CHARLOTTETOWN

PLANNING & HERITAGE COMMITTEE AGENDA
NOTICE OF MEETING

Wednesday, October 7, 2026 @ 3:30pm
City 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 Wednesday, October 7, 2026
4. **Adoption of Minutes** - Minutes of Planning & Heritage Committee Meeting from Tuesday, September 1, 2026
5. **Business arising from Minutes**
6. **Reports or Discussions:**
    a) Funding Allocation Request – Land Management (LAMA) Software Maintenance Agreement
7. **Introduction of New Business**
8. **Adjournment**

PLANNING & HERITAGE: COMMITTEE MINUTES
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 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** **Councillor Norman Beck**	**Councillor Julie McCabe**
Also:	**Michael Ruus, Director, Int. Growth** **Laurel Palmer, PIII** **Sebastian Hall, PIII**	**Jason Doucette, IO/AA*** **Minute taker*
Regrets:	**Brad MacConnell, CAO** **Mayor Philip Brown** **Donna Miller-Ayton, Mgr, Policy & Heritage** **Natalie Munn, Heritage Officer**	

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair Jankov called the meeting to order at 3:39 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, September 1, 2026, be approved.

   CARRIED
   (2-0)

4. **Adoption of Minutes**
   Moved by Councillor Beck and seconded by Councillor McCabe that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, July 29, 2026 as circulated, be approved.

   CARRIED
   (2-0)

5. **Business arising from Minutes**

A Committee member recalled the previous CMHC presentation and questioned whether the additional information that had been discussed at that meeting had been circulated to Council.

Reference was made to the July 29 meeting and the expectation that presentation materials or supporting information would be provided to members of Council.

Staff advised that an executive summary prepared by CMHC had been included in a previous Council package and had been discussed during the August Regular Council meeting.

Discussion followed regarding whether the complete report had also been distributed and it was asked whether the report had been uploaded to Council members' OneDrive accounts or otherwise distributed beyond the executive summary.

Staff confirmed that only the executive summary prepared by CMHC had been included in the Council package. Staff advised that if Committee or Council wished to receive additional information, a request could be made to obtain and circulate it.

Committee members noted that they had hoped CMHC would provide further information focused specifically on Charlottetown and local housing conditions. It was recalled that CMHC had indicated they would review the matter further and provide more targeted information for staff, Committee and Council consideration.

Staff agreed to follow up on the request and determine whether additional Charlottetown-specific information could be obtained from CMHC and shared with Council in the future.

6. Reports:

a) Patio Bylaw - What We Heard Report

Summary:

Michael Russ advised that the report was located on page 11 of the digital package and noted that the complete "What We Heard Report", along with supplementary survey results provided by Downtown Charlottetown Inc. (DCI), had been included for Committee and Council consideration.

Michael explained that the intent of the bylaw project was regulatory modernization, including transferring administration and oversight of patio permits to the Planning and Heritage Department and streamlining licensing and permitting processes to provide greater clarity and consistency in the interpretation and administration of patio regulations.

It was noted that public engagement was conducted on February 5 and February 24, 2026, and included a public information and stakeholder session, opportunities for written and verbal feedback, use of the Charlottetown Hall platform, and a survey undertaken by Downtown Charlottetown Inc. Additional discussions were also held with DCI to clarify feedback and identify operational concerns experienced during the current operating season.

DCI reported that its survey received 84 responses representing restaurants, retailers, service providers, entertainment operators and other downtown businesses.

Staff stated that participants generally expressed strong support for patios as a way of activating and animating the downtown core. Feedback indicated that patios contribute positively to tourism, pedestrian activity, economic development and the overall attractiveness of downtown Charlottetown.

Parking impacts were identified as a common concern. Businesses expressed concerns regarding the conversion of on-street parking spaces to patio use and the potential effects on customer access and business operations.

Questions and concerns were also raised regarding noise and neighbourhood impacts, including late-night noise, outdoor entertainment and effects on nearby residents and businesses.

Staff noted that these matters had previously been discussed at Committee and Council, including consideration of the permanent 1:00 a.m. closing time for Victoria Row, for which there had generally been public support.

