

From Jim Wright, 8300 Osgoode Drive, Richmond

Mayor Brodie and Councillors,

I hope to fill in some gaps in the staff referral report.

First, the report *leaves out* that it is **not** relevant whether the old Metro bylaw includes an Urban or General Urban designation. The legal opinion from lawyer Andrew Gage to the Garden City Lands Coalition Society is clear about that. [Holds up legal opinion.] Even if the **old** bylaw did violate the Agricultural Land Commission Act, that wouldn't permit the **new** bylaw to violate it.

But, just to be clear, the old bylaw **does not** violate the act. I've scoured the old bylaw, and there is **no** evidence of any faulty designation of the Garden City and DND Lands.

I'll add a note, though. The new "**General Urban**" means "**residential**" (including supporting uses), and "**residential**" is used in the old bylaw (along with "**commercial**" and "**industrial**" and, significantly, "**vacant urban land**") to describe land use. However, "**residential**" is not applied to the Garden City and DND Lands—and it's only a **small part** of the one-third of the GVRD that isn't Green Zone.

The pretence that "**General Urban**" comes from the old bylaw is a sure way to hurt our chances in the Musqueam Indian Band lawsuit. The pretense is legally irrelevant, but the Band can easily expose the untruth if they want to. (And defying the law in a doomed attempt at **self-enrichment** can only hurt our chances of **escaping** a payout of hundreds of millions of dollars.)

All of us who are Richmond owe thanks to Mr. Gage and West Coast Environmental Law for this treasure [holds up legal opinion]. It's a systematic analysis from a good lawyer with relevant expertise. I see no sign of further legal advice in the staff report. I don't even see the letters from the relevant tribunal, the Agricultural Land Commission.

You've all had the chance to benefit from Mr. Gage's legal analysis, so I'll just quote one bit in response to the disclaimer in the new bylaw. That excuse has no legal value, since the commission has firmly rejected it; however, Mr. Gage has explained it to help us non-lawyers to understand why the commission is right.

This is his final point:

. . . the idea that a general acknowledgment of the existence of a legal requirement . . . can give a person the ability to violate it at the specific level is a curious one. If correct, it would mean that Metro Vancouver could designate all ALR for future industrial development, relying on Section 6.1.12 [the acknowledgment] to rectify the clear illegality. The concept is analogous to a person prefacing threats to another person with the words: "I know that it's illegal to threaten you, so please disregard anything I'm about to say." These results are clearly absurd. [End of quote]


The gap in the staff report is filled by lawyer Andrew Gage's legal analysis, along with the clear communication from the Agricultural Land Commission, which interprets the law and essentially is the law in this matter.

You have two options:

1. **Respect the law.**
2. **Break the law.**

The citizens are counting on you to **respect the law.**

Thank you.



200 - 2006 West 10th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V6J 2B3
www.wcel.org

tel: 604.684.7378
fax: 604.684.1312
toll free: 1.800.330.WCEL (in BC)
email: admin@wcel.org

February 9, 2011

Garden City Lands Coalition Society
Attn. **Jim Wright, President**

***** BY EMAIL AT
GARDENCITYLANDS@SHAW.CA *****

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

Re: Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy and ALR Lands

You have asked us to provide an opinion further developing our view of Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy¹ (the RGS) in relation to the Garden City Lands and other ALR lands designated General Urban or Industrial. This opinion builds on the legal analysis provided in our Environmental Law Alert blog post: Metro Vancouver Growth Strategy on thin legal ice,² as well as responding to the response to that post received from Metro Vancouver.³

You have also instructed us to provide a copy of this legal opinion to Ms. Jessica Beverley, In-house Counsel to Metro Vancouver. She is cc'd on this opinion.

The Facts

The legal facts on which this opinion is based are as follows. A change in the information available could alter our legal conclusions.

For the most part the Regional Growth Strategy is very supportive of agricultural land and the vast majority of ALR lands are designated as being for agricultural use. This designation, according to the RGS, is (in part) "intended primarily for agricultural uses, facilities and supporting services with an emphasis on food production where appropriate."

