



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

August 11, 2010

Reply to the attention of Terra Kaethler
ALC File: O-38875

Joga Bassi
22527 – 136 Avenue
Maple Ridge, BC
V4R 2P7

Dear Sir:

Re: Application to Place Fill onto the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # **2598/2010** outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. Underhill', is written over the printed name.

Brian Underhill, Executive Director

Enclosure: Minutes

cc: District of Maple Ridge (SP/089/08)

RW/
O-38875d1



A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on July 7, 2010 in Langley, B.C.

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

For Consideration

Application: 45828
Applicant: Joga (Joe) Bassi
Proposal: To place approximately 35,000 to 40,000 m³ of fill over approximately 90%, or 3.6 ha, of the total property area. Due to the current poor drainage in the proposed fill area, the owner believes that the addition of fill is needed to make the area more productive. Currently blueberry fields are located on the western half of the property with a poorly drained boggy area located in the eastern half of the property. Madrone Environmental Services Ltd. was retained by the applicant to conduct a soil assessment of the subject property and review the proposed placement of fill on the subject site.

Legal: Lot 28, Section 32, Township 12, NWD, Plan 37547
Location: 13780 – 224 Street, Maple Ridge

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on July 6, 2010. Those in attendance were:

- Richard Bullock Chair
- Sylvia Pranger Chair, South Coast Panel
- Michael Bose Commissioner
- John Tomlinson Commissioner
- Tony Pellett Staff
- Victoria Stevens Consulting Agrologist
- Joe Bassi Applicant
- Aman Bassi Applicant

The Commission and the proponents viewed the site, and observed the low area on the east side of the property. The Commission questioned whether drainage might not be more appropriate than fill. The Commission noted that adjacent lands are in cranberry production and that the cranberry operations do not appear to be experiencing the same kind of problems arising on the blueberry fields.

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

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

I inundation (flooding by streams, etc.) W excess water

Organic Soils - Organic soils are grouped into seven classes, designated as O1 to O7. The organic soil class definitions are equivalent in terms of their relative capabilities and limitations for agricultural use to those defined for mineral soil.

Subclasses

L degree of decomposition - permeability
W excess water

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.

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 believed that fill will not solve the excess water problem on the eastern portion of the property; if blueberries are to be grown there, drainage and pumping may be necessary.

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.

IT WAS

MOVED BY: Commissioner Tomlinson
SECONDED BY: Commissioner Bose

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 # 2598/2010