CHARLOTTETOWN

PLANNING & HERITAGE COMMITTEE AGENDA
NOTICE OF MEETING

Thursday, June 11, 2026 @ 4:00 PM
Parkdale Room, 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 Thursday, June 11, 2026
4. **Adoption of Minutes** - Minutes of Planning & Heritage Committee Meeting from Tuesday, June 2, 2026
5. **Business arising from Minutes**
6. **Reports or Discussions:**
    a) What We Heard Report Phase 2 – Zoning & Development Bylaw *(continuation of discussion)*
    b) Euston Street Irving Redevelopment Project Update
    c) HAF Update
    d) Stormwater Management
7. **Introduction of New Business**
8. **Adjournment**

PLANNING & HERITAGE: COMMITTEE MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 2026, 3:30 PM
PARKDALE ROOM 2ND FLOOR, CITY HALL, 199 QUEEN STREET
Live streaming at www.charlottetown.ca/video

Present:	**Deputy Mayor Alanna Jankov, Chair** **Mayor Philip Brown**	**Councillor Julie McCabe** **Councillor Norman Beck**
Also:	**Brad MacConnell, CAO** **Michael Ruus, Director, Int. Growth** **Donna Miller-Ayton, Mgr, Policy & Heritage*attended virtually** **Natalie Munn, HO** **Bradley Vince, PII, HO**	**Jason Doucette, IO/AA*** **Minute taker* **Jacob Ritchie, Fathom Studios**

Regrets:

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair Jankov called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

2. **Declaration of Conflicts**
   Chair Jankov asked if there were any conflicts; there were none.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   Moved by Councillor McCabe and seconded by Councillor Beck that the agenda for Tuesday, June 2, be approved.

   CARRIED
   (3-0)

4. **Adoption of Minutes**
   Moved by Councillor Beck and seconded by Councillor McCabe that the minutes of the last meeting held on Tuesday, May 5, as circulated, be approved.

   CARRIED
   (3-0)

5. **Business arising from Minutes**

Habitat for Humanity Beech Street Project

- Mayor Brown asked for an update on the Habitat for Humanity project.
  - It was advised that legal has been working to secure a survey of the roadway and related properties for consideration through Finance Committee and Council.
  - Follow-up was conducted with legal to determine the status of the survey.
  - Legal has selected a different surveyor after being unable to retain the originally intended provider.
  - An update is anticipated for the next committee meeting.

- Clarification provided that the survey has not yet been completed but is expected to commence.

Minna Jane Drive Road Condition

- Mayor Brown asked for an update on Minna Jane Drive.
    - Question posed whether the property falls under the Unsightly, Dangerous and Hazardous Property Bylaw.
    - Administration noted that prior correspondence was issued on this matter.
    - Previous meeting discussion referenced permits issued with access from a private roadway.

- Zoning Bylaw Context
    - Amendment made to the zoning bylaw in 2020.
    - Amendment discontinued the creation of new private roadways.
    - Provision allows continued development on pre-existing private roadways.
    - This explains how recent developments on such roadways were permitted.

- Enforcement Considerations
    - Question raised regarding the municipality's authority to enforce conditions on private roadways.
    - Specifically, whether dangerous and unsightly premises provisions apply.
    - Legal has been asked to provide an opinion on enforcement authority.
    - Further information expected within the week.

- Policy Interpretation
    - Administration indicated the intent of the 2020 amendment was to gradually phase out private roadways.
    - Existing private roadways remain recognized due to their pre-amendment status.
    - Future development cannot include the creation of additional private roadways.

- Non-Conforming Use Discussion
    - It was suggested that the private lane functions as a non-conforming use.
    - Administration clarified that the bylaw includes a specific provision allowing continued development, rather than relying strictly on non-conforming status.

- Legal Review Scope
    - Question raised as to whether legal is reviewing practices in other jurisdictions (e.g., Halifax, Fredericton, Moncton).
    - Administration indicated they are not aware of the exact scope.
    - It is assumed legal counsel is reviewing relevant case law across Canada.

- Matter remains under legal review.

6. Report:

a) What We Heard Report Phase 2 – Zoning & Development Bylaw

Summary:

- Brad Vince, Planner II, HO gave a brief summary of the presentation brought by Jacob Ritchie from Fathom Studios.
  - To Provide Planning and Heritage Committee with an update on what was heard during the Spring 2026 comprehensive engagement.
  - Summarizes public and stakeholder feedback on the draft zoning and development bylaw.
  - Intended to inform City Council of issues raised, themes that emerged, and actions underway in response.

Spring 2026 Engagement Sessions

- Pop-up Awareness Events:
  - Royalty Crossing Mall
  - Founders Food Hall and Markets
  - Confederation Court Mall
- Public Open Houses:
  - Confederation Centre of the Arts
  - West Royalty Community Center
  - Hillsborough Park Community Center
- Post-Engagement Process:
  - City staff and consultants compiled all feedback for review.
  - Appropriate alterations were completed to the draft zoning and development bylaw.
  - Draft is currently being reviewed internally by city departments.
  - Will be presented to Council following internal review.

Jacob Ritchie Presentation:

- Presentation Introduction – Jacob Ritchie
  - Jacob Ritchie presented the 'What We Heard' report findings, outlining extensive engagement with the community, Council, and staff. He emphasized that the process was designed to both inform the public and gather meaningful input to refine the zoning and development bylaw.