Accessibility and safety were identified as key priorities and feedback emphasized the importance of ensuring that patios are accessible for individuals of all ages and abilities.

Staff noted that recent discussions had highlighted the need for patio design standards and consistent enforcement. Stakeholders expressed interest in establishing minimum expectations regarding materials, appearance and overall patio design while maintaining flexibility for operators.

Operational consistency was also identified as a recurring theme. Participants wanted patio requirements to be clearly articulated, consistently applied and for operators to make consistent use of approved patio spaces throughout the operating season.

Regarding next steps, staff advised that stakeholder and public feedback would be incorporated into a final draft of the Patio Bylaw. Staff would also evaluate opportunities to strengthen provisions related to patio size, parking space allocation, seasonal operations and permit holder expectations.

Staff further advised that a suggestion from DCI to develop a Patio Design and Operations Guide was appreciated and would be explored as a means of providing additional information and guidance to patio operators.

Once revisions are complete, the bylaw will undergo final review by senior management and the City Solicitor before proceeding to Committee and Council for consideration of bylaw readings.

Discussion:

It was asked why the report focused on transitioning from the COVID-19 Patio Program when many of the patios currently operating are located on City-owned property through the Street Vendors Bylaw. Staff explained that the intent is to create a single, comprehensive Patio Bylaw that incorporates both existing frameworks and applies consistent administration and oversight to all patio operations.

It was also asked whether the same rules would apply to patios located on private property and those occupying public parking spaces. Staff advised that the goal is to establish one overall framework, although some matters relating to parking requirements and zoning regulations are still being reviewed as part of related policy work.

Discussion took place regarding parking spaces that have been converted to patio use. Staff noted that the program originally involved approximately 23 to 24 spaces and has expanded over time to approximately 46 to 48 spaces. Staff further advised that consultation feedback demonstrated

support for maintaining some form of cap on patio-related parking space conversions to help preserve parking availability in the downtown core.

It was asked how businesses that converted their own private parking spaces into patios during the COVID-19 program would be treated under the proposed bylaw. Staff acknowledged the concern and advised that options are currently being reviewed through a jurisdictional scan and would be brought forward for Committee and Council consideration.

Further discussion occurred regarding potential fees and whether charges would apply equally to patios located on private property and those occupying City-owned parking spaces. Staff advised that this matter remains under review and noted that recommendations from the Parking Strategy, together with practices in other municipalities, will help inform future recommendations.

Questions were raised regarding the impact of new patio design standards on existing operators who have invested significant resources in constructing their current patios. Staff advised that operators had previously been informed that current encroachment agreements would expire at the end of the season and that all aspects of the patio program, including design standards, could be reconsidered through the new bylaw process.

It was noted that no commitment had been made to grandfather existing patio structures. However, staff acknowledged the investments already made by operators and indicated that practical considerations would be taken into account when developing future standards.

Discussion also focused on the intent of future design standards. Staff advised that the objective is to establish minimum expectations for patio appearance, materials and functionality while still allowing operators flexibility to reflect their individual branding and business identity.

Questions were asked about comments supporting increased pedestrian activity in the downtown core and whether this reflected support for expanded pedestrian-only areas. Staff clarified that the feedback generally reflected support for improving pedestrian environments and did not necessarily indicate support for full street closures. Improvements could include streetscape enhancements, lighting, active transportation infrastructure and other pedestrian-focused initiatives.

It was also discussed whether patios should continue to be associated primarily with food and beverage establishments. Staff advised that patio approvals have historically been tied to licensed establishments and that public feedback generally supported maintaining that approach.
In closing, Committee discussed next steps in the process. Staff advised that public and stakeholder feedback will be incorporated into a revised draft bylaw and accompanying report, which will return to Committee and Council for further consideration and direction.

b) 68 Queen Street - (PID#s 336982, 336974, 336909, 336917, 336966 and 1172915), request for approval of Public Benefit in exchange for Bonus Height.

Summary:

Laurel advised that the public benefit package had been proposed by the developer and the architect on the developer's behalf. Staff explained that the proposal relates to the creation of an active public alleyway intended for public use and includes space for public art, murals and seasonal food vendors. The proposal would also provide pedestrian access from businesses located on Queen Street into the public alleyway.

