



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

November 28, 2007

Reply to the attention of Simone Rivers
ALC File: B-37729

Frank Burg
Box 453
Vanderhoof, BC V0J3A0

Dear Mr. Burg:

Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 618/2007 outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Simone Rivers'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Regional District of Bulkley-Nechako (1042)

Enclosure: Minutes/



A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on November 22, 2007 at the offices of the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, Prince George, B.C.

PRESENT:	William Norton	Chair, North Panel
	John Kendrew	Commissioner
	Denise Dowswell	Commissioner
	Simone Rivers	Staff

For Consideration

Application: # B- 37729
Applicant: Frank Burg
Proposal: To subdivide for a relative - divide the parent property in half from east to west to create 2 lots of 31.5 ha. The objective is to provide the applicant's children with separate titles for future estate settlement.
Legal: PID: 013-942-778
The South West $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 9, Township 13, Range 5 Coast District, EXCEPT thereout a strip of land being the most W 66 feet in parallel width thereof
Location: Bearhead Road, approx 14 km west of Vanderhoof

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on November 21, 2007. Those in attendance were:

- William Norton Chair, North Panel
- John Kendrew Commissioner
- Denise Dowswell Commissioner
- Simone Rivers Staff
- Frank Burg Applicant

The Commissioners viewed the property with the applicant who stated that he wished to subdivide the property in order to provide lots for two of his sons. The Commission noted that the property was cleared and had been improved for agricultural use.

Mr. Burg confirmed that the staff report dated November 5, 2007 was received and no errors were identified.

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

The agricultural capability of the soil of the subject property is Class 5 with limitations of topography and other cumulative and minor adverse characteristics.

Class 5 – Land in this class has limitations that restrict its capability to producing perennial forage crops or other specially adapted crops.

The Commission recalled that the property had been cleared and was improved for pasture and forage production. The Commission believes that the property has agricultural capability and is correctly designated as ALR.

Assessment of 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 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 believed that splitting the property into two pieces would reduce the agricultural options available to the property because farm parcels need to be relatively large in areas such as this where forage and grazing predominate. The Commission believes the proposal would impact existing or potential agricultural use of surrounding lands as well as use of the subject property itself.

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 Kendrew

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Norton

THAT the application be refused.

CARRIED

Resolution # 618/2007