



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

May 16, 2008

Reply to the attention of Jennifer Carson
ALC File: F-37680

Charlie and Jackie Wild
c/o RR2
Sexsmith, AB T0H3C0

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Wild:

Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 255/2008 outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:


Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Village of Nakusp (3320-20-610-000)

Enclosure: Minutes

JC/37680d1



MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on May 8, 2008 in Nakusp, B.C.

PRESENT: Monika Marshall Chair, Kootenay Panel
 Carmen Purdy Commissioner
 D. Grant Griffin Commissioner
 Jennifer Carson Staff

For Consideration

Application: # F- 37680
Applicant: Charlie, Jackie and John Wild
Proposal: To subdivide the 4.0 ha subject property into two (2), 2.0 ha parcels.
Legal: PID: 016-063-945
 Parcel A (See 16916I) of Lot 10, District Lot 397, Kootenay District,
 Plan 870
Location: 182 Alexander Road, Nakusp

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on May 8, 2008. Those in attendance were:

- Monika Marshall Chair, Kootenay Panel
- Carmen Purdy Commissioner
- D. Grant Griffin Commissioner
- Jennifer Carson Staff
- Charlie & Jackie Wild Applicants

The Commission met with Mr. and Mrs. Wild on the subject property to discuss the application and view the property. The Wilds explained that they do not yet live on the property but are planning to move there soon. The applicants currently have a farm in Alberta where they used to farm cattle and alpacas, whereas now they have only a dozen alpacas for breeding and textiles. The Wilds showed the Commission how they have been clearing the property in order to facilitate its use in the future. The applicants explained that the subdivision of the property would facilitate Mr. Wild's brother, and the co-owner of the property, to have half of the property for a small orchard, while the Wilds would continue alpaca farming on their portion of the property. The applicants explained that they have town water available to their property. The Commission noted old fruit trees on the property and the applicants indicated that at one time the area was all in pasture.

Context

The proposal was weighed against the purposes of the Commission as stipulated in section 6 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* (the "Act"). They 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.

Discussion

Assessment of 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 improved ratings for the agricultural capability of the soil of the subject property are 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.

Subclasses

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| M | soil moisture deficiency | D | undesirable soil structure |
| T | topography | X | cumulative and minor adverse |

Assessment of Agricultural Suitability

The Commission assessed whether the external factors such as encroaching non-farm development have caused or will cause the land to become unsuitable for agriculture. The Commission does not believe there are external factors that render the land unsuitable for agricultural use.

Assessment of 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 property was a similar size to other properties in the area. Furthermore, the Commission noted the historic use of the property for agricultural purposes and discussed that although the applicants are proposing to farm the property, reducing the parcel size would reduce the types of agriculture that can occur on the property. The Commission is not in favour of further subdivision of prime agricultural land. The Commission believes the proposal would impact existing or potential agricultural use of surrounding lands.

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 Purdy
SECONDED BY: Commissioner Marshall

THAT the application be refused.

CARRIED

Resolution # 255/2008