



Planning Advisory / Heritage Committee Meeting

Tuesday, May 6, 2025

6:15 p.m.

Council Chambers

AGENDA

- 1. Call to order**
- 2. Items Added / Approval of the Agenda**
- 3. Review of Minutes, Re:**
 - a) July 16, 2024
 - b) April 1, 2025
- 4. EDPC Staff Reports**
 - a) New maximum setbacks for Commercial Wind Turbines -
Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for the Municipality of the County of Richmond and West Richmond Plan Area in Response to New Provincial Setback Requirements
 - b) Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Report - Tentative; report not completed at time of publication and will be presented at the meeting.
- 5. Next Meeting Date**
- 6. Adjournment**



Planning Advisory / Heritage Committee Meeting

July 16th, 2024

Location: Council Chambers

Present: Councillor Brent Sampson, Deputy Warden Shawn Samson, Councillor Melanie Sampson, Carolyn Clackdoyle, Appointed Member, Councillor Michael Diggdon, Warden Amanda Mombourquette

Also Present: John Bain, Director/Development Officer, Eastern District Planning Commission (EDPC), Troy MacCulloch, CAO (Virtual), Shelley David, Municipal Clerk

Regrets: Doug Begg, Appointed Member

Call to Order:

Councillor Brent Sampson called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M

Items Added to the Agenda (Approval of the Agenda)

Moved by Warden Amanda Mombourquette, seconded by Councillor Melanie Sampson, that the agenda be approved.

Motion carried.

Review of Minutes re:

a) April 16th, 2024

Moved by Warden Amanda Mombourquette, seconded by Deputy Warden Shawn Samson, that the Planning Advisory/Heritage Committee meeting minutes for April 16th, 2024, be approved.

Motion carried.

West Richmond Land Use By-Law Amendment of Part 2 “Administration”

Moved by Warden Amanda Mombourquette, seconded by Deputy Warden Shawn Samson that the Planning Advisory/Heritage Committee recommend to Council to accept the amendment of the West Richmond Land Use By-Law in Part 2 “Administration” as presented with the noted change to item 15 (d), adding receiving notice of refusal by email when possible.

Motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) opposed.



Central Richmond Land Use By-Law Amendment of Part 4 “ Interpretation”

Move by Warden Amanda Mombourquette, seconded by appointed member Carolyn ClackDoyle that the Planning Advisory/Heritage Committee recommend to Council to accept the amendment to the Central Richmond Land Use By-Law in Part 4 “Interpretation” as presented with the exception of change to item 3 (d) to include receiving notice of refusal by email when possible.
Motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) opposed.

St. Peter’s Land Use By-Law Amendment of Part 2 “Administration”

Move by Warden Amanda Mombourquette, seconded by appointed member Carolyn ClackDoyle that the Planning Advisory/Heritage Committee recommend to Council to accept the amendment to the St. Peter’s Land Use By-Law in Part 2 “Administration” as presented with the exception of item 13 (d), adding receiving notice of refusal by email when possible.
Motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) opposed.

Isle Madame Land Use By-Law Amendment of Part 2 “Administration”

Move by Warden Amanda Mombourquette, seconded by appointed member Carolyn ClackDoyle that the Planning Advisory/Heritage Committee recommend to Council to accept the amendment to the Isle Madame Land Use By-Law in Part 2 “Administration” as presented with the noted change to item 13 (d), adding receiving notice of refusal by email when possible.
Motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) opposed.

Municipality of the County of Richmond Land Use By-Law Amendment of Section 4.9 “Variances”

Move by Warden Amanda Mombourquette, seconded by appointed member Carolyn ClackDoyle that the Planning Advisory/Heritage Committee recommend to Council to accept the amendment to the Municipality of the County of Richmond Land Use By-Law in section 4.9 “Variances” as presented with the exception of 4.9.3 (d) adding in receiving notice of refusal by email when possible.
Motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) opposed.



A By-Law to Amend The Richmond County Subdivision By-Law for the Municipality of the County of Richmond

Moved by Warden Amanda Mombourquette, seconded by Councillor Melanie Sampson that the Planning Advisory / Heritage Committee recommend to Council to accept the amendments to the Richmond County Subdivision By-Law for the Municipality of Richmond County as presented.

Motion carried.

Honourable John A. Lohr, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Re: Summary of amendments to the Municipal Government Act

For Information Only

Items Added to the Agenda:

No additional items were added.

Next Meeting Date

To be later determined.

