



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

September 15, 2005

Reply to the attention of Gordon Bednard

Douglas McLellan
22050 – 136th Avenue
Maple Ridge, BC V4R 2P7

Dear Sir:

Re: **Application #O-36126**
Lot 5, Except Part taken by highway statutory R/W Plan 65178, 1 District Lots 275, 405, 406 and 408, Group1 New Westminster District, Plan 8827

The Provincial Agricultural Land Commission (the "Commission") has now concluded its review of your application to place 7950 m³ (approximately 1060 truckloads) of fill on the 2.04 ha property to an average depth of 1 m. The application was submitted pursuant to section 20(3) of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*.

The Commission wishes to thank you for taking the time to meet with its representatives on July 28, 2005. The Commission felt that filling the property as proposed would not improve the agricultural capability of the land and it is for this reason that it refused your application as proposed.

However, the Commission is prepared to reconsider the application subject to the submission of a professional agrologist's report that shows an agricultural benefit to the property with no drainage impacts to adjacent ALR land.

The decision noted above is recorded as Resolution **#472/2005**.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:


Erik Karsen, Chair

cc: District of Maple Ridge – 3060-20/ALRA1
Dallas McClung, 26783 Dewdney Trunk Road, Maple Ridge, BC – V2W1N9

GB/lv
36126d1



Staff Report
Application # O – 36126
Applicant: Douglas McLellan
Agent: Dallas McClung

DATE PREPARED: July 21, 2005

TO: Chair and Commissioners – South Coast Panel

FROM: Simone Magwood, Regional Research Officer

PROPOSAL: To place 7950 m³ (approximately 1060 truckloads) of fill on the 2.04 ha property to an average depth of 1 m. Fill is to be placed over the entire property

This application is made pursuant to section 20(3) of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act*.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The applicant wishes to place fill from residential projects in Maple Ridge on the property, as the property is wet and prone to water pooling in winter months. The stated purpose of the project is to raise the elevation of the property to match but not exceed that of adjacent properties. The proposal will benefit agriculture by eliminating the low areas and providing a firmer base for livestock.

In a supplemental note the agent notes that the area at the center of the property is at the same elevation as the property on the west side and therefore this area will not be filled. He also states that development and improvements to surrounding properties have left this property low and "of little use."

Local Government:

Corporation of the District of Maple Ridge

Legal Description of Property:

PID: 011-345-837

Lot 5, Except Part taken by highway statutory R/W Plan 65178, 1 District Lots 275, 405, 406 and 408, Group1 New Westminster District, Plan 8827

Location of Property:

23477 Lougheed Highway, Maple Ridge

Size of Property:

2.0 ha (The entire property is in the ALR).

Present use of the Property:

Vacant land – the owner of the property does not live on the parcel

Surrounding Land Uses:

- WEST:** Greenhouse (ALR)
- SOUTH:** Lougheed Highway
- EAST:** Residence (ALR)
- NORTH:** Maple Ridge Fair Grounds (ALR)

Agricultural Capability:

Data Source: Agricultural Capability Map # 92G/2H
The majority of the property is identified as having Prime Dominant ratings as follows:
(7:2T 3:1)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS:

The local government recommends support

STAFF COMMENTS:

Staff notes that there is a discrepancy between the amount of fill applied for on the application and on the local government report. The ALC application filled out by the applicant states that they wish to place 3500 m³ of fill to an average depth of 1 m over the property whereas the application to the Local Government states that the proposal is to place 7950 m³ over the property to a depth of 1.3 m. The reason for the difference in numbers on each application is not known.

Notwithstanding the above, the Commission has refused to consider applications for exclusion in this area pending an overall plan and discussion with the District. It might therefore be appropriate for the Commission to defer consideration of this application pending the outcome of that planning exercise.

END OF REPORT

Signature

Date