



500 West Big Beaver
Troy, MI 48084
troymi.gov

Planning Department
planning@troymi.gov
248.524.3364

ANIMAL CONTROL APPEAL BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Jayne Saeger, Chair, Al Petrulis, Vice Chair
Patrick K. Carolan, Doug Dombrowski, Patrick Floch

September 22, 2021

7:00 P.M.

Council Chambers

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 24, 2021
4. PROCEDURE
5. HEARING OF CASE: NONE
6. OTHER BUSINESS: Troy City Code Chapter 90.
7. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: People with disabilities needing accommodations for effective participation in this meeting should contact the City Clerk by e-mail at clerk@troymi.gov or by calling (248) 524-3317 at least two working days in advance of the meeting. An attempt will be made to make reasonable accommodations.

Chair Saeger called the Animal Control Appeal Board meeting to order at 7:01 PM on March 24, 2021 via remote meeting utilizing the GoTo Meeting platform.

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Patrick Carolan

Patrick Floch

Al Petrulis

Jayne Saeger

Doug Dombrowski

Also Present:

Jackie Ferencz, Administrative Assistant, Planning Department

Nicole MacMillan, Assistant City Attorney

Michael Szuminski, Troy Police Department

Paul Evans, Zoning & Compliance Specialist

RESOLUTION TO ALLOW ANIMAL CONTROL APPEALS BOARD MEETINGS ELECTRONICALLY

Previous motion to approve from January 20, 2021 meeting stands.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA-

MOTION by Carolan

SECOND by Floch

RESOLVED, to approve the agenda

Yes: All

MOTION PASSED

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Carolan

SECOND by Floch

RESOLVED, to approve the January 20, 2021 meeting minutes.

Yes: All

MOTION PASSED

4. PROCEDURE: Read by Mr. Evans

5. HEARING OF CASE:

- a. WAIVER REQUEST, 114 LYONS, ROBIN NEWSOME: In order to keep 2 chickens, a waiver from the requirement that a property be at least .75 acres in area. The property is approximately .14 acres in area.

Mr. Evans provided an overview of the case. Applicant stated her case. Board asked questions of applicant.

Chair Saeger opened public comment.

Ms. Ferencz dictated 2 voicemail messages of public comment.

Mr. Evans summarized 2 public comment emails.

Chair Saeger closed public comment.

Board members discussed.

MOTION by Dombrowski

SECOND by Carolan

RESOLVED to deny the request due to lot size and its detriment to the neighborhood and likely will cause issues with neighbors

YES All

MOTION APPROVED

6. OTHER BUSINESS-

- a. Troy City Code Chapter 90 - Board discussed Chapter 90
- b. Public Comment received after January 27, 2021 meeting – acknowledged by the Board.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Saeger adjourned the meeting at 8:29pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Jayne Saeger, Chair

Paul Evans, Zoning Administrator

G:\Animals\Animal Control Appeal Board\MINUTES\2021\DRAFT\Animal Control Board of Appeals Draft Minutes 03
24 2021.docx



500 West Big Beaver
Troy, MI 48084
troymi.gov

Planning Department
248.524.3364
planning@troymi.gov

Date: March 10, 2021

To: Animal Control Appeals Board

From: Paul Evans, Zoning & Compliance Specialist

Subject: Troy City Code Chapter 90

At your January meeting, Board Member Dombrowski presented potential modifications to Chapter 90. After Board discussion, there was some interest in seeing follow up information from Member Dombrowski. Member Dombrowski's follow up information is attached.

Additionally, Member Petrulis has provided information for potential modifications to Chapter 90, also attached.

It's my recommendation that, as you vet these proposals, consider that that your ultimate goal is to clearly enumerate the Board's desires to City Council. I anticipate this being in the form of a motion. If you end up doing so, it will be up to Council to determine next steps.

Presented by Member Dombrowski at January 2021 ACAB meeting

- I. "Opportunities" in the existing ordinance
 - a. Livestock is still allowed.
 - i. Cows & horses need 2+ 1 acres to graze.
 - b. ¾ acre requirement appears to have no basis.
 - i. Was it a subjective estimate by the developers of the original ordinance?
 - ii. What about lot shape?
 - c. The wording of sec 90.70.20.f. gives false hope to someone with <3/4 acre.
 - i. *"This requirement may be waived by the Animal Control Appeal Board if the applicant can demonstrate circumstances that allow for waiver pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Animal Control Appeal Board."*
 - ii. Without the promulgations being public, a person is inclined to believe that if they present a reasonable case, the Appeals Board will decide in their favor.
 - iii. Of the 23 cases brought before the Board over the last 10 years, 20 have been for chickens & ¾ acre, only 3 were approved with 0.72-0.74 with contingencies
 - d. Lack of regulations for animals regarding the public
 - i. Handling of waste
 - ii. Rodent/varmint prevention
 - iii. Restriction on roosters
 - iv. Proximity of shelters and coops to neighbors
 - v. Welfare/safety of the animals
 - e. The topic of chickens repeats over and over. Interest in the hobby is growing.
 - i. Of 34 other cities in MI that allow chickens, only Troy & Rochester cite >3/4 acre
 1. The others cite distance to neighbors and have much, much better regulations in place governing the keeping of the birds on any size lot.
- II. The animal ordinance needs to be improved.
 - a. No livestock
 - b. Promulgations published
 - c. Appellate clause should be clarified. For Example:

The Board shall not approve an application for a variance unless it has been found positively that:

1. The strict enforcement of the Ordinance would cause practical difficulty and deprive the owner of rights enjoyed by all other property owners

2. The conditions and circumstances are unique to the subject property and are not similarly applicable to other properties

3. The conditions and circumstances unique to the property were not created by the owner, or his/her predecessor

4. The requested variance will not confer special privileges that are denied other properties

5. The requested variance will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance

- d. $\frac{3}{4}$ acre replaced with distance
 - i. A minimum amount to neighboring residences
 - ii. A minimum distance to property lines
 - e. Tighter regulations on the keeping domestic animals to prevent complaints
 - i. Consideration for what the ordinance tolerates of dogs and cats
 - f. With these things, a few chickens can be allowed on a typical size lot
 - i. Trial period
- III. Motion to conduct a review of options

From: [Doug Dombrowski](#)
To: [Paul M Evans](#)
Subject: Re: March Animal Control meeting
Date: Sunday, March 7, 2021 7:55:47 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[ideas for revising animal ordinance 210307.docx](#)
[Proposed Revision to City of Troy Animal Ordinance 210306 Dombrowski.pdf.docx](#)
[chickens pros and cons 190816.docx](#)
[local city summary 190731.xlsx](#)

Hi Paul. I finally got motivated this weekend and put together a pitch for the next meeting. I've attached:

- (1) The points that I pitched at the end of the last Board meeting.
- (2) A mark-up of the existing ordinance, along with an explanation for each revision. I felt this was the best way to facilitate effective discussion.
 - a) Note that I'm also suggesting a revised way to handle appeals. Like the Supreme Court, I'm suggesting that the Board pre-screen appeals before holding a meeting, and judge whether the appeal is worthy of a meeting.
 - b) Also note that I'm suggesting to do away with the allowance of livestock
- 3) The 'Pros and Cons' attachment was in the last meeting packet, which originated from me a couple of years ago. It's relevant to the discussion of revising the ordinance.
- 4) The 'local city summary' is the same as #3.

I hope that this makes it to you in time for the next meeting agenda. Let me know if you see any issues with what I've provided.

Finally, thanks a lot for working with me. Your kindness and level of cooperation are really appreciated.

Doug

From: Paul M Evans <P.Evans@troymi.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 12:15 PM
To: Doug Dombrowski <userz2675@hotmail.com>
Subject: RE: March Animal Control meeting

Sounds good Doug thanks for the update.

