



ATTENDING

- Mayor Jodi MacKay
- Deputy Mayor Jennifer Ingham
- Councillor Mike Butler
- Councillor Wendy Elliott
- Councillor Ian Palmeter
- Councillor Howard Williams
- Chief Administrative Officer, Glenn Horne
- Recording Secretary, Laura Morrison

ALSO ATTENDING

- Director of Planning & Public Works, Devin Lake
- Senior Planner, Mark Fredericks
- Community Planner, Lindsay Slade
- Administrative Assistant, Laura Yaroshevskia
- Interested members of the public

REGRETS

- Councillor Kelly van Niekerk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Deputy Mayor Ingham, called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

Mayor MacKay read the Land Acknowledgement

Deputy Mayor passed the Chair to the Mayor

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
1. Approval of Agenda	THE AGENDA WAS APPROVED AS CIRCULATED.
2. Declarations of Conflicts of Interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No conflicts of interest declared
3. Public Input	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kevin Gildart, 292 Main Street developer. You will see a transformation in the next 30 to 45 days at 292. Building will have siding and living walls installed. It will take about 2 years for the walls to infill. This process has seen me be treated fairly by staff and council. The Town has competent planners who encouraged me to create living walls and courtyard space and should be thanked for that. Downtown density – it makes perfect sense in terms of surroundings and development economics. The fixed cost of elevators and security, whether for a 3 or 6 storey building, have to be absorbed. Downtown density helps with



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<p>traffic congestion and parking. People moving in are reducing vehicles from two family cars to one or one car to zero. Taking traffic off the street will be good for the merchants. There are three barrier free units in my building and all are subscribed, people with mobility challenges want to move downtown to enable independence. Density should be allowed downtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John MacKay, MacKay Realty - the Town has never looked prettier. Thank you.
4. Staff Reports for Discussion	
<p>a. RFD 053-2025: Housing Accelerator Fund Plan Review Implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director of Planning and Public Works and Jacob Ritchie from Fathom Studios, presented the pre-circulated report. • Acknowledgement of staff Lindsay Slade, Community Planner and Mark Fredericks, Senior Planner who have been involved heavily with this file. • Three separate zoning maps included in the package. Staff have done their best to respond to concerns re naming zones. • Will look at each zone, the changes being recommended and ask for feedback from council. <p><i>R1 Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) outside of the house. Any control over the aesthetics of the building would come under the design guidelines. No control under LUB (Land Use Bylaw) on the look of a building. • Environmental concerns around flooding. • ADU cannot be any more than 40% of the plot. There are storm water guidelines that require to be followed and this would be reviewed by staff when an application comes in. Would look at whether there is enough permeable land to soak up rainwater and snow. • Would like all main properties be owner occupied, meaning whoever owns the ADU must live in the main property. However, everyone has the right to rent their home. Those parameters can be in place at the beginning but if down the line they decided to rent it out, it's not something the Town would necessarily know about. It would only be looked at on a complaint basis.



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff to come back with example of what plots could look like with permeable coverage, maximum of 40% of footprint and up to maximum of 850ft². Include a garage. • Parking must be on the property not on street. • Only allowed where we have sidewalks to promote Active Transportation. • Pre-approved drawings of what an ADU could look like. County has put out two iterations to encourage people to build ADU's to their pre-approved plans. • What could an ADU above an already existing garage look like. • Size of ADU buffering is important, 3 metres/10ft is not enough, look at 12ft. • Outside line of ADU is appropriate for windows and not be looking into each others' backyards • Social impact concerns re water run off, buffering and outside lights. • Not in favour of limiting what people can do inside their homes, 1 or 2 bedroom is not an issue, the footprint is the main concern. • An ADU with a driveway has a lot more impermeable surface. • In the bylaw maximum amount of impervious surface allowed is 50%. Important note when writing bylaw, these controls stack on top of one another. The 40% isn't a given if you exceed lot coverage. Are not allowed to build driveway within 3 metres of buffer. Operating standards apply to all residential, mixed use and downtown lots. • Newer set of stormwater guidelines built into this. • Building code will set standards of accessibility upgrades, new building codes coming in now. Not covered in bylaw. Every building has to meet the building code. • If building an outside ADU, most of the storm water and sewage would have to go out to the street. The cost is \$6,500 to tie into existing sewer line. • Housing NS properties in Dale/Sherwood - no issues with change from R1 to R2. <p>R2 Discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As of right conditions 1-4 units and unique and site-specific cluster housing. Proposed change to LUB is if we cannot set up the conditions that are clear by site plan approval or as of right and it is still in spirit of what the zone is meant to do, we would bring to council under unique and site specific. It would still have to meet the intent of that



