CHARLOTTETOWN

PLANNING BOARD AGENDA
NOTICE OF MEETING

Tuesday, November 3rd, 2026, at 4:30 pm
Council Chambers, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 199 Queen Street
Live streaming: www.charlottetown.ca/video

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Declaration of Conflicts**
3. **Approval of Agenda** - Approval of Agenda for Tuesday, November 3rd, 2026
4. **Adoption of Minutes** – Minutes of Planning Board Meeting on Wednesday, October 7th, 2026
5. **Business arising from Minutes**
6. **Reports:**
   a) **Variances:**
      1. **175 Euston Street (PID# 872630)**

         Michael Fraser, Planner 2

         This is a request for Major Variance to allow for an appointment-based aesthetician service to operate within a portion of a single-detached dwelling within the Medium Density Residential (R-3) Zone as a Home Occupation accessory to the principal use. As per Section 5.9.3.g) of the Zoning & Development Bylaw, home occupations including uses having appointments on an hourly basis may be considered following the process of review of a Major Variance.

7. **Introduction of New Business**
8. **Adjournment of Meeting**

PLANNING & HERITAGE: PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2026, 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 2ND FLOOR, CITY HALL, 199 QUEEN STREET
Live streaming at www.charlottetown.ca/video

Present:	**Councillor Norman Beck, Interim Chair** **Deputy Mayor Jankov*** ***attended virtually**	**Dave Essery, RM** **Bobby Kenny, RM** **Paul Connolly, RM** **Lea MacDonald, RM** **Jacqui Scaman, RM** **Satyajit Sen, RM*** ***attended virtually**
Also:	**Mike Ruus, Director, Int. Growth** **David Gundrum, Mgr, PH** **Laurel Palmer, PIII, Senior Planner**	**Jason Doucette, IO/AA**** *****minute taker*
Regrets:	**Brad MacConnell, CAO** **Mayor Phillip Brown** **Councillor Julie McCabe**	

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair called the meeting to order at 4:36 PM

2. **Declaration of Conflicts**
   Chair Jankov asked if there were any conflicts. There were no conflicts.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   Moved by Jacqui Scaman and seconded by Bobby Kenny that the agenda for Wednesday, October 7, be approved.

   CARRIED

4. **Adoption of Minutes**
   Moved by Dave Essery and seconded by Jacqui Scaman that the minutes of the Planning Board meeting held on Tuesday, September 1, 2026, as circulated, be approved.

   CARRIED

5. **Business arising from Minutes**
   There was no business arising from the minutes.

6. **Reports:**

   a) Variances:

   1. 644 University Avenue (PID# 387852)
   Stephanie MacDonald, Planner 1

Property Information: Single Detached Residential (R-1L) Zone
Staff Presenter: Stephanie MacDonald, PI
Applicant: Coles Associates
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

This is a request for a Major Variance to allow for a proposed commercial building (new gas station convenience store and drive-thru building) to project into the rear yard setback by 1.66 metres (5.45 feet) for subject property identified as 644 University Avenue (PID# 387852) within the Highway Commercial (C-2) Zone. A rear yard setback of 7.5 metres (24.6 feet) otherwise applies.

Summary:

It was stated that a major variance application for 644 University Avenue (PID 387582) was presented to allow a proposed commercial building to project 1.66 metres (5.45 feet) into the required rear yard setback.

It was explained that the property is located in the CT-C2 Highway Commercial Zone, where a new convenience store and double-lane drive-thru are proposed. Staff noted that the existing building already projects 4.74 metres (15.5 feet) into the rear setback, and the new building would actually be positioned farther from the rear property line.

It was also reported that 14 notification letters were circulated to neighbouring properties and no comments or concerns were received.

It was concluded that staff found the variance would have no negative impacts on surrounding properties and recommended that the Planning Board recommend Council approval of the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that a letter had been received from an adjacent property owner regarding concerns about the proposed drive-thru; however, staff clarified that the comments did not relate to the rear yard setback variance currently under consideration and would instead be addressed during a future review of the drive-thru application.

It was further explained that the variance and drive-thru applications are being reviewed separately because approval of the setback variance is a prerequisite for the drive-thru proposal. Staff indicated that it would not be efficient to complete a comprehensive drive-thru review if the variance were not approved.

Concerns were raised about reviewing the project in stages rather than as a whole, with questions about whether approving one component could influence future decisions. Staff responded that the drive-thru application would undergo its own independent review and approval process and that approval of the variance would not automatically result in approval of the drive-thru.

