



**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

12<sup>th</sup> April 2012

Reply to the attention of Roger Cheetham  
ALC File: #52495

Greenline Management Ltd.  
11579 – 196 B St.  
Pitt Meadows, BC  
V3Y 1P2

Dear Sirs.:

**Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve**

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # **152/2012** 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 'Brian Underhill', is written over the printed name.

Brian Underhill, Executive Director

Enclosure: Minutes

cc: Township of Langley (Folder: AL100219)

rc/  
/52495d1



A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on March 20, 2012 at the offices of the Commission located at #133 – 4940 Canada Way, Burnaby, B.C.

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Richard Bullock	Chair
Jennifer Dyson	Vice-Chair
Sylvia Pranger	Vice-Chair
Jim Johnson	Commissioner
Jim Collins	Commissioner

**COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:**

Roger Cheetham      Land Use Planner

---

**APPLICATION ID: #52495**

**PROPOSAL:** The subdivision of a 30,4 ha parcel to create two parcels 14.35 and 16.17 ha in extent

(Submitted pursuant to section 21(2) of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*)

**PROPERTY INFORMATION:**

**Parcel ID:** 013-279-319;

**Legal Description:** East Half of the North East Quarter Section 8 Township 11 Except:  
Firstly: Parcel A (Reference Plan 5587), Secondly: Part Shown Road  
on Plan 29683, New Westminster District

**Civic Address:** 23072 – 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Langley

**Size:** 30.4 ha

**Area in ALR:** 30.4 ha

**Current Land Use:** Blueberries. There are several farm buildings and two houses

**Farm Classification:** Yes

(BC Assessment)

**Property Owner(s):** M&G Bros. Farms

**Agent:** Greenline Management Ltd.

**Purchase Date:** 10<sup>th</sup> November 1978

---

**COMMISSION CONSIDERATION:**

Section 6 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* identifies the purposes of the Commission 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.

### **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 bulk of the property is assessed as having unimproved ratings of 60% Class 2 with soil moisture, excess water and undesirable soil structure limitations and 40% Class 4 with excess water and undesirable soil structure limitations. The ratings are improvable to 60% Class 2 with undesirable soil structure limitations and 40% Class 3 with undesirable soil structure and excess water limitations. The ratings of the remaining areas of the property range from Class 2 to Class 4, improvable to Classes 2 and 3 with undesirable soil structure and excess water limitations.

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.

### **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 noted that the adjacent properties are farmed and that the property is within a large block of farmed land within the ALR. The Commission accordingly did not believe that there are external factors that render the land unsuitable for agricultural use.

### **Assessment of Potential Impact on Agriculture**

The Commission also assessed the impact of the proposal against the long term goal of preserving agricultural land. The Commission noted that the area within which the property is located has been heavily parcelized and this has significantly reduced the area's overall agricultural potential. The Commission noted that the property is one of the larger parcels in the area and considered that its subdivision into two would add to the parcelization in the area and would reduce the property's long term agricultural potential. The Commission weighed this against the possible benefits to the existing owners and concluded that the drawbacks of the proposed subdivision of the property outweighed the short term benefits. The Commission also noted that it had previously refused an application for the subdivision of the property and had also recently refused the subdivision of a nearby property across 232<sup>nd</sup> Street.

### **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 J. Dyson  
**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner S. 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.

This decision does not relieve the owner or occupier of the responsibility to comply with applicable Acts, regulations, bylaws of the local government, and decisions and orders of any person or body having jurisdiction over the land under an enactment.

**CARRIED**

**Resolution # 152/2012**