



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 29, 2007

Reply to the attention of Simone Rivers
ALC File: P-37501

Dave Dediluke
Dediluke Land Surveying Inc.
4801 Keith Avenue
Terrace B.C. V8G 1K6

Dear Mr. Dediluke:

Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 624/2007 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, appearing to read 'Simone Rivers', is written over the printed name 'Erik Karlsen, Chair'.

Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Regional District of Kitimat-Stikine (3370-20/276)

Enclosure: Minutes/Sketch Plan



MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on November 22, 2007 at the offices of the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, Prince George, B.C.

PRESENT:	William Norton	Chair, North Panel
	John Kendrew	Commissioner
	Denise Dowswell	Commissioner
	Simone Rivers	Staff

For Consideration

Application: # P- 37501
Applicant: Wilbert Asberg and Jeroen Wohe
Agent: Dediluke Land Surveying Inc.
Proposal: To subdivide the 64 ha property into four 16 ha lots. The applicants indicated that the subdivision as proposed would create manageable hobby farm units with potential to supply food through "farmer's markets".
Legal: PID: 015-672-883
Location: NorthWest ¼ of District Lot 1325, Cassiar District
Near the rural community of Kitwanga

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on November 20, 2007. Those in attendance were:

- William Norton Chair, North Panel
- John Kendrew Commissioner
- Denise Dowswell Commissioner
- Simone Rivers Staff
- Dave Dediluke Agent for the applicants.

The Commission met the agent at the subject property and viewed the property from an area where a driveway had been built into the property. The Commission also drove to either property boundary as well as visiting some of the properties to the north. The subject property was largely treed and gently undulating. The agent informed the Commission that the applicants wished to subdivide to create smaller rural residential/hobby farm sized parcels.

Mr. Dediluke confirmed that the staff report dated November 1, 2007 was received and no errors were identified.

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

The agricultural capability of the soil of the subject property is 70% Class 4PT – 30% Class 5PT with limitations of stoniness and topography.

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.

Although unimproved, the Commission believed that the property had agricultural capability and was correctly designated as ALR.

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 that the subject property has more potential and capability for agricultural use as a single parcel. Therefore the Commission believes the proposal would negatively impact existing or potential agricultural use of the subject property.

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 Kendrew

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Norton

THAT the application be refused.

CARRIED

Resolution # 624/2007