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ABSTRACT

FARM PARCEL CREATION: A COMPARISON OF POLICY AND AN EXAMINATION OF ADAPTATION AND PERSPECTIVES ON SMALL-ACREAGE Mennonite FARMS

Bryce E. Sharpe
University of Guelph, 2015

Advisor: Professor W.J. Caldwell

Mennonite families in Ontario, Canada are considering subdividing their farms into smaller parcels to create housing and employment options for a future generation of farmers who rely on horse-drawn vehicles for transportation. This thesis compares planning approaches and outcomes between Lancaster County, Pennsylvania and the Region of Waterloo, Ontario with a special emphasis on divergent minimum lot size standards in two Townships. The situation in Lancaster County confirms that Ontario’s basis for existing standards is generally correct from a planning perspective. It also examines adaptation and policy perspectives on small-acreage Mennonite farms across three Townships in Ontario. For certain production systems, existing standards appear to be serving their intended function. Existing standards may also lead to large parcels that are not necessarily required for certain forms of agriculture that are well suited to fewer acres and a unique cultural setting. This thesis concludes with a number of reflections and recommendations.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Efforts to protect farmland embrace the economic, environmental and social spheres of sustainability. Recognizing that there are important societal benefits to be derived from protecting farmland, planning authorities in North America have responded to the need to protect and conserve this land resource. The planning response to farmland loss has employed a diverse set of tools to protect and conserve farmland, ranging from rigid land use controls to incentive-based approaches. The former approach involves land division policy and regulation to control land use. Governing jurisdictions in both the U.S. and Canada have adopted minimum lot size standards that place limitations on the size of new farm parcels that can be created in agricultural areas. In Ontario, for example, a common standard of 100 acres means that a farm must be at least 200 acres in size before it can be subdivided or “split” into two independent farm parcels. It can be argued that these standards affect the farm community in a complex way – protecting farmland and the viability of agriculture on one hand while restraining individual needs and aspirations on the other. This study extends Bennett’s (2003) discussion about the moral conflict between the Anabaptist\(^1\) communities of Ontario, Canada and land-use policy and regulation for farm parcel creation. As large families within Ontario’s Anabaptist communities are being forced into a demographic pinch – a situation aggravated by a lack of availability and high price of farmland – there has been interest in subdividing farms into smaller parcels in an effort to

---

\(^1\) The literal meaning of “Anabaptist” (from Neo-Latin\(^{\text{anabaptista}}\)) is “One who baptizes over again, whether frequently as a point of ritual, or once as a due performance of what has been ineffectually performed previously” (“Anabaptist”, 2015). During the era of the Radical Reformation of 16\(^{\text{th}}\) Century Europe, Anabaptists rejected infant baptism in favor of adult baptism. Followers who had been baptized as infants chose to be re-baptized as adults (Kraybill, 1994). For the purposes of this research, it is used as a blanket term to describe the Amish and Mennonites - two contemporary groups with early Anabaptist roots.
create housing and employment for a future generation of farmers who rely on horse-drawn vehicles for transportation. Faced with land division policy that places limitations on the size of new farm parcels that can be created through the subdivision of existing farms, young families are taking extreme measures to bolster housing and employment opportunities, including ongoing migrations to northern Ontario and relocating out-of-province – a situation that threatens to impact culture and community (Dubinski 2014; Suen, 2014). Complicating matters are concerns in society about the feasibility and eventual non-farm use of small farm parcels. For example, it is argued that large parcels are comparably more efficient for livestock agriculture, row crop production and even tender fruit operations (Government of Ontario, 2008) and that rural estate lots can lead to the incremental loss of farmland (Jackson, 2004).²

This study involves two primary research components. First, the study involves a comparative case study of policy for farmland conservation between Lancaster County, Pennsylvania and Waterloo Region, Ontario with special attention paid to divergent minimum lot size standards. The two districts are similar in terms of agricultural activity, population, and distance from major metropolitan centers. Each district also has a high density of Anabaptist farms relative to other areas. Yet, they differ on account of respective approaches to farmland conservation. This can be illustrated by differing approaches to land division. Whereas the Region of Waterloo has adopted a very restrictive minimum lot size standard of 99 acres for new farm parcels, municipalities in Lancaster County have established standards as low as 10 acres (Region of Waterloo, 2009; Lancaster County, 2010). Second, the study involves an examination

² A preliminary and unpublished examination undertaken by the author and several of his student colleagues in April 2014 indicates that policy for farm parcel creation has become a point of friction between planners working with existing provincial policy and the Anabaptist farm community in southern Ontario (Zhou et al., 2014).
of small-acreage farmer strategies and policy perspectives by profiling Mennonite\(^3\) farmers across three rural municipalities in Ontario. These profiles serve as a snapshot in time, revealing individuals’ perspectives concerning existing policy for farm parcel creation and small-acreage strategies. Included with this introductory chapter is a review of the research purpose, a review of the research objectives, and a brief discussion of the relevance of the study to the wider practice of rural planning and development. Lastly, an outline of the study is presented. This outline describes the organization and subject matter of each chapter.

1.1 Research Purpose

The purpose of this research is to: (a) compare policy for farmland conservation with special attention paid to divergent minimum lot size standards in two jurisdictions – one Canadian and one American – each having a high density of Anabaptist farms; and (b) to document Mennonite perspectives regarding existing policy for farm parcel creation, as well as the adaptive strategies that Mennonite farmers are taking to adjust to, and even take advantage of, small parcel size. The aim is to contribute knowledge to an issue that has received very little attention in published literature.

1.2 Research Objectives

1.2.1 Comparative Case Study

The Region of Waterloo and Lancaster County are each characterized by unique planning systems that differ in terms of policy for farmland conservation. As substantial differences exist between planning systems, approaches and outcomes will likely differ. A cross-case comparison of planning approaches and outcomes in the Region of Waterloo and Lancaster County will

\(^{3}\) For the purposes of this research the term ‘Mennonite’ refers to any one of three Mennonite groups included in the study: David Martin Mennonites, Old Order Mennonites, and Orthodox Mennonites. Each of these groups is further described in Chapter 7.
provide for (a) the collection of detailed descriptive information about tools for farmland conservation with special attention paid to divergent minimum lot size standards in two Townships; (b) an examination in each landscape with special attention paid to how and why such tools and standards are effective (or ineffective) in promoting positive outcomes for agriculture and Anabaptist communities; and (c) the formation of recommendations for policymakers in Ontario. These elements form the first major objective of this research and have implications for land use decision-making.

1.2.2 Examination of Small-Acreage Adaptive Strategies and Policy Perspectives

The Region of Waterloo is home to a sizeable Mennonite farm community and represents an area where average farm size is small by comparison to other agricultural areas in Ontario (Region of Waterloo, 2011d). Therefore, the pattern of agricultural land use in the Region can be expected to correlate most directly with the unique cultural farming system of Mennonite communities characterized by Wandel and Mage (1998). An investigation into the lived experience of small-acreage Mennonite farmers will provide for (a) the collection of detailed empirical information about the adaptive strategies that these farmers are taking to adjust to, and even take advantage of small parcel size; (b) a detailed empirical evaluation of small parcel flexibility and viability within a unique cultural setting; and (c) an understanding of these farmers’ perspectives on policy for farm parcel creation. These elements form the second major objective of this research and have implications for land use decision-making.

---

4 Figures from the National Household Survey indicate that 9,740 individuals self identified as Mennonite in the geographic area of Kitchener - Cambridge - Waterloo in 2011 (Government of Canada, 2011a). This represents 1.9% of the Region of Waterloo’s total population of 507,096 (Region of Waterloo, 2011a).
1.3 Relevance of the Paper

This research will provide insight for planning strategies that will help address the needs of Anabaptist communities. The findings from the first research component – the comparative case study – may be used by planning authorities in Lancaster County to gain an improved understanding of what the County’s planning system looks like from an outsider’s point of view. They may then use this insight to make adjustments if they so choose. Similarly, planning authorities in the Region of Waterloo or elsewhere in Ontario may use the findings to understand what is happening elsewhere. The second research component – an examination of small-acreage farmer strategies and policy perspectives – is connected to policy development at the practical level. Published work of this nature, focused on policy for farm parcel creation and the Anabaptist farm community, is rare. Planning authorities may find the work useful to support and inform effective governance and decision-making.

1.4 Overview of the Paper

This study begins with a review of literature dealing with the topics of farmland conservation and policy for farm parcel creation. The review frames the study in terms of the subject matter that is important to these topics. Included in the literature review is an introduction to the history of the farmland conservation movement. It explores some of the main issues associated with farmland conservation and common planning responses to farmland loss with an intentional focus paid to Ontario and Pennsylvania. The chapter also explores the nuances of existing policy for farm parcel creation and resultant implications that are specific to the Anabaptist farm community.

Chapter 3 includes a review of the methodology used to complete this study. It includes the research questions that guided the study, as well as a review of methods. Chapter 4 is
structured to provide a description of each study area associated with the comparative case study. It introduces Lancaster County and Leacock Township, Pennsylvania, as well as the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Wellesley, Ontario. The majority of the chapter is dedicated to an overview of the policy and regulatory environments surrounding farmland conservation, farm parcel creation, and key directions that attempt to address the unique needs of the Anabaptist farm community in each of the study areas. This overview lends context to comparisons and addresses specifics in policy and lines of planning authority that allow conclusions to be drawn from the data.

Chapter 5 includes an examination of each landscape directed by the research questions that had been developed for the comparative case study. Attention is drawn to the effectiveness of tools for farmland conservation, the implications of divergent minimum lot size standards, and the use of agricultural easements for protecting small farm parcels. The researcher’s observations are discussed in this chapter. Chapter 6 is comprised of a summary of the comparative analysis with certain key observations, conclusions, and recommendations drawn from Chapter 5.

Chapter 7 is structured to provide a brief description of the study areas relevant to the examination of small-acreage farmer strategies and policy perspectives. It introduces the Township of Woolwich in the Region of Waterloo, Ontario, and the Township of Howick in the County of Huron, Ontario. It also introduces the Mennonite communities that are dealt with in the study. This is essential as it reveals the setting in which informants carry out their daily lives. The majority of the chapter is dedicated to an overview of the policy and regulatory environments concerning farm parcel creation and key directions that attempt to address the unique needs of the Mennonite farm community in each of the study areas.
Chapter 8 includes an analysis of data directed by the research questions that had been developed for the examination of small-acreage farmer strategies and policy perspectives. Data is presented in the form of summary tables and with a number of profiles that capture the ‘lived experience’ of informants. The researcher’s observations are discussed in this chapter. Chapter 9 is comprised of a summary of the analysis with certain key observations, conclusions and recommendations drawn from Chapter 8.

Chapter 10 serves as an epilogue, where the researcher reflects on the study as a whole. Along with a number of key reflections, beneficial practices aimed at planning for the Anabaptist farm community are formed.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

As large Anabaptist families in Ontario are being forced into a demographic pinch – a situation made worse by a lack of availability and the high price of farmland – there has been interest in subdividing farms into smaller parcels in an effort to support their children (Bennett, 2003). However, there is little provision for the creation of small farm parcels (e.g. ≤ 50 acres) in Ontario, albeit within those areas of the province where specialty crop areas exist. While planners struggle with the technical and political complexity of establishing policy for farm parcel creation (Pease, 1991), Anabaptist families contemplate drastic measures to bolster housing and employment, including ongoing migrations to northern Ontario and relocating out-of-province (Dubinski, 2014). Complicating matters are concerns about the feasibility and eventual non-farm use of small farm parcels. There is a need to fill strategic gaps in our understanding of this policy problem in order to support and inform effective decision-making.

This literature review deals with the topics of farmland conservation and policy for farm parcel creation. It sets the context for the study. The objectives are to: a) explore the history of farmland conservation in North America and the main issues that have surfaced over a period of more than forty years; b) review planning responses to farmland loss; and c) explore the nuances of existing policy for farm parcel creation and resulting implications specific to the Anabaptist farm community. These objectives will be met by exploring the available literature with a special focus paid to Ontario and Pennsylvania. The first goal is to elicit an awareness of the historical

5 For example, the OP for the County of Simcoe, Ontario prescribes a minimum lot size standard of 39.5 acres in specialty crop areas (e.g. the Holland Marsh Specialty Crop Area) where tender fruits, vegetables, greenhouse crops and crops from agriculturally developed organic soils are predominantly grown (County of Simcoe, 2013).
evolution of farmland conservation policy and the tools and practices that are connected with current approaches. This provides a solid foundation upon which to understand jurisdictional differences and the theoretical and practical applications of farmland conservation, which are conceptually important to this study. A second goal is to provide a solid foundation upon which to understand policy for farm parcel creation and its implications, both positive and negative.

2.2 Farmland Conservation: History, Issues and Responses

2.2.1 History and Issues

In North America, the issue of farmland loss has been a topic of discussion for over forty years. In one of the first studies to bring attention to the issue in Canada, Krueger (1959) documented the loss of 1,800 acres of farmland caused by urban sprawl in the Niagara Peninsula Grape and Tender Fruit Lands of Niagara Region, Ontario. It was not until the late 1960s and early 1970s that farmland conservation became a widespread public concern in North America. Prior to the 1960s, North America was generally considered the “breadbasket of the world” with an endless supply of farmland (Bunce, 1998, pg. 233). This proved to be a gross overestimation, as demonstrated by the momentous National Agricultural Lands Study (NALS), published in 1981 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Council on Environmental Quality, which found that the loss of farmland in the U.S. had increased from 1.1 million acres per year in the 1960s to 3.3 million acres per year in the 1970s (Alterman, 1997). The situation proved to be equally alarming north of the border. Citing figures stated in Bray (1984), Alterman (1997)
reports that the annual rate of farmland loss in Canada between 1966 and 1971 was 12,800 hectares (31,620 acres) of prime land.\(^7\)

These figures provoked a reaction of sharp public concern, causing a rise in attention given to the issue of farmland loss. In Ontario, the Province made an attempt to truly address the issue with two fundamental documents that contributed greatly to farmland conservation: the *Agricultural Code of Practice* (1976) and the *Foodland Guidelines* (1978). The former included a formula to calculate separation distances between farm infrastructure (e.g. livestock barns) and rural residences – the intent being to halt nuisance complaints stemming from farm odors (caused by increasingly intensive livestock operations). The *Foodland Guidelines* are generally considered to be the Province’s first binding provincial policy statement on planning for agriculture, which included policies to promote large contiguous tracts of farmland (Government of Ontario, 1978; Caldwell, 1995; Caldwell et al., 2007). Like Ontario and the rest of Canada, the response to farmland loss was rather laissez-faire in the U.S., occurring over a period of decades. In the American context, it was not until 1981 that the *National Agriculatural Lands Study* marked the beginning of federal intervention (Alterman, 1997).

The issue of farmland loss is often framed as a problem of urban sprawl along the edge of North America’s large cities. This area is known as the urban fringe (Immen, 2002; Ghosh, 2013). Indeed, urban sprawl is a major factor in the loss of farmland in North America. Bunce (1985) argued that farmland at the urban fringe (and arguably in rural environments too) is commonly understood as an investment commodity instead of a productive resource. This argument underscores an important paradox between competing land uses – a paradox that drives

\(^7\) Soil Classes 1 through 4 based on the *Canada Land Inventory (CLI) of Soil Capability for Agriculture* (Government of Canada, 1972).
the loss of farmland. With sharp speculative increases in the value of farmland at the urban fringe, combined with land use conflicts that result from non-farm development in this environment, farmers are tempted or sometimes even forced to sell-off their land.\textsuperscript{8} Pennsylvania’s Lancaster County, just 100 km (62 miles) west of Philadelphia, is no stranger to development priorities overshadowing agriculture. In the 1960s, Lancaster County was the fastest growing County in the Commonwealth. During that decade, over thirty new industries became established in the County and those industries (and their employees) required land for industrial development and housing (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004). This sparked a trend of accelerated urban sprawl and a rash of farmland conversion in the County that has continued for decades (D’Agostino and Frey, 2011). Perhaps nowhere else have the effects been felt more strongly than by the Amish farm community. Place (2003) gives an account of one Amish farmer’s experience of becoming surrounded by non-farm development on three sides, causing his farm to be of little value for agricultural use:

Only if he sells his land to developers will he realize sufficient income to purchase another farm. While the Amish have historically refused to sell their land for development, in the early 1990s several Amish farms [in Lancaster County] were sold for this purpose (pg. 201).

Like Lancaster County, farmland is being converted to urban use in Canada as well. The trend is especially alarming in Ontario, which contains the country’s largest supply of highest capability farmland (Simpson-Lewis et al., 1979). As of 2001, over 18% of Ontario’s Class 1 farmland had been converted for urban use (Hoffman, 2001). In consideration of these dynamics, near-urban counties and Regions have to be particularly vigilant when contemplating changes to land

\textsuperscript{8} Since 2008, the value of Canadian farmland has increased 12%. Where there are speculative pressures, the price-per-acre has increased by as much as 50% per year with prices reaching as high as $54,000 per acre on farmland slated for development across the Greater Toronto Area of Ontario (Rubin, 2013; Atkins, 2014).
division policy. It is argued that keeping farm parcels large and intact helps to decelerate development (Smith, 1998).

Urban sprawl is not the only driver of farmland loss. In more rural areas, non-farm development has led to both direct and indirect losses of farmland. Indirect losses occur when the rights and capacities of farmers are put in jeopardy by non-farm uses, such as when residential neighbours file unwarranted nuisance complaints about farm odors and noise, or when non-farmers construct homes on vacant and near-farm residential building lots that have been severed (subdivided) (Caldwell, 2001; Caldwell et al. 2011). Caldwell (1995) highlights the impact of severance approvals in Ontario by citing a study by the Province that found the rate of lot creation in just one County to be a single new lot for every 1,013 acres of land. While farmers seeking approval for agricultural severances may have sparked some of this activity, residential development was to blame. In Pennsylvania, a journalist’s account of one farmer’s estimate of new residential lots nearby his farm in Lancaster County reveals how rural residential development can incrementally fragment an agricultural landscape over time: “Within a three-mile [5 km] radius of his home farm, Garber counted 336 houses built during the previous 25 years” (Brubaker, 2010). It is evident that any change to land division policy that could possibly make farmland and a farmer more susceptible to non-farm development needs to be contemplated with extreme diligence.

2.2.2 Planning Responses to Farmland Loss: Tools and Practices

Daniels and Bowers (1997) suggest that farmland conservation programs are often shaped by the “politics of land protection” including the level of political will (or lack thereof) within a given jurisdiction (pg. 26). In the U.S., programs are most often comprised of a suite of tools that aim to conserve farmland through economic incentives or disincentives versus rigorous
land use controls alone (Alterman, 1997). The purchase-of-development-rights (PDR) is an example of an incentive strategy, suggested by some to be the best way to preserve farmland in an American context (Nelson, 1990). In the U.S., landowners essentially own a “bundle of rights” that materialize with land when it is purchased (Daniels and Bowers, 1997, pg. 45). If farmers are willing to voluntarily sell or donate those rights to a state or local government, they relinquish their right to develop the land but retain the remainder of rights (Daniels and Bowers, 1997). The voluntary nature of PDR programs is seen as a major advantage (Daubenmire and Blaine, 1998). After development rights have been purchased, an agricultural easement is placed on the land through a deed of easement, which limits the use of the land to farming – usually forever – as the deed remains with the property even if it is sold or gifted (Daniels and Bowers, 1997). The permanent protection of farmland afforded through a PDR program is seen as another major advantage (Daubenmire and Blaine, 1998). In some jurisdictions, private land trusts operate under the same principles (Daniels and Bowers, 1997). The cost associated with PDR programs is seen as the major disadvantage. As of 2014, $883,000,000 of Commonwealth funds had been spent over 26 years in Pennsylvania to purchase development rights to 484,272 protected acres (American Farmland Trust, 2014). A quick calculation reveals that this works out to a cost of $1,823 per acre. The fact that farmland is paid for from public coffers can stifle taxpayer support for PDR programs (Daubenmire and Blaine, 1998; Lynch and Musser, 2001).

Agricultural easements exist in Canada, but their application is comparatively less common. The prevalence of PDR programs in the U.S. by comparison with Canada highlights a fundamental difference in the way that land use is regulated between the two countries – a

---

9 For example, the Lancaster County Agricultural Preserve Board (AgBoard) has been set up by Lancaster County to administer a PDR program.
10 For example, in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania – the Lancaster Farmland Trust (LFT)
phenomenon that can be traced back to property rights. In the U.S., property rights are constitutionally protected. Central to this notion is the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. As part of the Bill of Rights, the Fifth Amendment contains an exhaustive list of rights and states: “private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation” (U.S Const. Amend. V). Put differently, the Fifth Amendment prohibits governments from “physically taking” private property without just compensation (Cosner, 2001, pg. 1). Over time, the notion of “regulatory excess” has gained relevance in U.S law, beginning in 1922 with a landmark U.S Supreme Court decision that gave rise to the concept of a “regulatory taking” (Cosner, 2001, pg. 1, emphasis added). Citing Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon (1922), Cosner (2001) discloses the Court’s ruling: “the general rule at least is that, while property may be regulated to a certain extent, if regulation goes too far, it will be recognized as a taking” (pg. 1). Consequently, disputes often arise when a government regulation places limits on the use of property in the U.S. (Daniels and Bowers, 1997). Importantly, the voluntary nature of certain strategies, such as PDR programs, are sometimes viewed by local and state governments as more politically acceptable approaches to farmland conservation by comparison to regulatory zoning (Lynch and Duke, 2007). In Canada, the legal situation is quite opposite. Subsection 92 (13) of the Canadian Constitution Act, 1867 grants to each province the legislative authority over “property and civil rights” (s. 92). According to Augustine (1986), this gives each province “clear legislative authority to legislate on any matters concerning property, including expropriation” (pg. 56). Consequently, land use controls receive a greater degree of acceptance in Canada, but are still contested.11

11 For example, one lobby group, the Ontario Landowners Association, is working to expand property rights in the province with a goal to thwart government intervention over land use (The Canadian Press, 2011).
Different jurisdictions across North America employ numerous forms of land use controls to conserve farmland. At the local level, policy directions for farmland conservation are typically found in official plans (OPs) or in the case of the U.S., comprehensive plans (CPs). The Government of Ontario’s latest policy statement – the *Provincial Policy Statement* – provides policy direction and guidance to municipalities and other planning authorities on matters related to land use planning that are of provincial interest, including farmland (Government of Ontario, 2014). A fundamental requirement of Ontario’s *Planning Act* – the primary piece of planning legislation in the province – is that any OP adopted by the council of a municipality shall be consistent with the *Provincial Policy Statement.* This differs substantially from the American situation. As Pennsylvania is a *home rule* state, municipalities, as opposed to state or county agencies, retain decision-making authority over land use decisions through local CPs and zoning ordinances (ZOIs). Under home rule, countywide (or Regional) planning and zoning can only be undertaken if counties and municipalities agree to work with one another, but municipalities are not obligated to cooperate (Cowan, 2000; D’Agostino and Frey, 2011). This stands in stark contrast to Ontario’s coordinated and comprehensive approach to land use planning.

In North America, land use controls are normally enabled through state or provincial (and territorial) legislation. For example, municipalities in Ontario are delegated authority by the Province to pass zoning by-laws (ZBLs) that restrict the use of land through Section 34 (1) of the *Planning Act.* In Ontario, the use of zoning as a regulatory tool is common and has become increasingly effective against the conversion of agricultural land (Caldwell et al., 2011). Restrictive zoning is less common in the U.S. Place (2003) identified two momentous court

---

12 In the U.S., legislation and policy for farmland conservation is also written at the federal level – the *Federal Farmland Protection Policy Act* requires all federal projects resulting in the conversion of agricultural land to be reviewed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
decisions that supported the use of agricultural zoning in Pennsylvania. In the first case, *Boundary Drive Associates v. Shrewsbury Township Board of Supervisors* (1985), the Pennsylvania Supreme Court upheld *sliding scale* zoning – a formula that permits an increased number of lots to be subdivided from a *parent* tract as the size of the parent tract increases. An apparent advantage of this approach according to one Michigan State municipality is that it “allows communities to more effectively avoid the claim that land has been ‘taken’ without compensation” (Hillsdale County, n.d.). Place (2003) cites a second ruling by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in *Codorus Township v. Rogers* (1985), which upheld the use of agricultural zoning as restrictive as one lot per 50 acres. While Ontario and local municipalities have implemented firm policies and zoning with respect to lot creation across its agricultural landscapes, zoning in the U.S., as already discussed, must not result in a taking of private property (Daniels and Bowers, 1997).

One policy-led approach that emerged in North America during the early 2000s is what has been characterized as “*smart growth*” (Davidson, 2007, pg. 195, emphasis added). In 2002, the Government of Ontario established five smart growth panels across the province to help plan for a population increase in urban areas that is expected over the next 25-30 years (Government of Ontario, 2003; Government of Ontario, 2013a). Since then, the Province has implemented several policy-led smart growth initiatives, including the *Greenbelt Plan* (2005) and the *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe* (2013c). These initiatives encourage the protection of farmland and aim to manage urban growth through intensification, among other means (Caldwell et al., 2012).

Concurrently, smart growth has gained popularity in the U.S. Pennsylvania for example, adopted growth management legislation in 2000 (D’Agostino and Frey, 2011). Shortly after
adopting this legislation, Lancaster County adopted *Envision Lancaster County*, a series of eight documents that comprise the County’s CP (LCPC, n.d.). *Balance* is the growth management element of *Envision* (LCPC, 2006a). It supports urban growth areas and contains a rural strategy to both protect farmland and elevate the viability of agriculture (D’Agostino and Frey, 2011). Unlike Ontario, where municipalities must conform with provincial policy statements, and in some cases provincial land use plans (e.g. the *Greenbelt Plan*), there is no requirement for Lancaster County’s 60 municipalities to conform to *Envision* (D’Agostino and Frey, 2011; LCPC, n.d.). As of 2011, only 44 of the County’s 60 municipalities were involved in comprehensive planning (D’Agostino and Frey, 2011). This lack of buy-in speaks to the complications presented by home rule – complications that must create a level of frustration for those interested in addressing farmland conversion or other important land use issues, comprehensively, within and across political boundaries.

### 2.3 Policy for Farm Parcel Creation and the Anabaptist Farm Community

#### 2.3.1 The Anabaptist Farm Community: A Brief Overview

The Amish and Mennonites are but two of several contemporary groups whose roots can be traced to the Radical Reformation of 16th Century Europe, a dispute over religious beliefs that resulted in the formation of several groups known as “radical reformers” (Ogilvie, 1992, pg. 239). In line with the reformation-era movement, Anabaptist groups like the Amish and Mennonites have maintained a degree of separation from the world, forming alternate societies modeled after early Christian communities (Ogilvie, 1992).

After years of poor treatment as a religious minority in Europe, Anabaptist groups capitalized on opportunities to immigrate to British colonies, particularly Pennsylvania, where there was more promise of religious freedom (Donnermeyer, Anderson and Cooksey, 2012).
They began to arrive in Upper Canada from Pennsylvania following the American Revolution. In the Region of Waterloo, settlement began with the arrival of Mennonites from Pennsylvania around 1800 (Fretz, 1989). Aside from religious freedom, they were also interested in obtaining sensibly priced or altogether free land (Shipley, Kovacs and Fitzpatrick, 2010). According to their unique religious philosophy, Anabaptist groups adhere to sets of beliefs and patterns of behaviour that range from very traditional attitudes and values to those that are less cautious about change and innovation (Shipley, Kovacs and Fitzpatrick, 2010). Today, the Region of Waterloo, Ontario, accounts for one of the most prevalent Mennonite communities in Canada (Shipley, Kovacs and Fitzpatrick, 2010). The Mennonite culture is a highly visible part of the Region – a culture characterized by plain clothing, non-motorized transport, and a particular approach to farming (Shipley, Kovacs and Fitzpatrick, 2010).

An agrarian lifestyle is central to Anabaptist ethnicity and culture (Stinner, Paoletti and Stinner, 1989). A preference for farming as a way of life manifests itself through religion. In this regard, the preparation of soil for the production of crops is in keeping with the Anabaptist interpretation of the bible (Hostetler, 1980). Old Order Mennonites and the Amish also follow strict socio-religious rules called the Ordnung, which create certain boundaries between the church membership and the outside world (Cronk, 1989). Farming is supported as a desirable occupation according to these rules (Stinner, Paoletti and Stinner, 1989).

Wandel and Mage (1998) consideration of three Anabaptist groups in the Region of Waterloo demonstrates the variety of distinctions that exist between groups: the Old Order Mennonites who rely on horse and buggy for transportation; “Black Bumper” Mennonites who, like the Old Orders, lead a conservative lifestyle, but have accepted modern conveniences and the use of motorized vehicles; and Modern Mennonites, whom they treated as members of mainstream society for the purposes of their research (pg. 2).
2.3.2 Setting the Context: Structural Changes in Agriculture and the Anabaptist Farm Community

Two divergent models of agricultural production are increasingly at odds in North America. Nowhere is the division between small-scale and industrial agricultural production more obvious than on North America’s Mennonite and Amish farms, where the everyday use of horses for transportation and often for fieldwork, serves as a visible reminder of the dissimilarity between the two models of agricultural production – a distinction that helps to connect us with the past. In his appraisal of the impact of Ontario’s land use planning system on the Old Order Amish of Perth County, Bennett (2003, pg. 157) turned to Pirages and Ehrlich’s (1974) concept of a “dominant social paradigm” to explain North American society’s worldview of agriculture - a worldview that dominates planning and stands in sharp contrast to the worldview of Ontario’s Old Order Amish, he argued. According to Bennett (2003), the dominant social paradigm of agriculture in North America is a paradigm characterized by:

(a) bigger-is-better growth orientation, (b) survival-of-the-fittest social and corporate Darwin-ism, (c) strong faith in science and technology, (d) a laissaz-faire economy, (e) globalization of resources and markets, (f) strong faith in the military - industrial alliance, and (g) control over nature. In that context, modern agriculture is considered to be an industrial process (pg. 158).

Indeed, a structural shift to a more industrialized style of agriculture has been well documented (see Goldschmidt, 1947; Lowe et al., 1993; Ibery and Bowler, 1998; Horrigan, Lawrence, and Walker, 2002, to name a few) and will not be detailed here. In short, traditional farms have been replaced by systems of production characterized by mechanized equipment and a range of procured inputs (Smithers and Johnson, 2004). It has been argued this shift has been met by a coordinated planning response requiring large farm parcels to support conventional norms (Bennett, 2003).
While North America’s farming systems are usually characterized according to their agricultural output, Wandel and Mage (1998) characterize Anabaptist agriculture as a “*cultural farming system*”, where the main factors distinguishing it from other farming systems in comparable locations are operator ethnicity and religion (pg. 1, emphasis added). Anabaptist farming systems are characterized by non-cash payments received for goods and services or what Wandel and Mage (1998) refer to as an “*income in-kind*” component (pg. 1, emphasis added). Anabaptist farms are generally accepted as more diversified than farms operated by mainstream farmers in comparable environments; are generally based on less capital-intensive methods of production because of a comparatively reduced dependence on technology; are generally more environmentally friendly because fewer inputs are derived from off the farm\(^\text{14}\); and they often result in a stable family-run farm business, which in turn, can benefit rural communities (Wandel and Mage, 1998).\(^\text{15}\) Bennett (2003) argues that Ontario’s land use planning system fails to appropriately consider the unique cultural requirements that stem from these differences. Take for example, the utilization of horsepower for daily fieldwork and/or transportation – choices that are a fundamental part of the Anabaptist belief system and an important symbol of their bond with culture. The consequences have been a demand for traditionally-sized 100-acre farms and fewer available options for housing and employment among those Anabaptist farmers who utilize horses for transportation and/or fieldwork. A combination of population pressure, lack of farmland availability, and inflated land prices in Lancaster County have effectively forced the County’s Amish to subdivide farms in an effort to keep successive generations on the farm – a

\(^{14}\) There are contradictions and anomalies in Anabaptist communities, just as there is in secular society. For example, Bhanoo (2010) cites a study undertaken by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, of 23 Anabaptist farms in Lancaster County; 17 farms were found to be managing manure inadequately leading to environmental concerns.

\(^{15}\) In an effort to re-invigorate the rural economy, the Township of Black River-Matheson in Northeastern Ontario has been working to encourage and invite Anabaptist farmers to begin farming in the Township. As of February 2014, 17 Mennonite families had purchased land in the Township (Milinkovich, 2014).
situation described by Kraybill and Nolt (2004) as a “crisis of major proportions” (pg. 34). As large Anabaptist families in Ontario are also being forced into a demographic pinch – a situation made worse by a lack of availability and high value of farmland – there has been interest in subdividing farms into smaller parcels in an effort to support their children (Bennett, 2003). Faced with strict zoning that places limitations on the size of new farm parcels that can be created through the subdivision of existing farms, Amish families in Perth County, as one example, are considering relocating out-of-province – a move that would surely impact the unique cultural arena in the municipalities where these farmers have resided for decades (Dubinski, 2014). Herein lies an exceptional planning problem that has caught the attention of the researcher, and which has received very little attention in published literature.

2.3.3 Minimum Lot Size Standards: Issues and Constraints

In North America, minimum lot size standards\textsuperscript{16} are a popular land use control (Pease, 1991). In the context of this research, a minimum lot size standard is a provision that places a restriction on the size of new parcels created through what are known colloquially as farm splits. A farm split can be defined as a severance that divides an existing farm parcel into two or more independent farm parcels (Government of Ontario, 2008). A standard of 100 acres, which is commonplace in Ontario, would mean that a farm parcel would need to be at least 200 acres in size before it could be split into two independent 100-acre parcels. A rationale behind this approach is to ensure flexibility for future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations that might be required as the economy or markets change (Government of Ontario, 2008; Government of Ontario, 2014).

