

Planning Advisory Committee Meeting

May 5, 2026

Town of Berwick Council Chambers

6:30 pm

Agenda

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Approval of the Agenda**
- 3. Approval of the Minutes**
 - April 7, 2026 PPM Minutes
 - April 7, 2026 PAC Minutes
- 4. New Business**
 - Potential Stormwater Management MPS Policy changes and LUB amendments
- 5. Activity Report**
 - March 2026
- 6. Adjournment**

Report to PAC – Stormwater Management Discussion

Prepared by:	Chrystal Fuller, LPP, MCIP with input from Tim Bouter, P. Eng (Town Engineer) and Aaron Dondale (Public Works)
Subject:	Potential Stormwater Management MPS Policy changes and LUB amendments
Date:	May 5, 2026
Purpose:	Preliminary feedback on potential MPS and LUB changes

1. Introduction

The Town of Berwick retained CBCL Limited to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan to better understand the performance of the Town's stormwater system, identify flood risk areas, and develop mitigation strategies to improve flood resilience while supporting future development. The final report was issued in April 2026. The study included hydrologic and hydraulic modelling, review of existing stormwater infrastructure, targeted field surveys, Town GIS information, and public input from a consultation session held on March 24, 2025.

The CBCL report confirms that Berwick experiences recurring flooding during large rainfall events, particularly along Main Street, in low-lying areas, and in areas adjacent to the Cornwallis River. It also confirms that the Town's major stormwater system relies heavily on overland flow paths, open ditches, and culverts, and that much of this aging infrastructure does not have sufficient capacity to manage increased stormwater flows associated with climate change and development.

This report focuses on land use planning and does not ask the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) to assess the engineering merits, timing, or cost of specific capital projects. Those matters will be considered separately through Council's infrastructure planning and budgeting processes. The purpose of this report is to begin a planning discussion about whether the Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Land Use By-law (LUB) should be updated so that future development better accounts for known flood risk, overland flow paths, stormwater constraints, and climate change.

This is a timely discussion. When the Town's MPS and LUB were amended in 2025, the final CBCL modelling was not available. The Town now has updated technical information that can inform whether changes should be made to the Conservation (OS2) Zone, development permit requirements, site plan approval criteria, and possible stormwater overlay areas.

2. Why stormwater management is important

Stormwater management matters because it affects residents, municipal infrastructure, public safety, environmental quality, and municipal risk.

For residents, unmanaged stormwater can contribute to flooded basements, damaged yards, unsafe roads, blocked access, erosion, icing, sediment build-up, and conflict between neighbouring properties. Even where flooding does not enter a building, recurring nuisance flooding can affect how people use their property and how safe they feel during large rain events.

For the Town, stormwater management is an infrastructure and risk management issue. Poorly managed stormwater can damage roads, culverts, ditches, parks, trails, wastewater infrastructure, public works

facilities, and private lands. It can also increase maintenance costs and create public expectations that the Town will solve drainage problems after development has already occurred.

Climate change makes this more important. The CBCL report applied climate change modelling using federal guidance and identified an overall projected rainfall increase of approximately 67 percent by 2100. This does not mean every storm will be extreme, but it does mean the Town should expect more pressure on drainage systems over time.

Stormwater is also a planning issue because development changes how land absorbs and conveys water. More buildings, driveways, parking areas, roads, compacted surfaces, and filled low areas can increase runoff and reduce natural stormwater storage. In Nova Scotia, municipal planning strategies may include policy on climate change adaptation, stormwater management and erosion control, fill and excavation, lands subject to flooding, and infrastructure.

The planning documents do not need to stop all development in stormwater-affected areas. However, they should ensure that development in known risk areas is reviewed using the best available information.

3. Summary of planning-related recommendations from the CBCL report

The CBCL report includes both infrastructure recommendations and general recommendations. The PAC's role is most directly related to the general recommendations that affect planning policy, land use regulation, development review, subdivision, and future municipal standards.

The key planning-related recommendations are summarized below.

