

**SPECIAL COUNCIL  
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING  
APPROVED MINUTES**

**DATE:** September 17, 2025

**TIME:** 06:45 P.m.

**PLACE:** Council Chambers

**PRESENT:** Deputy Mayor Steve Gallant, Councillors; Jody Jackson, Ron Dowling, Jill Chandler, Gordie Cox, Jeff MacDonald (online), CAO Jeremy Crosby, Town Planner; Phil Rough, Community and Business Engagement Coordinator; Wendy Watts.

**REGRETS:** Nil

**CHAIR:** Mayor Steve Ogden

**1 CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Ogden called the meeting to order at 6:46 p.m.

We acknowledge the land upon which we gather is the unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq, and we pay our respects to the Indigenous Mi'kmaq People of this territory past, present, and future.

**2 APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was moved by Councillor Cox and seconded by Councillor Jackson that the agenda be approved as circulated.

**3 PLANNING DEVELOPMENT AND HERITAGE**

a) **Resolution PH048-2025 - SD004-25 – CMLMT Holdings Ltd - Cond. Use (8 Unit Stacked Townhouse)**

**Moved by Councillor Jeff MacDonald  
Seconded by Councillor Deputy Mayor Gallant**

**WHEREAS** an application has been received from Sean McGuire, owner of CMLMT Holdings Ltd., to construct an 8-unit Stacked Townhouse Dwelling on the south lot proposed under SD004-25. A “Stacked Townhouse Dwelling (of up to 12 dwelling units), up to 40% of a block” is a Conditional use within the Medium Density Residential (R2) zone.

**WHEREAS** pursuant to Section 11.3.3 of the Town of Stratford Zoning and Development Bylaw #45, prior to the issuance of a Development Permit for a Conditional Use, Council shall ensure that property owners that directly abut the subject property are notified in writing and asked to provide their comments.

**WHEREAS** on August 14, 2025, letters were sent out to the thirteen (13) abutting property owners seeking comments on the proposed conditional semi-detached dwelling uses. The deadline for comments was the end of day on August 29, 2025.

**WHEREAS** five (5) letters with comments and a signed petition (with 31 signatures) from residents, in opposition to the proposal, were submitted before the comment's deadline.

**BE IT RESOLVED** that Council Grant approval to application from CMLMT Holdings Ltd. to construct an 8-unit Stacked Townhouse Dwelling complex on the south lot proposed under SD004-25 subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance with the conceptual drawings submitted to the Town prepared by SableARC, dated August 22, 2025.
2. That a Development Agreement be executed between the Town and the Applicant subject to such terms and conditions as Council deems necessary.
3. A detailed servicing plan must be submitted for approval to the Stratford Utility Corporation.
4. A detailed stormwater management plan must be prepared by a qualified engineer and approved by both the Town of Stratford and DTI.
5. A detailed Erosion and Sedimentation plan must be prepared showing how erosion and sedimentation will be controlled and contained during construction.
6. The retaining wall, along the south lot line will require, along the top of the wall, a railing or a fence for safety purposes.
7. Once the building has been constructed a final grading plan must be submitted and approved by the Town of Stratford.
8. Prior to the issuance of the final occupancy permit, the Swallow Drive Extension Road must be deemed as public by the DTI
9. All other relevant provisions of the Town of Stratford Zoning and Development Bylaw #45 are met.

*This resolution bears the recommendation of the Planning & Heritage Committee as discussed at a meeting held on September 2, 2025, and an email poll conducted between September 5-10, 2025.*

**Discussion:**

Councillor MacDonald confirmed Town Planner; Phil Rough was present. Councillor MacDonald noted that the Planning Department had prepared a

summary of the proposed development, which was included in the agenda package. With Council's agreement, Mr. Rough was requested to present the findings, provide an overview of Planning Staff's recommendations, and outline the rationale behind them.

Mr. Rough provided an overview of the proposed development. He noted that the resolution dealt with the conditional uses on the south side of Swallow Drive. At the previous Council meeting, the subdivision of the two lots had been approved, one located north of Swallow and one south of Swallow. The current resolution pertained only to the development on the south lot.