Germain MacDonald approached the Committee.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Municipal Clerk

Chairperson

To: **Richmond Planning Advisory Committee**
Richmond County Council

From: **Planning Staff (EDPC)**

Date: **April 16th, 2024**

Reference: **Review of Variance Notification Procedures and Amendments to the Richmond County Subdivision By-law**

Recommendations:

1. That no change be made to the Variance notification process. No motion is required; and
2. That Council approves the proposed amendments to the *Richmond County Subdivision By-law* as laid out in Appendix B of the Staff Report that remove the term “clearly surveyed” for clarity.

Background Information:

On December 19, 2023, Planning Advisory Committee asked the Eastern District Planning Commission to review its variance procedure to potentially implement the use of registered mail as opposed ordinary mail to serve neighbour notifications regarding variances and to review the Richmond County Subdivision By-law and propose options to improve clarity, specifically the following terms: “right-of-way” and “clearly surveyed”.

Like many other municipal planning departments within the Province, the Eastern District Planning Commission uses the variance procedure laid out by the *Municipal Government Act (MGA)*. All Municipalities are legally required to follow the *MGA’s* variance procedure at a minimum.

Analysis:

Variance Procedure Review

A policy analysis was conducted that examined the Land Use By-laws of twenty rural municipalities (not including the other municipalities serviced by the Eastern District Planning Commission) in the Province of Nova Scotia. It should be noted that there are some municipalities that have more than one plan area (secondary plan areas) and that there is not always consistency among the policies in each plan area, similar to Richmond County. The Table in Appendix A summarizes the findings.

Of the twenty rural municipalities examined, two currently do not have planning documents for developments aside from wind turbine developments and one municipality did not mention variances in its planning documents at all. All remaining rural municipalities, the other seventeen, have sections on variances in either their Municipal Planning Strategy or Land Use By-law or both

that in some way defers to the *Municipal Government Act* regarding the process of administering a variance.

Seven of the seventeen, or approximately 40%, of the rural municipalities specifically state that the method of notification regarding variances shall be the procedure laid out by the *Municipal Government Act*. Three of these seven municipalities specify and reiterate, as per the variance procedure of the MGA, that notification will be served by ordinary mail.

Only two municipalities of the seventeen added extra procedure to the standard MGA variance procedure. In both cases, this additional policy was not about the type of mail delivery but increased the notification radius from 30 m (100 feet) to 60 m (200 feet).

The American Planning Association Rhode Island Chapter (APA -RI) published a document titled "*Better Land Use 2021: APA RI's Recommendations for Improved Land Use in Rhode Island*". The document contains the organization's recommendations for improved efficient land-use regulation. Part H of the Process and Procedure chapter examines the use of certified mail for the delivery of planning notices. Certified mail in the US is equivalent to registered mail in Canada. The findings refer to certified mail as "more expensive and complicated" when compared to the use of other mailing options and less effective in achieving the desired public notification result. The General Assembly recommended and approved the use of mailings which eliminated the need for requiring a recipient's signature. This was because "*when no adult is home, a notification card is left in the mailbox indicating the need for the owner to pick up certified mail at the local post office. It was recognized that the actual success rate of meeting the notice requirement has decreased over the years due to a decreasing number of homes with an adult present during the day. The result has been a decreasing number of residents being notified of pending public hearings for zoning changes, variances and special use permits*" (APA -RI, 2021).

Regarding registered mail in Canada, the procedure is the same. If an adult is not home to sign for the registered mail, a notification card is left, and the mail is taken to the local post office for pickup because a signature is required. In the rural areas this is another barrier to notification. Instead of a variance notification letter being left in the mailbox at home for the property owner to pickup, they must now go out of their way to travel to the local post office. In some cases, this would potentially result in delays in arranging pickup such that they miss the timelines specified in the notice.

Finally, regardless of when the mail is received and if it is signed for or not, the variance notification letter would still be considered delivered three days after it was sent in accordance with the *Municipal Government Act*. Besides being an additional barrier for notification, registered mail costs more than ordinary mail, which places an extra financial burden on a variance applicant for an arguably inferior result.

Staff therefore recommend that there be no changes made to the variance notification process.

Richmond County Subdivision By-law Review

Council has several options in how they would like to address changes, if any, to the *Richmond County Subdivision By-law*:

1. *Approve the proposed amendments to the Richmond County Subdivision By-law as laid out in Appendix B of the Staff Report that remove the term “clearly surveyed” for clarity.*

In the *Municipal Government Act’s Provincial Subdivision Regulations*, there is no listed definition of “easement”, “right-of-way” or “right of-way easement”. However, Section 2(f)(iv) states:

“(f) “private road” means any road which
...
(iv) where not totally located within the area of land being subdivided, has an easement for right-of-way and access that is assignable and perpetual and has been clearly granted by deed, registered in the registry of deeds,
...”