MOTION:

Moved by Paul Connolly and seconded by Jacqui Scaman that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the following Major Variance for the subject property identified as 644 University Avenue (PID# 387852) to allow for the following:

1) **To allow for the proposed commercial building to project into the rear yard setback by 1.66 metres (5.54 feet).**

CARRIED
(7-0)

2. **12 Avonlea Drive (PID# 464016)**
   David Gundrum, RPP, MCIP, Manager of Development Planning

Property Information: Single Detached Residential (R-1L) Zone
Staff Presenter: David Gundrum, Manager of Development Planning
Applicant: Chris McCabe
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

This is a request for a Major Variance to allow for a Garden Suite (68 square metres) to be permitted in the front yard of a corner lot that is within the Single Detached Residential (R-1L) Zone having a lot area of 0.14 hectares (0.34 acres) whereas a minimum lot area of 0.2 hectares (0.5 acres) is otherwise required and a Garden Suite is otherwise only permitted within the rear yard of a property as per Section 5.7 of the Zoning & Development Bylaw.

Summary:

It was stated that a major variance application for 12 Avonlea Drive (PID 464016) was presented to permit a 728 sq. ft. garden suite on a corner lot. The application sought relief from the minimum lot size requirement, as the property is 0.14 hectares (0.34 acres) rather than the required 0.2 hectares (0.5 acres), and to allow the garden suite to be located in an area defined as the front yard under the zoning bylaw.

It was explained that, because of the lot's corner configuration and the orientation of the existing home, the area technically defined as the front yard functions more like a side yard. Staff determined that the proposed location would have minimal visual and privacy impacts on neighbouring properties and would not create traffic sight-line concerns.

It was also noted that the lot is larger than many residential properties in the neighbourhood and contains sufficient space to accommodate both the existing dwelling and the proposed garden suite while maintaining parking and amenity space requirements. Staff received one letter of opposition following circulation to 33 surrounding property owners.

It was concluded that the proposal maintains the intent of the Zoning and Development Bylaw, and staff recommended approval of the major variances, subject to a condition that the garden suite not be located closer to Avonlea Drive than the front wall of the existing dwelling.

Discussion:

It was noted for the record that the applicant is the husband of Councillor McCabe and, in the interest of openness and transparency, it was confirmed that she was not present and would not be participating in the discussion or vote on the application.

It was stated by board members that they had no concerns with the application. One member commented that the proposal appeared to be a good example of gentle density, indicating support for the addition of a garden suite within an established residential neighbourhood.

It was then moved and seconded that the Planning Board accept staff's recommendation regarding the major variance application for 12 Avonlea Drive.

MOTION:

Moved by Lea MacDonald and seconded by Jacqui Scaman that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the following Major Variance for the subject property identified as 12 Avonlea Drive (PID# 464016) to allow for the following:

1) **To allow for a reduced minimum lot size of 0.14 hectares (0.34 acres) for a proposed new Garden Suite and also to allow for the Garden Suite to be located within the front yard of the subject property, subject to the following condition:**

That the Garden Suite not be located closer to Avonlea Drive than the front wall of the existing single-detached dwelling facing north towards the street.

CARRIED
(7-0)

b) Rezonings:

1. **St. Martha's Court - Lot 2019-5 (Parent PID# 390740 New assigned PID#1176502)**
   Laurel Palmer, RPP, MCIP, Planner 3 (Senior Planner)

Property Information: Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) Zone
Staff Presenter: Laurel Palmer, PIII, Senior Planner
Applicant: Nick Jay
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

This is a request to approve a development concept plan for Lot 2019-5 (PID# 390740) on St. Martha's Court in the Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) Zone in order to facilitate future development of the site with three (3) apartment buildings having a combined total of one hundred and eighty-six (186) dwelling units.

Discussion:

It was stated that a Development Concept Plan application for Phase 3 of was presented for Lot 2019-5 on St. Martha's Court (PID 390740, new PID 1176502) within the Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) Zone. The proposal seeks approval to facilitate the future development of the site with three 62-unit apartment buildings, for a total of 186 residential units.

It was explained that the 3.17-acre property is located on the south side of St. Martha's Court and is surrounded by other CDA-zoned lands, existing multi-unit developments, and the Confederation Trail. The proposal includes underground parking, surface parking, and central courtyard areas, and represents an updated design from an earlier concept that proposed two apartment buildings.

It was also noted that 14 surrounding property owners were notified of the public meeting, and one response was received regarding the alignment of a proposed north-south connector road. Staff advised that the matter has been referred to Public Works for review and confirmation.

It was reported that City departments reviewed the proposal and indicated there is sufficient utility capacity, no major road upgrades are required, and that a second means of access will be required before approval of a building permit, either through the proposed north-south connector road or a future connection across the Confederation Trail.

It was concluded that the proposal supports Official Plan objectives for housing variety, higher-density residential development, and efficient use of existing municipal services.

As a result, staff recommended that the Planning Board recommend Council approve the Phase 3 Development Concept Plan, the associated site and architectural drawings, and the required amendment to Appendix B of the Zoning and Development Bylaw, subject to a development agreement.

Summary:

It was asked what is meant by a site servicing plan. It was explained that a site servicing plan is prepared by engineers prior to construction and identifies how municipal services, including water and sanitary sewer, will be provided to a development. It was noted that the plan shows where services enter the property and determines the infrastructure and pipe capacities required to accommodate the proposed development.

