



Public Information Meeting

1. Proposed Subdivision Bylaw Amendments - Stormwater Management Plans
2. Proposed Amendments to Bylaw P-1200, Lot Grading and Drainage

May 5 2025
Kennetcook Fire Hall

ATTENDANCE

Staff:

John Woodford, Director of Planning and Development
Debbie Uloth, Community Planner II
Derek Normanton, Senior Project Engineer
Logan Blanchard, Project Engineer
Hannah Grosvenor, Administrative Assistant

Members of the Public:

12 members, including 3 councillors: Councillor Hebb, Councillor Rhyno, Warden Roulston

AGENDA

1.	Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.
	The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by John Woodford, beginning with a land acknowledgement.
2.	Subdivision Bylaw Amendments - Stormwater Management Plans - Debbie Uloth
	Debbie Uloth presented.
3.	Questions from the Public
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A resident questioned why this would be a requirement in rural areas instead of those currently serviced. The individual also noted that each area would need



	<p>different systems, and that any issues with stormwater management on lots without requirements would be a civil matter, not a municipal matter. Staff said council had been getting complaints and would like to make regulations consistent. Staff would also like to be proactive instead of reactive to these needs and complaints, creating regulations that would assist landowners, road owners, and the municipality while providing documentation should civil matters arise. Staff also noted that regulations hold developments and developers accountable, allowing the municipality to prevent further development from happening until regulations were met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Residents expressed a large amount of concern for the increased costs this would add to neighbours that are looking to build during this housing shortage. Staff acknowledged that this was an important consideration.• A resident had concerns about their fields being drained into by neighbours putting in new culverts. The resident also expressed frustration with the municipality creating new requirements and costs while not providing services to the area.• A resident clarified that the term private roads meant registered private roads, not driveways. Staff confirmed.
4.	Bylaw P-1200, Lot Grading & Drainage - Proposed Amendments - Debbie Uloth
	Debbie Uloth presented.
5.	Questions from the Public
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A resident questioned the three-acre trigger. The resident noted that septic regulations were 2.2 acres. Staff acknowledged that they looked at all options, and that there is no “magic number.” Staff welcomed ideas for a more appropriate trigger or acreage, and agreed that the size of the lot does not equate to the amount of impact on your neighbor.• The same resident questioned where the lot grading plan would be required in the building process. Staff confirmed it would be required to receive a building permit.• A resident asked why this bylaw was needed. Staff explained council had been getting complaints from rural areas, similar to the ones received in 2006 about drainage issues. The issue was resolved with a similar bylaw in 2006 in serviced areas. Staff would also like to be proactive instead of reactive to these needs and complaints, creating regulations that would assist landowners, while providing documentation should civil matters arise. Staff later added that a lot size trigger was easier to administer than a trigger that required lidar elevations to be examined for every lot.



- Residents expressed concern about the cost this would add to landowners looking to build in our current housing crisis.
- A resident suggested a trigger for a lot grading certificate based on setbacks instead of arbitrary acreage, and noted that the municipality already had a built-in trigger of the location certificate. Resident suggested that if the proposed construction was between a certain setback and the minimum setback, a lot grading plan would be required.
- A resident suggested that the cost of getting a lot grading certificate was much higher than the report stated. Staff agreed that lot size would dictate the cost, and noted that the cost was accurate for a small lot in a Growth Management Area, but that not all lots in rural areas would be that small.
- A resident questioned the amount of engineering required on a lot under 3 acres, and expressed concern about the gray area since the lot and amount of change made to the lot dictate the need. Staff clarified that engineering requirement would be decided by the engineer. The municipality doesn't approve the plans.
- A resident noted that work can be done after lot grading is certified. Staff agreed and pointed out that having documentation for civil proceedings is helpful for all parties.
- A resident shared their believe that the chances of flooding are small, and that residents know not to build on swamps. The resident expressed concern that this bylaw is a money-grab for the municipality. Staff noted that the municipality doesn't make any money off this bylaw. The resident then questioned why this bylaw was necessary. Staff referred the resident to the presentation and discussion.
- A resident suggested a number of stages were already in the bylaw system that could have certification or review included. The resident later suggested that when comparing the number of building permits issued to the number of complaints about drainage, the data would prove that this would be a costly addition to the process for such a relatively small number of complaints.
- A resident has concerns about what happens after the engineer certifies the lot grading, and noted that it would then become a civil matter. Staff agreed, but believes that a lot of the problems will be solved in advance by having the requirements. The resident identified themselves as an engineer and stated that they would prefer not to get calls for lot grading certificate, even though they would profit from the requirement.
- A resident cited the federal government's mandate to keep costs low when creating housing, and had concerns that this addition would not abide by that.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">A resident noted that location certificates were discretionary, and wondered if lot grading could be done the same way, perhaps considered during a footing inspection. The resident estimated the additional costs would put families and individuals back by about 2 years from building. Staff acknowledged that cost was an important consideration on this issue.
6.	Adjournment
	The meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm.



