



Agriculture-Related Zoning Bylaw Changes

Updated DISCUSSION PAPER

DATE: Jan. 2017 version

FROM: Planning Services

SUBJECT: Zoning Bylaw Amendments – Agriculture/Livestock/ALR Concordance

Why are we making changes?

The proposed Zoning Bylaw 2400 (Bylaw) amendments are mainly in response to Board of Directors direction for staff to develop regulations to restrict livestock numbers and accessory building size on small agricultural parcels. The Board initially resolved to examine the issue of excess numbers of *livestock* being kept on small parcels at their May 14, 2015 meeting. More recently as part of the Whitecroft LUC discharge this spring, we proposed isolated amendments to the CR-1: Country Residential zone that would 1) establish limits for livestock on small lots, and 2) implement accessory building gross floor area/height regulations in all CR-1 areas and 3) reiterate *ALC Act* paramourncy and ensure our Bylaw is in concordance with recent changes in the ALR regulations and act. This was in part because the LUC prohibited livestock but the proposed new zone allowed it. This will be the case for other LUCs and proposed zones such as SH-1.

The Board approved Whitecroft replacement zones but *directed staff to forward a report on Zoning Bylaw 2400 amendment options which would set limits for animal operations on historic small lots where the broad zoning has resulted in land use conflicts.*



Status as of Jan. 2017:

A bylaw has not yet been prepared or finalized and no readings of any bylaw have commenced.

In summary, what is proposed to change?

We forward proposed zoning changes for agency and landowner review, discussion and comment. The recommended amendments to Bylaw, in summary, follow:

- a) **Definitions** (Part 1) to remove the definition of *livestock* and replace with new definitions for “small livestock”, “large livestock” and “poultry/rabbits” to provide clarity on what farm animals are included for the purposes of developing suitable numbers. New definitions to be cited and regulatory provisions to be adjusted in all zones accordingly.

Importantly,

similar issues will be at the forefront of other LUCs coming before the Board in the future - typically for SH-1 & CR-1 zoning replacing LUCs.

- b) **Keeping of Livestock on Non-ALR Lands** (Part 3) to both recognize the paramountcy of lands within the ALR and restrict the number of large and small livestock and poultry on small parcels that permit *agricultural and horticultural uses* on non-ALR lands.
- c) **Dwellings per Parcel** (s. 3.6) should be amended to reflect recent changes to ALC policy for dwellings in the ALR.
- d) **Accessory Buildings** changes to restrict the *height* and combined *gross floor area* on small parcels that permit *agricultural and horticultural uses*.
- e) **Parcel Coverage** changes to include a maximum *parcel coverage* on small parcels that permit *agricultural and horticultural uses* but not lands in the ALR that are classified as ‘Farm’ with BC Assessment.

The comments from the public and all agencies, including the Advisory Planning and Agricultural Advisory Commissions, will be forwarded to the Board for further review and to support decision making. The Board may opt to proceed with some or all of the changes. Staff will set out some options at the meeting. Based upon discussion at Committee of the Whole and Board of Directors direction, we will prepare that bylaw for an upcoming regular Board of Directors’ meeting.

What is the history of agricultural and horticultural zoning in the TNRD?

Agricultural and horticultural use has always been a permitted use in TNRD’s rural and agriculture zones, regardless of parcel size, since the first zoning bylaw was introduced in 1972. The only significant amendment to agricultural use was the 1980 addition of feedlot regulations (an early incarnation of *intensive agricultural use*) into Bylaw 500. Various zoning bylaws across the TNRD were merged into Bylaw 940 in 1984.

Aside from minor refinements to the *intensive agricultural use* definition in 1984 and then again in 2012 (see current definition in next section), *agricultural and horticultural use* has remained relatively open-ended with respect to agricultural activities, including the extent of livestock. The current *livestock* definition was only introduced into Bylaw 2400 in 2012. Under the general regulations of Bylaw 2400, we acknowledge that ALR lands enjoy immunity from many local government zoning requirements (see *Agricultural Land Commission Act*). The broad range of *agricultural and horticultural uses* coupled with the lack of an animal control bylaw has resulted in bylaw complaints and land use issues related to farm animals on small parcels (noise, smell, flies, etc.). Unregulated accessory buildings on small parcels has also led to complaint issues related to intrusive home-based businesses and excessively large buildings – *typically not used for farming*.