\textsuperscript{16} More commonly referred to as ‘minimum farm size requirements’ in the U.S.
Place (2003) argues that agricultural zoning affects Anabaptist farm families in a complex way. While minimum lot size standards keep farms large and intact, satisfying the goals of farmland conservation, they preclude the subdivision of farms so that the next generation of Anabaptist families might continue to farm (Place, 2003; Bennett, 2003). Faced with a mounting demographic pinch, high land prices and inflexible land use restrictions that precluded both a second permanent residence on a farm and the subdivision of a 100-acre farm, Bennett (2003) describes the concern among Ontario’s Old Order Amish in Perth County as being about where their children would live and practice their religious beliefs. Regarding the subdivision of farms, the County’s Director of Planning made his belief openly known that a 50-acre farm, by its very nature, could not meet provincial flexibility criteria for farm parcel creation (Bennett, 2003). Bennett (2003) argues that the flexibility rationale used in land use planning reflects the dominant social paradigm of agriculture – a paradigm that has been discussed at length in ss. 2.3.2, and which does not capture the unique cultural requirements of Ontario’s Old Order Amish, he argues. For all intents and purposes, Bennett’s (2003) argument applies equally well to other Anabaptist communities who rely on horses for transportation and/or fieldwork.

A review of Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) decisions from 2001 to the present reveals that the OMB has heard appeals stemming from disputes over minimum lot size standards for farm parcel creation over the past 14 years. Two cases were chosen for further study. In the first case, the Municipality of Bayham in Elgin County passed a zoning ZBL that specified a minimum lot size of 50 acres, whereas the Province appealed the ZBL, indicating that 99 acres was more appropriate (Jackson, 2004). The following evidence, was provided by the Province and is cited in point form here:

17 The Ontario Municipal Board is a quasi-judicial body that hears appeals regarding a range of land use planning matters, including ZBLs and consents (Government of Ontario, 2013b).
• *The Provincial Policy Statement* requires consideration of appropriate common standards that will provide flexibility, to ensure that agricultural operations have the ability to compete in a changing economy while avoiding land use conflicts;
• Larger farm operations can better compete in new markets with new technologies;
• [A 50-acre minimum lot size] increases the potential for non-farm severances, and provide[s] more potential for minimum distance calculations under the Minimum Distance formulae of the Province that may impede agricultural expansion, increase incompatibility and lead to complaints as to farm practices;\(^{18}\)
• Larger farms…permit the flexibility to meet mandated nutrient management requirements;
• Larger farms…allow operational costs and safety considerations to be handled better and prevent the creeping incrementalism leading to the loss of prime agricultural land\(^{19}\); and
• Smaller sized farms can…drive-up the price of farmland, since they may become available for non-agricultural uses (Jackson, 2004, pg. 3).

In light of ongoing losses of farmland and the importance of agriculture, economically or otherwise, it is evident that these arguments have significant weight.\(^{20}\) As discussed at length in s. 2.1, farmland is a finite resource that is sensitive to imposed change. Without *extreme* caution, setting more relaxed minimum lot size standards could have significant negative implications. One possibility is that small-acreage farm parcels, once created, could be farmed and later sold to non-farmers for non-agricultural use. The extent of this change would occur over a wide geographic area, thus compounding any number of issues that might arise including increases in the cost of farmland as mentioned by Jackson (2004).

In the case described above, an expert witness indicated that the farm strategies practiced by Anabaptist farmers are amenable to smaller farms – this was emphasized in defense of the Municipality’s position (Jackson, 2004). This view came to bear in a second case involving an

---

\(^{18}\) See *Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) Formulae Implementation Guidelines* (Government of Ontario, 2006).

\(^{19}\) Defined in Ontario as “specialty crop areas and/or Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2, and 3 lands” (Government of Ontario, 2014b, pg. 46, *emphasis in original*).

\(^{20}\) For example, the creation of smaller farms in Lancaster County, PA has resulted in larger concentrations of livestock on less acreage, a situation that has lead to manure management issues in some instances (Place, 2003).
An Amish couple in the City of Kawartha Lakes, Ontario (Denhez, 2004). The couple applied to the City to construct a second farmhouse near an existing barn on their farm. Initially, the couple applied to sever their 198-acre farm into two parcels: a 98-acre parcel and a 100-acre parcel. The application was denied, as it would have contravened the City’s ZBL, which specified a minimum lot size standard of 200 acres for an agricultural severance. In this case, the Amish farmer represented himself and the Board summarized his defense:

Although Mr. Stoll acknowledged that 200 acres would not be considered large for tractor-based farming, he testified that it was larger than what their style of agriculture could accommodate in a single farming operation. This was not contradicted…. The applicants’ method of farming was predicated on smaller lots; indeed, he said, it could sustain a higher local agricultural productivity – and population – than other methods (Denhez, 2004, pg. 2-4).

Here, the Amish farmer emphasizes an attribute of his cultural farming system that sets it apart from other farming systems in comparable environments. What is especially important about this case is that the Board cited an earlier case, Stoltzfus v. Elgin County (1978), involving an Amish application to sever lands into parcels that were smaller than the minimum standard established by Elgin County. Because of the significance of the Board’s ruling in that case, it is cited here in full:

The Amish are in the main, agricultural people and use horses and horsedrawn equipment. As a result, relatively small-acreages are viable farm units because they are usually very intensively cultivated…After carefully examining the evidence, the Board is satisfied that the agricultural land inventory in [the] County would not be depleted by the granting of the proposed severance and so the Official Plan would not be offended (as cited in Denhez, 2004, pg 4).

Acknowledging the earlier 1978 ruling, the Board, in reference to the Stoll’s appeal, stated:

An examination of the wording makes it clear that the pivotal point was not the applicants’ religious beliefs, which are completely irrelevant to this matter, but rather their practice of “intensive cultivation” (as it was called in [the Stoltzfus v. Elgin County case] – exactly the same concept as what Mr. Stoll calls “intensive farming”). Its distinctive characteristics, beginning with the use of horses, is uncontradicted…Although it is manifestly inaccurate to suggest that Amish or Mennonite farmers are capable of
maintaining viable farms regardless of how small (and that position has not been accepted by this Board), the Stoltzfus case stands for the proposition that it is equally unsafe to rely on purely mathematical formulas derived for a completely different agricultural process. Such matters must be weighed on their respective merits (Denhez, 2004, pg. 5).

Here, further attributes of a cultural farming system are revealed. As well, the Board underscores the difficulty of formulating appropriate minimum lot size standards. It is important to emphasize that setting minimum lot size standards is not an exact science (Pease, 1991). Smith (1998) speaks to the difficulty involved in establishing these standards and underscores the debate surrounding the approach:

Until a better method is implemented to deal with the subdivision of agricultural land, it can be assumed that zoning bylaws will continue to prescribe minimum lot size provisions. Trying to determine a minimum lot size for agriculture is not easy. Indeed it can be argued that the very concept of applying minimum lot size provisions to agricultural areas is an ill-suited regulatory technique. As a rule, minimum lot size provisions should be set relatively high to ensure the maintenance of parcels that promote, rather than deter, agricultural use and to discourage expectations of future subdivision (pg. 56).

Here, Smith (1998) captures the technical and political complexity that surrounds minimum lot size standards. His precautionary planning advice, it may be argued, is akin to a one-size-fits-all intervention.

In less formal settings where agricultural severances are debated, Anabaptist farm strategies are often thrown into the fray. The following example from Ontario is a case in point. In a meeting between a delegation from the Township of Dawn-Euphemia and Lambton County’s Agricultural Advisory Council, the delegation informed the Council that, “there are many Mennonite farmers [in Dawn-Euphemia] that operate a viable farm operation on farm parcels that are 50 acres or less” (County of Lambton Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2013, pg. 3). Such claims are very often championed without any tangible evidence of what is actually happening on these farms - an area that is worthy of empirical study. The minutes from this
meeting also reflect the many value-laden judgments of various actors involved – including what constitutes a viable farm. One member of the Council – a commodity farmer – opined, “50 acre farm parcels are for hobby farmers” (pg. 5). Conversely, Britten et al. (2009) argues that, “Smaller farms can often be equally, if not more, flexible as they have fewer capital investments in structures and farming technologies which can translate into more nimble changes in crop production and diversification based on changing economic conditions” (pg. 8). This stands to contradict the position of the Province. Indeed, this diversity of opinions and possibilities adds to the complexity of the policy problem. There is growing recognition that small-acreage Anabaptist farms can be viable, with appropriate management, and when they are considered within the cultural context in which they exist. In a study of an Amish-owned and operated organic produce cooperative in Ohio, Mariola and McConnell (2013) reported that one Amish farmer netted $7,000 per acre on his 10-acre farm – an impressive return on investment by comparison to the low (and sometimes negative) net returns of commodity crop producers in the U.S. In Lancaster County, where many Amish farms cannot be subdivided further, farmers have also developed farm-based businesses to supplement their farm income and remain economically viable (Place, 2003).

The researcher believes that policy for farm parcel creation is an example of a wicked problem, a term coined in 1973 by H.W.J. Rittel and M.M. Webber, two urban planners at the University of California, Berkley. Briggs’s (2007) review of wicked problems suggests that this is indeed the case. First, wicked problems are difficult to define (Briggs, 2007). Based on a review of the literature, it is possible that a Mennonite farmer is likely to define the problem differently than, say, a tractor-based farmer in secular society who farms many hundreds of acres on a large scale. Both parties are concerned about their future in farming, but approach the policy
problem from different perspectives stemming from ethnicity, among other factors. No one version of the policy problem is clearly right or wrong (Briggs, 2007). Second, wicked problems often involve conflicting goals and objectives that add to the difficulty of problem definition (Briggs, 2007). For example, farmland conservation is a primary goal behind policy for farm parcel creation. However, it is apparent that achieving this goal, through restrictive minimum lot size standards, can affect the needs and aspirations of individuals and communities. Third, wicked problems can often lead to unintended consequences (Briggs, 2007). It is apparent that existing standards are having unintended consequences within a culture whose values are based on farming.

2.4 Policy for Farm Parcel Creation and the Anabaptist Farm Community

This literature review began with an examination of the history of farmland conservation in North America, including the main issues that have surfaced over a period of more than 40 years. This was accompanied by a review of planning responses to farmland loss. This literature review also explored policy for farm parcel creation with a particular focus on the Anabaptist farm community. Land division policy, which includes the use minimum lot size standards, is an important farmland conservation tool in both Canada and the U.S. Existing standards in Ontario were explored against a backdrop of structural changes in agriculture as well as Anabaptist ethnicity. In this context, it is apparent that policy for farm parcel creation in Ontario has become a point of friction. Research focused on this issue and the Anabaptist farm community is rare. The issue itself is an ongoing discussion at a municipal level in Ontario as discussed in Zhou et al. (2014). It is apparent that adopting more relaxed minimum lot size standards in Ontario could easily affect people’s daily lives, with economic, social, and environmental implications. This community’s interest in small farm parcels raises challenging questions. For example, how do the
perceived risks of creating more lenient minimum lot size standards compare to the situation where more lenient standards are the rule? How do small-acreage Anabaptist farmers adjust to, or even take advantage of, small parcel size? Research is needed to add knowledge to a point of friction in land use planning that is arguably dominated by dichotomous thinking.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In order to meet the stated research objectives in Chapter 1, the methodology presented here is utilized. This methodology has been developed to best reflect the desired outcomes of this study. Objectives, data requirements, and methods are summarized in Table 1.

3.1 Research Questions

3.1.1 Comparative Case Study

The comparative case study involves a cross-case comparison of planning approaches and outcomes in the Region of Waterloo and Lancaster County providing for (a) the collection of detailed descriptive information about tools for farmland conservation with special attention paid to divergent minimum lot size standards in two Townships; (b) an examination within each jurisdiction, with special attention paid to how and why such tools and standards are effective (or ineffective) in promoting positive outcomes for agriculture and Anabaptist communities; and (c) the formation of recommendations for policymakers in Ontario. This component of the research is guided by the following research questions:

Q.1 What tools are most effective for safeguarding against the loss of farmland at each of the two case study sites and how do they differ?

Q.2 How have existing minimum lot size standards affected the farm community at each of the two case study sites?

Q.3 How have planning authorities at each of the two case study sites responded to any negative implications associated with existing minimum lot size standards for farm parcel creation?

Q.4 If the Region of Waterloo were contemplating a policy adjustment to make the existing minimum lot size standard of 99 acres more lenient (i.e. ≤ 50 acres), what would Lancaster County’s contingent of planning officials advise?
Q.5 How have agricultural easements been used to protect small farm parcels in each of the two case study sites?

3.1.2 Examination of Small-Acreage Farmer Strategies and Perspectives

The examination of small-acreage farmer strategies and perspectives involves an investigation into the lived experience of small-acreage Mennonite farmers providing for (a) the collection of detailed empirical information about the adaptive strategies that these farmers are taking to adjust to, and even take advantage of, small parcel size; (b) a detailed empirical evaluation of small parcel flexibility and viability within a unique cultural setting; and (c) an understanding of these farmers’ perspectives on policy for farm parcel creation. This component of the research is guided by the following research questions:

Q.1 Do informants across the sample feel that their home farm financially supports itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed (i.e. does farm autonomy correspond with an increase in acres farmed)?

Q.2 Among the informants across the sample, is farm enlargement viewed as the only way to be successful and to sustain the home farm?

Q.3 Among the informants across the sample, what strategies have they implemented to be successful and to sustain the home farm?

Q.4 Are informants across the sample involved in off-farm employment?

Q.5 Are informants across the sample renting acreage off their home farms?

Q.6 How have developments in the local food movement contributed to informants’ abilities to sustain the home farm? Do they produce food for local markets?

Q.7 Are informants skeptical about their ability to keep pace with the trend of consolidation in Ontario’s agricultural sector?

Q.8 How do demographics and the value of farmland factor into informants’ perspectives regarding existing policy for farm parcel creation?

Q.9 What are informants’ perspectives regarding existing policy for farm parcel creation?
Q.10 What are informants’ perspectives regarding relaxed minimum lot size standards?

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 Literature Review

The literature review in Chapter 2 sets the context for the study. A review of literature relating to the topic of farmland conservation was undertaken. Because the theoretical and practical foundations of farmland conservation are conceptually important to this work, the literature review explores the history of the farmland conservation movement, the main issues that have surfaced, and the planning response to farmland loss with an intentional focus paid to Ontario and Pennsylvania. Changes to policy must be viewed with an awareness of farmland as a finite resource and this review provides the researcher and reader with an awareness of the historical evolution of policy and the tools and practices that are connected with current approaches. A review of literature relating to farm parcel creation was also undertaken. This review explores the nuances of existing policy for farm parcel creation and resultant implications that are specific to the Anabaptist farm community. This review provides the researcher and reader with a solid foundation upon which to understand policy for farm parcel creation and its implications.

3.2.2 Comparative Case Study

This research component utilized a case study approach. Yin (2014), an expert in case study design, explains that case studies are suitable when a researcher is asking how and why questions about a present-day set of events over which the researcher has little or no control. The case study followed a two-case design. This design is preferred over a single-case design because of the more robust outcomes that can be achieved from the investigative benefits of two cases.
from which conclusions can be drawn (Yin, 2014). Leacock Township in Lancaster County and the Township of Wellesley in the Region of Waterloo formed the two primary units for analysis.

The researcher’s case study approach followed three main steps. First, background information was collected to establish extensive profiles of each case study site. Background information included physical, economic and socio-demographic characteristics; and local policies, regulations, and directions that are relevant to the research. Next, semi-structured key informant interviews (Mason, 2004) were undertaken with eighteen key actors from August to November 2014 in order to supplement the background information collected. The focus was to obtain feedback about existing approaches in each jurisdiction. All interviews were undertaken on location, recorded, and later transcribed with the consent of the informants. Transcriptions were provided to the informants for review and confirmation of accuracy following each interview. Copies of the interview guides are included in Appendix A and B. The approach was reviewed and approved by the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board in July 2014. Eight interviews were undertaken with eleven informants in Lancaster County. Dr. Tom Daniels, Professor of City and Regional Planning at the University of Pennsylvania, helped the researcher select key informants based on his direct knowledge of Lancaster County’s planning system. The researcher interviewed professional planners with the Lancaster County Planning Commission (LCPC), officials with Leacock Township, an official with the AgBoard, officials with the LFT, an academic, and an Amish farmer in Leacock Township. A total of seven interviews were undertaken in the Region of Waterloo. Key informants were selected based on the researcher’s direct knowledge of the Region of Waterloo’s planning system. Six of the seven informants are either working or retired professional planners. Finally, data was summarized to reflect the desired outcomes of the study with special attention paid to the triangulation or convergence of
data from different sources (Yin, 2014, pg. 241). From this convergence of data, conclusions and recommendations were developed.

3.2.3 Examination of Small-Acreage Farmer Strategies and Perspectives

Smithers and Johnson’s (2004) examination of family farm development trajectories in Huron County, Ontario, inspired this component of the research. At first, the design was predicated on a lengthy questionnaire, but the researcher decided against this approach following receipt of feedback from individuals with first-hand experience with Mennonite communities. It was established that in-person interviews would be a more appropriate approach, as long as the interviews remained short (i.e. approx. 15 minutes).

The researcher’s approach followed three main steps. First, background information was collected to establish brief profiles for each rural municipality under study. Background information included general economic and socio-demographic information; general information about the Mennonite communities under study; and a brief review of relevant policy. Next, semi-structured interviews (Mason, 2004) were undertaken from November to December 2014 with eighteen small-acreage Mennonite farmers across three rural municipalities in the Region of Waterloo and the County of Huron: the Townships of Wellesley, Woolwich and Howick. Informants represented three groups: David Martin Mennonites, Old Order Mennonites and Orthodox Mennonites. In each Township, the researcher identified farm parcels with a residence and 50 acres or less using the tax assessment rolls stored at each of the three Township administrative offices and with the assistance of individuals with first-hand knowledge about the

\[\text{In addition to the 18 small-acreage informants comprising the sample, three additional Mennonite farmers were interviewed. They have been excluded from the analysis either because their home farms, defined as the home parcel excluding other acreage owned an/or rented, exceeded 50 acres or because their home farms were outside the three Townships under study. However, the three farmers are profiled in Appendix C.}\]
communities. To account for the possibility that a single farmer might own more than one parcel, the identified farms were described as the home farm, defined as the home parcel excluding other acreage owned and/or rented. Fifty acres was identified as a suitable small-acreage threshold beyond which interviews would not be undertaken. Certain factors influenced this decision. First, farm parcels in southern Ontario generally follow a 100-acre parcel fabric. An even split on these farms would equate to two independent 50-acre farm parcels. Hence, 50 acres is often proposed in cases where a more lenient standard is being contemplated (e.g. see Jackson, 2004). Second, common knowledge suggests that even 50-acre farms tend to constitute a small proportion of the farms across the three Townships under study. Discussions with Township officials suggested that choosing a smaller threshold (e.g. 25 acres) might prevent much-needed interview opportunities. Third, the prospects for meeting provincial flexibility criteria seemed to be better on 50 acres versus 25 acres or smaller.

Each farmer was asked to respond to a series of questions about their home farm and acreage, additional acreage owned and/or rented, changes to the scale of their farming operation, secondary on-farm activities and businesses, off-farm employment, the demand for small farm parcels within their communities, and perspectives on policy. A copy of the interview guide is included in Appendix D. The approach was reviewed and approved by the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board in July 2014. Finally, data was summarized in tables, and with informant profiles. Special attention was paid to the triangulation or convergence of data from different sources (Yin, 2014, pg. 241). From this convergence of data, conclusions and recommendations were developed.

22 The researcher did not collect data to substantiate the proportion of farms that these units tend to constitute across the three Townships under study.
3.2.4 Reflections on Fieldwork with the Mennonite Farm Community

As a non-Mennonite individual coming from a different culture and background, the researcher regarded himself as an outsider to Mennonite culture and community. On several occasions, the researcher was asked by prospective informants to return at a later date, only to return and be told once again to return at a later date. The researcher came to the realization that this reaction is meant to imply rejection without saying no and the researcher took great care to respect boundaries. Given that this research spans different perspectives, the researcher also took great care to be sensitive towards others’ viewpoints. As part of this effort, religious and cultural values and practices were treated with the utmost respect. Communication was almost always face-to-face and in cases where correspondence was in written form, the researcher opted to write hand-written letters. Farm visits often involved social time at the outset and the researcher utilized his background in agriculture to build rapport with informants. On one occasion, the researcher was invited for lunch. On another occasion, the researcher had the good fortune to be taken on a tour of a farm. The visits often involved work time, with the researcher jotting down responses to questions while the informants carried-on with their daily work. The researcher enjoyed the time he spent with Mennonite farmers and has learned a great deal about their traditional culture and practices. Relationships are essential to the practice of planning, but are rarely discussed. Over the course of nearly two years, the researcher developed relationships with Mennonite individuals in small increments. These relationships became paramount to the research. For example, with the help of his Mennonite contacts, the researcher was able to describe the research approach to a mostly Mennonite audience at the Elmira Produce Auction Cooperative (EPAC) Annual Growers’ Meeting and was able to secure space in a Mennonite publication to spread awareness of the research within the community.
Table 1: Summary of Objectives, Data Requirements, and Methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Component</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Data Requirements</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Comparative Case Study**          | (a) Collection of detailed descriptive information about tools for farmland conservation, with special attention paid to divergent minimum lot size standards in two Townships.  
(b) An examination in each jurisdiction with special attention paid to how and why such tools and standards are effective (or ineffective) in promoting positive outcomes for agriculture and Anabaptist communities.  
(c) Formation of recommendations for policy makers in Ontario. | • Background information to establish extensive profiles of each case study site.  
• Data from individuals with direct knowledge of the planning systems under study: effectiveness of existing tools and positive and negative implications of existing minimum lot size standards among other lines of inquiry. | • Literature review (Chapter 2).  
• Comparative case study.  
• Semi-structured key informant interviews.  
• Triangulation                                                                 |
| **Examination of Small-acreage Adaptive Strategies and Perspectives** | (a) The collection of detailed empirical information about the adaptive strategies that these farmers are taking to adjust to, and even take advantage, of small parcel size  
(b) A detailed empirical evaluation of small parcel flexibility and viability within a unique cultural setting  
(c) An understanding of these farmers’ perspectives on policy for farm parcel creation | • Background information to establish brief profiles for each rural municipality under study.  
• Data for Mennonite farms of ≤ 50 acres: home farm and acreage, additional acreage owned and/or rented, changes to the scale of farming operation, secondary on-farm activities and businesses, off-farm employment, demand for small farm parcels and policy perspectives. | • Literature review (Chapter 2).  
• Semi-structured key informant interviews.  
• Illustrative informant profiles.  
• Triangulation                                                                 |
CHAPTER 4

COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY: PROFILES OF STUDY AREAS

4.1 Physical, Economic and Socio-Demographic Characteristics

4.1.1 Lancaster County, Pennsylvania

Lancaster County is located in the southeastern part of Pennsylvania. The City of Lancaster, the seat of the County, is located approximately 110 km (68 miles) west of Philadelphia and 56 km (35 miles) southwest of Harrisburg, the state capital. To the south, the County borders the State of Maryland. Figure 1 depicts Lancaster County and its geographic location within Pennsylvania. The County’s sixty municipalities include the City of Lancaster, eighteen boroughs and forty-one Townships (D’Agostino and Frey, 2011). As of 2010, the County had a total land area of approximately 2,458 km$^2$ (949 mi$^2$) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Over the past several decades, Lancaster County has been one of the fastest growing counties in Pennsylvania. Its population grew from 362,346 in 1980 to 470,658 in 2000 – an increase of 30% (LCPC, 2009). As of the latest 2010 census, the County had a population of 519,448 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

Lancaster County’s Anabaptist population is estimated to be 59,000 – approximately 31,000 are Amish (Pennsylvania Dutch Convention and Visitors Bureau, 2014). Although the County has the largest population of Amish residents of all U.S counties, the proportion of the County’s total population that is Amish – approximately 5% – is small (Donnermeyer, Anderson and Cooksey, 2012; Kraybill and Nolt, 2004). However, the County holds the distinction of having the oldest and second largest Amish settlement in North America, which is comprised of approximately 150 different church districts (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004). Near the center of this
settlement, Kraybill and Nolt (2004) estimate that up to 90% of the farmland is under Amish ownership.

Figure 1: Map of Leacock Township in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania

As of June 2014, the County’s labour force consisted of 265,700 people with an unemployment rate of 4.5% (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2014). With some of the most
productive soils in the U.S., agriculture is regarded as a “defining element” of the County’s character and “sense of place” (LCPC, 2006b, pg. 94). Kraybill and Nolt (2004) estimate that at least one in five jobs in the County are related to agriculture. Tourism is also an important industry in the County and it is recognized that this industry hinges on the County’s Amish culture. In this regard, the Hollywood film Witness helped to raise the County’s profile as a tourist destination (LCPC, 2006b).

The importance of agriculture in Lancaster County is reflected on the landscape. With about 54% of its land area dedicated to some type of agricultural use, farming is undoubtedly an important activity in the County (LCPC, 2009). As of 2012, there were 6,657 farms in the County and the market value of agricultural products sold totaled an impressive $1,474,954,000. Comparing this figure with that generated by other counties across Pennsylvania and the U.S., Lancaster County ranked first and fifteenth respectively, making it the most agriculturally productive non-irrigated County in the country (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2012a; Lancaster County Agricultural Council, 2013). Table 2 offers a comparison of the agricultural products sold on a per-acre basis between Lancaster County and the Region of Waterloo. It must be remembered when considering these figures that Lancaster County has nearly double the amount of land in production. Of the nearly $1.5 billion generated from agriculture in Lancaster County in 2012, $1,213,918,000 was generated from livestock sales. The balance ($261,037,000) was generated from crop sales. Milk production, as well as poultry and egg production accounts for the majority of income with cattle production a distant third (U.S Department of Agriculture, 2012a). In the context of this research, it is important to note that farms in Lancaster County are, on the whole, relatively small. The average farm size in the County is 78 acres, consisting of one or more parcels per farmer, as compared to the statewide average of 130 acres (U.S. Department
of Agriculture, 2012a and 2012b). Lancaster County has gained a reputation as a place where an extremely productive agricultural sector is supported by many small farms. A connection can be made between the predominance of small farms and the County’s Anabaptist community whose traditional farming practices have played a part in keeping farms small (Rosset, 2009).

Table 2: Comparison of Agricultural Products Sold on a Per Acre Basis in Lancaster County and the Region of Waterloo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Farms</th>
<th>Farm Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Value of Agricultural Products Sold ($)</th>
<th>Average Value of Agricultural Products Sold ($/acre) (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster County</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>439,481</td>
<td>1,474,954,000</td>
<td>3,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>221,087</td>
<td>472,894,531 (b)</td>
<td>2,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Not adjusted for differences in currency.
(b) Total gross farm receipts (excluding forest products sold), 2010.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2012a

4.1.2 Leacock Township, Lancaster County

Leacock Township is located in the east-central part of Lancaster County. Figure 1 depicts Leacock Township and its geographic location within Lancaster County. It shares borders with Upper Leacock, Earl and East Earl Townships to the north; Salisbury Township to the south; and East Lampeter Township to the west. Leacock Township consists of 54.9 km² (21.2 mi²) of land area (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a). The Village of Intercourse – the major settlement located in the heart of the Township – is approximately 18 km (11 miles) east of the City of Lancaster.

As of the latest U.S census, Leacock Township had a population of 5,220 with approximately 24% of the total population residing in the Village of Intercourse and approximately 10% of the total population residing in the Village of Gordonville (U.S. Census
According to data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau by Hanover Engineering Associates Inc. (2003), Leacock Township’s population increased by 29.8% over three decades between 1970 and 2000. Between 2000 and 2010, the Township’s population grew by nearly 10% and recent projections suggest that the population of the Township will continue to increase, but at a somewhat lower rate than previous decades (LCPC, 2014).

Figure 2 displays a representative agricultural landscape in Leacock Township. With nearly 90% of the total land area in agricultural use, agriculture is the major industry in Leacock Township and agriculture plays an important role in the local economy (LCPC, 2014; Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a). Almost all of Leacock Township’s land area is prime farmland (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a), defined by the U.S Department of Agriculture (n.d.) as “land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and is available for these uses”. Leacock Township and the adjacent Townships make up the heart of Lancaster County’s Amish settlement (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004). Although it is unclear exactly how many Amish reside in the Township, a telling statistic from the U.S. Census Bureau (2010) indicates that 57.4% of all residents age five and over speak a language other than English at home – probably Pennsylvania Dutch or German (Smart, 2013). Nearly all the farmland in the Township is under Amish ownership (Place, 2003; Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a). The Township’s other major industry – tourism – is closely linked with the Amish culture in Lancaster County (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a).
4.1.3 Region of Waterloo, Ontario

The Region of Waterloo is located in southern Ontario. It consists of three major metropolitan centers: the cities of Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge. Together, these cities are commonly referred to as the ‘Tri-City’. The City of Waterloo, the largest of the three cities, is located approximately 113 km (70.2 miles) northwest of Toronto. Figure 3 depicts the Region of Waterloo and its geographic location in southern Ontario. In addition to the three cities already mentioned, the Region’s seven municipalities include the Townships of Woolwich, Wilmot, Wellesley and North Dumfries. As of 2011, the Region had a total land area of approximately 1,368 km² (528 mi²) (Government of Canada, 2012). As of 2010, the Region had a population of 507,096 (Region of Waterloo, 2011a). Between 2006 and 2011, the Region’s growth rate was 6.1% – ranking eighth among all municipalities across Ontario (Region of Waterloo, 2011a).
Figure 3: Map of the Township of Wellesley in the Region of Waterloo, Ontario

Historically, the largest Mennonite settlement in Ontario was established in the Region beginning in 1800 (Burkholder and Bender, 1990). The initial arrival of Mennonites to the Region from Lancaster County was followed by Amish immigrations from Pennsylvania throughout the 1820s and Russian Mennonite migrations over many decades ending in the 1940s (Fretz, 1989). Figures from the National Household Survey indicate that 9,740 individuals self-
identified as Mennonite in the geographic area of Kitchener - Cambridge - Waterloo in 2011 (Government of Canada, 2011a). This represents 1.9% of the Region of Waterloo’s total population of 507,096 (Region of Waterloo, 2011a). There does not appear to be reliable statistics for the Region’s Anabaptist population as a whole. However, the use of the Swiss-German ‘Pennsylvania Dutch’ dialect has been retained by the Region’s Anabaptist population (Wandel and Mage, 1998). Serving as a surrogate measure, data compiled from the 2011 census by the Region of Waterloo (2011b) indicates that, in 2011, 16,515 people or 3.34% of the Region’s population reported a German mother tongue, making German the Region’s second most common mother tongue besides English.

As of 2011, the Region’s labour force consisted of 263,815 people (Region of Waterloo, 2011c). With some of the best agricultural soils in Ontario, agriculture is an integral element of the Region’s economy – each job in agriculture supports an additional four jobs in the broader Regional economy (Region of Waterloo, 2009). As of 2011, there were 1,389 farms in the Region earning total gross farm receipts of $472,894,531 (Government of Canada, 2011b). Table 2 offers a comparison of the agricultural products sold on a per hectare basis between the Region of Waterloo and Lancaster County. It must be remembered when considering these figures that Lancaster County has nearly double the amount of land in production. Latest figures from the Government of Ontario (2014a) indicate that the production of cattle and calves accounts for the highest farm receipts in the Region of Waterloo, followed by dairy, poultry, hog, corn, and egg and soybean production. Like Lancaster County, the Region’s agricultural sector is heavily focused on livestock production with 70% of all farms considered livestock farms (Region of Waterloo, 2011). In the context of this research, it is important to note that farms in the Region of Waterloo are, on the whole, relatively small. The average farm size in the Region is 159 acres
consisting of one or more parcels per farmer as compared to the province wide average of 243 acres (Region of Waterloo, 2011d).

4.1.4 Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo

The Township of Wellesley is located in the northwest part of the Region of Waterloo. Figure 3 depicts the Township and its geographic location within the Region. The Township shares borders with the Township of Woolwich to the east, the City of Waterloo to the southeast, the Township of Wilmot to the south, the Township of Perth East in Perth County to the west and the Township of Mapleton in Wellington County to the north. The Township of Wellesley consists of 277.7 km² (107.2 mi²) of land area (Government of Canada, 2014). The town of Wellesley – the most populated settlement in the Township – is approximately 24 km (15 miles) northwest of the City of Waterloo. As of the 2011 census, the Township of Wellesley had a population of 10,713 – an increase of 9.3% from 2006 (Government of Canada, 2014).

Figure 4 displays a representative agricultural landscape in the Township of Wellesley. Land use in the Township is predominately agricultural and it is well understood that agriculture is an important contributor to the Township’s economy (Township of Wellesley, 2004). Prime agricultural areas identified by the Region cover virtually the entire areal extent of the Township (Region of Waterloo, 2006). The Township supports a large Anabaptist community. Although it is unclear exactly how many Mennonites and Amish reside in the Township, 3,515 residents reported a German mother tongue in 2011 representing 32.8% of the total population (Government of Canada, 2014).

---

23 In Ontario, prime agricultural areas are defined as areas where prime agricultural lands predominate. This includes Canada Land Inventory Class 1 through 3 lands and associated Class 4 through 7 lands (Government of Ontario, 2014b).
4.2 Regional Policy and Regulatory Environments

4.2.1 Lancaster County, Pennsylvania

As Pennsylvania is a home rule state, local authorities maintain virtually complete control over land use planning decisions in Lancaster County. The LCPC – the planning arm of the County level of government – has little authority over planning matters in Leacock Township. Leacock Township’s CP and ZO override Envision Lancaster County – the Countywide CP. The planning function performed by the LCPC in Leacock Township is, as the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors for the Township remarked, “strictly advisory” (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code outlines the authority and functions of the LCPC. Among other responsibilities, the Commission provides recommendations to municipalities and performs planning functions for those municipalities that formally request assistance (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2003). These factors combined have made it difficult to plan comprehensively on a Regional basis in Lancaster County (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014).
In Pennsylvania, municipalities are delegated authority by the Commonwealth to pass ZOs restricting the use of land through s.603 of the *Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code* (Place, 2003; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2003). Exacting land use controls in the U.S. are often met with fierce opposition from landowners – an important consideration in a country where planning authorities are required to be particularly mindful of property rights (Furuseth and Pierce, 1982). Within this context, zoning in Pennsylvania must not result in a taking of private property (Daniels and Bowers, 1997). Despite this complication, thirty-nine of forty-one Townships in Lancaster County have agricultural zoning (T. Daniels, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014) that helps to protect farmland and prevent opposing non-farm uses (Daniels and Bowers, 1997). Approximately 350,000 acres of land is zoned for agriculture in Lancaster County (T. Daniels, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). This is regarded as quite a remarkable gain considering that it is not uncommon for agricultural land to be exempt from zoning in the U.S. (F. Behlau, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014).