Public Information Meeting

1. Proposed Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use Bylaw Amendments
Application by KelGreg Enterprises
2. Proposed Subdivision Bylaw Amendments - Stormwater Management Plans
3. Proposed Amendments to Bylaw P-1200, Lot Grading and Drainage

May 5 2025

Lloyd E. Matheson Centre

ATTENDANCE

Staff:

John Woodford, Director of Planning and Development
Debbie Uloth, Community Planner II
Derek Normanton, Senior Project Engineer
Hannah Grosvenor, Administrative Assistant

Representative for KelGreg Enterprises:

Brent Keys

Members of the Public:

15 members, including 3 councillors: Councillor Hebb, Councillor Merriam, and Councillor Mitchell

AGENDA

1.	Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.
	The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by John Woodford, beginning with a land acknowledgement.
2.	1. Proposed Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use Bylaw Amendments Application by KelGreg Enterprises - John Woodford



	John Woodford presented.
	Brent Keys, representative for KelGreg Enterprises, spoke.
	Questions from the Public: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Resident asked about the impact on Belnan Ave. Staff and applicant confirmed there is no rezoning happening on Belnan Ave.
3.	Subdivision Bylaw Amendments - Stormwater Management Plans - Debbie Uloth
	Debbie Uloth presented.
	Questions from the Public:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A resident questioned why this amendment was necessary. Staff stated that they have identified a disparity between private roads having no protections because of no plan and roads that have plans.• A resident questioned if the 2023 flood has impacted the way we view stormwater plans. Staff noted that the 2023 flood was a rare occurrence, and all bets are off with a storm like that. However, new stormwater standards will be coming out soon that will include updated information that takes climate change into consideration.• A resident observed that insurance companies are also looking for stormwater plans.• A resident suggested that a privately owned road with issues would be a civil matter, not a municipal matter. Staff replied that it seems prudent to put standards in place to design correctly in the beginning. They also noted that private roads do have to be engineered to certain standards and not everyone can afford litigation.• A resident observed that the cost either goes to the developer now or the taxpayer later.
4.	Bylaw P-1200 Lot Grading & Drainage - Proposed Amendments - Debbie Uloth
	Debbie Uloth Presented.
	Questions from the Public:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A resident questioned if adding lot grading certificates will cause the lot sizes to be increased. Staff said no.• A resident asked what percentage of building permits issued were having drainage issues, and asked for demographics. Staff confirmed new developments were an issue and becoming more regular issue in rural areas. While staff doesn't have exact numbers, they acknowledged the percentage would be low, but increasing as more rural subdivisions are being built.• The same resident expressed concern about implementing more burden to the homeowner before the building process even began in a time when housing costs are already too high. Staff agreed, saying that council is wrestling with the same



issue. However, if flooding of homes can be prevented, it should be. There is no one-size-fits-all answer, and staff is welcome to ideas and alternatives.