In this case, a definition for an “easement for right-of-way (and access)” is defined within the definition of “private road”. In this definition, an easement for right-of-way and access only needs to be granted by deed and registered in the Registry of Deeds. There is no mention of the easement for right-of-way and access to be “clearly surveyed”. Removing the wording “clearly surveyed” from the *Richmond County Subdivision By-law* would bring the document closer in conformity with the *MGA’s Provincial Subdivision Regulations*.

Additionally, whether a right-of-way is surveyed or not, should not be a determining factor of whether an “easement/right-of-way” exists. If an “easement/right-of-way” is in a deed, then it exists. Requiring a survey showing the “easement/right-of-way” as a determinant for an “easement/right-of-way” to be required for subdivision is an added unnecessary hurdle. It potentially removes a property owner’s legal right where an “easement/right-of-way” in a deed lawfully exists, due to a technicality in the municipal *Subdivision By-law*.

For these reasons, removing the wording “clearly surveyed” from the *Richmond County Subdivision By-law* is Staff’s recommended option.

2. *Remove the right-of-way easement requirement to subdivide a landlocked parcel altogether.*

The *Municipal Government Act’s Provincial Subdivision Regulations* originally permitted the creation of a lot from a landlocked parcel so long as each lot or lot and remainder were served by a right-of-way easement. The condition of service by right-of-way easement has since been removed. Removing the requirement of a right-of-way easement in order to create a lot from a landlocked parcel from the *Richmond County Subdivision By-law* is an option as *the Municipal Government Act’s Provincial Subdivision Regulations* has done this already.

The expectation would still be that property owners secure a right-of-way easement, but we would not require it. Removing this requirement, however, would not guarantee that the property owner secures an easement. Additionally, it would be possible for land locked lots without right-of-way easements to receive a Building/Development Permit depending on the wording of the corresponding Plan Area's Planning Documents. Going with this option may also lead to an increase in civil disputes.

While this is an option open to Council staff believe the drawbacks outweigh the benefits and therefore do not recommend this option.

3. *Add the definition of "clearly surveyed"*

"Clearly surveyed" was intended to mean an easement shown on a survey that was surveyed to the accepted standard of the day. This meaning ties the required survey to the standards and regulations of the profession while allowing for flexibility for amendments and changes over time. Defining "clearly surveyed" would also better clarify the definition and requirements of "right-of-way easement". Staff are of the opinion that the definition is already clear and, with only one exception, has been the accepted interpretation of the by-law.

4. *Keep the Richmond County Subdivision By-law unchanged*

Council may keep the *Richmond County Subdivision By-law* as it is. This option is self explanatory.

Conclusion:

Staff are of the opinion that the Eastern District Planning Commission's procedural policy for variance notification is standard and in line with rural municipalities within the province. Furthermore, Staff find that there appears to be little to no benefit in using registered mail for variance notification. If anything, the use of registered mail for variance notification creates more barriers for both neighbouring property owners of a development and the variance applicant.

Council has a few different options with how they could proceed from this Staff Report with respect to the *Subdivision By-law*, however staff recommend simply removing the term "clearly surveyed" from the *By-law* and replacing it with wording, consistent with the Provincial Subdivision By-law regulations, as laid out in Appendix B. This recommended amendment removes an unnecessary requirement thus cutting some of the red tape associated with land development in Richmond County.

Proposed Motions for the Planning Advisory Committee:

Based upon the staff recommendation, the proposed motions for PAC are:

1. *That the Planning Advisory Committee recommend that Municipal Council approve the proposed amendments to the Richmond County Subdivision By-law as laid out in Appendix B that remove the term “clearly surveyed” for clarity; and
That Municipal Council give First Reading and schedule a Public Hearing.*

Proposed Motions for Council:

Based upon a positive recommendation from the PAC, the proposed motions for Council are:

FIRST READING AND SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING DATE:

1. *That Municipal Council give First Reading and schedule a Public Hearing regarding approving amendments to the Richmond County Subdivision By-law as laid out in Appendix B that remove the term “clearly surveyed” for clarity.*

SECOND READING AND APPROVAL:

1. *That Municipal Council give Second Reading and approve amendments to the Richmond County Subdivision By-law as laid out in Appendix B that remove the term “clearly surveyed” for clarity.*

Appendices:

Appendix A: Nova Scotia Variance Policy Analysis (20 Rural Municipalities)

Appendix B: Amending Pages

Appendix A: Nova Scotia Variance Policy Analysis (20 Rural Municipalities) Tables