Staff noted that the request for bonus height had previously been reviewed by the Design Review process and was supported by the Design Reviewer. When the application was presented to Planning Board, Board members were advised that approval of the public benefit component would be required before the bonus height request could be finalized.

Staff explained that the public benefit contribution is determined through a formula established in the Zoning and Development Bylaw. The calculation identifies the monetary value required for the public benefit component of a bonus height application. In this case, the required contribution was calculated at approximately $94,376.

Staff further advised that the value of the required public benefit is based on a set rate established by Council resolution and calculated using the gross floor area located above the pre-bonus height. Staff noted that Council approved the current rate on February 12, 2018, at $4 per 0.1 square metres, or approximately one square foot, and that the rate has not changed since that time.

Staff outlined the developer's proposed public benefit package, which has an estimated value of approximately $125,000 plus HST. The proposal includes pedestrian paving and walkway improvements between King Street and Dorchester Street estimated at approximately $85,000, exterior lighting valued at approximately $15,000, public benches estimated at $6,000, planter boxes and climbing ivy lattice features valued at approximately $3,500, a public art mural valued at approximately $10,000, and services for seasonal food vendors estimated at approximately $5,500.

Staff advised that the total value of the proposed improvements exceeds the minimum public benefit contribution required under the formula. Staff indicated that, should Committee support the proposal, the recommendation would be forwarded to the Chief Executive Officer and the Mayor for final approval.

It was noted that the public benefit approval process does not proceed to Council for final approval and is instead finalized administratively through the CEO's Office.

Staff concluded by advising that approval of the proposed public benefit package was being recommended and invited questions from Committee members.

Discussion:

Committee members sought clarification regarding whether the public benefit proposal required a formal vote or recommendation to Council, or whether the item was being presented for information purposes only.

Staff advised that the Committee's position on the proposal would be taken forward as a recommendation to the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer. A member questioned whether Committee had the authority to support a proposal directly, noting that Committee recommendations typically proceed to Council for consideration.

Staff explained that the process for public benefits associated with bonus height applications differs from the normal Council approval process. Under the applicable bylaw, the matter proceeds directly to the Mayor and CEO rather than to Council.

Committee discussed how the process compares to Design Review matters, noting that certain planning-related decisions do not proceed to Council unless there is a discrepancy or issue requiring further consideration. It was agreed that the current application appears to follow a similar approval framework.

Questions were also raised regarding the proposed public art component. Committee members asked whether artwork and murals included within the public benefit package would require review by another body, such as the Arts Advisory Committee. Staff indicated that any artwork would likely be subject to a separate review process through the appropriate committee, and that the current discussion was limited to consideration of the public benefit proposal itself.

It was noted that the Committee was being asked to indicate whether it supported the proposed public benefit in exchange for the approved bonus height component of the development. Members acknowledged that Council had previously approved the development subject to the public benefit requirements being satisfied.

Committee members asked whether approval of the public benefit and the encroachment request were the final items required before the project could proceed. Staff advised that the encroachment application would be considered by Planning Board later the same day and that these were the primary remaining approvals needed before a development permit could be issued.

Staff further noted that a development agreement would still need to be signed and that the approved public benefit package would be incorporated into the agreement before finalization.
Following discussion, Committee members indicated their support for moving the public benefit proposal forward to the Chief Executive Officer and Mayor for final consideration in accordance with the approval process established under the bylaw.

MOTION:

Moved by Councillor Beck and seconded by Councillor McCabe that Planning & Heritage Committee accept the proposal from the developer (Quentin Bevan, Weymouth Properties Ltd.) to construct and incorporate an active alleyway for public art and murals within their building at 68 Queen Street (PID #336982, 336974, 336909, 336917, 336966 and 1172915) as their public benefit requirement for two (2) additional storeys containing approximately 11,797 sq ft. (1,096 m2). of floor area per storey.

CARRIED
(2-0)

7. Introduction of New Business

There was no new business

8. Adjournment of Public Session

Moved by Councillor Beck and seconded by Councillor McCabe that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 PM.