- A resident suggested that buildings on slabs could be exempt from lot grading plans as they don't have basements to flood. Staff later noted that while you may have built on a slab, that doesn't mean your new build won't impact your neighbour.
- A resident questioned if there are any laws about where water should be directed. Staff explained that this bylaw would do that.
- A resident observed that ditching is also an issue. If a resident decides to fill in their ditch, the neighbourhood is impacted.
- A resident reminded the group that this is a proposal for unserviced lots, and would place a large financial burden on the home owners. Another resident disagreed, implying that all are impacted by new builds.
- A resident suggested a trigger of lot dimensions instead of lot size, and another suggested the distance from the house to the setback. Staff welcomed new ideas, and noted that whatever the trigger was it needed to be easy to administer and measurable to ensure building permits are not held up.
- A resident noted that HRM had tried to introduce a lot grading bylaw. Staff confirmed this, saying it was later repealed due to complaints about costs.
- A resident questioned how many other municipalities in Nova Scotia have this bylaw. Staff said HRM was the only one so far, but that was fairly normal for the province as HRM and East Hants tend to lead the way due to growth and the clay soil. Staff also said that Summerside, PEI had lot grading requirements, and Ontario had municipalities with lot grading requirements.
- A resident observed that a quality contractor would be able to make sure your lot grading was properly done, and that asking an engineer to do it was unnecessary and costly. Another resident observed that insurance companies are driving the need for lot grading certificates and drainage plans.
- A resident suggested that the safest subdivision belonged to another resident in the room.
- That resident noted that their concern isn't just increased cost, but the increased paperwork and professionals involved in the building process, increasing the time it takes to build. The resident later noted that they do their own lot grading plans, but they are not engineered or stamped.
- A resident noted that the run-off goes to the rivers, which are quick to rise and affect homes on the rivers.
- Another resident asked if there was any flooding happening along the Nine-Mile River.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A resident observed that nature was powerful, that things change, and that if you build too close to the river you may have some trouble.• A resident asked if this bylaw was currently in effect or was still in discussion. Staff explained it was still in discussion, which was why this meeting was being held.• A resident asked what municipalities are saying about this issue. Staff advised that there was no consensus.• A resident suggested that commercial builds should require a drainage plan.• A resident who identified as an engineer stated that they do not like to do this kind of work, ex: rural residents trying to give their kids some land to build on, and the cost of lot grading making it more difficult.
5.	Adjournment
	The meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm.



Public Information Meeting

1. Proposed Subdivision Bylaw Amendments - Stormwater Management Plans
2. Proposed Amendments to Bylaw P-1200, Lot Grading and Drainage

May 7 2025
Mt. Uniacke Legion Hall

ATTENDANCE

Staff:

John Woodford, Director of Planning and Development
Debbie Uloth, Community Planner II
Logan Blanchard, Project Engineer
Hannah Grosvenor, Administrative Assistant

Members of the Public:

13 members, including 4 councillors: Councillor Hebb, Councillor Rhyno, Councillor Perry, and Councillor Moussa

AGENDA

1.	Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.
	The meeting was called to order at 7:00pm by John Woodford, beginning with a land acknowledgement.
2.	Subdivision Bylaw Amendments - Stormwater Management Plans - Debbie Uloth
	Debbie Uloth presented.
3.	Questions from the Public
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A resident asked for a copy of the presentation. Staff advised where to find online and offered to send a copy.• A resident asked when the deadline for written submissions were accepted. Staff will be putting out a report in June, and requests that any comments be sent by the end of May.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A resident questioned what was driving the need for this amendment, the frequency of complaints, and the amount of staff time spent resolving stormwater issues. Staff confirmed that this is a complaint driven amendment. Stormwater management used to be a problem in the more urban areas, but in the last 5 years more development has emerged in unserved areas, causing more problems and more complaints. Staff expects more issues and complaints as development continues to grow.• A resident expressed concern about the cost of ponds they felt were unnecessary. They suggested that large lots shouldn't require ponds in subdivisions. Staff reminded the resident that the intent is to hold back excess water, and that cutting and building will increase the amount of water going downhill. The resident alluded to a disagreement between themselves and a design engineer, and reiterated that ponding was costly and sometimes unnecessary. Staff advised that stormwater management includes more than ponds, though ponding is often the cheapest option and thus chosen by developers.• A resident questioned whether the municipality had a set of standards to be followed by design engineers. Staff confirmed this.• The resident identified as residing on Cockscomb Lake, and expressed concern about water flowing into the lake and to lots downhill. The resident noted that the road, power, lots were all created without a long-term plan leaving the lake and existing residents at a huge risk. Staff agreed that this was a concern, and welcomed any suggestions or ideas for council to hear and work through.•
4.	Bylaw P-1200, Lot Grading & Drainage - Proposed Amendments - Debbie Uloth
	Debbie Uloth presented.
5.	Questions from the Public
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A resident felt that there was nothing to consider, that council should pass this bylaw immediately. Staff cited the two earlier PIMs where residents expressed concern about the increased cost to build.• A resident identified themselves as a surveyor. The resident noted that HRM had a similar bylaw that was repealed, and expressed concern that that costs here could get out of hand, and that involving the municipality will take more time, and administration. The resident observed that if common sense would be utilized, most of these lots wouldn't have issues. Staff confirmed that HRM had a similar bylaw for all lots which was later repealed due to cost complaints. Staff noted that HRM does currently require lot grading plans for multiple unit builds.



