



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

June 27, 2008

Reply to the attention of Jennifer Carson
ALC File: F-37976

Jerome Hango
2924 - 9th Avenue
Castlegar, BC V1N2Z1

Dear Mr. Hango:

Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 316/2008 outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application. As agent, it is your responsibility to notify your client(s) accordingly.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:


Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Regional District of Central Kootenay (A08041-05831-582)

Enclosure: Minutes

JC/37976d1



A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on June 3, 2008 in Cranbrook, B.C.

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

For Consideration

Application: # F- 37976
Applicant: Phillip Raozinkin
Agent: Jerome Hango
Proposal: To subdivide the 5.7 ha subject property to create a two (2) lot subdivision of 3.1 ha and 2.6 ha.
Legal: PID: 013-134-329
Lot 1, District Lot 1239, Kootenay District, Plan 9345
Location: Glade Road, Castlegar

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on June 3, 2008. Those in attendance were:

- Monika Marshall Chair, Kootenay Panel
- Carmen Purdy Commissioner
- D. Grant Griffin Commissioner
- Jennifer Carson Staff
- Phillip Rozinkin Applicant

The Commission met with Mr. Rozinkin at the subject property to discuss the application. Mr. Rozinkin explained that the property has never been farmed and was bought eighty years ago by his grandparents who originally purchased the property with the intent of subdividing it and passing it onto future generations. The Commission viewed the property and was shown the approximate subdivision line. Mr. Rozinkin also mentioned that there is currently enough water on the property for irrigation and there will be a new well created for the proposed parcel.

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 ALR portion of the subject property has agricultural capability ratings improvable to Class 3 – Land in this class has limitations that require moderately intensive management practices or moderately restrict the range of crops, or both.

Class 6 – Land in this class is non-arable but is capable of producing native and or uncultivated perennial forage crops.

Subclasses

M soil moisture deficiency P stoniness

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 believes that as the ALR portion of the property has good agricultural capability with access to water, the subdivision of the ALR portion of the property would have an adverse impact on the agricultural potential of the subject property as well as the 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 # 316/2008