



**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

March 18, 2008

Reply to the attention of Ron Wallace  
ALC File: O-37774

David Rode  
510-10620-150th Street  
Surrey, BC V3R7R9

Dear Sir:

**Re: Application to Place Fill Within the Agricultural Land Reserve**

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 97/2008 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, appearing to read 'Erik Karlsen', is written over a horizontal line.

Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: The Corporation of the Township of Langley (SO000499)

Enclosure: Minutes



A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on February 21, 2008 in Langley, B.C.

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Sylvia Pranger Michael Bose John Tomlinson Ron Wallace Tony Pellett	Chair, South Coast Panel Commissioner Commissioner Staff Staff
-----------------	---	--

**For Consideration**

Application: # O- 37774  
Applicant: David Rode  
Proposal: Subject property totals approximately 7.44 ha in area and is currently vacant. Applicant is requesting permission to deposit soil on the subject property.  
Legal: PID: 008-526-834  
Lot 11, Section 6, Township 14, New Westminster District, Plan 37877  
Location: 48 Avenue, Langley

**Site Inspection**

A site inspection was conducted on 21 February 2008. Those in attendance were:

- Sylvia Pranger                  Chair, South Coast Panel
- Michael Bose                  Commissioner
- John Tomlinson               Commissioner
- Ron Wallace                   Staff
- Tony Pellett                   Staff
- David Rode                     Applicant

The Commissioners, staff and the applicant met to view the property and discuss the proposal to fill the southwest corner of the property. It was noted that the applicant had made a proposal in 2006 to deposit fill over another portion of the property in order to fill a low area and seed the area for pasture development. It was also noted that the filled area had no vegetation growing yet and that the fill contained quite a few small rocks.

The proposed new fill site was quite low with significant surface ponding and that the area had many tall trees growing. It appeared that the site would require the services of a professional Agrolgist to oversee the project to ensure it was done correctly.

**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 agricultural capability of the soil of the subject property is

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.

#### Subclasses

D      undesirable soil structure  
T      topography  
W      excess water

### **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 from the on-site that the area proposed for filling has significant surface water deposits. It appeared that the proposed area would require more than just fill to alleviate the excess water problems in this portion of the property.

The Commission would be prepared to reconsider the application provided a professional Agrologist prepares a report outlining why the additional fill is necessary to develop the land for agricultural use and why alternative drainage options are not available or viable to alleviate the observed soil wetness. If this can be justified the report should also include the amount (volume) of fill required, details of the soil quality of fill material, drainage requirements, as well as the existing and proposed topography of the area.

**Conclusions**

1. That the land under application is low lying and subject to excess water as noted from the onsite and indicated in the agricultural capability ratings (outlined above)
2. That the proposal to fill the southwest portion of the property may not improve the site for agriculture.
3. That the Commission would be prepared to reconsider the application subject to receipt of a professional Agrologist report as described above.
4. That the current proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* to preserve agricultural land.

**IT WAS**

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner Tomlinson

**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Pranger

THAT the application be refused as proposed.

**CARRIED**

**Resolution # 97/2008**