Given the political complexities concerning land use controls such as zoning in the U.S., incentives-based tools for farmland conservation have received widespread public acceptance (Fureseth and Pierce, 1982). Pennsylvania has adopted a program of preferential tax assessment for farmland under the *Clean and Green Act*. In Lancaster County, any resident who owns farmland and is able to meet certain criteria prescribed by the program is eligible for property tax assessments based on the value of their property for agriculture versus its market value (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2015). PDR programs have also received widespread acceptance across Lancaster County. The AgBoard and the LFT comprise the two conservation organizations working to protect farmland through PDR programs. The AgBoard is a government-sponsored agency and has been operating since 1980 with funding from both
Lancaster County and the Commonwealth. The LFT is a private, non-profit land trust that was started in 1988 following a realization that Lancaster County’s large Anabaptist population would not likely participate in the AgBoard’s program because of cultural reasons (K. Martynick, Aug. 27, 2014). Together, the two organizations have acquired development rights to more than 800 farms protecting in excess of 100,000 acres in Lancaster County (J. Swinehart, Aug. 27, 2014).

4.2.2 Region of Waterloo, Ontario

Unlike Lancaster County, local authorities do not maintain complete control over land use planning decisions in the Region of Waterloo. Instead, planning is based on a policy-led system that supports provincial goals (Government of Ontario, 2010). Ontario’s Planning Act provides the legislative foundation for this system. Section 3 of the Act gives Ontario’s Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing the authority to issue policy statements on matters related to municipal planning that are of provincial interest. The Provincial Policy Statement affords policy direction and guidance to municipalities and other planning authorities on matters related to land use planning that are of provincial interest, including agricultural land (Government of Ontario, 2014b). When the Region of Waterloo makes a decision that affects a planning matter, s. 3 of the Planning Act requires that it conform to any policies found in provincial plans and remain consistent with any policies issued in the Provincial Policy Statement. These requirements have enabled the Region to create a strong Regional policy framework that sets the tone for local municipalities (B. MacKinnon, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). As the approval authority for the Regional Official Policies Plan – referred to locally as the upper-tier plan – the Province makes judgments in regard to the implementation standards of conformity and consistency.
The Region of Waterloo operates under a two-tier system of local government. The Township of Wellesley is one of seven lower-tier municipalities comprising a second tier of local government. As the upper-tier planning authority, the Region of Waterloo approves the land use plans of local governments like the Township of Wellesley. These lower tier plans, as well as the accompanying ZBLs, must conform to the Regional Official Policies Plan. In this way, a hierarchy of planning policy is achieved through a system with built-in checks and balances. As part of this system, local governments like the Township of Wellesley are required to consult with the Region regarding certain planning matters, including consents to subdivide farm parcels. The Region reviews these applications to ensure that they conform to both the Regional Official Policies Plan, as well as provincial policy. In this sense, local governments are supported by strong provincial policies for farmland protection and this helps when dealing with the complexities of rural land division (B. MacKinnon, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014).

Ontario’s policies for rural land division help to accentuate key differences between the planning systems under study. Development applications that would create a new residential lot in a prime agricultural area are not allowed under the Provincial Policy Statement, except in those circumstances where the new residential lot is created for an existing dwelling that will become surplus to a farm operation through farm consolidation (Government of Ontario, 2014b). Since this policy was enacted, coordinated planning efforts have led to a significant decrease in the number of new lots created in agricultural areas (Caldwell et al., 2011). These efforts have been enabled by a provincially-led planning system that enjoys strong legislative authority over property as opposed to the locally-centered governance structure in Lancaster County where consistency is optional and zoning must not result in a taking of private property.
4.3 Local Policies, Regulations and Directions

4.3.1 Leacock Township, Lancaster County

Unlike the Township of Wellesley, Leacock Township does not staff a planning position. The Board of Supervisors for Leacock Township has created both a Township Planning Commission (PC) and a Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB). Each member of the Township PC is appointed by the Board of Supervisors and serves up to five years. Each member must be a Township resident (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2003; Leacock Township, n.d.). As would be expected for a rural Township, the Township’s PC has at least one farmer among the appointees, but this is not a legislated requirement. The Township PC makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and is responsible for a number of planning functions including, but not limited to, the preparation of a CP and ZO, as well as the review of subdivision plans and zoning changes (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2003; Leacock Township, n.d.). The Board of Supervisors also appoints each member of the Township’s ZHB; each member serves up to three years. The ZHB evaluates requests for variances or special exceptions from the provisions found in the ZO (Leacock Township, n.d.).

Leacock Township’s CP and ZO guide local planning decisions. The CP describes future land use over a planning horizon of 15-20 years. It is apparent that the Township is cognizant of the importance of agriculture and this is reflected in its CP, where the protection of prime agricultural soils and the overall enhancement of agricultural activities are expressed as primary goals. These goals help to achieve a central aim of the Township’s planning efforts – to preserve the area’s Amish culture (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a). Although farmland conservation is a goal, the potential seems to exist for severe problems concerning non-farm
development to surface in Leacock Township because of comparatively lenient provisions found in its ZO as opposed to what is prescribed by the Township of Wellesley.

It is apparent that farmland, while important, is very much subordinate to other values. Leacock Township’s ZO prescribes a minimum lot size standard of 40 acres for farm parcel creation in its Agricultural (A) Zone (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2014). This provision can be found in Appendix E. A standard of 40 acres means that a farm must be at least 80 acres before it can be split in half to form two independent 40-acre farm parcels. The Township of Wellesley standard is more than double that size. Aside from the lower standard, the Township’s ordinance includes a form of sliding scale zoning that allows multiple parcels to be created in the Agricultural (A) Zone and dwellings to be developed on those parcels. On a 40-acre farm or parent tract, the subdivision of two parcels, up to 1 acre each, is permitted (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc. 2014). This provision can be found in Appendix F. This is commonly referred to as 1 per 20 zoning (J. Swinehart, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). Aside from allowing additional residential uses in the Agricultural (A) Zone, the Township’s ZO includes a provision to allow non-farm business uses to also occur there. This provision can be found in Appendix G. These business uses are permitted by special exception, are not intended to become the primary use of a property, and may include such activities as manufacturing and repair services (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2014). Together, these various provisions have been adopted in an effort to support the needs of Leacock Township’s Amish residents (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a). Allowing non-farm uses amid agricultural areas is seen as the only way to preclude the ongoing exodus of young Amish families who are being forced to move regardless of whether they are involved in agriculture or not (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a). With that being said, it is apparent that the
Township is making a concerted effort to direct development to smaller farms that had been previously subdivided to keep any large farm parcels intact (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a). It is apparent, then, that the Township is labeling large farms as comparatively more important than smaller acreage farms.

4.3.2 Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo

Unlike Leacock Township, the Township of Wellesley employs a planner who undertakes a range of planning functions. They include consulting with Regional planning staff and making recommendations to the Council of the Township. Council can disagree with these recommendations, but they do so at substantial risk of decisions being appealed and possibly reviewed by the OMB. The Township has adopted an OP and ZBL and together these documents guide local planning decisions. The OP serves as an expression of the community’s goals and objectives for land use. They include managing growth and protecting farmland. The Township is conscious of the importance of agriculture and this is reflected in its OP – the protection of the Township’s agricultural areas is a primary goal (Township of Wellesley, 2004). Strong provisions in the Township’s ZBL support this goal. For example, the zoning-by-law prescribes a minimum lot size standard of 99 acres for new farm parcels in the Township’s General Agricultural (A1) Zone (Township of Wellesley, 2006). This provision can be found in Appendix H. The Township’s standard of 99 acres is the same standard prescribed by the Regional Official Policies Plan, aligning the Township with the provincial requirement for conformity between upper-tier and lower-tier plans (Region of Waterloo, 2006). In Ontario, farm parcel creation is enabled by policy found in the Provincial Policy Statement, which prescribes two criteria for farm splits. This policy can be found in Appendix I. The standard of 99 acres has been judged against these criteria and has been deemed acceptable. The policy basis for the first
criteria is that farm parcels have to be large enough to accommodate the type of farming that is common in any given municipality, and the policy basis for the second criteria is that large farm parcels afford farmers greater flexibility to modify their operations as the economy and markets change (Government of Ontario, 2008). The Township has a policy in place that gives farmers in the Township some flexibility to propose a farm split that would lead to resultant farms having less than 99 acres. This policy can be found in Appendix J. However, applications must still satisfy the two criteria described above.

The Township’s OP and ZBL contain policies and provisions to expand the range of on-farm housing and employment choices available to its rural population, including its Mennonite population. For example, a second permanent or temporary farm-related residential unit may be permitted on a farm parcel within the General Agricultural (A1) Zone (Township of Wellesley, 2004). The conversion of an existing farm-related residential unit, in order to create a second residential unit, may also be permitted in this zone. Both possibilities can be accomplished through a site-specific ZBL amendment. This policy can be found in Appendix K. A second example is the Township’s Rural Mixed Use/Agricultural Cluster (MAC) Zone. The policies and provisions specific to this zone are included in Appendices L and M. Within this zone, non-commercial and limited agricultural activities can be undertaken on lots up to 10 acres with a single detached dwelling, a greenhouse, a barn, and a dry industrial use with a maximum floor area of 6,002 sq. ft. (Township of Wellesley, 2006). This zone serves to expand the range of housing and employment choices for Township residents who rely on horse-drawn vehicles as their primary means of transportation (Region of Waterloo, 2009). The Township’s OP and ZBL also contain policies for on-farm business activities in the General Agricultural (A1) Zone. These policies are included in Appendix N. A farm-related occupation is accepted on any parcel
of land not less than 20 acres in size in the Township’s Agricultural (A1) Zone, but the occupation must be minor in nature compared to the farming operation (Township of Wellesley, 2006). The Township’s provisions for a farm-related occupation can be found in Appendix O.

Figure 5: Comparison of Roles and Central Planning Principles Across Lancaster County (Leacock Township) and the Region of Waterloo (Township of Wellesley).
CHAPTER 5

COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.1 Results on the Ground: Farmland Conservation

5.1.1 Leacock Township, Lancaster County

Research Question: *What tools are most effective for safeguarding against the loss of farmland in Leacock Township and how do they differ from those in use in the Township of Wellesley?*

Of the tools currently in use in Leacock Township, and more broadly, in Lancaster County, there was general consensus among the informants that zoning is the most effective tool for safeguarding against the loss of farmland. Leacock Township’s zoning follows a form of *hybrid zoning* that has been devised with a very high Amish population in mind (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). Although both Townships have zoning, it is comparably weak in Leacock Township. While completing fieldwork in Leacock Township, the researcher was asked by members of the Township PC to describe Ontario’s land division policy in agricultural areas. His explanation provoked a reaction of disbelief when they were informed that new lots for residential use are simply not allowed in prime agricultural areas in Ontario, albeit for surplus farm dwellings in some municipalities. Their reaction underscores the disparity that exists between values in Leacock Township and the Township of Wellesley.

For Dean Severson, Principal Agricultural and Rural Planning Analyst with the LCPC, zoning has been the foundation for farmland conservation in Lancaster County, “Without our agricultural zoning, we would be trying to keep agriculture as an industry out in the countryside without the means to be able to prevent incompatible land uses from being located there” (personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). Zoning has resulted in many benefits for those municipalities in Lancaster County *that have it*. For example, zoning has simplified the process...
of siting Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs) (T. Daniels, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014) and has helped to preserve agricultural land until permanent protection can be achieved through either the purchase or donation of development rights (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014). The researcher was reminded, however, that zoning is temporary – it can be changed by the vote of a board of supervisors (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014). Conversely, re-zoning is a very formal process in the Township of Wellesley with opportunities to file an appeal with the OMB if a member of the public disagrees with Council’s exercise of authority in regard to a planning matter.

Apart from zoning, it is apparent that the PDR is a much-preferred incentives-based tool for farmland conservation in Lancaster County, although not all informants agreed. Karen Martynick, Executive Director of the LFT, emphasized that the purchase or donation of development rights is the only way to ensure that farmland is protected in perpetuity across the County (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). Matt Knepper, Director of the AgBoard, supported this sentiment (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). Both organizations attribute their success to the application of other tools, particularly zoning. Matt Knepper shared his insight:

Whenever I’m invited to speak on behalf of the AgBoard… to talk about why we are successful, [my] message is always clear – agricultural zoning is required to keep the land available until you can preserve it. Without agricultural zoning, it’s almost a waste of time to put effort into a PDR program because, without zoning, there won’t be an overall strategy for land use. It will be just kind of a shotgun approach (personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014).

This feedback underscores informants’ sensitivity around a necessary integration of tools to form a packaged farmland conservation strategy in Lancaster County. For this reason, some informants were hesitant to isolate any one tool as most effective since the tools are commonly applied together as a package.
While certain informants were very much in favor of PDR, others had mixed opinions about this incentives-based tool. Frank Howe, Chairman of the Leacock Township Board of Supervisors sees the PDR as a “good piece of the puzzle for preservation” (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014) but has reservations about the long-term impacts on farmers’ futures. In his opinion, to sell or donate the development rights to a farm is to risk losing the farm, because of the farmer’s subsequent inability to raise value from the land in bad times by, for example, subdividing a building lot and selling it to someone else: “I think it is a little scary to some of the kids coming along because they look at what their parents have done and they say to themselves – this better work because I have no way out, no other alternatives,” (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). Mr. Howe’s reservation is reflected in the Township’s CP, which suggests that only those farmers with no interest in subdividing their land should consider selling their development rights (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003a). This is an indication that farmland, while important, may be subordinate to other values. Dennis Groff, the LCPC’s Representative for Region 6 (includes Leacock Township) and Supervisor for Paradise Township, has similar reservations about the feasibility of PDR: “Is it practical to expect our farmland to be preserved forever when we don’t know what forever means?” he asked. As well, Mr. Groff has reservations about unheralded implications of PDR. In his opinion, preserved farms can actually attract development pressures on adjacent properties leading to farmland loss and nuisance complaints – effects that stem from individuals seeking an idyllic lifestyle next to a permanently protected farm in the countryside (D. Groff, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). While the AgBoard requires that a farm be in an Agricultural Security Area (ASA) prior to enrolling in its program, the LFT does not (J. Swinehart, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). These security areas afford an added level of confidence against the situation described...
by Mr. Groff. The AgBoard’s program is also one of the few in Pennsylvania to require that agricultural zoning be in place as a minimum criterion for accepting applications for preserving farms (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014). It is easy to see how the hypothetical posed by Mr. Groff could come to fruition with weak zoning. As it stands in Paradise Township, a developer could literally buy a 100-acre farm and subdivide it into 2-acre lots. Neither the Commonwealth nor the LCPC view this zoning as acceptable and, therefore, Paradise Township residents are ineligible for enrollment into the AgBoard program (D. Groff, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014).

5.1.2 Township of Wellesley, Waterloo Region

*Research Question: What tools are most effective for safeguarding against the loss of farmland in the Township of Wellesley and how do they differ from those in use in the Leacock Township?*

Of the tools currently in use in the Township of Wellesley and, more broadly, in the Region of Waterloo, there was general consensus among the informants that zoning is an effective tool for safeguarding against the loss of farmland. A good many informants were hesitant to identify any one tool as ‘most effective’ since the tools are commonly applied together as a package. In conversation with the informants, the stated connections between policy and regulation across local, Regional and provincial levels of government were very pronounced – much more so than in Leacock Township. For Susan Duke, retired Director of Planning for the Township of Wellesley, zoning is the most effective tool because it is stable, understood, practical, and linked-in across all levels of policy: “Ultimately it is the tool that people come into contact with on a daily basis” (personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). A number of informants mentioned the importance of the Province’s *Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) Implementation Guidelines*, which aim to reduce land use conflicts and indirectly safeguard against the loss of farmland. These guidelines achieve the full force and
effect of law through ZBLs. The Region’s UGBs minimize the outward spread of the urban footprint (K. Eby, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). Again, these boundaries are implemented through ZBLs. It is apparent then, that zoning lays the groundwork for farmland conservation in the Township of Wellesley.

Describing this relationship between policy frameworks and implementation tools, Kevin Eby, Director of Community Planning for the Region, had this to say: “They all fit together. Virtually none of them work without the other. So, you end up with a suite of policy and implementation tools that are hierarchical” (personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). In consideration of this feedback, it is apparent that the hierarchical structure of Ontario’s planning system has created a jurisdictional arrangement in the Region that allows the Region to apply a strong Regional planning presence, while at the same time, allowing opportunities for lower-tier municipalities, like the Township of Wellesley, to create their own local land use plans and ZBLs. Zoning, combined with this nesting of policy across different levels of government, has been instrumental to the success of farmland conservation efforts in the Township of Wellesley.

5.2 Results on the Ground: Minimum Lot Size Standards

5.2.1 Leacock Township, Lancaster County

Research Question: How have existing minimum lot size standards affected the farm community in Leacock Township?

It is apparent that a 40-acre minimum lot size standard for farm parcel creation has enabled Leacock Township to absorb a growing Amish population. If the standard were 99 acres, like it is in the Township of Wellesley, “half the Amish in this Township would have to go somewhere else,” explained Frank Howe, Chairman of the Township’s Board of Supervisors. It is important to reiterate that every farm that is divided in Leacock Township has the potential to create housing for several families because of the extra subdivisions that can be obtained. While
dividing farms has served to create housing for the Township’s burgeoning Amish farm population, it seems to have only delayed the demographic pinch that young Amish families are feeling (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004). Today, there are very few farms remaining in Leacock Township that are large enough (i.e. ≥ 80 acres) to be split in half following an earlier bout of farm parcel creation in the Township (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). Because of the lack of farmland availability in the heart of the Amish settlement, it is now common to see horse-drawn vehicles elsewhere in the County as families have expanded their land base (K. Martynick, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014).

There is a concern in Lancaster County that existing minimum farm size standards limit farmers’ flexibility to adjust to future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations that might be needed. This is reflected in the AgBoard’s policies for splitting preserved farms (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). The AgBoard’s minimum farm size standard is 75 acres (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014). This is much higher than even Leacock Township’s minimum standard of 40 acres, which is even comparatively higher than other standards across Lancaster County. Because there are so many small parcels in Leacock Township, conventional farmers are sometimes forced to rent several parcels. The researcher was informed that there is an acreage threshold below which it does not make sense for these farmers to farm small parcels. Therefore, numerous farms are occasionally rented out to form one contiguous tract of farmland because larger acreage is seen as more economically feasible to farm with modern equipment (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). Farmers also have the option to purchase more land to make up their desired acreage. If a farmer is forced to purchase multiple small parcels versus one large parcel alone, it obviously costs that farmer comparatively more money. The farmer in this scenario also has the
additional burdens of dealing with any unwanted farmsteads if it is only soil that is desired (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014).

It is apparent that a 40-acre minimum farm size standard has affected certain farmers’ capacities to have an autonomous farm operation in Leacock Township. This is especially the case on dairy farms across the Township. A 40-acre parcel can only reasonably support a certain number of cows. In this regard, some Amish dairymen find that they cannot produce enough feed to support more cows. To expand their milking herds, they grow what feed they can and buy-in the rest (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). Those farmers that buy-in feed have operating costs that are comparatively higher than farmers with larger acreage (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). As Sam Stoltzfus, an Amish farmer in Leacock Township explained, “You can only buy-in so much grain. When grain prices were low, you could do it, but when grain prices went up, it became very difficult” (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). For this very reason, volatile commodity prices have been a problem for livestock producers on small-acreages in Lancaster County (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004). Melvin Eby, a member of Leacock Township’s PC and a retired dairy farmer, spoke of his experience on 40 acres: “I would have liked to have had more acreage, but through the years, my ancestors chopped it all off. Land rent is very, very tight” (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014).

It is apparent that nutrient management has become a problem on the small-acreage farms in Leacock Township, and across Lancaster County, which is the country’s largest contributor of nutrients to the Chesapeake Bay. Because comparatively fewer livestock units can be legally accommodated on a 40-acre versus 100-acre farm, parcel size can affect a farmer’s capacity to expand a livestock operation (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). Because of these requirements, livestock producers on small-acreage have been forced to get creative when
handling manure. As Sam Stotlzfus, an Amish farmer explained, “These guys that have chicken houses, they have to haul their chicken manure away. That is another problem” (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). This is an indication that some farms have an insufficient land base to receive manure and, therefore, it is taken off-farm. Indeed, the pairing of intensive poultry operations with small-acreage has made it possible for Amish farmers to adapt to small-acreage – that is until Pennsylvania’s rules for nutrient management rendered this approach quite challenging (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004).

With each farm split, Leacock Township’s development footprint has increased. Aside from the absolute loss of farmland from new development resulting from each farm split, a concern top of mind is that once a small farm parcel is created, there is a comparatively higher likelihood that it will be surrendered to some type of non-agricultural use in the future (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26). While a 40-acre farm might make a desirable rural estate lot for the urban wealthy, few of the farms that go up for sale in Leacock Township are sold to non-farmers. This is because there is an extremely high demand for farms among the Amish in Leacock Township. With such a high density of farms in one area it would be rational to assume that odor and noise complaints would be common across the Township. However, the researcher was surprised when the Township’s Zoning Officer informed him that he has not received a single odor or noise complaint in eight years (L. Dukeman, personal communication Oct. 25, 2014). Since the Amish own the vast majority of the farmland in the Township, the farm community’s acceptance of agriculture as a rural land use and awareness of so-called right-to-farm law might explain the low number of complaints.

It is apparent that minimum lot size standards in Leacock Township affect the Anabaptist farm community in a complex way. While a minimum standard of 40 acres has helped to curb
the fragmentation of farms in Leacock Township (as compared to lesser requirements across the County of 20 or even 10 acres), it is apparent that the existing standard serves to impede certain individuals from venturing into farm enterprises that are not predicated on animal agriculture. It is apparent that even a standard of 40 acres becomes a hard rule to apply when even smaller parcels can be agriculturally viable. The researcher was informed that a growing number of Old Order Mennonites in Lancaster County have transitioned from dairying and tobacco to intensive produce growing. These farmers have informed the LCPC that all they require is 8-10 acres to grow fruits and vegetables (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). Although the small-scale model of agriculture has proven itself to be viable in Lancaster County, it is apparent that this model of agriculture is very much specific to the Anabaptist population (K. Martynick, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). While these farms might be viable in a certain cultural setting, some informants remained generally uncomfortable with the thought of smaller farm parcels. Misgivings ranged from concerns about eventual non-farm use (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014) to concerns about farm flexibility (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014).

Research Question: How have planning authorities in Leacock Township responded to any negative implications associated with the existing minimum lot size standard for farm parcel creation?

The LCPC’s advice for those municipalities that have larger parcels has been to keep them intact. “This is always our recommendation,” said Dean Severson, Principal Agricultural and Rural Planning Analyst with the LCPC. Leacock Township’s approach has been to place rather prohibitive restrictions on the extent to which farms can be divided, while directing development to parcels that have already been severely fragmented (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). At the surface, this seems like a rational move, but now the
expectation is that small farms can be utilized for non-agricultural use. This is a concern. Other municipalities across Lancaster County have been reluctant to increase their minimum lot size standards. Even going from 10 to 20 acres has been a struggle for some municipalities (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). In tightknit communities, Township officials just cannot bring themselves to establish standards that might affect a neighbour’s plans to subdivide (F. Behlau, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). While the LCPC believes that minimum lot size standards should be increased, the variability of buy-in illustrates how difficult it can be to plan comprehensively across the County as a whole (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). According to Frank Behlau, Director of Community Planning, with the LCPC, “The upshot is that we work where we can, we have our successes from a policy standpoint, and we encourage [municipalities] by example. We work to minimize losses” (personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014). Working to minimalize losses contrasts sharply with the Township of Wellesley situation, where the approach has been one of precaution with planning officials remaining steadfast in their commitment to a 99-acre standard over a period of decades.

In Leacock Township, there has been an attempt to resolve the disparity that exists between human-scale and conventional farming systems in terms of the acreage that is required. In 2003, the Township adopted an ordinance with a provision allowing a so-called farmette of up to 15 acres to be subdivided from any farm encompassing at least 55 acres so as not to reduce the remnant farm parcel to less than 40 acres (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003b). It has since been removed from the ordinance because of a lack of use. However, there is a renewed interest in this size of farm and it is anticipated that the provision will be re-instated (L. Dukeman, personal communication, Feb. 11, 2015). The provision restricted the use of the
farmette to agriculture only. Although a formal severance could be obtained, the 15 acres could be leased with a dwelling and buildings added to the leased parcel subject to certain limitations. The provision can be found in Appendix P. It was adopted because of feedback received from the Amish community that a living can be made from 15 acres if the right type of produce is grown (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). On the few farmettes that were created, produce is grown and then trucked to auctions throughout the County (L. Dukeman, personal communication, Feb. 11, 2015). Restricting the use of these parcels to agriculture was a deliberate move. The Board of Supervisors decided that residents would otherwise forget about farming and start a different business instead (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). It is apparent that this provision would be met with skepticism in the Ontario context. However, in a policy environment where subdivisions are allocated to new farm parcels by right, the perceived risks in Leacock Township are relative. Although Lancaster County’s planning system has its problems, this provision illustrates that land division policy can be comparatively more flexible there. It also underscores the Township’s confidence in Amish farmers’ capacities to raise a profit from as few as 15 acres.

Research Question: If the Region of Waterloo were contemplating a policy adjustment to make the existing minimum lot size standard of 99 acres more lenient (i.e. \( \leq 50 \) acres), how would Lancaster County’s contingent of planning officials advise?

Informants’ intuitive response was to be cautious. Based on his experience, Matt Knepper, Director of the County AgBoard, advised that once farms are split up with relaxed minimum lot size standards it is unlikely that they can be reassembled (personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014). Lewis Dukeman, Zoning Officer with Leacock Township, felt that larger parcels are generally better, but emphasized that a 100-acre standard would literally cause “pandemonium among the Amish” in Leacock Township because of the way they farm (personal...
communication, Aug. 25, 2014). For Frank Howe, Chairman of Leacock Township’s Board of Supervisors, it comes down to a matter of intention. If it is the Region of Waterloo’s intention to support the Anabaptist way of life and community, then he felt that concessions would need to be made in the way that they do business. “You have to work with them,” he advised. He felt that discouraging small farms and secondary businesses does not lend support to that community’s way of life (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014).

Other informants emphasized the complexity of setting an appropriate minimum lot size standard. “Let’s face it, [a relaxed minimum lot size standard] is a huge leap of faith for anyone to be faced with; just suddenly having it thrown at you like that. That is a challenge,” said Dennis Groff, Supervisor with Paradise Township and LCPC Representative for Region 6. For Karen Martynick, Executive Director of the LFT, it is a matter of balance. There are issues related to how large a farm needs to be in order for that farm to be viable and, in her mind, this should be a principal consideration. At the same time, a 100-acre standard presents a great challenge for young people looking to get started in farming and a hardship for Amish farmers who cannot reasonably manage that much acreage (K. Martynick, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). It is apparent that all of these considerations have combined to form a perplexing and difficult problem to address in the Township of Wellesley.

### 5.3.2 Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo

*Research Question: How have existing minimum lot size standards affected the farm community in the Township of Wellesley?*

In the Township of Wellesley, the expectation that farmland can be subdivided for non-agricultural use has been avoided with a minimum lot size standard that requires new farm parcels to be at least 99 acres in size. As a result, there have been few conflicts between farm and non-farm land uses in the Township (S. Duke, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). Aside
from the rather obvious benefit of conserving farmland, the Township’s existing minimum lot size standard has given farmers the flexibility to adjust as Ontario’s farm economy and markets change. By keeping parcels large and intact, farmers can easily switch from one commodity to another if they have to (B. MacKinnon, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). Carol Neumann, Rural Planner with the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) echoed this sentiment, “Agriculture and farming is dynamic. It depends a lot on market conditions and demand. The bigger the parcel, the more able you are to accommodate those fluctuations” (personal communication, Oct. 27, 2014).

Over the years, the Township of Wellesley has contemplated smaller farm parcels paired with intensive livestock operations – a common small-acreage adaptive strategy in Lancaster County – but quickly realized that small-acreage farmers would be hard pressed to grow the feed required by an intensive livestock operation. The Township decided that buying-in feed would necessitate increased truck traffic and road maintenance among other concerns (S. Duke, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). This contrasts with the Leacock Township situation, where purchasing feed from off-farm has become the norm. As well, the problem of handling manure on small-acreage has also been avoided in the Township of Wellesley. It was decided long ago that farmers in the Township would be hard pressed to handle manure on smaller acreage (S. Duke, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). A standard of 99 acres has also enabled farmers to successfully establish or expand existing livestock operations in the Township (G. VanderBaaren, personal communication, Oct. 2, 2014). The smaller the parcel, the more difficult it is for farmers to site their livestock facilities and manure storages in accordance with requirements prescribed by Minimum Distance Separation Implementation Guidelines (Government of Ontario, 2008). Based on the researcher’s observations of the sheer density of
farms in Leacock Township, the siting of livestock facilities would become a significant concern if that same density of farms were to be transposed onto the Ontario landscape. Figure 6 displays a photograph taken in Leacock Township where at least six farms are visible within the frame. This photograph illustrates the sheer intensity of farming there.

Figure 6: Density of Farms in Leacock Township (Source: Sharpe, 2014)

Like Leacock Township, it is apparent that the existing minimum lot size standard in the Township of Wellesley affects the Anabaptist farm population in a complex way. A negative offshoot of the 99-acre standard is that Mennonite families are moving elsewhere to find housing and employment (McClurg, 2003). This creates a rather awkward situation, because the Region wants families to stay (B. MacKinnon, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). While Amish families in Leacock Township are moving elsewhere too, they are doing so in a policy environment where more lenient minimum lot size standards have led to smaller farms. This is an indication that relaxing a minimum lot size standard serves only to meet the demand for housing over the short-term.
While a minimum lot size standard of 99 acres has helped to curb the fragmentation of farms in the Township of Wellesley, it is apparent that this standard serves to impede certain individuals from venturing into farm enterprises that are not predicated on animal agriculture. The two Townships share common ground in this regard. It is apparent that a 99-acre standard becomes a hard rule to apply when even smaller parcels can be agriculturally viable (G. VanderBaaren, personal communication, Oct. 2, 2014). However, informants remained generally uncomfortable with the thought of smaller farm parcels. Misgivings ranged from concerns about eventual non-farm use (G. VanderBaaren, personal communication, Oct. 2, 2014) to concerns about farm flexibility (B. MacKinnon, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). Regarding the complexities of establishing appropriate minimum lot size standards, informants let it be known that land use planners cannot “people zone” or base land-use planning decisions on religious beliefs in Ontario (K. Eby, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014; C. Neumann, personal communication, Oct. 27, 2014). It is apparent that these considerations add complexity to the challenging task of establishing appropriate minimum lot size standards where divergent communities exist in the Township of Wellesley and elsewhere in Ontario.

Research Question: How have planning authorities in the Township of Wellesley responded to any negative implications associated with the existing minimum lot size standard for farm parcel creation?

The Township of Wellesley’s minimum lot size standard of 99 acres has remained the same for a period of decades. With that being said, there is a policy in place that gives farmers in the Township of Wellesley some flexibility to propose a farm split that would lead to resultant farms having less than 99 acres (see Appendix H). Each case is evaluated according to its own individual merits, with a justification report submitted to the Region. Although the Mennonite population has inquired with the Region about this policy, applications are rarely successful.
Brenna MacKinnon has not received what she would consider to be a decent justification report in the 15 years that she has been employed with the Region (B. MacKinnon, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). It is apparent that even when there is a sensible application for a small farm parcel, planners might be inclined to say no. It is felt that planning authorities are upholding their minimum lot size standards for farm parcel creation even when there may be options that are appropriate (C. Neumann, personal communication, Oct. 27, 2014). A disconnect between policy planners and what agriculture involves is at issue here. The unique style of farming practiced by Amish and Mennonite farmers further complicates the issue (C. Neumann, personal communication, Oct. 27, 2014).

The Township of Wellesley’s Rural Mixed Use/Agricultural Cluster (MAC) Zone is part of a concerted planning effort by the Township to support residents who rely on horse-drawn vehicles as their primary means of transportation (B. MacKinnon, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). The idea for this zone was born out of a situation where the Township’s Mennonite population was increasing very rapidly, and there were no farms available for families to purchase. The Township was faced with the dilemma of splitting farms into smaller parcels versus keeping farms large and intact (K. Eby, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). Framing the demographic pinch as a situation that could be resolved through farm parcel creation presented a number of problems. Top of mind among the planning officials involved was that the Township had to find a way to accommodate its Mennonite population without opening the door for so-called hobby farms. The situation was ultimately framed as a housing and transportation issue. In essence, both the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Wellesley set out to accommodate a rural cultural community that faces certain restrictions in terms of housing and employment based on mode of transportation versus merely a different style of farming. For this
reason, planning officials were very careful not to frame the 10-acre properties as farm parcels even though non-commercial agricultural activities are permitted (K. Eby, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). To the casual observer, it seems very odd that the exclusion of commercial agriculture, no matter the type, would necessarily be an appropriate direction given the attributes of the rural cultural community for whom the development was designed. However, shops were a primary motive aside from the requirement for housing. When asked if it would be possible to incorporate commercial agricultural activities into policies for a second development, if and when a proposal is received, planning officials did not completely reject the idea but expressed certain reservations. For example, one hurdle would be figuring out a way to keep the parcels from falling into conflict with provincial policy (K. Eby, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). The researcher was informed that this is one of the unfortunate parts about planning in the Ontario context – it can be argued that delivering the Province’s objective of protecting farmland can actually hamper the viability of the farm economy (K. Eby, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). In Leacock Township on the other hand, the Township’s 15-acre farmette provision illustrates that ordinances can be tailor-made at the local level to suit the unique needs of divergent communities, such as the Old Order Amish, seemingly at the drop of a hat. Comparing the two case study sites, it is apparent that it is difficult to find balance between dichotomous approaches.