CBCL report recommendation	Planning implication
Establish drainage easements	The report recommends drainage easements to enable legal access to key pieces of stormwater infrastructure. This has implications for subdivision approvals, development agreements, and development affecting overland flow routes.
Implement a proactive inspection and maintenance program	The report recommends a proactive maintenance program so existing stormwater assets provide maximum value. Planning documents should avoid approving development that blocks access to ditches, culverts, drainage routes, or other stormwater infrastructure.
Expand municipal stormwater management design standards	CBCL recommends expanding municipal standards to include clear and specific stormwater quantity and quality control requirements. This is best addressed through Municipal Services Specifications, supported by MPS and LUB amendments.
Recognize the overland system	The report confirms that Berwick's major stormwater system is made up of overland flow paths, open channels, and culverts. Planning controls should recognize that these drainage routes are part of the Town's stormwater system, even where they cross private lands.
Use updated flood and stormwater information	The report provides updated information that can inform where restrictions, technical reports, or additional review should apply, especially north of Main Street and in overland flow areas south of Main Street.
Consider development restrictions in flood risk areas	The report includes a specific recommendation section on development restrictions. This supports the Town considering whether current zoning and LUB provisions should be updated now that better data is available.
Treat capital works and land use controls as complementary	The report identifies capital works such as culvert upgrades, Centennial Park detention, Horsburgh Drive channel and diversion options, Public Works floodproofing, and lifecycle renewal opportunities. These are important, but should be considered through capital planning rather than debated in detail through this PAC report.

The practical planning takeaway is that Berwick should move from a general approach of “stormwater should be considered” to a clearer approach where development in known risk areas must demonstrate that it will not worsen stormwater impacts or block existing drainage functions.

4. Existing planning framework

Berwick already has several planning tools that relate to flood risk, environmental constraints, and stormwater. The issue is not that the Town has no tools. The issue is whether the existing tools are specific enough now that the CBCL report is available.

The MPS includes an Environmental Designation that enables both the Recreation and Open Space (OS1) Zone and the Conservation (OS2) Zone. Policy 3.43 states that Council intends to identify known environmentally sensitive areas, including steep slopes, flood areas, and watercourses, where development activity will be restricted or prohibited, and to apply the OS2 Zone to those lands. Policy 3.44 states that the Town will undertake floodplain mapping to identify at-risk areas and that, until the study is completed, new residential, commercial, or industrial development within the Environmental Designation may require a flood risk assessment study prepared by a qualified person.

The LUB currently includes the OS1 and OS2 Zones. In the OS2 Zone, no development permit may be issued except for a limited list of uses, including cemeteries, agriculture, garden nurseries, public parks, trails, passive recreation facilities, wastewater treatment facilities, flood control facilities, and market gardens. The LUB states that no permanent building may be erected, added to, or altered in the OS2 Zone except buildings or structures related to sewage treatment or flood control.

The LUB also includes site plan approval criteria for certain residential, mixed-use, and commercial developments. These criteria address matters such as location of structures, parking, access, landscaping, and neighbourhood impacts, but they do not appear to include detailed criteria for stormwater, overland flow routes, grading, drainage easements, or stormwater maintenance.

The current planning documents therefore provide a foundation. The question for PAC is whether that foundation should be updated to reflect the new CBCL information.

5. Summary of best practices from other municipalities

Stormwater regulation is increasingly handled through a combination of planning policy, land use regulation, engineering standards, subdivision requirements, and maintenance obligations. No single tool does all the work.

The Nova Scotia Minimum Planning Requirements Regulations support the inclusion of MPS policies related to climate change mitigation and adaptation, stormwater management and erosion control, fill and excavation, lands subject to flooding, steep slopes, and other hazard lands. This confirms that stormwater is an appropriate planning topic where the approach is grounded in local conditions and properly implemented through municipal planning tools.

Halifax provides a useful Nova Scotia example, although Berwick would need a smaller-scale version. Halifax’s Administrative Order 2020-010-OP establishes stormwater management standards for development activities. Its standards include retaining stormwater runoff from the first 10 mm of rainfall on-site, matching pre-development and post-development stormwater runoff conditions for the 1:5-year and 1:100-year return design storms, and applying stormwater quality and erosion control measures.

The Halifax example is useful because it does not rely only on general wording. It sets measurable requirements, requires technical submission where appropriate, and connects stormwater review to

development activity. Berwick should not copy Halifax's approach wholesale, because Berwick's administrative capacity, development scale, and drainage system are different. However, the broader principle is applicable: MPS policy should provide authority, the LUB should identify when stormwater review is required, and technical standards should sit in municipal specifications.