- Presentation Overview
  - The presentation reviewed public and stakeholder feedback, reiterated the purpose of the bylaw, described engagement methods, and summarized key findings. Ritchie also outlined next steps, emphasizing the importance of clear communication as the bylaw progresses to adoption.
- Housing Density and Four Units As-of-Right, as appropriate
  - Housing density and the proposal to allow up to four units as-of-right in residential areas were central topics. There was general support when regulations were clearly explained, though some residents remained opposed to increased density in established neighbourhoods.

Question: When can the public formally comment during the adoption process?
Response: Opportunities will occur during legislated stages, including Planning Board review and the public meeting of Council, where residents can provide direct input before final adoption.

- Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)
  - Feedback highlighted concerns regarding minimum lot sizes excluding smaller properties, as well as technical drafting errors. Adjustments were made to allow heritage carriage houses to be considered as ADUs and to align regulations with short-term rental controls.
- Parking and Transportation
  - The draft proposes reduced or eliminated parking minimums, particularly in the downtown core, with reduced ratios in growth corridors. This reflects a shift toward market-driven parking supply to improve development feasibility and affordability.

Question: Could buildings be constructed with zero parking and still be viable?
Response: Yes, particularly in the downtown core where requirements would be removed; however, developers are expected to provide sufficient parking based on market demand, as units would be difficult to rent without addressing parking needs.
Question: How do these parking standards compare to other cities?
Response: Comparable cities such as Moncton and Halifax have reduced or eliminated parking requirements in appropriate areas, demonstrating that market-based approaches can function effectively.
Question: Will cash-in-lieu parking requirements be eliminated downtown?
Response: Yes, in areas where no parking minimum is required, cash-in-lieu provisions would not be necessary, although they may still exist elsewhere in the bylaw.

- Environmental and Waterfront Regulations
  - Flood mitigation measures require residential uses to be located above a minimum elevation of 3.67 metres. Lower levels may be used for commercial or other non-residential purposes. Building height limits remain unchanged.

Question: Does the elevation requirement increase building height or number of storeys?
Response: No, the total permitted height remains the same; the requirement only affects where residential uses can begin within the structure.

Question: What is CGVD28?
Response: It is a Canadian geodetic vertical datum used as a standard reference for elevation, ensuring consistent measurement of height relative to sea level and should be updated to CGVD2013.

- Next Steps and Timeline
  - The revised draft will be finalized and presented to Committee of the Whole in June, followed by Planning Board review in the summer and a public meeting in September and Council adoption in October. Council expressed concern regarding the ambitious timeline and the need to adequately address public input before the next election.

Question: Is the timeline realistic given the level of feedback?
Response: Staff acknowledged the timeline is ambitious but emphasized the importance of progressing the work within the current Council term, noting that further revisions can still occur during the legislative process.

Committee did not consider the Euston Street Irving Redevelopment Project Update, Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) Update, and Stormwater Management agenda items. The Committee agreed that these items would be brought forward for consideration at a future Planning & Heritage Committee meeting.

7. Introduction of New Business

No new items were brought up for discussion.

8. Adjournment of Public Session

Moved by Mayor Brown and seconded by Councillor Beck that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 PM.

CARRIED
(3-0)

_____
Deputy Mayor Alanna Jankov, Chair

City of Charlottetown Committee Report

Report No: PH-2026-06-06

Date: June 11, 2026

Directed to Council through the following Committee:
Planning and Heritage Committee

Reporting Department:
Planning and Heritage Department

Other Associated Departments:
None

Prepared by:
Brad Vince, Planner II & Heritage Officer

Attachments:
A) What We Heard Report Phase II

Report Title:
Zoning and Development Bylaw Update – What We Heard Report Phase II

Report Purpose:
Provide planning and heritage committee with an update on what we heard during the Spring 2026 comprehensive engagement for the Zoning and Development Bylaw update.

Staff Recommendation:
That the Planning and Heritage Committee and Council accept this report and attachment for information purposes as a summary of the feedback received during the Spring 2026 public engagement sessions on the draft Zoning and Development Bylaw.

Report Details:

This report summarizes the public and stakeholder feedback received during the Spring 2026 engagement process for the City of Charlottetown's draft Zoning and Development Bylaw. It is intended to inform City Council of the issues raised, the themes that emerged, and the actions underway in response.

The Spring 2026 engagement sessions included pop-up awareness events, as outlined below:

- Royalty Crossing Mall, 670 University Avenue - Thursday, April 16, 2026 (4:00 – 6:00 pm)
- Founders Food Hall & Market, 6 Prince Street - Saturday, April 18, 2026 (5:00 – 7:00 pm)
- Confederation Court Mall, 134 Kent Street - Monday, April 20, 2026 (12:00 – 1:00 pm)

Report Details Cont'd:

There were also Public Open Houses, which included:

- Confederation Centre of the Arts, 145 Richmond St. - Wednesday, April 22, 2026 (5:30 – 8:00 pm)
- West Royalty Community Centre, 1 Kirkdale Rd. - Thursday, April 23, 2026 (6:00 – 8:30 pm)
- Hillsborough Park Community Centre, 199 Patterson Dr. - Thursday, May 21, 2026 (5:30 – 8:00 pm)

Following the spring engagement sessions City Staff and Consultants compiled all the feedback for review and completed the appropriate alterations to the Draft Zoning and Development Bylaw. The Draft is now being reviewed internally by city departments before being presented to Council.

