

The motions **SRD 956/23 and 957/23** document the board's decision to halt the **Shelter Point Farms Ltd.** Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) application (ALR 1D 23) before it could reach the provincial commission. While these motions show the board following professional administrative advice, our conversation history and the sources suggest this file serves as a complex data point in the ongoing debate over **consistent governance** and **"administrative friction"** leading into the **October 17, 2026 election**.

## The Technical Conflict: Farm Improvements vs. Zoning

The application for properties at 4610 and 4612 Regent Road proposed reconfiguring 68 hectares into **three 1.0-hectare waterfront lots** and one large 65-hectare agricultural parcel 1.

- **The Applicant's Justification:** Shelter Point Farms argued that selling the high-value waterfront lots would generate necessary capital to fund a new **on-land salmon aquaculture operation** and protect productive soils by amalgamating the inland parcels.
- **The Administrative Barriers:** Despite the intent to fund agriculture, regional staff identified several critical conflicts. The land is zoned **Rural One (RU-1)**, which mandates an **8.0-hectare minimum lot size**; the proposed 1.0-hectare residential lots were a direct violation of local law.
- **Infrastructure Risks:** Staff and the Ministry of Agriculture (MAFF) expressed concern over a proposed **700-metre-long access road** that would cut through active farmable land, diminishing its productivity and introducing potential conflicts with farming operations.

## The Legislative Outcome: Halting the Process

Based on these findings, the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) recommended that the application **NOT be authorized** to proceed to the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC).

- **Local Government Gatekeeping:** Under the *ALC Act*, if a proposal is non-compliant with local zoning (as this one was), it cannot move to the ALC for a final decision without the explicit authorization of the local board.
- **The Voting Record:** In a rare alignment with staff advice, **Director Gerald Whalley** moved both to receive the report and to deny the application's progress to the ALC (**SRD 956/23 and 957/23**) Query. This move effectively closed the file.

## Election 2026: A Study in Inconsistent Friction

In the context of the current election cycle, the handling of the Shelter Point Farms file highlights a notable inconsistency in the "rural block's" approach to administrative advice:

- **Alignment with Staff:** On this file, Director Whalley moved to support the CAO's recommendation to block the application. Proponents of his platform may frame this as a commitment to **protecting agricultural integrity** and adhering to the RU-1 zoning standards.
- **The Contrast to "Phase 3" Obstruction:** Our conversation history contrasts this with the **Bylaw 519 (Burridge)** application, where the same directors (Whalley and Mawhinney) voted **against** a compliant land-use file that had full staff, community, and OCP support. That later action was labeled **"quasi-judicial abuse"** because they ignored the very same types of administrative recommendations they followed in

the Shelter Point case.

In summary, the Shelter Point Farms motions represent a moment where the board exercised its role as a "gatekeeper" to the ALC.