The Municipality of the County of Kings provides a more directly comparable Valley example. Kings has prepared a Storm Water Management Policy that applies to all future development and recognizes that property owners are responsible for managing drainage on their own property so neighbouring properties are not negatively affected by stormwater arising from development. The policy is also careful to clarify the municipality's limited role on private property and states that municipal guidance and minimum standards do not relieve the owner of responsibility or guarantee that there will be no negative stormwater flows onto other properties.

The Kings policy is useful for Berwick because it uses clear permit-stage triggers without requiring an engineered stormwater plan for every small development. Under the Kings approach, the Development Officer may request a Storm Water Management Plan for new multi-unit dwellings, grouped dwellings of three residential units or more, townhouses of three residential units or more, new main commercial and industrial buildings, commercial or industrial expansions of more than 50 percent of the existing main building footprint, and new development or expansions that exceed 35 percent lot coverage.

The Kings policy also includes practical exemptions. The Development Officer may exempt individual lots containing one- or two-unit dwellings, developments with less than 35 percent lot coverage, developments where drainage is regulated through a development agreement, and developments where building footprints are not proposed to expand. This is a useful model for Berwick because it balances stormwater risk management with administrative practicality.

Another useful feature of the Kings policy is the role clarity between the Development Officer and Municipal Engineer. The Development Officer requests the Storm Water Management Plan as part of the permit review, forwards it to the Municipal Engineer or designate, and issues the permit only after receiving written notification that the plan addresses drainage management on the property. The Municipal Engineer reviews the plan, may request additional information, and reviews consistency with the Municipal Services Specifications Manual, even where no municipal infrastructure is involved.

For Berwick, the best-practice lesson from Kings is that the Town can create a practical permit-stage process that does three things: places responsibility for private drainage on the property owner, gives the Development Officer clear authority to request a stormwater plan, and keeps the technical review with the Municipal Engineer rather than expecting the Development Officer to make engineering judgements.

The best practice lessons for Berwick are:

- Use the MPS to establish policy authority.
- Use the LUB to identify where and when stormwater review is required.
- Use the Subdivision By-law and Municipal Services Specifications for technical design standards.
- Use site plan approval and development agreements for larger or more complex projects.
- Use clear development permit triggers, such as multi-unit residential development, commercial and industrial buildings, larger building expansions, higher lot coverage, parking areas, fill, grading, ditch changes, culvert changes, and development within mapped stormwater constraint areas.

- Avoid requiring engineered stormwater plans for every small residential project unless the property is within a mapped risk area or involves material grading or drainage changes.
- Clarify that property owners remain responsible for managing drainage on their property so that neighbouring properties are not negatively affected.
- Require professional input where the Town does not have enough information to determine whether a development will affect stormwater conveyance, storage, or downstream properties.
- Ensure the Development Officer can request the required information, but that technical review is completed by the Municipal Engineer or designate.
- Recognize that public infrastructure upgrades and private development controls are both needed. One does not replace the other.

6. Key planning tools under discussion

For clarity, this report uses the following terms:

Tool	Meaning
Conservation (OS2) Zone	A zoning tool already used in Berwick to restrict development on environmentally sensitive lands, including flood areas and watercourses.
Flood Risk Overlay	A possible new overlay that could apply to riverine flood-prone lands, particularly north of Main Street, while leaving the underlying zoning in place.
Stormwater Management Overlay	A possible new overlay that could apply to rainfall-induced flood risk areas, overland flow paths, culvert corridors, ditches, and drainage constraints, particularly south of Main Street.
Municipal Services Specifications	Technical engineering standards that can set measurable stormwater design requirements without placing all engineering detail in the MPS or LUB.
Development agreement clauses	Site-specific legal terms that can require stormwater plans, easements, phasing, bonding, as-built drawings, and maintenance obligations for larger or higher-risk projects.

The CBCL mapping provides the technical basis for further planning review. Before adoption into the LUB, the mapping should be translated into a clear planning schedule or overlay, reviewed by planning and engineering staff, and adjusted as needed so that property owners, staff, and Council can understand where additional requirements apply.

