

# Agricultural Land Commission Staff Report

**DATE:** September 8, 2010

**TO:** Vice Chair and Commissioners - North Panel

FROM: Martin Collins

**RE:** Application # 51795

PROPOSAL: To subdivide a 2.4 ha lot from the 7.7 ha subject property leaving a remainder of 5.3

ha.

### PROPOSAL INFORMATION

**Background:** The applicants purchased the property in 2007 and wish to subdivide because

someone is interested in buying a portion of the property. The property was

created in 1980.

Received Date: June 23, 2010

Applicant: Frank & Shelley Garcia

Agent: N/A

Local Government: Peace River Regional District

#### **DESCRIPTION OF LAND**

**PID**: 006-487-033

Legal Description: Lot 1, Section 14, Township 78, Range 17, West of the 6th Meridian, Peace River

District, Plan 23079, EXCEPT Plan 26098

Civic Address: South of Highway 97, Near Arras

Area: 7.7 ha ALR Area: 7.7 ha

Purchase Date: November 28, 2007

Owner: Frank & Shelley Garcia

Total Land Area: 7.7 ha
Total ALR Area: 7.7 ha

Current Land Use: The property is vacant treed land. There are no houses on the property. The

property is located south of Highway 97 in the Arras area.

#### PROPOSAL DETAILS

**Subdivision** 

Area Agricultural Agricultural

Capability Capability Source

7.7 Mixed Prime and Secondary CLI

Number of Lots Lot Size (ha)

1 2.4 1 5.3

7.7 Prime Dominant CLI

Number of Lots Lot Size (ha)

1 2.4 1 5.3

**Surrounding Land Uses:** 

North Highway 97, three 10 ha parcels (two of which are cleared)
East 10 ha rural residential parcel, cleared and used for pasture/hay.

South Small rural residential lots.

West 2 ha rural residential parcel, and Highway 97

Official Community Plan

**Bylaw Name:** Dawson Creek Rural Area OCP Bylaw No. 477 (1986)

**Designation:** Small Holdings

**OCP Compliance:** Yes

**Zoning** 

**Zoning Bylaw Name:** PRRD Zoning Bylaw No. 1343 (2001)

**Zoning Designation:** R-6 - Residential 6

Minimum Lot Size: 8.0 ha Zoning Compliance: No

#### PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

Application #: 29822

Applicant: G&J Chruikshanks

Proposal: Decisions: Resolution

Number Decision Date Decision Description

Note: Legacy Application # 08487 Decision Date: May 9, 1979

Decision: Refused on the grounds that the Commission does not want any further subdivision than already exists in this area. Such a proposal would be an intrusion into

the ALR.

Reconsideration

Decision Date: December 19, 1979

Decision – Allowed

The decision was reconsidered and allowed on the basis of an onsite inspection by

Rob Kline. The property was completely surrounded by roads and small lots making it less suitable for agricultural use.

This application created the subject property.

**Application #:** 4152

**Applicant:** Arthur Young

**Proposal:** To subdivide the property into a 7.2 ha lot and an 19.2 ha lot as divided by the

highway. The parcel south of the highway would be consolidated with adjacent lands.

Decisions:

Resolution

Number Decision Date Decision Description

Allowed, subject to consolidation.

Note: Legacy Application # 00591

**Committee Recommendations** 

Type Recommendation Description

Planning Staff Refuse Peace River Regional District Planning Staff: Local

Government Planning staff recommended that the Board refuse authorizataion for the application as the proposal did not meet the zoning requirements.

Board/Council No Comment Peace River Regional District Board: The Regional

Board authorized the application to proceed to the

Commission.

#### STAFF COMMENTS

Staff note the following:

- 1) The proposal is not consistent with local zoning regulations as the minimum parcel size is 8 ha.
- 2) There are no houses on the subject property, which is forested and has not been cleared or improved for agricultural use.
- 3) Previous subdivision (which created the subject property) was allowed on the basis that the property had limited suitability for agricultural use due to its location between the highway to the north and small lots to the south.
- 4) This intersection area (East Arras Road, Old Hart Highway and Highway 97) is used primarily for rural residential purposes. The agricultural potential of the ~8 ha subject property would be reduced by subdivision. However, overall its value for agriculture is minimal given its relatively small size and location adjacent to smaller parcels.
- 5) If this subdivision is permitted it would be difficult for the Commission to justify refusing other similar applications in the surrounding area.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

51795 ag cap.pdf 51795 air photo.pdf 51795 previous apps.pdf 51795 proposal sketch.pdf 51795\_ContextMap20k.pdf

END OF REPORT		
Signature	Date	