Our initial planning lens was focused on properties zoned CR-1 and SH-1; however, this view was broadened, at the Board's request, to include small agricultural parcels in the Region's 'Big 5' rural and agricultural zones - AF-1, AF-2, RL-1, SH-1 and CR-1. We also broadened the review to include other housekeeping matters related to agriculture on small parcels. The number of parcels affected by the proposed amendments will be significant (in the 1000s).

Amendment Highlights: what the proposed amendments are and are not...

Importantly, our primary goal in this exercise is to provide more refined agricultural management tools by forwarding reasonable caps on the number of livestock and poultry that can be kept on a small agricultural parcel and establish provisions related to maximum "build-out". The proposed amendments are not designed to penalize the horse lovers with a few horses on their property, separate property owners from their hobby farm or thwart one's ability to build a barn. The amendments also do not limit livestock keeping or buildings on large parcels or ALR lands as these are governed by the ALC and subject to policy set out under the *ALC Act*. Larger scale commercial farm activities are subject to policy established under the *Farm Practices Protection Act*. Lastly, the amendments do not limit horticultural practices as these, within reason, are customary and ancillary to living in the country and have not been the subject of complaints.

DISCUSSION

For context, we provide the following current definitions from Zoning Bylaw No. 2400 for reference to compare and contrast with proposed amendments on the following pages:

AGRICULTURAL AND HORTICULTURAL USE means a use for the storage, sale and processing of agricultural products produced on the farm on which the storage, sale and processing is taking place; and excludes an *intensive agricultural use*.

INTENSIVE AGRICULTURAL USE* means the business use of land, *buildings* and other structures for the: *(*noting this is limited to parcels >16 ha)*

- (a) confinement of poultry, *livestock* or fur bearing animals;
 - i) a cattle, deer, goat or similar feeding enterprise which involves 200 or more animals that are contained within the feeding area for a period of greater than 150 consecutive days in any one calendar year;
 - ii) any swine enterprise exceeding 20 head, including piglets;
 - iii) any fowl or poultry enterprise exceeding 500 birds; and
 - iv) any fur bearing animal enterprise exceeding 50 animals.
- (b) growing of mushrooms; or
- (c) operation of a *slaughterhouse* or *stockyard* that does not include an incinerator for the disposal of animal waste or specified risk material (SRM).

LIVESTOCK means any market animal raised for food or profit and includes ungulates and fowl, but excludes exotic animals and domestic pets that have been tamed and adapted to a human environment.

Agricultural and horticultural use is permitted in the following zones: AF-1, AF-2, RL-1, SH-1, CR-1, LRT-1, LRT-2, C-2, C-6, I-2, I-3, I-4, P-3, CD-2 and CD-3. *Intensive agricultural use*, permitted only in AF-1, RL-1, C-6 and CD-3 zones, is restricted to parcels that are at least 16 ha (40 acres) in area.

1. Small Livestock, Large Livestock and Poultry Definitions

Issue

The Bylaw's current *livestock* definition generally includes all farm animals - small, big, fur or feather – under one umbrella. Of course, not all *livestock* are the same. Similar to other local government zoning bylaws, the proposed new definitions set out to distinguish farm animals into three generic groups.



Rationale for change

Livestock come in all shapes and sizes with some contributing to the nuisance factor more than others. As a pre-cursor to establishing livestock limits, we felt it necessary to break down the existing livestock definition by separating farm animals into three distinct categories – large, small and poultry. The intent of the new definitions is to develop a kind of hierarchy of farm animals to be considered within the context of *agricultural and horticultural use* and in parallel with the new section in the Bylaw entitled “Keeping of Livestock on Non-ALR Lands” (see below). In addition, the amendments will provide staff the ability to provide a more definitive answer to a popular question: *What farm animals can I have on my property?* The Bylaw’s current definitions of both *livestock* and *agricultural and horticultural use* have been the historic “catch-all” reference point for all farm animal types with permitted animal numbers being basically *anything less than what “intensive agricultural use” permits* (see above). The Bylaw does not effectively distinguish between the various types of animals typically found on a farm, resulting in a large assortment of animals on small parcels all over the region. The proposed new definitions will help provide some clarity to property owners wishing to raise and manage farm animals and attempt to lessen the ambiguity between the number and type of animals that are permitted and are not permitted.

What can we do differently in order to provide more clarity?

