



**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-38021

Craig and Shannen Armstrong  
224 Rau Road  
Quesnel, BC V2J6Y5

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Armstrong:

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

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 194/2008 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-B279)

Enclosure: Minutes/

SBR/

i/38021d1



**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.**

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

**For Consideration**

Application: # D- 38021  
 Applicant: Craig and Shannen Armstrong  
 Proposal: Subdivision for a Relative: To subdivide the 65 ha subject property into two (2) parcels, one (1) at +29.2 ha and the remainder at +35.8 ha.  
 Legal: PID: 015-316-777  
 District Lot 5070, South West 1/4, Cariboo District  
 Location: 224 Rau Road - 16 km north of Quesnel

**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
- Craig Armstrong Applicant

The Commission viewed the property and discussed the applicant's plans. He proposed to subdivide the property by the road in order to sell a portion to one of his children. He owns an adjacent quarter section that he would sell to his other child keeping a portion for himself. Only a portion of the property was cleared.

Mr. Armstrong confirmed that the staff report dated March 20, 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 Class 3, 4 and 5 with limitations of Topography, stoniness, undesirable soil structure and cumulative and minor adverse characteristics. The majority of the property is given a rating of Class 4

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.

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. The Commission does not believe there are external factors that render the land unsuitable for agricultural use. The property is located in a rural area with large agricultural holdings. Although the property is split by a road, it carries low traffic volumes, and the Commission does not believe that the road is an impediment to using the property as a single unit.

### **Assessment of Impact on Agriculture**

The Commission also assessed the impact of the proposal against the long term goal of preserving agricultural land. Subdivision of the property will lead to the alienation of agricultural land when a new homesite is developed on the subject property. 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 Campbell

**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Gillette

THAT the application be refused.

**CARRIED**

**Resolution # 194/2008**