There are a small number of exceptions. Significant amounts of ALR lands are included in Special Study Areas, which may be reviewed for possible development in the future. Since Special Study Areas do not in and of themselves allow a particular type of development the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) has suggested, and we agree, that there is no legal inconsistency between this designation and the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* ("the Act").

However, there are also lands located in Richmond and Aldergrove which are ALR lands and which are specifically designated by the RGS for urban residential or (in the case of one area in Aldergrove) industrial use. The affected lands in Richmond include, of course, the Garden City Lands.

¹ *Regional Growth Strategy*, Bylaw No 1136, 2010.

² <http://wcel.org/resources/environmental-law-alert/metro-vancouver-growth-strategy-thin-legal-ice>.

³ Letter from C. De Marco to Andrew Gage dated January 27, 2011.

I have been advised by Metro Vancouver staff that these designations are based upon the designations found in the previous Regional Growth Strategy (known as the Livable Region Strategic Plan).⁴

I have also been advised by Metro Vancouver staff that they are based upon the designations that appear in the Official Community Plans (OCP) for the respective municipalities, although at least in the case of Richmond this appears not to be the case in at least some cases: the Garden City Lands are identified as Public and Open Space in Richmond's Official Community Plan (a designation in respect of which the Agricultural Land Commission passed an order, confirming it as an appropriate use within the ALR).

I am advised by Metro Vancouver staff that as a result of discussions with the ALC the draft RGS was modified to add a clause which explicitly recognized that nothing in the RGS could be inconsistent with the Agricultural Land Commission Act (s. 6.11.2 – discussed below).

However, this general clause apparently did not fully satisfy the ALC in relation to the Richmond and Aldergrove ALR Lands. In October 2010, after Metro Vancouver referred the RGS to the Agricultural Land Commission, Mr. Brian Underhill, Executive Director of the Commission, wrote to Metro Vancouver. While he expresses appreciation for wording changes in the RGS (presumably including s. 6.11.2), he clearly sets out his concerns about the Richmond and Aldergrove ALR lands designated by the RGS for urban residential or industrial use:

From the Commission's perspective, the most important outstanding issues are the two instances where the Urban Containment Boundary encroaches into the Agricultural Land Reserve. ... These designations are not consistent with the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*, with the ... Regulation or with any existing order of the Commission. Under section 46 of this Act a local government in respect of its bylaws [including a bylaw to adopt a regional growth strategy] must ensure consistency with this Act, the regulations and the orders of the commission. ... If the Regional Board decides to adopt a bylaw enacting a regional growth strategy without any modification, subsection 46(4) of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* provides that to the extent of the inconsistency, the bylaw is of no force or effect.

When Metro Vancouver went ahead and gave second reading to the RGS without addressing the ALC's concerns, the Chair of the ALC, Mr. Richard Bullock, took the unusual step of writing to the regional district for a second time to further emphasize that the RGS violates the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*.

Reference is ... made to section 46 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* (the Act), which requires that a local government must ensure consistency with the Act, the regulations and the orders of the commission. ... This letter identifies lands with respect to which Bylaw 1136 as currently drafted is inconsistent with the Act, [the Regulations] ... or with any existing order of the commission.

When the Metro Vancouver Board considered the RGS, staff summarized Mr. Bullock's letters as part of the public submissions as relating to "mapping inconsistencies" – clearly an inadequate description of the serious legal concerns raised in that letter.

⁴ I know that you have provided a detailed rebuttal of this claim on your Garden City Lands Blog: <http://gardencitylands.wordpress.com/2011/02/02/weak/>, last accessed February 9, 2011. I do not believe that it is necessary to resolve this dispute at this time; as discussed below, Metro Vancouver's claim on this point makes no difference to my conclusion.

Issues

1. Does the designation of the Richmond and Aldergrove lands in the RGS as General Urban and Industrial comply with the legal requirements of the Act?
2. If the answer to 1 is no, does the general clause in 6.11.2 of the RGS bring the RGS back into compliance with the Act?