Analysis and Conclusion:

One of our consultants, Jacob Ritchie, has joined us today to present the findings of the What We Heard Report.

Council or Committee History:
Special Meeting of Council – March 4, 2026

Financial Implications:
None.

Public Engagement and Communication:
In preparation for these events a social media campaign was launched, PSAs were issued, and radio and newspaper ads were published to inform residents of the Public Open House sessions.

Legislative Authority:
Planning Act
Municipal Government Act

Strategic Alignment:
Community-Building and Placemaking
Governance and Civic Engagement
Inclusive Economic Growth
Infrastructure and the Environment

Reviewed By:	
Manager Original document signed by Donna Miller-Ayton	**Director** Original document signed by Michael Ruus

Committee Recommendation: (if differing from staff)



CHARLOTTETOWN

ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT BYLAW REVIEW
PHASE 2 WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

MAY 26, 2026

Fathom

CONTENTS

1.0 Purpose of this Report 3

2.0 Engagement Overview 4

2.1 Earlier Engagement in 2025 4

2.2 Spring 2026 Engagement 5

2.3 Stakeholder Consultations 7

3.0 Summary of Themes 9

4.0 What We Heard: Theme by Theme 10

4.1 Housing Density & Four-Units As-of-Right 10

4.2 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) 10

4.3 Conservation Zones 11

4.4 Parking Reform & Transportation 12

4.5 Environmental Protection & Stormwater 12

4.6 Zoning Map Corrections 13

4.7 Definitions, Drafting & Technical Corrections 13

5.0 Next Steps 15

6.0 Acknowledgement 16

1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report summarizes the public and stakeholder feedback received during the Spring 2026 engagement process for the City of Charlottetown's draft Zoning and Development Bylaw (ZDBL). It is intended to inform City Council of the issues raised, the themes that emerged, and the actions underway in response.

More than 100 submissions were logged, drawing from individual residents, professional planners and engineers, city departments, environmental advocacy organizations, and online survey respondents. All issues raised have been reviewed, with many addressed and others currently under active review.

2.0 ENGAGEMENT OVERVIEW

The Zoning and Development Bylaw review has been an ongoing, multi-round public engagement process. The feedback summarized in this report was gathered primarily during the Spring 2026 round, which followed earlier rounds of community outreach in 2025.

2.1 EARLIER ENGAGEMENT IN 2025

Prior to the Spring 2026 engagement, two rounds of public consultation were held in 2025 to introduce the bylaw review process and gather early input on land-use priorities.

- Public Open House - Charlottetown Library Learning Centre, April 7, 2025: An introductory session presenting the scope of the bylaw review and inviting early feedback from the community.
- Public Open House - Simmons Sports Centre, May 14, 2025: A second session reaching residents in the south end of the city, focused on the draft framework and zoning structure.
- Public Open House - West Royalty Community Centre, May 15, 2025: A third session serving the West Royalty and suburban growth areas, where growth corridor and residential density questions were prominent.
- Pop-Up Session - Founders Food Hall & Market, February 21, 2026 (11:00 am – 2:00 pm): An early pop-up coinciding with the draft bylaw release, reaching residents in the downtown core.

These earlier sessions helped shape the draft bylaw that was released for public review ahead of the Spring 2026 engagement. Themes identified in 2025, including housing supply, ADU accessibility, and environmental protection, carried forward and deepened in the Spring 2026 round.

2.2 SPRING 2026 ENGAGEMENT

The Spring 2026 engagement was the most intensive round of the process, coinciding with the release of the full draft ZDBL. It included both pop-up awareness events and formal public open houses, as well as written submissions, an online survey, and internal staff review sessions.

Pop-Up Awareness Events

Three Spring pop-up events were held at high-traffic locations across the city to raise awareness of the draft bylaw and encourage residents to attend the open houses and submit feedback:

- Royalty Crossing Mall, 670 University Avenue - Thursday, April 16, 2026 (4:00 – 6:00 pm): Reached residents in the University Avenue and suburban west corridors.
- Founders Food Hall & Market, 6 Prince Street - Saturday, April 18, 2026 (5:00 – 7:00 pm): A second downtown pop-up in advance of the formal open houses.
- Confederation Court Mall, 134 Kent Street - Monday, April 20, 2026 (12:00 – 1:00 pm): A midday session targeting downtown workers and shoppers in the lead-up to the open house week.

Public Open Houses

Three formal public open houses were held over a four-week period, each serving different areas of the city:

- Confederation Centre of the Arts, 145 Richmond St. - Wednesday, April 22, 2026 (5:30 – 8:00 pm): Held in the downtown core, this session drew a strong response from heritage property owners, planning professionals, and residents with an interest in the 500 Lot Area and downtown zoning provisions.
- West Royalty Community Centre, 1 Kirkdale Rd. - Thursday, April 23, 2026 (6:00 – 8:30 pm): Serving West Royalty and surrounding suburban neighbourhoods, this session generated significant discussion around growth corridor zoning, residential density, and the Eastern Gateway Zone.
- Hillsborough Park Community Centre, 199 Patterson Dr. - Thursday, May 21, 2026 (5:30 – 8:00 pm): The final open house reached residents in the east end of the city, where mapping

corrections and neighbourhood zone questions were prominent topics.