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<p>zone and MPS policies. Cluster housing is a hold over from previous plan and is a group of small dwellings in one lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move from 1-3 units to 1-4 units e.g. a triplex. Currently a lot of single-family units currently in R2. You could build ADU inside and one outside but similar parameters to R1 would be put in. All same parameters need to be discussed for all the zones such as permeability, water run off, outside lights and buffering and will be clearly articulated. • Short term rental in this zone and if you had two you can short term rental both. • You might build from scratch so you could build a 3-unit total on a property. • Same variables for R2 to come back. • Currently can convert to three units. Nova Scotia additive architecture is most likely. The bylaw now allows people rights to do things on their property. Doesn't necessarily mean there will be a rush of people to start building. • If you can build 2 ADU's that are short term rentals each with 2 bedrooms, seems a lot. Would like to see what that looks like because there would still have to be buffering. • Bylaw does not allow more than one main building on a lot and don't believe more than 2 ADUs are allowed, above garage could be allowed. Want to rule out certain circumstances for very large properties. Staff will bring this back. • Two spots for re consideration from R2 to R1 in the map. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Balcom is R2 currently to R1 only difference is short term rental. Not sure there are any there, as most are single homes. – Top of Westwood large lots with beautiful stately family homes. Flanks onto university. Could be someone is already doing short term rentals, don't want to take away their income. Could you grandfather in anyone doing it now. – Staff will look at legal implications of down zoning and bring back the information including a legal opinion. – When limited to single unit, they can be bought out and all the bedrooms being rented out. – R2 has cluster units allows 3 units instead of 2 units. The Development Agreement, council and public do have discretion on aesthetics. – In R1 we don't accept DA's for anything. In R2 we would look at it.



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consider that in R1 none of these properties would have the ability to re-zone. – Staff will look at all of this and bring back information. <p>R3 Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oak Ave is now all R3. Looking at transitions of zones. We do have a larger R4 property. • Will leave properties on Oak Ave as R2 if fully built out. • Larger properties on North side of Main St down to the Downtown could be R3. • Larger ones on South side of Main St if stayed R2 could be a good place for cluster housing as opposed to being an R3 apartment building. • Staff will look at that. • Not proposing to use Unit Per Acre on R3, looking at lot size and using all the other parameters as previously discussed. 50% of lot can be covered in a building and can go 3 storeys. • Very large lots with road frontage could be subdivided with 50 units on each. Servicing can handle it and will change the fabric of the lot. • R3 in Hillcrest Extension and Jessie Jaggard is under a development agreement and can do four units. R3 was logical next step to deal with this area. Developer who is working on four units had desire to do a 5- or 6-unit townhome. No issues on this. • Portion of Willowbank Cemetery being rezoned at Gaspereau – no issues. • Corner of Whidden and Main St, there is a desire to do a hotel – 6 or 8 unit hotel, staff will bring something back, seems a small lot. <p>R4 – Medium Density Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In southeast area next to Reservoir Park there is a Spring Peeper pond. Desire to see the pond remain or be incorporated into Reservoir Park. It's a dead-end street with a daycare and no sidewalks. Could fall under unique and site-specific bylaw. Will define process in LUB to bring those to council and it is clear it is consistent with Municipal Plan and what the zone is trying to do. Desire to leave as R3 now. There is driveway access to Pleasant. Anything above 16 units could have some negotiating power to protect the pond. • Leave R4 status quo for now. Will be brought back with full draft with zoning requirements.



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<p><i>R5 Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only change was removal of the R4 lot with the pond that was just discussed. <p><i>Mixed Use (MU) Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roselawn properties, there is an R3 in amongst the mixed use not sure what that is. MU's are mostly hotels or Inns that are presently here. In East End there is a 4 storey, but rest are 3 storeys. Proposal is 3 storeys by Site Plan with 4th storey by DA. Downtown is different from MU. Wolfville Elms could be 4 storeys now. This is the property the petition was received for. Must be enhanced buffering for new construction and renovations and consideration of the social impact on your neighbours. If that is site plan and MU then the most that can be on that property is 60 units. A 120-bed long term or nursing home cannot be built there. Provincial definitions are evolving – staff will clarify those definitions. Is a unit different to a bedroom. For the property owners who back onto that strip, there is an opportunity for them to propose a purchase of that land. Even it does remain R2, someone can use their land for different things. Accessory use for parking on this site is within the realms of possibility. We can bring back conditions but there is a lot of variety in the MU zone. Multiple-year expansion of Tattingstone which also has neighbours on each side and a heritage overlay. Done well. CAO put on the public record that his personal property abuts the land being discussed even though no conflict of interest as no decision being made and CAO would not be participating in any vote. Whidden/Main is R3 and can do 8 units now. More information to come back. <p><i>DT (Downtown) discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of boundary of downtown as not a lot of commercial properties currently. Baptist church is zoned downtown. Heard from both sides where people who have single family homes on Gaspereau don't want downtown to go further south than Acadia Street and others who want the option to do something more with their property than they currently are able to.



Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like more information on what DT allows for and then we can see if they agree or disagree with the proposed boundary change. • New properties would place an overlay with conditions. They would not have same rights as main street and front street properties. • Heritage properties would have a separate process if registered which we have in place now. • Clarifying question, Subway property is owned by Acadia and is zoned DT so would be limited to the agreed storeys. <p><i>Neighbourhood Commercial Use Discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some type of limited commercial uses in these zones, beyond home-based business such as day cares, laundromats, home based business acceptable on R2. Laundromats and café in R2 only on main corridors. • Glad to see those commercial zones are above sea level. <p><i>Final thoughts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council would like to be walked through the background information on the rail line and waterfront Area. • Follow up from staff will bring back to Town Council meeting on December 16.
5. Regular Meeting Adjourned	REGULAR MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:24pm.

Approved by Committee of the Whole meeting of January 13, 2026
 As recorded by Laura Morrison, Town Clerk & Manager of Administration