

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2023-1015 / LOC2023-0159
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2023 October 05



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p>Commissioner Tiedemann</p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application seeks to retain the existing DC (based on C-COR1) but include a modification to allow for a liquor store within 300m of another, existing liquor store. The existing 300m rule is largely intended to prevent the proliferation of the liquor store use. I am not overly concerned about proliferation in this area however, the rules written into the original amended DC were such that the liquor store could have been located anywhere within the building currently under construction. I supported the amendment put forward by Commissioner Weber as it limited the size of any future liquor store to 500 square meters and ensured that any future liquor store use would have to front onto Kensington Road (and not into the neighbouring residential uses). With these revisions in place, I was happy to support the application as I believe they put appropriate belts and braces on the liquor store use being requested by the applicant.
<p>Commissioner Hawryluk</p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application is primarily about the proximity of a proposed liquor store to other liquor stores. The closest liquor store is 225m away (Attachment 4, page 2). Typically, a liquor store “must not be located within 300m of any other liquor store” (LUB, 225d). Exceptions to this 300m rule are in regional commercial areas like enclosed malls (C-R2), comprehensively planned and designed subdivisions and developments with multiple buildings on multiple parcels (C-R3), and downtown commercial/residential (CR20-C20/R20). <p>Personally, I am not a proponent of liquor stores. However, I can see an argument that as populations increase in existing neighbourhoods, demand for liquor stores may increase to the point where neighbourhoods can sustain liquor stores more frequently than every 300m like the Land Use Bylaw allows under the C-R2, C-R3, or CR20-C20/R20 Land Use Districts. As or after such locations redevelop, our Land Use Bylaw only allows liquor stores within 300m of each other through a Direct Control District such as the one proposed.</p>

	<p>To try to ease concerns about a large liquor store taking up most of the main floor, the Planning Commission (with the applicant's consent) revised the Direct Control to limit the size of the liquor store to 500m² and require it to face Kensington Road NW (instead of 18 St NW). The applicant has talked about a grocery store on the main floor. The revised Direct Control would allow a smaller liquor store, which might support a grocery store, and leave the rest of the main floor for a grocery store</p> <p>This location is 200m from Queen Elizabeth School (K-6) and Queen Elizabeth High School (7-12) (Attachment 4, page 2). The Land Use Bylaw states that a "liquor store ... must not be located within 150m of a parcel that contains a school" (LUB, 225e). Given this rule, this application is not about proximity to a school.</p> <p>Sections 1, 19 and 20 of the Direct Control District are new or updated. I hope this will help speed up your review.</p>
Commissioner Weber	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I support the amended Direct Control District recommended by CPC. In my review of the draft Direct Control I noted that in crafting the district to facilitate the relaxation of the separation distance on liquor stores the location and size of the use was not limited. Therefore this would have enabled a large format liquor store to occupy the majority of the main floor of the proposed development. One of the primary reasons the separation distances have been included in land use bylaw 1P2007 was to prevent proliferation of certain uses. In this case the relaxation well beyond the typical 10% of 300 metres made it apparent to me that the location of the liquor store and size should be controlled. A small liquor store would have a much different impact on the community than a large one, whereby in my opinion a very large liquor store would constitute proliferation in this area. I asked the applicant and they were supportive of the amendment. Therefore I recommend council adopt the amended direct control for this parcel.