Additional Submission Channels

Beyond the in-person events, feedback was received through:

- Written submissions from residents, planning professionals, engineers, and neighbouring municipalities
- An online survey open throughout the engagement period
- Focused stakeholder sessions with agencies and developers from downtown and suburban areas of the City
- Submissions from all relevant City of Charlottetown departments (including the GIS Department, Development Officers, the Department of Economics, Culture and Tourism, and the Environment and Sustainability teams)
- Internal Planning & Heritage staff review sessions identifying technical and drafting corrections

In total, 100+ submissions were logged across all channels. Submissions ranged from brief notes of support to detailed multi-section technical analyses. The submissions reflected a broad range of perspectives, from long-time property owners on West Street to the Charlottetown Area Watershed Association and T3 transit operators. This reflects the broad community interest in this bylaw update.

2.3 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

As mentioned as part of the engagement process, planning staff and the consulting team conducted a series of targeted meetings with key stakeholders, including active developers, infrastructure providers, and provincial and municipal agencies. These conversations provided on-the-ground perspectives on how the draft bylaw will function in practice and surfaced issues not always visible through open public channels.

Developer and Builder Consultations

Meetings were held with several local developers and builders actively working in the Charlottetown market. Across these conversations, a consistent set of themes emerged:

- Zoning precision and density permissions: Developers broadly supported four units as-of-right on larger lots and welcomed mid-rise permissions of up to six storeys where feasible along commercial corridors. There was a strong emphasis on precise zoning language to close loopholes, prevent unintended uses, and limit abuse of variance. The shift from CDA to Urban Expansion (UE) zoning was welcomed for removing restrictive unit count limits and enabling more flexible secondary planning.
- Building economics and construction methods: Wood panelized construction with concrete overpour is the dominant method for mid-rise buildings in the local market. Mass timber and concrete construction were identified as cost-prohibitive without government support. Stepback and street wall height requirements need to accommodate the constraints of panelized construction.
- Commercial requirements: Creating opportunity for new commercial uses near neighbourhoods is supported, but blanket mandatory ground-floor commercial space in mixed-use buildings was flagged as a risk to project feasibility.
- Approval certainty and process transparency: Developers were consistent and emphatic on the point that clear, predictable approval timelines are essential to retaining investment in Charlottetown. Broad appeal rights, interference in as-of-right approvals, and inter-departmental inconsistencies were identified as key sources of uncertainty. The absence of an online permitting portal was a recurring frustration; permit tracking currently requires phone calls and inspection scheduling is unpredictable.

» Parking and site design: The current 40% front yard impervious surface limit was flagged as too restrictive for stacked townhouse configurations, where tenant demand typically requires two parking spaces per unit. Pervious pavers were identified as a potential compliant solution.

Infrastructure and Transit Consultations

Meetings with the City's transit operator highlighted infrastructure and service considerations relevant to the bylaw:

» Transit route alignment and density: A meeting with the transit operator focused on the relationship between the draft zoning map and existing bus route coverage. Several zoning map corrections in areas relevant to transit corridors were identified and have been completed. There was clear alignment that concentrating residential density along served corridors, in addition to intensifying growth nodes, is the most effective way to support transit viability over time.

Provincial and Agency Consultations

A series of meetings was held with provincial and regional agencies. These conversations were consistent in focus and tone, centering on two broad areas:

» Provincial interests and planning legislation: Agencies emphasized the importance of ensuring the draft bylaw aligns with the provincial Planning Act and the 18 provincial interests embedded within it. Conservation design standards, environmental impact assessment requirements, and floodplain regulations were identified as areas requiring explicit bylaw provisions. The Province confirmed its role in providing ecological feature data layers for use in bylaw schedules and appendices.

» Growth targets and housing supply: There was strong shared recognition across agencies that Charlottetown's population growth trajectory requires a bylaw that actively enables housing supply. Agencies expressed support for the overall direction of the draft while flagging the need for infrastructure coordination, particularly water, sewer, and health facility capacity. Several agencies indicated interest in ongoing coordination as the bylaw moves toward adoption.

3.0 SUMMARY OF THEMES

The feedback clustered into seven primary theme areas. The table below provides an at-a-glance overview of each theme, the volume of submissions touching on it, and the current response status.

Theme	Submissions	Response Status
Housing Density & Four-Units As-of-Right	18+	**Addressed** - four-unit permissions confirmed; minor wording refinements in progress
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	14+	**Addressed** - lot size, numbering errors, and carriage house provisions resolved
Conservation Zones	12+	**Addressed** - conservation zones removed and to be applied as an overlay rather than zone
Parking Reform & Transportation	8+	**Addressed** - parking minimums reduced, density aligned with transit corridors
Environmental Protection & Stormwater	11+	**In progress** - flood GIS data to be added as schedule; setback and stormwater language under review
Zoning Map Corrections	7+	**In progress** - specific PID corrections and mapping errors are being updated
Definitions, Drafting & Technical Corrections	11+	**Addressed** - numbering errors, outdated legislation references, and definition updates resolved

4.0 WHAT WE HEARD: THEME BY THEME

4.1 HOUSING DENSITY & FOUR-UNITS AS-OF-RIGHT

This was the most visible theme in the engagement, generating a range of perspectives from strong support to outright opposition. The majority of respondents, including advocacy organizations, planning professionals, and online survey participants, support increased density as a necessary response to Charlottetown's housing needs.

