



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

April 16, 2010

Reply to the attention of Ron Wallace
ALC File: 51348

Coastland Engineering & Surveying Ltd.
101-19212 - 60 Avenue
Surrey, BC V3S 3M2

Attention: Mike Helle

Re: Application to Subdivide in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # **2406/2010** 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:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Erik Karlsen', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Erik Karlsen, Chair

Enclosure: Minutes

cc: Zora \$ Harminder Grewal, 1698 Greer Street, Abbotsford, BC V2S 8P6
Township of Langley, 20338 - 65 Avenue, Langley, BC V2Y 3J1

RW/
51348d1



MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on March 25, 2010 in Langley, B.C.

PRESENT:	Sylvia Pranger	Chair, South Coast Panel
	Michael Bose	Commissioner
	John Tomlinson	Commissioner
	Tony Pellett	Staff

For Consideration

Application: 51348
 Applicant: Zora & Marminder Grewal
 Agent: Coastland Engineering & Surveying Ltd.
 Proposal: To subdivide a 24.6 ha parcel into 3 parcels of 8.0 ha, 8.3 ha and 8.3 ha within the ALR.
 Legal: Lot "I" Section 22 Township 11 New Westminster District Plan 59155
 Location: 7260 – 240 Street, Langley

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on March 24, 2010. Those in attendance were:

- Sylvia Pranger Chair, South Coast Panel
- Michael Bose Commissioner
- John Tomlinson Commissioner
- Tony Pellett Staff
- Harminder Grewal Applicant
- Zora Grewal Applicant

Harminder Grewal explained that it is difficult for the family to accommodate different ideas of how the farm should be worked, thus they wish to subdivide equally. The Commissioners explained that the land had been consolidated under the Commission's former property management function, thus it is difficult to contemplate its subdivision, especially considering the message that would send to the owners of other consolidated parcels in the surrounding area.

The Commissioners noted that the public road across the farm does not appear to create a problem for farm operations. The applicants agreed with that statement, explaining that was why they did not proposed the road as one of the new property boundaries

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 agricultural capability of the soil of the subject property is

- Class 1 – Land in this class either has no or only very slight limitations that restrict its use for the production of common agricultural crops.
- 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.

Subclasses

- A soil moisture deficiency
P stoniness
T topography

Assessment of Agricultural Suitability

The Commission assessed whether 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 Commission believes the property currently forms a suitable farm parcel and that subdivision would be detrimental to agriculture and would raise expectations regarding potential subdivision of other large farm parcels in the area.

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 negatively 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 Bose
SECONDED BY: Commissioner Pranger

THAT the application be refused.

AND THAT the applicant be advised of the provisions of Section 33 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* which provides an applicant with the opportunity to submit a request for reconsideration.

- S.33 (1) *On the written request of a person affected or on the commission's own initiative, the commission may reconsider a decision of the commission under this Act and may confirm, reverse or vary it if the commission determines that*
- (a) evidence not available at the time of the original decision has become available,*
 - (b) all or part of the original decision was based on evidence that was in error or was false.*
- (2) *The commission must give notice of its intention to reconsider a decision under subsection (1) to any person that the commission considers is affected by the reconsideration.*

AND THAT the applicant be advised that a revised proposal does not constitute new information and will not be considered as a basis for reconsideration and the time limit for submitting a request for reconsideration is one (1) year from the date of the decision letter.

CARRIED

Resolution # 2406/2010