5.4 Results on the Ground: Agricultural Easements

5.4.1 Leacock Township, Lancaster County

Research Question: In Leacock Township and, more broadly, Lancaster County, how have agricultural easements been used to protect small farm parcels for agriculture?

In Lancaster County, the AgBoard will preserve a farm as small as 10-acres, but a farm this size is considered a low priority for protection. Farms are ranked according to acreage,
among other factors, and farms with large acreage receive a higher ranking. In this way, larger farms are prioritized for protection. If the AgBoard decided to purchase development rights to a 10-acre farm, the acquisition would need to be supported with County funds exclusively versus a combination of Commonwealth and County funds. A farm has to be at least 35 acres for Commonwealth funds to be allocated (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014).

This approach contrasts with that of the LFT who works with the County’s Anabaptist farmers – easements are held on a number of 20-acre farms and they are very viable farming operations (J. Swinehart, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). The goal of the LFT has been to build-up a large matrix of protected farmland that can be zoned for agricultural use. In a situation where there is a contiguous block of 800-1000 acres of protected farmland, it can be argued that a minimum lot size standard becomes less of an issue because all of the farmland in a given area is allocated for agricultural use (K. Martynick, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014).

It is apparent that agricultural easements can be used to ensure that a parcel of land will remain available for agricultural use in Lancaster County, but an easement does not necessarily ensure that a parcel will remain in agricultural production from year to year. Disparities between personal circumstances are part of this and it is very difficult to dictate. Requiring that a parcel remain in agricultural production through a restrictive covenant means that the easement will be difficult to enforce. This leads to uncertainty that might ultimately lead to an easement being overturned in the future (K. Martynick, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). At the same time, preserved farms sitting idle have not been an issue in Lancaster County because the demand for farmland among farmers is so high that there will always be someone willing to rent if the owner is not actively farming (M. Knepper, personal communication, Aug. 26, 2014).
5.4.2 Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo

Research Question: In the Township of Wellesley and, more broadly, in the Region of Waterloo, how have agricultural easements been used to protect small farm parcels for agriculture?

It is apparent that agricultural easements are comparatively far less common in the Township of Wellesley. In fact, agricultural easements are very rarely used in Ontario. The Ontario Farmland Trust (OFT) – the only land trust in the province dedicating its efforts to farmland – has protected a total of eight farms since it was founded in 2004 (Ontario Farmland Trust, 2014). With at least 800 farms protected by easement in Lancaster County, the OFT’s eight farms compares to only 1% of that amount. Based on the feedback from informants, it is apparent that agricultural easements are not top of mind for most planning officials. In fact, informants were generally uncomfortable with agricultural easements. After giving some consideration to agricultural easements, Susan Duke, retired Director of Planning for the Township of Wellesley concluded that easements do not seem to be an effective tool because they can become subject to change through the legal process (personal communication, Oct. 5, 2014). Brenna MacKinnon, Manager of Greenfield Planning with the Region of Waterloo, echoed this sentiment and raised concerns about the regulatory aspects of holding easements, especially in terms of monitoring (personal communication, Oct 6, 2014). Carol Neumann, Rural Planner with OMAFRA, explained that agricultural easements might lend credence to the saying “once a farm always a farm” but they might become problematic if a change in policy necessitated an expansion of UGBs into a periphery of protected farms (personal communication, Oct. 27, 2014). This accentuates the complexities of planning and is an example of where agricultural easements can arguably be both a benefit from a farmland protection standpoint and a detriment for other land use planning considerations such as growth management.
CHAPTER 6

COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY: SUMMARY FROM ANALYSIS

6.1 Observations, Conclusions, and Recommendations

“Provincial policy that is very dictatorial at the local level tends to be generally right, but is quite often specifically wrong. So the general objective of protecting farmland is great, but if you get down too deep in policy that needs to apply in many different situations, you are inevitably going to be wrong in at least one of them. This is how the provincial planning framework can be beneficial in one sense, but obstructive in another.” – Kevin Eby, Director of Community Planning, Region of Waterloo

An objective of this research was to collect detailed descriptive information about tools for farmland conservation with special attention paid to divergent minimum lot size standards in Leacock Township and the Township of Wellesley. Land division policy in the Township of Wellesley is far more restrictive than in Leacock Township, and this is illustrated by a minimum lot size standard of 99 acres for farm parcel creation. Nonetheless, a comparison of the two planning systems under study confirms that zoning, as a rigid land use control, is seen as a necessary tool for safeguarding against the loss of farmland in both Townships.

A second objective was to undertake an examination of tools for farmland conservation (including minimum lot size standards) in each jurisdiction with special attention to how and why such tools and standards are effective (or ineffective) in promoting positive outcomes for agriculture and Anabaptist communities. In terms of zoning, it is apparent that the overall stability of the planning system in the Township of Wellesley contributes to the effectiveness of zoning there, whereas in Leacock Township, zoning seems easier to change, but is a keystone for other tools like PDR. In terms of minimum lot size standards, the situation on the ground in Leacock Township confirms that the Government of Ontario’s basis for keeping farm parcels large and intact follows Kevin Eby’s notion of generally right. It is apparent that livestock
producers generally need a large land base for crop production and manure management (Government of Ontario, 2008). It is apparent that large farm parcels generally provide farmers with flexibility to adjust their operations as the farm economy and markets change (Government of Ontario, 2014). It is apparent that large farm parcels generally allow farmers to reduce their operational costs (Government of Ontario, 2008) by, for example, growing the feed that is required by their livestock instead of purchasing feed from off-farm. Finally, it is apparent that keeping farm parcels large and intact avoids both the cumulative and incremental loss of farmland (Jackson, 2004) as well as the expectation that farmland can be subdivided for non-agricultural use (Smith, 1998). It is also apparent that a lower minimum lot size standard will not necessarily resolve an ongoing demographic pinch over the long-term. In these respects, the research seems to provide justification for the status quo.

A comparison of the two planning systems under study confirms that Leacock Township is better equipped to respond to the individual needs and goals of divergent communities, such as the Old Order Amish. On the one hand, there are Old Order Amish families in Ontario earning a living from 10 acres of vegetables (Bennett, 2003) while on the other, there are individuals farming hundreds of acres conventionally. Within this context, it is easy to discern how balance, as an end goal of policy, can be difficult to achieve. Leacock Township’s soon-to-be-reinstated ordinance provision for a 15-acre farmette is illustrative of local government’s capacity to respond to individual needs and goals by enabling a style of farming predicated on small parcel agriculture. When asked how existing minimum lot size standards serve the public interest, it came as no surprise when informants from Leacock Township saw value for the well-being of the general public in a 40-acre standard that creates opportunities for young families to find farm-based housing and employment. Conversely, informants from the Township of Wellesley saw
value for the well-being of the general public in a 99-acre standard that protects farmland first and foremost. In this sense, farmland is held to deserve greater importance than individual needs and goals in the Township of Wellesley. It can be concluded that the logic behind approaches to land division policy across the two Townships can be explained by differences between values. In the Township of Wellesley, setting an appropriate minimum lot size standard has been a matter of balance between individual goals and the public interest. Planners are faced with the challenging task of balancing small parcel agriculture with the reality that once a 100-acre farm is divided into smaller parcels, it is unlikely that it will ever revert back to being whole again. The question then becomes: Is there value today in creating smaller farm parcels for a community whose cultural farming system can be compatible with small parcel agriculture versus maintaining large and contiguous tracts of farmland in the face of an uncertain future? Insofar as farmland continues be valued over individual needs and goals, Kevin Eby’s notion of policy that is generally right might be all that can be reasonably achieved.

The body of literature surrounding so-called wicked problems is conceptually important to this work. As discussed in Chapter 2, policy for farm parcel creation is an example of a wicked problem. Camillus (2008) argues that wicked problems might be impossible to solve, but they can be tamed. The collaborative work that went into the existing Rural Mixed Use / Agricultural Cluster in the Township of Wellesley illustrates that it is possible, with much effort, to work within Ontario’s existing policy framework to lessen the effects of a demographic pinch caused by land division policy among other factors. Provincial requirements gave leverage to planners collaborating with a Mennonite community to find solutions to an ongoing housing shortage (K. Eby, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014). Under Section 1.4 of the Provincial Policy Statement municipalities are required to “provide for an appropriate range and mix of
housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents” and must facilitate “all forms of housing required to meet the social, health and well-being requirements of current and future residents” (Government of Ontario, 2014b, pg. 14).

A third objective of this research was to form recommendations for policy makers in Ontario. An important finding from the literature dealing with wicked problems is that stakeholder engagement is vital to the process of exploring possible solutions (Briggs, 2007) and it is apparent that planners in the Region of Waterloo exceeded all expectations in this regard. Jeff Conklin (2006), author of Dialogue Mapping: Building Shared Understanding of Wicked Problems, argues that taming wicked problems is “fundamentally a social process” (pg. 29, emphasis in original). This is a reminder that it is no longer acceptable, in the 21st century, for land use planners to be merely technocrats. Just as it is no longer acceptable for planners to insulate themselves from the public, citizens have to be willing to engage with planners in critical dialogue about how best to approach problems (Conklin, 2006). After all, the cluster development in the Township of Wellesley exists today because of collaborative efforts amongst a handful of dedicated planners and members of a Mennonite community who felt strongly enough about an issue to work alongside local and Regional governments.

The information presented here, and in the preceding chapter, leads the researcher to certain key observations and recommendations. While existing policy and provisions specific to the existing cluster might be considered a small win in the Township of Wellesley, it is apparent that much work remains to be done to explore possible policy avenues for small parcel agriculture specific to the Anabaptist population. Reflecting on Kevin Eby’s phrase – generally right, but specifically wrong – the researcher wonders if it might be possible to begin a shift toward outcomes that are specifically right. Starting with the Township of Wellesley’s Rural
Mixed Use / Agricultural Cluster Zone, the researcher cannot help but wonder if the exclusion of commercial agriculture, no matter the type, would necessarily be the right approach for a second development in a world where uncertainties about various climate change scenarios might necessitate the need for a renewed focus on local food in order to meet Ontario’s own domestic consumption needs. This research also points to agricultural easements as a tool that might be paired with existing policy to bolster confidence that small parcels will remain available for agriculture. It is apparent that the timing is right to explore this avenue, given that the Wynne Government has earmarked $40 million a year over ten years for a “Farms Forever” program aimed at protecting farmland near urban areas with easements (Jones, 2014). Adopting an even wider outlook, the researcher’s intuitive conclusion is that there needs to be recognition of Mennonite and Old Order Amish cultural heritage in the Provincial Policy Statement. This would provide some much-needed leverage for planners as they explore possibilities for change. Above all, exploring potential policy avenues will require a collaborative effort between policy makers and the communities affected by their decisions.
CHAPTER 7

EXAMINATION OF SMALL-ACREAGE FARMER STRATEGIES AND POLICY PERSPECTIVES: TOWNSHIP AND INFORMANT PROFILES

For this component of the research, a total of eighteen small-acreage Mennonite farmers were interviewed from November to December 2014. Interviews were undertaken across three rural municipalities in the Region of Waterloo and the County of Huron. Seven interviews were undertaken in the Township of Wellesley, eight interviews were undertaken in the Township of Woolwich, and five interviews were undertaken in the Township of Howick. This chapter profiles each Township, relevant policy, and the informants themselves. The chapters that follow – Chapter 8 and Chapter 9 – discuss the results from the inquiry.

7.1 Township of Wellesley

7.1.1 Informants

A total of seven informants were interviewed in the Township of Wellesley. Six of these informants were included in the sample; the remaining informant – Farmer 19 – has been excluded from the sample because his home farm exceeds 50 acres. However, Farmer 19 is profiled in Appendix C. All seven informants belong to a group known as David Martin Mennonites. This group originated after a separation in 1917 from the Old Order Mennonite Conference of Ontario owing to differences between individual families. Deacon David Martin led this separation. The David Martin group has maintained a separate identity with no interaction with any other Mennonite groups (Fretz, 1989). Since 1958, the group has grown rapidly through natural increase. In 2010, it numbered around 3,500 people (Hoover, 2010a).

\textsuperscript{24} A detailed profile of the Township of Wellesley (and relevant policy) can be found in ss. 4.1.4 and has not been repeated in this chapter.
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Observations by an individual with direct knowledge of the group confirmed that members utilize horse-drawn vehicles for transportation, draught horsepower for fieldwork, and certain aspects of modern technology on their farms including skid-steers for manure handling, as well as cell phones and computers for business (Jane C. Doe, personal communication, Oct. 3, 2014). Through the use of stationary engines and power plants, a high level of industrialization has been attained and the group is considered to be at the “forefront of industry and commerce” (Hoover, 2010a).

7.2 Township of Woolwich

7.2.1 General

The Township of Woolwich is a predominately rural municipality in the Region of Waterloo, Ontario. Located in the northeast corner of the Region, the Township of Woolwich is directly north and east of the City of Waterloo (Figure 7). In 2011, it had a total population of 23,145 (Government of Canada, 2014). The Township of Woolwich (2012) considers itself a “Rural - Small Urban” municipality and this feeling reflects the Township’s proximity to the major urban centers of Waterloo and Kitchener (pg. 6-1). It is well understood that agriculture is an important contributor to the Township’s economy (Township of Woolwich, 2012). Prime agricultural areas identified by the Region cover much of the Township (Region of Waterloo, 2006). There is a strong revealed pattern of commodity specialization across the Township with 69% of the Township’s 492 farms dedicated to animal production. In 2011, 121 farms, the largest proportion of farms across the Township, specialized in dairy cattle and milk production (Government of Canada, 2011b).

7.2.2 Policy
The ZBL for the Township of Woolwich prescribes a minimum lot size standard of 99 acres for farm parcel creation in the Township’s Zone A- Agriculture zone (Township of Woolwich, 2014). Applications for farm parcels having less than a minimum of 99 acres are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and may be permitted through a site-specific ZBL amendment subject to policy that can be found in Appendix Q. The Township’s OP and ZBL contain policies and provisions to expand the range of on-farm housing choices available to its farm population. For example, a second permanent or temporary farm-related residential unit may be permitted on a farm parcel in Zone A- Agriculture in order to accommodate full-time farm employees, members of the household, or to aid retiring farmers. The conversion of an existing farm-related residential unit, to create a second or even third residential unit may also be permitted in this zone. Either option can be accomplished through a site-specific ZBL amendment (Township of Woolwich, 2012). This policy can be found in Appendix R. The Township’s OP and ZBL also contain policies and provisions for on-farm business activities in Zone A- Agriculture. For example, a farm-related occupation on any parcel of land not less than 25 acres is a permitted use, but the range of occupations are limited to woodworking or activities providing a good or service for farm operations such as blacksmithing (Township of Woolwich, 2014). This provision can be found in Appendix S and serves to expand the range of employment choices available to the Township’s farm population.

7.2.3 Informants

A total of eight informants were interviewed in the Township of Woolwich. Seven of these informants were included in the sample; the remaining informant – Farmer 20 – has been excluded from the sample because his home farm exceeds 50 acres. However, Farmer 20 is profiled in Appendix C. All seven informants in this category belong to the Old Order Mennonite
Church. Observations by an individual with direct knowledge of the group confirmed that Old Order Mennonites utilize horse-drawn vehicles for transportation, but have adopted certain modern conveniences such as tractors for fieldwork (Jane Doe, personal communication, Oct. 3, 2014). Figure 8 displays a representative Mennonite farm in the Township of Woolwich.

Figure 7: Map of the Township of Woolwich in the Region of Waterloo, Ontario
7.3 Township of Howick

7.3.1 General

The Township of Howick is a predominately rural municipality in Huron County, Ontario. It is located in the northeast corner of the County (Figure 9). In 2011, it had a total population of 3,856 (Government of Canada, 2012b). 85% of the Township’s land area is rated as Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2 and 3 for agricultural capability. The quality of the Township’s soil, combined with the skill and dedication of its farmers, has resulted in a strong agricultural economy (Township of Howick, 2011). There is a strong pattern of commodity specialization across the Township with 63% of the 274 farms dedicated to animal production. In 2011, 84 farms, the largest proportion of farms across the Township, specialized in oilseed and grain farming (Government of Canada, 2011b).
7.3.2 Policy

The ZBL for the Township of Howick prescribes a minimum lot size standard of 74 acres for farm parcel creation in the Township’s General Agriculture (AG1) Zone. This standard “is based on the long-term needs of agriculture” (Township of Howick, 2011, pg. 8). Unlike the Townships of Wellesley and Woolwich, the Township of Howick’s OP provides no indication...
that an application for a parcel having less than 74 acres would be considered. The Township’s OP and ZBL contain policies and provisions to expand the range of on-farm housing choices available to its farm population. For example, a single mobile home accessory to an agricultural use is permitted in the General Agriculture (AG1) Zone and so is a dwelling enlarged to contain a maximum of two dwelling units, provided they are accessory to an agricultural use (Township of Howick, 2013). This provision can be found in Appendix T. The Township’s OP and ZBL also contain policies and provisions for on-farm business activities in the General Agriculture (AG1) Zone. For example, a home industry (e.g. carpentry, electrical, window framing) is permitted as an accessory use to agriculture subject to a number of conditions (Township of Howick, 2013). This provision can be found in Appendix U and serves to expand the range of employment choices available to the Township’s farm population.

7.3.3 Informants

A total of five informants were interviewed in the Township of Howick. All five of these informants were included in the sample and belong to a group known as Orthodox Mennonites. This group formed after the excommunication of Elam Martin in 1957, a minister in the David Martin group. In 1979, some members withdrew, with some returning to the David Martin group, whereas others moved to the Gorrie – Wroxeter area in the Township of Howick (Fretz, 1989). This group has sustained steady growth in Huron County, doubling, tripling and quadrupling in numbers as of 2010 (Hoover, 2010b). Orthodox Mennonites tend toward simplicity and non-conformity with the world (Hoover, 2010b). They do not have electricity, telephones, computers, and automobiles, hot running water, clothes dryers, etc. Most families live on mixed-farms where the work is done by hand or by horses and horse-drawn equipment. Figure 10 displays a representative Mennonite farm in the Township of Howick.
Figure 10: Township of Howick Farm
CHAPTER 8

EXAMINATION OF FARMER STRATEGIES AND PERSPECTIVES: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

8.1 Farm Type and Operations

8.1.1 Summary of Data Compiled from Across the Study Sample (Three Ontario Townships)

As I arrived to introduce myself, I was greeted by two towering draft horses pulling a plow that was steered by an undeniably proud young man with his hands firmly on the reins. With large billowing puffs of white steam escaping with each labored breath, the horses stopped to gaze at me with gentle eyes. This scene appeared against a backdrop of the field behind the plow. From our vantage point on the hill, the same scene unfolded on countless neighbouring farms for as far as the eye could see – Researcher’s Journal Entry, Twp. of Wellesley

Table 3 shows the principal farm types across the sample of eighteen informants. Four informants representing 22.2% of the sample are dairy producers (i.e. dairy cows or goats). Only one of these informants – Farmer 18 – combined his dairy operation with livestock. For the purposes of this research, livestock (i.e. beef cattle, sheep, and hogs) are treated separately from dairy cows and goats. Nine informants representing 50% of the sample produce livestock with four informants producing beef only (specialized), three informants producing a combination of beef and sheep (mixed), one informant producing a combination of beef and hogs (mixed), and one informant producing hogs only (specialized) (Table 4). The approximate inventory of livestock for all farms (excluding dairy cows and goats) was: beef cattle (700), sheep (305 - 405), and hogs (750 - 800). Three informants, representing 16.6% of the sample, have poultry only. A single informant derives his solitary farm income from growing produce. Likewise, a single informant derives a solitary farm income from a tree nursery. Twelve informants representing 72.2% of the sample of eighteen informants grew field crops in 2014 with corn, mixed-grain and hay forage commonly grown. Only one informant – Farmer 5 – identified himself as a ‘cash cropper’. He also raises hogs and has therefore been classified as a livestock
producer for the purposes of this study. It is unclear if two informants – Farmer 11 and Farmer 15 – grew field crops because information about field crops was not obtained from these farmers. Therefore, the number of informants producing field crops may actually be higher. Characteristics of produce growing across the sample of eighteen informants are shown in Table 5. Seven informants or 38.9% of the sample of eighteen informants grew produce in 2014, with a combined acreage of at least 46.5 acres in production. It is unclear if Farmer 11 grows produce because information about produce growing was not obtained from this farmer. It is also unclear how many acres of garlic Farmer 17 had in production. Farmer 17 grows garlic, but it is unclear how much acreage is in production because this information was not obtained. Therefore, the combined acres in production are actually greater than that which is stated above. Of the seven definite informants growing produce, six were involved in other agricultural activities. This is an indication that produce growing is very much a “sideline” activity for these informants.

Table 3: Principal Farm Types Across the Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Farm Type</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Production (Cows)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Production (Goats)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Production</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Production</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and/or Vegetables</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Nursery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Informants with Mixed v. Specialized Livestock Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock Production</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialized¹</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed²</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Beef, sheep or hogs only.
² Combination of beef, sheep or hogs.
Table 5: Characteristics of Produce Growing Across the Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produce Growing</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Total Acreage in Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Principal Farm Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined with Other Agricultural Activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the distribution of total home farm acreage – defined as the home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented – across the sample. The sum total home farm acreage is 712 acres. The home farms ranged in size from 10 to 50 acres with a median of 48.7 acres and a mode of 50 acres. The average size of the home farms across the sample is 39.5 acres.

Table 6: Distribution of Home Farm Acreage Across the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Home Farm Acreage(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-10 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Farms</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

Table 7 shows the distribution of total acreage – defined as the total home farm acreage and other acreage owned, rented and farmed – across the sample. The sum total acreage is 1434.9 acres, an increase of 722.9 acres over the total home farm acreage across the sample. Total acreage ranged from 20 to 210 acres with a median of 54 acres and a mode of 50 acres. Based on the total acreage for all eighteen informants, the average farm size across the sample increased from 39.5 acres to 79.7 acres. Farmer 1 owns an additional five farms, but these farms are rented out. Therefore, they were excluded from the calculations in Table 7. All acreage owned, rented and farmed was included. On some farms, the acreage farmed exceeded the

\(^{25}\) As a reminder to the reader, only farm parcels of 50 acres or less were identified for the study.
minimum acreage requirements prescribed by minimum lot size standards. Given that they are farming this amount, it is apparent that transposing their existing farm operations onto a 50-acre parcel could put these farmers at a disadvantage.

Table 7: Distribution of Total Acreage Across the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Acreage$^1$</th>
<th>0-30</th>
<th>31-60</th>
<th>61-90</th>
<th>91-120</th>
<th>121-200</th>
<th>200+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Farms</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Total home farm acreage and other acreage owned, rented and farmed.

Table 8 shows each informant’s financial dependency on additional acreage. The largest cohort in the sample (61.1 percent) was found to be *home-farm focused*. The eleven informants indicated that their home farm financially supports itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed. A second group was found to be *acreage-assisted* (38.9 percent). The seven informants – each with livestock – indicated that their home farm does not financially support itself and the household without additional acreage farmed.

Table 8: Informants’ Financial Dependency on Additional Acreage Farmed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependency on Additional Acreage</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Farm Focused$^1$</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage-Assisted$^2$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ The home farm (i.e. the home farm parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented) financially supports itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed.

$^2$ The home farm does not financially support itself and the household without additional acreage farmed.

8.1.2 Illustrative Informant Profiles

The following two informant profiles are illustrative of the two distinct types of farm operations observed across the sample – mixed (Farmer 15) and specialized (Farmer 9):
Farmer 15’s home farm of 50 acres with 45 acres tillable is in the Township of Howick. He and his wife have owned it for 17 years. He neither owns nor rents additional acreage. He fattens 50 cattle in an anti-biotic free environment and has 35 sheep. The sheep are shipped to a sale barn in Brussels and the cattle are shipped to a specialty market in Toronto. He feels that his home farm financially supports itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed. “I do buy-in corn off and on,” he explained. He recently took up produce growing and has 5 acres of vegetables in production. Vegetables grown include potatoes, sweet corn, tomatoes, beans, peas, carrots, etc. He also has a small apple orchard comprising about 30 trees. 100% of the vegetables are sold through a market stand at the farm gate. His customers are primarily cottagers heading to points north along the Bruce Peninsula. He and his wife have 10 children.

Farmer 9’s home farm of 46 acres with 30 acres tillable is in the Township of Wellesley. His family has owned the farm since the 1940s. He does not feel that the home farm could financially support itself and the household without additional acreage farmed. He owns an additional 70 acres (all of it tillable), which he views as a necessity. He also rents an additional 30 acres (all of it tillable), which he views as discretionary. He farms with modern equipment and participates in a supply-managed sector by milking between 36 and 40 dairy cows. A truck picks up the milk at the farm and delivers it to a plant where it is processed. He grows the vast majority of the feed for the operation and buys-in some straw. Without the additional 70 acres owned, he would have to buy-in more feed and manure management would be a problem.

8.1.3 Discussion

In 1989, Winfield Fretz wrote, “Nothing is more characteristic of Waterloo Mennonites today than their role as productive farm families” (pg. 181). It is evident that the same is true for the sample of eighteen informants. While their farms may be small, it is evident that they are
making a significant contribution to Ontario’s agri-food sector. Farmer 15’s operation typifies the oft-cited Mennonite farm described by Fretz (1989) as a “non-specialized family enterprise” (pg. 182). This style of mixed farming is entrenched in the Mennonite philosophy of financial autonomy, which Fretz (1989) described as “not putting all one’s eggs in a single basket” (pg. 188). Despite the frequency of mixed farming among Mennonites, Fretz (1989) identified a rising trend of specialization on Mennonite farms in response to economic conditions in agriculture. Farmer 9’s dairy operation typifies this trend. He specializes in dairy production, farms with mechanized equipment, and has more acreage.

8.2 Home-Farm Focused

I returned as the sun was falling below the tree line. On my way, I passed a farm where a high hoe was busy dismantling some farm buildings. Against the backdrop of the setting sun and in the soft light of a glowing Coleman lantern, the man explained how a “cash cropper” had recently paid in the ballpark of $1.6 million for the farm I had passed. “We didn’t even have a chance at it...we can’t compete with the cash croppers,” he said. This made for a rather ominous setting—Researcher’s Journal Entry, Twp. of Howick

8.2.1 Summary of Data Compiled From Across the Category

The distribution of total home farm acreage – defined as the home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented – among those informants found to be home-farm focused is shown in Table 9. Across the eleven informants in this category, the sum total home-farm acreage is 426 acres. The farms ranged from 10 to 50 acres with a median and mode of 50 acres. Home farms averaged 38.7 acres.
Table 9: Distribution of Home-Farm Acreage Among the Home-Farm Focused

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Home Farm Acreage(^1)</th>
<th>0-20 Acres</th>
<th>21-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Farms</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Category</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

Table 10 shows the characteristics of those informants found to be home-farm focused. These informants indicated that their home farm financially supports itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed. Of these eleven informants, three are poultry producers, four are livestock producers, two are dairy producers, one grows produce, and one operates a tree nursery. Two informants owned and/or rented additional acreage: Farmer 2 owns, rents, and farms additional acreage as a discretionary choice whereas Farmer 17 owns and farms additional acreage as a necessity, not to financially support the home farm and household \textit{per se}, but, rather, because the acreage lies in waiting for one of his children who will eventually need a farm. All of the informants in the home-farm focused category are involved in some type of on-farm business or extra paid activity to diversify revenue. All but a single informant – Farmer 13 – consider these extra revenue streams as a necessity. Growing produce is an extra paid activity for three of the eleven informants in the home-farm focused category. Two informants – Farmer 1 and Farmer 3 – are involved in employment off-farm. They are the only informants with off-farm employment across the sample. Farmers 1 through 3 also rent acreage off their home farms as an extra revenue stream. They are the only informants renting acreage off their home farms across the sample.
Table 10: Characteristics of Informants Found to be Home-Farm Focused

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home Farm Acreage&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Principal Farm Type</th>
<th>Additional Acreage Owned and/or Rented</th>
<th>On-Farm Business or Extra Paid Activity</th>
<th>Produce</th>
<th>Off-Farm Job&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Acreage Rented Out&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Livestock (Beef)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Dairy (Goats)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>Produce</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Livestock (Beef)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Livestock (Beef and Sheep)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Livestock (Beef and Sheep)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tree Nursery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Dairy (Goats)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

<sup>2</sup> Farmer 1 and Farmer 3 are the only informants across the sample of eighteen informants with off-farm employment. Not a single spouse held off-farm employment across the sample.

<sup>3</sup> Farmers 1 through 3 are the only informants across the sample of eighteen informants who rented acreage off their home farms.

Table 11 shows the stated intent, among those informants who were found to be home-farm focused, to change the scale of their farming operations by adding more acres. Of the eleven informants who were found to be home-farm focused, only three informants – Farmer 1, Farmer
15 and Farmer 18 – stated a future intent to expand the number of acres farmed. They are the only three informants with future intentions to expand acreage farmed across the sample.

Table 11: Acreage Intentions Among Those Informants Found to be Home-Farm Focused

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage</th>
<th>Intention to Expand Acres Farmed</th>
<th>Stay the Same</th>
<th>Intention to Decrease Acres Farmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

2 Farmer 1, Farmer 15 and Farmer 18 are the only informants across the sample of eighteen informants with an intention to expand the number of acres farmed.

8.2.2 Illustrative Informant Profiles

Farmer 18’s home farm of 50 acres with 35 acres tillable is in the Township of Howick. He and his wife have owned it for 17 years. With the help of his family of eleven he milks 80 goats by hand. The milk is shipped to Hewitt’s Dairy. “The goats carry the farm,” he explained. He stockers 20 beef cattle and stables a family milk cow, two driving horses, and four draught horses. He grows mixed-grain and blends it with kiln-dried corn that is purchased from off-farm. He also purchases distiller’s grain from off-farm as well as his hay. He grows 3 acres of fruit and vegetables which is very labour intensive: a half acre each of garlic and onions which are sold outside of Huron County; and a half acre each of muskmelon and pumpkins which are sold
locally. Other extra paid-activities include a woodshop and maple syrup (approx. 1,000 taps). He views the income derived from these activities as a necessity.

Farmer 17’s home farm of 10 acres with 6 acres tillable is in the Township of Howick. He and his wife have owned it for 4 years. “A smaller acreage farm was our most viable option financially,” he explained. He has a tree nursery and grows between 5,000 and 10,000 trees including fruit trees, shade trees, conifers for windbreaks, and shrubs. 75% of the trees are sold within Huron County. He grows garlic for a buyer from Toronto and assembles parts for beehives. He views the income derived from these extra paid activities as a necessity. He owns an additional 48-acre parcel with 21 acres tillable. He explained that it’s “for the next generation”. Fourteen acres are rented to a cash cropper for $300.00 an acre, but he views this income as discretionary.

Farmer 16’s home farm of 50 acres with 35 acres tillable is in the Township of Howick. He and his wife have owned it for 11 years. He fattens between 100-200 lambs. He buys them in at 50-60 lbs. and brings them to 100 lbs. each. He buys-in corn for the sheep and grows hay and corn silage for 30 head of stocker cattle. He feeds the cattle corn silage and hay that is grown on the farm. The livestock are shipped to a local sale barn. He operates an on-farm woodshop where he builds upwards of fifty storage sheds per year. He views the income from the shop as a necessity. He felt that he could get by without the shop if he worked more intensely with his hands growing produce. “I wouldn’t see a problem with the land being self-supporting,” he explained.

Farmer 15’s operation was also relevant in ss. 8.1.2 and is profiled there. It has not been repeated here.
**Farmer 14**’s home farm of 50 acres with 20 acres tillable is in the Township of Howick. He and his wife have owned it for 10 years. Ten beef cattle are fed on a contract basis for Howick Community Farmers, a cooperative between several other Mennonite farmers in the area. He operates a cider mill. Customers drop off their apples and pick up the juice. This is a seasonal on-farm business that is busy for about 6-7 weeks in the fall. The cattle are sold to specialty markets in Toronto and 100% of the apple juice is for local customers. He has a shoe manufacturing and harness shop on the farm. He views the income derived from this on-farm business as a necessity. Although there are other things he could do on the farm so that he would not need the shop, he chose to start the shop because he is a skilled tradesman and there is a need for his products across the community.

**Farmer 13**’s home farm of 21.5 acres with 20 acres tillable is in the Township of Woolwich. He and his wife have owned it for 8 years. He grows 18.5 acres of strawberries, leeks, specialty carrots, beets, rooted parsley, parsnip and kale. He has a 6,000 sq. ft. greenhouse where he grows flowers. All of the produce is sold through the EPAC. “The farming operation pays for itself and our bills. It is a financially viable business,” he explained. He grows high-value crops that bring a high return per acre and which are very labor intensive. He has a sideline business that makes up 10% of his total income. He does not view this income as a necessity.

**Farmer 7**’s home farm of 49.5 acres and 43 acres tillable is in the Township of Woolwich. He and his wife have owned it for 8 years. He neither owns nor rents any additional acreage. He milks dairy goats and has approximately 110 milking at any given time. Both the size of his farm and the absence of any quota requirements were factors in his decision to invest upwards of $200,000 in a herd, a milking barn and equipment. “[The farm] holds its own, but that is probably it,” he explained. “The reason it works is that we have private interest-free
loans," he explained. He grows 20 acres of corn – half for grain and half for silage – 10 acres of soybeans and 10 acres of oats on rotation. He buys-in hay because he does not have the land base to grow his own, “If I wanted to have 300 goats, like what you see on some of the larger farms, I would have to have more acreage,” he explained. He markets homemade soap and has a small woodshop on the farm. He views the income from these extra paid-activities as a necessity.

Farmer 4’s home farm of 50 acres with 45 acres tillable is in the Township of Wellesley. He neither owns nor rents any additional acreage. His family has owned the farm for 29 years. He farms 70 head of beef cattle, plants corn and mixed-grain, and harvests hay forage. He purchases feed from off-farm to start the cattle but “everybody does this,” he explained. He stockers cattle and when they reach the desired weight, they are loaded onto a truck and shipped to a stockyard that pays by the pound. He sometimes fattens cattle too. He operates an on-farm business machining automotive parts, which he described as “pretty much a full time job”. He views the income derived from this on-farm business as a necessity.