Brief Answers

1. No. Section 46 of the Act clearly prohibits the enactment of bylaws, including bylaws enacting regional growth strategies, that provide for the development of ALR lands, even if further changes to zoning bylaws or Official Community Plans or other government approvals will also be required before ALR lands could in fact be developed.
2. No. The Act identifies very clearly when a bylaw will be considered inconsistent with the Act, or associated regulations and orders. A general condition such as s. 6.11.2, which simply reiterates the legal requirements of section 46, cannot save an otherwise illegal portion of the bylaw.

Analysis

Legality of designations of Richmond/Aldergrove Lands

Section 46 of the Agricultural Land Commission Act very clearly states that every local government must make sure that its bylaws (including bylaws enacting Regional Growth Strategies) are “consistent” with the Act and its regulations. Section 46 states, in part:

46 (2) A local government in respect of its bylaws and a first nation government in respect of its laws must ensure consistency with this Act, the regulations and the orders of the commission. ...

(4) A local government bylaw or a first nation government law that is inconsistent with this Act, the regulations or an order of the commission has, to the extent of the inconsistency, no force or effect.⁵

“Bylaws” is explicitly defined as including bylaws adopting a regional growth strategy.⁶

In general “consistency” is not a strong legal requirement. However, section 46(5) explicitly addresses this problem:

(5) Without limiting subsection (4), a local government bylaw or a first nation government law is **deemed to be inconsistent with this Act** if it

(a) **allows a use of land in an agricultural land reserve that is not permitted under this Act**, or

(b) **contemplates a use of land that would impair or impede the intent of this Act**, the regulations or an order of the commission, whether or not that use

⁵ *Agricultural Land Commission Act*, S.B.C. 2002, c. 36 (the “Act”), s. 46 (2) and (4)

⁶ Act, *ibid*, s. 46(1).

requires the adoption of any further bylaw or law, the giving of any consent or approval or the making of any order.⁷

This section goes out of its way to clarify that a bylaw that meets that requirement will be inconsistent if it merely “contemplates” non-farm uses of land in the ALR, even if further zoning bylaws or other approvals (including ALC orders) are required before the land can be converted to a non-farm purpose.

The remaining subsections of section 46 confirm the ability of local governments to restrict agricultural use on ALR lands, but do not alter the clear legal requirements of the subsections quoted above to ensure that bylaws, including regional growth strategies, do not allow, or even contemplate, non-farm uses on ALR lands.

On its face the RGS does purport to allow and/or contemplate the use of the Richmond and Aldergrove Lands for residential development and industrial uses: clearly uses of lands not allowed in the ALR under the Act or its regulations without the approval of the ALC.

Metro Vancouver staff have suggested that the fact that the designations in respect of these lands remain the same as in the previous RGS⁸ and/or that they may have been (in at least some cases) similarly designated in the Official Community Plans for some years in some way overcomes any problem of consistency.

With respect, it does not. The responsibility of local governments under s. 46(2) to ensure consistency is an ongoing one, and the legality of new bylaws must be considered at the time they are adopted, even if they are merely adopting previous terms.

In relation to the Richmond lands, Metro Vancouver staff have also suggested that the RGS designations of the Garden City Lands as General Urban are consistent with the Richmond Official Community Plan’s designation of those lands as Public and Open Space. They further note that the ALC has approved Richmond’s Public and Open Space designation.

The Garden City Lands are designated “Public and Open Space Use” in Richmond’s Official Community Plan and have been designated as such since the 1990s. We are aware that the status of the Garden City Lands has been the subject of ongoing dialogue within the community and with the Agricultural Land Commission. Richmond provided to us the attached letter from the Agricultural Land Commission in which the Commission consents to Richmond’s designation of the Garden City Lands as “Public and Open Space Use”.

The regional “General Urban” designation can contain a number of municipal designations, including “Public and Open Space Use” as it is reasonable to consider parks within a general urban context.⁹

Again, with respect, this argument is flawed. The Public and Open Space Use designation does not provide for urban development; despite that fact the City of Richmond still sought (and received) specific ALC approval for that designation.¹⁰

By contrast, the “General Urban” designation, while allowing for the use of land for urban parks, also explicitly allows those lands to be used for residential development (indeed, that is the main

⁷ Act, *ibid*, s. 46(5), emphasis added.