Mr. Rough explained that the proposal was for a single building consisting of eight stacked townhouse units, arranged four units wide and two units high. As part of the subdivision and original concept, notification letters were sent to 13 adjacent landowners. In response, the Planning Department received five letters and a petition from nearby property owners.

**Concerns raised included:**

- Potential loss of green space from the subdivision and subsequent development;
- Loss of privacy due to the increased number of dwellings in proximity to existing properties;
- Potential negative impact on property values;
- Pedestrian safety due to the absence of sidewalks; and
- Reference to a similar proposal denied in 2023.

**In addressing these concerns, Mr. Rough reported that:**

- The Transportation Department reviewed the proposal and raised no issues regarding traffic or parking;
- No public green space or tree removal would occur on the south lot, as the property is privately owned;
- Research indicates that higher-density developments generally have no negative effect, and in some cases a positive effect, on property values. While some buyers may be less interested in lots adjacent to higher-density housing, actual values are not typically reduced;
- The proposal required 12 parking spaces for the eight units, and 15 spaces were included, exceeding the requirement.

Mr. Rough also reviewed the site plan and layout. He noted that the building would be positioned to reduce impact on surrounding properties, with a setback closer to existing roadways and tree buffers. The southern side of the lot would back onto a public park as part of the Grey Group Phase 3 development. He further reported that a retaining wall and appropriate fencing or barrier would be included as a safety measure along the curved section of the lot.

Mr. Rough concluded by noting that the proposed design was similar to developments at Woodhouse Court and was intended to minimize impacts on the neighborhood while meeting all zoning and planning requirements.

Councillor MacDonald reminded Council that a decision had been made the previous week to subdivide the properties in question, creating a north lot and a south lot. The initial proposal to the Planning Committee included 20 stacked townhouse units on the north lot and eight stacked townhouse units on the south lot. In response to concerns about the intensity of the proposed development, the developer withdrew the north lot proposal and agreed to proceed only with the south lot, which formed the basis of the Committee's recommendation before Council.

Councillor MacDonald acknowledged the concerns raised by residents and emphasized that Council must balance public input with the policies outlined in the Official Plan, the Zoning and Development Bylaw, and other guiding documents. He stated that while many concerns related to the loss of green space, the land is privately owned and intended for future development, and therefore the argument to preserve it solely as green space was not persuasive. He noted, however, that the character of the surrounding neighborhood was a significant factor. The area is a mature, well-defined neighborhood, and while the Official Plan strongly supports denser housing forms, infill development, and greater housing diversity, such objectives must be balanced against existing neighborhood character.

Councillor MacDonald expressed concern that eight units on a small lot represented relatively high density and that such densities are best suited for transit-friendly locations. In this case, the proposal would end in a cul-de-sac, which he observed is not typically compatible with higher density development. He further noted that the proposed infrastructure improvements would not provide a complete or comprehensive transit-supportive network. He also raised uncertainty about the future of the north lot, acknowledging that while it was not part of the current application, its potential development could further affect the character of the area.

In conclusion, Councillor MacDonald stated that, after weighing all factors, he could not support the proposed development. He emphasized that the defining character of the existing neighborhood was the overriding consideration in his decision.

Councillor Dowling stated that the proposal was not consistent with the character of the neighborhood, noting that while the area contains some mixed uses, surrounding development has generally been single-family homes, duplexes, and small multi-unit dwellings. He referenced the proposed Phase 3 of Kelly Heights,

which is anticipated to follow a similar pattern. He observed that while the south lot proposal was less intensive than the previously considered north lot, the Planning Committee had not fully discussed the eight-unit development on its own. Based on resident feedback and concerns with neighborhood compatibility, Councillor Dowling advised he could not support the proposal.

Deputy Mayor Gallant stated that he shared the concerns expressed by Councillors MacDonald and Dowling and acknowledged that residents had raised valid complaints. While noting that the developer has a strong track record, including the Woodhouse stacked townhouse project, he emphasized that this proposal raised different considerations. He observed that the property is zoned R2; while surrounding areas such as Kelly Heights are predominantly R1 with single-family and duplex dwellings. Introducing an eight-unit stacked townhouse would not be consistent with the existing neighborhood character.

The Deputy Mayor also highlighted concerns related to traffic, property values, and the perception of stacked townhouses as multi-unit buildings more suited to other areas. He noted the lack of connectivity to Swallow Drive as another limitation.

