



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

July 7, 2008

Reply to the attention of Simone Rivers
ALC File: W-38132

John and Edith Marilynne Herron
RR4 - Site 8 - Box 20
Innisfail, AB T4G1T9

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Herron:

Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 342/2008 outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:


Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Peace River Regional District (37/2008)

Enclosure: Minutes/

SBR/
i/38132d1

Discussion

Assessment of Agricultural Capability

The agricultural capability of the soil of the subject property is 100% Class 2 C. Class 2 – Land in this class has minor limitations that require good ongoing management practices or slightly restrict the range of crops, or both.

Subclasses: C- Adverse Climate

The Commission believes that the subject property has good agricultural capability and is 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. Although the subject property is in close proximity to the City of Fort St. John and some existing rural residential subdivision, the Commission noted that the eastern boundary of the property is on to a full quarter section and that the existing subdivision is quite isolated. Therefore 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 railway tracks effectively separate the subject property from the subdivided lands to the east and further believe that the property has more agricultural options as a single unit than it would as two properties. The Commission believes that 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 Dowswell

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Norton

THAT the application be refused.

CARRIED

Resolution # 342/2008