Key points raised:

- Strong support for four units as-of-right citywide, with calls to remove the qualifier "as appropriate"
- Concerns that density near post-secondary institutions (UPEI, Holland College) falls short of Housing Accelerator Fund commitments, and requests allowing at least 4-storeys
- Some respondents opposed four-unit infill in residential neighbourhoods that have existed with minimal additional density or renting of units on single-family home sites, citing concerns about neighbourhood character

4.2 ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADUS)

ADUs attracted significant attention, both in support and with detailed technical concerns. Respondents broadly welcomed the expansion of ADU permissions but raised several specific implementation issues.

Key points raised:

- Multiple respondents argued the 500 m^2 minimum lot size requirement is arbitrary and excludes many downtown properties that could otherwise accommodate a small ADU

- Cross-references to ADU sections (4.5, 4.6, 4.7) contained numbering errors that appeared throughout the bylaw
- A request to allow carriage house restoration on designated heritage properties as a permitted detached ADU in any zone
- Concerns that ADU permissions could be used for short-term rentals, undermining their housing intent

4.3 CONSERVATION ZONES

The proposed Conservation Zone was broadly supported in principle but drew substantial criticism regarding its implementation. Concerns came from property owners, environmental organizations, a professional land surveyor, and the Watershed Alliance.

Key points raised:

- Zone boundaries were not defined by coordinates or metes-and-bounds descriptions, creating legal uncertainty for property owners and enforcement challenges for the City
- Specific properties appeared to be incorrectly zoned as Conservation (or incorrectly excluded), with no clear public rationale
- The prohibition on rezoning within Conservation Zones, combined with poorly defined boundaries, was seen as a potential “vested rights” legal risk
- A conflict was identified between Section 4.1 (uses permitted in all zones) and the intent of the Conservation Zone, the current drafting could allow roads and parking lots in conservation areas
- Respondents called for clearer criteria governing when and how conservation controls would apply

4.4 PARKING REFORM & TRANSPORTATION

Parking was a consistent thread through many submissions, with strong support for reducing minimum requirements and linking parking policy to transit and active transportation.

Key points raised:

- Support for waiving parking minimums for affordable housing within 400 m of a bus stop, with some calls to extend the waiver to all residential units near transit
- Calls to eliminate parking minimums entirely in the downtown core and growth areas
- Recognition that parking reform must be paired with improved transit and cycling infrastructure to be effective

4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION & STORMWATER

Environmental submissions were among the most technically detailed in the engagement, led by the Charlottetown Area Watershed Association and supported by the City's GIS department and multiple online respondents.

Key points raised:

- The waterfront minimum building elevation (3.67 m CGVD28) applies only to the Waterfront Zone, not all low-lying areas vulnerable to storm surge, flagged as a significant gap given Charlottetown's flooding history
- The elevation reference should be updated from CGVD28 to CGVD2013
- Watercourse and wetland setbacks are considered too small relative to other PEI municipalities (e.g., Stratford's 60 m Environmental Reserve Zone)
- Stormwater policy should prioritize swales, ditches, and holding ponds over direct pipe discharge into waterways
- Section 7.11.2, which prohibits the City from accepting wetlands and buffers as parkland dedication, is seen as contrary to the City's own Climate Action Plan and Integrated Community Sustainability Plan

4.6 ZONING MAP CORRECTIONS

A number of specific mapping errors were identified through the engagement, including incorrectly zoned parcels, mislabelled areas, and legacy subdivision plans not yet reflected in the draft map.

Key points raised:

- Lands currently zoned Institutional should remain Institutional; the draft map showing RN and Conservation on some areas was identified as inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map
- Several properties having approved subdivision or concept plans that are not yet reflected in proposed zoning
- The Eastern Gateway Zone boundary raised concerns about leaving existing single-family properties in a zoning limbo that restricts additions and accessory suites.
- Growth Corridor Zone was requested to be extended to include the Killorn family property (PID 191718) on St. Peters Road, where land has been donated to the City

Response: The PID-specific corrections are being made. The Growth Corridor extension to include the Killorn lands is considered reasonable given the donation context. The Eastern Gateway Zone is being removed and zoning was applied to the lands based on the Eastern Gateway Land Use Master Plan. Internal detailed mapping comments are being worked through systematically.

4.7 DEFINITIONS, DRAFTING & TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Staff review sessions and several external submissions identified a number of drafting errors, outdated references, and definition gaps that require correction before adoption.

Key points raised:

- The Dwelling, Multi-Unit definition needs to be updated to include four units, and cross-references to

"apartment dwelling" (a removed definition) need to be replaced throughout

- The Child Care Facilities Act referenced in section 4.10 was repealed in 2010 and should be replaced with the Early Learning and Child Care Act
- The Lounge definition incorrectly references a control act from another jurisdiction
- Solar Collectors should be removed from Table 3.3 to avoid regulating solar panels
- Accessory building size limits in section 3.1 need a maximum cap to prevent an unintended calculation that would allow very large accessory structures on lots just under 0.5 acres
- Temporary poster signage is defined but not addressed in the signage regulations section
- The Cluster dwelling typology needs to be added to the RM zone permitted uses, with fire access provisions resolved

5.0 NEXT STEPS

Planning staff and the project team are working through the full set of comments in the revision cycle currently underway. The following items remain in progress and are expected to be resolved prior to the next Council review:

- Incorporation of provincial flood GIS data
- Review and strengthening of stormwater and wetland setback language
- Completion of zoning map corrections
- Refinement of the ADU lot size provisions
- Final reconciliation of all definition cross-references
- Resolution of fire access requirements for cluster housing typology

A revised draft incorporating all changes from this engagement cycle will be presented to Council for review prior to entering the adoption process.