It was asked whether a traffic impact study had been completed for the development and what would trigger the need for a new study. It was stated that an original traffic study was completed for the first two phases of the development based on the projected number of units. It was further explained that when Phase 3 was proposed, an updated traffic study was required to assess the impacts of the additional development.

It was explained that the applicant had the option of commissioning an independent traffic study but instead chose to wait for the City's broader traffic master planning process. It was noted that the development was incorporated into the City's area-wide traffic review, allowing traffic impacts to be evaluated in the context of the surrounding road network and anticipated future growth.
It was further stated that the City had previously completed a traffic master plan for lands south of the development area several years earlier in anticipation of future development. Staff advised that the most recent traffic study had been received approximately one to two months prior and included consideration of the subject development.

It was asked whether a potential easement on the property could affect proposed parking areas. It was explained that parking can generally be constructed over a waterline easement; however, if the City requires access to municipal infrastructure in the future, portions of the parking area may need to be disturbed or removed to facilitate maintenance or repairs. Staff noted that property owners accept this possibility when development occurs over an easement.

It was also asked whether drainage and grading associated with the development could impact neighbouring properties. It was explained that all developments are required to manage stormwater on-site through engineered solutions such as stormwater management ponds or underground drainage systems. Staff noted that grading and drainage designs are reviewed to ensure runoff is properly controlled and directed to appropriate locations.

Discussion then turned to the proposed north-south connector road and whether it would align with future road connections identified on neighbouring properties. It was explained that Public Works would undertake further review to confirm that the roadway alignment is compatible with future connections and functions as intended within the broader transportation network.

It was suggested that approval be contingent upon resolution of matters relating to stormwater management and road alignment. In response, it was clarified that Council was only considering the concept plan at this stage. It was emphasized that detailed matters such as road placement, engineering design, site servicing, stormwater management, grading, and building design would be reviewed and addressed through the subsequent engineering and permit approval processes before construction could proceed.

MOTION:

Moved by Dave Essery and seconded by Paul Connolly that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the Phase 3 Development Concept Plan for Lot 2019-5 (Parent Parcel PID# 390740 new assigned PID #1176502) on St. Martha's Court in the Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) Zone in order to facilitate future development of the site with three (3) apartment buildings with a total density of one hundred eighty-six (186) units and to approve the working site drawings as submitted; and

1) **To approve the request to amend Appendix "B" Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) Parcels and Permitted Uses of the Zoning and Development Bylaw subject to the signing of a Development Agreement.**

CARRIED
(7-0)

2. **151 Kensington Road (PID# 385872)**
   Stephanie MacDonald, Planner 1

Property Information: Low Density Residential (R-2S) Zone
Staff Presenter: Stephanie MacDonald, PI
Applicant: Cooper Campbell
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

This is a request to proceed to public consultation concerning a proposed rezoning of the subject property from the Low Density Residential Single (R-2S) Zone to the Medium Density Residential Townhouse (R-3T) Zone to allow for an increase in density on the parcel in future.

Summary:

It was explained that the subject property is an oversized interior lot containing a single-family dwelling and is surrounded by residential, commercial, and recreational uses.

It was noted that the property is designated as Neighbourhoods within the Official Plan Future Land Use Map, a designation that supports consideration of rezoning along Kensington Road to permit small-scale multi-residential development in accordance with legislative requirements.

It was stated that, should Council permit the application to proceed, the proposal would advance to the public consultation phase. It was further explained that the Planning and Heritage Department would notify the public of a future public meeting in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning and Development Bylaw.

It was noted that the applicant's intent is to facilitate a modest increase in residential density through the future development of townhouse dwelling units on the property.

Staff advised that if the rezoning is ultimately approved, the applicant would be required to submit building and development permit applications for detailed review and evaluation against the Zoning and Development Bylaw.

It was explained that the existing site currently contains a single-family dwelling located on a large lot. Staff then reviewed the proposed site plan, which depicts the development of five townhouse dwelling units on the property.

Discussion:

There was no discussion.

MOTION:

Moved by Dave Essery and seconded by Paul Connolly that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the request to proceed to public consultation for the request to amend Appendix "G" – Zoning Map of the *Zoning and Development Bylaw* from Low Density Residential Single (R-2S) Zone to Medium Density Residential Townhouse (R-3T) Zone for the property located at 151 Kensington Road (PID# 385872).

CARRIED
(7-0)

3. 9 Kirkwood Drive (PID# 370932)

David Gundrum, RPP, MCIP, Manager of Development Planning

Property Information: Low Density (R-2) Zone
Staff Presenter: David Gundrum, Manager of Development Planning
Applicant: CVC Realty
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

This is a request to proceed to public consultation concerning a proposed rezoning of the subject property from the existing Low Density Residential (R-2) Zone to the Mixed Use Corridor (MUC) Zone for the purpose of allowing for veterinary services and uses accessory to veterinary services (i.e. office space).

Summary:

It was explained that the application for 9 Kirkwood Drive (PID 370932) is a request to proceed to public consultation regarding the proposed rezoning of the property from the Low Density Residential (R-2) Zone to the Mixed Use Corridor (MU) Zone. The rezoning would allow for veterinary services and accessory office uses on the property in the future.