New definitions proposed to be added to “Part 1” and replace “Livestock” definition:

“Livestock, Large” means a domestic animal normally raised for food, milk, or wool and includes Bovinae such as cattle or oxen, bison, llamas, alpacas, swine, and animals belonging to the family Equidae including horses, asses, donkeys and mules. Livestock, Large excludes exotic animals and domestic pets that have been tamed and adapted to a human environment.

“Livestock, Small” means a domestic animal, excluding any large livestock, normally raised for food, milk, or wool and includes sheep, goats, fallow deer, ostriches, emu, miniature horses. Livestock, small excludes exotic animals and domestic pets that have been tamed and adapted to a human environment.

“Poultry” means small fowl or animals normally raised for food or egg production and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes:

- | | | | |
|-------------|----------|-----------|--------------------|
| hens | bantams | partridge | peahens |
| geese | ducks | pigeons | turkeys |
| guinea fowl | pheasant | quail | missing any birds? |

Amendment to current Agricultural and Horticultural Use definition to recognize small and large livestock and poultry use could read:

“Agricultural and horticultural use” means a use for the storage, sale and processing of agricultural products produced on the farm on which the storage, sale and processing is taking place, including the raising of small and large livestock and poultry in compliance with section (tbc) and excludes any *intensive agricultural use*.

2. Keeping of Livestock/Poultry on Non-ALR Lands

Issue

The Bylaw permits *agricultural and horticultural use* in 15 of the 30 land use zones with no limits on the number of farm animals permitted under this use. The threshold for the number of farm animals permitted under *intensive agricultural use* is generally high, allowing a significant number of *livestock* under regular agricultural use regardless of parcel area. The TNRD is unusual in that we currently do not limit hobby farming on primary residential use land. Some interior local governments that we researched set limits (see attached comparative survey); however, we found that there was no established ‘number of animals per unit of land’ or science-based ratio. The limits we suggest are more permissive on the basis that at present we have NO limits.

Rationale for change

The number of permitted farm animals on a parcel <16 ha in any zone that lists *agricultural and horticultural use* would be anything less than (any combination of) what is set out in the *intensive agricultural use* definition. The lack of regulation for the number of farm animals permitted for agricultural use results in the nuisance factor generally being raised incrementally as the number of farm animals increases on smaller parcel sizes adjacent to other small parcels.

Limiting the number of farm animals based on parcel area is an effective approach used by other local governments to minimize nuisance complaints. Through research and discussion with Provincial and local government colleagues, we have determined that there is no template or “best” animal/parcel area ratio to incorporate into local bylaws. Bylaws ratios vary from place to place and they seem to be effective in regulating animal numbers in their respective locations. Note that many jurisdictions regulate animal numbers through an animal control bylaw.

The proposed amendment would allow one large *livestock* and one small *livestock* for every 0.4 ha (1 acre) and poultry keeping based on 20 animals for 0.1 ha (¼ acre) minimum lot area, increasing by steps up to 4 ha (9.8 acres), beyond which the limit is 200. In excess of 500 poultry shifts the use to *intensive agricultural use* which requires a minimum 16 ha (40 acres) parcel area under the Bylaw. There are properties that exceed this limit in the TNRD. As noted in the draft text and reinforced under s. 3.2 of the Bylaw, the proposed change will not apply to ALR land. The animal numbers on affected properties at the time of bylaw approval would be “grandfathered”.

Did you know?

Under the current Zoning Bylaw, a landowner could raise 499 chickens, 199 cattle and an unlimited number of horses on a 0.2 ha (½ ac) parcel where agricultural use is permitted (inc. lakeshore & Crown parcels).

As noted in the draft zone and reinforced under s. 3.2 of the Bylaw, the proposed changes will not apply to ALR land though property owners in the ALR may refer to the zone as a voluntary guide. The proposed amendment is a preemptive effort to move away from nuisances associated with excessive *livestock* or poultry numbers. To reiterate, the proposed number of animals per given area is in no way representative of a science-based ratio and all proposed ratios are open for discussion.

The clarity provided with respect to the number of large and small livestock and poultry on small agricultural parcels will help property owners better manage their animals and allow staff to provide more accurate advice to the second most asked questions to planners - *How many animals can I have on my property?* The current answer is: “however many you like” (< intensive use limits).

Looking to the future....