6.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

City staff and the project team thank all participants for their time and care in reviewing the draft bylaw. The quality and depth of feedback received from technical professionals, environmental advocates, long-time residents, and engaged community members is directly strengthening the document. All submissions are on file and have been considered in the revision process.

CHARLOTTETOWN

City of Charlottetown Committee Report

Report No: PH-2026-06-07

Date:
June 11, 2026

Directed to Council through the following Committee:
Planning and Heritage Committee

Reporting Department:
Planning and Heritage

Other Associated Departments:
None

Prepared by:
Brad Vince, Planner II & Heritage Officer

Attachments:
- Historic Photos

Report Title:
Euston Street Irving Rehabilitation Project – Heritage Update

Report Purpose:
Provide an update on the remaining heritage value at 85 Euston Street (PID 355925 & 355917) to Planning and Heritage Committee. Including an explanation of why the redevelopment is classified as a heritage preservation project.

Staff Recommendation:
That Committee and Council accept this report for information purposes.

Report Details:
During the regular meeting of Council on May 12th Councillor Mitchell Tweel requested an update regarding the Euston Street Irving project in order to clarify the heritage value of the property/project.

Each designated heritage property has a description of the property history, heritage value associated with that property, and the specific character defining elements assigned to that property. These important heritage identifiers were established as part of the Canada's Historic Places registry, which is publicly accessible online. When any application is submitted on a designated heritage property, Heritage Officers review the application against the *Heritage Preservation Bylaw* and *The Standards and Guidelines for Historic Places in Canada*.

The *Heritage Preservation Bylaw* establishes the *Evaluation Criteria for Heritage Permits* in Section 5.1.1.:

In evaluating an application for a Heritage Permit involving a Building or Structure, the Heritage Officer, Heritage Board and/or Council shall review the compatibility of the proposed Development in relation to the original and/or existing Building or Structure, including the following:

a. *The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada,* as may be amended from time to time;
b. The original character, construction and architectural details;
c. The original or existing materials;
d. The scale of a proposed Development in relation to the scale and proportions of the original or existing Building or Structure;
e. The size and alignment of existing doors and windows;
f. The material and style of existing windows and doors, including details such as the casements, sashes, mullions, muntins, trims, and glazing;
g. The pitch, direction and arrangement of the roof and any associated chimney;
h. The significance of the accessory Building to the historic nature of the property and the original design elements of the accessory structure; and
i. Any other historical elements or architectural design considerations as deemed relevant by the Heritage Officer.

When reviewing applications against *The Standards and Guidelines for Historic Places in Canada* establish that one must first understand the heritage value and character defining elements.

> "An historic place's heritage value and character-defining elements are identified through formal recognition by an authority or by nomination to the Canadian Register of Historic Places. If this has not yet been done, the first essential step in any conservation project is to identify and describe the character-defining elements that are important in defining the overall heritage value of the historic place. The essence of these elements is captured in a Statement of Significance (SoS) or equivalent document." (p. 3)

A Statement of Significance (SOS) is a formal document that declares why a historic place, in our case, a designated heritage property, is important.

It acts as a link between the building's historical value and future conservation actions, and is typically broken down into three core sections:

- **Description of the Historic Place:** A brief snapshot of the property, including its location, style, physical form, and date of construction.
- **Heritage Value:** The core argument detailing why the site matters historically, architecturally, culturally, or socially.
- **Character-Defining Elements:** A specific list of the physical features or materials that must be preserved.

The City of Charlottetown Planning and Heritage Department has completed this process for all designated heritage properties in the city, which are available online on the Canada's Historic Places registry.

Further *The Standards and Guidelines for Historic Places in Canada* define Heritage Value and Character-defining Element as:

> **"Heritage Value:** the aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance or significance for past, present and future generations. The heritage value of an historic place is embodied in its character-defining materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings.
>
> **Character-defining Element:** the materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the heritage value of an historic place, which must be retained to preserve its heritage value." (p. 5)

The 85 Euston Street rehabilitation project is classified as a heritage preservation project as it is completing a major rehabilitation of a previously vacant designated heritage property that was left in a deteriorated condition. The rehabilitation of the vacant designated heritage resource is intended to return the existing structure to its original configuration with exterior cladding, roofing, windows, and doors to match the originals. The alternative to the work being completed now would have been eventual demolition of the property, which would result in a complete loss of the existing character defining elements of the property that are being maintained in this project.

85 Euston Street's character-defining elements include:

- The overall single storey massing of the building.
- The size, shape, and placement of the distinctive corner tower.
- The flat roof above the former service bays.
- The three lights illuminating the sign above the two bays.
- The size and placement of windows and doors, which will match the historical style and articulation as the original building.
- The decorative weathervane with the letter "N" atop the tower, which is being re-installed as part of this restoration.
- The decorative band running across the tower and the dormer painted to match the trim of the gable.
- The brick chimney.