From: Doug Dombrowski <userz2675@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 10:18 AM
To: Paul M Evans <P.Evans@troymi.gov>
Subject: Re: March Animal Control meeting

Pros/Benefits

1) For Bird Owners

a) It is a great hobby

i) Poultry are fun pets

ii) Raising poultry is cheap

iii) The Social Aspect

(1) It's novel which piques people's interest and conversation

(2) Kids are interested and want to get involved.

b) Entertainment Value

i) Observing the individual personalities and quirks of each

c) Improved lawn

i) Chickens are ground birds, with strong, sturdy feet that are meant for digging and scratching in search of grubs, worms, bugs, tender shoots, and aerating.

ii) They turn leaf litter and dead bio-matter into the soil.

d) Fresh Eggs

i) Organic & Non-GMO

ii) Greater Nutrition

e) Stress relief and companionship

i) A Source of Therapy

f) Plenty of literature, websites, and support groups exist for urban chicken hobbyists for reference to help conduct the hobby in a cohesive manner in the neighborhood environment.

g) Weed Control

i) As they scratch and claw the ground, they eat and disperse weed seeds that have blown in

2) For Community

a) A Taste of Country Life

- i) Many people would prefer to live in the country but their job or your family keeps them in the city. Keeping backyard poultry is a way of bringing country life to the city.

b) Educational Value

- i) Learn Where Food Comes From
- ii) A Lesson in Self-Sustainability

c) Pest Control

- i) Chickens are omnivores by nature and thoroughly enjoy chasing down plant-destroying insects like grasshoppers, grubs, beetles, and larvae.

d) Less Food Waste/Bio-recycling

- i) up to 25% of a chicken's diet can be table scraps, thereby avoiding landfill waste.
- ii) each bird can bio-recycle more than 2 pounds per month in vegetable matter and table waste.
- iii) A flock of four birds, if fed a diet of 75 percent layer ration and 25 percent food waste, can eat more than 100 pounds per year in waste.

e) Chicken owners care for the birds like pets and go to extreme measures to pacify neighbors.

- i) Good regulation through local ordinances provides framework for cohabitation
- ii) Local clubs help guide urban chicken owners on how to manage their hobbies

3) For the Chickens

a) Cruelty Free

- i) hens on factory farms are often kept in such close, inhumane quarters that they cannot stretch their legs or wings, walk around, or participate in normal social behaviors

b) Save a Life

- i) 300 million birds each year are crammed into cages that are far too small

- ii) Give a bird a chance at a happy life
- a) Save Heritage Breeds
 - i) Different breeds have different characteristics.
 - (1) Because only certain chickens are good for meat, and others are specially bred for maximum egg production, today's chickens look significantly different from their ancestors.
 - (2) Hobbyists are the ones who raise rare heritage breeds.

Problems/Concerns

Table 3. Common urban chicken keeping concerns addressed

CONCERN	MORE INFORMATION	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
Disease	Contracting a communicable disease, like the flu or respiratory illness is negligible for urban poultry farming because of the size of the flock. This is a larger concern in industrial farming. Bacteria, like <i>Salmonella</i> , can be found in poultry droppings.	The hazards of bacterial infections can be mitigated by education regarding how to handle and care for poultry, including washing hands after returning indoors, and how to properly compost droppings for fertilizer. This can easily be addressed by educating urban chicken farmers with printed materials or offering classes.
Attracting pests	Flies and other pests lay their eggs in droppings because they like moisture.	Pests can be minimized through proper bedding care, and the chickens help by eating pests.
Attracting predators	Chickens should not attract urban predators any more than a cat or dog.	With the exception of hawks, most predators are nocturnal while chickens are diurnal (active during the day). Enclosing the chickens at night should prevent predators from accessing the chickens.
Cost for low-income families		Part of the Metropolitan Food Systems Plan is addressing issues of food access, possible barrier reduction could include funding and management from outside sources, like a non-profit, to cover the startup costs.
Disposal		For a fee, the Vet Diagnostic Lab at NDSU will provide dead animal disposal.* Other communities have offered these options: 1. City provides dead animal pick-up free of charge 2. Buried on property at least two feet down 3. Closed securely in a plastic bag and placed in the municipal trash
Noise	Hens "talking" at their loudest, speak at the same decibel level as human conversation (about 60 decibels). This is also personality-based; some hens are more talkative than others. Roosters crow at about the same decibel level as a barking dog (90 decibels).	A majority of urban ordinances ban roosters, because of their loud crowing.
Smell	Chicken manure is high in nitrogen, which can lead to an ammonia smell if not properly cared for.	Adding carbon material, like dried leaves and straw, to the bedding will get rid of the smell; it is all about carbon to nitrogen ratio. Odor can be remedied through quality bedding.
Winter keeping		Proper education can reduce the impact of winter poultry farming: make sure to keep combs warm and use a heat lamp when the temperature gets below 20 degrees.

Options

- 1) Increase the distance to lot line in the proposed animal ordinance revision from 10' to 25' and to adjacent house from 40' to 50'.
- 2) For concerns about noise, require soundproofing of coop.
- 3) Limit the number of birds allowable on any property to a maximum number.
- 4) Increase the number of birds allowed on smaller lots from 4 to 6.
- 5) Different quantity max's of birds
- 6) Expand the scope of revising the animal ordinance
 - a. Include a restriction on all or most livestock, based on input from Troy Animal Inspectors' experience; or
 - i. Limit number of livestock on $\frac{3}{4}$ acre
- 7) Include a restriction on Pitbulls and Rottweilers.
- 8) Endorse creation of poultry club to aid in kickoff of revised ordinance to ensure minimal issue.
- 9) Trial pilot program like Berkley limited # of permits for trial period.

Sources

<https://www.greenamerica.org/green-living/many-benefits-backyard-chickens>

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/sponsor-story/tractor-supply-co/2018/03/12/benefits-of-owning-chickens/32855461/>

<https://permaculturenews.org/2017/07/18/benefits-keeping-chickens/>

[https://my.chicagobotanic.org/education/adult ed/the-environmental-benefits-of-backyard-chickens/](https://my.chicagobotanic.org/education/adult-ed/the-environmental-benefits-of-backyard-chickens/)

<https://www.naturallivingideas.com/20-convincing-reasons-to-keep-backyard-chickens/>

- I. Deficiencies in the existing ordinance
 - a. Livestock is still allowed.
 - i. Cows & horses need 2+ 1 acres to graze.
 - b. $\frac{3}{4}$ acre requirement appears to have no basis.
 - i. Was it a subjective estimate by the developers of the original ordinance?
 - ii. What about lot shape?
 - c. The wording of sec 90.70.20.f. gives false hope to someone with $<3/4$ acre.
 - i. *"This requirement may be waived by the Animal Control Appeal Board if the applicant can demonstrate circumstances that allow for waiver pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Animal Control Appeal Board."*
 - ii. Without the promulgations being public, a person may incorrectly think that unless the ordinance doesn't explicitly state the regulation, it is not legal.
 - iii. Of the 23 cases brought before the Board over the last 10 years, 20 have been for chickens & $\frac{3}{4}$ acre, only 3 were approved with 0.72-0.74 with contingencies
 - d. Lack of regulations for animals regarding the public
 - i. Handling of waste
 - ii. Rodent/varmint prevention
 - iii. Restriction on roosters
 - iv. Proximity of shelters and coops to neighbors
 - v. Welfare/safety of the animals
 - e. The topic of chickens repeats over and over. Interest in the hobby is growing.
 - i. Of 34 other cities in MI that allow chickens, only Troy & Rochester cite $>3/4$ acre
 - 1. The others cite distance to neighbors and have much, much better regulations in place governing the keeping of the birds on any size lot.

