



**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

Reply to the attention of Terra Kaethler  
ALC File: # **J-37803**

February 7, 2008

Ian and Jennifer Bakker  
2385 Inverarity Road  
Duncan, BC V9L4K1

Dear Sir/Madam:

**Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve**

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 8/2008 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', written over a white background.

Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: The Corporation of the District of North Cowichan (3320-20-07-08)

Enclosure: Minutes

TK  
i/37803d1.doc



**A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on January 17, 2008 in Langford, B.C.**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Lorne Seitz	Chair, Island Panel
	David Craven	Commissioner
	Donald Rugg	Commissioner
	Terra Kaethler	Staff

**For Consideration**

Application: # J- 37803  
 Applicant: Ian and Jennifer Bakker  
 Proposal: To subdivide the 0.8 ha subject property into two equal halves on Inverarity Road.  
 Legal: PID: 000-097-721  
 Location: Lot 1, Section 3, Range 7, Somenos District, Plan 29236  
 2385 Inverarity Road

**Site Inspection**

A site inspection was conducted on January 17, 2008. Those in attendance were:

- Lorne Seitz                      Chair, Island Panel
- David Craven                    Commissioner
- Donald Rugg                    Commissioner
- Terra Kaethler                 Staff
- Ian Bakker                       Applicant

It was noted that the property was adjacent to a large agricultural parcel to the west and across Inverarity Road. To the back of the property was a residential subdivision, outside the ALR. The Commission noted that the property was currently used primarily for a residence, and also contained chickens coops, and a small field. The applicant informed the Commission that an alternative subdivision was possible, which would widen the panhandle access to the back and place the dwelling of the new lot facing the road.

**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 identified as Class 2 and Class 3, with limitations of undesirable soil structure, topography, shallow soil / bedrock outcroppings.

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.

The Commission considered that the soil capability ratings reflected prime capability for agricultural use and that the property could thus support a broad range of agricultural activity in its present size. The Commission believed that subdivision of the property would decrease the agricultural potential of the property.

### **Assessment of Agricultural Suitability**

The Commission considered whether the property was suitable for agriculture. This consideration included details such as property size, surrounding land uses and other external limitations to agriculture. The Commission recognized that the parcel was small and bordered on one side to a non-ALR residential subdivision. However, it was noted that the majority of the area consisted of large agricultural parcels. The Commission also considered that the property was currently being used to raise chickens and that expansion of this agricultural activity was possible on the current size of the lot.

The Commission did not believe there are external factors that render the land unsuitable for agricultural use. It was the view of the Commission that, given its agricultural capability, its size and close proximity to an urban population, the property had good potential for intensive, small lot agriculture.

### **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 the subject parcel had more agricultural value as a single unit than as two separate parcels and that subdivision would negatively impact the agricultural opportunities suited to the subject property in the long-term.

**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.

**IT WAS**

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner Rugg

**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Seitz

THAT the application be refused as proposed.

**CARRIED**

**Resolution # 8/2008**