7. Discussion Point 1: Flood risk areas north of Main Street

The lands north of Main Street require focused discussion because they are affected by flood risk associated with the Cornwallis River and low-lying lands. The current MPS already recognizes that known environmentally sensitive areas, including flood areas and watercourses, may be identified and placed in the OS2 Zone, where development activity will be restricted or prohibited.

When the MPS and LUB were amended in 2025, the final CBCL modelling was not yet available. The current OS2 boundaries therefore do not appear to fully reflect the new stormwater and flood-risk information now available to the Town.

Three broad approaches are available.

Option 1: Leave the OS2 Zone as it is

From a risk management perspective, this is the least preferred option.

Maintaining the current OS2 boundaries without further review would be administratively simple. However, the Town now has updated technical information from the CBCL report. If the planning documents are not reviewed in light of that information, the Town may face increased public safety, infrastructure, financial, reputational, and legal risk, particularly as rainfall intensity increases with climate change.

This option may be defensible only if Council concludes, after review, that the current OS2 Zone already adequately captures the affected lands and that no additional development pressure is likely. Based on the CBCL report, that conclusion does not seem supportable.

Option 2: Amend the OS2 Zone

This is the most precautionary approach.

Under this option, the OS2 Zone would be amended to reflect updated flood risk mapping and affected lands north of Main Street. This would provide the clearest regulatory response and would align with the existing MPS direction that known flood areas may be placed in the Conservation Zone.

The advantage of this option is clarity. It would tell landowners and developers that these lands are not intended for urban development because of flood risk and stormwater function. It would also reduce future pressure on staff and Council to consider site-specific development proposals in areas where the Town now has evidence of risk.

The disadvantage is that it may be viewed by some landowners as a significant restriction. It may also require careful communication so the public understands that the change is based on updated technical information, climate risk, public safety, and protection of municipal infrastructure.

Option 3: Apply an intermediate approach with mitigation measures

This option would update the planning documents but would not necessarily rezone all affected lands to OS2.

An intermediate approach could include one or more of the following:

Possible measure	Purpose
Expand OS2 only in the highest-risk areas	Focus the strongest restriction where risk is most clear
Create a Flood Risk Overlay	Allow existing underlying zoning to remain, while requiring flood risk review before development
Require flood mitigation reports for new development in mapped areas	Allow some flexibility while requiring professional assessment
Require flood mitigation analysis for all new development over a certain size	To have clear thresholds for when stormwater assessments are required.
Limit sensitive uses	Avoid new residential, institutional, or other vulnerable uses in higher-risk areas
Require floodproofing, grading review, or no-net-loss of flood storage	Reduce risk where development may be considered
Require development agreement rather than as-of-right approval	Allow Council to consider site-specific mitigation, phasing, easements, and infrastructure
Allow only low-risk uses	Permit parks, trails, open space, parking, utilities, flood control, or similar uses where appropriate

This option may be attractive if Council wants to reduce risk but avoid a blanket rezoning approach. The trade-off is that it is more complex to administer and may require clearer technical criteria.

8. Discussion Point 2: Stormwater Management Requirements south of Main Street

The stormwater issues south of Main Street are generally different from the flood-risk issues north of Main Street. Many of these areas are affected by overland flow, ditch capacity, culvert capacity, road overtopping, and localized storage issues. The CBCL report identifies potential capital improvements that may reduce flood risk over time, including culvert upgrades, Centennial Park detention, Horsburgh Drive channel and diversion options, and lifecycle renewal opportunities.

Those capital improvements will need to be considered by Council through budgeting, detailed design, easements, landowner discussions, public works planning, and any required approvals. However, **it would be prudent to improve development review practices while Council considers next steps.**

The planning concern is straightforward: where the Town has information about stormwater constraints, it should avoid approving new development that worsens those constraints before public works improvements are completed. Public works improvements may reduce risk over time, but planning controls are still needed so that development does not worsen existing conditions before those improvements are completed, or in areas where residual risk remains.

Two broad options are available for PAC discussion. Both options would be supported by clear permit-stage triggers and review by the Town Engineer.