- II. The animal ordinance needs to be improved.
 - a. No livestock
 - b. Promulgations published
 - c. Appellate clause should be clarified. For Example:

The Board shall not approve an application for a variance unless it has been found positively that:

1.The strict enforcement of the Ordinance would cause practical difficulty and deprive the owner of rights enjoyed by all other property owners

2.The conditions and circumstances are unique to the subject property and are not similarly applicable to other properties

3.The conditions and circumstances unique to the property were not created by the owner, or his/her predecessor

4.The requested variance will not confer special privileges that are denied other properties

5.The requested variance will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance

- d. $\frac{3}{4}$ acre replaced with distance
 - i. A minimum amount to neighboring residences
 - ii. A minimum distance to property lines
- e. Tighter regulations on the keeping domestic animals to prevent complaints
 - i. Consideration for what the ordinance tolerates of dogs and cats
- f. With improved regulations, a few chickens can be allowed on a typical size lot

ORDINANCE SUMMARIES OF 34 MICHIGAN CITIES THAT ALLOW CHICKENS

CITY	# of CHICKENS ALLOWED	ROOSTERS ALLOWED?	PROPERTY SIZE	ADDITIONAL ORDINANCE PROVISIONS	LINK TO REFERENCE
Albion	5 birds<1 acre 7 birds >acre	no	no restriction	kept in backyard location of enclosure feed waste	http://www.cityofalbionmi.gov/2015_02.pdf
Auburn Hills	6	no	no restriction	backyard only pen location noise nuisance wandering restrictions safe conditions sanitary conditions no slaughtering feed	https://library.municode.com/mi/auburn_hills/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COOR_CH14AN_ARTIINGE_S14-2.1KECH
Ann Arbor	6	no	no restriction	kept in backyard location of enclosure feed waste rodent/vermin prevention no slaughtering	https://library.municode.com/mi/ann_arbor/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TITIXPORE_CH107AN_9_42KECHDU
Berkley	3	no	no restriction	no slaughtering eggs for personal use only	https://library.municode.com/mi/berkley/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH22AN_ARTIVCH
Charlotte	6	no	no restriction	kept in backyard location of enclosure feed waste rodent/vermin prevention no slaughtering	http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/Michigan/charlotte_mi/cityofcharlottemichigancodeofordinances/chapter10animals?f=templates\$fn=default.htm\$3.0\$vid=amlegal:charlotte_mi\$anc=JD_10-4

ORDINANCE SUMMARIES OF 34 MICHIGAN CITIES THAT ALLOW CHICKENS

Chelsea	4	no	no restriction	noise nuisance wandering restrictions safe conditions sanitary vermin coop structure pen size per chicken pen location rodent/vermin prevention personal use only revocation guidelines	https://library.municode.com/mi/chelsea/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COOR_CH4AN_ARTIIBACH
Cold Water	no max	yes	no restriction	smell not dangerous to public health wandering restrictions	https://www.backyardchickens.com/articles/cold-water-michigan-chicken-ordinance.61474/
Dearborn	no max	yes	no restriction	sanitary conditions wandering restrictions	
De Soto	6 max	no	no restriction	noise nuisance wandering restrictions safe conditions sanitary	https://www.ecode360.com/28314852?highlight=chickens&searchId=2550658570039322#28314852
East Lansing	4	no	no restriction	backyard only pen location noise nuisance wandering restrictions safe conditions sanitary no slaughter on-site	https://www.cityofeastlansing.com/DocumentCenter/View/644/Animals-and-Pets-PDF
Eastpointe	3	no	no restriction	personal use/pet shelter no ground feeding	https://library.municode.com/mi/eastpointe/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH8AN_ARTIINGE_S8-6POGABI
Farmington Hills	no limit	yes	no restriction	severe distance restriction noise limits	https://library.municode.com/mi/farmington_hills/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH6AN_ARTIINGE_S6-4KEANOTPEPROTDWRULA
Ferndale	3	no	no restriction	wandering restrictions backyard only	https://ferndalechickens.com/

ORDINANCE SUMMARIES OF 34 MICHIGAN CITIES THAT ALLOW CHICKENS

Georgetown Twp	6	no	no restriction/ zoning requirements	coop size pen location coop construction no slaughtering	https://www.gtwp.com/documentcenter/view/304
Grand Rapids	no max	yes	3,800 square feet (0.087 acres)	Coop must be under 8 feet tall Coop size Pen location	https://www.grandrapidsmi.gov/Services/Apply-for-a-Backyard-Chicken-Permit
Hazel Park	no max	yes	no restriction	not well defined	https://www.municode.com/library/mi/hazel_park/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT6AN_CH6.08RAPO_6.08.020APKE
Holland	4 5 6	no	<1/2 acre 1/2 - 1 acre > 1 acre	coop size rodent/vermin prevention pen location personal use only no slaughtering	https://www.cityofholland.com/permitsandinspections/backyard-chickenfowl-permits?fbclid=IwAR3UFLkBD0NvX7stKN27vKMJaPYTEszfDiyvmQs7dmHnuHD2w5BKafNeQkFY
Lansing	5	no	no restriction	coop size rodent/vermin prevention pen location personal use only no slaughtering	https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B64q3VhsvqiZWJEX0tSOVhBT0t1RIZPbFhEVng2QzlFNHZv
Lanthrup Village	3	no	no restriction	personal use only no slaughtering	http://www.lathrupvillage.org/document_center/Animals%20-with%20review%20board.pdf
Kalamazoo	4	no	no restriction	coop size pen location no slaughtering wandering restrictions	http://ktwp.org/Portals/16/Ordinance%20Officer/fillable%20chicken%20application%20%202-%20K%20Twp.pdf
Madison Heights	3	no	no restriction	adequate shelter no ground feeding	https://library.municode.com/mi/madison_heights/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH5AN_ARTIINGE_S5-4REKECEAN
Northville	no max	yes	no restriction	containment pen location	https://library.municode.com/mi/northville/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COOR_CH10AN_ARTIINGE_S10-10RAPO
Norton Shores	4	no	0.275 acre min	shelter pen location coop size	https://library.municode.com/mi/norton_shores/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COORNOSHMI_CH6AN_ARTIIILI_S6-52LI
Pontiac	4 10	yes	<1 acre >1 acre	coop sq ft per bird pen sq ft per bird	https://www.codepublishing.com/MI/Pontiac/?Pontiac18/Pontiac1801.html&?f

ORDINANCE SUMMARIES OF 34 MICHIGAN CITIES THAT ALLOW CHICKENS

Rochester Hills	12	yes	>1 acre	limit # on livestock min 2 acre for livestock	https://library.municode.com/mi/rochester_hills/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=SPBLADERE_CH138ZO_ART4ZO_DIPEUS_CH4DESTSPUS_S138-4.438RAKEAN
Roseville	4	no	no restriction	shelter backyard sanitary conditions pen location rodents and vermin coop construction	https://ecode360.com/7617521
Royal Oak	no limit	yes	no restriction	sanitary condition	https://ecode360.com/8261474?highlight=chicken#8261474
Redford	3	yes	no restriction	pen location	http://chicken.io/ordinance/redford-michigan-chicken-ordinance
Southfield	no max	yes	no restriction	pen location wandering restriction	https://library.municode.com/mi/southfield/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICO_TITIXPORE_CH113AN_S9.76KEOTAN
Troy	no limit	yes	min 3/4 acre	- poultry and livestock addressed together as domestic animals - humane treatment - kept from escaping - "promulgated regulations"? - Waiver possible	https://cms6.revize.com/revize/troymi/Departments/City%20Attorney/Code%20and%20Charter/Code%20Table%20of%20Contents/CH090.pdf
Traverse City	4	no	no restriction	shelter pen location no slaughter backyard	https://library.municode.com/mi/traverse_city/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTSIXGEFCO_CH610AN_610.01PRAN
Warren	3	no	no restriction	shelter pen location no slaughter backyard	http://www.cityofwarren.org/images/stories/ordinances/80-766.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3PZI46djyasQCFixEYOZ4z0j8vHp5R61uZx9W9Lgapx5M1yHP4IS223j4
Westland	no limit	yes	min 1/2 acre	- poultry and livestock addressed together as domestic animals - pen location	https://library.municode.com/mi/westland/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH18AN_ARTIINGE_S18-3KEFAAN
Ypsilanti	4	no	no restriction	no slaughtering backyard only shelter pen location rodent/vermin prevention	https://library.municode.com/mi/ypsilanti/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIICOOR_CH14AN_ARTIINGE_S14-5KEFECHHE