It was noted that the property is currently developed with a single detached dwelling and is located near the University Avenue commercial corridor. Staff advised that the surrounding area contains a mix of residential, institutional, and commercial uses, including the Charlottetown Veterinary Clinic on the adjacent property to the east, which is owned by the same owners.

It was stated that, if approved to proceed, the Planning and Heritage Department would provide public notice and schedule a public meeting in accordance with the Zoning and Development Bylaw. Staff also noted that Council is required to receive public input before considering a rezoning application.

It was explained that planning staff believe the application has merit and that sufficient information has been provided to allow the proposal to proceed through the public consultation process.

It was recommended that Planning Board recommend to Council that the rezoning application for 9 Kirkwood Drive proceed to public consultation, with the proposed amendment changing the zoning from R-2 to MU to permit veterinary services and accessory office uses.

Discussion:

There was no discussion.

MOTION:

Moved by Dave Essery and seconded by Jacqui Scaman that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the request to proceed to public consultation for the request to rezone the subject property identified as 9 Kirkwood Drive (PID# 370932) from the Low Density Residential Single (R-2) Zone to Mixed Use Corridor (MUC) Zone to allow for veterinary services and accessory office use on the property in future.

CARRIED
(7-0)

4. Unaddressed Property - Summer Street (PID# 368803)

David Gundrum, RPP, MCIP, Manager of Development Planning

Property Information: Parking (P)
Staff Presenter: David Gundrum, Manager of Development Planning
Applicant: Claude Ayoub
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

This is a request to proceed to public consultation concerning a proposed rezoning of the subject property from the existing Parking (P) Zone to the Medium Density Residential (R-3) Zone for the purpose of facilitating future medium density residential development at this location. A lot consolidation with abutting property to the north identified as 54 Eden Street (PID# 368878) is also proposed and will be considered at a future date pending outcome of the proposed rezoning.

Summary:

It was explained that the application concerns an unaddressed property on Summer Street (PID 36883) and is a request to proceed to public consultation regarding the proposed rezoning of the property from the Parking (P) Zone to the Medium Density Residential (R-3) Zone to support future residential development.

It was noted that the property is currently vacant and used as a parking area within an established neighbourhood containing a mix of low and medium-density residential uses. Staff advised that the property is located near University Avenue and adjacent to Dino's Pizza, which is under the same ownership.

It was stated that the applicant is seeking the rezoning to facilitate future medium-density residential development, with a related lot consolidation application to be considered pending the outcome of the rezoning request.

It was explained that, if approved to proceed, a public meeting would be scheduled and public notice provided in accordance with the Zoning and Development Bylaw. Staff noted that the proposal has merit and that sufficient information has been provided to allow the application to proceed through the public consultation process.

It was recommended that Planning Board recommend to Council that the rezoning application for the Summer Street property (PID 36883) proceed to public consultation, with the proposed amendment changing the zoning from Parking (P) to Medium Density Residential (R-3).

Discussion:

There was no discussion.

MOTION:

Moved by Bobby Kenny and seconded by Paul Connolly that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the request to proceed to public consultation for the request to rezone the subject property identified as PID# 368803 from the Parking (P) Zone to the Medium Density Residential (R-3) Zone to allow for future medium density residential development on the property in future.

CARRIED
(7-0)

c) Subdivisions & Lot Consolidations:

1. 307-311 Patterson Drive (PID# 676585)

David Gundrum, RPP, MCIP, Manager of Development Planning

Property Information: Business Office Commercial (C-1)
Staff Presenter: David Gundrum, Manager of Development Planning
Applicant: Dr. Krishna Thakur
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

This is a request to consolidate two (2) existing parcels in the Business Office Commercial (C-1) Zone to form one new consolidated parcel measuring approximately 1,206 square metres (0.30 acres) in size containing an existing 1-storey commercial building.

Summary:

It was explained that the application concerns the consolidation of 307 and 311 Patterson Drive (PID 676585). The proposal would combine two abutting lots under common ownership for legal and technical purposes related to a recent rezoning and to support the future conversion of the existing building into a private community centre.

It was noted that the property contains an existing one-storey commercial building that historically operated as a neighbourhood convenience store. Staff advised that the property was recently rezoned to the Business Office Commercial (C-1) Zone in order to harmonize zoning across both parcels.

It was explained that the proposed consolidation would eliminate the internal lot line between the two properties, which would otherwise create setback issues for future use of the site. Staff noted that the consolidation would create one parcel of approximately 1,026 square metres with frontage along Patterson Drive.

It was further stated that the lot consolidation is considered legal and technical in nature, as it would remove an unnecessary internal lot line on what functions as a single site and would facilitate the proposed community use.

It was recommended that Planning Board recommend to Council approval of the request to consolidate 307 and 311 Patterson Drive (PID 676585) into one parcel, subject to a final survey plan.

