
Subject: Council Consideration of Cannabis Licence Application No. CN000017

Importance: High

From: Allan MacDonald [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 2:47 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Council Consideration of Cannabis Licence Application No. CN000017

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Attention City Staff and City Council:

As citizens of Prince George and as the owners of the adjacent property- Brookwood Plaza - We object to the Temporary Use Permit Cannabis Licence Application No. N000017.

We would like to remind you that you have already granted a permanent zoning for a Cannabis store across the street from the new applicant.

As the Landlord we permitted our existing Tenant to act as agent to apply for a Permanent Zoning Application to grant a Cannabis Licence Application at 2626 Vance Road.

Our permission to grant this agency was reluctant and conditional. We are concerned about potential adverse effects that this new tenancy may have on our existing tenants and the centre itself. The tenants who applied also own a Liquor Store in our centre and had proven to be good operators. We were reluctant in providing a retail space when there were so many unknowns regarding the legalization of Cannabis.

Our tenants explained that the new rules and regulations were very stringent from the Federal/Provincial authorities and they made us aware of all the product safeguards and regulations that they were required to follow. They also informed us that the City had zoning controls over the locations to act in the best interest of the community. Based on these tenant representations we granted the group permission to act as our agent provisionally in order to achieve the new zoning required. We overcame our initial reluctance to be 'Not In Our Back Yard' types. We educated ourselves and realized that compared with other areas near schools etc. that our site was better situated than others. We went down this application path with our tenants.

The tenants went through the full process for a permanent zoning change which included a public hearing etc.. Despite their successful bid we are still only willing to grant their usage based upon a three year term. We are reserving the right to see if this highly regulated industry could stand up to the vision represented by all the authorities and the tenant. We even included a provision which included a matching financial contribution to a drug educational initiative. The tenants agreed to this condition.

In our view we were willing to grant a temporary use to see if this was in the best interest of our centre. This final approval has just only been recently achieved and we still have not finished the lease arrangement. This new application could change the parameters of what had been represented to us by our tenants through no fault of their own. It adversely affects our comfort in the rules and regulations approach by which we are viewing their lease request. Our prudent approach would be undermined by an adjoining use if problems should occur.

We believe that this new Temporary Use Permit Application is an attempt to achieve future permanent zoning without having to go through the increased scrutiny of the permanent zoning process. The cost of setting up a retail store very steep for such a temporary intent. By granting this temporary use it will welcome further such approaches and is not fair to those who went through the more expensive and rigorous permanent zoning approach. In our view the City should not be using the temporary use approach as a substitute for obtaining permanent zoning change. It would make more sense to monitor existing businesses that have been approved under the existing rules and regulations and then make a determination in time.

We are also aware that a bylaw exists that limits the distance to 1.6 km minimum distance between venues in the Cannabis Retail section in the City's Liquor and Cannabis Licensing Policy. We are surprised that this is being recommended by City staff in violation of the City's own policy and despite proximity concerns voiced by the RCMP in the City Staff Report. I do not believe that this temporary zoning would be approved if it was a liquor store application. The new unknown Cannabis approach was intended to be more stringent not less.

For these various reasons we ask the Council to reject this new application. In this case we think a more prudent approach is to follow the policy as intended.

Thanks for your consideration,

Allan MacDonald
Brookwood Properties Inc.

on the nearby piece of property