



**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 3, 2008

Reply to the attention of Ron Wallace  
ALC File: MM-38318

Joseph, Sandra & Kevin Beausoleil  
48995 Elkview Road  
Chilliwack, BC V2Z1E7

Dear Sir/Madam:

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

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 653/2008 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

Enclosure: Minutes

cc: City of Chilliwack (3370-20 (ALR00197))  
H G Sanborn & Associates Inc 45974 Ivy Avenue, Chilliwack, BC V2R2C6

RW/  
i/MM-38318d1



A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on September 29, 2008 in Chilliwack, B.C.

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

**For Consideration**

Application: # MM- 38318  
 Applicant: Joseph, Sandra & Kevin Beausoleil  
 Agent: H G Sanborn & Associates Inc  
 Proposal: To subdivide the subject property along the ALR boundary creating a 7.9 ha lot within the ALR and a 4.2 ha lot mostly outside the ALR. Access to the non-ALR property would be via a 10 meter wide panhandle along the northern portion of the ALR lot.  
 Legal: PID: 007-096-887  
 Lot 7, Section 11, Township 26, New Westminster District, Plan 34290  
 Location: 48995 Elk view Road, Ryder Lake, Chilliwack

**Site Inspection**

A site inspection was conducted on September 29, 2008. Those in attendance were:

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

The Commissioners and staff met with the applicant at the home of the subject property. It was noted that the property rises steeply from Elk View Road and that the proposed panhandle access along the northern portion of the property would likewise be a very steep grade.

**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**

The Commission believed after its on-site of the property that the proposed access to the new non-ALR property along the northern boundary via a panhandle would be too steep a grade from Elk View Road for vehicles to travel. It appeared that the proposed access point from the road would not be feasible within the 10 meter wide panhandle described in the proposal.

### **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 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.
- Class 5 – Land in this class has limitations that restrict its capability to producing perennial forage crops or other specially adapted crops.
- Class 7 – Land in this class has no capability for arable or sustained natural grazing

#### Subclasses

- A soil moisture deficiency
- P stoniness
- R shallow soil / bedrock outcroppings
- T topography

### **Conclusions**

1. That the proposed access to the new non-ALR property along the northern boundary via a panhandle would be too steep a grade from Elk View Road for vehicles to travel.
2. That in light of the proposed steep access the proposed subdivision would not be feasible.

### **IT WAS**

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner Pranger  
**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Tomlinson

THAT the application be refused.

AND THAT the applicant be advised of the provisions of Section 33 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* which provides an applicant with the opportunity to submit a request for reconsideration.

*S.33 (1) On the written request of a person affected or on the commission's own*

*initiative, the commission may reconsider a decision of the commission under this Act and may confirm, reverse or vary it if the commission determines that (a) evidence not available at the time of the original decision has become available,*

*(b) all or part of the original decision was based on evidence that was in error or was false.*

*(2) The commission must give notice of its intention to reconsider a decision under subsection (1) to any person that the commission considers is affected by the reconsideration.*

AND THAT the applicant be advised that a revised proposal does not constitute new information and will not be considered as a basis for reconsideration and the time limit for submitting a request for reconsideration is one (1) year from the date of the decision letter.

**CARRIED**

**Resolution # 653/2008**