Farmer 3’s home farm of 25 acres with 21 acres tillable is in the Township of Wellesley. He and his wife have owned it for 20 years. He neither owns nor rents any additional acreage. He grows 7 acres of hay and rents out the remaining 14 acres to a neighbor. He has a poultry barn and raises waterfowl under contract for a poultry dealer. “It’s a non-quota deal,” he explained. Although “It’s a challenge to stay on top of it… we’ve learned how things work in the poultry market,” he said. He does not rely on his home farm acreage for the poultry operation since he buys-in feed from off farm. He views the income from the rented acreage as a necessity. He also views the income from his on-farm woodshop and casual off-farm employment as a necessity.

Farmer 2’s home farm of 50 acres with 44 acres tillable is in the Township of Wellesley. He has owned it for 19 years. He has a poultry farm where he raises waterfowl as hatch flocks.
The ducklings are sold to local growing barns. He also manufactures horse-drawn vehicles. He views the income derived from this on-farm business as a necessity. He rents the tillable acreage off the home farm and views the income from the rented acreage as a necessity. Two years ago he purchased an additional 60-acre parcel. “I wanted it for my kids in case they want to farm in the future,” he explained. In 2014, he rented 100 acres with 60 acres tillable to grow corn as a cash crop. He farmed this additional acreage to “make some extra cash” but maintained that his decision to rent additional acreage was a discretionary choice rather than a necessity. “If commodity prices were good right now, I would keep up with it, but commodity prices are way down,” he explained.

Farmer 1’s home farm of 20 acres with 15 acres tillable is in the Township of Wellesley. He and his wife have owned it for 20 years. He feeds 6,000 turkeys in a poultry barn that he described as a “small operation by industry standards”. He rents 10 acres off the home farm to a neighbour. He views the income from these rented acres as a necessity. He owns a 6,000 sq. ft. woodworking shop and has contracts with various companies. He views the income derived from this on-farm business as a necessity. He also works off-farm as a contractor, and he views this extra paid activity as a necessity. Ten years ago, he purchased five farms in Bruce County totaling approximately 600 acres. These farms are being rented to cash croppers until his sons and their families require farms of their own.
8.2.3 Discussion

Research Question: For those informants found to be home-farm focused, do they feel that their home farm financially supports itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed (i.e. does farm autonomy correspond with an increase in acres farmed)?

While the informants in this category indicated that their home farm financially supports itself and the household without additional acres farmed, it is evident that certain informants are more reliant on inputs from off-farm than are others. This is illustrated by Farmer 18’s profile. He absorbs a cash outlay for purchased feed. It is evident that purchased feed serves as a small-acreage adaptive strategy, but this strategy necessitates an added operational cost that might otherwise be avoided if his home farm was larger. Farmer 18 informed the researcher that 100 acres would be ideal because this would allow him to grow all of his own hay and feed. Looking ahead to the future, it is Farmer 18’s intention to expand the number of acres farmed. This adds support to the provincial position that operational costs can be handled better on larger farms (Jackson, 2004). Farmer 13’s profile points to a situation that is quite the opposite. With just 21.5 acres, he grows produce as his main source of income and has no plans to expand the number of acres he farms in the future. In this sense, the farm is autonomous. This is supportive of the idea that produce growing is comparatively better suited to smaller acreage than livestock production. The latter generally requires a large land base for pasture, crop production and manure management (Government of Ontario, 2008).

Research Question: For those informants found to be home-farm focused, is farm enlargement viewed as the only way to be successful and to sustain the home farm?

According to the Government of Ontario (2008), “[a]ll types of agricultural operations must be located on farm parcels that are large enough to let them not only operate today, but expand in the future if it is needed” (pg. 6). While this is an apparent prerequisite, only three of the eleven informants in this category indicated that it is their future intention to expand the
number of acres that they farm. This is a strong indication that these informants do not view farm enlargement as the only way to be successful on their farms. In contrast, attention is drawn to Smithers and Johnson’s (2004) findings from their study of change on family farms across the Township of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh in Huron County, Ontario. From a sample of 70 farmers, they found that 48.6%, the largest cohort in the sample, were actively pursuing expansion of their farms. Deciding to stay the same appears to be a rational choice given the price of farmland that ranges from $10,000 an acre in the Township of Howick to $18,000 an acre in the Townships of Wellesley and Woolwich. Aside from the obvious factors of farmland availability and affordability, the researcher suggests that there are three other factors that might help explain the low number of farmers with future intentions to expand the number of acres farmed.

First, it is apparent that mixed farming with hand labor and horses does not fit well with an expansionist strategy. As Farmer 16 explained, “For me to expand doesn’t make sense. If I want to do all my work by hand, intensely, I can’t work more than 30 acres alone”. For those informants who farm intensively with hand labour and horses it is evident that profitability is contingent on intensive land use rather than farming additional acreage. This supports Bennett’s (2003) research, which found that young Amish families do not aspire to have large farms, even if they could afford them, because this would necessitate an undesirable move toward mechanization.

Second, comparative differences in the intensity of livestock production might be a factor in attitudes toward the need for additional acreage. The four livestock producers who were found to be home-farm focused have a lower combined stock of cattle, sheep and hogs (N= 395) than the livestock producers in the acreage-assisted category (N= 1,496). Removing the informant
with the largest stock of animals (N=500 hogs) in the acreage-assisted category reduces the latter estimate to around 996 animals, which is still comparatively higher. While an economist might criticize this disparity on purely economic grounds, financial gain is not the only criteria by which success is measured by Mennonites on their farms. Less tangible criteria include permanency, industriousness, candour, stewardship and a deep respect for the soil (Fretz, 1989).

Third, certain cultural factors appear to boost the profitability of these farms, precluding the need to expand the number of acres farmed. For example, certain informants in this category practice a style of farming that allows family labour to be employed in labor-intensive farm work that might otherwise be accomplished with expensive labour-saving machinery on more specialized farms (Fretz, 1989). When asked about his overhead relative to the $30,000 of gross profit from his 5 acres of produce, Farmer 15 explained, “We didn’t hire anybody – it’s just the family;” he has ten children. This is an indication that he does not carry the financial burden of diverting a substantial amount of his farm income for paid services, although he still has a large family to raise. As well, Farmer 15 has a comparatively lower capital investment relative to farms with more acreage and modern equipment because he farms fewer acres with horses and traditional equipment (Fretz, 1989). When the low cost of labour is combined with the core Mennonite cultural value of living simply, the impact on the profitability of the farm enterprise is clear (Stoltzfus, 1973).

Research Question: Among those informants found to be home-farm focused, what strategies have they implemented to be successful and to sustain the home farm?

It is evident that intensification is one strategy. Farmer 4’s profile is illustrative of the formula for cattle production across the sample, which centers on what are commonly referred to as stocker and fattening (or finishing) operations. Stocker and finishing operations can both be set-up as a dry-lot cattle-feeding arrangement, where the cattle are not let out to graze.
Traditionally, stocker operations include a pasture phase in summer. Among other factors, the pasture phase is dependent on the amount of land that any given farmer has at his (or her) disposal. On Mennonite farms in the Region of Waterloo, cattle are sometimes fed storage feed on a year-round basis. What would otherwise be pasture is put into crop production (Fretz, 1989). This dry-lot arrangement has been identified as a small-acreage adaptive strategy on Amish farms in the U.S. (Kraybill and Nolt, 2005). The formula for cattle production across the sample suggests that the cattle producers in this category might also utilize dry-lot feeding as a small-acreage adaptive strategy. In the face of any uncertainty, the fact remains that purchased feed is used to achieve greater livestock intensities. A disadvantage is that this is not necessarily an economically efficient strategy. This has to do with instability in the price of purchased feed as commodity markets fluctuate (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004).

Specialization is a second strategy. Farmer 13’s profile is illustrative of this strategy. Indeed, his operation is a special case. He informed the researcher that gross income from an acre of produce should not be less than $4,000 and can be as high as $25,000 – $30,000 an acre with some crops. He believes that growing produce on small-acreage parcels can be a profitable option for young people in his community, but he informed the researcher that there is little confidence in the community. The result has been that families continue to grow produce as a sideline. “What it is going to take is a few of us farming in this way to prove that it can be viable,” he explained. He felt that a major advantage of growing produce is that it provides young people who want to farm an opportunity to start out small. “I say it doesn’t matter what the size of acreage is. You can have 5 acres and still be viable,” he explained. The profiles for Farmers 1 through 3; Farmer 7; and Farmer 17 are also illustrative of specialized strategies,
although to a lesser extent than Farmer 13 because of his comparatively lower dependence on extra revenue streams.

Diversification is a third strategy. Historically, Mennonite mixed farming has been characterized by the production of extra cash products like maple syrup and produce (Fretz, 1989). It is evident that this tradition continues. Farmer 18’s decision to become involved in produce growing appears to be a rational choice given the constraints introduced by his method of horse farming, a demand for labour opportunities among his eleven children and a desire to earn a living from high value crops, the comparatively low profitability of field crops on small-acreage, and the high cost of land, including taxes and rent (Stotz fus, 1973). “Because of my large family it was necessary to diversify and come up with more,” Farmer 18 explained. The limitations of livestock production on small-acreage might be an added factor. It is possible that the environmental regulation of animal waste in Ontario precludes Farmer 18 from further intensifying his livestock operations because of the limitations introduced by nutrient management. If this is indeed the case – and all evidence seems to point in this direction – then intensive produce growing has been a way for Farmer 18 to adapt to the environmental prerequisites of modern agriculture while retaining elements of his cultural farming system.

In Lancaster County, on-farm businesses have enabled families to work together and maintain the profitability of their small farms (Place, 2003). The uniformity of informants who were found to be home-farm focused and involved in an on-farm business or extra paid activities mirrors the Lancaster County situation and underscores the importance of diversified revenue streams on these farms. As with nearly all the informants who were found to be home-farm focused, Farmer 15 viewed these extra revenue streams as a necessity, “We can’t make a living from just the farm. We need an additional source of income to help boost our overall income,” he
explained. Farmer 14’s profile is illustrative of a very diversified mix of on-farm revenue streams – all of which he views as a necessity. It is evident that these on-farm businesses and extra paid activities are enabling informants to continue raising their families on a farm. The fiscal significance of the buildings required for these on-farm businesses is obvious. Yet, there seems to be a stigma among planners attached to farmers who are involved in anything on their farms besides farming. Through correspondence with a Mennonite informant who is not part of the sample of eighteen informants, the researcher was informed that everything that is done on a Mennonite farm – be it growing produce, splitting firewood or building furniture – all relates back to the ultimate goal of being sustainable (Jack F. Doe, personal communication, Nov. 14, 2014). In Lancaster County, the Amish are sometimes forced into business by the high price of farmland but, oddly, they often raise sufficient profits from their businesses to buy farmland. Farmer 1’s profile illustrates that an on-farm business can do more than provide some economic security for a small farm. It is likely that his on-farm business has helped subsidize the cost of securing farms for a future generation of Mennonite farmers. If support for the culture and farming practices of Mennonites is a goal among planners, and the researcher believes that it should be, than policy needs to be sympathetic to the opportunities on small farms. In a casual conversation with a Mennonite man, the researcher asked what opportunities might exist on a small farm. “Opportunity is a long word,” the man replied. His expression illustrates the characteristic industriousness of Mennonites to come up with more.

*Research Question: Are any of those informants found to be home-farm focused involved in off-farm employment?*

A surprisingly low number of informants who were found to be home-farm focused held off-farm employment (N=2). This indicates a preference among these informants for on-farm income streams and contrasts sharply with the situation in secular society where off-farm work
by full-time farmers has gradually become the norm (Smithers and Johnson, 2004). It is also an indication that those informants who have been found to be home-farm focused are not scaling-back their on-farm operations beyond what their acreage demands. The profiles for Farmer 1 and Farmer 3 illustrate that they remain involved in agriculture as poultry producers despite their farms being ≤ 25 acres. It also illustrates that a poultry operation can serve as a small-acreage adaptive strategy (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004).

Research Question: Are any of those informants found to be home-farm focused renting acreage off their farms?

A surprisingly low number of informants who were found to be home-farm focused rent acreage off their home farms as an extra revenue stream (N=3). Granting temporary use of land in return for a fee appears to be an altogether uncommon practice across the sample of eighteen informants. Three factors deliver an indication that the vast majority of those informants who were found to be home-farm focused are not scaling-back their farm operations. First, zero informants across the sample indicated that it is their future intention to decrease the number of acres farmed. Second, there is a low rate of off-farm employment across the category and the sample as a whole. Third, the practice of renting out acreage is uncommon across the category and the sample as a whole. Even those informants who do rent acreage off their home farms remain involved in agriculture as poultry producers, as demonstrated by the profiles for Farmers 1 through 3.

Research Question: For those informants found to be home-farm based, how have developments in the local food movement contributed to their ability to sustain the home farm? Do they produce food for local markets?

It is evident that certain informants in this category, and others across the sample as a whole, are prominent and possibly even leading the way with local food production in their respective Townships. Launched in 2004, the EPAC, located just outside of Elmira in the
Township of Woolwich, is helping local farmers to find a market for their fruit and vegetables. One of the rules of the auction is that produce must be sourced from within a 120 km radius (Kimmett, 2010). Farmer 13 informed the researcher that the EPAC has been a major factor in the success of his operation and was the family’s first consideration when deciding to buy the farm. Gorrie Line Produce, an outlet that offers a wide selection of locally-grown fruits and vegetables on a seasonal basis, is serving a similar function for informants in the Township of Howick. Farmer 18 indicated that much of his produce is sold there. The demand for local food has driven a group of Mennonite farmers in that Township to spearhead their own co-operative enterprise called Howick Community Farmers whose axiom is the German phrase “Hoffnung” which means “Hope”. Farmer 14 helps supply this co-operative with the beef that its customers demand. These cases illustrate that developments in the local food movement are having a positive impact. EPAC’s total sales have steadily increased each year over the past 6 years (see Appendix V). As Farmer 13 explained, “EPAC has kept on growing and by now there is no sign of turning back”. In their study of an Amish organic farming cooperative in Holmes County, Ohio, Mariola and McConnell (2013) concluded that growing produce for a cooperative has proven to be a successful strategy in response to a grim agricultural marketplace. Farmers in the cooperative are realizing net profits of $1,000 to $5,000 per acre and sometimes even more. Although these numbers are promising, it is evident that growing produce is still very much a “sideline” activity for most of EPAC’s growers. Of the 231 growers in 2014, 114 had total sales of $0 - $1,000 whereas only 18 growers had total sales over $40,000 (see Appendix V).

Rosset (2009) argues that Amish and Mennonite farm communities typically produce food for local and national markets because the small-scale farmers in these communities have, what he calls, a “food-producing vocation” v. the “export vocation” that typically characterizes
agribusiness (pg. 114-115, emphasis in original). It is evident that this category of informants and their families are dedicating their life’s work to producing food. Produce is generally sold locally, either within each informant’s respective Township, Region or County. In certain cases, produce is sold beyond these boundaries. Informants were generally less certain as to the post-farm whereabouts of certain agricultural products like milk, which is logical given the bulk style of delivery that typifies this sector. Likewise, the vast majority of livestock are shipped to local sale barns, although certain informants confirmed that their beef cattle are serving specialty markets in Toronto. The fact remains that these productive farm families are making a significant contribution to Ontario’s food system.

Research Question: Are those informants found to be home-farm focused skeptical about their ability to keep pace with the trend of consolidation in Ontario’s agricultural sector?

Among those informants who were found to be home-farm focused, three informants stated that it is their future intention to expand the number of acres farmed. Their reasons were not due to financial necessity *per se* but, rather, because of a need to find farms and employment for family members. These informants’ families are reaching a point where considerations such as adulthood are demanding more acreage. “We have a big family and we’re trying to get homes for them,” explained Farmer 15. The researcher was struck by the strangeness of this situation. Here is a family that wants to remain rural and keep farming, but it is unclear how they will achieve that objective in an atmosphere where the consolidation of farms has become the norm. Farmer 15 explained that a 200-acre farm nearby sold to a cash cropper for $1.6 million. “We didn’t even have a chance at it…we can’t compete with the cash croppers,” he explained. Regarding the contradiction between his style of mixed farming and modern farming that demands larger acreage, Farmer 16 explained that it is becoming less clear how his style of farming fits into today’s pace. Farmer 17 explained that he is not concerned about his own
capacity to earn a living from small-acreage, but rather, he has reservations about how the “big farmers” are faring: “I’m not sure how they afford it. They pay $300.00 to rent an acre of land. A gentleman who does cash crops told me that he loses $120.00 an acre. This is just with the seed, fertilizer and rent. That’s not including equipment costs and fuel”.

8.3 Acreage-Assisted

_He had the curious expression I had come to expect. I was invited inside where we could sit and have a conversation at the kitchen table; a clear indication that my research might be worthy of his time. “From 1994 to 2003 the home farm pulled its own weight, but the bottom fell out of the hog market and that’s when we started renting,” he said. Not only did I come away from that table with a better understanding of the flexibility that larger parcels can afford, my experience re-affirmed that we need to get to know the people we’re planning for._

– Researcher’s Journal Entry, Twp. of Woolwich

8.3.1 Summative Data Compiled from Across the Category

Table 12 shows the distribution of total acreage - defined as the total home farm acreage and other acreage owned, rented and farmed – for the informants found to be acreage-assisted. The sum total is 800.9 acres, an increase of 286 acres over their home farm acreage. Total acreage across this category of informants ranged from 75.9 acres to 180 acres with a median and mode of 115 acres. Based on the total acreage of informants in this category, the average farm size is 114.4 acres.

**Table 12: Distribution of Total Acreage Among the Acreage-Assisted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Acreage(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Farms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Sample</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Total home-farm acreage and other acreage owned, rented and farmed.

Table 13 shows the characteristics of those informants found to be acreage-assisted. These informants indicated that their home farm does not financially support itself and the
household without additional acreage farmed. Two informants are dairy producers. The remaining five informants are livestock producers. Five viewed their additional acreage as a necessity, while the remaining 2 informants – Farmer 5 and Farmer 12 – felt that their additional acreage is discretionary. It is noted that the additional parcels owned by three of the seven informants in this category – Farmer 8, Farmer 9 and Farmer 10 – are simply on the other side of a country road. Accordingly, they have always considered these parcels part of their home farm.

Table 13: Characteristics Acreage-Assisted Farms Across the Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Principal Farm Type</th>
<th>Additional Owned Acreage a Necessity?</th>
<th>Additional Rented Acreage a Necessity?</th>
<th>On-Farm Business or Extra Paid Activity?</th>
<th>Produce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own and Farm Additional Acreage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>Dairy (Cows)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent and Farm Additional Acreage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Livestock and Cash Crops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Additional Owned and Rented Acreage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Dairy (Cows)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

2 Total home-farm acreage and other acreage owned, rented and farmed.

As noted above, two of the seven informants – Farmer 5 and Farmer 12 – view their additional acreage as discretionary. As they both indicated that their home farm does not
financially support itself and the household without additional acreage farmed, it is evident that these two informants view their dependency on additional acreage in light of adjustments that can be made on the farm. This will be discussed in more detail below. All of the informants in the acreage-assisted category are involved in some type of on-farm business or extra paid activity to diversify revenue. All but a single informant – Farmer 9 – view these extra revenue streams as a necessity. Growing produce is an extra paid activity for three of the seven informants in the acreage-assisted category. No informants in this category hold off-farm employment, nor do they rent acres in return for a payment.

8.3.2 Illustrative Informant Profiles

Farmer 12’s home farm of 48 acres with 45 acres tillable is in the Township of Woolwich. He and his wife have owned it for 27 years. He owns and farms an additional 27.9-acre parcel (all of it tillable). He and his wife have owned this parcel for 15 years. He is a dairy producer and has a milking herd of 28 cows. He uses half of his total acreage to grow corn; the remaining half is used to grow “green feed,” Farmer 12 explained. He also grows 4 acres of produce including spinach, tomatoes, strawberries and raspberries. The milk is marketed by the Dairy Farmers of Ontario. Twenty percent of the produce is sold at a farmers’ market. The remaining 80% is sold at the EPAC. Although he stated that the home farm does not financially support itself and the household without additional acreage farmed, he views the additional acreage that he owns and farms as discretionary; “I crop additional acreage, but I could maybe do without it. I would have to buy-in some feed,” he explained.

Farmer 11’s home farm of 20 acres with 19 acres tillable is in the Township of Woolwich. He and his wife have owned it for 21 years. Over the past 10 years, he has rented and farmed an additional 160 acres with 120 acres tillable. The 40 non-tillable acres are comprised of
a maple bush. Each spring, he drills 4,000 taps. Half the syrup is sold from the farm gate and the remaining half is sold at a farmers’ market. He has 160 beef cattle: “We bring them in at 600 lbs. and bring them to fat,” he explained. The cattle are shipped to Toronto. He feeds 300 hogs under contract for a bigger producer. The hogs are shipped to Quebec. Regarding his dependency on additional acreage, he explained, “[f]rom 1994 to 2003 the home farm pulled its own weight, but the bottom fell out of the hog market and that is when we started renting”. Although he stated that he rents and farms the additional acreage out of necessity, he explained that it would be possible to “set up the farm otherwise”.

**Farmer 10**’s home farm of 36 acres with 34 acres tillable is in the Township of Woolwich. He and his wife have owned it for 14 years. He owns and farms an additional 44 acres and rents 13 acres (all of it tillable). He and his wife have owned and rented this additional acreage for 14 years. He has a stocker operation with 100 cattle. He grows all his own feed. He also grows 10 acres of produce including potatoes, sweet corn, tomatoes, spinach, and onions. 100% of the produce is sold at his farm stand or at the EPAC. His additional acreage is required for crop production and manure management. “On 36 acres, I couldn’t have the stocker operation that I have now,” he explained. He views the extra paid activity of produce growing as a necessity; “It really helps with the income,” he explained.

**Farmer 9**’s operation was also relevant in ss. 8.1.2 and is profiled there. It has not been repeated here.

**Farmer 8**’s home farm of 36 acres with 35 acres tillable is in the Township of Woolwich. He and his wife have owned it for 23 years. He owns and farms an additional 40 acres with 35 acres tillable. He and his wife have also owned this parcel for 23 years. He has 80 beef cattle, which he described as a “fattening operation”. He grows corn, wheat and hay. He
also grows 6 acres of produce, including potatoes, onions, peas, beans, various vine crops, and eggplants. The beef cattle are shipped to Dominion Meat Packers in Toronto. The vast majority of the produce is sold at the EPAC. He explained that the additional acreage is required for crop production. Without it, he explained, “[i]t wouldn’t be economical because we would have to buy-in our feed”. He has an on-farm business – a blacksmith shop. He views this extra revenue as a necessity; “[t]his really helps pay the bills,” he explained.

**Farmer 6**’s home farm of 50 acres with 42 acres tillable is in the Township of Wellesley. He and his wife have owned it for 3 years. He owns and farms an additional 25 acres with 23 acres tillable. He and his wife have owned and farmed this additional acreage for 3 years. He also rents an additional 40 acres (all of it tillable) and has done so for 3 years. He has 180 beef cattle and 170 sheep. The beef cattle are shipped to St. Helen’s Meat Packers in Toronto and the sheep are shipped to a stockyard. He grows corn, wheat, mixed-grain, and hay. He needs the additional acreage for crop production. “I need more feed for my cattle. I still have to buy-in feed, even with the additional 40 acres rented and the additional 25 acres owned,” he explained. He has an on-farm business fabricating sheet metal. He views this extra revenue stream as a necessity in order to reduce his debt load.

**Farmer 5**’s home farm of 50 acres with 40 acres tillable is in the Township of Wellesley. He and his wife have owned it for 4 years. He also rents and farms an additional 65 acres with 60 acres tillable and has done so for 4 years. He grows organic cash crops, including beans, corn, mixed-grain, and spelt. He hires custom operators to do the fieldwork. He feeds 450-500 hogs on a contract basis for someone else who supplies the feed. Although he indicated that his home farm does not financially support itself and the household without additional acreage farmed, he views the additional acreage that he rents and farms as discretionary. He has an on-farm business
– a custom machining and fabrication shop. He views this extra income stream as a necessity: “It’s difficult for me to make a living from this farm, even with the additional acreage. If farming would support a family there wouldn’t be any shops around here. It would be very nice to farm full-time, but these days farms don’t support themselves,” he explained.

8.3.3 Discussion

Research Question: For those informants found to be acreage-assisted, do they feel that their home farm financially supports itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed (i.e. does farm autonomy correspond with an increase in acres farmed)?

From the profiles for five of the seven informants in this category, it is apparent that farming additional acreage above and beyond what is available on their home farms is not discretionary. This illustrates that provincial policy is generally right in the sense that larger farm parcels can be beneficial. Livestock producers are certainly benefactors of existing minimum lot size standards across the three Townships because they generally require large parcels for pasture, crop production and manure management (Government of Ontario, 2008). The profile for Farmer 9 – a dairy producer – illustrates the benefits of larger acreage. Farmer 9 grows nearly all of the feed required by his operation and this reduces his operational costs because he is able to supply the feed himself. Without the additional 70 acres that he owns and farms, Farmer 9 explained that he would have to buy-in more feed. This is supportive of the provincial position that operational costs can be handled better on larger farms (Government of Ontario, 2008). As well, Farmer 9’s profile illustrates a central limitation of smaller acreage. He is unsure if he could meet Ontario’s strict rules around the environmental management of animal waste on his home farm of 46 acres. This is supportive of the position that larger farms provide the flexibility to meet nutrient management requirements (Government of Ontario, 2008). Farmer 11 demonstrated some hesitation when confirming that the rented acreage he farms is a
necessity. If he was not renting additional acreage, Farmer 11 assured the researcher, he would simply adjust. After observing first-hand the inventiveness of a people belonging to a culture that is continually adjusting to the demands of modernity, the researcher has no doubt that Farmer 11 would do just that. However, it was unclear what that adjustment might entail, but “opportunity is a long word” for these farmers.

The remaining two informants who were found to be acreage-assisted viewed their dependency on additional acreage in light of adjustments they could make on the farm. Although Farmer 12 – a dairy producer – felt that his home farm does not financially support itself or the household without any additional acreage farmed, he viewed his ownership and use of additional acreage for farming as a discretionary choice. He explained that the additional 27.9 acre parcel that he owns and farms was a convenient purchase and that he could do without it assuming that he could buy-in feed. While buying-in feed exists as an adaptive strategy, if the economy and commodity prices were such that Farmer 12 could not afford to purchase feed, his operation might struggle to compete. This concern was doubly expressed by Farmer 8 – a livestock producer – when he explained to the researcher that it would not be economical to purchase the feed required by his operation. While Farmer 5 – a livestock producer and small-scale cash cropper – felt that his home farm does not financially support itself and the household without additional acreage farmed, he viewed his rental and use of additional acreage for farming as a discretionary choice. Although it went unsaid, Farmer 5’s position suggests that he could make up for the lost acreage by finding more work in his on-farm machine and fabrication shop. If this is indeed the case – and all evidence seems to point in that direction – then Farmer 5’s situation underscores the flexibility that can be built into small-acreage farms by adding an on-farm
business that serves as a financial hedge against changing economic conditions and market fluctuations.

*Research Question: Among those informants found to be acreage-assisted, what strategies have they implemented to be successful and to sustain the home farm?*

It is evident that expanding the number of acres farmed is one strategy. Farmer 11’s profile is a reminder that farms are not static units (Government of Ontario, 2008). In his case, the hog market changed in the early 2000s. Up until that point, Farmer 8 explained that “farrow to finish” operations with herds of 30-60 sows had been profitable on farms across the community for a period of approximately 30 years. He explained that so-called “loops” run by large corporations have ruined these operations and farmers have been forced to adjust. In this type of arrangement, hogs are raised and then shipped between farms with each farmer specializing in a single stage of production. Farmer 11 chose to adjust his operation by renting land, an adaptive strategy that requires a cash outlay that might otherwise be avoided if his home farm parcel were larger.

Specialization is a second strategy. Farmer 5’s profile typifies the very specialized formula for hog production across the sample and it reflects those changes to the hog market that are described above. Farmer 5 does not personally own the 450-500 hogs on his home farm, but feeds them under contract. In Farmer 5’s case, he confirmed that someone else supplies the feed for the hogs. Farmer 5 carries neither the risk of owning or supplying feed for the hogs. It is evident that this arrangement allows Farmer 5 to achieve certain efficiencies. For example, Farmer 5 might be supporting an intensity of livestock production, with feed supplied from off-farm, which might not be otherwise possible. As well, he can dedicate acreage to the production of cash crops that might not otherwise be available if he was growing the feed for the hogs himself. Likewise, Farmer 9’s profile points to a specialized operation – a dairy farm.
Diversification is a third strategy. The uniformity of informants who were acreage-assisted and involved in an on-farm business or extra paid activities (N=7) underscores the importance of diversified revenue streams on their farms. As with nearly all the informants who were found to be acreage-assisted, Farmer 5 considers his extra revenue streams as a necessity; “[i]ts difficult for me to make a living from this farm, even with the additional acreage,” he explained. This supports a belief among some informants who were found to be home-farm focused that a sideline is a pre-requisite no matter the size of farm. With gross income of $4,000 per acre and few expenses, Farmer 8 views the income he derives from growing 6 acres of produce as a necessity. Like those home-farm focused informants growing produce, Farmer 8 considers developments like the EPAC as vitally important: “It gives us a market,” he explained.

Research Question: Are any of those informants found to be acreage-assisted involved in off-farm employment?

Of the informants who were found to be acreage-assisted, none were found to be involved in off-farm employment. Comparatively, two informants are involved in off-farm employment within the cohort found to be home farm-focused.

Research Question: Are any of those informants found to be acreage-assisted renting acreage off their farms?

Of the informants who were found to be acreage-assisted, none were found to be renting acreage off their farms. Granting temporary use of land in return for a fee appears to be an altogether uncommon practice across the sample of eighteen informants. Comparatively, three informants rent acreage off their home farms within the cohort found to be home-farm focused.
8.4 Informant Perspectives on Policy for Farm Parcel Creation

The 75-acre policy stands for good. It all stands for good. However, if they could come up with some reasonable by-laws that would allow folks to make a living off 25 acres or less, the same as they could on a 100-acre farm, all while keeping folks from the city away, it would be a good thing,” he said while cradling a bright-eyed baby in his arms. The sense of urgency in his voice led me to wonder: Are planners doing enough to support this unique community of farmers?

– Researcher’s Journal Entry, Twp. of Howick

8.4.1 Summative Data Compiled from Across the Study Sample (Three Ontario Townships)

Appendix W shows a summary of informant perspectives regarding existing minimum lot size standards for farm parcel creation across the three Ontario townships selected for this research component. There was general consensus that existing standards are suitable for livestock production. In terms of the weaknesses of existing minimum lot size standards, key themes were: existing standards have translated into a shortage of farms relative to community needs; the choices available to the community are scarce; existing farm parcels are too large for actual needs; large parcels are unaffordable; and existing standards necessitate competition for farmland with large-scale farmers. While relaxing minimum lot size standards is a rather obvious opportunity to expand the available choices for housing and employment, informants stated a number of alternative opportunities that might be useful. From this feedback, key themes include: natural severances\textsuperscript{26}; small farm parcels on low capability soils; \textit{tenants-in-common} arrangements\textsuperscript{27}; and relaxed land use controls for existing undersized parcels.

Appendix X shows a summary of informant perspectives regarding a relaxed minimum lot size standard for farm parcel creation across the three Ontario townships. There was general

\textsuperscript{26} In certain prescribed circumstances in Ontario, a stream or body of water can naturally sever a parcel of land into two separate parcels of land.

\textsuperscript{27} A tenancy-in-common arrangement is a form of co-ownership where two individuals hold equal or unequal interests in an asset. In the context of this research, this form of ownership might be applied where land use policies allow for the creation of a second farm-related residential unit for which consent cannot be granted (e.g. see Appendix K).
consensus that a relaxed standard would not be appropriate for livestock production. Conversely, there was general consensus that a relaxed standard could support produce growing combined with an extra on-farm revenue stream. In terms of the strengths of a relaxed minimum lot size standard, key themes were: families would remain rooted if more farms were available; more farms and on-farm businesses would have a positive affect on tax revenue and rural commerce; a relaxed standard would mean more opportunities for young people; a relaxed standard would translate into lower capital investments for young people; and a relaxed standard would be supportive of local food. The extent to which the standards across the three Townships should be relaxed was a matter of attitude between informants. While the researcher mentioned 50 acres as a starting point, some informants supported an even more relaxed standard (e.g. ≤ 25 acres).

In terms of possible threats stemming from a more relaxed standard, key themes were: complications with nutrient management; complications with MDS; the possibility of non-farm use; possible undesirable implications on land values; and a concern about a relaxed standard being a temporary solution.

Top of mind for all informants was the price of farmland. Table 14 demonstrates how the value of a Mennonite farm in the Township of Wellesley has appreciated over a period of 63 years.²⁸ Given the large family size that is typical of Mennonite communities in Ontario, many informants expressed concerns about how their children will find (and afford) farms of their own. Table 15 shows the interest in farming among the informants’ children across the sample. Seventeen of eighteen informants have children. Nine informants confirmed that they have children who want to farm. The remaining eight informants with children stated that they might want to farm, but they are too young to know if they want to pursue farming as an occupation.

²⁸ The information presented in Table 14 is sourced from the researcher’s casual conversation with a Mennonite man who is not part of the sample of eighteen informants.
Table 14: Farm Succession on a Mennonite Farm Through the Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farm Succession</th>
<th>Price Paid/Acre</th>
<th>Payback Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>A Father purchases a 112-acre farm for $10,000 and pays it off within 13 years. Buys farms in the area for his sons.</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Youngest son purchases the 112-acre farm from his father for $185,000 – a discounted price of 50% the market value of $370,000.</td>
<td>$1,652(^1)</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>A son purchases the farm from his father for $850,000 – a discounted price of 25% the market value of $1.1 million.</td>
<td>$7,589(^2)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Discounted by 50% the market value.

\(^2\) Discounted by 25% the market value.