Nova Scotia Variance Policy Analysis (20 Rural Municipalities)		
Municipality	MPS & LUB Policy	Notes on Notification Policies
Cape Breton Regional Municipality	LUB defers to MGA	No
Queens Regional	Defers to MGA	Urban Service Area - 30 m Rural Development Area & Hamlets - 60 m
West Hants Regional	LUB defers to MGA	Specifically defers to MGA
Annapolis County	Reiterates/Defers to MGA	No
Colchester County	MPS defers to MGA	No
Cumberland County	LUB defers to MGA	No
Kings County	LUB defers to MGA	No
Pictou County	N/A (No General Municipal Planning Strategy & Land Use By-law)	
District of Argyle	No MGA References	No
District of Barrington	MPS defers to MGA	No
District of Chester	Defers to MGA	60 m (200 feet) Notification Radius Specifies "ordinary mail" Specifically defers to MGA
District of Clare	Does not mention Variances	No
District of Digby	Defers to MGA	Specifically defers to MGA
District of East Hants	Defers to MGA	No
District of Guysborough	Defers to MGA	Specifically defers to MGA
District of Lunenburg	Defers to MGA	Specifies "ordinary mail" Specifically defers to MGA
District of Shelburne	N/A (No General Municipal Planning Strategy & Land Use By-law)	
District of St. Mary's	Defers to MGA	Specifies "ordinary mail" Specifically defers to MGA
District of Yarmouth	Defers to MGA	Specifically defers to MGA Reiterates MGA 30 m radius

Appendix B: Amending Pages

**A BYLAW TO AMEND THE RICHMOND COUNTY SUBDIVISION BY-LAW
FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND**

The Richmond County Subdivision By-law for Municipality of Richmond County is hereby amended by:

1. Part 2: "Interpretation" of the Subdivision By-law is hereby amended by removing the following text in strikethrough and adding the text in **bold** to Subsection (j)(i) "Private Road Right-of-Way":

...

- (i) extends to and has access to a public street and where not totally located within the area of land being subdivided, the private road right-of-way shall have an easement for right-of-way and access ~~which has been clearly surveyed and~~ **that is assignable and perpetual and has been clearly granted by deed,** registered in the registry of deeds, and

...

2. Part 2: "Interpretation" of the Subdivision By-law is hereby amended by removing the following text in strikethrough and adding the text in **bold** to Subsection (n):

...

- (n) "Right-of-way easement" means an easement for right-of-way and access, extending to and having access to a public street or highway, and where not totally located within the area of land proposed to be subdivided the right-of-way easement shall be ~~clearly surveyed and~~ **assignable and perpetual and clearly** granted by deed, registered in the Registry of Deeds for the County of Richmond:

...

3. Part 18 of the Subdivision By-law (Subdivision of an Island) is hereby amended by removing the following text in strikethrough and adding the text in **bold** to Subsection (2)(c):

...

- (c) the subdivider provides an easement for right-of-way and access, ~~clearly surveyed and~~ **assignable and perpetual and clearly** granted by deed registered in the Registry of Deeds having minimum width of 15 metres (49.2 feet) extending from a public street or highway or a private road to the parking area and to the shoreline of the navigable watercourse where there exists suitable boat launching facilities, and

...

**A BYLAW TO AMEND THE WEST RICHMOND LAND USE BY-LAW
FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND**

The West Richmond Land Use By-law is hereby amended by:

in Part 2: “Administration” of the Land Use By-law adding to the following subsection immediately after Subsection 2.12 the subsequent and renumbering the part accordingly:

Variances

13. Notwithstanding anything in this By-law, the Development Officer may vary:
 - a) the percentage of land that may be built upon;
 - b) the size or other requirements relating to setbacks;
 - c) lot frontage;
 - d) lot area;
 - e) the location and number of parking spaces and loading spaces required;
 - f) the ground area of a structure;
 - g) the height of a structure;
 - h) the floor area occupied by a home-based business; and/or
 - i) the height and area of a sign.

14. In accordance with the *Municipal Government Act*, a variance shall not be granted if:
 - a) the variance violates the intent of the Land Use By-law;
 - b) the difficulty experienced is general to properties in the area; or
 - c) the difficulty experienced results from an intentional disregard for the requirements of this Land Use By-law.

15. Where the Development Officer has granted or refused a variance in the requirements of this Bylaw, notification of the variance shall be served upon all assessed property owners as follows:
 - a) entitled in the manner prescribed by the Variance Sections of the *Municipal Government Act*;
 - b) such notice shall be served ordinary mail;
 - c) where a variance is granted, a property owner served a notice may appeal the decision to the Council within twenty-one days after receiving the notice; and
 - d) where a variance is refused, the applicant may appeal the refusal to council within seven days after receiving notice of the refusal (by email where available), by giving written notice to the clerk who shall notify the development officer.

