



**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

Reply to the attention of Terra Kaethler  
ALC File: 51619

August 12, 2010

Dan and Jeanette Wardrop  
12852 -224<sup>th</sup> St.  
Maple Ridge, BC V4R 2P9

Dear Sir and Madam:

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

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 2602 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', is written over a horizontal line.

Brian Underhill, Executive Director

Enclosure: Minutes

cc: District of Maple Ridge (3060-20/ALRA1-Prior)

TK/  
51619d1



A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2010 at the offices of the Commission located at #133 – 4940 Canada Way, Burnaby, B.C.

**PRESENT:**

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

**For Consideration**

Application: 51619  
 Applicant: Dan and Jeanette Wardrope  
 Proposal: To build a residential unit above a detached garage as a secondary dwelling on the property.

Legal: Lot 19 Section 29 Township 12 new Westminster District Plan 32791  
 Location: 12852 – 224<sup>th</sup> St.

**Site Inspection**

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

- Sylvia Pranger                      Chair, South Coast Panel
- Michael Bose                        Commissioner
- John Tomlinson                     Commissioner
- Tony Pellett                         Staff
- Dan Wardrope                       Applicant
- Jeanette Wardrope                 Applicant

The Commission viewed the area under proposal and discussed with the applicants their intention to build a new garage with a residential suite above it. The proposed garage site is currently wooded and buffered from the neighbouring lot to the north. The land across 224th Street is fully residential.

**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 identified as Class 3 and 4 with limitations of soil moisture deficiency and stoniness:

- Class 3 – Land in this class has limitations that require moderately intensive management practices or moderately restrict the range of crops, or both.
- Class 4 – Land in this class has limitations that require special management practices or severely restrict the range of crops, or both.

The Commission noted that the subject property had agricultural capability.

### **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 noted that the subject property was only 0.8 ha and that the surrounding neighbourhood was predominantly rural residential in use. However, the Commission does not believe these are factors that render the land unsuitable for small-scale 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 is generally of the view that increased residential development in an area capable of agricultural use is inappropriate.

Further, encroaching residential development into agricultural areas has the potential to negatively impact present and future agricultural activity in the area, by decreasing the land available for agricultural use. The Commission believed that allowing the additional dwelling on the subject parcel would encourage further residential development on farmland in Maple Ridge.

### **Conclusions**

1. That the land under application has agricultural capability.
2. That the land under application is suitable for agricultural use.
3. That the proposal will negatively 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 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 # 2602**