of chickens in the Regional Centre, staff advise that there is a clear need to update HRM's planning policies concerning the keeping of chickens throughout the Municipality. While the Plan and By-law Simplification Program is expected to consider this item in the future, awaiting this future project work may not be reasonable given that the Centre Plan may permit the keeping of chickens in the urban core several years before it is

considered in suburban and rural neighbourhoods. The following sections discuss recent examples from other Canadian Municipalities, related HRM planning initiatives, and the proposed policy direction intended to guide updates to HRM's planning documents.

### **Review of Other Canadian Municipalities**

In Nova Scotia, the Municipality of the County of Kings, Wolfville, and Bridgewater permit the keeping of chickens for personal use in residential areas. Presently, Vancouver, Victoria, Surrey, Kamloops, Oak Bay, Kingston, Brampton, Niagara Falls, Guelph, Caledon, Corner Brook, and Whitehorse all permit the keeping of chickens for personal use. Gatineau, Toronto, and Edmonton are currently carrying out pilot projects to consider allowing the keeping of chickens for personal use in residential zones. Based on a review of the land use policies and regulations from these communities, several common themes are identified:

- Limited number of chickens per property: Out of the eighteen communities examined, the number of chickens permitted per lot varies widely. Bridgewater only permits 2 chickens per lot while Victoria has no specified limit. However, most communities permit between 4-5 chickens. Some communities base the number of the chickens permitted on the size of the lot.
- Hens vs. roosters: Most communities make a distinction between hens and roosters and prohibit the keeping of roosters due to concerns about noise. Only the Municipality of the County of Kings permits roosters in residential areas and requires a greater lot area and separation distances.
- Property line setbacks: For the location of coops, most communities require between a 1 and 1.5 metre setback from rear and side property lines and a greater setback of 3 metres where the side yard is a flanking yard. Several communities require a 3 metre setback from windows or doors of buildings on abutting properties.
- Coop and outdoor space for chickens: Most communities regulate the square footage and height of the coops. Communities typically permit a maximum area of 10 square metres and a maximum height of 2 metres and only permit one coop per lot. Most communities specify the amount of coop and outdoor space required per chicken.
- Animal Control By-law: 11 of the reviewed communities use their Animal Control By-law to regulate the keeping of egg-laying hens instead of, or in tandem with their Land Use By-laws.
- Registering or licensing: 11 communities require the chickens to be either licensed or registered with the municipality.
- Sale and slaughter prohibited: All municipalities reviewed prohibit the slaughter of chickens on residentially-zoned properties and most prohibit the sale of eggs.

### **Relevant projects and policy direction**

Interest and commitment to food security has increasingly been demonstrated by HRM in recent years. The following identifies current initiations related to food security, which also provide direction for considering backyard chickens in residential areas.

#### Case 21769, The Municipal Role in Supporting Food Security

On May 18, 2017, the Community Planning and Economic Development Standing Committee passed a [motion](#) requesting a staff report to evaluate options to further support the Municipality's participation in the issue of community food security. This motion asked for a staff report that considers HRM's partnership with the Halifax Food Policy Alliance, the possibility of creating a Food Charter and Strategy for HRM, a study that shows where the most vulnerable communities are within HRM and existing food assets that support community food security, and an exploration of policy barriers, opportunities, and enablers to supporting community food security. Staff research for the pending report identifies a lack of clear regulations for the keeping of chickens as a policy/regulatory barrier to community food security.

#### The Halifax Green Network Plan

Adopted on August 14, 2018, the Halifax Green Network Plan supports small-scale agriculture on private properties. Specifically, Action 24 provides the following directions:

Action 24: Amend Municipal Planning Strategies and Land Use By-laws to encourage small-scale agriculture on private properties. Specific measures to consider include:

- removing barriers to appropriately-scaled urban agriculture and food retail on private property including, road side stands and animal husbandry.

### Centre Plan

As noted in the Background section, package A of the proposed Centre Plan permits keeping up to 10 egg-laying hens as an accessory use in the D, CEN-1, CEN-2, COR, HR-2, and HR-1 Zones. Although only Package A is to be considered for adoption in 2019, the 2017 version of the Centre Plan, known as the “Purple Document”, addressed Package A and Package B areas. Section 2.7.5 Land, Urban Agriculture, has the following policy direction: “Permit domestic fowl and bees in all zones as accessory uses with policies to ensure off-site nuisances are avoided and that these activities are appropriately scaled.” Thus, it is likely that the keeping of chickens for personal use will be proposed in lower density residential areas as well.

