

Paula Kusack

From: Regular Council Meetings
Subject: FW: Zoning Bylaw 1996, No. 2100 – Amendment No. 221 (Bylaw No. 3322)

From: g karbar <22 (1)>
Sent: November 24, 2025 7:56 PM
To: Regular Council Meetings <CouncilMeetings@langleycity.ca>
Subject: Zoning Bylaw 1996, No. 2100 – Amendment No. 221 (Bylaw No. 3322)
Written Submission to Langley City Council

Re: Zoning Bylaw 1996, No. 2100 – Amendment No. 221 (Bylaw No. 3322)
Proposed exemption from 400-metre spacing requirement for 20334 56 Avenue

Mayor and Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding Bylaw No. 3322, which proposes a site-specific exemption from the 400-metre separation requirement for pharmacies at 20334 56 Avenue. I am the owner of an established pharmacy located within 400 metres of the proposed new pharmacy, and I am writing to express my concerns regarding this exemption and the potential impacts on small local businesses, community health services, and the intent of Langley City's planning framework.

When the City introduced the 400-metre spacing requirement, the stated purpose was to prevent the oversaturation of pharmacies in concentrated areas, ensure a diversity of commercial services, and avoid the kind of clustering that had previously contributed to operational and safety concerns downtown. The rule was not arbitrary; it was designed to create stability, protect the viability of existing businesses, and support balanced land-use planning.

Granting a site-specific exemption in this case — especially for a full-service pharmacy located so close to an existing one — undermines that planning intention. My business was established with the reasonable expectation that this bylaw would remain in place and be applied consistently. Allowing a new pharmacy within the restricted radius risks oversaturating the immediate area, diluting service quality, and potentially destabilizing long-standing businesses that have invested significantly in the community. It also creates an uneven competitive environment where new entrants may bypass regulations that existing operators have complied with for years.

I recognize and respect the important role of medical clinics in improving access to health services. However, if Council determines that supporting the clinic's operations is in the public interest, I strongly urge that any approval include clear and enforceable conditions to ensure that the pharmacy operates strictly as a clinic-support function — not as a general-retail competitor. These conditions could include: limiting the pharmacy's use to servicing clinic patients, restricting square footage or expansion, ensuring it does not have independent retail signage or a separate exterior entrance, and tying the permission directly to the continued existence of the clinic itself.

These measures would allow the clinic to meet its patient-care objectives while also maintaining the purpose and integrity of the 400-metre rule, protecting the viability of existing pharmacies, and preventing unintended long-term impacts on the local business ecosystem.

Thank you for considering my submission. I appreciate Council's commitment to thoughtful planning and its ongoing support of local small businesses. I respectfully request that Council either decline this exemption or, if approving it, implement appropriate safeguards that maintain fairness and uphold the intent of the City's zoning policies.

Sincerely,
Gary Karbar
Local Pharmacy Owner
Langley, BC