



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

May 23, 2008

Reply to the attention of Simone Rivers
ALC File: D-37856

Raymond and Mildred Tresierra
Box 4397
Quesnel, BC V2J3J4

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Tresierra:

Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 192/2008 outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:

Simone Rivers
Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Cariboo Regional District (4035-20-A152)

Enclosure: Minutes/

SBR/
i/37856d1



MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on April 30, 2008 at the offices of the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, Kamloops, B.C.

PRESENT:	Grant Huffman	Chair, Interior Panel
	Holly Campbell	Commissioner
	Gordon Gillette	Commissioner
	Simone Rivers	Staff

For Consideration

Application: # D- 37856
Applicant: Raymond and Mildred Tresierra
Proposal: To subdivide the 12 ha property into a 4 ha lot and an 8 ha lot
Legal: PID: 011-423-234
Lot 2, Cariboo District, EXCEPT Part dedicated road on Plan BCP29540 District Lot 3952, Plan 17512
Location: 3315 N Cariboo Highway 97, 2km south of Dragon Lake

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on April 28, 2008. Those in attendance were:

- Grant Huffman Chair, Interior Panel
- Holly Campbell Commissioner
- Gordon Gillette Commissioner
- Simone Rivers Staff
- Milly Tresierra Applicant

The Commission walked the property with the applicant and noted that the majority of the property was flat and had been cleared for agricultural use. The property had been used to raise horses. The property appeared to have good agricultural capability.

Ms. Tresierra confirmed that the staff report dated March 19, 2008 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 60% Class 3M – 40% Class 3DT improvable to 60% Class 2M – 40% Class 3DT and 60% Class 2D – 40% Class 3TD

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.

Subclasses

M	soil moisture deficiency	D	undesirable soil structure	E
T	topography			

The Commission believes that the property has agricultural capability and is correctly designated as ALR.

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. Although there are some smaller properties nearby, 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 subdivision of the property would reduce the productive capacity of the parent farm parcel by the introduction of another homesite and associated infrastructure. 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 Huffman

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Gillette

THAT the application be refused.

CARRIED

Resolution # 192/2008