### **Proposed Policy Direction, Project Initiation and Scope**

Staff advise that there is a need to update HRM’s policy and regulatory approach on the keeping of chickens in residential zones throughout the Municipality. Building on the direction in the Regional Plan to support community food security and HRM’s ongoing projects to promote urban agriculture, staff recommend that this work be guided by the following proposed policy directions:

1. Allow a limited number of chickens as an accessory use in residentially zoned lots for personal use based on best practices research across Canada and the United States.
2. Based on a jurisdictional scan, consider prohibiting roosters or limiting roosters to larger lots.
3. Use existing accessory structure regulations for hen enclosures with added limitations on size and setbacks.
4. Use, and amend where necessary, the existing Animal Control By-law to ensure nuisance, cleanliness, and animal-at-large concerns are addressed.
5. Consider registration or licensing requirements based on the practices of several municipalities in Canada with careful consideration of costs and effectiveness.
6. Ensure concerns regarding health and safety are carefully considered.

Guided by the above policy directions, a project will need to be initiated and the scope would focus on creating clear and reasonable policies and regulations related to keeping chickens in all residential zones. Amendments to the Regional Plan may also be needed to provide more detailed region-wide policy direction and ensure the consistent use of terms. This work would:

- Implement the direction established in the Regional Plan to support community food security throughout the Municipality;
- Respond to the direction of the Halifax Green Network Plan to encourage small scale agriculture on private properties;
- Review and amend the Regional Plan and all relevant Secondary Municipal Planning Strategies and Land Use By-laws;
- Be closely coordinated with the Plan and By-law Simplification Program and Centre Plan; and
- Involve stakeholder and public consultations, including discussions with Halifax Food Policy Alliance, the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture, Chicken Farmers of Nova Scotia and the Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture.

For clarity, this work will not:

- review existing policies and regulations concerning commercial agricultural uses; or
- consider the keeping of other types of livestock in residential areas, such as goats, pigs and sheep.

### **Conclusion**

While the Regional Plan supports community food security, the policies and regulations that are spread throughout HRM’s 21 SMPs and 22 LUBs are outdated and do not contemplate the increasing public interest in small-scale agriculture, such as keeping chickens in residential areas. While the Plan and By-law Simplification program is expected to review this matter, given the public interest and the length of time

it may take for the Plan and By-law Simplification Program to begin reflecting these changes in the suburban and rural areas, staff recommend that Regional Council initiate a project to update HRM's approach to regulating backyard chickens for personal use in the near term. This work should be closely coordinated with the Centre Plan, Plan and By-law Simplification program, and implement the proposed policy directions outlined in this report.

### **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Should Regional Council choose to initiate the RMPS, SMPS, and LUB amendment process, the HRM Charter requires that Regional Council approve a public participation program. In February of 1997, Regional Council approved a public participation resolution which provides broad discretion on the consultation process required for MPS amendments that are regional in nature. Staff advise that considering amendments to allow the keeping of egg-laying hens in all residential zones is regional in nature since the project may impact all residentially zoned areas in the Municipality. Accordingly, should Council initiate the MPS amendment process, staff recommend that Regional Council obtain stakeholder and public feedback through:

- a Municipal webpage and on-line questionnaire; and
- stakeholder meetings including, but not limited to, discussions with the Halifax Food Policy Alliance, the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture, Chicken Farmers of Nova Scotia and the Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture.

In addition to this public participation, the *HRM Charter* requires a public hearing to be held before Regional Council can consider approval of any amendments. Regional wide amendments to Regional Plan and all applicable SMPSs and LUBs will potentially impact the following stakeholders: residents and agricultural business.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications associated with this report. The HRM costs associated with the planning document amendment process can be accommodated within the approved 2019-2020 operating budget. The operating costs to administer any changes to HRM by-laws, to allow the keeping of chickens, will be considered as part of future staff reports.