CARRIED
(2-0)

_____
Deputy Mayor Alanna Jankov, Chair

City of Charlottetown Committee Report

Report no. PH-2026-10-07

Date: October 7, 2026

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

Attachments:

- LAMA Invoice

Reporting Department:
Planning and Heritage Department

Other Associated Departments:

Prepared by: David Gundrum – Manager of Development

Report Title:
Funding Allocation Request – Land Management (LAMA) Software Maintenance Agreement

Report Purpose:
To request that the Finance Committee recommend that Council approve the additional funding required to cover costs related to renewal of annual Maintenance Agreement (Annual Software Assurance and Support) related to the Land Management (LAMA) software Permit system, as recommended by the Planning and Heritage Committee.

Staff Recommendation:
That the Finance Committee recommend that Council approve the submitted request and the allocation of $45,946.22, plus HST, from existing budget lines to fund the annual renewal of the Maintenance Agreement related to the Land Management (LAMA) software Permit system.

Report Details:

In 2022, the City of Charlottetown implemented an electronic Building & Development Permit system known as LAMA which involves annual subscription and maintenance fees.

To ensure continued client support for the system for the remainder of the calendar year and until the City's new successor electronic Permit system by ESRI is implemented, the Planning & Heritage Department is requesting that funds in the amount of $45,946.22, plus HST, are transferred to the appropriate Budget line item to ensure that an existing invoice can be paid.

It is recommended that the Planning & Heritage Committee recommend that the request be forwarded to the Finance Committee for consideration and approval before proceeding to Council, in accordance with the City's established operating procedures.

The proposed costs will be accommodated through reallocation of existing funding within the Planning and Heritage Department's operating budget.

Council or Committee History:
n/a

Financial Implications:
This cost will be funded through the Planning and Heritage Department's annual operating budget.

Public Engagement and Communication:
n/a

Legislative Authority:
Municipal Government Act

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

Reviewed By:

Manager	**Director**
Original document signed by David Gundrum	Original document signed by Michael Ruus

Committee Recommendation: (if differing from staff)

INVOICE

City of Charlottetown
PO Box 98
199 Queen St
CHARLOTTETOWN PE C1A 1M9
CA

Invoice Date
Oct 15, 2025

Invoice Number
25B12-PECH

The Davenport Group
102 S Tejon St, Ste 870
Colorado Springs, CO
80903

Description		Amount CAD
2025-2026 Annual Software Assurance and Support (Dec 1)		36,401.33
2025-2026 User CALs (11 @ $750)		8,250.00
2025-2026 CPI-U Adjustment (Aug) 2.9%		1,294.89
	INCLUDES TAX	0.00
	TOTAL CAD	**45,946.22**

Due Date: Nov 30, 2025

We would like to thank you for your continued support of our company and the LAMA software! The annual subscription includes software updates, hosting fees, and support per the Terms of the Agreement. This renewal term starts on the day after the Due Date above and is valid for the specified term. A 1% monthly late fee shall be applied to your account balance if payment is not received within 30 days the Due Date. Related services shall be suspended if payment is not received within 60 days after the Due Date. Please email accounts@davengis.net with any questions or concerns.

PAYMENT ADVICE

To: The Davenport Group
102 S Tejon St, Ste 870
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Customer	City of Charlottetown
Invoice Number	25B12-PECH
Amount Due	**45,946.22**
Due Date	Nov 30, 2025
Amount Enclosed	

Enter the amount you are paying above

City of Charlottetown

Transfer of Budget Funds Form

Department:

Date: October 7, 2026

TRANSFER FROM			TRANSFER TO			REASON
Amount	Account No.	Account Name	Amount	Account No.	Account Name	
$45,946	010-6100-50010-0000	Planning Wages-Permanent Non Union	$45,946	010-6100-56721-0000	Computer Tech Services	To faciliate transfer of funds to Planning & Heritage Department related to LAMA Annual Maintenance Agreement fees.
$ 45,946.22			$ 45,946.22			

Original signed by David Gundrum

Manager

Original Signed by Michael Ruus

Director

Finance department may affect budget transfers of less than $10,000 within a department upon written request authorized by the department manager and her/his director.

All other transfer requests shall be advanced to the Finance department authorized by the manager of the department from which funds are requested to be transferred. Such transfer requests will be advanced to the Finance Committee for consideration.