Discussion:

It was asked what is meant by a "private community centre." It was explained that a private community centre is a community gathering space located on privately owned land and operated by a private organization or owner, rather than by the City. Staff noted that a public community centre would typically be owned and operated by the municipality, whereas the proposed use would be privately owned and managed.

It was further clarified that a private community centre is a permitted use within the C-1 Business Office Commercial Zone. Staff confirmed that the proposal does not include a residential component and would be intended solely for community-oriented activities and gatherings.

It was asked whether the two parcels are already under the same PID and whether the application is essentially combining two legal descriptions into a single parcel. Staff confirmed that this is correct and explained that the consolidation would combine the existing legal descriptions into one parcel for future use of the site.

It was noted that any additional details regarding the proposed community centre would be addressed at the development permit stage. Members indicated they had no further concerns regarding the lot consolidation request itself.

MOTION:

Moved by Paul Connolly and seconded by Jacqui Scaman that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the request to consolidate two (2) abutting lots identified as 307 and 311 Patterson Drive (PID# 676585) to form one new parcel being 1,206 square metres in area, subject to a final pinned survey plan.

CARRIED
(7-0)

2. **375 University Avenue (PID# 368589)**
   David Gundrum, RPP, MCIP, Manager of Development Planning

Property Information: Mixed Use Corridor (MUC) Zone
Staff Presenter: David Gundrum, Manager of Development Planning
Applicant: Fitzgerland & Snow c/o Ryan Ladner
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

Request to consolidate five (5) existing abutting lots in the Mixed Use Corridor (MUC) Zone identified as 375 University Avenue (PID# 368589) for legal and technical purposes related to a proposed future building expansion. All lots subject to the proposed consolidation are under common ownership.

Summary:

It was explained that the application concerns 375 University Avenue (PID 368589) and is a request to consolidate five consecutive abutting lots within the Mixed Use Corridor (MU) Zone.

The consolidation is being proposed for legal and technical purposes related to a future expansion of the existing commercial building occupied by Source for Sports.
It was noted that the site contains an existing commercial plaza and a two-storey commercial building, with all five lots under common ownership. Staff advised that the property is located along the University Avenue commercial corridor and is surrounded by commercial uses.

It was explained that the proposed consolidation would eliminate internal lot lines across the site that could create setback issues for future development. Staff noted that the property owners intend to construct an addition to the existing Source for Sports building and that combining the lots into a single parcel would facilitate future expansion opportunities.

It was further stated that the proposal supports the continued growth of an established commercial area and is considered legal and technical in nature, as it removes internal lot lines on what functions as a single integrated site.

It was recommended that Planning Board recommend to Council approval of the request to consolidate the five lots at 375 University Avenue (PID 368589) into one parcel of approximately 0.55 hectares (1.36 acres), subject to a final survey plan.

Discussion:

It was asked for clarification regarding which properties were included in the proposed lot consolidation. Staff confirmed that the application involves five existing lots, specifically the two lots highlighted in blue and the three lots highlighted in purple on the site plan, all of which are under the same ownership and PID.

It was also asked whether parking is permitted within the Mixed Use Corridor (MU) Zone. Staff confirmed that parking is permitted and noted that the property owners must continue to meet all zoning requirements related to the provision of parking for the various commercial uses operating on the site.

It was explained that the proposed building addition for Source for Sports would be used for additional storage and warehouse space and would result in the loss of some parking spaces. However, staff advised that a parking analysis had been completed and demonstrated that the site would continue to exceed the minimum parking requirements.

It was further noted that the proposed consolidation was prompted by setback issues created by the existing internal lot lines. Staff explained that, although the site functions as a single commercial property and has been under common ownership for many years, the internal lot lines create unnecessary development constraints. The consolidation was described as a housekeeping measure that would eliminate those setbacks and provide greater flexibility for future development and site improvements.

MOTION:

Moved by Paul Connolly and seconded by Jacqui Scaman that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the request to consolidate five (5) consecutive abutting lots identified as 375 University Avenue (PID# 368589) to form one new parcel being 0.55 hectares (1.36 acres) in area, subject to a final pinned survey plan.

CARRIED
(7-0)

3. 8 Newland Crescent (PID# 370528)

David Gundrum, RPP, MCIP, Manager of Development Planning

Property Information: Mixed Use Corridor (MUC) Zone
Staff Presenter: David Gundrum, Manager of Development Planning
Applicant: Fitzgerland & Snow c/o Ryan Ladner
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

Request:

This is a request to sever a portion of lands in the Institutional (I) Zone measuring approximately 511 square metres (0.13 acres) in area belong to property addressed as 30 Dunkirk Street (site of Spring Park Elementary School) and consolidate that parcel with abutting lands to the east belonging to 8 Newland Crescent in the Low Density Residential (R-2) Zone to form one new consolidated parcel measuring approximately 1,607 square metres (0.40 acres) in area containing an existing single-detached dwelling. The requested consolidation has been proposed to facilitate a future building addition for the existing single-detached dwelling at 8 Newland Crescent

Summary:

It was explained that the application concerns 8 Newland Crescent (PID 370528) and is a request to consolidate approximately 0.05 hectares (0.13 acres) of land from 30 Dunkirk Street, the site of Spring Park Elementary School, with the residential property at 8 Newland Crescent. The request is being made for legal and technical purposes related to a proposed future addition to the existing dwelling.