### **RISK CONSIDERATION**

There are no significant risks associated with the recommendations contained within this report. This report involves proposed MPS amendments. Such amendments are at the discretion of Regional Council and are not subject to appeal to the N.S. Utility and Review Board. Information concerning risks and other implications of adopting the proposed amendments are contained within the Discussion section of this report.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

No additional concerns were identified beyond those raised in this report.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

1. Regional Council may choose to initiate the consideration of potential planning policy that would differ from those outlined in this report. This may require a supplementary report from staff.
2. Regional Council may choose not to initiate amendments to the Regional MPS, applicable secondary planning strategies and land use by-laws at this time and instead update HRM's approach to keeping chickens in residential areas through the Plan and Land Use By-law Simplification program. A decision of Council not to initiate a process to consider amending its planning documents is not appealable to the NS Utility and Review Board as per Section 262 of the HRM Charter.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Keeping of Chickens in Current HRM Land Use By-laws

---

A copy of this report can be obtained online at [halifax.ca](http://halifax.ca) or by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 902.490.4210.

Report Prepared by: Meaghan Dalton, Planner I, 902.490.4560, &  
Ben Sivak, Principal Planner, 902.292.4563

---

ATTACHMENT A: KEEPING OF CHICKENS IN CURRENT HRM LAND USE BY-LAWS

<b>PLAN AREA</b>	<b>Zones which permit chickens</b>	<b>Lot area requirements</b>
<b>CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW THROUGH CENTRE PLAN</b>		
<b>Dartmouth</b>	NONE, specifically not permitted	N/A
<b>Downtown Dartmouth</b>	NONE, specifically not permitted	N/A
<b>Downtown Halifax</b>	SILENT but agricultural uses not in permitted uses	N/A
<b>Halifax Peninsula</b>	SILENT but agricultural uses not in permitted uses	N/A
<b>Halifax Mainland</b>	SILENT but agricultural uses not in permitted uses	N/A
<b>Bedford</b>	SILENT but agricultural uses not in permitted uses	N/A
<b>Sackville</b>	R-6 (Rural Residential)	6,000 ft <sup>2</sup> – 20,000 ft <sup>2</sup> depending on services
	P-3 (Floodplain)	40,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1, R-1-0, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6A, CDD, C-1, C-2, C-3, BP, BP-1, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH, P-1, P-2, P-4, RPK, TR</i>	
<b>Sackville Drive</b>	NONE, specifically not permitted	N/A
<b>Eastern Passage / Cow Bay</b>	RA (Rural Area)	50,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	FP (Floodplain) but no buildings permitted	10,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1, R-1a, R-2, R-3, R-5, R-6, R-7 C-1, C-2, C-5, C-6, C-7, I-1, I-2, I-3, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH, MR-2, P-1, P-2, P-3, RPK, EC, PA, D-1, CDD, US, TR, UR</i>	
<b>Cole Harbour/Westphal</b>	R-8 (Special Area) only permits existing agricultural uses	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	Considered by DA in Long Hill area	Not specified
	List of existing agricultural uses in Appendix D	Not specified
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1A, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5, R-6A, R-6, R-7, R-8, C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, I-1, P-1, P-2, P-3, RPK, P-4, PWS, CDD, CD-1, ICH, UR.</i>	
<b>North Preston / Lake Major/ Lake Loon / Cherry Brook / East Preston</b>	RS (Rural Settlement)	80,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MR (Mixed Resource)	80,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	Considered by DA to expand certain agricultural uses in Residential Designation	Not specified
	Appendix C lists existing commercial agriculture uses.	Not specified
	<i>Not Permitted in RA, C-1, C-2, C-4, P-1, P-2, PWS, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH, PA</i>	
<b>Lawrencetown</b>	RR-1 (Rural Residential)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1, C-1, I-1, I-2, RPK, CDD, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>	
<b>Eastern Shore East</b>	MU (Mixed Use)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RE (Rural Resource)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in R-6A, I-1, P-3, RPK, PA, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>	
<b>Eastern Shore West</b>	MU (Mixed Use)	40,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	R-6 (Rural Residential)	40,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	FI (Fishing Industry)	40,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	FV (Fishing Village)	40,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	VIL (Village)	40,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in I-1, P-3, P-4, RPK, PA, CDD, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>	