- The same resident voiced their support for lot grading plans for multiple unit builds. Staff shared that they were looking into various metrics and triggers, including distance from the property line. The resident noted that nobody wants the authorities involved until something goes wrong.
- A resident asked if the main driver for this bylaw was complaints. Staff confirmed, and cited issues where the drainage corridor was changed and water is flowing right into the neighbour's lawn.
- A resident expressed concern that this was not a municipal issue, but instead a civil issue. Staff agreed, but noted that getting this right before moving in lessens the headaches later on. Staff welcomed comments and ideas.
- A resident observed that the stormwater management amendment may take care of some of the drainage issues, making this bylaw unnecessary.
- A resident expressed concern over the affordability of housing and the time to get a permit. They estimated that a 6k increase to the builder could mean a 12k increase in price for the homebuyer.
- A resident expressed concern over the affordability of housing and the time it would take to get a building permit.
- A resident expressed concern about the time it takes to build being increased by this bylaw. Staff agreed, but suggested this would be part of the front-end of the process when you apply for a building permit. Staff then clarified the building permit process.
- A resident suggested the municipality provide a set of best practices to builders to abide. The resident felt that requiring lot grading plans for the entire municipality was painting with too broad a brush.
- A resident suggested that the issues were likely coming from developments, and suggested subdivisions be required to have lot grading plans.
- A resident asked how many issues staff had seen. Staff estimated around 12 in the last year, and noted that downhill lots are impacted by development happening uphill.
- A resident inquired why lot drainage plans would be needed on roads that couldn't be built upon such as roads that already had 100 units and no secondary access. Staff explained that council was looking into the secondary access regulation, and it could change.
- A resident questioned how many of the 12 drainage complaints were due to new lots, and observed that they have not had any complaints on the lots they had developed. The resident expressed concern about the affordability of homes should this new bylaw be introduced, and estimated that in the community they have developed, this would have cost them 2 million dollars. The resident



claimed that they have sold 24 homes in the last 8 weeks for an average price of 362k, and was concerned that their homes would no longer be in the buyers' mortgage range with the additional cost of lot grading plans.

- A resident observed that drainage issues involve common sense and accountability. Staff agreed that regulations are always made to provide a minimum standard for those not meeting it. The resident alluded to a drainage issue with a neighbour, and suggested that the contractor and/or workers be liable for poor drainage.
- Councillor Perry stated he had received a large number of calls regarding drainage issues, and that some homeowners were engaged in civil litigation over it. The councillor noted that families have lost their septic system and wells, which is more costly to replace than a lot grading certificate, and that new developments were impacting existing homes. The councillor expressed concern that the worst-case scenario was already happening in his district.
- A resident asked if staff was familiar with the terrain along the lake, and questioned why this issue was being discussed. Staff explained the process and council's choice to receive feedback on this issue. The resident again asked why this was being considered instead of immediately put into effect, to which other residents reminded them about the cost involved in lot grading. Staff advised that council was always trying to balance time, cost, and their responsibility for residents and communities.
- Councillor Moussa questioned whether the engineer on a lot grading plan was liable should something go wrong. Staff confirmed, and noted that the intent was to have documentation. Councillor Moussa suggested that a lot grading plan was a form of insurance.
- A resident acknowledged that doing nothing about drainage was not a good option. Staff agreed, and again encouraged residents to share their ideas.
- A resident asked how the position of a house reflects the drainage. Staff advised that distance helps provide an opportunity for infiltration, but isn't exact. The resident lamented that despite vegetation requirements in the lakeshore region, some residents just do what they wish and pay the fine; there is no remediation done. The resident then questioned where lot grading is currently required. Staff confirmed the regulations were in place for serviced areas, and reminded the resident that council was considering applying it to unserviced lots under 3 acres. Staff then clarified the difference between the two presentations given.
- A resident claimed the writing is on the wall.
- Staff thanked residents and encouraged them to be in contact with their ideas, concerns, and questions.



6.	Adjournment
	The meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm.