

**Residential Project Committee  
Meeting Summary  
26 September 2011**

**Present:** Michael Hingston, William Dietrich, Kate Connolly, Joan Garipay, Jonathan Edwards, Vicki Smith, Judith Brotman, Jim Kennedy, Judith Esmay

Bill Dietrich chaired the meeting until Judith Esmay arrived.

**Minutes of September 19, 2011**

The minutes of September 19, 2011 were reviewed and amended. Kate Connolly made a motion to approve the minutes. Michael Hingston seconded the motion. The amended minutes were approved unanimously.

**Discussion about Rural Land Use: Agriculture**

Jim Kennedy presented his ideas for updating the Zoning Ordinance with regard to agriculture. Copies of RSA 674:32 a-c were distributed. A zoning amendment review form from 2008 regarding agriculture and forestry was reviewed. This amendment came from the Hanover Landowner's Association, a loose organization of people who do agriculture and forestry on their rural Hanover properties.

The proposal suggests that Agriculture is defined in a narrow way in the Zoning Ordinance. It needs to be broadened to better conform to the State definition. The State definition was reviewed.

Raising, breeding or sale of poultry or game birds was discussed. Roosters have been disallowed in special exception cases. Judith Brotman suggests a check list and use permit for chickens so that they would be allowed by right in town. In the rural area, they are permitted. Llamas and horses have also been suggested in town, but formal applications never came forward.

Gardening and agriculture should be considered separate activities. There is also the commercial element to the different land-based activities.

Each element of the State definition was discussed.

-Cultivation, conservation and tillage of soil. Lawns are not agriculture. Noise and odor are potential problems.

-Storage, use of and spreading of commercial fertilizer, and other lawful of soil amendments. Odiferous soil amendments and public health are potential problems. Septage use or storage should not be allowed in town. Storage of many of these items could be a problem. Storage for materials generated on-premise could be acceptable.

-Use and application of agricultural chemicals such as herbicides and pesticides. Large scale spraying may cause off site spillage.

-The raising and sale of livestock. There may be odor, insects, slaughtering and disposal of dead animals, fencing and proximity of neighbors are potential issues. Its success is dependent upon how the operation is run. Different animals need different lot sizes. Minimum setback issues might be appropriate. Water quality and escape of the animals may be a problem.

-Breeding, boarding, raising, training, riding instruction and selling of equines. Parking of visitors and trailers, odor, disposal of dead animals, insects, fencing and proximity of neighbors may be issues. Water quality and escape of the animals may be a problem.

-Commercial raising, harvesting and sale of fresh water fish or other aquaculture. This activity relies upon a water resource which brings up local water resource regulation through the zoning. Private stocking of a pond is not commercial and thus not agriculture. Exotic species might be introduced.

-The raising, breeding or sale of poultry or game birds. Potential issues are noise (especially if male birds are present), odor especially if they are contained, water quality, free ranging and traffic conflicts, slaughtering and disposal of dead animals.

-The raising of bees. Orientation of the hive and distance from neighbors relative to the bee lines need to be taken into consideration. On-site honey sales are a possible related commercial use.

-The raising, breeding or sale of domesticated strains of fur-bearing animals. These animals are regulated by Fish and Game laws. The animal must be killed in order to harvest the fur. Potential problems are disposal of dead animals, containment, odor,

-The production of greenhouse crops. Greenhouse structures bring up discussions of temporary/permanent nature, accessory/principal use and structure/building. Scale and traffic generation could be issues.

-Production, cultivation, growing, harvesting and sale of many different non-animal products. Traffic impacts tend to be concentrated time over a short period of time at Christmas tree farms, berry farms and orchards. Structures such as sugar houses or mills need to be considered. Parking might be an issue.

Are animal-oriented activities necessarily more disruptive than plant-oriented activities? Processing on-site may be more intensive than if processed off-site. The scale of the enterprise is very important.

Does it matter if the activity is for profit, not for profit, accessory, sharing or subsistence?

Licensing these activities was considered as opposed to regulating through zoning.

-Preparation for market, delivery to storage and to market, and carriers from transportation to market of any products from the farm. Traffic, slaughter of animals and public health effects are concerns.

-Transportation to the farm of supplies and materials. Traffic and noise are potential problems.

-Transportation of farm workers. How are these folks housed? Is worker housing considered an accessory use?

-Forestry or lumbering operations. These involve big trucks and noise. On-site and off- site processing present different challenges to a neighborhood.

-The marketing or selling at wholesale or retail, on-site and off-site, where permitted by local regulations, any products from the farm. On-site and off-site activities present different impacts.

-Irrigation of growing crops from private water supplies or public water supplies where not prohibited by state or local rule or regulations. Drawing down water supply for irrigation has impacts to the local water supply.

-The use of dogs for herding, working or guarding livestock. Public safety and noise issues and the ability to regulate these dogs were identified.

-Production and storage of compost and the materials necessary to produce compost, whether such materials originate, in whole or in part, from operations of the farm. Maybe we should consider the origination location, odor, scale and what is stored.

Agri-tourism, shoot for fee places, corn mazes, and petting zoos were mentioned as other activities not mentioned by the Statute .

All agreed that the State definition is too broad for every location in Town and by regulation by Hanover's Zoning Ordinance.

Next week the Committee will discuss what people in Hanover want to do from a farming perspective and how to accommodate them via the Zoning Ordinance. The Committee will want to review the ZARC proposal on pages 4 and 5.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicki Smith, Scribe