PLAN AREA	Zones which permit chickens	Lot area requirements
<b>Planning Districts 8 &amp; 9 (Lake Echo/ Porter's Lake)</b>	RR-1 (Rural Residential) only permits existing agriculture	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup> for "other uses"
	R-A (Residential A)	2 acres
	R-6 (Rural Residential)	3 acres
	RE (Rural Enterprise)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MR (Mixed Resource)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1, R-1A, R-B, R-BA, R-2, R-3, C-1, C-2, I-2, I-3, PWS, RPK, D-1, PA, CDD, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>	
<b>Planning Districts 14 &amp; 17 (Shubenacadie Lakes)</b>	R-6 (Rural Residential)	40,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	R-7 (Rural Estate)	80,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	P-3 (Park)	40,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RPK (Regional Park)	3716 m <sup>2</sup>
	MR (Mixed Resource)	200,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1A, R-1B, R-1C, R-1D, R-1E, C-1, C-2, C-4, CC, VC-CDD, VMS, VG, FRB, RCDD, I-3, AE-1, AE-2, AE-3, AE-4, AE-H, H-1, P-2, PWS, PA, UR, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>	
<b>Beaverbank / Hammonds Plains/ Upper Sackville</b>	R-6 (Rural Residential)	10,000 ft <sup>2</sup> - 29,064 ft <sup>2</sup> depending on services
	MU-1 (Mixed Use 1)	29,064 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MU-2 (Mixed Use 2)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	GU-1 (General Use)	29,064 ft <sup>2</sup>
	I-1 (Mixed Industrial)	29,064 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MR-1 (Mixed Resource)	80,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	PWS (Protected Water Supply)	1858 m <sup>2</sup> or 7432 m <sup>2</sup> for residential
	FP (Floodplain)	29,064 ft <sup>2</sup> but residential uses not permitted
<i>Not Permitted in R-1, R-1a, R-1B, R-2, R-3, R-3A, R-8, C-2, C-4, C-5, C-6, I-1, I-4, P-2, RPK, FP, CDD, BWCDD, US, TR, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>		
<b>Timberlea / Lakeside / Beechville</b>	MR-1 (Mixed Resource)	80,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1, R-1A, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-5, C-1, C-2, C-3, I-1, I-4, P-1, P-2, P-4, RPK, CDD, UR, WCRPK, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>	
<b>Planning Districts 1 &amp; 3 (St. Margaret's Bay)</b>	MRR-1 (Mixed Rural Residential 1)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MU-1 (Mixed Use) non-intensive agriculture permitted	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MU-2 (Mixed Use) non-intensive agriculture permitted	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MR-1 (Mixed Resource) permits intensive and non-intensive agriculture	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MR-2 (Mixed Resource)	100,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	Intensive agriculture may be permitted by DA	Not specified
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1, R-A, R-A1, R-1E, R-2, VR, VG, VC, C-1, C-1A, C-3, I-1, I-2, I-3, RPK, PWS, PA, CDD, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>	

PLAN AREA	Zones which permit chickens	Lot area requirements
<b>Planning District 4 (Prospect)</b>	RB-1 (Residential B-1)	Goodwood, Hatchet Lake, Shad Bay 25,000 ft <sup>2</sup> for > 50 fowl McGraths Cove, East Dover 20,000 ft <sup>2</sup> > 20 fowl
	RB-2 (Residential B-2)	Same as above
	RB-3 (Residential B-3)	25,000 ft <sup>2</sup> for > 50 fowl
	RB-4 (Residential B-4)	as above
	RRA-1 (Rural Residential A-1)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRB-1 (Rural Residential B-1)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRB-2 (Rural Residential B-2)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRC-1 (Rural Residential C-1)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRD-1 (Rural Residential D-1)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRE-1 (Rural Residential E-1)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MU-1 (Mixed Use 1)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	MU-2 (Mixed Use 2)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRA-C (Rural Residential C)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRB-C (Rural Residential B Commercial)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRD-C (Rural Residential D Commercial)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RRE-C (Rural Residential E Commercial)	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	RE (Resource)	80,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	Larger scale agriculture uses may be considered by DA	Not specified
<i>Not Permitted in RA-1, RA-2, RA-3, RA-4, C-2, I-1, I-3, P-2, P-3, PA, P-5, RPK, WC, CR-1, CR-2, I, CDD, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>		
<b>Planning District 5 (Chebucto)</b>	R-6 (Rural Residential) permits "Restricted Agricultural Uses"	6,000-20,000 ft <sup>2</sup> depending on services
	R-6a (Rural Mixed Residential) permits "Restricted Agricultural Uses"	20,000 ft <sup>2</sup>
	<i>Not Permitted in R-1, R-2, R-2A, R-2B, HCR, V-1, V-3, V-4, C-1, C-2, C-5, F-1, P-2, P-3, P-4, P-5, RPK, PA, D-1, UR, CD-1, CD-2, CD-3, ICH</i>	