Staff Memo

This is to certify that the resolution of which this is a true copy, was duly passed at a duly called meeting of the Council for the Municipality of the County of Richmond held on the ____ day of _____ 2024

Given under the hand of the Chief Administrative Officer and under the corporate seal of the said Municipality this ____ day of _____ 2024

Troy MacCulloch, CAO

**A BYLAW TO AMEND THE CENTRAL RICHMOND LAND USE BY-LAW
FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND**

The Central Richmond Land Use By-law is hereby amended by adding to the following Part immediately after Part 4 “Interpretation” and renumbering the part accordingly:

PART 5 – VARIANCES

1. Notwithstanding anything in this By-law, the Development Officer may vary:
 - a) the percentage of land that may be built upon;
 - b) the size or other requirements relating to setbacks;
 - c) lot frontage;
 - d) lot area;
 - e) the location and number of parking spaces and loading spaces required;
 - f) the ground area of a structure;
 - g) the height of a structure;
 - h) the floor area occupied by a home-based business; and/or
 - i) the height and area of a sign.
2. In accordance with the *Municipal Government Act*, a variance shall not be granted if:
 - a) the variance violates the intent of the Land Use By-law;
 - b) the difficulty experienced is general to properties in the area; or
 - c) the difficulty experienced results from an intentional disregard for the requirements of this Land Use By-law.
3. Where the Development Officer has granted or refused a variance in the requirements of this Bylaw, notification of the variance shall be served upon all assessed property owners as follows:
 - a) entitled in the manner prescribed by the Variance Sections of the *Municipal Government Act*;
 - b) such notice shall be served ordinary mail;
 - c) where a variance is granted, a property owner served a notice may appeal the decision to the Council within twenty-one days after receiving the notice; and
 - d) where a variance is refused, the applicant may appeal the refusal to council within seven days after receiving notice of the refusal (by email where available), by giving written notice to the clerk who shall notify the development officer.

This is to certify that the resolution of which this is a true copy, was duly passed at a duly called meeting of the Council for the Municipality of the County of Richmond held on the ____ day of _____ 2024

Given under the hand of the Chief Administrative Officer and under the corporate seal of the said Municipality this ____ day of _____ 2024

Troy MacCulloch, CAO

**A BYLAW TO AMEND THE ST. PETER'S LAND USE BY-LAW
FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND**

The St.Peter's Land Use By-law is hereby amended by:

In Part 2: "Administration" of the Land Use By-law is hereby amended by adding to the following section immediately after Subsection 2.10 and renumbering the part accordingly:

Variances

11. Notwithstanding anything in this By-law, the Development Officer may vary:
 - a) the percentage of land that may be built upon;
 - b) the size or other requirements relating to setbacks;
 - c) lot frontage;
 - d) lot area;
 - e) the location and number of parking spaces and loading spaces required;
 - f) the ground area of a structure;
 - g) the height of a structure;
 - h) the floor area occupied by a home-based business; and/or
 - ri the height and area of a sign.

12. In accordance with the *Municipal Government Act*, a variance shall not be granted if:
 - a) the variance violates the intent of the Land Use By-law;
 - b) the difficulty experienced is general to properties in the area; or
 - c) the difficulty experienced results from an intentional disregard for the requirements of this Land Use By-law.

13. Where the Development Officer has granted or refused a variance in the requirements of this Bylaw, notification of the variance shall be served upon all assessed property owners as follows:
 - a) entitled in the manner prescribed by the Variance Sections of the *Municipal Government Act*;
 - b) such notice shall be served ordinary mail;
 - c) where a variance is granted, a property owner served a notice may appeal the decision to the Council within twenty-one days after receiving the notice; and
 - d) where a variance is refused, the applicant may appeal the refusal to council within seven days after receiving notice of the refusal (by email where available), by giving written notice to the clerk who shall notify the development officer.

This is to certify that the resolution of which this is a true copy, was duly passed at a duly called meeting of the Council for the Municipality of the County of Richmond held on the ____ day of _____ 2024

Given under the hand of the Chief Administrative Officer and under the corporate seal of the said Municipality this ____ day of _____ 2024

Troy MacCulloch, CAO

**A BYLAW TO AMEND THE ISLE MADAME LAND USE BY-LAW
FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND**

The Isle Madame Land Use By-law is hereby amended by:

In Part 2: “Administration” of the Land Use By-law is hereby amended by adding to the following section immediately after Subsection 2.10 and renumbering the part accordingly:

Variances

11. Notwithstanding anything in this By-law, the Development Officer may vary:
 - a) the percentage of land that may be built upon;
 - b) the size or other requirements relating to setbacks;
 - c) lot frontage;
 - d) lot area;
 - e) the location and number of parking spaces and loading spaces required;
 - f) the ground area of a structure;
 - g) the height of a structure;
 - h) the floor area occupied by a home-based business; and/or
 - i) the height and area of a sign.

