

## Sheralee Mitchell-MacEwan

---

**Subject:** FW: SUB egress

---

**From:** Pam MacInnis  
**Sent:** September 7, 2025 2:15 PM  
**To:** Kim Ramsay <[kramsay@easthants.ca](mailto:kramsay@easthants.ca)>  
**Subject:** SUB egress

Hello Kim,

Can you please distribute the following letter to all councillors. Thank you.  
Kind regards,  
Pam

Dear Councillors,

Re: No second egress requirement until 100 lots

The reports on this topic clearly state that there is a high vulnerability risk in some East Hants sub division locations.

One of the stated policy goals is to "...improve emergency access...".

Should there be a fire in the new end of Havenwood Drive, for example, how will the residents beyond it at the dead end of the road get out, should there be a risk of the woods catching fire? The Elmwood subdivision has been needing, and the residents have been requesting, a second exit, for a very long time. I expect there are others making that request.

I can only imagine the complications of doing this, however, the safety of residents must trump whatever difficulties arise to create this by-law. This new by-law being one which reasonably uses DUs, rather than lots, for starters, I humbly suggest.

In one report with proposed options, "Based on staff evaluation, the risk to the residents seems to outweigh the benefit to specific landowners."

I notice in the 'vulnerability assessment' that water/flooding is not included and I wonder about that. It is a clear threat in some areas, as seen during Fiona.

I would like to hear back with what led to the decision to maintain the status quo. Nothing in any of the reports I read would lead me to agree with the decision so I'm looking for the reasons to help me understand.

Thank you.

Kind regards,  
Pam MacInnis

---

Verified virus free by MessageLabs