

## **Comments on Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in the Greater Golden Horseshoe and Agricultural System Portal**

### Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in the Greater Golden Horseshoe

#### *Section 3.1.1: municipal refinement of the Agricultural Land Base*

- *Consistency across municipal boundaries* – does not recognize that different regions use different policy approaches to planning (natural heritage system as an overlay vs a designation);
- Municipal refinements for land areas < 250 ha will be done during municipal conformity exercises... Based on the province’s approach to refinement in other scenarios is 250 ha is very large and a new threshold of 50 has or less should be used and all other lands corrected before the 2nd LEAR mapping is released;
- The onus is on the municipalities to prove why certain lands are not prime in their OP’s. The onus should be on the province to prove why they are changing it.

#### *Section 3.1.1.1 – Prime Agricultural Areas*

- Concern with paragraph 2 that says refinement won’t be considered if:
  - bullet 1 - they do not align with the provincial identification of the g land base Notwithstanding all the local work that has been done.
  - bullet 2 - “significant discrepancies with provincial mapping”.

Hamilton has significant discrepancies with the provincial mapping and on the basis of the 2 statements above no changes will be made to the provincial mapping and therefore ultimately, the City’s OP.

#### *Section 3.1.1.2 – Rural Lands*

- *rural lands* – rural lands *within the agricultural land base* can only be used if there is agricultural production. For any other land use that is designated as rural or other non-ag use would be excluded from the ag land base. Creating another layer of “rural land use” to allow for non-ag is confusing and unnecessary. Firstly, when lands are zoned they provide for a variety of rural type land uses and at any point in time one of these land uses may develop. This type of land use segregation would create a patchy land use plan. Furthermore the provincial policy recognizes that rural land use are part of the agricultural system.

### *Section 3.1.3 Official Plan policies*

- should not include an appendix in the OP identifying assets from the portal. This information has nothing to do with land use planning. It will be outdated the minute it is published. It is a waste of a map.
- Text box – how do we determine ‘lower priority agricultural lands within prime ag areas’?

### *Agricultural System Portal Comments*

The following comments are suggestions to make the portal easier to use:

- The user should be able to double-click to zoom in on the map instead of relying on the + and – buttons;
- The Layers list – accumulation of datasets is weak and not truly reflective of the entire supply-chain/Agriculture system – The agri-food network component of the mapping is lacking;
- There are no dates on the Basemap Gallery options list;
- The portal is slow to react to commands;
- The Spatial Density Maps are good but should be expanded to include other assets (i.e. manufacturing and warehousing/cold storage);
- There is no explanation of density colours/categories directly on the map or in a legend;
- Layers list should be further broken down into categories (i.e. Spatial Mapping, Livestock, Crop etc.) with + arrows to expand layers;
- Compared to the GHFFA Asset Mapping tool, staff are unlikely to use this portal too much with the exception of the spatial mapping for crops, and agri-food assets.