12. In accordance with the *Municipal Government Act*, a variance shall not be granted if:
 - a) the variance violates the intent of the Land Use By-law;
 - b) the difficulty experienced is general to properties in the area; or
 - c) the difficulty experienced results from an intentional disregard for the requirements of this Land Use By-law.

13. Where the Development Officer has granted or refused a variance in the requirements of this Bylaw, notification of the variance shall be served upon all assessed property owners as follows:
 - a) entitled in the manner prescribed by the Variance Sections of the Municipal Government Act;
 - b) such notice shall be served ordinary mail;
 - c) where a variance is granted, a property owner served a notice may appeal the decision to the Council within twenty-one days after receiving the notice; and
 - d) where a variance is refused, the applicant may appeal the refusal to council within seven days after receiving notice of the refusal (by email where available), by giving written notice to the clerk who shall notify the development officer.

This is to certify that the resolution of which this is a true copy, was duly passed at a duly called meeting of the Council for the Municipality of the County of Richmond held on the ____ day of _____ 2024

Given under the hand of the Chief Administrative Officer and under the corporate seal of the said Municipality this ____ day of _____ 2024

Troy MacCulloch, CAO

**A BYLAW TO AMEND THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND LAND USE BY-LAW
FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND**

The Municipality of the County of Richmond Land Use By-law for the Municipality of the County of Richmond is hereby amended by:

In Section 4.9: "Variances" of the Land Use By-law, adding to the following Subsection immediately after Subsection 4.9.2:

4.9.3 Where the Development Officer has granted or refused a variance in the requirements of this Bylaw, notification of the variance shall be served upon all assessed property owners as follows:

- a) entitled in the manner prescribed by the Variance Sections of the *Municipal Government Act*;
- b) such notice shall be served ordinary mail;
- c) where a variance is granted, a property owner served a notice may appeal the decision to the Council within twenty-one days after receiving the notice; and
- d) where a variance is refused, the applicant may appeal the refusal to council within seven days after receiving notice of the refusal (by email where available), by giving written notice to the clerk who shall notify the development officer.

This is to certify that the resolution of which this is a true copy, was duly passed at a duly called meeting of the Council for the Municipality of the County of Richmond held on the ____ day of _____ 2024

Given under the hand of the Chief Administrative Officer and under the corporate seal of the said Municipality this ____ day of _____ 2024

Troy MacCulloch, CAO



Planning Advisory / Heritage Committee Meeting

April 1, 2025

- Location:** Council Chambers
- Present:** Warden Lois Landry (Virtual), Councillor Brian Marchand, Councillor Amanda Mombourquette, Councillor Shawn Samson, Robbin Cotton, Appointed Member, Robert Wambolt, Appointed Member
- Also Present:** John Bain, Director/Development Officer, Eastern District Planning Commission (EDPC), Troy MacCulloch, CAO, Shelley David, Municipal Clerk
- Regrets:** Deputy Warden Brent Sampson

Call to Order

Troy MacCulloch called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Selection of Vice Chair

Troy MacCulloch called for nominations for the position of Vice Chair. Councillor Brian Marchand nominated Councillor Amanda Mombourquette, who accepted the nomination. Nominations were called two more times, and as there were no further nominations, Councillor Amanda Mombourquette was acclaimed for the position of Vice Chair.

Items Added to the Agenda (Approval of the Agenda)


Moved by Councillor Brian Marchand, seconded by Appointed Member Robbin Cotton, that the agenda be approved as presented.

Motion carried.

Review of Minutes

a) July 16th, 2024

It was the consensus of the Committee to defer the approval of the minutes to the next meeting.



b) March 4, 2025

Moved by Appointed Member Robbin Cotton, seconded by Councillor Shaun Samson, that the March 4, 2025, Planning/Heritage Advisory Committee meeting minutes be approved as presented.

Motion carried.

Unfinished Business

a) Registered Mail for Variance Notifications

Mr. Bain provided a review of the April 16, 2024, EDPC Staff Report regarding registered mail for variance notification. Discussion ensued.

EDPC Staff Update

For information only.