Chapter 90 - Animals

90-1

GENERAL REGULATIONS

- 90.10.10 **Definitions.** The following terms when used in this Chapter shall have the meanings set forth in this Section:
- 90.10.11 “Animal” - Any living creature, except humans and plants. “Animal” includes any mammal, bird, reptile, snake, turtle, crustacean or any other vertebrate or invertebrate.
- 90.10.25 “Dangerous Animal” - A wild or feral animal, other than a dog or cat, which because of its size, aggressive nature or other characteristics constitutes a danger to persons or property.
- 90.10.30 “Domestic Animal” – **livestock and poultry¹** - An animal, other than a dog, that is not feral in nature, including, but not limited to horses, cows, chickens, geese, pigeons, ducks, steers, ponies, mules, donkeys, sheep, swine, pigs and goats.
- 90.10.31 “Livestock” - **Farm animals, with the exception of poultry, including, but not limited to cattle, sheep, pigs, goats, horses, donkeys, and mules.²**
- 90.10.32 “Poultry” - **Birds raised commercially or domestically for meat, eggs, and feathers including, but not limited to chickens, ducks, turkeys, and geese.³**
- 90.10.35 “House Pet” - A non-domestic and non-dangerous small animal normally kept confined as a pet, including but not limited to hamsters, fish and parakeets.
- 90.10.60 “Owner” - A person or a group of persons who owns, controls, harbors, keeps, or has a property interest in any animal.
- 90.10.65 “Person” - An individual, employee, corporation, partnership or association.
- 90.10.90 “Wild Animal” – An animal that is not defined in this Chapter as a dangerous animal, domestic animal or house pet.
-
- 90.70.20 Permit Application Process. An applicant for a domestic, dangerous or wild animal permit shall:

- a) furnish the Housing and Zoning Inspector a list of the species of animals to be kept and the maximum number of each species to be kept at any one time, and
- b) demonstrate that the animals will be treated humanely and will not be neglected or treated with cruelty, and
- c) demonstrate that the animals will be maintained in quarters constructed to prevent their escape, and
- d) demonstrate that reasonable precautions shall be taken to protect the public from the animals and the animals from the public, and
- e) demonstrate that he or she can comply with the ordinance and any regulations promulgated by the Animal Control Appeal Board, and
- f) ~~as of <date>, ownership of livestock is no longer permitted. Existing permits are valid until their expiration. ⁴ in the case of domestic animals, demonstrate to the Housing and Zoning Inspector that the lot or parcel that animals will be kept on is three-quarters ($\frac{3}{4}$) of one (1) two acres or larger owning and harboring such animals are prohibited. This requirement may be waived by the Animal Control Appeal Board if the applicant can demonstrate circumstances that allow for waiver pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Animal Control Appeal Board. Waivers will not be granted for animals that are loud or likely to be detrimental to the neighborhood.~~
- g) in the case of poultry, demonstrate the following to the Housing and Zoning Inspector ⁵:
 - 1) A covered or fenced enclosure shall not be located closer than ten feet from a property line of an adjacent property nor shall it be located closer than 40 feet to any residential dwelling on an adjacent property. ⁶
 - 2) Coop and pen must be kept in the backyard only. ⁷
 - 3) Birds must be kept on poultry owner's property unless permission is granted by adjacent property owner(s). ⁸
 - 4) All enclosures for the keeping of poultry shall be constructed to prevent rodents from being harbored underneath or within the walls of the enclosure. ⁹
 - 5) Waste materials (feed, manure, and litter) must be bagged and disposed of in the trash. It is not acceptable to pile waste materials on the property. ¹⁰
 - 6) Feed must be stored in a manner to prevent access to rodents

and varmints. ¹¹

- 7) Only small birds, no larger than chickens and ducks, are allowed. ¹²
- 8) No roosters. ¹³
- 9) The birds are kept as a hobby or pets. ¹⁴
- 10) Birds can only free-roam under supervision. ¹⁵
- 11) No slaughtering birds on site. ¹⁶
- 12) No housing birds in residential dwellings. ¹⁷
- 13) A maximum of ten, and a minimum of two, birds are allowed. ¹⁸
- 14) Birds must be provided shelter, at least ten feet from the residence and provide a minimum of 1 foot of perch space for roosting at least 12" and no more than 4' from the floor. ¹⁹
- 15) Birds must be provided a minimum of 4 sf of coop space (roofed shelter). ¹⁹
- 16) Roofed shelters (coops) must contain a layer of wood shavings, straw, or similar bedding material to facilitate clean-up of waste and provide bedding and nesting material. ¹⁹
- 17) Birds must be provided a minimum of 10 sf of enclosed outdoor run space. ¹⁹
- 18) A safe source of heat must be provided for birds in cold weather to maintain a minimum coop temperature of 32F. ¹⁹
- 19) The lot on which the birds are kept must be fenced on the sides with neighbors. ²⁰

Additional restriction for poultry on less than ¼ acre lots:

- 20) Flock size must be between two and four birds, or six if miniature in size (bantams, quail, etc). ²¹

.....

90.80.80 Procedure for Appeals.

Appeals from the decisions of the Housing and Zoning Inspector to the Animal Control Appeal Board must be:

- a) filed at the office of the Troy Housing and Zoning Inspector on forms provided, and
- b) filed within seven (7) days of the date of the Housing and Zoning Inspector's decision regarding the issuance or denial of a permit for dangerous animals or domestic animals, and
- c) filed within seven (7) days of the date of the Housing and Zoning Inspector's decision regarding the revocation of a permit for dangerous animals or domestic animals.

d) the Animal Control Appeal Board members will individually review case submissions and provide their assessment on whether an Animal Control Appeal Board meeting shall be held to hear the case. A majority of members in favor of a meeting must exist prior to scheduling the review meeting.

The Board shall not approve an application for a variance unless it has been found positively that:

1.The strict enforcement of the Ordinance would cause practical difficulty and deprive the owner of rights enjoyed by comparable other property owners

2.The conditions and circumstances are unique to the subject property and are not similarly applicable to other properties

3.The conditions and circumstances unique to the property were not created by the owner, or his/her predecessor

4.The requested variance will not confer special privileges that are denied other properties

5.The requested variance will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance

e) upon acceptance of an appeal, the City Clerk shall provide notice of the time, date and place of the appeal to all property owners within 300 feet of the appellant's property.

¹ The definition of "Domestic Animals" in the existing ordinance is wrong. Domestic Animals includes dogs and cats, which the ordinance addresses elsewhere, outside of the section of Domestic Animals.

² This is the Britannica definition

³ This is the Britannica definition

⁴ It is for the Council to consider if horses, cows, donkeys, and other livestock should still be allowed on ¼ acre. Some people in Troy supposedly have pet pigs and goats. There are no more horses in Troy, and presumably cows neither. Cows & horses need 2+ 1 acres to graze. Most other livestock are similar.

⁵ A simple internet search shows that pet poultry is growing in popularity and benefits the community. Poultry are contained in enclosed pens. Livestock wander freely and graze. Control of these animals must be handled separately. Poultry needs to be addressed apart from livestock.