Table 15: Interest in Farming Among Informants' Children Across the Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage(^1)</th>
<th>Total Acreage Owned(^2)</th>
<th>Do You Have Children who Think They May Want to Farm?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>620 in 6 Parcels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110 in 2 Parcels</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75 in 2 Parcels</td>
<td>Not Yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76 in 2 Parcels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>116 in 2 Parcels</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91 in 2 Parcels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.9 in 2 Parcels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5 in 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Howick, County of Huron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58 in 2 Parcels</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 as 1 Parcel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

\(^2\) Includes home-farm acreage and additional acreage owned. Farmer 1 owns five additional parcels, but does not currently farm them.

8.4.2 Illustrative Informant Profiles

Farmer 18’s home farm of 50 acres with 35 acres tillable is in the Township of Howick. The 50-acre parcel is part of a 150-acre farm that is split with his brother through a tenants-in-common arrangement. He and his wife have eleven children who live on the farm. “When chore time comes, it’s a busy place,” he said. He explained that it is a challenge to find farmland for
large families. He is contemplating selling his farm and moving away so that the family land base can be expanded in an area where land might be cheaper. “I’m afraid that one of these days, we’re going to have to pack up and go elsewhere because I have some teenage boys. I hate to say that because I like where I am,” he said. He explained that farmers have to be “nimble” with livestock on less than 50 acres. He felt that 15-20 acres of produce on a 30-40 acre farm would sustain a large family with some rotation of crops for power, transportation, and a family milk cow.

**Farmer 15’s** home farm of 50 acres with 45 acres tillable is in the Township of Howick. He and his wife have 10 children who live on the farm. He explained that the prospects of making a living off the farm with just livestock are “pretty grim”. He would like to split his 50-acre farm into two independent 25-acre parcels for two of his boys. His relative with a farm nearby is moving to Renfrew County because of the high price of farmland and competition between farmers for land in the Township. The relative’s decision to move to Renfrew County was not an easy one. Farmer 15 plans to take over the empty farm following the move – he would like this farm to provide housing and employment for more than one family. If a policy existed that would allow smaller farm parcels to be created, his community would have made an offer on a nearby farm that sold for $1.6 million but, with nothing certain about it, it would have been taking a risk.

**Farmer 11’s** home farm of 20 acres with 19 acres tillable is located in the Township of Woolwich. One of his boys recently purchased a 10-acre parcel with a maple bush. This son grows organic produce and makes maple syrup to supplement the income derived from his off-farm employment. The 10-acre parcel with a house was purchased for $400,000. The 100-acre
farms that the family considered purchasing were being sold for $1.5 million. The 10-acre parcel was purchased because of the obvious difference in price.

8.4.3 Discussion

Research Question: How do demographics and the value of farmland factor into perspectives regarding existing policy for farm parcel creation?

The profiles for Farmer 18 and Farmer 15 are illustrative of the demographic pinch that is being felt on some farms. With 21 children and two 50-acre parcels between them, these two informants explained that they are concerned about how their children will find and afford farms of their own. Informants felt that farmland is not available for purchase in their respective areas. Even when farms do become available, it is apparent that price is a principal barrier to ownership. The gentleman who shared the information displayed in Table 14 is not part of the sample of eighteen informants. When asked how long it will take his son to pay off the family farm that was purchased for a generously discounted price he explained, “A lot longer than 13 years…it’s just not sustainable”. He explained that a farm must be paid for within 15 years to maintain the family supportive style of farm succession that is historic in his community. It is true that immediate family, relatives, or church members have historically financed Mennonite farms. This began to change in the 1970s and external funds have increasingly been used (Fretz, 1989). While Table 14 demonstrates that farmland can be a wise long-term investment, this is of little consequence to a young person with few assets available for collateral against commercial credit.

Research Question: Among the informants across the sample, what are their perspectives regarding existing policy for farm parcel creation?

Informants generally felt that larger farm parcels are appropriate for livestock production and this is reflected in two of the three informant profiles presented above. Manure management
and crop production were oft-cited reasons why this is the case. In Lancaster County, the subdivision of Amish farms has led to an increased concentration of animals, yielding a great deal of manure on a per acre basis. This is particularly true of the concentrated hog and poultry operations in the County, which tend to be on farms with comparatively few acres for manure handling. The result has been that run-off is an issue on these farms. The ratio of manure to acreage is generally better on most dairy farms in the County, as these farms have retained the necessary acreage to grow feed (Place, 2003). The Lancaster County situation illustrates one negative implication of a move toward relaxed minimum lot size standards if livestock production is an objective.

While relaxing minimum lot size standards is a rather obvious opportunity to expand opportunities for housing and employment for Mennonite families across these three Ontario townships, informants stated a number of alternative opportunities that should be considered. Farmer 8 explained that there might be opportunities for undersized farm parcels where farmland is bisected by a navigable stream, creating a natural severance. Indeed, under certain prescribed circumstances, a navigable stream can naturally subdivide a property to create a legal severance because the property on either side of a navigable stream might not be “abutting lands” under s. 50 of the Planning Act.

Farmer 1 explained to the researcher that there might be opportunities to create undersized parcels on farms with hilly land, suggesting that farm splits might be comparatively better suited to farms with lower soil capabilities for agriculture (e.g. CLI Class 4). “If the 100-acre farms are comprised of good farmland, they should be used for cropping,” he explained. The Township of Wellesley and the Region of Waterloo have already done this with a Rural Mixed-Use / Agricultural Cluster Zone, but the relevant policies and provisions in local planning
documents preclude commercial agricultural activities from being undertaken on these parcels (see Appendices L and M). The researcher believes that the concept has merit if it could be tailor-made with enabling policies that would preclude commercial livestock production, while enabling alternative forms of agriculture, such as produce growing, combined with extra on-farm revenue streams. It is evident that this opportunity should be explored. A possible barrier may be finding an appropriate farm with all of the prerequisite characteristics (S. Duke, personal communication, Oct. 6, 2014).

A tenants-in-common arrangement on larger farms was seen as another opportunity. This is also discussed in Bennett (2003). This type of arrangement is illustrated in Farmer 18’s profile above. In the Township of Wellesley, as one example, the list of permitted uses for lands zoned Agricultural (A1) precludes a second dwelling on a farm unless it was in existence prior to the passing of the by-law (Township of Wellesley, 2006). Farmer 2 explained, “A policy that would allow two homes on a 100-acre parcel, instead of just one, without subdividing the 100-acre parcel, would be totally necessary in this community”. Farmer 4 informed the researcher that he perceives this type of arrangement as a “brother to brother” agreement that would allow relatives to divide family labour between an on-farm shop and the farm itself. He felt that this would result in a more viable operation overall. While it is apparent that this opportunity should be explored, both the Township of Wellesley (2006) and the Township of Woolwich (2012) have adopted OPs with policy that enables a second dwelling to be permitted on a farm with added options for the conversion of an existing farm-related residential unit to create a second and even a third residential unit on a farm (see Appendices K and R). Likewise, the Township of

\[29\] In Lancaster County, the LCPC has recommended that Amish families build new homes and businesses within the building envelopes of existing farmsteads. Because of unclear title, however, the LCPC has been informed that it can be difficult to obtain loans for this type of development. This has not been verified (D. Severson, personal communication, Aug. 25, 2014).
Howick (2013) has adopted a ZBL that allows for a mobile home and converted dwelling unit on a farm (Appendix T). An apparent demand for this type of opportunity on one hand and existing enabling policy on the other speaks to a need for communicative action between planners and the Anabaptist farm community.

Informants identified that land use restrictions applied to existing retirement lots in agricultural areas are a barrier to housing and employment in their communities. When these parcels go up for sale, Farmer 2 explained, land use restrictions preclude certain activities from happening on those parcels. While an agricultural use such as produce growing might be permitted on these parcels through a change in zoning (and an OP amendment), the researcher was informed that it would be ideal to pair this strategy with an on-farm business as an extra revenue stream. At the time of writing, existing parcels zoned Agricultural (A1) in the Township of Wellesley, as one example, must be \( \geq 20 \) acres before they can accommodate a farm-related occupation (Township of Wellesley, 2006).\(^{30}\) Farmer 11’s profile, which describes his son’s experience on a 10-acre parcel that includes a dwelling, reflects the possibilities that might be enhanced on existing undersized parcels with supportive (and creative) by-laws. With that being said, there appears to be an acreage threshold after which parcels become too small to allow Mennonite communities to effectively maintain their cultural practices (MLPC, 2014).

*Research Question: Among the informants across the sample, what are their perspectives regarding relaxed minimum lot size standards?*

There was general consensus that produce growing, combined with an on-farm business for extra revenue, could be feasible on parcels smaller than what existing standards allow. Any relaxed standard to serve this purpose would need to be conscious of the number of nutrient units

\(^{30}\) Land use restrictions on existing undersized parcels vary by municipality across Ontario. In the Township of Howick in Huron County, parcels as small as 1850 sq. ft. can support a limited agricultural use, home occupation use, and a home industrial use (Township of Howick, 2013).
required for transportation, draft power in some communities, and possibly a family milk cow. Even if Ontario’s strict regulations for the environmental management of animal waste could be met, it is evident that prospective farm splits might be constrained by setbacks applied under the Government of Ontario’s (2006) *Minimum Distance Separation Implementation Guidelines*. Conversely, there is the potential that these parcels could obstruct the expansion of existing or new livestock facilities.

There is also the issue of “putting all of one’s eggs in a single basket” that comes with specialization (Fretz, 1989, pg. 188). Drawing on the Lancaster County experience, the division of farms into increasingly smaller parcels has forced the Amish into a more intensive form of land use that has resulted in specialized farming (Hostetler, 1980). Farmer 13’s operation in the Township of Woolwich, Ontario, while successful, is illustrative of a very specialized operation. If smaller farm parcels were to be predicated on the intensive cultivation of produce as an alternative to mixed farming with livestock, it is apparent that this move toward a more specialized style of farming could make these farms more vulnerable to market fluctuations (Stoltzfus, 1973). Although some flexibility (and stability) might be afforded through supportive policy for extra on-farm revenue streams, if relaxed standards were predicated on produce growing alone, what happens if supply suddenly exceeds demand when production is increased?

The researcher believes that this is an important consideration that requires further exploration.

The possibility of non-farm use is another concern top-of-mind among informants and planners alike. One motive for keeping existing standards high is to avoid the expectation that

31 This has happened in Lancaster County: “There have been instances where the market was flooded with vegetables – there were too many and not enough demand,” explained Sam Stoltzfus – a farmer and businessman in Leacock Township (personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). It is noted that policy for regulated industries like dairy and poultry has helped to stabilize markets in Ontario and elsewhere.
farms can be subdivided for non-agricultural use (Smith, 1998). A number of the farms owned by informants found to be home-farm focused have been under the same ownership for a period of decades. This challenges the concern that small farm parcels won’t stay connected to agriculture once they are created amidst a strong market for rural estate lots. While it is clearly inaccurate to suggest that all Mennonite farmers are comparatively less likely than other farmers to sell farms to non-farmers, the researcher cannot help but wonder if there might be some truth to such a claim. Through correspondence with a Mennonite informant in Huron County, who was not part of the sample of eighteen informants, the researcher learned that it very rare for a farm to be sold outside the Orthodox Mennonite community once it has been used as a residence within the community (John N. Doe, personal communication, March, 2014). The researcher did not gather any empirical data to support this claim. Farmer 17, who resides in the Township of Howick, Ontario, informed the researcher that community farms that do become available are sold within the community and often for a reduced price. An additional consideration that illustrates the permanence of the Mennonite farm is the low rate of farm failure among Mennonites. Fretz (1989) asked two ministers about the rate of farm failure among Old Order Mennonites in the Region of Waterloo. Neither minister was able to recall a single case of absolute failure. While these considerations might add some certainty to a prospective policy adjustment, they offer no guarantees. Agricultural easements might lend some assurance that these parcels will remain available for agriculture after they have been created and the researcher believes that this would need to be, at the very least, a prerequisite if relaxed standards were contemplated.

Farmer 7 explained that he has reservations about a more relaxed standard driving up the price of farmland in the Township of Woolwich, Ontario. In Lancaster County, the division of
farms combined with the demand for housing across a growing population, has driven up the price beyond what most farmers can reasonably afford to pay (Kraybill and Nolt, 2004). This is a very real concern if there is even a remote possibility that small farm parcels might become available for non-agricultural use after they have been created (Jackson, 2004). In the Kitchener-Waterloo area, there is a strong market for small farms among wealthy individuals moving from cities to rural areas in search of so-called hobby farms. In 2014, 15-to-50 acre farms in the Kitchener-Waterloo area sold for upwards of $1M (Atkins, 2014).

In many ways, the informants across the Ontario sample are facing the same problem and difficulties that the Amish and Mennonites faced in Lancaster County in the 1970s. Faced with rising population pressures, the Amish in Lancaster County subdivided their farms to create farms for young families (Hostetler, 1980). By the end of the 1970s, it was not unusual for a family to be milking upwards of 35 cows on 40 acres or less (Fisher, 1978). Since the farms could only be split once and remain viable for dairying, Kraybill and Nolt (2004) have labeled this approach a temporary solution; “[a]lthough many farms were split, this tactic only delayed the crisis,” they explained (pg.28). With populations that can double in new communities over a period of decades, Farmer 8 in the Township of Woolwich, Ontario, explained to the researcher that dividing a farm into two 50-acre parcels might help momentarily, but questioned if it would be advisable to reduce those farms even further when more land will be needed over the long term. He felt that creating farms with relaxed minimum lot size standards would be a temporary solution. This reflects the Lancaster County experience discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.
CHAPTER 9

EXAMINATION OF SMALL-ACREAGE FARMER STRATEGIES AND POLICY PERSPECTIVES: SUMMARY FROM ANALYSIS

9.1 Observations, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The first objective of this research component was to collect information about the adaptive strategies that small-acreage Mennonite farmers are taking to adjust to, and even take advantage of, small parcel size. A second objective was to evaluate small parcel flexibility and viability within a unique cultural setting. It is apparent that a number of informants are earning a living on farm parcels that would otherwise be refused under existing minimum lot size standards across the three Ontario townships under study. This speaks to the viability of these farms. Does this mean that relaxed minimum lot size standards should be approved carte blanche across Ontario? No it does not. However, it is apparent that Mennonite farmers have a number of adaptive strategies at their disposal to adjust to small parcel size. This research points to intensive produce growing as the strategy with the most potential to support an autonomous small-acreage farm enterprise. Of course, with specialization comes a loss of diversity that might serve as an economic hedge against changes in the external environment. This situation becomes aggravated when acreage becomes a limiting factor in a farmer’s ability to be flexible and change as the economy and markets change. If produce markets plunged due to a sudden abundance of product, the list of agricultural activities that could be feasibly undertaken on a 20 to 30-acre farm whilst making a living and maintaining a meaningful contribution to Ontario’s agri-food sector is comparatively small. That being said, it is apparent that a poultry operation could serve as an alternative strategy keeping in mind the need for very expensive quota. Supposing the Region of Waterloo received an application from an Old Order Mennonite farmer to split a 100-acre farm into two independent 50-acre farm parcels predicated on intensive
produce growing and a poultry barn, the researcher would be curious to see how the Province or other professionals knowledgeable in farm economics and management would deal with it. The addition of an on-farm business would help to further stabilize this farm enterprise by maintaining flexibility in a pure sense. Within this context, it is apparent that Mennonite farmers are already accustomed to having an on-farm business. In fact, a sideline has arguably become as much a part of their culture as farming itself. While it might be argued that a large machine or metal fabrication shop is neither a sideline nor agriculture per se, perhaps it is time to re-frame these businesses as part of a Mennonite agricultural operation rather than separate from it? Even with the score of industrious on-farm businesses across the category of informants found to be home-farm focused, the researcher cannot recall a single farm that he would not consider agriculturally productive. Visually, the farms appeared well kept and the fact that no informants indicated that it is their future intention to decrease the number of acres farmed is illustrative of their stability as farm enterprises. While the researcher is not espousing a move to more relaxed minimum lot size standards, these reflections contribute knowledge and background information to existing policy for farm parcel creation.

It is apparent that the culture and farming practices of Mennonites collide with provincial policy for farm parcel creation to form two main points of friction. First, existing minimum lot size standards are predicated on the type of agricultural use(s) that are common in an area (Government of Ontario, 2014b). Cattle production is a core staple across the farming system in both Waterloo Region and Huron County. Therefore, existing standards are predicated on the typical acreage requirements for that type of production system. It is apparent from this research that existing standards across the three Townships are serving their intended function. In fact, for certain production systems, the research provides justification for the status quo. With that said,
it is also apparent that existing standards may lead to large parcels that are not necessarily required for certain forms of innovative agriculture that are growing in popularity and appear well-suited to fewer acres and a unique style of farming that reflects Mennonite cultural values. Opportunities for individuals like Farmer 13 to pair small-acreage with an apparent winning combination of produce growing and other on-farm revenue streams – a combination that is still relatively uncommon – appears to be stagnated by policy for farm parcel creation that is predicated on the type of agricultural use(s) that are common in an area. While the researcher understands the intent and purpose of existing policy language, it becomes justifiably problematic for Mennonite farmers with needs and goals that can differ from those of other farmers (e.g. local v. export-oriented production). This is an appropriate segue into the second point of friction. That is, provincial policy assumes that change necessitates expansion.

It is well known that the size of farms in Ontario has gradually and continually increased since the 1940s (Government of Ontario, 2008). It is apparent from this research that Mennonite farmers, particularly those who still rely on draft power for farm work, choose to, as Farmer 18 put it, “come up with more” on less acreage than to expand. In fact, 30 tillable acres might be all that one family can handle alone when it is being farmed intensely with hand labour and horses. Yet, policy fails to deal with difference – an issue that is compounded by the belief amongst planners that they must treat everyone the same. Bennett (2003) argues that this belief has led to unjust hardship for Ontario’s Old Order Amish. Throughout the course of this research the planner’s lament – “we can’t people zone” – has emerged in the researcher’s conversations with land use planners. The Township of Wellesley drew a line with its Rural Mixed-Use / Agricultural Cluster Zone that pushed the limit of this prevailing norm. The paradigm of equality versus equity is conceptually important to this discussion. In short, equality can be defined as
“equal treatment” (Catarro et al., 2013, pg 151). Put differently, equality is about *sameness* in treatment. In the context of policy for farm parcel creation, it can be argued that Ontario’s policies promote fairness by treating everyone the same. Conversely, Shapiro and Stefkovich (2001) maintain that equity “deals with difference and takes into consideration the fact that this society has many groups in it who have not always been given equal treatment and/or have not had a level field on which to play” (as cited in Catarro et al., 2013, pg. 151). Put differently, equity creates the conditions for equality by ensuring that individuals can benefit from the same opportunities regardless of their differences. Bennett (2003) argues that Ontario’s planning system is not doing enough to support the needs and goals of traditional cultures like the Old Order Amish. Asking the right questions is part of professional planning practice. Many hours in the field – traversing the Ontario countryside to develop an understanding of the needs and aspirations of the Mennonite community – have led the researcher to ask: Can planners do more to balance the public interest with the unique socio-economic and cultural needs and goals of the Anabaptist community?

A third objective of this research was to develop an understanding of small-acreage Mennonite farmers’ perspectives of policy for farm parcel creation. When compared against the risk management factors of magnitude, duration, frequency, and reversibility it is apparent that relaxed minimum lot size standards could possibly result in *significant* adverse implications that are high in *magnitude* because the extent of change would over a wide geographic area and *irreversible* because farms will remain fragmented once they have been split. It is apparent from the results in Chapter 8 that there may be opportunities to create housing and employment for young Mennonite farm families *without* relaxing existing minimum lot size standards for farm parcel creation. It is recommended that these opportunities be investigated. Each opportunity
must be weighted on its respective merits. In line with Farmer 1’s opinion that small farm parcels might be well-suited to lower capability lands, it is the researcher’s opinion that a development modeled after the Township of Wellesley’s existing Rural Mixed-Use Agricultural Cluster shows promise. According to the housing policies found in the Provincial Policy Statement, planning authorities are required to provide for “an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents” (Government of Ontario, 2014b, pg. 14). This policy served as a point of leverage for big changes in the Township of Wellesley. Any investigation into the need for a second cluster development would have to begin with a population study in order to properly establish projected demand and housing requirements across Anabaptist communities. The researcher believes that this is an area that municipalities could improve on. Second, a siting study would be required in order to determine an appropriate location for the development. This study would need to consider such important factors as soil capability, the existing mix of non-farm lots in an area, and impacts to existing agricultural operations (Township of Wellesley, 2006). Regrettably, finding an appropriate site (or sites) might be the biggest roadblock for such a development. Third, appropriate OP policies and ZBL provisions would need to be crafted and established. In this regard, the researcher believes that the Township of Wellesley development fell short by dismissing the meaningful contribution to the Regional food system that these parcels could facilitate if feasible commercial agricultural activities had otherwise been integrated into the design. The researcher envisions a human-scale farm enterprise that would be horticultural-based, family-centered, ecologically sound, and intensive. Such a development would need to be planned and designed so that its inhabitants could thrive socially and culturally. Among other considerations, this would mean appropriate setbacks between dwellings for privacy and
environmental reasons, an appropriate minimum lot size, and an appropriate number of nutrient units for transportation at the very least. If done right, the researcher believes that such a development has the potential to change the way that communities are designed for improved sustainability and Regional resilience (Condon et al., 2010).

The information presented here, and in the preceding chapter, leads the researcher to certain key observations and recommendations. When evaluating the opportunities that might exist, it is apparent that planners cannot act alone. John Friedmann’s theory of transactive planning is conceptually important to this work. Friedmann (1973) argued that planners must aspire to join technical expertise and experiential knowledge when they intervene in society on behalf of government or an organization. He argued that the best way to do this is through a series of transactive interactions between planners and the public whomever that may be. These interactions are based on a process of mutual learning. In this process, both planner and citizen learn from one another. According to Friedmann (1973), “A common image of the situation evolves through dialogue; a new understanding of the possibilities for change is discovered. And in accord with this new knowledge, the client will be predisposed to act” (pg. 185). Like Bennett’s (2003) work with Ontario’s Old Order Amish, this research has embodied a process of mutual learning. The informants have helped the researcher understand their culture, as well as their needs and aspirations. In turn, the researcher has helped with their interpretation of policy and developed research that is connected to policy development at the practical level. The challenges of existing policy are clearly serious enough that they allowed the researcher – a stranger to their culture and community – to try to understand the issues. The seriousness of the challenges seems to even transcend a desire to not have to deal with government (Bennett, 2003). This is reflected in the researcher’s correspondence with a Mennonite man in Huron County,
who had this to say: “I would suggest the establishment of a joint provincial and Amish, Mennonite committee to formulate, direct, and co-ordinate provincial programs in regard to the Amish and Mennonite life. Such a liaison approach would help, and promote community cooperation” (James K. Doe, personal communication, March 2014). Herein exists an opportunity to develop a shared understanding through mutual learning.
CHAPTER 10

EPILOGUE

10.1 Reflections

“Until a better method is implemented to deal with the subdivision of agricultural land, it can be assumed that zoning bylaws will continue to prescribe minimum lot size provisions. Trying to determine a minimum lot size for agriculture is not easy. Indeed it can be argued that the very concept of applying minimum lot size provisions to agricultural areas is an ill-suited regulatory technique. As a rule, minimum lot size provisions should be set relatively high to ensure the maintenance of parcels that promote, rather than deter, agricultural use and to discourage expectations of future subdivision” (Smith, 1998, pg. 56).

Barry Smith said it well when he commented on the difficulty of setting appropriate minimum lot size standards more than 15 years ago. If solving the issue of setting appropriate minimum lot size standards for farm parcel creation was easy, municipalities across North America would have found the means to effectively deal with the challenges by now. It is against this backdrop of a so-called wicked problem that this research has been undertaken. Indeed, trying to determine a minimum lot size standard for agriculture is not easy. In line with Smith’s direction, above, municipalities across Ontario have erred on the side of caution and for good reason considering what is at stake – large contiguous tracts of high capability farmland are undoubtedly a strategic and finite resource in the areas where they exist. Borrowing a phrase used by Kevin Eby, Director of Community Planning for the Region of Waterloo, the outcome of the current approach might best be described as generally right, but specifically wrong.

In some ways, this research provides justification for the status quo particularly when certain animal intensive production systems are common in an area. Reflecting on the information presented in Chapters 5-6, a 40-acre minimum lot size standard in Leacock Township has given rise to certain operational issues that echo the concerns of the Province. For example, a 40-acre parcel can only reasonably support a certain number of cows. To reflect on
what was learned in Leacock Township, it is apparent that some Amish dairymen find that they cannot produce enough feed to support more cows. To expand their milking herds, they grow what feed they can and buy-in the rest (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). Those farmers who buy-in feed have operating costs that are comparatively higher than farmers with larger acreage (F. Howe, personal communication, Aug. 27, 2014). This operational issue was also reflected in the work undertaken with small-acreage Mennonite farmers presented in Chapter 8-9 – some informants on 50 acres or less buy-in feed that they might otherwise grow themselves if they were farming more acreage. Conversely, informants with more acreage seemed to have higher crop production potentials and more animals. It is not surprising then, that reduced operational costs are used to justify standards that keep farm parcels relatively large and intact (Government of Ontario, 2008). At the same time, the work undertaken with small-acreage Mennonite farmers suggests that, with the right practical knowledge, certain forms of agriculture can be viable on parcels as small as 20-25 acres. Reflecting on Farmer 13’s operation, the researcher is convinced that certain Mennonite cultural traits such as hard work, industriousness and family-style farming contribute to the agricultural viability and flexibility of such parcels. While this research lends fresh insight to arguments about one style of agriculture or size of acreage being necessarily more viable than another, it is easy to lose focus on the big picture: large Anabaptist families in Ontario are being forced into a demographic pinch – a situation made worse by a lack of availability and high price of farmland.

If subdividing farms is the answer, and the researcher is not espousing it, then there are certain impediments and realities from a policy perspective that need to be acknowledged and viewed through a systems lens (Figure 11). First and foremost, to treat one group differently from another requires a very careful and thoughtful approach. This is demonstrated by the Mornington
(Township) v. Kuepfer case involving the contravention of a by-law caused by the stabling of a horse by two Amish residents in the hamlet of Newton, Ontario. In that case, the Honorable R. Trachy (1996) ruled:

It is my view, that Section 15(1) and 15(2) of the [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms] accommodates positive discrimination to allow for the special needs of people with special disabilities…special religious and ethnic needs, such as the Old Order Amish, in a way that supersedes any zoning by-law.

It was the Court’s decision that Mornington Township’s by-law, as it related to the stabling of a horse at the time, was a violation of s. 2(a) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the charges were dismissed (Trachy, 1996). While it may be clearly erroneous to suggest that a similar ruling would be conferred in a case of minimum lot size standards infringing on special needs, the Mornington (Township) v. Kuepfer case supports the proposition that it might be equally precarious to assume that treating everyone the same will result in equitable outcomes.

There are also the issues of the shaky ground that exists between land use planning, religion and culture; the gradual and continual shift toward larger and larger farms where even 100-acre farms are increasingly becoming a minority; the unfavorable impacts of smaller parcels relative to certain production systems mentioned earlier; complications with existing policy such as Minimum Distance Separation Formulae (which are in place for good reason in their own right); concerns about a viable after-use in the face of an uncertain future and demand for rural estate lots; and, finally, the loss of farmland of which all farmers – large and small – would tend to agree needs to be curtailed to the extent possible for today and for future generations.
Returning to the big picture, the researcher’s conclusion is that making minimum lot size standards more lenient is not the best solution to the demographic pinch. Although the high price and lack of availability of farmland seem to be factors driving the demand for relaxed standards – factors that speak to a broader set of issues in agriculture and rural Ontario that require attention – what can be done to support the unique socio-economic and cultural needs and goals of the Anabaptist community? The information presented in the preceding chapters points to certain key beneficial practices when planning for the Anabaptist farm community:
1. Policies that afford farmers the opportunity to at least propose farm splits for Councils to consider that would lead to resultant farms having fewer acres than what is prescribed by minimum lot size standards are beneficial (see Appendix J).

2. Collaboratively explore options for special policy areas supporting rural mixed-use/agricultural clusters on fragmented and marginal lands. The mixed-use concept of having a house, barn, and shop all on one property can be very fitting to the unique cultural and socio-economic needs and goals of Anabaptist communities. Policy and ZBL provisions in the Township of Wellesley enable parcels from 5-10 acres in size with a 6,002 sq. ft. shop and up to five people working within. Animal units as well as barn size are limited (see Appendix L and M). Intensive produce growing should be explored as part of the mixed-use concept, as 5 acres of produce production could very well contribute to the economic, social and environmental spheres of sustainability in a given area.

3. Local policies and appropriate ZBL provisions that are supportive of certain forms of farm-related residential development (e.g. so-called garden suites, granny flats and tenants-in-common arrangements) can be very fitting to the unique cultural and socio-economic needs and goals of Anabaptist communities. As one example, policy and ZBL provisions in the Township of Woolwich enable landowners with agricultural properties to create a second temporary or permanent farm-related residential unit, or convert an existing farm-related residential unit to create a second or even a third dwelling unit. As one of several conditions, consents are not granted for such developments (see Appendix R).

4. Local policies and appropriate ZBL provisions that highlight the special importance of existing undersized parcels in agricultural areas can be very fitting to the unique cultural
and socio-economic needs and goals of Anabaptist communities. As one example, policy and ZBL provisions in the Township of Howick enable landowners with agricultural properties from 0.4 – 10 acres in size to have an agricultural use (limited), a home industrial use, a home occupation use and one single detached dwelling. Such parcels have a high potential for intensive produce growing to be combined with other on-farm revenue streams.

5. Local policies and appropriate ZBL provisions that are supportive of on-farm business uses can be very fitting to the unique cultural and socio-economic needs and goals of Anabaptist communities. As one example, policy and ZBL provisions in the Township of Wellesley enable landowners with agricultural properties ≥ 20 acres to build up to a 6,000 sq. ft. building to accommodate a business use (e.g. dry manufacturing) while employing up to two employees who are not permanent residents of the property. There are a number of other restrictions (see Appendix N).

6. Engage with the Anabaptist community in a collaborative mutual learning process. Through this process, both planner and citizen learn from one another to shape a new understanding of the possibilities for change. As with all social interactions, one party must commit to approaching the other in order to initiate this process.
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Appendix A
Comparative Case Study Interview Guide for Lancaster County, Pennsylvania
Small Farm Parcels in a Post-Productivist Landscape: A Cross-Case Comparison of Land Use Policy and an Examination of Anabaptist Coping Strategies

INTERVIEW GUIDE: CASE STUDIES OF AGRICULTURAL LAND USE PLANNING POLICY

I am presently completing a cross-case comparison of land use policy between Lancaster County, PA and the Region of Waterloo, ON - both are characterized by small farms and burgeoning Anabaptist farm communities. This research arises out of recognition that, in Ontario, the creation of new farm parcels on lands designated for agriculture is limited by minimum lot size standards that require the parcels to be of a certain size. The intent is to ensure the parcels are sufficiently large to maintain flexibility for future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations that might be needed. Despite these restrictions, it has been argued that Anabaptist farm strategies, when practiced on small parcels, can provide flexible and viable farm operations. The purpose of this research is to (a) compare divergent agricultural lot size interventions in two districts—one American and one Canadian; and (b) to document the measures that small acreage Anabaptist farms are taking to adjust to, and even take advantage of, changing conditions in agriculture. The aim is to inform the ongoing debate about Ontario’s existing minimum lot size standards and the viability of Anabaptist agriculture on small farm parcels. The findings will be useful for decision-makers to support and inform effective governance and policymaking for agricultural land.

As part of my case study, I am asking informed people like yourself to participate in an interview that will take approximately 30-60 minutes. You have been identified as a person with knowledge of agricultural land use planning in your geographic area.

The main purpose of the interview is to obtain your feedback on information I have collected to date in my research process and to gain additional information where there are gaps [Review and sign consent form].

1. Can you please describe your role as it relates to planning and/or farmland conservation in the County and/or your respective Township?

2. To date, I have identified a number of tools that are in place in the United States to safeguard against the loss of farmland and to prevent land use conflicts between farmers and non-farmers. They include: comprehensive plans; differential assessment of farmland; agricultural districts; right to farm law; agricultural zoning; urban growth boundaries; purchase of development rights; transfer of development rights; private land trusts and easements.
a. Can you please confirm if I’ve missed anything?

b. Can you confirm which tools are currently in use in the County and/or your respective Township.

c. Reflecting on the tools currently in use, which is most effective in your opinion, for safeguarding against the loss of farmland? For preventing land use conflicts? Why?

d. Reflecting on the tools currently in use, which is the least effective in your opinion, for safeguarding against the loss of farmland? For preventing land use conflicts? Why?

3. In Ontario, local municipalities create their own land use plans- these plans must conform to broader plans at the county or regional level. I’ve read that county-level planning is essentially advisory in Lancaster County.

a. Can you explain why this is the case?

b. In your experience, has this affected the ability of various key actors to effectively plan for agriculture in the County? How (positively or negatively)?

4. In Ontario, the creation of new farm parcels is limited by what are commonly referred to as ‘minimum lot size standards’. In some cases the standard is 100 acres- meaning that any new farm parcel created on lands designated for agriculture must be at least 100 acres in size. My understanding is that most townships in the County apply a minimum farm size requirement.

a. Can you verify the existing (or range of) minimum farm size requirement(s) in the County and/or your respective Township?

b. Is it common for new farm parcels to be created in the County and/or your respective Township that are 50 acres or less? 25 acres or less? 10 acres or less? Are larger parcels more common? How large?
c. In your experience, are the majority of small farms in the County and/or your respective Township, owned by Anabaptist farmers? If yes, why do you think this is the case?

d. In your experience, what types of agricultural operations are undertaken on smaller farm parcels to keep them viable?

e. Is there a concern that the existing minimum farm size requirements in the County limit farmers’ flexibility to adjust to future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations that might be needed?

f. In your experience, what have been the positive and negative implications of existing minimum farm size requirements in the County and/or your respective Township?

g. How have various planning authorities throughout the County responded to any negative implications associated with existing requirements?

h. How have conservation easements been used to protect small farm parcels for agriculture in the County and/or your respective Township? In your experience, have they been effective?

i. In your opinion, how do existing minimum farm size requirements serve the public interest in the County and/or your respective Township?

j. In your experience, is there interest in setting a higher minimum farm size in the County and/or your respective Township? Why?

k. If planning authorities in Ontario were contemplating a policy adjustment to make existing minimum lot size standards more lenient (i.e. <50 acres) what would be your advice? Why?

