



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 26, 2008

Reply to the attention of Ron Wallace
ALC File: O-38032

ABM Engineering Services
PO Box 185
Maple Ridge, BC V2X7G1

Attention: Antonin (Tony) B. Mikes

Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 283/2008 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, appearing to read 'E. Karlsen', is written over a horizontal line.

Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Corporation of the District of Maple Ridge (AL/005/08)

Enclosure: Minutes



MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on April 9, 2008 in Maple Ridge, B.C.

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

For Consideration

Application: # O- 38032
Applicant: Johannes and Ruth Pedersen
Agent: ABM Engineering Services
Proposal: To subdivide the 5.2 ha subject property pursuant to the Homesite Severance Policy.
Legal: PID: 012-035-661
See Title
Location: 9707 - 256th Street, Maple Ridge

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on April 9, 2008. Those in attendance were:

- Sylvia Pranger Chair, South Coast Panel
- Michael Bose Commissioner
- John Tomlinson Commissioner
- Ron Wallace Staff
- Tony Pellett Staff
- Johannes Pederson Applicant
- Ruth Pedersen Applicant
- Tony Mikes Agent

The Commissioners and Staff met with the applicants and the agent to review the application.

Discussion

The Commissioners reviewed the application in terms of the policy which states:

- a. no one has an automatic right to a "homesite severance",
- b. the Commission shall be the final arbiter as to whether a particular "homesite severance" meets good land use criteria; (see * below)
- c. a prime concern of the Commission will always be to ensure that the "remainder" will constitute a suitable agricultural parcel.

* There will be cases where the Commission considers that good land use criteria rule out any subdivision of the land because subdivision would compromise the agricultural integrity of the area, and the Commission must therefore exercise its discretion to refuse the "homesite severance".

The Commission felt the creation of a new residential lot would reduce the agricultural potential of the property and therefore did not support the application.

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 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

D undesirable soil structure
T topography

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.

Assessment of Impact on Agriculture

The Commission also assessed the impact of the proposal against the long term goal of preserving agricultural land. It was felt the creation of a residential lot would reduce the agricultural potential of the 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 Tomlinson

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Pranger

THAT the application be refused.

Page 3 of 3 Resolution # 283/2008
Application # O-38032

CARRIED
Resolution # 283/2008