Option 1: Require stormwater management plans across Town using clear development thresholds

One option is to create a Town-wide stormwater management policy, similar in concept to the Municipality of the County of Kings approach. Under this option, the requirement for a stormwater management plan would not be limited to properties within a mapped overlay. Instead, it would apply across Berwick where development meets defined thresholds.

This approach recognizes that stormwater issues are not always confined to mapped flood-risk or overland-flow areas. Site grading, increased lot coverage, parking areas, commercial and industrial development, and larger residential projects can create stormwater impacts even outside an overlay area. A Town-wide approach would also be simpler to explain in some respects because the same basic trigger would apply throughout the Town.

Potential Town-wide triggers could include:

- new multi-unit dwellings;
- grouped dwellings or townhouse developments of three units or more;
- new main commercial or industrial buildings;
- expansions of commercial or industrial buildings over a defined threshold;
- development exceeding a defined lot coverage threshold;
- creation or expansion of significant parking areas;
- development involving fill, grading, ditch alteration, culvert installation, culvert removal, or changes to existing drainage patterns; or
- any development where the Development Officer, based on advice from the Town Engineer, determines that additional stormwater information is needed.

This option could also include exemptions for low-risk development, such as individual lots containing one- or two-unit dwellings, minor additions that do not materially increase impervious surface,

development already regulated through a development agreement, or development where the Municipal Engineer confirms that a stormwater management plan is not required.

Option 2: Require stormwater management plans within a mapped Stormwater Management Overlay

Under this option, the Town would create a Stormwater Management Overlay for mapped stormwater constraint areas, particularly south of Main Street. Within that overlay, the Town could require a stormwater management plan for development that meets defined thresholds, such as:

- development creating more than two dwelling units;
- new commercial, industrial, institutional, or mixed-use development;
- creation or expansion of parking areas;
- development involving fill, grading, ditch alteration, culvert installation, culvert removal, or changes to existing drainage patterns; or
- development that may affect a mapped overland flow route, ditch, culvert, drainage easement, or stormwater storage area.

This approach would focus the stormwater management plan requirement on areas where the CBCL report or Town information identifies known drainage constraints. It would avoid applying the same level of review to every property in Town, while still requiring better information before development proceeds in areas where stormwater risk is already known.

A Stormwater Management Overlay would not necessarily prohibit development. It would require development in mapped areas to demonstrate that it will not worsen stormwater impacts, block overland flow, redirect drainage onto neighbouring properties, or interfere with stormwater infrastructure.

Common elements under either option

Whether the Town chooses a Town-wide threshold approach, an overlay-based approach, or some combination of the two, the same general principles should apply.

Stormwater management requirements should be based on clear triggers. A unit-count threshold, such as more than two dwelling units, is useful but not sufficient on its own. Some lower-unit developments, large parking areas, commercial uses, or grading and fill projects may have greater stormwater impacts than a small triplex. For that reason, any final approach should combine unit count with other triggers, including impervious surface, lot coverage, parking area creation or expansion, fill, grading, ditch changes, culvert changes, and location within a mapped flow path.

The Town should also reserve the ability to exempt applications from the requirement where:

- relevant capital improvements have been completed;
- the Town Engineer confirms that the development does not affect a mapped overland flow route or stormwater constraint;
- the development is minor and does not materially increase impervious surface;
- adequate stormwater controls have already been approved through subdivision, site plan approval, or development agreement; or
- updated mapping or engineering review shows that the property is no longer within an area of concern.
- Exemptions should be based on written confirmation from the Town Engineer or Municipal Engineer. This would provide clarity for the Development Officer, applicants, and property owners.

Potential stormwater requirements under either option could include:

Requirement	Purpose
Stormwater management plan for development over defined thresholds	Ensures technical review before approval
Lot grading plan	Helps prevent drainage being redirected onto neighbouring properties
Protection of overland flow paths	Avoids blocking the major drainage system
No obstruction of ditches, culverts, drainage channels, or easements	Maintains existing conveyance
Erosion and sediment control during construction	Reduces construction-related impacts
Maintenance plan for private stormwater facilities	Avoids future failure of private systems
Town Engineer or review	Keeps technical judgement with qualified engineering staff, not solely the Development Officer

For PAC discussion, the key choice is whether Berwick should begin with a Town-wide threshold approach, an overlay-based approach, or a hybrid approach that applies Town-wide triggers while also imposing additional requirements in mapped stormwater constraint areas.