Exploration of changes to zoning by-laws that support secondary and backyard suites

Moved by Warden Lois Landry, seconded by Councillor Shaun Samson, that the Planning/Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council to direct staff to explore what other municipalities have in place for zoning for these units, and the advantages and disadvantages to different options.

Motion carried.

Appointed Member Robert Wambolt arrived at the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Correspondence

a) Letter from Hon. John Lohr, Minister of Municipal Affairs, regarding the maximum setback for commercial wind turbines.

Moved by Councillor Brian Marchand, seconded by Appointed Member Robert Wambolt, that the Planning/Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council to refer these new setbacks to staff to investigate any potential by-law changes that may be required.

Motion carried.



- b) Letter from Darren Boudreau regarding the pre-blast inspection of his home for the new long-term health care facility.

Councillor Amanda Mombourquette invited Mr. Boudreau to speak to the Committee.

Moved by Warden Lois Landry, seconded by Councillor Shaun Samson, that the Planning/Heritage Advisory Committee recommend to Council to direct staff to reach out to the appropriate department to register our concern and to find out if there are either alternative options or a full explanation of the safety measures put in place to protect the municipal water reservoir and local residents.

Motion carried.

Next Meeting Date

May 6, 2025, at 6:00 p.m.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

Municipal Clerk

Chairperson

To: **Richmond Planning Advisory Committee
Richmond County Council**

From: **Planning Staff (EDPC)**

Date: **May 6, 2025**

Reference: **Proposed Amendments to the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for the Municipality of the County of Richmond and West Richmond Plan Area in Response to New Provincial Setback Requirements**

Recommendations:

That Richmond County Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for the Municipality of the County of Richmond and the Land-Use-By-law for the West Richmond Planning Area to align with the new wind turbine setback regulations introduced by the Province of Nova Scotia on March 7, 2025.

Background:

On March 7, 2025, the Province of Nova Scotia introduced amendments to the Environment Act regulations concerning wind energy development. These amendments establish proportional setback distances between wind turbines and nearby dwellings, with additional provisions related to sound levels and shadow flicker impacts. The intent of the changes is to create a consistent province-wide standard while addressing public concerns raised by residents and municipalities.

The new setback regulations will apply to all new large-scale wind turbine projects throughout Nova Scotia. As a result, these provincial changes will affect the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for the Municipality of the County of Richmond and the Land-Use-By-law for the West Richmond Planning Area.

Setback:

Richmond County

Currently, utility-scale wind turbines in the Municipality of the County of Richmond must be set back a minimum of 600 metres from dwellings. For turbines over two megawatts or those requiring environmental assessment under the Environment Act, the setback increases to 1,000 metres. Additional setbacks from lot lines, roads, and watercourses are based on the height of the turbine. Several waivers apply, including for adjacent leased land or the construction of new homes after turbines are installed.

The upcoming amendments to the Minimum Planning Requirements Regulations under the Municipal Government Act will establish maximum allowable setback standards. Specifically,

municipalities will be limited to requiring no more than four (4) times the turbine height in distance from dwellings. This distance may be increased where necessary to ensure that sound levels remain below 40 decibels at the exterior of nearby dwellings. This change reduces municipal discretion to impose larger setbacks based on visual impact, land use compatibility, or other considerations.

West Richmond Planning Area

The current Land Use By-law for the West Richmond Planning Area does not include specific setback requirements for wind turbines within the Heavy Industrial (I-3) Zone. While utility-scale wind farms such as the Point Tupper installation are permitted in this zone as “Electrical Power Stations,” there is currently no regulation establishing minimum distances from residential properties.

To address this regulatory gap and comply with the new provincial regulations, a new setback provision will be introduced for utility wind turbines located within the I-3 Zone. Where such turbines are located adjacent to residential properties, a minimum setback of four (4) times the turbine height will be required. This distance may be increased where necessary to ensure that sound levels remain below 40 decibels at the exterior of nearby dwellings.

Conclusion:

Staff recommend updating the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-laws for Richmond County and the Land-Use-By-law for the West Richmond Planning Area to align with the recently introduced provincial regulations concerning wind turbine setbacks.

Appendix:

Appendix A: Proposed Amending By-laws

Appendix A: Amending Pages

BYLAW TO AMEND THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND MUNICIPAL PLANNING STRATEGY ADDRESSING WIND TURBINE SETBACKS

The Municipal Planning Strategy for the County of Richmond addressing wind turbine setback is hereby amended by:

1. Policy 5-52 of the Municipal Planning Strategy is hereby amended by removing the following text shown in strikethrough and adding the following text in bold to Policy 5-52:
 - a. ~~“Policy 5-52: Council shall, through the Land Use By-law, regulate the size and scale of permitted wind turbines, required setbacks, noise requirements for wind turbine development, development application requirements, and any other matters pertaining to wind turbine development. Council shall establish setback thresholds within the Land Use By-law from residential dwellings based on the size of the project and whether it requires an environmental assessment.~~
Government of Nova Scotia’s regulations for wind turbine development.”