5. It is my understanding that Lancaster County has an average farm size of 78 acres, consisting of one or more parcels per farmer. Moreover, as we have already discussed, various townships have zoning ordinances that permit even smaller parcels to be created with residences.
a. Reflecting on these factors, how has Lancaster County’s $1.5 billion agricultural sector remained viable? Are the County’s Anabaptist farm communities a factor?
Appendix B
Comparative Case Study Interview Guide for the Region of Waterloo, Ontario

Small Farm Parcels in a Post-Productivist Landscape: A Cross-Case Comparison of Land Use Policy and an Examination of Anabaptist Coping Strategies

INTERVIEW GUIDE: CASE STUDIES OF AGRICULTURAL LAND USE PLANNING POLICY

I am presently completing a cross-case comparison of land use policy between Lancaster County, Penn. and the Region of Waterloo, Ont.-both are characterized by small farms and burgeoning Anabaptist farm communities. This research arises out of recognition that, in Ontario, the creation of new farm parcels on lands designated for agriculture is limited by minimum lot size standards that require the parcels to be of a certain size. The intent is to ensure the parcels are sufficiently large to maintain flexibility for future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations that might be needed. Despite these restrictions, it has been argued that Anabaptist farm strategies, when practiced on small parcels, can provide flexible and viable farm operations. The purpose of this research is to (a) compare divergent agricultural lot size interventions in two districts-one American and one Canadian; and (b) to document the measures that small acreage Anabaptist farms are taking to adjust to, and even take advantage of, changing conditions in agriculture. The aim is to inform the ongoing debate about Ontario’s existing minimum lot size standards and the viability of Anabaptist agriculture on small farm parcels. The findings will be useful for decision-makers to support and inform effective governance and policymaking for agricultural land.

As part of my case study, I am asking informed people like yourself to participate in an interview that will take approximately 30 minutes. You have been identified as a person with knowledge of agricultural land use planning in your geographic area.

The main purpose of the interview is to obtain your feedback on information I have collected to date in my research process and to gain additional information where there are gaps [Review and sign consent form].

1. Can you please describe your role as it relates to planning and/or farmland conservation in the Region and/or your respective Township?

2. To date, I have identified a number of tools that are in place in Ontario to safeguard against the loss of farmland and to prevent land use conflicts between farmers and non-farmers. They include: provincial ‘smart growth’ initiatives; official plans; agricultural zoning; right to farm law; urban growth boundaries; urban intensification and density targets; conservation easements.
a. Can you please confirm if I’ve missed anything?

b. Can you confirm which tools are currently in use in the Region and/or your respective Township?

c. Reflecting on the tools currently in use, which is most effective in your opinion, for safeguarding against the loss of farmland? For preventing land use conflicts? Why?

d. Reflecting on the tools currently in use, which is the least effective in your opinion, for safeguarding against the loss of farmland? For preventing land use conflicts? Why?

3. In Ontario, as you are aware, local municipalities create their own land use plans- these plans must conform to broader plans at the county or regional level. These broader plans must then conform to provincial plans (where applicable), as well as the Provincial Policy Statement.

   a. In your experience, has this affected the ability of various key actors to effectively plan for agriculture in the Region? How (positively or negatively)?

4. In Ontario, the creation of new farm parcels is limited by minimum lot size standards. In the Region of Waterloo the standard is 100 acres- meaning that any new farm parcel must be at least 100 acres in size.

   a. Is it common for new farm parcels to be created in the Region and/or your respective Township that are 100 acres or less? 50 acres or less? 25 acres or less? Are larger parcels more common? How large?

   b. In your experience, are the majority of small farms in the Region and/or your respective Township, owned by Anabaptist farmers? If yes, why do you think this is the case?

   c. In your experience, what types of agricultural operations are undertaken on smaller farm parcels to keep them viable?
d. Is there a concern that a more lenient minimum lot size standard for new farm parcels in the Region might limit farmers’ flexibility to adjust to future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations that might be needed?

e. In your experience, what have been the positive and negative implications of the existing minimum lot size standard in the Region and/or your respective Township?

f. How have various planning authorities throughout the Region responded to any negative implications associated with the existing standard?

g. Has any consideration been given to using conservation easements to protect small farm parcels for agriculture in the Region? In your opinion, what might some of the positive and negative implications be?

h. In your opinion, how does the existing minimum lot size standard for new farm parcels serve the public interest in the Region and/or your respective Township?

i. In your experience, is there interest in setting a lower minimum lot size standard for new farm parcels on lands designated for agriculture in the Region and/or your respective Township? Why?

j. If planning authorities in Pennsylvania were contemplating a policy adjustment to make existing minimum lot size standards more restrictive (they are quite lenient at the present time), what would be your advice? Why?

5. The Region has an average farm size (i.e. 159 acres) that is much lower than the provincial (i.e. 243 acres) and national (i.e. 778 acres) averages. For the last census period, over 20% of the farms in the Region were between 10-69 acres, consisting of one or more parcels per farmer. At the same time, farms are becoming fewer in Ontario while remaining farms are becoming larger.

a. Reflecting on these factors and the preponderance of small farms, how has the Region’s agricultural sector remained viable? Are the Region’s Anabaptist farm communities a factor?

6. The Region, together with the Township of Wellesley, has implemented a unique land use policy known as a ‘Rural Mixed-Use Agricultural Cluster’. The ‘Cluster’ is a grouping
of lots on which a combination of compatible residential, industrial/commercial, and limited non-commercial agricultural uses are permitted. The policy addresses the housing and employment needs of the Township’s Anabaptist community, which relies on horse-drawn vehicles for transportation. The 7 lots within the Cluster are each less than 10 acres in size.

a. Do you have any awareness of the Cluster? [If not, interview ends].

b. In your opinion, what have been the merits of the Cluster? Why? Have there been any negative implications?

7. In a recent survey by the Township of Wellesley, all Cluster owners responded that they have some sort of non-commercial livestock/produce operation and a barn. Several had greenhouses. In North America, there is growing recognition that small farm parcels can be profitable with proper management (e.g. intensive produce growing) combined with a direct marketing sales approach.

a. In your opinion, why does the policy limit the use of each lot to non-commercial agricultural activities?

b. In your opinion, what might be some of the implications (both positive and negative) of allowing commercial agricultural activities to be undertaken on these parcels?
Appendix C
Examination of Farmer Strategies and Perspectives, Additional Informant Profiles

Farmer 19’s home farm of 100 acres with 75 acres tillable is in the Township of Wellesley. He and his wife have owned it for 26 years. They own and farm an additional 50-acre parcel (45 acres tillable) and an additional 100-acre parcel (70 acres tillable). They have owned the 50-acre parcel for six years and the 100-acre parcel for less than a year. He has 125 head of beef cattle and 2,000 weaner hogs. He grows all of the feed required by the operation, including corn, wheat and alfalfa. The home parcel financially sustains itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed; the two extra parcels are owned and farmed so that their children will have a place to farm. He has a woodworking shop and he views the income derived from this extra activity as necessary “to make the payments”. Neither he nor his wife work off-farm. He has children who want to farm and it is his future intention to expand the number of acres farmed. If a farm comes up for sale nearby Farmer 19 explained that he will attempt to purchase it. “If farms are available nearby one another, you want to buy them, because of our transportation,” but he added that farms are cheaper elsewhere. He felt that farms are not available in the Township of Wellesley. Aside from this barrier, he explained that young people have to borrow a lot of money to purchase farms and he is concerned that the possibility of a hike in interest rates will “knock them out”. However, he emphasized that farms appreciate in value and felt that they can be a good investment. He sees existing policy as a good thing: “We like to be spread out a bit,” he explained. However, he felt that there might be benefit in having 50-acre parcels combined with on-farm shops.

Farmer 20’s home farm of 100 acres with 85 acres tillable is in the Township of Woolwich. He and his wife have owned it for 26 years. He grows vegetables, including sweet corn, cabbage, watermelons and strawberries. Having made a switch from a different style of
farming, growing produce has been a learning curve: “I realized that its going to take some time to get a handle on things – maybe a generation or more,” he explained. Approximately 10% of his vegetables are sold at the farm gate, approximately 5% are sold through the EPAC, and the remaining vegetables are direct marketed to retail outlets in Kitchener and Waterloo. While he has attempted to market wholesale volumes of vegetables, “direct to consumer markets are really the only markets that are sustainable,” he explained. The home farm financially supports itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed. This is because high-value crops are grown intensively: “We have to specialize in high-value crops to maintain viability,” he explained. He does not intend to expand the number of acres farmed but, rather, plans to expand his direct marketing business and intensify production in his greenhouse space. The revenue derived from his direct marketing efforts has been a necessary source of income to sustain the home farm and household. Neither he nor his wife work off-farm. He has children who want to farm and explained, “we desperately need governments to come up with a program to allow existing farm parcels to be subdivided into smaller farm parcels to make it more viable for young folks in our community” and added “We do need to recognize that once a small farm parcel is created, there is a risk that it could be sold to a non-farmer in the future”. As one option, he suggested that, in a family setting, a policy allowing a second house on a 100-acre parcel would be helpful, with both the land and dwellings under single ownership. In this way, a young family could live on a farm and lease farmland at low cost from their parents over the long-term.

Farmer 21’s home farm of 30 acres with 22 acres tillable is in the Township of Huron-Kinloss in Bruce County, Ontario. He and his wife have owned it for 11 years. He grows 10 acres of vegetables, including asparagus, strawberries, onions, shallots, carrots, Roma tomatoes, potatoes and specialty corn. On average, his gross profit is $3,000/acre and explained that having
a large family helps reduce labour expenses: “We do a lot of hard work…we depend on our backs and our family. All the picking is done by hand,” he explained. He also has 2,000 sq. ft. of greenhouse space. All of the produce is sold at the Bruce-Huron Produce Auction (BHPA). In 2014, he built a packinghouse and purchased a machine to do the washing. The home farm supports itself financially and the household, without any additional acreage farmed. He manufactures steel wheels for Amish customers, feeds 25 head of beef cattle under contract in the winter, and occasionally sells horses. The revenue derived from these extra activities is necessary to sustain the home farm and household. He intends to utilize more of the land he owns for produce growing, but does not plan to purchase or rent additional acreage: “Why would I? Another 50 acres would be a financial burden. I don’t need more acres,” he explained. He does not feel that there is farmland available to purchase in the Township of Huron-Kinloss. He is aware of young married couples in his community who would like to farm, but cannot find farms that they can afford. “These folks will work out or start a new community elsewhere. Time will tell, that is about all I can say,” he said. He would like to see a policy that would allow smaller farm parcels to be created, but identified a need to have restrictions in place to prevent those parcels from being owned by non-farmers and to prevent farms from being split into too many parcels.
Appendix D
Interview Guide for Examination of Farmer Strategies and Perspectives

Small Farm Parcels: A Cross-Case Comparison of Land Use Policy and an Examination of Farmer Strategies

INTERVIEW GUIDE: EXAMINATION OF FARMER STRATEGIES AND PERSPECTIVES

I am presently completing a case study of the Region of Waterloo. This research arises out of recognition that, in Ontario, the creation of new farm parcels on lands designated for agriculture is limited by minimum lot size standards that require the parcels to be of a certain size. The intent is to ensure the parcels are sufficiently large to maintain flexibility for future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations that might be required. Despite these restrictions, it has been argued that Anabaptist farm strategies, when practiced on small parcels, can provide flexible and viable farm operations. However, very little has been done to document the measures that small acreage Anabaptist farms are taking to adjust to, and even take advantage of, changing conditions in agriculture or to explore what these measures and changes mean for agricultural land use planning policy. This is the primary purpose of this research.

As part of my case study, I am asking farmers like you to participate in an interview that will take approximately 15-20 minutes. The purpose of the interview is to understand the strategies through which you are developing your farm, the factors (e.g., farm size) influencing your decisions, and your perspectives regarding existing land use policy [review and sign Consent Form].

PART 1: FARM TYPE

1. Please describe the type of farming you are engaged in [elicit details from participant with additional probing questions – dairy, beef, hogs, poultry, field crops, fruit crops, vegetable crops, etc.]?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
2. Reflecting on the agricultural products produced on your farm, what proportion is sold locally (e.g. from the farm gate or at the Elmira Produce Auction Cooperative) as a percentage of the total (e.g. 100%, 50%, 25%, <25%)?


PART 2: HOME FARM AND ACREAGE

3. Please describe your home farm according to the following table [guide participant through table]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acreage of Property</th>
<th>Tillable Acreage</th>
<th>Length of Ownership (Years)</th>
<th>Type of Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Financially, does the home farm support itself and the household without any additional acreage farmed?

[ ] Yes    [ ] No

Please explain:


[If participant answered no, skip to PART 3]
5. What strategies have you implemented to sustain the home farm and household without expanding the number of acres farmed? For example, have you transitioned to high-value crops grown intensively? Have you started a sideline business (e.g. a blacksmith shop)?

Please describe:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

6. As you may be aware, the number of farms in Ontario is steadily declining while remaining farms become larger. Do you worry about your ability to keep pace with developments in the agricultural sector without expanding the number of acres farmed?

Please explain:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

PART 3: ADDITIONAL ACREAGE OWNED OR RENTED

7. Do you own additional acreage and farm it?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

*[If participant answered no, skip to Question 10]*
8. Please describe the additional acreage you own and farm [guide participant through table]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage of Property</th>
<th>Tillable Acreage</th>
<th>Length of Ownership (Years)</th>
<th>Type of Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you own and farm this additional acreage out of necessity in order to sustain the home farm and household or is it farmed as a discretionary choice?

[   ] Out of necessity  [   ] A discretionary choice

Please explain:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. Do you rent additional acreage and farm it?

[   ] Yes  [   ] No

[If participant answered no, skip to Question 13].

11. Please describe the additional acreage you rent and farm [guide participant through table]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage of Property</th>
<th>Tillable Acreage</th>
<th>Number of Years Rented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Do you rent and farm this additional acreage out of necessity in order to sustain the home farm and household or is it farmed as a discretionary choice?

[ ] Out of necessity    [ ] A discretionary choice

Please explain:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

13. Do you rent out any land (e.g. to other farmers)?

[ ] Yes    [ ] No

Number of acres: ______________

[If participant answered no, skip to PART 4].

14. Is the income you receive from renting out this acreage a necessary source of income to sustain the home farm and household or is it rented as a discretionary choice?

[ ] Out of necessity    [ ] A discretionary choice

Please explain:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PART 4: CHANGES TO SCALE OF FARMING OPERATION

15. Looking ahead to the future, is it your intention to expand the number of acres farmed; to stay the same; or to decrease the number of acres farmed?

[ ] Expand  [ ] Stay the same  [ ] Decrease

Please explain:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

PART 5: SECONDARY ON-FARM ACTIVITIES AND BUSINESSES

16. Are you involved in any secondary (agricultural or non-agricultural) activities or businesses (e.g. direct marketing, pick-your-own, sawmill, furniture repair, machinery repair, tin-smithing, black-smithing, harness repair, etc.) on the farm?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

[If participant answered no, skip to PART 6].

17. Please describe the secondary activities and/or businesses that you are involved with on the farm:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

18. Are these secondary activities and/or businesses a necessary source of income to sustain the home farm and household or is your involvement a discretionary choice?

[ ] A necessity  [ ] A discretionary choice

Please explain:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PART 6: OFF-FARM EMPLOYMENT

19. Do you and/or your spouse hold a job off the home farm?

[  ] Yes    [  ] No    [  ] Spouse    [  ] Both

Occupation(s): _______________

[If participant answered no, skip to PART 7].

20. Is this off-farm employment a necessary source of income to sustain the home farm and household or is the job a discretionary choice?

[  ] Necessary source of income    [  ] Discretionary choice

Please explain:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

PART 7: DEMAND FOR SMALL FARM PARCELS

21. Do you have children who think they may want to farm?

[  ] Yes    [  ] No

[If participant answered no, skip to Question 24].

22. How do you think they will enter into farming? For example, will they buy your farm? Will they look for other farms?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
23. Do you feel that there is farmland available in the general area that your children may be able to purchase?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No
Please explain:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

24. In your experience, what are some of common barriers faced by young people in your community as they endeavor to own their own farms?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

25. As you may know, in Ontario and within Waterloo Region, it is difficult to divide farms into parcels less than 100 acres in size. Do you have any comments concerning this policy and how it impacts your community?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
Appendix E
Leacock Township Minimum Lot Size Standard
(Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2014)

.02 Minimum Lot Size.

Unless otherwise provided for in this Ordinance,

a) The minimum size for a farm shall be forty (40) acres.

b) For single family dwellings and other nonfarm uses, where public sewer is not available - one (1) acre.

c) For single family dwellings and other nonfarm uses, where public sewer is available - 15,000 square feet.

d) Specific nonfarm uses may require a greater minimum lot size.

.03 Maximum lot size for non-farm uses shall be two (2) acres, unless:

a) a larger lot area is required to meet all applicable setbacks and Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) requirements for the location of on-site water supply and sewage disposal facilities, including replacement system location; or

b) a larger lot size is required for a use permitted by right, by special exception or by conditional use.

(Amended 1/07/14)
Appendix F
Leacock Township “1 per 20” Zoning (Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2014)

Section 4.04.00 - Bulk and Lot Regulations

.01 Subdivision and Land Development Limitations. It is the intent of the Supervisors to preserve and protect agriculture and to preserve prime agricultural soils through limitations on subdivision and land development. It is also the intent of this Ordinance to allow for gradual growth directed at already existing smaller parcels, while also controlling the rate of growth and the amount of development on all parcels. In furtherance of this intent the number of lots permitted to be subdivided in the Agricultural Zone shall be limited as follows:

a) For each parent tract of forty (40) acres or more, there shall be permitted:

1) the subdivision of one (1) lot for every twenty (20) acres contained in the parent tract

(Amended 1/07/14)
Appendix G
Leacock Township Provisions for Businesses in the Agricultural (A) Zone
(Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2014)

Section 18.17.00 - Businesses in the Agricultural Zone

Goals and Intent of Businesses in the Agricultural Zone:

Businesses in the Agricultural Zone provide at-home employment opportunities that are intended to serve residents of the agricultural community. The business shall not become the primary use on the parcel. The primary use of the parcel shall be (1) residential or (2) occupied farm use, as defined by Article 2. The business shall be owned and operated by the owner or resident of the subject parcel.

Businesses in the Agricultural Zone shall be permitted only by Special Exception and shall meet the following standards and conditions:

.01 Businesses in the Agricultural Zone shall be limited to the following types of activities:

   a) Manufacturing - Production of goods for resale at retail or wholesale

   b) Repair Services – Including, but not limited to, farm machinery service and repair, shoe repair shops, blacksmith shops, welding shops, carpenter shops, plumbing shops, and appliance repair shops.

   c) Accessory retail sales – Limited retail sales of manufactured goods produced on the premises and/or supplies related to services provided on the premises – subject to the provisions below.

      1) No stand-alone retail stores shall be permitted

      2) Retail sales shall be limited to no more than 25% of the total building floor area of the business.

   d) Veterinary facilities and animal hospitals, subject also to Section 18.11.00.

   e) Kennels, subject also to Section 18.39.00.

   f) Riding School and Horse Boarding Stables, subject also to Section 18.59.00.

.02 Businesses may be located on a subdivided lot (with a dwelling) or on a portion of an existing lot.

.03 A minimum one (1) acre lot size (or lot area) is required to establish a business in the Agricultural Zone. Maximum lot size (or lot area) is two (2) acres, except as follows:

   a) The maximum 2-acre lot size/lot area may be increased only where required to meet PADEP requirements for on-site sewage disposal or where extenuating physical conditions exist on the lot.
Maximum Building and Impervious Coverage on Lots One (1) – Two (2) Acres in Size

a) Maximum (total) building coverage for all buildings used for businesses in the Agricultural Zone is as follows.

1) One (1) acre lot/area Maximum Business Building Coverage = 2,500 square feet

2) Two (2) acre lot/area Maximum Business Building Coverage = 4,000 square feet

3) For lots greater than one (1) acre but less than two (2) acres, the maximum allowable Business Building Coverage shall be calculated as follows:

Maximum Business Building Coverage (BC)

1 Acre Lot = 2,500 SF Maximum; 2 Acre Lot = 4,000 SF Maximum

Lot Size between 1 and 2 Acres:

BC = 2,500 + 1,500X, where X = [(Area in Acres) – (1.0)]

Example – 1.4 Acres

BC = 2,500 + (1,500)(1.4 – 1.0)
BC = 2,500 + (1,500)(0.4)
BC = 2,500 + (600)
BC = 3,100 SF

4) Existing buildings that exceed the Business Building Coverage allowed in subsection 3) above may be used in the business provided they don’t exceed the total impervious coverage limitations in subsection b) below.

b) Total impervious coverage, as defined in this Ordinance, shall not exceed fifty (50%) percent.

.05 On existing lots greater than two (2) and less than forty (40) acres in size:

a) The Maximum Business Building Coverage shall be 4,000 square feet, with the following exceptions:

1) Existing buildings may be converted for business use without limitation on size, provided the area for the business is delineated from the farming operations.

2) Indoor storage in existing buildings shall also be unlimited.

b) All business-related activities, including new and existing buildings used in the business, outdoor storage, and storm water management facilities – but excluding parking, shall be located within a 2-acre area delineated on the lot. Total
impervious coverage within the delineated area shall not exceed fifty (50\%) percent.

c) Outdoor storage areas shall be properly screened.

.06 On farms (40 acres or greater in size):

a) The Maximum Business Building Coverage shall be 4,000 square feet, with the following exceptions:

1) Existing buildings may be converted for business use without limitation on size, provided the area for the business is delineated from the farming operations.

2) Indoor storage in existing buildings shall also be unlimited.

b) All business-related activities, including new and existing buildings used in the business, outdoor storage, and storm water management facilities – but excluding parking, shall be located within a 2-acre area delineated on the lot. Total impervious coverage within the delineated area shall not exceed fifty (50\%) percent.

c) Outdoor storage areas shall be properly screened.

.07 All businesses in the Agricultural Zone shall require the preparation of a land development plan in accordance with the requirements of the Township’s Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and shall comply with the requirements of the Township’s Storm Water Management Ordinance.

.08 New structures shall observe all lot, bulk, and setback requirements of the Agricultural Zone.

.09 Off-street parking shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of Article 19. Required parking spaces shall not be utilized for storage or otherwise reduced.

.10 The applicant shall provide information on the type and number of truck trips to be generated by the business.

.11 The applicant shall provide a listing of any hazardous or flammable materials proposed to be used in the business.

.12 Outdoor storage of supplies, materials and products shall be screened from adjoining roads and properties.

.13 No mobile home may be utilized as part of the business.

.14 No more than one (1) business per lot shall be permitted.

(Amended 1/07/14) 18-17
Fruits, vegetables, baked goods, and canned goods may be sold to the general public except that no food shall be consumed on the premises.

a) A food certificate from the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture shall be provided and maintained.

b) A building or area used for such sales shall not exceed three hundred (300) square feet.

c) Craft type merchandise exceeding one (1) cubic foot in volume shall not be sold or displayed at the food sales location.

In its review of the Special Exception request for a business in an Agricultural Zone, the Zoning Hearing Board may attach such reasonable conditions as it may deem necessary to implement the purposes of this Ordinance. Such conditions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

a) Amount of floor space to be used for accessory retail sales
b) Number of non-resident employees
c) Hours of operation
d) Type and placement of screening
Appendix H
Township of Wellesley Minimum Lot Size Standard (Township of Wellesley, 2006)

SECTION 5 AGRICULTURAL (A1) ZONE REGULATIONS

The General Agricultural (A1) Zone is intended to apply to all lots designated “Agricultural Resource Area” in the Official Plan.

5.1 PERMITTED USES

No land shall be used and no buildings or structures shall be erected, used or altered in the General Agricultural (A1) Zone except for the following purposes:

Agricultural use (except sod farming);
Agricultural Greenhouses;
Animal clinic;
Animal kennel;
Bed and breakfast establishment;
Farm;
Farm produce outlet;
Farm-related occupation;
Forestry use;
Group home;
Home occupation;
Riding stable;
One (1) single-detached dwelling lawfully in existence as of the date of passing of this By-law or on lots lawfully existing as of the date of passing of this By-law;
One (1) principal farm dwelling to the farm operation;
Converted dwelling;
Accessory uses to the above permitted uses.

5.2 MINIMUM LOT AREA

40.0 ha (99 ac)

5.3 MINIMUM LOT FRONTAGE

230.0 m (755 ft)
Appendix I
Provincial Policy for Farm Parcel Creation (Government of Ontario, 2014b)

2.3.4 Lot Creation and Lot Adjustments

2.3.4.1 Lot creation in prime agricultural areas is discouraged and may only be permitted for:

a) agricultural uses, provided that the lots are of a size appropriate for the type of agricultural use(s) common in the area and are sufficiently large to maintain flexibility for future changes in the type or size of agricultural operations;

b) agriculture-related uses, provided that any new lot will be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate sewage and water services;

c) a residence surplus to a farming operation as a result of farm consolidation, provided that:
   1. the new lot will be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate sewage and water services; and
   2. the planning authority ensures that new residential dwellings are prohibited on any remnant parcel of farmland created by the severance. The approach used to ensure that no new residential dwellings are permitted on the remnant parcel may be recommended by the Province, or based on municipal approaches which achieve the same objective; and

d) infrastructure, where the facility or corridor cannot be accommodated through the use of easements or rights-of-way.

2.3.4.2 Lot adjustments in prime agricultural areas may be permitted for legal or technical reasons.

2.3.4.3 The creation of new residential lots in prime agricultural areas shall not be permitted, except in accordance with policy 2.3.4.1(c).
Appendix J  
Township of Wellesley Policy for Farm Parcel Creation (Township of Wellesley, 2004)

3.2 Farm Parcel Creation/Alteration

3.2.1 Where a new farm is proposed to be created, or where part of an adjoining farm is to be severed and merged in title with an existing farm, the development application will comply with the following:

a) Each resultant farm that is created must have a minimum area of 40 hectares; or

b) Resultant farms having less than a minimum of 40 hectares will:

   i) Be of a size appropriate for the type of agricultural use(s) proposed. Such development applications will be evaluated by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, or other professional(s) knowledgeable in farm economics and management to determine if the proposed farm is of sufficient size and nature to be reasonably expected to sustain a commercially viable operation as an independent farm unit, and for flexible re-use for agricultural purposes in the event of business failure; and,

   ii) Be permitted by a site specific zoning by-law amendment.
ii) wherever feasible, the area of operation is to be part of the farm cluster; and,

iii) considers any impacts such as noise, dust, vibration, visibility to the adjacent agricultural operations. Mitigation of impacts may require screening or fencing, as determined by Council;

c) The subject property will remain zoned for agricultural purposes;

d) No new lot will be created;

e) The proposed on-farm business activity will not be detrimental to the environment;

f) Shall not include any use which is or may become obnoxious, offensive or dangerous by reasons of the presence, emission or production in any manner of odour, dust, smoke, noise, fumes, vibration, refuse matter or water carried wastes;

g) Shall be limited to dry manufacturing and/or repair, with ancillary retail;

h) Shall not include automotive sales and/or repair.

i) The owner/operator must obtain a Township Certificate of Occupancy.

3.3.2 The range of on-farm business activities permitted and the standards applying to them shall be set out in the Zoning By-law. On-farm business activities may be subject to site plan control.

3.3.3 Consents shall not be granted for any on-farm business activity created in accordance with this policy.

3.4 Farm-Related Residential Development

To accommodate full-time farm employees, including members of the farm household, or to aid retiring farmers, the construction of a second permanent or temporary farm-related residential unit, or the conversion of an existing farm-related residential unit, to create a second unit may be permitted on a farm by site-specific zoning by-law amendment. Consents will not be granted for any farm-related residential units created in accordance with this policy. It is an objective of this Plan that second farm-related residential units will be clustered with the farmstead.
Appendix L
Township of Wellesley Policy for Rural Mixed Use/Agricultural Clusters
(Township of Wellesley, 2004)

taking into consideration the nature of the proposed use and the availability of lands designated within the Wellesley Urban Area, Rural Settlement Areas, and the Agricultural Resource Area for such uses;

c) The amount of land proposed to be designated and zoned is the minimum appropriate for the requirements of the proposed use based on the nature of the proposed use;

d) Conformity with the Minimum Distance Separation Formulae;

e) The use is clearly demonstrated to be compatible with the adjacent agricultural operations; and,

f) The submission of environmental and servicing studies as required by the policies of this Plan.

3.7.4 Minor additions to, or intensification of existing industrial, commercial, recreational and/or institutional uses located outside of a Rural Settlement Area, or minor changes in use thereof, may be permitted. Minor expansions to lot areas may be permitted where:

a) Consideration is given to both the size of the lot addition and the impact of the proposed development on surrounding agricultural uses; and

b) The lot addition does not result in the creation of any additional lot held, or capable of being held, in distinct and separate ownership pursuant to the Planning Act.

3.7.5 In order to preserve and support the historic social and cultural needs of a unique segment of the Region’s existing rural community which rely on horse-drawn vehicles as their sole means of transportation, the Township may, by an amendment to the Zoning By-law, permit the establishment of small-scale schools, churches and associated cemeteries where their location in the Agricultural Resource Area can be justified.

3.7.6 The creation of lots specifically for the purpose of conserving woodlands or Environmental Areas as designated on Map 7 of this Plan, may be permitted only where such lands are designated as Open Space in this Plan and zoned to prohibit any use not related to conservation. The creation of such lots will not be permitted where the configuration of the remnant parcels will create the potential for new non-farm uses or lots, or result in farms which may not be commercially viable in accordance with Policy 3.2 of this Plan.

3.8 Rural Mixed Use/ Agricultural Clusters

3.8.1 A Cluster consists of lots ranging from approximately two hectares in size to a maximum of four hectares on which a combination of residential, dry industrial and limited non-commercial agricultural uses may be permitted.

3.8.2 A Cluster may also contain lots for small-scale schools, churches and associated cemeteries to
support this segment of the rural community.

3.8.3 The identified Rural Mixed Use/Agricultural Clusters are designated as shown on Maps 2 and 11 of this Plan. An amendment to this Plan is required to establish a new Cluster.

3.8.4 Each Cluster shall be separated from another Cluster, a designated settlement area, an industrial/commercial area, or a Township Urban Area by a minimum distance of one kilometre as measured along public roads.

3.8.5 In accordance with the application of the MDS I and II Guidelines approved by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food for Clusters:

a) MDS I for Type ‘A’ Land Uses shall apply between agricultural facilities external to the Cluster and the residential and industrial uses within Clusters;

b) MDS does not apply between lots within a Cluster;

c) MDS I for Type ‘B’ Land Uses shall apply between agricultural facilities external to the Cluster and institutional type uses within the Cluster; and

d) Lots within clusters shall be considered as agricultural uses in the calculation of MDS II for future construction or expansion of agricultural facilities external to the Clusters.

3.8.6 In considering the creation of a Cluster, the Township will require the submission of studies to determine:

a) The suitability of the lots for servicing by private wells;

b) The suitability of the lots for servicing by individual wastewater treatment systems, and for disposal of manure that could reasonably be anticipated to be generated by the limited agricultural uses; and

c) The impact on Natural Habitat Network and Natural Resources identified in the Regional Official Policies Plan.

3.8.7 The Township may adopt “Rural Mixed Use/Agricultural Cluster Planning Guidelines” (Guidelines) for the purposes of considering proposed zoning By-law amendments, subdivision plans and severances. Planning Guidelines may contain requirements for land use, site planning, environmental protection, design features for buildings, and any other matter that will assist the Township and landowners in creating a Cluster that satisfies the objectives of this Policy and maintains the integrity of the rural character of the Township.

3.8.8 Each Cluster shall be regulated by a Zoning By-law amendment, in conformity with the policies of this Subsection of the Official Plan, that contains provisions for: permitted uses; lot areas and frontages; required yards; floor areas of buildings; building heights; number of animal units; accessory retail sales; number of employees; off-street parking and loading;
accessory signs; accessory buildings and structures; and ‘Building Areas’.

3.8.9 A minimum of 3 lots and a maximum of 7 lots are permitted within each Cluster.

3.8.10 A subdivision plan or simultaneous consents to sever shall be used to create lots in a Cluster.

3.8.11 The Cluster policies contained in this Plan and the associated Guidelines shall be reviewed by Council two years after the occupancy of the fifth residential building within the first Cluster approved in accordance with these policies. Such review shall include an evaluation of the monitoring of the following matters undertaken during the two years noted above:

a) Groundwater quality;

b) Traffic generated by the cluster;

c) Impact on the condition of public roads utilized by cluster traffic;

d) Appropriateness of the size of industrial and agricultural buildings and structures for the permitted uses;

e) Appropriateness of the number and type of animal units;

f) Appropriateness of lot areas;

g) Compatibility between land uses within the cluster;

h) Appropriateness of on-site parking; and

i) Compliance with Township By-laws and standards, and other applicable legislation within the jurisdiction of the Township.

3.8.12 If, after three years following the coming into effect of the “Cluster” policies of this Plan, there has not been occupancy of five residential buildings within the first Cluster approved in accordance with these policies, Council shall consider revisions to this Plan as necessary to address the appropriateness of Clusters as a land use within the Township of Wellesley.

3.8.13 Applications for any additional “Clusters” shall not be considered by Council until such time as Council has either completed the review noted in Policy 3.7.11 or has considered revisions to this Plan in accordance with Policy 3.7.12.
Appendix M
Township of Wellesley Provisions for Rural Mixed Use / Agricultural Clusters
(Township of Wellesley, 2006)

SECTION 7  RURAL MIXED USE / AGRICULTURAL CLUSTER (MAC) ZONE REGULATIONS

The Rural Mixed Use / Agricultural Cluster (MAC) Zone applies to lots designated “Rural Mixed Use / Agricultural Cluster” in the Official Plan.

