



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 19, 2010

Reply to the attention of Jennifer Carson
ALC File: 51551

Roberta Drake and Richard Kramp
9977 Grigg Road
Chilliwack, BC
V2P 6H4

Dear Madam/Sir:

Re: Application for Non-Farm Use in the Agricultural Land Reserve

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # **2600/2010** 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 'Brian Underhill', written in a cursive style.

Brian Underhill, Executive Director

Enclosure: Minutes

cc: City of Chilliwack (3370-20 (ALR00217))

RW/
51551d1



A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on July 22, 2010 in Langley, B.C.

- PRESENT:** Richard Bullock Chair
 Sylvia Pranger Chair, South Coast Panel
 Michael Bose Commissioner
 Ron Wallace Staff
 Tony Pellett Staff
- ABSENT:** John Tomlinson Commissioner

For Consideration

- Application: 51551
 Applicant: Richard Kramp and Robert Drake
 Proposal: To establish a wedding business on the property.
 Legal: Lot 3, District Lot 392, Group 2 new Westminster District, Plan
 LMP8135
 Location: 9977 Grigg Road, Chilliwack

Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on July 22, 2010. Those in attendance were:

- Sylvia Pranger Chair, South Coast Panel
- Richard Kramp Applicant

Commissioner Pranger met with the applicant to view the site and discuss the proposed wedding business.

Commissioner Eligible to Vote

Commissioner Bose was not present at the site inspection. It was confirmed that a summary of the site inspection was provided thus establishing the Commissioner's eligibility to vote on the application.

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 1 – Land in this class either has no or only very slight limitations that restrict its use for the production of common agricultural crops.

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

T topography

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 the proposed wedding business is not an appropriate use on what is otherwise good agricultural land that is suitable for farming. The Commission also believes the proposal could impact potential agricultural use of surrounding 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 Bose

SECONDED BY: Commissioner Pranger

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 # 2600/2010