⁸ Again, I am aware of your objection to this assertion. Above, note 4.

⁹ Above, note 3.

¹⁰ You advise that this request for approval came after a refusal by the ALC to remove the Garden City Lands from the ALR and while a second request was still pending.

purpose of the designation). Unlike the Public and Open Space designation, it explicitly allows or contemplates a non-farm use. And, again unlike Richmond, Metro Vancouver has not sought the consent of the ALC in respect of those uses. Given the very strong wording of section 46, the General Urban designation is inconsistent with both the Act and with the consent given by the ALC to Richmond in respect of the Public and Open Space designation.

In my view the designations of these ALR lands for urban and industrial purposes is on its face inconsistent with the Act, regulations and orders of the ALC. The remaining question is whether this apparent inconsistency is saved by section 6.11.2 of the RGS.

The legal effect of s. 6.11.2

Metro Vancouver staff argue that even if the Richmond and Aldergrove ALR land designations are by themselves inconsistent with the ALC Act, section 6.11.2 of the RGS rectifies these inconsistencies by conceding that the ALC takes precedence. Section 6.11.2 reads:

In accordance with the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*, in the event that there is an inconsistency between the regional land use designations or policies set out in the Regional Growth Strategy and the requirements of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* or regulations and orders made pursuant thereto, the Agricultural Land Commission requirements will prevail.¹¹

Metro Vancouver states its position as follows:

The intent of this section is to make it clear that Metro Vancouver recognises that the Agricultural Land Commission Act takes precedence over the Regional Growth Strategy and to address the Commission's concerns. It is Metro Vancouver's position that the Regional Growth Strategy is not inconsistent with the Agricultural Land Commission Act. However, to the extent there is any inconsistency, the Agricultural Land Commission Act resolves the issue by providing that the Regional Growth Strategy has, to the extent of the inconsistency, no force or effect.¹²

There are several problems with argument that section 6.11.2 makes everything good again.

Purely on a technical level, section 6.11.2 doesn't change the fact that the RGS "contemplates" residential and industrial development on ALR lands.

In addition, the interpretation also undermines what we take to be the intent of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*. In our view the very strong requirements of section 46 contemplate two levels of protection for ALR lands.

- The ALC has a general mandate to ensure that no non-farm uses occur on ALR lands (or to regulate such use if it views it as appropriate); and
- Local governments are specifically charged (under section 46(2)) with ensuring that their bylaws also protect ALR lands against development for non-farm purposes.

This means that in general approval for the development of land for a non-farm purpose will require at least two levels of approval, from both the ALC and from relevant local governments, creating a high level of legal protection for ALR lands. This is consistent with the purposes of

¹¹ Above, note 1.

¹² Above, note 3.

the Act and the high level of protection for agricultural lands provided in other sections of the Act.

Metro Vancouver acknowledges that as a result of the designations in the RGS this level of protection no longer exists for the Richmond and Aldergrove Lands:

The practical effect of the Garden City Lands and the Aldergrove Lands having a regional "General Urban" or "Industrial" designation is that if, at some point in the future, the Agricultural Land Commission determines that these lands may be removed from the Agricultural Land Reserve, Richmond and the Township of Langley, respectively, will not need to apply to the Metro Vancouver Board for a change to the regional designation.¹³

In our view this "practical effect" is precisely what section 46 attempts to prevent.

We also note that the idea that a general acknowledgment of the existence of a legal requirement (and section 6.11.2 essentially just repeats the legal effect of section 46 of the Act) can give a person the ability to violate it at the specific level is a curious one. If correct it would mean that Metro Vancouver could designate all ALR lands for future industrial development, relying on section 6.11.2 to rectify the clear illegality. The concept is analogous to a person prefacing threats to another person with the words: "I know that it's illegal to threaten you, so please disregard everything I'm about to say." These results are clearly absurd.

