



Agricultural Land Commission
133-4940 Canada Way
Burnaby, British Columbia V5G 4K6
Tel: 604-660-7000
Fax: 604-660-7033
www.alc.gov.bc.ca

October 29, 2007

Reply to the attention of Jennifer Carson
ALC File: O-37513

Greenline Management Ltd
11579 - 196B Street
Pitt Meadows, BC V3Y1P2

Dear Mr. Mackenzie:

Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 504/2007 outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application. As agent, it is your responsibility to notify your client(s) accordingly.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:


Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: The Corporation of the Township of Langley (AL100144)

Enclosure: Minutes

JC/37513d1



MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on September 25, 2007 in Langley, B.C.

PRESENT:	Sylvia Pranger	Chair, South Coast Panel
	Michael Bose	Commissioner
	John Tomlinson	Commissioner
	Tony Pellett	Staff
	Gordon Bednard	Staff
	Thomas Loo	Staff
	Ron McLeod	Staff
	Jennifer Carson	Staff

For Consideration

Application: # O- 37513
Applicant: Do Holdings Ltd
Agent: Greenline Management Ltd
Proposal: To subdivide the 24.33 ha subject property into two (2) parcels, one (1) at 8.09 ha and one (1) at 16.24 ha in size.
Legal: PID: 013-264-699
South 15 Chains, North East 1/4, Section 29, Township 10, New Westminster District
Location: Located at 3675 - 232nd Street, Langley

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on September 25, 2007. Those in attendance were:

- Sylvia Pranger Chair, South Coast Panel
- Michael Bose Commissioner
- John Tomlinson Commissioner
- Tony Pellett Staff
- Gordon Bednard Staff
- Thomas Loo Staff
- Ron McLeod Staff
- Jennifer Carson Staff
- Martin Chia Applicant
- Lee Mackenzie Agent

The Commission met with the applicant and agent on the subject property to discuss the application and view the property. Mr. Chia explained that in 2005 the mushroom barn burnt down and has since had difficulties receiving money back from the insurance company for the reconstruction of the buildings. Mr. Chia is proposing to rebuild the mushroom facility for specialty mushrooms. Mr. Chia also explained what he described as the road blocks he had been experiencing when dealing with local government in terms of the permitting for building the new structures. The subdivision is being proposed in order to allow for the financing of planting of a blueberry crop on what is proposed to become the second property. It was the Commission's understanding that the planting of blueberries cannot be accomplished in the present situation due to the financial uncertainty of the mushroom barn and the insurance claims not being resolved.

Context

The proposal was weighed against the purposes of the Commission as stipulated in section 6 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* (the "Act"). They are:

1. to preserve agricultural land
2. to encourage farming on agricultural land in collaboration with other communities of interest, and
3. to encourage local governments, first nations, the government and its agents to enable and accommodate farm use of agricultural land and uses compatible with agriculture in their plans, bylaws and policies.

Discussion

Assessment of Agricultural Capability

In assessing agricultural capability, the Commission refers in part to agricultural capability mapping and ratings. The ratings are interpreted using the Canada Land Inventory (CLI), 'Soil Capability Classification for Agriculture' system, or the BC Land Inventory (BCLI), 'Land Capability Classification for Agriculture in B.C.' system.

The improved ratings for the agricultural capability of the soil of the subject property are

- Class 2 – Land in this class has minor limitations that require good ongoing management practices or slightly restrict the range of crops, or both.
- Class 3 – Land in this class has limitations that require moderately intensive management practices or moderately restrict the range of crops, or both.
- Class 4 – Land in this class has limitations that require special management practices or severely restrict the range of crops, or both.
- Class 5 – Land in this class has limitations that restrict its capability to producing perennial forage crops or other specially adapted crops.
- Class 7 – Land in this class has no capability for arable or sustained natural grazing

Subclasses

- A soil moisture deficiency
- D undesirable soil structure
- T topography
- W excess water

Assessment of Agricultural Suitability

The Commission assessed whether the external factors such as encroaching non-farm development have caused or will cause the land to become unsuitable for agriculture. The Commission does not believe there are external factors that render the land unsuitable for agricultural use.

Assessment of Impact on Agriculture

The Commission also assessed the impact of the proposal against the long term goal of preserving agricultural land. The Commissioners were concerned that the proposed

subdivision would limit the range of farming activities that could be practiced on the property in the future. Another concern was that if this subdivision were permitted it would heighten the expectations of other property owners in the area to be able to do the same. The Commission believes the proposal would impact existing or potential agricultural use of the subject property and the surrounding lands.

Assessment of Other Factors

The Commission feels compassion for Mr. Chia and his family with regards to the difficult circumstances they have had to endure with the burning down of their operation, difficulties with insurance companies and subsequent financial problems. It is important to note that the Commission does not base its decisions on the personal circumstances and financial situations of the applicant.

Conclusions

1. That the land under application has agricultural capability and is appropriately designated as ALR.
2. That the land under application is suitable for agricultural use.
3. That the proposal will impact agriculture.
4. That the proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* to preserve agricultural land.

IT WAS

MOVED BY: Commissioner Tomlinson

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Bose

THAT the application be refused.

CARRIED

Resolution # 504/2007