The only element that is being lost is the three lights illuminating the sign above the two bays. It was determined in early conversations between heritage staff and the architects, that those lights were not original to the 1930's building. The new lights being added are complimentary to a 1952 version of the building shown in the attached photos.

The heritage value of 85 Euston Street lies in its role as the only remaining gas station of its type on Prince Edward Island and its association with Acadian architect, Samuel Roy. Mr. Roy designed dozens of these gas stations across Atlantic Canada and very few remain, either fallen to demolition or replacement. Few have opted to keep the buildings original single storey massing and restore the character defining elements as is being done with this building.

Regarding the addition, *the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* establish that the appropriate approach is to "conserve the heritage value and character defining elements when creating any new additions to a historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place." Which has been done in this project.

Property History
85 Euston Street is an excellent example of a typical Irving Oil "Tower" station. It is located on the corner of Euston Street and Queen Street. Its unique features include a corner tower, gable roof and attached two bay garage. The designation encompasses the building's exterior and parcel; it does not include the building's interior.

Heritage Value
The heritage value of 85 Euston Street lies in its role as the only remaining gas station of its type on Prince Edward Island and its association with Acadian architect, Samuel Roy.

85 Euston Street is an example of a small turreted gas station designed by Samuel Roy. He designed a limited number of these particular little gas stations for founder of Irving Oil and fellow Bouctouche, New Brunswick resident, Kenneth Colin Irving, in the 1930s. A number of Maritime cities and communities had them including Halifax, Bridgewater, and Truro in Nova Scotia and Sackville, New Brunswick but few examples remain. It is likely that this gas station was constructed in the early 1930s. It remained a popular filling station until 2008 when it closed. A rental car business now operates from the building. 85 Euston Street is the only gas station building of its type left standing on Prince Edward Island.

Traditionally, these stations were white with red trim, featured the Irving logo and contained two service bays, a gable roof and a distinctive corner tower. Influenced by the Queen Anne Revival or Chateauesque style, they were seen as a new type of station for a new kind of business. 85 Euston Street's structure has remained intact but the trim has been changed to green and the Irving logo is no longer visible. The pumps were removed in 2008.

Acadian architect, Samuel Roy began designing filling stations for KC Irving in 1931 and continued to do so until 1974. Roy was born in Sainte-Marie-de-Kent, New Brunswick on 8 May 1895. He completed his primary education in Bouctouche, New Brunswick and then went on to Boston, Massachusetts where he began to study architecture. Roy joined the Canadian Armed Forces in 1918, but returned to his studies, eventually going on to work with the Irving Oil Company designing stations as well as the Irving manor. He died in 1978.

Character-Defining Elements
The heritage value of 85 Euston Street is shown in the following character-defining elements:

- the overall single storey massing of the building.
- the size shape and placement of the distinctive corner tower.
- the gable roof with gable dormer.

- the two service bays with flat roof.
- the three lights illuminating the sign above the two bays.
- the size and placement of the windows.
- the style and placement of the doors.
- the decorative weathervane with the letter "N" atop the tower.
- the decorative band running across the tower and the dormer painted to match the trim of the gable.
- the brick chimney.

The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
https://www.historicplaces.ca/media/18072/81468-parks-s+g-eng-web2.pdf
General Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation and Restoration include:
1. *Conserve the heritage value of an historic place. Do not remove, replace or substantially alter its intact or repairable character defining elements.*

10. *Repair rather than replace character-defining elements. Where character-defining elements are too severely deteriorated to repair, and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials and detailing of sound versions of the same elements. Where there is insufficient physical evidence, make the form, material and detailing of the new elements compatible with the character of the historic place.*

11. *Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to an historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.*

12. *Create any new additions or related new construction so that the essential form and integrity of an historic place will not be impaired if the new work is removed in the future.*

Analysis & Conclusion:
The rehabilitation of the existing gas station is long overdue and will serve to conserve its historic prominence on this corner.

Given that the specific character-defining elements on this designated heritage resource are largely being retained or reflected in the renovations, it was staffs recommendation to Heritage Board to recommend to Council that the application for rehabilitation of, and a new addition to 85 Euston Street be approved.

The application that was reviewed and established a recommendation from Heritage Board on September 29, 2025, and gained approval from Council October 1, 2025, was successful because it aligned with the City of Charlottetown *Heritage Preservation Bylaw* and *The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* for rehabilitation of this designated heritage resource.

The character-defining elements of this property go beyond only the physical materials that once existed on the property, but apply directly to the location, special configuration, massing, form, and architectural design of the property. These elements are being rehabilitated to preserve the heritage value of this property and allow this heritage asset to be enjoyed for years to come.

Council or Committee History:
Heritage Board – September 29, 2025 – Exterior Renovations and New Addition at 85 Euston Street, PID #355917 & 355925
City of Charlottetown Resolution of Council – October 1, 2025

Financial Implications:
None.

Public Engagement and Communication:
None.