For the above reasons, we do not believe that a general recognition that the Act has precedence over the RGS, such as that found in section 6.11.2, can save otherwise illegal specific cases of inconsistency between the RGS and the Act.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, we are of the view that the RGS, as currently drafted, is illegal in respect of the designations of the Richmond and Aldergrove lands for future urban and industrial development. We believe that the designation of these Lands in the RGS should be re-evaluated prior to adoption of the RGS.

Sincerely,



Andrew Gage,
Staff Counsel

cc. Jessica Beverley, Barrister and Solicitor (by email at Jessica.beverley@metrovancover.org)

¹³ Ibid.

From: Pellett, Tony ALC:EX [Tony.Pellett@gov.bc.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2010 11:58 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Agricultural Land Commission submission to RGS public hearings
Attachments: 36732m4.pdf

On behalf of Provincial Agricultural Land Commission chair Richard Bullock I am asking that you please ensure that the attached document forms part of the record of the public hearing process on Bylaw No. 1136.

<<36732m4.pdf>>

K.A. Pellett

Tony Pellett, Registered Planner

Provincial Agricultural Land Commission

133 - 4940 Canada Way

BURNABY BC V5G 4K6

604 660-7019 FAX 660-7033



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

23 November 2010

Metro Vancouver
4330 Kingsway
BURNABY BC V5H 4G8

Attention: Chair Lois Jackson and members of the Regional Board

Re: Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy — our file #O-36732

This letter offers a formal response from the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission (the "commission") to the second reading edition of Metro Vancouver Bylaw No. 1136, 2010 *Metro Vancouver 2040—Shaping Our Future*. Prior to second reading, the Commission offered comments in 2009 and earlier in 2010 on previous drafts—which also included a presentation by Commission representatives to the Metro Vancouver Planning Committee.

The following response is made in the context of the Commission's statutory mandate to preserve agricultural land, to encourage farming in collaboration with other communities of interest and to encourage local governments, among others, to enable and accommodate farm use of ALR lands. Reference is also made to section 46 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* (the "Act"), which requires that a local government in respect of its bylaws [including a bylaw to adopt a regional growth strategy] must ensure consistency with the Act, the regulations and the orders of the commission. It specifies that a bylaw is deemed to be inconsistent with the Act if it

- (a) allows a use of land in an agricultural land reserve that is not permitted by the Act, the regulations or an order of the commission, or
- (b) contemplates a use of land that would impair or impede the intent of the Act, the regulations or an order of the commission, whether or not that use requires the adoption of any further bylaw or law, the giving of any consent or approval or the making of any order.

This letter identifies lands with respect to which Bylaw 1136 as currently drafted is inconsistent with the Act, with the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation or with any existing order of the commission. This letter also discusses "Special Study Areas".

Inconsistencies

1. In the City of Richmond, two parcels of ALR land totaling 112 ha in area have been designated for General Urban development within the Urban Containment Boundary. Neither the regulations nor any order of the commission provides for general urban development of either parcel.
2. Adjacent to the Aldergrove municipal town centre, four discrete areas of ALR land totaling 160 ha and containing 19 parcels have been designated for General Urban development within the Urban Containment Boundary. Neither the regulations nor any order of the commission provides for general urban development of any of these parcels.
3. Immediately to the west of Aldergrove's urban area and to the north of its existing industrial area, five parcels of ALR land totaling 17 ha have been designated for Industrial development within the Urban Containment Boundary. Neither the regulations nor any order of the commission provides for industrial development of any of these parcels.

A regional growth strategy designation of ALR land for general urban or industrial development clearly contemplates uses of land that would impair or impede the intent of the Act. By definition these designations are inconsistent and must be altered to achieve the required consistency.

Special Study Areas

The Commission has noted that most of the Special Study Areas are depicted entirely within the ALR. Given that these depictions do not designate ALR land for a use other than agriculture, and given the wording of RGS section 6.10.2, these Special Study Areas are not Inconsistent *per se*. The Commission therefore has no objection to the depiction of Special Study Areas through Bylaw No. 1136, 2010 *Metro Vancouver 2040—Shaping Our Future*.

