



**TOWN OF KENTVILLE**  
**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Meeting Minutes: April 22, 2026**  
Town Hall, 354 Main Street, Kentville Nova Scotia

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

This meeting was held in Council Chambers and was called to order by Andrew, moved by Ziolkowski and seconded by Maxwell at 5:05 pm.

**PRESENT**

Councillor Cathy Maxwell, Councillor John Andrew, Jakub Ziolkowski, and Carol Goodwin.

Staff Representatives: Recording Secretary Ben Croll, Director of Planning & Development Darren Shupe, Mayor Zebian, and Acting Chief Administrative Officer Dave Bell.

**REGRETS**

Councillor Cate Savage

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Approval of the agenda moved

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Approval of the minutes moved

**NEW BUSINESS**

- (a) **Home-Based Business - Text Amendments to LUB**

Shupe provided a presentation regarding a LUB text amendment regarding HBBs. The proposal is to allow HBB to conduct one-on-one classes to up to 8 people.

Andrew read the recommended motion which including moving option 2. Moved by Maxwell and seconded by Zebian.

This begun the discussion:

- Maxwell mentions there is too big of a discrepancy between the required 2 parking stalls, but up to 8 students. Maxwell recommends that any required parking above 2 must be provided by the business owner.
- Goodwin mentions that there is already sufficient on-street parking. If it is a more traffic heavy area, then there should be "no parking" signs installed on the street.
- Bell, as Traffic Authority, is not concerned about any excess on-street parking and supports the recommended motion.
- Ziolkowski brought up snow clearing or winter condition bans. Bell says that is for overnight parking and should not affect HBBs.
- Zebian mentions that it is not just a one-time situation. Some HBBs may have up to 8 students all day long. He then recommends option 3.
- After further discussion, option 3 became the preferred choice and recommended by all members.

The amendment was moved to adopt option 3 instead of option 2 by Maxwell and seconded by Zebian.

### **(b) Concurrent Construction - Text Amendments to MPS and LUB**

Shupe provided a presentation regarding the MPS and LUB amendments regarding concurrent construction. The proposal is to allow the construction of Non-Occupied Dwellings before Final Subdivision has been granted.

Andrew read the recommendation. Moved by Zebian and seconded by Goodwin.

This begun the discussion:

- Goodwin inquired as to which zones the proposed amendments would apply. Croll advised that the amendments would be limited to specific residential zones and provided a review of the zoning map.
- Andrew questioned the potential risks to the Town and the extent to which such developments could become problematic. Shupe and Croll clarified that the associated risks would rest solely with the developer.

The motion was put to a vote and carried unanimously.

### **(c) Program-Based Housing - Text Amendments to MPS and LUB**

Shupe provided a presentation regarding the MPS and LUB amendments regarding Program-Based Housing (PBH).

Andrew read the recommendation. It was moved by Zebian and seconded by Goodwin.

This began the discussion:

- Maxwell expressed concerns regarding the placement of PBH within residential zones, particularly the R3 Zone, noting it is predominantly occupied by young families with children. She indicated that permitting up to eight rooms without sufficient controls could create negative impacts in the area and recommended strengthening the definition.
- PAC engaged in broader discussion regarding the regulation of people and families vs land use, and the extent of the Town's jurisdiction.
- Goodwin inquired about the origin of the PBH definition. Shupe confirmed the definition was developed internally. Goodwin recommended revising the language by replacing the first "may" with "must" to strengthen the provisions.
- Zebian noted there appeared to be significant overlap between the definitions of PBH and Emergency Shelters, questioning the distinction between the two uses. He further asked, "If not in the R3 Zone, then where?"
- Maxwell disagreed that there was overlap between the definitions and provided clarification. Goodwin expressed agreement with Maxwell's position.
- Zebian added that operational and management standards would ultimately be the determining factor in the success of such uses.
- Maxwell stated that if children in the R3 Zone are to be exposed to PBH, then consistency should be applied across all residential zones. She emphasized that families in the R3 Zone should not be discriminated against.
- Andrew agreed with the need for fairness but noted that PBH must be subject to some form of control. He acknowledged that no option would be without challenge and that the current recommendation could face opposition if moved forward.
- Maxwell suggested that the Town consider acquiring property to establish a dedicated zone for PBH.
- The discussion shifted to Emergency Shelters, with Zebian suggesting that PBH and Emergency Shelters be considered as separate amendments.
- Andrew recommended consulting with the Mayor of Berwick, noting similar challenges in that municipality. He emphasized that outcomes depend significantly on management and support systems and requested that the report be referred back to Town staff for further refinement.
- Zebian noted that staff have been working on the matter for several months and indicated that the file has reached a point where limited additional refinement is possible. He stated the options were to either abandon the proposal or proceed.

- It was acknowledged that proceeding may not be well received; however, a location for such uses must be identified. Advancing the matter would allow for public input, which could assist PAC in further deliberations.

The motion was put to a vote and was carried with 4 in favour and 1 opposed.

**(d) Heritage Bylaw - Review of Amendments and Process**

Shupe provided a presentation regarding the amendments and current process regarding the Heritage Bylaw. Shupe asked if any members of PAC had any questions:

- Maxwell wanted to confirm that the registry for the Town of Kentville and not Provincial, which it is.

Andrew read the motion and it was approved by Maxwell and seconded by Goodwin.

This begun the discussion:

- No discussion was made

The motion was put to a vote and carried unanimously.

**(e) Plan Review - Provincial Statements of Interest - Housing**

Shupe provided an overview of the Plan Review process, including what to expect in future meetings, timelines, objectives, and the role of PAC in supporting the Plan Review. He then commenced the presentation on the current focus area of the Plan Review, being housing.

Prior to reviewing the mapping materials, Shupe asked whether the Committee supported the general direction of the review and whether housing should remain the primary focus. This led to a broader discussion regarding planning considerations related to future growth and development.

Committee members raised the following comments and questions:

- Andrew asked whether parkland and green space would be considered as part of future housing growth to ensure adequate recreational and open space for new residents.

- Goodwin inquired whether environmental constraints, specifically floodways, had been considered in the preparation of the maps.

- Andrew asked whether expropriation could be considered, where appropriate, to ensure adequate servicing for growth areas, including sewer, water, as well as social and health services.

- Maxwell inquired whether residential zoning could be revised to encourage mixed-use development, higher densities, and a greater range of housing options.
- Andrew requested that existing industrial lands be maintained and not converted to residential uses. Maxwell agreed.
- Maxwell suggested that zoning changes should be focused primarily on undeveloped lands, while developed areas should remain unchanged.
- Andrew asked Shupe to share his vision for future growth, specifically regarding the role of Donald E. Hiltz Connector Road. Shupe advised that he believes Donald E. Hiltz will play a significant role in future growth and could ideally function as a second main street through the Town. This resulted in further discussion regarding potential connections, traffic flows, and surrounding development opportunities associated with the future arterial road.

Following discussion, it was agreed that the map would be referred back to staff for further review. Staff will return at the next meeting with proposed growth areas and a preliminary vision for housing development to provide the Committee with a stronger foundation for continued discussion.

#### **NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting is scheduled for May 13, 2026 at 4pm.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 7:16 pm

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