Legislative Authority:
City of Charlottetown Heritage Preservation Bylaw
The Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

Strategic Alignment:
Infrastructure and the Environment

Reviewed By:

Manager	**Director**
Original document signed by Donna Miller-Ayton	Original document signed by Michael Ruus

Committee Recommendation: (if differing from staff)

Attachments

Attachment A



Attachment B



Attachment C



Attachment D



City of Charlottetown Committee Report

Report No: PH-2026-06-08

Date: June 11, 2026

Directed to Council through the following Committee: Planning & Heritage Committee

Reporting Department: Planning & Heritage Department

Other Associated Departments: Public Works, Parks & Recreation, Economic Tourism & Cultural Development

Prepared by: Michael Ruus, Director of Integrated Growth

Attachments:

Report Title:
HAF Revenue/Expenditure Update

Report Purpose:
To update Committee and Council on the CMHC Housing Accelerator Fund Revenue and Expenditure Status

Staff Recommendation:
That Committee and Council receive for information purposes.

Background:
The Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) is a federal program administered by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) aimed at increasing housing supply by reducing restrictive zoning practices and accelerating development approvals. Under the program, municipalities receive funding in exchange for implementing ambitious housing action plans and achieving agreed-upon milestones.

The City of Charlottetown entered into a HAF Agreement with the federal government in January 2024, committing to an eight-initiative Housing Action Plan. This plan includes key reforms to enable higher-density housing across the city. In return, the City was originally allocated $10,059,000 in incentive funding, to be distributed in annual installments of $2,514,750.

In April 2026, the federal government announced a funding reduction of $1.26 million due to delays in implementing certain initiatives. Notably, delays were identified in Initiative 8, which focuses on removing exclusionary zoning and promoting higher-density development, including permitting four residential units as-of-right city-wide.

HAF Use of Funds:

The Housing Accelerator Fund allows for incentive funding to be used under four categories:

1. Investments in Housing Accelerator Fund Action Plans
2. Investments in Affordable Housing
3. Investments in Housing-Related Infrastructure
4. Investments in Community-Related Infrastructure that Supports Housing

At the June 11, 2024 Regular Meeting of Council, Council approved the HAF Implementation and Spending Plan, to be administered by the appropriate City departments. A summary of this plan, along with updated estimated spending as of April 2026, is provided below.

Proposed Uses	Year of Implementation	Estimated Spend	Estimated Spend (As of April, 2026)	Notes
Implement Official Plan & Zoning Bylaw	Years 1, 2 & 3	$550,000	$185,928	Completion 2026
Accessory Dwelling Unit Program	Years 1 & 2	$1,500,000	$116,603	Inclusive of pre-approved housing designs and incentive program
E-Permitting	Years 1 & 2	$350,000	$337,398	Completion 2026
Parking Strategy	Years 1 & 2	$300,000	$65,545	Public Works - Awaiting approval through Public Works Committee
Re-Development for Higher Density	Years 1 & 2	$200,000	$0	Implementation through Zoning & Development Bylaw
Flood Risk Mapping and Assessment		$200,000	$0	Implementation through Zoning & Development Bylaw
Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, & Reconciliation Strategy	Year 1	$100,000	$47,300	Economic, Tourism & Cultural Development - Completion 2026
City Positions to Support HAF Initiatives, Population Increase & Densification ✓Development Officer ✓Heritage Officer (Full-Time) ✓Digitization Technician ✓GIS Specialist ✓Building Inspector Level 2 ✓Fire Inspector ✓Municipal Engineer ✓Civil Technician	Years 1 & 2 & 3	$1,626,400	$174,968	Successful hiring Fire Inspector, Digitization Technician
Surplus Property Inventory & Analysis, GIS Collection	Years 2 & 3	$300,000	$0	Public Works - Work proceeding internally
Development Levy Program	Years 2 & 3	$110,000	$37,377	Public Works - Council resolution to pause work on bylaw
Transportation Master Plan	Years 2 & 3	$150,000	$0	Public Works - Completion 2027
Engineering Specifications and Standards		$300,000	$107,722	Public Works - Completion 2026
Open Space Master Plan	Years 1 & 2	$100,000	$0	Parks & Recreation - Completion 2027
Amendment/Update of the Heritage Preservation Bylaw	Years 1 & 2	$150,000	$81,750	Completion 2026
Investments in Community Related Infrastructure	Years 1, 2 & 3	$380,000	$0	
Strengthen Affordable Housing Incentive Program	Years 1, 2 & 3	$1,000,000	$0	Pending Zoning & Development Bylaw
Fund to Support HAF Initiatives	Years 1, 2 & 3	$2,742,600	$0	
Total		* **$10,059,000**	**$1,154,591**	

*** Original approved amount**

Council or Committee History:
N/A

Financial Implications:
Further spending of incentive funding under the program is contingent on contractual performance. As previously noted, CMHC and the federal government reserve the right to reduce funding further or terminate the agreement entirely if the City does not meet its obligations.

Current expenditures, in line with the approved spending plan, have primarily been directed toward short-term costs, such as consulting services required to fulfill contractual commitments under the HAF agreement. However, if the City fails to meet all requirements of the funding agreement, any remaining or future work will need to be either funded through the City's operating budget or discontinued.

Public Engagement and Communication:
None

Legislative Authority:

Strategic Alignment:
Community-Building and Placemaking
Governance and Civic Engagement
Inclusive Economic Growth
Infrastructure and the Environment

Reviewed By:

Manager	**Director**
	Original Documents Signed by Michael Ruus

Committee Recommendation: (if differing from staff)