⁶ This is the crux of the proposed revision. Minimum limit of space between animals and neighbors should be defined by distance, not area. Requiring $\frac{3}{4}$ acre does little to ensure distance to neighbor nor does it consider lot shape (i.e. long and narrow, L-shaped). Of 34 cities in Michigan that allow pet poultry, Troy is unique, with the only exception being Rochester, that minimum area is used to restrict poultry. (Rochester's Animal Ordinance is very similar to Troy's. Perhaps they were developed together which explains why they share the same deficiencies). What protects neighbors' interests better – the existing Troy restriction on area that allows someone to put a coop or pen on the property line or a revised code that ensures suitable distance buffer? Some of the 32 Michigan poultry ordinances allow 5 feet to property line and 25 feet to dwelling. The herein proposed 10 and 40, respectively, are conservative.

⁷ The existing code allows residents to have coops and pens in their front yard. Restricting this will prevent future disputes in Animal Control and Inspection. The good ordinances have this.

⁸ Prevention of wandering birds prevents neighbor complaints. The good ordinances have this.

⁹ The good ordinances cite prevention of rodents and varmints.

¹⁰ The good ordinances cite sanitary requirements.

¹¹ Same as #9.

¹² Turkeys, peacocks, ostriches, and exotic farm birds are outside the scope of this revision.

¹³ Another blatant example that the existing ordinance needs to change. Most cities prevent roosters for obvious reasons. This is a point that stands alone in weeding out poorly planned animal ordinances.

¹⁴ Small scale backyard poultry works in suburban communities because the birds are pets, like dogs and cats. Studies have shown that the noise level of a few birds is less than an average dog, and they are easier to care for.

¹⁵ This is called "limited free range" and is another point in well-considered animal ordinances.

¹⁶ Most poultry ordinances restrict slaughtering. Troy's existing ordinance does not for any Domestic Animal.

¹⁷ Supposedly some people in Troy have appealed to have indoor chickens. Studies and consensus of hobbyists is that indoor keeping is disadvantageous for the birds.

¹⁸ Yet another paramount issue with no restriction in the existing Troy ordinance. According to the ordinance, a resident is allowed unlimited birds regardless of the lot size. However, the 10 maximum is an existing promulgated regulation. Promulgated regulations should be formalized at this opportunity. A person may incorrectly think that, unless the ordinance explicitly states the regulation, the promulgated regulation is not legal and is, therefore, arguable.

¹⁹ Hobbyists' criteria for adequate accommodations.

²⁰ A primary complaint is wandering, forging birds.

²¹ People have requested the Troy Animal Ordinance be changed before for chickens but have not done the research nor proposed a case until now. Nearly all of the applications for appeals are for chickens

and nearly all of those are denied. By providing better regulations on poultry including distance restrictions, which protect the interests of neighbors, a beneficial opportunity arises for those previously denied their enjoyment. In all but one of the other 34 communities cited in the study of Michigan urban poultry, Troy stands alone in preventing chickens as pets on under $\frac{3}{4}$ acre.

By limiting the number of birds, and basing space restrictions on distance rather than area, neighbors of even $\frac{3}{4}$ + acre poultry owners are protected. The average allowance of birds of the 34 Michigan cities is five. Restricting to four is conservative and sufficient for hobbyists. Consensus of hobbyists is that less than a pair of birds is disadvantageous to the lone bird.

+

From: [Al Petrule](#)
To: [Paul M Evans](#)
Cc: [Jackie Ferencz](#); [Nicole F MacMillan](#)
Subject: Chapter 90.70
Date: Friday, March 5, 2021 10:59:40 AM
Attachments: [Cities - Prohibition Domestic Animals.docx](#)

Paul,

In consideration for a solution with the issue of maintaining chickens or any domestic/livestock animals in the City of Troy, I would like to propose to the Troy Animal Control Board of Appeals (ACBA) a change to Chapter 90 – Domestic Animal Ordinance specifically as it relates to traditional domestic/livestock animals such as chickens, pigs, cows, etc, and the issuance of permits to keep and maintain such animals within residential properties.

My proposal consists of removing Section 90.70 altogether. Instead, I propose a section that clearly prohibits domestic animals and livestock from being kept and maintained within residential properties regardless of property size. A grandfather clause would be included to protect those that have existing valid permits but would not be transferable upon the sale of the property. Also, I propose to allow current property owners with lots greater than $\frac{3}{4}$ acres that have existing domestic animals to be allowed a valid permit to keep their current animals.

It is my opinion that the City of Troy is not obligated to allow its residents to keep and maintain domestic animals within residential properties. Even though there are cities in Southeast Michigan that choose to have ordinances and provisions that allow residents to keep domestic/livestock animals, many other cities instead have chosen to implement ordinances that completely prohibit domestic/livestock animals on residential properties.

The following is a list of cities in S.E. Michigan that prohibits non-common pets, such as domestic and livestock animals including pigs, cows, goats, fowl, and wild animals.

Ada Township
Allen Park
Birmingham
Bloomfield Hills
Bronson
Dearborn Heights
Detroit
Farmington
Flint
Fraser
Garden City
Grosse Pointe
Grosse Pointe Woods

Harper Woods
Huntington Woods
Mount Clemens
New Baltimore
North Branch
Oak Park
Plymouth
Rochester
Romeo
Shelby Township
St. Clair Shores
Taylor
Utica

Attached are summaries of the ordinances for each of the cities listed above (as of 2016).

Below is a “rough” sample of the wording for my proposal for a section prohibiting domestic/livestock and wild animals in the City of Troy.

Sample Section: Keeping of domestic animals, including fowl, livestock and wild animals. No person shall keep or house any animals within the city except dogs, cats, birds, or animals commonly classified as pets. No horse, cow, calf, swine, sheep, goat, chickens, geese or ducks, etc. shall be kept at any residential property regardless of size. Any permits previously issued shall be grandfathered until such time as the fowl are deceased and at that time said permits shall expire and no new permits shall be granted. Existing permits shall be honored for properties larger than $\frac{3}{4}$ acres. No new permits to be issued regardless of property size.

The exact wording would need refinement and approval by the ACBA.

I realize my proposal may not be appreciated by all residents but I do believe that the majority of Troy residents would agree that the keeping of domestic/livestock animals on our residential properties is not in the best interest of the city.

I look forward to discussing my proposal at the March 24th, 2021 meeting with the ABCA.

Kindest regards,

Al Petrulis



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Cities that DO NOT allow chickens & fowl:

Ada Township Sec. 78-17. – Keeping of pets and livestock. The keeping of more than three dogs and/or cats or the keeping of *poultry*, hogs, horses or other livestock is prohibited within any district except the AGP, RP-1, RP-2 and RR districts; provided, however, that any litter of dogs or cats which causes the aforesaid limit of three to be exceeded shall not constitute a violation of this provision for a period of four months after birth.(Ord. No. O-042682-1, § 3.13, 4-26-1982; Ord. No. O-021710-1, § 5, 2-17-2010)

Allen Park Sec. 6-50. Restrictions on keeping non-common pets or wildlife.

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to keep, harbor or raise any non-common pet or wildlife including but not limited to any of the following: (1) Bear; (2) Canine, except and not including any member of the dog family customarily domesticated by man; (3) Exotic bees; (4) Feline, except and not including any member of the cat family not customarily domesticated by man; (5) Hoofed animal, including potbellied pigs; (6) Marsupial; (7) Primate; (8) Raptor; and (9) Reptile, except and not including any non-venomous member of the order Crocodylia under six inches in length. (10) Fowl, except and not including any member of the bird family not customarily domesticated by man that is housed in a cage in a family residence and whose wings have been clipped to prevent flight.