Rural Areas

The Commission notes that the wording of RGS section 1.3.3 has been changed in response to earlier Commission comments. The Commission thanks the Regional Board for its attention to this and other matters in the formulation of its regional growth strategy.

Summary


The Commission believes that by virtue of the proposed regional growth strategy's focus on maintaining a secure and productive resource base, it will play an important rôle in supporting preservation of the region's scarce farm land base. The Commission looks forward to engaging in future discussion with the region's member municipalities to ensure that regional context statements and official community plans are consistent with the provincial interest to preserve agricultural land.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:

Richard Bullock,
Chair



36732m4

This page left blank intentionally.



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

20 October 2010

Metro Vancouver Policy and Planning Department
4330 Kingsway
BURNABY BC V5H 4G8

Attention: Christina DeMarco, Regional Development Division Manager

Re: Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy — our file #O-36732

This letter is in response to the referral of the 03 September 2010 draft of the proposed Regional Growth Strategy *Metro Vancouver 2040—Shaping Our Future*.

The Commission appreciates that many of the modifications from the previous draft reflect a positive response to comments made by the Commission by letters dated 20 and 26 May 2009 and in the 2009 presentation to the Metro Vancouver Planning Committee by representatives of the Commission. The following comments therefore relate to outstanding issues of a broader scale than would normally be dealt with at the level of a municipal regional context statement.

From the Commission's perspective, the most important outstanding issues are the two instances where the Urban Containment Boundary encroaches into the Agricultural Land Reserve. At Aldergrove, the encroachment areas to the north and south of the existing urban area are proposed for a General Urban designation; the encroachment area to the north of the existing industrial area is proposed for an Industrial designation. In Richmond, the encroachment area bounded by Westminster Highway, Garden City Road, Alderbridge Way and Shell Road is proposed for a General Urban designation. These designations are not consistent with the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*, with the Agricultural Land Reserve Use, Subdivision and Procedure Regulation or with any existing order of the Commission. Under section 46 of this Act a local government in respect of its bylaws [including a bylaw to adopt a regional growth strategy] must ensure consistency with this Act, the regulations and the orders of the commission. If the Regional Board wishes to request that the Commission enact an order consenting to all or part of the otherwise inconsistent provisions, that request should reflect an understanding of the associated agricultural implications. If the Regional Board decides to adopt a bylaw enacting a regional growth strategy without any modification, subsection 46(4) of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* provides that to the extent of the inconsistency, the bylaw is of no force or effect.

The Commission also notes that seven of the Special Study Areas are depicted entirely within the Agricultural Land Reserve. These depictions are not inconsistent *per se*, given that they do not designate agricultural land for a use other than agriculture. Provided the RGS procedures require that the Commission be consulted and offered an opportunity to participate in the special study, and that any regional growth strategy amendment resulting from a special study does not proceed unless the Commission has first consented to that amendment as it affects the ALR, the Commission has no objection to the depiction of these Special Study Areas.

Finally, although the Commission had earlier asked that the Rural designation in the ALR be reduced in area, the Commission accepts that the current draft shows substantially the same the boundary as in the previous draft. An earlier draft spelled out a strategy which specified very low densities and required regional context statements to "identify policies which...support agricultural uses on rural lands". The Commission is concerned that the current draft simply requires that Rural areas be protected from urban development and that regional context statements "identify policies which...support agricultural uses, where appropriate". The Commission would prefer wording which requires that regional context statements identify policies which support agriculture within the ALR and support agricultural uses outside the ALR, where appropriate. The Commission would also prefer that Type 2 amendments from the Rural land use designation be limited to lands which at the time of amendment are not within the ALR or which the Commission has approved or agreed in principle for exclusion from the ALR. In any event, the Commission intends to pay close attention to the wording of any regional context statement pertaining to a Rural area within which there are ALR lands, to ensure that agriculture is supported and protected and that subdivision of ALR land is not encouraged.

We look forward to an opportunity for further dialogue on the matters discussed above.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION



Brian Underhill,
Executive Director

36732m3