



**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

November 10, 2011

Reply to the attention of Liz Sutton  
ALC File: 52050

Joseph & Marjorie Gendron  
1064 Anderson Road  
Williams Lake, BC  
V2G 8720

Dear Joseph and Marjorie Gendron:

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

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # **346/2011** 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 that reads 'Liz Sutton'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Brian Underhill, Executive Director

Enclosure: Minutes

cc: Cariboo Regional District (4035-20-E069)

LS/  
52050d1



## MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

---

**A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on October 26, 2011 in Burnaby, B.C.**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Gordon Gillette	Chair
	Lucille Dempsey	Commissioner
	Jerry Thibeault	Commissioner
	Jim Collins	Commissioner
	Denise Dowswell	Commissioner
	Liz Sutton	ALC Staff
	Colin Fry	ALC Staff

### **For Consideration**

Application: 52050  
Applicant: Joseph & Marjorie Gendron  
Proposal: Proposal to subdivide a 12 ha parcel into a 4 ha lot and a 8 ha remainder  
Legal: Parcel A District Lots 267 and 12886 Cariboo District Plan PGP36297  
Location: Williams Lake, BC

### **Site Inspection**

A site inspection was conducted on September 27, 2011. Those in attendance were:

- Gordon Gillette Commissioner
- Liz Sutton ALC Staff
- Marjorie Gendron Applicant

Marjorie Gendron confirmed that the staff report dated September 12, 2011 was received and no errors were identified.

### **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) system.

The improved 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.

With limiting subclasses of stoniness, topography, and adverse climate.

### **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. The Commission believes that proposed subdivision of the parcel into a 4 ha hobby farm, and allocating the 8 ha remainder for residential use would reduce the agricultural potential of the land. The Commission noted the stoniness of the proposed 8 ha remainder, but considered that given the size of the parcel, that the agricultural capability of the property is reasonable, particularly for grazing activity.

### **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 believes that the subject parcel has more agricultural potential as a larger unit and that subdivision would negatively impact the agricultural opportunities available to the subject property in the long-term.

## **Conclusions**

1. That the land under application is suitable for agricultural use.
2. That the proposal will impact agriculture.
3. That the proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* to preserve agricultural land.

## **IT WAS**

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner Gordon Gillette

**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Jim Collins

- THAT the application be refused on the basis that the proposed subdivision would reduce the agricultural potential of the land.

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.

**CARRIED**  
**Resolution # 346/2011**