Birmingham Sec. 18-8. – Keeping of domestic animals and *fowl*. No person shall keep or house any animals within the city except dogs cats, birds, or animals commonly classified as pets. No horse, cow, calf, swine, sheep, goat, chickens, geese or ducks shall be kept in any dwelling or part thereof. Nor shall any such animal be kept on the same lot or premises with a dwelling. This offense is punishable by up to 90 days in jail and/or \$500.00 fine. (Code 1963, § 9.64; Ord. No. 2075, 11-28-11)

Bloomfield Hills Sec. 3-4. – Livestock prohibited. (b)"Livestock" means horses and other equine, cattle, sheep, swine, mules, burros, goats, llamas or other new world camelids, bison, *poultry*, rabbits and other animals used for human food and fiber or primarily for service rather than companionship to humans. Livestock does not include dogs and cats.(c) It shall be unlawful and a violation of this section for any person to possess or maintain livestock within the city. Owners or possessors of livestock shall be responsible for compliance with this section and subject to punishment for violations. For purposes of this section, "possess or maintain" means the act or ability of having or exerting control and influence over livestock, without regard to ownership and "owners or possessors" mean persons who have a right of property in livestock, who have livestock in their care of custody, or who knowingly permit livestock to remain on or about property occupied or controlled by them.

Bronson 90.03 KEEPING OF FARM OR WILD ANIMALS. (A) No person shall own, keep or house any farm or wild animals within the city. (B) No horses, cows, swine, goats, sheep, chickens , geese, ducks, donkeys, pigeons or any other farm or wild

animal be kept in any dwelling, or part thereof. (C) No such animals or fowl shall under any circumstances be kept on any lot or premises within the city limits.

REPORT THIS AD

Dearborn Heights Sec. 6-66. – Domestic animals and fowl. No person shall keep or house any animals or domestic fowl within the city except dogs, cats, canaries or small animals commonly classified as pets which are customarily kept or housed inside dwellings as household pets. (Code 1969, § 9.87)

Detroit Sec. 6-1-3. – Owning, harboring, keeping, maintaining, selling or transferring of *farm* or wild *animals* prohibited; exception for circuses, zoos, and other approved activities; separate violations for each *animal*; disposition of *animals* in violation of this section.(a) It shall be unlawful for a person to own, harbor, keep, or maintain, sell, or transfer any *farm animal*, or any wild *animal*, on their premises or at a public place within the City; provided, that *farm animals* or wild *animals* may be kept in circuses, zoos, or laboratories, subject to the approval of the City, where the care or custody is under the care of a trained and qualified *animal* attendant at all times, whose responsibility shall be to see that such *animals* are securely under restraint. (Ord. No. 04-04, § 1, 1-30-04)

Farmington (UNCLEAR ; acreage limit, farms can keep, but has on the books an ordinance disallowing livestock) Sec. 20-303. – *Livestock*, exotic or vicious animals. The keeping of *livestock* is prohibited. The keeping of any exotic or vicious animal is prohibited.

Flint (residential- allowed in agri zoning) 9-15.1 KEEPING OF POULTRY AND THE LIKE RESTRICTED. No poultry or domestic fowl, other than household pets such as canaries and parakeets, shall be kept upon any residentially zoned lot within the City. (Ord. 2058, passed 6-10-1968)

Fraser Sec. 32-33. – Animals. No animals, livestock or *poultry* of any kind shall be raised, bred or kept on any lot, except that non-vicious dogs, cats or other household pets may be kept, provided they are not kept, bred or maintained for any commercial purposes. (Ord. No. 279, § 3.02, 12-12-96)

Garden City 90.01 PETS; SALE OF ANIMALS; PROHIBITIONS. (A) No person shall keep or house any animals or fowl within the city except dogs, cats, canaries, or animals commonly classified as pets, customarily kept or housed inside dwellings as household pets. (B) No person shall sell, or offer for sale, barter, or give away baby chicks, rabbits, ducklings, or other fowl as pets or novelties, whether or not dyed, colored, or otherwise artificially treated. This division shall not be construed to prohibit the display or sale of natural chicks or ducklings in proper brooder facilities by hatcheries or stores engaged in the business of selling the same to be raised for commercial purposes.(Ord. 11-006, passed 4-25-11)

Grosse Pointe Sec. 10-4. – Keeping domestic animals and *fowl* generally. Except as provided in this chapter, no person shall keep or house any animals or domestic *fowl* within the city except dogs, cats, birds, *fowl* or animals commonly classified as pets. (Code 1980, § 9.84)

Grosse Pointe Woods Sec. 6-3. – Livestock. (a) definitions. The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this section, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning: Livestock means horses, cows, calves, swine, sheep, goats, rabbits, chickens, geese, ducks, pigeons or other like or similar animals or *fowl*.(b) Harboring. It shall be

unlawful for any person to keep livestock in the city with the exception of the Grosse Pointe Woods Hunt Club.(Code 1975, § 8-13-2; Code 1997, § 6-157)

Harper Woods Sec. 4-2. – Animals prohibited; exceptions. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to keep any animal or *fowl* within five hundred (500) feet of any dwelling, street, alley or public place, except such animals as are commonly kept or housed as household pets; or permit any animal or any *fowl* owned by him or in his possession or control to run at large in any street, alley or public place, or upon the premises of another without express permission of the owner or occupant thereof.

REPORT THIS AD

Huntington Woods Sec. 4-4. – Domestic animals and *fowl*. No person shall keep or house any animals other than domestic dogs, domestic cats, canaries or animals commonly classified as pets, which are customarily kept or housed inside dwellings as household pets. The term “pet” or “household pet,” as used in this section, does not include exotic, wild, vicious or dangerous animals including, but not limited to, any of the following: domestic *fowl*, live monkeys, alligator, crocodile, raccoon, skunk, fox, bear, sea mammal, poisonous snake, constrictor snake longer than six feet in length, member of the feline species other than the domestic cat, member of the canine species other than the domestic dog, or any other animal which would require a standard of care and control greater than that required for customary household pets sold by commercial pet shops. This section shall not apply to any lawfully operated zoo. (Code 1988, § 9.38; Ord. No. 423, § 1, 5-19-1998)

Mount Clemens 15.042 – Sec. 4.2 ANIMALS. No animals, *livestock* or poultry of any kind shall be raised, bred or kept on any residentially zoned or used property, except that non-vicious dogs, cats or other household pets may be kept, provided they are not kept, bred or maintained for any commercial purposes. All animals shall be maintained in accordance with applicable City Ordinances.

New Baltimore Sec. 8-6. – Domestic animals and *fowl*. No person shall keep or house any animals or domestic *fowl* within the city except dogs, cats, birds, *fowl* or animals commonly classified as pets. (Code 1981, § 9.65)

North Branch Section 2. RIGHT TO KEEP FARM ANIMALS. No person shall keep or harbor farm animals on any property within the Village limits unless the farm animals are located on a farm which had such farm animals on the effective date of the Village Zoning Ordinance, December 1, 1980 or unless a zoning variance has been granted.