In conclusion, he stated that he could not support the proposal, as it was inconsistent with the zoning intent, neighborhood character, and resident expectations.

Councillor Chandler expressed concerns regarding the proposed development. She noted that over the years, residents of Swallow Drive have raised complaints about traffic and parking, including vehicles associated with local ball games. She cautioned that further densification could exacerbate these safety and quality-of-life concerns.

While a traffic study was not required for this proposal, she acknowledged that such studies typically confirm that roads can handle additional vehicle trips, but intersections and parking availability are often the limiting factors. She also noted that although the proposal provides the required parking, residents may have more vehicles than allotted, which could overflow onto surrounding streets.

Councillor Chandler observed that the cul-de-sac layout limits traffic flow but felt the proposed development was not consistent with the existing character of the neighborhood. Based on these considerations, she indicated that he was unlikely to support the proposal.

Councillor Cox stated that he generally supports new residential development, including stacked townhouses, in appropriate locations. However, he expressed concern that the cul-de-sac layout of the south lot could create congestion, particularly if residents exceed the provided parking allocations. While he

supports building and increasing housing options, he indicated that in this case, he agreed with the concerns raised by other councillors and was not in favor of the proposal.

Councillor Jackson, as the councillor for the area, acknowledged that he had received numerous concerns from residents. He agreed with some of the points raised by Mr. Rough and other councillors, noting that while some concerns were valid, others were less persuasive. He observed that the proposed development differed from the existing character of the neighborhood, which primarily consists of single-family and duplex dwellings.

Councillor Jackson stated that he generally supports stacked townhouses as a housing option and noted that green space and traffic were not significant issues in this proposal. He emphasized the importance of not allowing resident opposition alone to prevent development, noting that the town needs additional housing options.

However, he also acknowledged that the Planning Committee had not had an opportunity to fully discuss the south lot proposal and that, based on recent resident feedback and the departure from the established neighborhood pattern, he could not support the proposal in its current form. He expressed hope that an alternative development could be proposed that would better balance housing needs with neighborhood compatibility.

Councillor Cox added that while supportive of development and recognizing the value of stacked townhouses in appropriate locations, he struggled with this application. He referenced his past opposition to the Stratford Road Garden Homes, which ultimately proved to be a positive addition to the community and observed that they had not impacted his own property value when selling his home. While acknowledging concerns such as pedestrian safety and sidewalks exist throughout Stratford, he stated that at this time he could not support the proposal.

Councillor MacDonald acknowledged the difficulty of the decision and noted that, unlike the Woodhouse development which fit well at the end of a road, this proposal would be infilled into the middle of an established neighbourhood and was not consistent with its character. He emphasized that while the land is prime for development and some additional density could be appropriate, this particular configuration does not align with resident expectations or the intent of the Official Plan. He encouraged the developer to bring forward an alternative proposal.

Mayor Ogden acknowledged the thoughtful input from councillors and noted the difficulty of the decision. He emphasized that the proposal represents “missing middle” housing, providing options between single-family homes and apartments. He clarified that concerns about neighbourhood character are complex, citing

Bryer Court as an example of an area that initially faced issues but is now functioning well. He added that the project follows sound planning principles by providing buffers and separation, with opportunities for further screening. Parking provisions are close to two spaces per unit, and he stressed that this type of housing is needed. Mayor Ogden concluded by reiterating that while resident input is important, zoning decisions ultimately rest with Council.

Councillor MacDonald added that while he supports the concept of “missing middle” housing, it is not limited to stacked townhouses and could also include other forms such as single townhomes. He emphasized that both the Planning Committee and Council would welcome an alternative proposal that addresses the missing middle in a less dense form.

Mayor Ogden concluded by adding that many communities, including Charlottetown, successfully integrate different housing types and densities side by side. He reiterated his respect for Council’s views and appreciation for the work of planning staff and the developer, and echoed Councillor MacDonald’s hope that an alternative proposal can be brought forward.

Question: **DEFEATED**

**4 OTHER BUSINESS**

**Nil.**

**5 ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Ogden adjourned the meeting at 7:24 P.m.

---

X

CAO, Jeremy Crosby

---

X

Mayor, Steve Ogden