



Provincial Agricultural Land Commission - Staff Report

Application: 52035

Applicant: Synergy West Coast Investments
Agent: Platinum Projects Ltd
Local Government: Township of Langley

Proposal: SUBDIVISION - to subdivide the existing 21.5 ha parcel of land into 2 approx equal parcels of 10.75 ha each

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A second dwelling was allowed by the Commission in 1986. A subdivision application to create two lots of 8.0 ha and a remainder lot was refused in 2000 on the grounds that it had no agricultural merit.

PROPERTY INFORMATION

PID: 002-180-898
Legal Description: Lot 1 of Lots 18 & 19 District Lot 21 & 22 Group 2 New Westminster District Plan 3547
Property Area: 21.5 ha
Purchase Date: August 31, 2009
Location: Glover Road, just west of Highway 10, south of Fort Langley
Owner: Synergy West Coast Investments

LAND USE

Current Land Use:

Property is cleared and was used for horse breeding in the past. There are 2 residences - an old riding ring with a viewing berm exists on the north east 1/3 of the site. There are several paddocks, small out-buildings, partial foundation for a stable/shed which burnt down last year

Surrounding Land Uses:

North: Rural residential property being used as a hayfield
 East: Railway line and Glover Road, 2 greenhouses, and a cleared parcel
 South: 216 Street and 2 parcels which are used as a nursery operation
 West: Two parcels which are both used as a hayfield operation

PROPOSAL DETAILS

Subdivision - ALR Area: 21.5 ha

Number of Lots	ALR Area of Lot (ha)
2	10.7

Agricultural Capability:

The majority of the area under application is rated as: Prime

Source: BCLI

Mapsheet: 92G/2h

PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

Application ID: 15720

Legacy #: 20653

Applicant: Arthur & Marlene Small

Proposal: Proposed to locate a new second dwelling and retain the existing dwelling for farm help.

Decision:

Resolution #	Decision Date	Decision Description
1303/1986	December 5, 1986	Allowed.

Application ID: 15466

Legacy #: 33163

Applicant: Assemi Holdings Ltd

Proposal: Propose to subdivide the 21.5 ha property into 2 lots of 8 ha and a remainder. both properties would have an existing home located on them.

Decision:

Resolution #	Decision Date	Decision Description
252/2000	May 25, 2000	Refuse based on no agricultural benefit to be derived from subdivision of house permitted for farm help.

RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

Application ID: 20013

Legacy #: 34489

Applicant: Peter Wall

Proposal: To locate an equestrian community to be associated with an ongoing farm business on the 63.13 ha (156 acre) property. To include approximately 12 ha of conservation area adjacent to the Salmon River for improved fish habitat, 12 ha to be developed for residential purposes (approximately 30 lots) and 40 ha of farm land to be improved to Class 2 or better.

Decision:

Resolution #	Decision Date	Decision Description
590/2002	October 7, 2002	Refused on the grounds that the development would: 1) have a direct, negative impact the agricultural use of the property's high capability agricultural lands, 2) raise expectations for similar developments on other properties which have areas of limited capability, and 3) provide no benefit to the agricultural community.

Note: To northwest of the subject property.

Application ID: 15718

Legacy #: 24780

Applicant: Brian Franklin

Proposal: Proposed to develop 87 ha into a 18 hole golf course, driving range, training centre and clubhouse.

Decision:

Resolution #	Decision Date	Decision Description
954/1990	October 16, 1990	Conditions set in accordance with Section 2(1)(m) of B.C. Reg. 7/81 amended by B.C. Reg. 238/88. The properties became subject to the G/C Development Moratorium and the G/C had to be complete within 24 months and the properties not transferred. Following the two year period the property had its right to construct a G/C on it extinguished.

Note: to west of the subject property.

RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

Application ID: 15717

Legacy #: 26315

Applicant: Russell Bruce

Proposal: Proposed to sell items associated with the nursery on site, including fertilizer, potting soil, garden tools, and other items associated with a garden centre.

Decision:

Resolution #	Decision Date	Decision Description
233/1992	March 26, 1992	Refused on the grounds that the Commission did not want to heighten expectations of surrounding property owners for further commercial development of highly productive agricultural lands in this area.

Note: To northeast of the subject property.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Official Community Plan:

Bylaw Name: Rural Plan

Designation: Agriculture-Countryside

OCP Compliance: No

Zoning:

Zoning Bylaw Name: Bylaw 2500

Zoning Designation: RU-3

Minimum Lot Size: 8.0 ha

Zoning Compliance: Yes

Comments and Recommendations:

Board/Council

Complies with minimum lot size and local zoning bylaw.

ALC STAFF COMMENTS

It is recommended that the Commission consider the following:

- The owners purchased the property in 1995. They submitted a previous subdivision application in 2000 (Assemi Holdings), which was refused.
- The agricultural capability of the area under application is identified as improvable to Class 2DW, based on the BCLI ratings. The application states that there are many shallow cross swales on the property and a low spot that does not drain. However, given the property' s prime capability, these limitations could likely be improved with proper management.
- The property is in a productive agricultural area. The Commission has refused a variety of applications (see Relevant Applications section) in this area on the grounds of negative impact to agriculture.
- It is the Commission' s experience that smaller parcels are correlated with less (not more) agricultural activity. Subdivision into smaller lots would reduce the agricultural options for the property.
- Subdivision may heighten landowner expectations in the surrounding area that similar requests would be routinely permitted. The effects of heightened expectations are speculation, increased farmland prices, and reduced agricultural investment and activity.
- Through discussion with the agent, it is staff' s understanding that the intent of the subdivision is to raise capital from the sale of one of the lots to improve agricultural production on the other. While sympathetic to the financial needs of the owners, this is not a legitimate reason to subdivide farmland.
- Based on the above comments, staff recommend that the subdivision be refused.

ATTACHMENTS

52035proposal.pdf
52035_ContextMap20k.pdf
52035_AgCapabilityMap.pdf
52035_AirphotoMap20k.pdf

END OF REPORT

Prepared by: Terra Kaethler