Oak Park Sec. 14-5. – Keeping of animals and *fowl*. No person shall keep or house any animals or domestic *fowl* within the city except dogs, cats, canaries or animals commonly classified as pets which are customarily kept or housed inside dwellings as household pets, and excepting further, the temporary keeping of live poultry by any lawfully established live poultry market incidental to the normal course of business. (Code 1973, § 6-5)

Plymouth Sec. 14-4. – Domestic animals and *fowl*. No person shall keep or house any animals or domestic *fowl* within the city except dogs, cats, birds, *fowl* or animals commonly classified as pets. (Ord. No. 99-9, 6-21-99)

Rochester Sec. 8-5. – Unlawful to keep certain animals and *fowl*. No person shall keep or house any animals or domestic *fowl* within the city except dogs, cats, birds, or animals commonly classified as household pets. (Ord. No. 1991-15, 8-12-1991; Code 1982, § 9.2-4)

Romeo Sec. 4-1. – Keeping within corporate limits. No person shall keep any horses, cattle, swine, sheep, ponies, goats, rabbits, poultry or other animals and *fowl*, except dogs and cats, within the corporate village limits. (Code 1993, § 35.251)

Shelby Township Section 3.02. – Animals. No animals, livestock, or *poultry* of any kind shall be raised, bred or kept on any lot, except that non-vicious dogs, cats or other household pets may be kept, provided that they are not kept, bred or maintained for any commercial purpose. Horses may be allowed as per requirements of **section 3.19**. All animals shall be kept and maintained so as not to create a nuisance. The maintenance of animals is further regulated by **chapter 6**, article I of the Shelby Township Code of Ordinances. Kennels may be allowed as a special land use in the HM, Heavy Manufacturing District subject to compliance with the requirements of **Section 13.51**. (Ord. No. 212.5, § 2, 7-20-1999; Amend. of 10-21-2008; Ord. No. 212.89, 9-4-2012)

REPORT THIS AD

St. Clair Shores 35.059 – Farm animals prohibited. Sec. 19-9. No person shall own, keep, harbor, have custody or raise any farm animal except that one rabbit shall be permitted per residential premises. (chap. 19 eff. Nov. 22, 1988)

Sterling Heights SECTION 3.01. PERMITTED USES B. Agriculture, provided that on parcels of less than eight acres, there shall be no raising of livestock, fowl or other animals;

Taylor Sec. 14.09. – Keeping of animals. (a) Domestic animals, dogs, cats, birds and nonbreeding rabbits are limited to a total of three animals age four months or older per household. (b) Unless otherwise provided in this ordinance, no building or land in any district shall keep, raise, procreate or otherwise allow on the premises any wild or exotic animal, *fowl*, farm animal or livestock. (c) Excluded from this regulation are facilities owned and operated by the city and fully accredited academic institutions. All are subject to the health and sanitation provisions of the City of Taylor and shall not become a nuisance. (Ord. No. 09-434, § 14.09, 1-20-2009)

Utica Sec. 2-5-56 Fowl—Prohibited. [Ord. No. 107, 9-2-2009; amended 2-16-2011 by Ord. No. 30] **(a)** No person shall have, or keep, or offer to sell any fowl within the City of Utica. “Fowl” includes any live chickens, geese, ducks, pigeons, or doves. **(b)** Any permits previously issued shall be grandfathered until such time as the fowl are deceased and at that time said permits shall expire and no new permits shall be granted.