It was noted that 8 Newland Crescent is developed with a two-storey single detached dwelling and is surrounded by residential properties, while the lands proposed to be added are located within the Institutional (I) Zone associated with the school property.
It was explained that the additional land would extend the rear yard of the property and eliminate setback constraints that would otherwise affect the proposed house addition. Staff advised that the owners intend to construct a rear addition to the existing dwelling and that the consolidation would provide sufficient space to accommodate that expansion.

It was further stated that the proposal is consistent with the Official Plan's neighbourhood designation, which supports the continued use and improvement of established low-density residential properties without impacting neighbouring lands.

It was recommended that Planning Board recommend to Council approval of the request to sever approximately 0.05 hectares (0.13 acres) from 30 Dunkirk Street and consolidate it with 8 Newland Crescent, creating a new parcel of approximately 0.16 hectares (0.40 acres), subject to a final survey plan.

Discussion:

It was asked whether the applicant currently owns the portion of land being acquired from the school property and how such a transaction would occur. Staff explained that the applicant does not currently own the land but has entered into a conditional agreement of purchase and sale that is dependent upon approval of the lot consolidation. It was further noted that the portion of land being transferred would remain within the Institutional (I) Zone and is not part of any rezoning application at this time.

It was emphasized that, even if the lot consolidation is approved, the additional land would retain its institutional zoning. Staff advised that the owners have been informed that a future rezoning application would be required before any building addition could extend onto that portion of the property. As a result, approval of the lot consolidation alone would not permit construction of the proposed addition.

Discussion then turned to the existing use of the property and the permissions of the R-2 Zone. It was asked whether a triplex or third dwelling unit would be permitted. Staff explained that the current R-2 Zone allows a single detached dwelling, a semi-detached dwelling, or a single detached dwelling with one accessory unit, for a maximum of two dwelling units on a property.

It was clarified that the existing property already contains two dwelling units and therefore could not be expanded to accommodate a third unit under the current zoning regulations. Staff noted that their understanding is that the owners are seeking additional land to facilitate an expansion of the existing living area rather than the creation of a new dwelling unit.

It was further explained that the lot consolidation is being sought because the current rear lot line creates setback limitations that prevent a larger building footprint. The additional land would provide the necessary rear yard area to accommodate a future building addition, subject to any future rezoning approvals that may be required.

MOTION:

Moved by Dave Essery and seconded by Bobby Kenny that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the request to sever a 0.05 hectare (0.13 acre) portion of property belonging to 30 Dunkirk Street (PID# 370833) within the Institutional (I) Zone and consolidate it with abutting property identified as 8 Newland Crescent (PID# 370528) within the Low Density Residential (R-2) Zone to form a new parcel having a lot area of approximately 0.16 hectares (0.40 acres), subject to a final pinned survey plan.

CARRIED
(7-0)

4. <u>Carraigbrook Avenue and Clonhaven Street – Lot 153A, Lot 154A, Lot 155A (PID#s 1194620, 1194612, 1194638)</u>
David Gundrum, RPP, MCIP, Manager of Development Planning

Property Information: Apartment Residential (R-4) Zone
Staff Presenter: David Gundrum, Manager of Development Planning
Applicant: Ashish Goel c/o 103580 PEI Inc.
Reference: Planning Board Meeting Package

<u>Request:</u>

This is a request to subdivide portions of land identified as Parcel A (307 square metres), Parcel B (299 square metres), Parcel C (0.2 hectares) and Parcel D (340 square metres) and have them appended as lot consolidations to separate lots identified as Lot 154A and Lot 155A with portions donated from Lot 153A to re-configure existing lot lines for three (3) existing parcels of land all within the Apartment Residential (R-4) Zone.

<u>Summary:</u>

It was explained that the application is best described as a series of lot line adjustments and consolidations involving Lots 153A, 154A, and 155A, all of which are located within the R-4 Zone. The proposal would create four new parcels, identified as Parcels A, B, C, and D, and redistribute them between the existing lots for legal and technical purposes associated with future apartment development.
It was noted that the three properties are either vacant or currently under development for apartment buildings. Staff advised that Council previously approved major variances for the sites in May 2026, permitting developments of up to 64 apartment units on each lot.

It was explained that the proposed lot line adjustments would facilitate the installation of future drainage easements and private stormwater infrastructure required to service the developments. Staff noted that the reconfigured lot boundaries would not alter the approved development plans but would ensure that drainage infrastructure is properly accommodated on the affected properties.

It was further stated that written notice of the application was provided to 33 property owners within 100 metres of the site, and no comments or feedback were received.
It was noted that staff consider the application to be legal and technical in nature, as it is intended to address future drainage and servicing requirements while supporting the orderly development of the apartment projects previously approved for the properties.