This is to certify that the by-law of which this is a true copy, was passed at a duly called meeting of the Council of the Municipality of the County of Richmond held on the _____ day of _____ 2025.

Given under the hand of the Municipal Clerk and under the corporate seal of the Municipality this _____ day of _____ 2025.

Troy MacCulloch,
Chief Administrative Officer

**BYLAW TO AMEND THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND LAND-USE BY-LAWS
ADDRESSING WIND TURBINE SETBACKS**

The Land-use By-laws for the County of Richmond addressing wind turbine setback is hereby amended by:

1. Section 6.35.9 (a) of the Land-Use By-Law Planning is hereby amended by removing the following text shown in strikethrough and adding the following text in bold to Section 6.35.9 (a):
 - a. “The minimum setback from all dwellings, except dwellings located on the same lot as the wind turbine, shall be ~~600.0 metres (1,968.5 feet)~~ **four (4) times the turbine height unless a greater distance is required to ensure that sound levels do not exceed 40 decibels at the exterior of a dwelling.** There shall be no setback requirement from dwellings located on the same lot.”

2. Section 6.35.9 (b) of the Land-Use By-Law Planning is hereby amended by removing the following text shown in strikethrough and adding the following text in bold to Section 6.35.9 (b):
 - a. “The minimum setback for wind turbine developments with a nameplate capacity greater than two (2) megawatts or turbines requiring an Environmental Assessment, as stipulated in the Nova Scotia Environment Act, from all dwellings, except dwellings located on the same lot as the wind turbine, shall be ~~1000.0 metres (3,280.84 feet)~~ **four times the turbine height unless a greater distance is required to ensure that sound levels do not exceed 40 decibels at the exterior of a dwelling.** There is no setback requirement from dwellings located on the same lot.”

This is to certify that the by-law of which this is a true copy, was passed at a duly called meeting of the Council of the Municipality of the County of Richmond held on the _____ day of _____ 2025.

Given under the hand of the Municipal Clerk and under the corporate seal of the Municipality this _____ day of _____ 2025.

Troy MacCulloch,
Chief Administrative Officer

BYLAW TO AMEND THE WEST RICHMOND PLANNING AREA LAND-USE BY-LAW

The Land-Use By-laws for the West Richmond Planning Area is hereby amended by:

The Land-use By-laws for the West Richmond Planning Area is hereby amended by:

1. Adding the following permitted use under Part 9-Heavy Industrial (I-3) Zone after “Storage Facilities” and before “I-1 Uses subject to the requirements of the I-1 Zone”:
 - Utility Wind Turbine
2. Adding to the following policy under Part 9 – Heavy Industrial (I-3) Zone titled “Special Restrictions: Wind Turbine Setbacks from Residential Uses”:
 - a) The minimum setback from all dwellings, except dwellings located on the same lot as the wind turbine, shall be four (4) times the turbine height unless a greater distance is required to ensure that sound levels do not exceed 40 decibels at the exterior of a dwelling, and
 - b) There shall be no setback requirement from dwellings located on the same lot.
3. Adding the following definitions to Part 15 – Definitions:
 28. HEIGHT OF WIND TURBINE refers to the distance from the bottom of the turbine to the height of a rotor blade in vertical position.
 29. HEIGHT OF ROTOR refers to the diameter of the swept area of the rotor blades.
 32. KILOWATT (kW) is a measure of power for electrical current (1 kW= 1000 watts). A Megawatt (MW) equals 1000 Kilowatts
 56. SETBACKS OF A WIND TURBINE is measured from the base of the wind turbine tower.
 63. UTILITY WIND TURBINE refers to a device for converting wind power to electricity, which has a name plate capacity of more than 100 Kilowatts (kW) and generates power primarily for sale to a third party and which may be developed either as a standalone machine or be grouped with others in a wind farm.
4. Section 15 of the West Richmond Land-Use By-law Strategy is hereby amended by renumbering the definitions accordingly.

This is to certify that the by-law of which this is a true copy, was passed at a duly called meeting of the Council of the Municipality of the County of Richmond held on the _____ day of _____ 2025.

Given under the hand of the Municipal Clerk and under the corporate seal of the Municipality this _____ day of _____ 2025.

Troy MacCulloch,
Chief Administrative Officer