Proposed animal limit examples:

- 4 ha (9.8 ac) parcel could have 10 horses, 10 sheep (or no horses and 30 sheep) and a lot of hens
- 0.8 ha (2 acres) parcel could have 2 cows, 2 sheep & 40 hens
- 0.2 ha (½ acre) could have 20 hens

What can we do differently to help better manage this land use?

Propose new section “Keeping of Livestock on Non-ALR Lands” to be added to Part 3 – General Provisions could read as follows:

1. The keeping of *livestock* as an *accessory use* on non-ALR lands shall be limited to:
 - (a) One (*or maybe two so they are not solitary*) *large livestock* may be kept per every 4000 square metres of parcel area; and
 - (b) in addition to the preceding, one *small livestock* may be kept per every 4000 square metres, except where a lesser quota of *large livestock* are on the parcel, one *small livestock* may be kept per every 1000 square metres; and
 - (c) in addition to the preceding, the maximum number of rabbits or *poultry* or combination thereof, that may be kept on a *parcel* is restricted as follows:

Parcel Size	Number of Poultry
500 to 1000 square metres	4 head
1000 to 4,000 square metres	20 head
4000 square metres to 1 hectare	40 head
1 hectare to 4 hectares	80 head
Over 4 hectares	200 head

2. Despite the preceding, a person must not keep roosters on any parcel less than 1 ha except where agriculture is permitted as a primary use.

Sidebar: Do we even want to regulate roosters, if so how?

Aside: The proposed amendments look at livestock ratio to land area but complaints related to agriculture are also the result of other matters NOT regulated by bylaws, e.g. poor manure management practices. Property owners must be more vigilant in their efforts to manage animals (and their by-products) on their respective properties and consult with the variety of Provincial regulations and guides related to farm animal waste management, regardless of the number.

3. Accessory Buildings on Small Agricultural Parcels

Issue

All Bylaw 2400 zones where agricultural use is permitted, allow accessory buildings *with no restrictions on number of accessory buildings, maximum gross floor area or building height* (with the exception of restricted area/height for home-based business use). Accessory buildings on small parcels in the LRT-1, C-2 and LRT-2 zones are limited (e.g. LR-1 allows 135 sqm for lots >2500 sqm). To avoid excessively large buildings being built on small parcels, the Bylaw can limit size so as to maintain rural character. This also reduces compliance complaints about non-farm activities occurring within huge buildings. Note that accessory building gross floor area or height is generally not an issue on large agricultural parcels.

Rationale for Change

Small agricultural parcels, not unlike small residential parcels, should have minimum standards for build-out in order to control the scale of buildings, reduce the visual impact on neighbouring owners and discourage non-compliant uses from commencing. Bylaw 2400 suburban and lakeshore residential zones (e.g. R-1, R-2 and LR-1), where parcel sizes are generally <8000 sqm, have combined accessory building *gross floor area* and *height* limits. In



the absence of accessory building limitations on small agricultural parcels, excessively large accessory buildings (out of character for a neighbourhood) have been constructed and caused contentious complaint issues.

Stipulating combined maximum gross floor area for all accessory buildings, maximum overall lot coverage and height is standard practice in almost all zoning bylaws and is recommended for small agricultural parcels.

Did you know?

Under the current Bylaw, a smaller agricultural parcel could have 100% parcel coverage with a limitless number of accessory buildings with no height restrictions (lakeshore and Crown parcels included).

What can we do differently to better manage this land use?

The following are proposed to be included in the SH-1 and CR-1 zones and on small parcels only in the AF-1, AF-2, RL-1 Zones

Height of Buildings

For all parcels not within the Agricultural Land Reserve and less than 8 ha in area, the maximum permitted height of an accessory building shall be 8.5 metres.

Conditions of Use

For all parcels not within the Agricultural Land Reserve, the maximum permitted combined gross floor area of all accessory buildings used for agricultural or horticultural use on a parcel shall be limited in relation to parcel area as follows:

Parcel Area	Max. combined accessory building(s) gross floor area
4000 sqm or less	100 sqm
4000 to 8000 sqm	150 sqm
8000 sqm or more	300 sqm

*Do we cap this restriction at 5 acres/2 ha or 10 acres/4 ha?
 Leaving large parcels unregulated*

4. Land Coverage on Small Parcels

Issue

Maximum *parcel coverage* is absent from small agricultural parcel zoning. Other zones (e.g. C-2, I-2, I-3, LRT-1 and LRT-2) set out a building coverage cap. All told, a maximum *coverage* requirement will assist efforts to reduce over-building on small parcels.