It was recommended that Planning Board recommend to Council approval of the request to sever and consolidate Parcels A and D with Lot 154A, and Parcels B and C with Lot 155A, subject to a final survey plan.

Discussion:

It was asked whether Board members can properly assess potential conflicts of interest when an application is submitted on behalf of a numbered company and the identities of the directors or shareholders are not known.

It was explained that City records identify the legal property owner as **103580 PEI Inc.**, and that staff do not routinely undertake corporate searches to determine the directors or shareholders of a numbered company, as doing so would require additional time and expense. Staff noted that if any member is aware that they are a director, shareholder, or otherwise have a connection to the corporation, they should consider whether a conflict of interest exists and declare it accordingly.

It was further discussed whether a relationship with a family member, director, or shareholder of a numbered company could create a conflict of interest. Staff advised that they could not provide a definitive determination and suggested that members should consider whether there is an actual or perceived conflict. The Director noted that declaring a conflict is ultimately the responsibility of each individual Board or Council member, and specific circumstances could be reviewed with legal counsel if necessary.

A Board member advised that they may have previously met a person they believed could be associated with the applicant but were uncertain whether it was the same individual and did not believe a direct conflict existed. Following discussion, it was noted that conflict of interest determinations are personal decisions that must be made by the member involved.
It was subsequently indicated that the member preferred not to participate in the decision and would abstain from voting on the application out of an abundance of caution.

MOTION:

Moved by Bobby Kenny and seconded by Paul Connolly that Planning Board recommend that Council approve the request to sever and consolidate Parcel A (307.2 square metres) and Parcel D (340.9 square metres) with property identified as Lot 154A (PID# 1194620) and to also sever and consolidate Parcel B (299.1 square metres) and Parcel D (0.2 hectares) with property identified as Lot 155A (PID# 1194638), subject to a final pinned survey plan for all lots.

CARRIED
(6-0)*
***RM Satyajit Sen abstained in conflict**

7. **Introduction of New Business**
   There was no new business that arose.

8. **Adjournment of Public Session**
   Moved by Paul Connolly and seconded by Bobby Kenny that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 6:12 PM.

_____

Deputy Mayor Alanna Jankov, Chair

City of Charlottetown Committee Report

Report No:
PLAN-2026-03-NOVEMBER-6A-1
175 Euston Street (PID# 360107)

Date:
November 3, 2026

Directed to Council through the following Committee:
Planning Board

Reporting Department:
Planning and Heritage

Other Associated Departments:
N/A

Prepared by:
Michael Fraser, Planner 2

Attachments:

A. Air Photo
B. Zoning Map
C. Circulation Letter

Report Title:
Major Variance to permit an appointment-based home occupation (esthetics business) within a single-detached dwelling on the subject property identified as 175 Euston Street (PID# 360107).

Report Purpose:
To evaluate a request to permit a home occupation for an esthetics business as an appointment-based home occupation within an existing dwelling. The application was submitted by the business owner and resident Nhu Nguyen.

Staff Recommendation:
The Planning & Heritage Department encourages Planning Board to recommend to Council that the following Major Variance for the subject property addressed as 175 Euston Street (PID# 360107) be approved:

1. To allow for an appointment-based home occupation in the form of an esthetics business.

And request that Council establish:

2. The approved number of client appointments per day and week.
3. The approved number of parking stalls.

Report Details:

The proposed Major Variance application for the subject property identified as 175 Euston Street in the Medium Density Residential (R-3) Zone, was submitted by the owner of the proposed business Nhu Nguyen on September 17, 2026. The intent of the application is to allow for an appointment-based business for esthetics that would be located within a portion of the existing building. The applicant has indicated that they are seeking a maximum of five (5) client visits per day.

Development Context

The subject property is located on the north side of Euston Street within one parcel of Prince Street and within two blocks of University Avenue. The business is proposed to operate within an existing residential building directly fronting Euston Street, occupying the space normally used as a living room. This area of the dwelling unit has a direct entrance from the main entry hall. The applicants have no plans for signage.

The subject property is located within the Medium Density Residential (R-3) Zone, though there is a wide diversity of zones and types of zones in the local area. The parcels directly adjacent to the property are also zoned Medium Density Residential (R-3) and those across Euston are zoned Downtown Mixed-Use Neighbourhood (DMUN). The local area also includes many corridor and downtown based zones including Downtown Main Street (DMS), Mixed Use Corridor (MUC), and Downtown Mixed Use (DMU) zones. This area includes a wide mix of development and is somewhat transitional in nature, with areas to the west (closer to University Avenue) being newer and developed for commercial use, those to the east (near Weymouth Street) being older and developed for commercial, industrial, and multi-family uses, with the area in between being older residential and institutional buildings used for a variety of uses.

This area is considered part of the walkable downtown core of Charlottetown, with bus service operating on both University Avenue and Fitzroy Street. The existing building has a long driveway, though this can only be counted as one parking stall on the property due to bylaw rules stating that tandem parking cannot be considered for parking minimums. That being said, the block of Prince Street closest to the building includes a considerable number of 2-hour public parking spaces and the Fitzroy Parkade is within a block of the building as well.

