



Request for EAD Meeting Business Item

SUBJECT:	Cannabis Policy A-71
REQUEST BY:	Jay Simpson
DESCRIPTION/ CONTEXT:	<p>The policy is too restrictive in two ways</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Eliminating all cannabis cultivation in ALR lands is not necessary. The ALC has this very restrictive requirement now and I don't think we should be duplicating other jurisdictions rules. Should the ALC determine that ALR land, or even some class of ALR land is ok for this then we have to either change our policy or the developer has to go through a variance process unnecessarily. <p>I feel there are significant lands within the ALR that are of marginal use (class 4), where a cannabis cultivation facility would take up a small percentage of space and bring significant value to that land, money into the community and jobs for our people.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) The setbacks identified in the policy are unnecessary. Developers that wish to cultivate cannabis will take appropriate measures to provide safety and security. These setbacks might restrict possible development of existing buildings or industrial zoned lots that cannot provide the restrictive setback requirements. Why should a developer have to go through the variance process? <p>There is minimal if any 'Industrial' zoned land in any of our EA's. Any that is should be allowed to provide this opportunity no matter what its size.</p>

<p>DISCUSSION:</p>	<p>As you know, Celistra has a high tech, organic facility under construction and is in discussions with the ALC as to whether they will be allowed to build out to their full plan. That discussion is ongoing.</p> <p>This company has plans to spend over \$10m in the community and bring some 80+ full-time, year-round, well paying jobs which are much needed. The facility is taking up under 6% of the available land on that parcel of 40 acres. They have plans to increase the agricultural value of the rest of the lot.</p> <p>They are already contributing to our community events and are a North Shuswap Chamber member.</p> <p>Our community need growth both population and economic. We need jobs and cash through personal spending and taxes. This is an important first step for the North Shuswap and should be encouraged in any way possible.</p>
<p>OTHER COMMENTS:</p>	<p>I would suggest amending the A-71 Cannabis policy in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Change Part 2 section 1.a to amend the limitation of Industrial Zones to read “industrial zones or Agricultural zones where permitted.” 2) Change Part 2 section 1.b to remove the not supported on ALR lands restriction. 3) Remove setback discussion Part 2 section 1.d entirely OR include something like “must use standard Industrial Zone setbacks”.