9. Questions for PAC to consider

The purpose of this section is to identify the main policy choices. Detailed wording can be prepared later if PAC and Council support the general direction.

- Does PAC agree that the MPS and LUB should be reviewed and potentially amended in response to the CBCL Stormwater Management Plan?
- Should the planning amendments address only mapped flood-risk areas, or should they also address broader stormwater management issues across Town, including overland flow paths, open ditches, culverts, drainage easements, channels, and storage areas?
- For lands north of Main Street, should Council consider expanding the OS2 Zone, creating a Flood Risk Overlay, or using a combination of both to manage development in higher-risk areas?
- In the highest-risk areas north of Main Street, should new urban development, particularly new residential development, be restricted or prohibited, while allowing lower-risk uses such as parks, trails, open space, utilities, flood control works, or similar uses?
- Should Berwick require stormwater management plans Town-wide for certain developments, only within mapped Stormwater Management Overlay areas, or through a hybrid approach?

If PAC supports further work, staff could prepare a more detailed amendment package for Council's consideration. Potential changes could include:

Planning document	Potential change
MPS	Add policies recognizing stormwater management as part of infrastructure planning, climate adaptation, public safety, and development control
MPS	Add policy support for mapping and regulating Stormwater Management Areas
MPS	Update OS2 policies to reflect the CBCL report and current flood risk mapping
LUB	Amend the OS2 Zone boundaries based on updated mapping, subject to Council direction
LUB	Add a Flood Risk Overlay for areas north of Main Street if Council prefers a flexible approach

LUB	Add a Stormwater Management Overlay for mapped overland flow and stormwater constraint areas south of Main Street
LUB	Add stormwater management plan triggers for development over two units within mapped overlay areas
LUB	Add stormwater management plan triggers for commercial, industrial, institutional, mixed-use, parking area, fill, grading, ditch, and culvert-related development
LUB	Add provisions restricting obstruction of overland flow paths, ditches, culverts, drainage easements, and stormwater storage areas
LUB	Update site plan approval criteria to include grading, drainage, stormwater, maintenance, and easements
Subdivision By-law	Require stormwater plans, drainage easements, and protection of overland flow routes for new subdivisions
Municipal Services Specifications	Add technical stormwater standards based on the CBCL recommendations and accepted municipal practice
Development agreement templates	Add standard clauses for stormwater plans, easements, phasing, bonding, as-built drawings, and maintenance

10. Proposed next steps and timeline

If PAC supports further work, the next step would be to move from general policy direction to draft planning amendments. The proposed process would include PAC review, landowner and public consultation, preparation of detailed amendments, and Council's formal public hearing process.

The following preliminary timeline is suggested:

Step	Timing	Purpose
PAC Meeting #1	May 5	Introduce the CBCL Stormwater Management Plan from a planning perspective, review potential MPS and LUB amendment directions, and receive preliminary PAC feedback.
Landowner and public consultation	June	Meet with affected landowners and the broader public to explain the CBCL findings, discuss potential changes to the OS2 Zone and proposed Stormwater Management Overlay areas, and hear concerns before detailed amendments are finalized.
Draft detailed amendments	June	Prepare draft MPS and LUB amendments based on PAC feedback, public input, staff review, engineering input, and the CBCL mapping. This may include draft policy language, overlay mapping, OS2 boundary changes, site plan criteria, and stormwater management plan triggers.
PAC Meeting #2	July	Review draft amendments and consultation feedback. PAC may recommend that Council proceed, revise the draft, defer, or seek additional information.
First Reading	September	Council considers First Reading of the proposed MPS and LUB amendments. If First Reading is given, the amendments proceed to the formal public hearing process.
Public Hearing and Second Reading	October / November	Council holds the statutory Public Hearing, considers public submissions, and decides whether to approve, amend, or refuse the proposed amendments at Second Reading.

This timeline is intended to allow enough time for landowner discussion before formal amendments are advanced. That is important because some of the potential changes may affect development

expectations on private lands, particularly north of Main Street and within any proposed stormwater overlay areas.

