



**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

26<sup>th</sup> October 2010

Reply to the attention of Roger Cheetham  
ALC File:51815

Lawrence and Theresa Wicks  
7058 Barrett Hat Road  
Houston, BC  
V0J 1Z1

Dear Sir and Madam:

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

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 2680/2010 outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'RH Cheetham', is written over the printed name of the Executive Director.

Brian Underhill, Executive Director

Enclosure: Minutes

cc: Regional District of Bulkley Nechako (#1094)

rc/  
51815d1



## **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 assessed as predominantly Class 4 with cumulative and minor adverse limitations. The area around Vallee Lake is rated as Class 6 with excess water limitations.

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

Class 6 – Land in this class is non-arable but is capable of producing native and or uncultivated perennial forage crops.

### **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 did not believe there are external factors that render the land unsuitable for agricultural use. The Commission noted that the property is in an area that is generally used for cattle ranching and grazing with large parcels, more suited to this form of agriculture.

### **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 noted that most subdivisions in the area are large. It considered that the creation of additional smaller parcels would not be in the general interests of agriculture. The carrying capacity of the property for livestock would be reduced by subdivision as would the potential range of agricultural options. Moreover, pressure would be increased for more rural subdivisions, the cumulative effect of which would be to generate more conflicts between rural residents and livestock operations.

### **Other Considerations**

The Commission noted that it had previously refused two subdivision applications on the property and that it has generally refused other subdivision requests in the area.

### **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 proposed subdivision will not benefit 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 D. Dowswell

**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner R. Bullock

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, that the time limit for submitting a request for reconsideration is one (1) year from the date of the decision letter, and that if the applicant sells or transfers the property within one (1) year of the decision the new owner is not eligible to submit a request for reconsideration.

This decision does not relieve the owner or occupier of the responsibility to comply with applicable Acts, regulations, bylaws of the local government. This includes zoning, subdivision, or other land use bylaws, and decisions of any authorities that have jurisdiction under an enactment.

**CARRIED**

**Resolution # 2680/2010**