Rationale for Change

When viewed in conjunction with other Bylaw requirements including *gross floor area*, accessory building *height* and *setbacks*, the proposed amendment will encourage a more orderly built environment on small agricultural parcels, especially on those parcels with views worthy of protecting. Not unlike similar sized suburban or lakeshore residential zones, maximum *parcel coverage* will play a key role to limit over-building. Some LUCs set out build-out limits that are advisable to maintain when transferring to regular zoning.



Lot Coverage = % of bldgs over parcel
For example:

House	300 m²
Barn	250 m²
Lean-to	80 m²
Shed	20 m²
Total	650 m²

Thus 650m² of 4000m² = 16% lot coverage

What can we do differently to better manage this land use?

The following is proposed to be included in the AF-1, AF-2, RL-1, SH-1 and CR-1 zones:

For parcels less than 10,000 sqm (1 ha) the maximum parcel coverage permitted shall be 25%; except in the case of ALR parcels classified as a 'Farm' under the Assessment Act, in which case parcel coverage does not apply to buildings and structures used exclusively for agricultural and horticultural use.

5. Dwellings per Parcel for Lands in the ALR

Issue

Bylaw 2400, s.3.6.2 currently provides property owners on parcels 8 ha or larger in the AF-1, AF-2 or RL-1 zone an opportunity for one additional detached *dwelling unit* provided they hold Class 9 Farm assessment. New ALC Zone 2 regulations provide some flexibility and opportunity for additional dwellings per parcel – depending of lot area. This should be acknowledged in the Zoning Bylaw.

Rationale for Change

The proposed changes are the result of ALC policy amendments issued in January 2016. Previous Bylaw amendments forwarded in 2013 suggested more than one additional dwelling for farm help *where permitted in the ALR*. New ALC policy changes have further refined this use: a stand allow stick-built second dwelling is only permitted on parcels over 50 ha in area. A suite is permitted in the primary dwelling and a secondary unit is allowed in a manufactured home or farm building. Current Bylaw 2400 s.3.6.3 reads as follows:



- 3.6.3 In addition to the preceding, further additional dwellings are only permitted if and when approved or allowed by the Agricultural Land Commission.

Proposed replacement s.3.6.3 reads:

- 3.6.3 In addition to the preceding, further additional dwellings are only permitted in the ALR as follows:
- a) one secondary suite in a *single family dwelling*,
 - b) either
 - i. one manufactured home, up to 9 metres in width, for use by a member of the owner's immediate family, or
 - ii. accommodation that is constructed above an existing building on the farm and that has only a single level, and
 - iii. a second (detached) *single family dwelling* provided the parcel is at least 50 ha in size and if the total area occupied by all residences and other residential structures, roads and service lines, and all land between them is 4000 sqm or less.

6. Other Agricultural Matters . . .

Agri-Tourism

Lands in the ALR are subject to the *ALC Act* thus enjoy uses, provisions, etc. that are restricted on those not in the ALR. This includes a range of farm based recreational and tourism activities generally described as *agri-tourism* under the *ALC Act*. Recent amendments of the *Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation* include the following:

1. Revised “agri-tourism” definition
2. New definition for “gathering for an event” which includes weddings, music festival or other events. Gathering for an event is permitted conditional on the following:
 - the farm must be located on land classified as a farm under the *Assessment Act*;
 - permanent facilities must not be constructed or erected in connection with the event;
 - parking for those attending the event must be available on the farm, but must not be permanent nor interfere with the farm’s agricultural productivity (i.e. no paving the field);
 - no more than 150 people, excluding residents and employees of the farm, may be gathered on the farm at one time for the purpose of attending the event;
 - the event must be of no more than 24 hours duration;
 - no more than 10 gatherings for an event of any type may occur on the farm within a single calendar year.
3. Additional activities acceptable under “agri-tourism” uses are listed.

While property owners in the ALR are now able to take advantage of these new regulations, Non-ALR property owners are subject to TNRD Zoning Bylaw 2400 requirements.