Analysis

Section 5.9.3(f) of the Zoning & Development Bylaw outlines the process required to approve a home occupation and specifically notes that uses with appointments may be considered following the process of review for a Major Variance. Section 5.9.1(k) states that the maximum number of clients permitted will be determined by Council. The applicant has indicated that they will operate by appointment only, not offer retail or walk-up services, and they are requesting a maximum of five (5) appointments per day.

Due to the location within the core of the City, the proposed home occupation is not expected to notably change the character of the surrounding neighbourhood. The neighbourhood itself, and specifically the Euston Street corridor, allow for a wide variety of business operations. For example, the properties directly across Euston Street are zoned Downtown Mixed-Use Neighbourhood (DMUN), which permits retail stores, offices, and even restaurants. Other home occupations, including Short-Term Rentals and other appointment-based businesses, already exist in nearby properties.

The location within the City also helps mitigate any potential traffic or congestion impacts. The property is within steps of over thirty-five (35) angled 2-hour public parking spaces on the first block of Prince Street. Beyond this, the angled 2-hour parking continues down Prince Street and the Fitzroy Parkade is located within a 5-minute walk of the proposed business. T3 Transit provides consistent service in the area, including a major stop for several routes at the corner of University Avenue and Euston Street.

Due to the realities of the neighbourhood, the subject property is well positioned to support the use of this building as a home occupation. Many of the potential risks are mitigated by the surrounding parking and transit assets, while the neighbourhood's character already includes the diverse use of properties. Planning staff are therefore in support of the application.

Council or Committee History:
N/A

Financial Implications:
N/A

Public Engagement and Communication:
In accordance with Section 3.9 of the Zoning & Development Bylaw, on October 14, 2026 notice of the Major Variance application for 175 Euston Street (PID# 360107) was circulated to seventy-four (74) surrounding property owners within 100 metres (328.1 feet) of subject property to request written comments on the proposed variance (see Attachment C). The deadline to submit written comments was 4:30pm on Wednesday, October 28, 2026. This notice indicated that the applicant was requesting permission for a maximum of five appointments per day.

As of the date this report was written (October 28, 2026), no written responses were received.

Legislative Authority:
Zoning and Development Bylaw
Official Plan
Strategic Plan

Strategic Alignment:
Community-Building and Placemaking

Submitted By Planner:
Michael Fraser,
Planner 2

Reviewed By:

Manager	**Director/CAO**
David Gundrum, RPP, MCIP, 10/28/2026	Michael Ruus, RPP, MCIP, 10/30/2026

Committee Recommendation: (if differing from staff)

Attachment “A” – Air Photo:



Attachment "B" – Zoning Map:



Attachment "C" – Circulation Letter:

City of Charlottetown
Planning & Heritage Department
70 Kent Street
Charlottetown, PE C1A 1M9

CHARLOTTETOWN

t 902.629.4158
f 902.629.4156
e planning@charlottetown.ca
w www.charlottetown.ca

October 14, 2026

RE: 175 Euston Street (PID #360107)

Dear Property Owner:

The City of Charlottetown Planning & Heritage Department has received a request for Major Variance at 175 Euston Street (PID #360107) within the Medium Density Residential (R-3) Zone.

The Major Variance application is to allow for a home occupation to accommodate an esthetics business. Section 5.9.3 (g) of the *Zoning and Development Bylaw*, outlines regulations for home occupations and states that additional uses, including uses with appointments typically on an hourly basis or as scheduled, may be considered following the process of review for a Major Variance. Section 5.9.1 (k) states that the maximum number of clients permitted on the premise of appointment-based home occupations at any one time will be determined by Council. The application indicates that they are requesting a maximum of 5 appointments per day and that they will not permit walk-ins, retail sales, or non-resident employees.

Pursuant to the requirements of the *Zoning and Development Bylaw*, and as an owner of a property within 100 metres (328.1 feet) of the boundaries of the proposed development at the subject property, you are being notified of the Major Variance request. If you have any objections or comments regarding the Major Variance please state the rationale for your objection(s) as part of your written comments. Written comments shall be submitted no later than **4:30pm on Wednesday, October 28, 2026.** Please email written comments to the reporting Planner at mfraser@charlottetown.ca.

Please be advised that any written comments received will become part of the public record.

In accordance with Section 3.9.4 (Major Variances) of the *Zoning and Development Bylaw*, the Major Variance will be referred to Planning Board which shall consider the request and any comments received in response to the notice and shall make a recommendation to Council. Council may, without prejudice, approve or reject the major variance. City of Charlottetown Planning Board will consider this application at its meeting at **4:30pm, Tuesday, November 3rd, 2026 in the Council Chambers (2nd Floor) at City Hall** and may then recommend to Council to grant or deny this variance.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the Planning & Heritage Department at (902) 629-4158.

Sincerely,

Michael Fraser
Planner II