The June consultation should be designed to be practical and plain-language. The goal should not be to debate engineering calculations in detail, but to help landowners understand:

- what the CBCL report identified;
- what the Town is considering from a planning perspective;
- how the proposed changes could affect development applications;
- what options are available for the OS2 Zone north of Main Street;
- what a potential Stormwater Management Overlay south of Main Street could require;
- how exemptions or technical reviews may work; and
- how public works improvements and planning controls would work together.

The amendment drafting should also include a technical review of the CBCL mapping before it is placed into the LUB. The mapping may need to be translated into a clear planning schedule or overlay that can be understood by landowners, staff, PAC, and Council. Where possible, boundaries should be clear enough to administer at the development permit stage.

11. Preliminary conclusion

The CBCL Stormwater Management Plan gives Berwick better information than it had when the MPS and LUB were amended in 2025. The Town now has a stronger technical basis to consider changes to the OS2 Zone north of Main Street and to introduce a potential Stormwater Management Overlay south of Main Street.

The planning issue is not whether Council should immediately construct every capital improvement identified in the CBCL report. That is a separate infrastructure and budgeting discussion.

The planning issue is whether Berwick should continue approving development under the current planning framework, or whether the MPS and LUB should be updated so that known stormwater risks are considered before development occurs.

The recommended direction for discussion is:

- Consider amendments to the OS2 Zone or a Flood Risk Overlay north of Main Street.
- Consider a Stormwater Management Overlay south of Main Street.
- Consider requiring stormwater management plans for development over two units within mapped overlay areas, unless exempted by the Town.
- Include additional triggers for commercial, industrial, institutional, mixed-use, parking area, fill, grading, ditch, and culvert-related development.
- Add LUB provisions to protect overland flow paths, ditches, culverts, stormwater storage areas, and drainage easements.
- Update site plan approval criteria to address stormwater management more directly.
- Prepare or update Municipal Services Specifications so that stormwater management expectations are clear, measurable, and technically reviewable.
- Proceed with a staged process that includes PAC review on May 5, landowner and public consultation in June, detailed amendment drafting, a second PAC review in July, First Reading in September, and a Public Hearing and Second Reading in October or November.

This approach would allow Berwick to support growth while reducing avoidable stormwater risk. It would also give staff, developers, residents, and Council clearer expectations about what is required in areas where the Town now has evidence of flood or drainage constraints.

Sources reviewed

- CBCL Limited. Berwick Stormwater Management Plan, Final Report, Project No. 251083.00, April 2026.
- Town of Berwick. Municipal Planning Strategy, 2025 version provided for review.
- Town of Berwick. Land Use By-law, 2025 version provided for review.
- Municipality of the County of Kings. Storm Water Management Policy, Policy DBS-03-006, Development & Building Services,
- Nova Scotia. Minimum Planning Requirements Regulations, made under the Municipal Government Act.
- Halifax Regional Municipality. Administrative Order 2020-010-OP, Respecting Stormwater Management Standards for Development Activities.

Town of Berwick

Activity Report - March 2026

Permit Counts	Last Fiscal Year		This Fiscal Year	
	Total for March 2025	Total for Year to Date	Total for March 2026	Total For Year to Date
Building Permits	2	40	2	38
Development Permits	0	1	0	0
Demolition Permits	0	1	0	2
Sign Permits	0	0	0	0
Total Permits	2	42	2	40
Total Building value	\$138,000	\$4,169,950	\$29,160	\$3,946,556
Number of Residential Units				
One Unit	0	5	0	8
Two Unit	0	6	0	5
Multi Unit	0	6	0	6
Townhouse	0	0	0	0
Farm Dwelling	0	0	0	0
Mobile Home	0	1	0	0
Farm Tenement	0	0	0	0
Accessory Dwelling Unit	0	0	0	0
Res Units in Commercial	0	0	0	0
Total Residential	0	18	0	19
Recreational Cabins	0	0	0	0



Town of Berwick

Permits by District - March 2026

Permit	Location	Work Type	Building Type	Proposed Use	Res # of Units	Estimated Value
260141	34 MACINTOSH ST BERWICK	RENOVATION	Solar	RESIDENTIAL	0	\$23,400
260099	31 BROWN ST BERWICK	ADDITION	Deck	RESIDENTIAL	0	\$5,760
				Totals	0	\$29,160