ALR versus Non-ALR Properties

The negative perception of being caught in the ‘Land Freeze’ is seeing a reversal. The most recent changes to the *ALC Act* as noted above adds to the growing list of permitted non-farm uses in the ALR yet draws attention to the growing division between land use allowances on ALR properties versus non-ALR properties. The benefits of being in the ALR include:

1. immunity from certain local government bylaw requirements as *ALC* legislation is paramount to zoning bylaws (e.g. no animal limits, building size restrictions, and coverage requirements);
2. range of outright permitted non-farm use on ALR land has broadened, and in some cases, well beyond what is listed in an applicable zone;
3. ALR parcels have the right to be used for farming regardless of zoning or parcel area;
4. reduced annual parcel tax applies to ALR properties pursuant to the *School Act*; and
5. application to include lands into the ALR is free, allowing landowners to try to take advantage of the growing list of uses for lands in the ALR.

REFERRALS & LIAISON

- **Agricultural Advisory Commission (AAC)** considered the proposed bylaw amendments at their September 9th meeting. The AAC discussed the matter at length and generally agreed that best practices are more critical to avoid nuisance than animal numbers. They also noted that large commercial farms are bound by all manner of inspections, regulations, and environmental rules, while hobby farms are relatively free to farm as they please. The AAC resolved to generally support the zoning bylaw changes and suggested the following revisions:
 - allow for a minimum of two animals for companionship and social well-being; and
 - List fallow deer under “livestock, small” definition. *(These revisions were made.)*

- **Advisory Planning Commission for Electoral Areas “A”, “B” & “O”** considered the proposed amendments during their September 27 meeting. Commission members stated that the livestock limits are generous; and further, that they had discussed the limits with some area hobby farmers who concurred. R. Dee stated that the proposed provisions could be adjusted to decrease the incremental jump between thresholds (e.g. the jump from 1000 to 4000 sqm). Staff agreed and offered that they would look at redrafting and refining the provision.

The APC did not pass a resolution in respect of this project but also did not oppose it. Planning staff acknowledged the input and asked that if they or the missing APC members wished to offer any more input on an informal, individual basis, we would be grateful.

- **Advisory Planning Commission for Electoral Areas “J”, “L”, “M” & “P”** considered the proposed bylaw amendments during their September 28 meeting. They acknowledged the complexity of this issue and the work that had gone into the report and offered the following valuable input:
 - That the matter proposed to be regulated overlaps with other agencies such as the SPCA, the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Farm Practices Review Board which have more authority and expertise;
 - That the proposed livestock numbers do not seem unreasonable;
 - That environmental issues such as manure management, drainage and water contamination, and range/grassland preservation are more important but the proposed Zoning Bylaw changes will not directly address those issues;
 - That there is no science or best practice to guide us; and
 - That the TNRD has no authority to govern farming practices.

On request of staff for specific commentary, the APC further added:

- Peacock and peahen noise potential;
- The abuses by hobby farms of Class 9 Farm assessment across BC and the ensuing cost to our tax base was noted;
- Management best practices are key not always livestock numbers – thus it is a difficult issue to address by zoning limits for livestock;
- Suggestion to provide best practices guides for prospective or existing hobby farmers;
- Suggestion put forth to licence hobby farmers– staff confirmed that regional districts typically did not regulate via business licences or animal control bylaws (noting some special allowances have been made e.g. CORD);
- Noted that big farms or ranches must abide by a lot of rules and inspections (e.g. dairies, manure management plans, or farm environmental plans) while small enterprises or hobby farms do “whatever they wish” with virtual impunity;
- Consensus that some rules may be better than no rules though some Commission members stated they would prefer that we could issue *guidelines* rather than *regulations*.

By consensus the Advisory Planning Commission confirmed general support for the agricultural-related changes.

- **Advisory Planning Commission for Electoral Areas “E”, “I” & “N”** considered the proposed bylaw amendments during their September 28 meeting along with a short staff presentation. Members recommended that planning consider sustainability whether the animals are cats, dogs or other farm animals. A provision should also include protection of bighorn sheep in the known range boundary from other farm animals. This will reduce the threat from the transfer of pathogens that are carried by domestic sheep which can be deadly to bighorn sheep.
- **Interior Health Authority (IHA)** confirms that the proposed amendments are to develop regulations to restrict livestock numbers and accessory building size on small agricultural parcels. This amendment is paramount since changes from LUC to new zoning would allow for livestock on these parcels. Interior Health supports these planning initiatives since Interior Health recognizes that sound planning principals provide positive health outcomes.
- **Agricultural Land Commission** has no objection to the proposed bylaw amendments.

To see what other local governments are doing see the link on our webpage to the comparative survey of livestock limits.