7.1 PERMITTED USES

No land shall be used and no buildings or structures shall be erected, used or altered in the Rural Mixed Use / Agricultural Cluster (MAC) Zone except for the following purposes:

Non-commercial limited agricultural uses, which do not involve the retail sale of any crops, plants, or livestock grown or raised on the property;

One (1) greenhouse accessory to a residential use;

One (1) barn for the non-commercial limited agricultural housing, breeding or raising of livestock of any kind;

Any required manure management facilities accessory to a barn;

One (1) building for a “dry industrial use” as defined in this By-law, provided that a single-detached dwelling is established on the same lot, and provided that the use does not use large volumes of water or produce large volumes of effluent;

A retail or wholesale outlet or showroom as an accessory to a dry industrial use;

One (1) single-detached dwelling on one lot, which may include an accessory dwelling unit within the dwelling;

Accessory uses to the above permitted uses, but not including portable classrooms, cabins, mobile homes, trailers, or any other residential buildings;

Accessory signs

7.2 LOT AREA

Minimum: 2.0 ha. (5 ac)

Maximum: 4.0 ha. (10 ac)

Maximum total area for Dry Industrial uses including accessory and ancillary open storage, and off-street parking: 0.4 ha. (1 ac)

7.3 MINIMUM LOT FRONTAGE

100.0 m (328 feet)
7.4 **BUILDING HEIGHT REGULATIONS**

**Maximum Height - Barn:**

10.67 m (35 ft)

**Building for Dry Industrial Use:**

Maximum height shall be 7.3 metres (24 feet), and any such building shall have a gable, gambrel, hip, or ridge type roof

7.5 **FLOOR AREA REGULATIONS**

**Minimum ground floor area for a single-detached dwelling:**

100 m² (1,076 ft²) for a one-storey dwelling or 70 m² (753 ft²) for a multi-storey dwelling

**Maximum floor area for accessory dwelling unit within dwelling:**

36% of existing floor area of residential building converted to the accessory use

**Maximum floor area of greenhouse:**

11.6 m² (125 ft²)

**Maximum floor area of barn:**

297 m² (3,197 ft²), whereby no more than 50% of the floor area shall be permitted for the non-commercial limited agricultural housing, breeding or raising of livestock

**Maximum floor area of building for dry industrial use which shall include all floor areas within basements, ground floor, upper floors and mezzanines, but shall not include the area for power generation if it is located below the ground floor:**

557.6 m² (6,002 ft²), of which not more than 25% may be used for the sale of goods produced on-site

7.6 **MINIMUM FRONT YARD DEPTH**

6.0 m (20 ft)

7.7 **MINIMUM SIDE YARD WIDTH**

For a single-detached dwelling:

3.0 m (10 ft)

All other cases:

one-half (1/2) building height, but not less than 3.0 m (10 ft)

7.8 **MINIMUM REAR YARD DEPTH**

7.5 m (25 feet)
7.9 SUPPLEMENTAL REGULATIONS

7.9.1 Maximum Animal Units

Seven (7) provided that there shall be a minimum of one (1) animal unit for horses used for transportation purposes; the remaining six animal units permitted on the lot may be for horses and or the following: a maximum of one animal unit for poultry (chickens, turkeys and ducks) and rabbits; and a maximum of two animal units for cattle (dairy, beef, veal), swine (sows/boars, hogs, and weaners), sheep and goats.

7.9.2 Prohibited Uses

a) Retail sale of produce or other agricultural products grown or raised on the premises.

b) Uses of a building for dry industrial uses that are or may become obnoxious, offensive or dangerous by reason of the presence, emission or production of excessive noise, vibration, odour, danger of fire or explosion, radiation or the release of noxious fumes, smoke, gases or other forms of air or water borne pollutants or contaminants are prohibited unless permitted by a Certificate of Approval issued under the authority of the Environmental Protection Act.

c) Not more than five (5) employees shall be engaged in a dry industrial use, of which the owner/occupant of the property is also deemed to be an employee.

d) An operation which uses large volumes of water or production of large volumes of effluent.

7.9.3 Parking / Loading Regulations

a) Off-street parking for motor vehicles in any enclosed or open space, for any permitted use, including any residential use, except a dry industrial use and retail or wholesale outlet accessory to a dry industrial use, is not permitted or required for purposes of this By-law.

b) A maximum of five (5) off street parking spaces are permitted for motor vehicles required for a dry industrial use and retail or wholesale outlet accessory to a dry industrial, or a maximum of one (1) off-street parking space where there is no accessory retail or wholesale outlet.

c) One (1) off-street loading space for a dry industry for motor vehicles.

7.9.4 Minimum Distance Separation

Minimum Distance Separation I and II regulations do not apply between lots located within an MAC Zone;
Lots located within an MAC Zone are considered agricultural uses for Minimum Distance Separation II calculations for new or expanding agricultural facilities located outside (external) the MAC Zone.

7.9.5 Other Regulations

a) Outdoor storage of goods, materials, parts, machinery, finished or unfinished products related to a dry industrial use is permitted in accordance with site plan control.

b) Accessory signs shall be in conformity with the provisions of the sign By-law of the Township of Wellesley or the Regional Municipality of Waterloo as applicable.

c) Buildings or structures accessory to a residential use shall be in conformity with Section 4.2 of this By-law.

d) No building erected or used in connection with a dry industrial use shall be occupied until a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued. No change in use shall be made without the issuance of a new or revised Certificate of Occupancy. Only one Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued for the business in a building used for dry industrial uses.

e) With the exception of a permitted barn, all buildings used for the permitted uses shall be restricted to the defined building area.

7.10 EXCEPTIONS – RURAL MIXED USE / AGRICULTURAL CLUSTER (MAC) ZONE

7.10.1 Defined Area

MAC-1 as shown on Schedule “A”, Map 30 to this By-law

Maximum Number of Lots

7
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Township. of Wellesley Policy for On Farm Business Activities
(Township of Wellesley, 2006)

3.3 On-farm Business Activities

On-Farm Businesses may be permitted on farm parcels within the Agriculture Resource Area designation subject to provisions in the Zoning By-law to regulate the nature and scale of the operations. On-Farm Businesses are dry industrial or farm-related commercial activities located on a farm to supplement farm income and it is intended that they shall be minor activities relative to the farm operation, such that the farm remains valued for its agricultural capability and not for its industrial or commercial business potential.

3.3.1 Where an on-farm business activity is proposed to be established, the development application will comply with the following:

a) It must be demonstrated that the proposed on-farm business activity will remain secondary to the farm operation and that the cumulative effect of on-farm business activities does not undermine the agricultural nature of the area. Determination of whether a proposed activity is secondary to the farm operation must include an evaluation of the relationship between the existing agricultural operation and the proposed on-farm business. This will include the financial investment, the number of employees, the type of operation for both the agricultural operation and the proposed on-farm business and any other factors as may be deemed appropriate;

b) Be permitted by a site specific zoning by-law amendment which:

i) identifies the area of the operation including all buildings and storage areas;
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SECTION 5 AGRICULTURAL (A1) ZONE REGULATIONS

The General Agricultural (A1) Zone is intended to apply to all lots designated “Agricultural Resource Area” in the Official Plan.

5.1 PERMITTED USES
No land shall be used and no buildings or structures shall be erected, used or altered in the General Agricultural (A1) Zone except for the following purposes:
- Agricultural use (except sod farming);
- Agricultural Greenhouses;
- Animal clinic;
- Animal kennel;
- Bed and breakfast establishment;
- Farm;
- Farm produce outlet;
- Farm-related occupation;
- Forestry use;
- Group home;
- Home occupation;
- Riding stable;
- One (1) single-detached dwelling lawfully in existence as of the date of passing of this By-law or on lots lawfully existing as of the date of passing of this By-law;
- One (1) principal farm dwelling to the farm operation;
- Converted dwelling;
- Accessory uses to the above permitted uses.

5.2 MINIMUM LOT AREA
40.0 ha (99 ac)

5.3 MINIMUM LOT FRONTAGE
230.0 m (755 ft)
4.10 **ESTABLISHED BUILDING LINE ON STREETS OR ROADS**

Notwithstanding any other subsequent provisions of this By-law, where a single-detached dwelling or accessory use thereto is to be erected within a settlement area where there is an established building line, such dwelling or accessory use may be erected closer to the street line or to the centre line of the street or road, as the case may be, than required by this By-law provided such dwelling or accessory use is not erected closer to the street line or to the centre line of the street or road, as the case may be, than the established building line on the date of passing of this By-law.

4.11 **EXISTING LOTS**

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this By-law, existing lots with less than the required lot area or lot frontage may be developed for the use specified in the appropriate zone provided all other regulations of this By-law are satisfied and in the case of lots where buildings or structures requiring private sanitary sewage facilities are to be erected therein:

a) Such lots are serviced by approved sanitary sewage services;

b) Such lots have a minimum frontage of twenty (20.0) metres (66 feet) on a public street where a public water supply is not available;

c) Such lots have a minimum lot area of thirteen hundred (1,300) m (13,993 ft ) where a public water supply is not available.

4.12 **FARM RELATED OCCUPATIONS**

Where a farm related occupation is permitted in a particular zone, the following provisions shall apply:

a) Such use is conducted only by a farmer or their immediate family, who are permanent residents on, and one of which is the owner of the farm property, and may include up to two (2) employees who are not permanent residents of the property;

b) The farm where such use is secondary, clearly qualifies for the farm tax assessment rate;

c) All buildings, structures, storage, parking, and loading areas associated with such use shall not exceed 0.4 hectares (1 acre) in size;

d) All buildings associated with such use shall not exceed a total floor area of 557.4 m (6,000 ft );

e) All buildings associated with such use shall have a peaked roof with a minimum pitch (slope) of 4 in 12 (1 in 3), and shall not exceed a wall height of 7.3 metres (24 feet) measured to the top of the top plate of the wall;

f) All buildings associated with such use shall be constructed in a manner that facilitates its conversion back to agricultural uses should the use cease to exist;
g) All buildings associated with such use shall not be located any closer to the front lot line than any existing buildings on-site, and in no instances may be located closer than the required front yard setback for the zone in which it is located;

h) Any such use shall be restricted to dry manufacturing, repair of goods, and trades which have limited retail sales. Accessory sales of goods manufactured on the premises shall be restricted to not more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the floor area of the permitted building;

i) Permitted uses shall not include any activity that would constitute a Prohibited Use or Obnoxious Use as defined elsewhere in this By-law;

j) All buildings associated with such use that exceeds 331.6 m (4,000 ft.) in total floor area shall provide a subsurface fire reservoir in accordance with the Township Fire Department, and the owner/operator shall enter into an agreement with the Township pertaining to the specific use of the fire reservoir;

k) All buildings associated with such use shall have a minimum side yard of one-half (1/2) the building height, or 4.5 metres (15 feet), whichever is greater;

l) Any such use shall be accompanied by an agreement between the Township and the owner/operator prohibiting operation between 9:00pm and 6:00am, as well as the entirety of Sunday;

m) Any such use shall not be permitted, or allowed to change, until such time as a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued by the Township;

n) Only one Certificate of Occupancy for a farm-related occupation shall be issued per farm, and shall be required to be renewed every two (2) years.

### 4.13 FLOOR AREA

4.13.1 No person shall erect or use a dwelling unit that is not in compliance with the following minimum floor area requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Minimum Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor:</td>
<td>28 m² (301 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom:</td>
<td>37 m² (398 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms:</td>
<td>55 m² (592 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms:</td>
<td>70 m² (753 ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms:</td>
<td>83 m² (893 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwelling unit in a boarding house, rooming house or bed and breakfast establishment. 35 m² (377 ft)
Appendix P
Leacock Township “Farmette” Provision
(Hanover Engineering Associates Inc., 2003b)

2) the subdivision of not more than one (1) lot every three (3) years

c) For each parent tract of ten (10) acres or less, there shall be permitted:

1) the subdivision of one (1) lot for every two (2) acres contained in the parent tract, and

2) the subdivision of not more than one (1) lot every two (2) years.

d) Any farm encompassing fifty-five (55) acres or more may subdivide not more than one (1) farmette for the purpose of agriculture only. The subdivision of said farmette shall not reduce the size of the parent tract to less than forty (40) acres. No further subdivision of said farmette shall be permitted.

1) in lieu of subdivision, the farmette may be leased and a dwelling and farm buildings may be built on the leased tract without formal subdivision, subject to the following limitations:

i) the buildings must be located in a way that will allow formal subdivision in the future.

ii) the lease can have any term, but must be renewed annually, with a copy of the renewal being filed with the Township.

iii) if the lease of the tract is terminated, the formal subdivision of the buildings must be completed. The size of the formally subdivided parcel shall conform to the maximum parcel size allowed in Section 4.04.02.

iv) the remainder of the tract shall remain with the parent tract.

2) the use of the provisions of this subsection f shall count as one of the subdivisions allocated to the parent tract.

e) Exemptions from limitation on subdivision of land. The following types of subdivisions shall not be counted against the subdivision/land development limitations established by Sections a) through f) above:

1) A subdivision, the sole purpose of which is to transfer land being used for agricultural purposes from one farm to another farm. Allocated rights of subdivision may be transferred with the land; provided, however, that the combined number of available subdivisions from the two parent tracts shall not be exceeded.

2) A subdivision to create a lot which will be transferred to the Township or a municipality authority created by the Township.

3) The subdivision of an 80-acre or greater tract to create two (2) or more 40-acre or larger farms

(Adopted 8/05/03)
Appendix Q

Township of Woolwich Policy for Farm Parcel Creation
(Township of Woolwich, 2012)

6.1.1.5 Farm Parcel Creation/ Alteration

Where a new farm is proposed to be created, or where part of an adjoining farm is to be severed and merged in title with an existing farm, the development application will comply with the following:

a) each resultant farm that is created must have a minimum area of 40 hectares and result in a flexible farm unit; or

b) resultant farms having less than a minimum of 40 hectares will:
   i) be of a size appropriate for the type of agricultural use(s) proposed. Such development applications will be evaluated to determine if the proposed farm is of sufficient size and nature to be reasonably expected to sustain a commercially viable operation as an independent farm unit, and for flexible re-use for agricultural purposes in the event of business failure; and
   ii) be permitted by a site specific zoning by-law amendment for the purpose of determining whether a new lot is being created through a development proposal, regard will be had to Policy 6.1.2.1.2
Appendix R
Township of Woolwich Policy for Farm-Related Residential Development
(Township of Woolwich, 2012).

6.1.1.3 Farm-Related Residential Development

To accommodate full-time farm employees, including members of the farm household, or to aid retiring farmers, the construction of a second permanent or temporary farm-related residential unit, or the conversion of an existing farm-related residential unit, to create a second or third dwelling unit, may be permitted on a farm. Consents will not be granted for any farm-related residential units created in accordance with this policy. It is an objective of this plan that permitted farm related residential units will be clustered within the farmstead.

6.1.1.4 Farm-Related Non-Residential Uses

Development applications for Farm-Related Non-Residential Uses in the Rural Land Use designation will comply with the following:

a) will conform to the Zoning By-law and the policies of this Plan;

b) where feasible, not be located on Prime Agricultural Lands, as identified in the Regional Official Policies Plan;

c) be prohibited in a woodlot except where an exception from the Regional Tree Cutting By-law has been obtained;

d) minimize impacts on Environmental Areas in accordance with policies in Chapter 13 of this Plan; and


Lot creation for a Farm-Related Non-Residential Use will only be permitted in Prime Agricultural Areas, as identified in the Regional Official Policies Plan, where the use has been established.
Appendix S
Township of Woolwich Provisions for On Farm Businesses (Township of Woolwich, 2014)

6-14

Regulations for On-Farm Businesses By-law 93-97 passed November 11, 1997

6.22.1 On-Farm Businesses are limited to woodworking shops (any fabricating process which primarily involves wood, such as furniture-making, woodbending, pallet manufacturing) and farm-related, dry industrial or commercial activities providing a good or service primarily geared for farm operations, including blacksmithing.

6.22.2 On-Farm Businesses are limited to the following floor areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Size</th>
<th>Woodworking</th>
<th>Farm-Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-20 ha</td>
<td>100 square metres</td>
<td>150 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1-35 ha</td>
<td>200 square metres</td>
<td>250 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1+ ha</td>
<td>300 square metres</td>
<td>350 square metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.22.3 On-Farm Businesses must be operated by the resident farmer, a resident member of the farm family or non-resident owner of the farm who farms the property.

6.22.4 On-Farm Businesses are not permitted until a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued by the Township. No change in use can be made without the issuance of a new Certificate of Occupancy.

6.22.5 All buildings/structures and storage, display, parking and loading areas used in connection with an On-Farm Business must be separated by at least 150 metres from buildings used for residential, recreational or institutional purposes located on an adjacent lot. New residences on an adjacent property must be a minimum of 180 metres from buildings housing an On-Farm Business for which a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued.

6.22.6 Accessory retailing areas are permitted for woodworking shops for goods produced on-site.

6.22.7 Outdoor storage for all On-Farm Businesses is limited to 25% of the operation’s floor area and must be located to the rear of the On-Farm Business building(s). Notwithstanding this, the outdoor display of farm equipment/machinery for sale is permitted in front of the buildings but behind the Building Line Setback and is not subject to the 25% of floor area restriction.

6.22.8 The recycling of animal products, a rendering plant, the recycling or refining of petroleum products, a junk, scrap, salvage or wrecking yard or a use which is or may become offensive or dangerous by reasons of the presence, emission or production in any manner of odour, dust, smoke, noise, fumes, vibration, refuse matter, water carried wastes or traffic is specifically prohibited.

6.22.9 Notwithstanding 6.22.5, any building or structure erected or used in connection with an On-Farm Business must be located behind the building line(s) and in close proximity to the cluster of existing farm buildings.
Appendix T
Township of Howick Provisions for Accessory Uses (Township of Howick, 2013)

Section 4.

General Agriculture (AG1)

4.1. Permitted Uses:

4.1.1. Agricultural use;
4.1.2. Conservation;
4.1.3. Exploration, drilling for and production of oil and natural gas;
4.1.4. Forestry use;
4.1.5. A farm produce sales outlet;
4.1.6. A wayside pit or quarry;
4.1.7. Uses accessory to the permitted uses.

4.2. Accessory Uses:

4.2.1. Home industry (amended by By-law 7-1997);
4.2.2. Home occupation (amended by By-law 7-1997);
4.2.3. One mobile home accessory to an agricultural use (A mobile home may be used as a primary or supplementary residential unit provided that a supplementary mobile home shall be removed when it is no longer required in the farm operation); (By-law 30-1991);
4.2.4. A single detached dwelling accessory to an agricultural use;
4.2.5. Converted dwelling unit;
4.2.6. Dwelling, enlarged to contain not more than 2 dwelling units, accessory to an agricultural use.

4.3. Permitted Structures:

4.3.1. Single detached dwelling, converted dwelling units and/or a mobile home accessory to an agricultural use;
4.3.2. More than one main building per lot is allowed;
4.3.3. Buildings and structures for the permitted uses;
4.3.4. Other buildings and structures, not including residences, accessory to the permitted uses;

4.4. Zone Regulations:

4.4.1. Lot Area (minimum) - 30 hectares. Areas of the lot zoned "Natural Environment" may be included in the calculation of the lot area.
4.4.2. Lot Frontage (minimum) - 150 m.
4.4.3. Yard Requirements (minimum):

4.4.3.1. For buildings and structures used for livestock, poultry and fur bearing animal housing and waste storage:
   4.4.3.1.1. Front yard depth - 30 metres;
   4.4.3.1.2. Rear yard depth - 30 metres;
   4.4.3.1.3. Side yard depth - 30 metres;
   4.4.3.1.4. Exterior side yard depth - 30 m.
   4.4.3.2. Other permitted buildings and structures, and accessory structures:
   4.4.3.2.1. Front yard depth - 17 metres;
   4.4.3.2.2. Rear yard depth - 7.5 metres;
   4.4.3.2.3. Side yard depth - 7.5 metres;
   4.4.3.2.4. Exterior side yard depth - 17 m.

4.5. Separation Distance (Agricultural)

Notwithstanding any yard setback requirement of this By-law to the contrary, no livestock housing facility shall be established or enlarged unless it complies with the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) Formulae.

For Closed or Inactive Cemeteries

Notwithstanding any other provision of this By-law to the contrary, for the purposes of calculating MDS II for a first expanding livestock facility, cemeteries located within an I1 Zone shall be treated as a Type A land use. (Amended by By-law 20-2007)

4.6. Separation Distance (Residential)

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this By-law to the contrary, no residential, institutional, commercial, industrial or recreational building or structure, located on a separate lot shall be established unless it complies with the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) Formulae. (Amended by By-law 20-2007)

4.7. Existing Agricultural Uses

Notwithstanding the provisions for Section 4.4., where an existing lot is developed for an agricultural use, and contains existing farm buildings and accessory structures, additional farm buildings and structures may be erected, or existing farm structures may be altered in accordance with the following minimum requirements, and all other provisions of this By-law.

4.7.1. Minimum lot area - 4 hectares;
   (Areas of the lot zoned "Natural Environment" may be included in the calculation of lot area.)
4.7.2. Minimum frontage - 100 metres.

4.8. Existing Farm Holdings

Where an existing lot developed for agricultural uses, exists on the date of passage of this By-law, but does not meet the zone provisions with respect to minimum lot area and minimum lot frontage, the farm holding will be deemed to conform with the By-law with respect to the minimum lot area and minimum lot frontage provisions.

4.9. Status Zoning

(Amended by By-law 21-1983)

4.9.1. AG1-1

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.1. to the contrary, the area zoned AG1-1 may be used for an existing restaurant and accessory

Consolidated: June 19, 2013
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Appendix U
Township of Howick Provisions for a Home Industry (Township of Howick, 2013)

Township of Howick Zoning By-law 23-1984, Consolidated

2.97.1. in the case of a flat roof, the highest point of the roof surface or the parapet, whichever is the greater;
2.97.2. in the case of a pitched roof, the point midway between the eaves and the ridge.

2.98. HISTORIC SITE
Shall mean an area containing buildings or places in which historic events occurred, or having special public value because of notable architecture or features relating to the cultural or artistic heritage of the community.

HOME FOR THE AGED
See ‘Dwelling, Nursing Home’

2.99. HOME INDUSTRY
Shall mean a gainful occupation including an animal kennel, carpentry, electrical, woodworking, window framing, welding, plumbing, machine or auto repair shop, or blacksmith, conducted in whole or in part in an accessory building to a single detached dwelling by the residents, provided that:
2.99.1. there is no external advertising other than a sign erected in accordance with any By-laws of the Corporation regulating signs;
2.99.2. there is no outside storage of goods, materials or equipment unless fully enclosed by a fence or other enclosure, which provides visual screening;
2.99.3. such home industry is not an obnoxious trade, business or manufacture;
2.99.4. such home industry is clearly secondary to the main residential use and does not change the residential character of the dwelling;
2.99.5. not more than 2 persons, other than the owner, are employed therein on a full-time basis; and
2.99.6. the lot shall be an existing lot with not less than 24 metres of frontage and 60 metres of depth and a total area of not less than 1,850 square metres.

2.100. HOME OCCUPATION
Shall mean any occupation which is carried on as an accessory use and only by members of that one family residing in a dwelling or dwelling unit provided that:
2.100.1. no person, other than a member of the family is engaged in canvassing, delivering or as a go-between in distributing merchandise to customers;
2.100.2. there is no display, other than a legal sign, to indicate to persons outside that any part of the dwelling, dwelling unit or lot is being used for a purpose other than residential;
2.100.3. such home occupation is clearly secondary to the main residential use and does not change the residential character of the dwelling or dwelling unit nor create or become a public nuisance, particularly in regard to noise, noxious odours or emission of smoke, traffic or parking;
2.100.4. such home occupation does not interfere with television or radio reception;
2.100.5. not more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the gross floor area of the dwelling unit is used for the purposes of home occupation uses; or, in the case of a Bed and Breakfast establishment, shall meet definition 2.21.a.; and
2.100.6. such home occupation uses may include a service or repair shop, a personal service shop, a bed and breakfast establishment, the office of a doctor, dentist, lawyer, or a real estate agent, insurance agent, planner, architect, or engineer, but not including a clinic, a hospital, a nursing home, and a tea room. An animal kennel shall not be deemed to be a home occupation.

2.101. HOSPITAL
Shall mean a hospital as defined under the Public Hospitals Act, or under the Private Hospitals Act, as amended from time to time.

2.102. HOTEL
Shall mean:
2.102.1. a building or part thereof used to accommodate the traveling public for gain or profit, by supplying them with sleeping accommodation (with or without meals) but without private cooking facilities provided that each guest room may only be entered from the interior of the building; does not include boarding houses or guest cabins.

2.103. HOUSEKEEPING COTTAGE
Means one of a group of buildings in a tourist resort designed for human habitation and equipped with a kitchen, which has a common piped water supply with other such buildings in the group and is inhabited only on a seasonal basis.

2.104. INDUSTRIAL USE
Shall mean the use of land, structure or building for each or any of the following operations:
2.104.1. the carrying on of any process or manufacture whether or not a finished article

Consolidated: June 19, 2013
## Appendix V

**EPAC Grower Volume Based on Dollars 2009 – 2014 (EPAC, 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1000's</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>GROWERS</th>
<th>$ AVERAGE</th>
<th>$ TOTAL</th>
<th>$ PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 TO 1</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>36,575.00</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>339.00</td>
<td>44,748.00</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>303.00</td>
<td>42,127.00</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>301.14</td>
<td>30,415.00</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>293.13</td>
<td>37,520.00</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>285.58</td>
<td>32,670.00</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 TO 5</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2,790.00</td>
<td>121,270.00</td>
<td>8.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,520.00</td>
<td>151,200.00</td>
<td>9.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2,392.00</td>
<td>105,248.00</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2,415.27</td>
<td>118,348.00</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2,220.96</td>
<td>119,932.00</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2,492.13</td>
<td>132,083.00</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TO 10</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,397.00</td>
<td>66,573.00</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7,124.00</td>
<td>156,744.00</td>
<td>9.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,828.00</td>
<td>102,420.00</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,981.00</td>
<td>97,734.00</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,512.73</td>
<td>71,640.00</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>6,794.33</td>
<td>61,149.00</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 TO 20</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12,975.00</td>
<td>168,675.00</td>
<td>12.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16,168.00</td>
<td>161,680.00</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14,248.00</td>
<td>142,480.00</td>
<td>8.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15,632.67</td>
<td>149,874.00</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14,394.67</td>
<td>215,520.00</td>
<td>11.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13,274.00</td>
<td>132,740.00</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 TO 30</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26,850.00</td>
<td>80,550.00</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24,333.00</td>
<td>241,871.00</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24,854.00</td>
<td>248,832.00</td>
<td>12.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25,818.71</td>
<td>180,731.00</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25,470.67</td>
<td>229,236.00</td>
<td>12.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24,275.80</td>
<td>121,379.00</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 TO 40</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34,720.00</td>
<td>312,480.00</td>
<td>23.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35,280.00</td>
<td>246,960.00</td>
<td>13.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33,961.00</td>
<td>169,805.00</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32,886.00</td>
<td>197,316.00</td>
<td>11.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33,873.25</td>
<td>271,002.00</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34,095.40</td>
<td>340,954.00</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 40</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51,342.00</td>
<td>564,762.00</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61,508.00</td>
<td>676,588.00</td>
<td>42.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70,984.00</td>
<td>851,808.00</td>
<td>52.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70,696.38</td>
<td>999,769.00</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73,591.23</td>
<td>936,686.00</td>
<td>50.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67,604.44</td>
<td>1,217,960.00</td>
<td>39.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>231</th>
<th>5,848.00</th>
<th>1,350,985.00</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>6,465.00</td>
<td>1,609,791.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>6,921.00</td>
<td>1,612,710.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8,620.84</td>
<td>1,764,167.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7,957.89</td>
<td>1,901,936.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>9,310.21</td>
<td>2,038,935.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix W
Informant Perspectives on Existing Policy for Farm Parcel Creation,
Townships of Wellesley, Woolwich and Howick, Ontario

Strengths
- Suitable for livestock (i.e. crop production and manure management).

Weaknesses
- Lack of farmland availability.
- Few choices available.
- Farms are too large for actual needs.
- Farms are too expensive ($1.6 M for 100 acres).
- Can’t compete with large-scale farmers for land.

Opportunities
- Natural severances.
- Smaller parcels on "hilly" or low capability land.
- Tenants-in-common (two homes) on larger farms paired with an on-farm business.
- Relax lot size standards for "farm splits" - pair with produce growing and on-farm business.
- Relax land use restrictions on existing "farm retirement lots"; combine produce with a shop.

Threats
- Families are leaving.
Appendix X
Informant Perspectives on Relaxed Minimum Lot Size Standards, Townships of Wellesley, Woolwich and Howick, Ontario.

- More families would stay because farms would be available.
- More sideline businesses = more rural commerce = more tax revenue.
- Gross income with produce ranges from $4,000 - $30,000 an acre.
- More "local food".
- More opportunities for young people in the community.
- Cheaper to "start in".

- Not suitable for livestock production.
- 25 acres would be better than 50 acres

- Produce growing paired with secondary on-farm businesses.

- Complications with nutrient management.
- Complications with MDS.
- Possibility of non-farm use.
- Could possibly drive-up the price of farmland.
- A temporary solution.
### Table 1, Appendix Y: Farm Operation Data, Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total Tillable Acreage&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dairy (Cows)</th>
<th>Dairy (Goats)</th>
<th>Beef</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Hogs</th>
<th>Poultry</th>
<th>Field Crops</th>
<th>Fruit and Vegetable Crops</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+/- 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000 Turkeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterfowl Hatchlings</td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterfowl Hatchlings</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+/- 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Mixed-Grain</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Mixed-Grain</td>
<td>Spelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>Mixed-Grain</td>
<td>Hay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> From the home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

<sup>2</sup> Tillable acres from home-farm acreage and additional acreage owned and/or rented and farmed. Excludes tillable acres rented out.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total Tillable Acreage&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dairy (Cows)</th>
<th>Dairy (Goats)</th>
<th>Beef</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Hogs</th>
<th>Poultry</th>
<th>Field Crops</th>
<th>Fruit and Vegetable Crops</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td>Oats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>10 Acres of Produce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Maple Syrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Annuals for ‘Greenfeed’</td>
<td>4 Acres of Produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5 Acres of Produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> From the home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

<sup>2</sup> Tillable acres from home-farm acreage and additional acreage owned and/or rented and farmed. Excludes tillable acres rented out.

- Missing data.
Table 3, Appendix Y: Farm Operation Data, Township of Howick, County of Huron

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total Tillable Acreage&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dairy (Cows)</th>
<th>Dairy (Goats)</th>
<th>Beef</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Hogs</th>
<th>Poultry</th>
<th>Field Crops</th>
<th>Fruit and Vegetable Crops</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Apple Orchard and 5 acres of Produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td>Tree Nursery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed-Grain</td>
<td>3 Acres of Produce</td>
<td>Maple Syrup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> From the home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.

<sup>2</sup> Tillable acres from home-farm acreage and additional acreage owned and/or rented and farmed. Excludes tillable acres rented out.

- Missing data.
Table 4, Appendix Y: Home-Farm and Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage</th>
<th>Tillable Acres</th>
<th>Length of Ownership (Years)</th>
<th>Type of Ownership</th>
<th>Home-Farm Supports Itself Financially Without Additional Acreage Farmed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sole</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+/- 45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Howick, County of Huron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 From the home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.
Table 5, Appendix Y: Additional Acreage Owned and Farmed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Township of Howick, County of Huron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Home-Farm Acreage&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Additional Acreage Owned and Farmed?</td>
<td>Additional Acreage Owned and Farmed (Total Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> From the home parcel excluding other acreage owned and/or rented.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes acreage rented out.
Table 6, Appendix Y: Additional Acreage Rented and Farmed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage</th>
<th>Additional Acreage Rented and Farmed?</th>
<th>Additional Acreage Rented and Farmed (Total Acres)</th>
<th>Additional Acreage Rented and Farmed (Tillable Acres)</th>
<th>Number of Years Rented</th>
<th>Additional Acreage Rented and Farmed out of Necessity to Sustain the Home-Farm and Household?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A Discretionary Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A Discretionary Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A Discretionary Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Howick, County of Huron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.
### Table 7, Appendix Y: Land Rented Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Township of Howick, County of Huron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Home-Farm Acreage</td>
<td>Total Tillable Acreage</td>
<td>Land Rented Out?</td>
<td>Home-Farm Acreage Rented Out (Total Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+/- 45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.  
2. From home-farm acreage and additional acreage owned and/or rented and farmed.
Table 8, Appendix Y: Changes to Scale of Farming Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total Tillable Acreage&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Expand Acres Farmed</th>
<th>Stay the Same</th>
<th>Decrease Acres Farmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+/- 45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Howick, County of Huron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.
<sup>2</sup> From home-farm acreage and additional acreage owned and/or rented and farmed.
Table 9, Appendix Y: Secondary On-Farm Activities and Businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage</th>
<th>Total Tillable Acreage</th>
<th>Involved in Secondary Activities or Businesses on the Farm?</th>
<th>Secondary Activities or Businesses</th>
<th>Are these Secondary Activities or Businesses a Necessary Source of Income to Sustain the Home-Farm and Household?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodshop</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Buggy Shop</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodshop</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+/- 45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Machine Shop</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Machine Shop</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Metal Fabrication</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodshop</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Blacksmith Shop</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Repair Shop</td>
<td>A Discretionary Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maple Syrup</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bookkeeping</td>
<td>A Discretionary Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Howick, County of Huron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cider Mill</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Harness Repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Shoe Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woodshop</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Garlic</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.
2 From home-farm acreage and additional acreage owned and/or rented and farmed.
- Missing data.
Table 10, Appendix Y: Off Farm Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Total Home-Farm Acreage</th>
<th>Total Tillable Acreage</th>
<th>Do you Hold a Job Off the Home-Farm?</th>
<th>Does your Spouse Hold a Job Off the Home-Farm?</th>
<th>Is this Off-Farm Employment a Necessary Source of Income to Sustain the Home-Farm and Household?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wellesley, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes, part-time</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+/- 45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich, Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 13</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Howick, County of Huron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The home parcel excluding other acreage owned and rented.
2 From home-farm acreage and additional acreage owned and/or rented and farmed.