



**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

October 8, 2008

Reply to the attention of Simone Rivers  
ALC File: W-38388

Scott MacLean  
SS2 - Site 23-Comp 26 - 8420 - 269  
Fort St John, BC V1J4M7

Dear Sir:

**Re: Application to Subdivide Land within the Agricultural Land Reserve**

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 588/2008 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:

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

Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Peace River Regional District (115/2008)

Enclosure: Minutes/

MC/  
i/38388d1



## MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

---

**A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on September 24, 2008 at Chetwynd, B.C.**

**PRESENT:**

William Norton	Chair, North Panel
Denise Dowswell	Commissioner
John Kendrew	Commissioner
Martin Collins	Staff

### **For Consideration**

Application: # W- 38388  
Applicant: George Stewart  
Agent: Scott MacLean  
Proposal: Subdivision For a Relative: To subdivide the 64.0 ha subject property into two (2) 2.0 ha lots from the northwest corner leaving a remainder of 60.0 lot. The purpose of the subdivision is to provide residences for the owner and his children.  
Legal: PID: 012-757-420  
The North West  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 33, Township 85, Range 18, West of the 6th Meridian, Peace River District  
Location: North Pine Road and 261 Road, North Pine. Approximately 26 km northeast of the City of Fort St. John.

### **Site Inspection**

A site inspection was conducted on Monday, September 22, 2008. Those in attendance were:

- William Norton Chair, North Panel
- Denise Dowswell Commissioner
- John Kendrew Commissioner
- Martin Collins Staff
- Scott MacLean Agent

Scot MacLean confirmed that the staff report dated August 29<sup>th</sup>, 2008 was received and no errors were identified.

The Commissioners viewed the area proposed for subdivision noting that the purpose of the subdivision was to provide residences for the applicant and his children. The 4 ha area proposed for subdivision is not in cultivation and comprises the existing homesite and yard area.

### **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.

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.

The CLI rating indicates that the land has very good capability for agriculture.

### **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 believes the proposal would negatively affect the existing or potential agricultural use of surrounding lands.

It is the Commission's experience that the subdivision of small, rural residential parcels generally has a negative affect on agriculture in that it takes land out of agricultural production, and introduces additional non farm residents into a farm area. In addition it raises expectations that subdivision will be routinely permitted in farm areas (particularly for family members). The impacts of widespread, diffuse, small lot subdivision are loss of agricultural land to new homesites, yards and access, and increased potential for residential/farm conflicts. Increasing rural residential pressures tend to restrain farm activity and investment to the detriment of agricultural communities.

## **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 negatively 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 William Norton  
**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner John Kendrew

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 # 588/2008**