Posted on **September 8, 2016** by **Laura Mikulski** ferndalechickens.com

Animal Permit

Created:
3/25/2021, User:
VieiraF

Permit Number	Status	Address Display String	Date Issued	Date Expires	Work Description	Stipulations
PA2012-0001	FINALED	2223 TUCKER	03/22/2012	10/28/2017	7 CHICKENS, COOP, FENCED PEN REAR YARD	
PA2012-0002	ISSUED	6478 LIVERNOIS	04/05/2012	10/05/2022	UP TO 12 CHICKENS WITH CHICKEN COOP. NO ROOSTERS. EXPIRES 10/05/2022 NOTE ORIGINAL PERMIT EXPIRATION INCORRECTLY ENTERED. 5 YEAR RENEWAL BASED ON 10/5/2017 EXPIRATION OF ORIGINAL PERMIT. Fence enclosure added 2020. Ok PE	OBTAIN BUILDING PERMIT FOR CHICKEN COOP IF REQUIRED BY INSPECTOR
PA2012-0003	FINALED	712 VANDERPOOL	05/02/2012	10/30/2017	5 chickens 2 turkeys coop & fence	Obtain building permit for coop if required by field inspector.
PA2012-0004	FINALED	793 HARTLAND	09/27/2012	04/25/2018	15 CHICKENS ALL HENS. NO ROOSTER	RESTRAINING FENCE AROUND HEN HOUSE REQUIRED.
PA2013-0002	EXPIRED	4751 BEACH	05/08/2013	11/04/2018	UP TO 3 COWS, 25 CHICKENS, 2 PYGM GOATS. SEE PERMIT FOR APPROVAL CONDITIONS	SUBJECT TO FIELD INSPECTION BY HOUSING & ZONING INSPECTOR
PA2013-0003	FINALED	4867 VALLEY VISTA	05/24/2013	05/24/2023	20 HOMING PIGEONS IN EXISTING ACCESSORY BUILDING	OBTAIN FINAL HOUSING & ZONING INSPECTION UPON COMPLETION OF WORK AFTER ANIMALS ARE ON
PA2013-0004	FINALED	1425 W SOUTH BOULEVARD	05/08/2015	11/04/2015	*REVISED*- UP TO 10 CHICKENS AND TO 2 RAMS. SUBJECT TO HOUSING & ZONING INSPECTION.	
PA2014-0001	FINALED	5760 CLIFFSIDE	02/07/2014	08/10/2016	AMEND ANIMAL LICENSE 2010-0005 PER ANIMAL CONTROL APPEALS BOARD 1-22-2014.	3 CHICKENS, EXPIRES SEPTEMBER 17, 2015
PA2014-0002	FINALED	785 TRINWAY	03/12/2014	03/12/2019	3 HONEYBEE HIVES AS DESCRIBED IN APPLICATION DOCUMENTS.	
PA2014-0003	FINALED	5732 ADAMS	04/01/2014	09/28/2019	10 CHICKENS, NO ROOSTER	OBTAIN FINAL INSPECTION UPON COMPLETION OF WORK
PA2014-0004	FINALED	659 CRESTON	03/25/2010	11/23/2015	21 CHICKENS	
PA2014-0005	FINALED	1641 E WATTLES	11/07/2014	11/06/2019	10 CHICKENS AND APPURTENANT STRUCTURES. ACAB 11-5-2014. FREE ROAMING ALLOWED.	
PA2015-0001	FINALED	1265 BOYD	02/10/2015	01/28/2020	2 CHICKENS AND COOP. ACAB WAIVER GRANTED 1-28-2015. EXPIRES 1-28-2020.	OBTAIN FINAL INSPECTION UPON COMPLETION OF WORK.
PA2016-0001	FINALED	2899 BRETBY	01/04/2016	01/04/2021	BACKYARD COOP 6 HENS, NO ROOSTERS.	OBTAIN FINAL INSPECTION UPON COMPLETION OF WORK
PA2016-0002	FINALED	6110 NILES	05/13/2016	05/30/2021	1 CHICKEN, 1 GOOSE, 1 RABBIT, SMALL BEEHIVE. SEE NOTES ON PERMIT DOCUMENTS Revised 3/14/2018 6 chickens, 4 ducks, 1 beehive.	OBTAIN FINAL INSPECTION UPON COMPLETION OF STRUCTURES/FENCE Permit modifications approved 3/14/2018
PA2016-0004	ISSUED	2320 W SQUARE LAKE	10/05/2016	10/03/2021	DUCKS & CHICKENS IN SHED AND SURROUNDING PEN. NO MORE THAN 12 ANIMALS TOTAL	SUBJECT TO SITE INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS
PA2017-0001	ISSUED	3245 TALBOT	03/01/2017	03/01/2022	UP TO 10 CHICKENS AND/OR DUCKS. APPROVAL FOR NEW COOP AND ROTATING PADDOCKS	DOES NOT INCLUDE USING EXISTING BARN
PA2017-0003	ISSUED	793 HARTLAND	10/13/2017	10/13/2022	15 CHICKENS NO ROOSTERS	
PA2018-0002	FINALED	5073 SOMERTON	01/26/2018	01/25/2023	5 CHICKENS, NO FREE ROAMING, ACAB WAIVER 1-24-2018. LOCATION #1 ON SITE PLAN. 3-22-2018: slight modification to chicken housing approved, see permit file.	SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS IN PERMIT DOCUMENTS. FORWARD COPY OF RECORDED EASEMENT TO TROY PLANNING PAUL EVANS.
PA2018-0003	EXPIRED	6685 COOLIDGE	03/23/2018	09/19/2018	OUTDOOR CAGE AREA FOR 5 OWLS	OBTAIN FINAL INSPECTION UPON COMPLETION OF WORK
PA2018-0005	FINALED	1300 BRADLEY	04/26/2018	04/26/2023	2 NIGERIAN DWARF GOATS. PLACE BARN AT LEAST 6 FEET AWAY FROM PROPERTY LINE.	KEEP ALL AREAS FREE OF ANIMAL FECES AT ALL TIMES. CALL FOR FINAL INSPECTION UPON COMPLETION
PA2018-0006	FINALED	178 FABIOUS	06/14/2018	06/14/2023	4 CHICKENS.	BUILDING PERMIT REQUIRED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ANIMAL ENCLOSURE STRUCTURE
PA2018-0007	ISSUED	97 FABIOUS	07/13/2018	07/09/2023	10 CHICKENS NO ROOSTERS COOP AND FENCED AREA REAR YARD	CONTACT BUILDING DEPARTMENT TO SEE IF BUILDING PERMIT REQUIRED. FINAL ANIMAL PERMIT
PA2018-0008	FINALED	189 FABIOUS	08/01/2018	01/28/2019	ONE ALASKAN CROSS FOX	PB2018-1433 ISSUED FOR ENCLOSURE
PA2018-0010	FINALED	1896 BEECH LANE	08/31/2018	08/23/2023	2 BEEHIVES. ACAB JULY 25, 2018. LOCATE HIVES IN EXTREME NORTHEAST CORNER OF PROPERTY.	SUBJECT TO FINAL INSPECTION AND REPRESENTATIONS MADE BEFORE THE ANIMAL CONTROL APPEALS
PA2018-0011	FINALED	6590 CROOKS	09/25/2018	09/25/2023	3 TURKEY 6 CHICKENS	SUBJECT TO FIELD INSPECTION.
PA2018-0012	ISSUED	4294 ROUGE CIRCLE	04/11/2019	09/18/2023	4 HENS AND COOP REAR YARD. REVISED OCT 22.	SUBJECT TO FINAL INSPECTION.
PA2018-0013	FINALED	718 ECKFORD	01/28/2019	01/28/2023	8 CHICKENS, COOP AND CHICKEN WIRE COVERED RUN. NOTHING MAY BE PLACED ON TOP OF CHICKEN WIRE COVER. NO ROOF STRUCTURES EXCEPT THOSE SHOWN IN PERMIT DOCUMENTS	NO ROOSTERS. CALL FOR FINAL INSPECTION AFTER WORK IS COMPLETED.
PA2019-0001	EXPIRED	528 E LONG LAKE	05/10/2019	11/06/2019	12 CHICKENS	
PA2019-0004	FINALED	380 E SOUTH BOULEVARD	08/09/2019	08/09/2024	1 MICRO COW AND ENCLOSURE	FINAL INSPECTION REQUIRED AFTER WORK COMPLETE AND ANIMAL ON SITE
PA2019-0005	ISSUED	550 E LOVELL	11/20/2019	10/02/2024	9 CHICKENS NO ROOSTERS	SUBJECT TO FINAL INSPECTION
PA2020-0001	FINALED	1641 E WATTLES	01/03/2020	01/02/2025	PERMIT RENEWAL: 10 CHICKENS AND APPURTENANT STRUCTURES. ACAB 11-5-2014. FREE ROAMING	PERMIT RENEWAL SITE INSPECTION REQUIRED WHEN PERMIT ISSUED
PA2020-0002	CANCELED	1265 BOYD	01/31/2020	01/30/2025	2 CHICKENS AND COOP. ACAB WAIVER GRANTED 1-28-2015.	SUBJECT TO FINAL INSPECTION REQUIRED
PA2020-0005	FINALED	3245 TALBOT	06/02/2020	12/01/2020	2 PIGS, 10 CHICKENS, NO ROOSTERS. FINAL INSPECTION REQUIRED UPON COMPLETION OF IMPROVEMENTS	
PA2020-0007	FINALED	718 ECKFORD	07/22/2020	07/05/2025	2 MINIATURE SILKIE FAINTING GOATS	Need visual specifications on pasture enclosure
PA2020-0010	FINALED	2223 TUCKER	09/14/2020	09/11/2025	10 CHICKENS	FINAL INSPECTION REQUIRED UPON COMPLETION OF ALL WORK. CALL INSPECTION LINE NUMBER ON
PA2020-0011	ISSUED	1250 W WATTLES	09/18/2020	09/11/2025	8 CHICKENS.	CALL INSPECTION LINE FOR FINAL INSPECTION
PA2021-0001	ISSUED	4890 BELHAVEN	02/16/2021	02/08/2026	5 DUCKS, ENCLOSURE, PEN	FINAL INSPECTION REQUIRED AFTER WORK COMPLETED AND ANIMALS BROUGHT IN
PA2021-0003	ISSUED	1875 EASTPORT	03/10/2021	03/10/2026	3 HENS. ACAB APPROVAL JANUARY 2021	CALL FOR FINAL INSPECTION AFTER STRUCTURES AND ANIMALS PRESENT.
TOTAL		39 PERMITS FROM 2012 TO 3-25-2021				

Date	Location	Request	Result
5/27/2009	N/A	3 hens	withdrawn, because applicant wanted rabbits as well
9/1/2010	1438 Leafgreen	49 pigeons	denied
11/30/2010	1135 Congress Drive	10-15 pigeons	denied
2/22/2012	1438 LEAFGREEN	29 pigeons	denied
9/26/2012	906 MINNESOTA	10 chickens	granted property was .72 acres with similar size parcels in area
11/28/2012	4282 SUGAR GROVE	8 chickens	denied
3/27/2013	4282 SUGAR GROVE	4 chickens	denied
1/22/2014	5760 CLIFFSIDE	3 chickens	granted because license incorrectly issued in 2010 without Board approval.
5/28/2014	2042 KIRKTON	6 chickens, 1 duck	denied
5/28/2014	3535 ANVIL	6 chickens	denied
7/23/2014	5781 WRIGHT	10 chickens	denied
9/23/2014	1265 BOYD	6 chickens	denied

11/5/2014	1641 E WATTLES	10 chickens	granted property .735 acres
1/28/2015	1265 BOYD	2 chickens	granted
3/25/2015	477 HURST	6 chickens	denied
12/2/2015	5760 CLIFFISDE	3 chickens	denied
3/23/2016	5105 SOMERTON	8 hens	denied
5/25/2016	6366 DONALDSON	4 ducks or chickens	denied
7/27/2016	1350 MINNESOTA	8 chickens and 4 ducks	denied
9/27/2017	2910 QUARTZ	14 pigeons	denied
11/29/2017	953 MUER	6 chickens, 2 guineas, and 2 pheasants	denied
1/24/2018	5073 SOMERTON	5 chickens	granted, based on easement with next door neighbor
5/23/2018	1411 FALCON	4 chickens	temporary grant, for applicant to be able to sell chickens at fair
5/23/2018	1353 MADISON	2 chickens	denied
7/25/2018	1353 MADISON	3 chickens	denied
7/25/2018	1896 BEECH LANE	2 honeybee hives	granted
5/22/2019	3273 Talbot	6 chickens	denied
3/24/2021	114 LYONS	2 chickens	denied

TOTALS	28 requests	1 withdrawn during meeting	7 granted, 1 of which was temporary, 1 was later denied
---------------	-------------	----------------------------	---