



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

June 2, 2009

Reply to the attention of Simone Rivers
ALC File: D-38660

Doug Dodge
Exton & Dodge Land Surveying Inc.
133 Borland St
Williams Lake, BC V2G1R1

Dear Mr. Dodge:

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

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 128/2009 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: 

Erik Karlsen, Chair

Enclosure: Minutes/

cc: Cariboo Regional District (4035-20-F247)

SBR/
i/38660d1

Discussion

Assessment of Agricultural Capability

The Commission believes that the subject property had 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. The Commission does not believe there are external factors that render the land unsuitable for agricultural use. The property is located in an area of predominantly large holdings.

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, when it considers applications for subdivision generally takes the view that subdivision is not consistent with long term agricultural activity and productivity. While the Commission appreciates the personal circumstances that led to this application, in fulfilling its mandate it must evaluate the long term impacts of each proposal on the agricultural land base. The Commission believed that the subject parcel has more agricultural potential as a single unit and that subdivision would negatively impact the agricultural opportunities available to the subject property in the long-term. In this case the Commission believes that any subdivision of the property will have a negative impact on agriculture. Additionally, the Commission believed that the road dedications as proposed would have a negative impact on the long term agricultural potential of adjacent ALR lands.

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.

AND THAT the applicant be advised of the provisions of Section 33 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* which provides an applicant with the opportunity to submit a request for reconsideration.

S.33 (1) On the written request of a person affected or on the commission's own

- initiative, the commission may reconsider a decision of the commission under this Act and may confirm, reverse or vary it if the commission determines that*
- (a) evidence not available at the time of the original decision has become available,*
 - (b) all or part of the original decision was based on evidence that was in error or was false.*
- (2) The commission must give notice of its intention to reconsider a decision under subsection (1) to any person that the commission considers is affected by the reconsideration.*

AND THAT the applicant be advised that a revised proposal does not constitute new information and will not be considered as a basis for reconsideration and the time limit for submitting a request for reconsideration is one (1) year from the date of the decision letter.

CARRIED
Resolution # 128/2009