

This document was created using best practices in document accessibility. Should you need assistance reading or understanding this document, call 902-543-8181 or email info@modl.ca.

Municipal Council Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, May 12, 2026 – 6:00 p.m.
MODL Council Chambers – 10 Allée Champlain Drive, Cookville

- 1. Call to Order**
 - 1.1 Mi'kma'ki Territorial Acknowledgement
- 2. Announcements, Acknowledgements, Recognition**
- 3. Public Input (15 Minutes)**
- 4. Changes/Approval of Agenda (as circulated)**
- 5. Approval of Minutes - Council April 28, 2026 & Special Council April 28, 2026**
- 6. Business Arising from Minutes**
- 7. Awarding of Tenders/RFPs**
 - 7.1 Award of RFP 2024-01-400 Extension of Contract Grub Control, Liming & Fertilizing MARC Ballfields..... 1-2
 - 7.2 Award of “remoteLocker+” Purchase for Community Hub..... 3-10
 - 7.3 Award of Furniture & Replacement Millwork Contract for Community Hub..... 11-16
- 8. Presentations/Scheduled Times - Nil**
- 9. Consideration of Correspondence - Nil**
- 10. Recommendations from Committees & Boards**
 - 10.1 Municipal Joint Services Board**
 - 10.1.1 MJSB Office Relocation..... 17-18
 - 10.2 Planning Advisory Committee** 19
 - 10.2.1 Revisions to Final Draft of Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law 20-49
- 11. Staff Reports**
 - 11.1 Recreation, Parks & Trails**
 - 11.1.1 Service Impacts of Discontinuing In-Person Visitor Information Services..... 50-53

12. Mayor's/Deputy Mayor's/Councillors' Matters

- 12.1 MJSB Update
- 12.2 Deputy Mayor's Update
- 12.3 Mayor's Update

13. Added Items

14. In Camera

- 14.1 Land Negotiations under Section 22(2)(a) of the MGA
- 14.2 Contract Negotiations under Section 22(2)(e) of the MGA
- 14.3 Contract Negotiations under Section 22(2)(e) of the MGA
- 14.4 Contract Negotiations under Section 22(2)(e) of the MGA

15. Adjournment

Council
Item #7.1
May 12, 2026
T. MacEwan



Municipality of the District of Lunenburg Request for Decision

Report to: Municipality of the District of Lunenburg Council
Submitted by: Trudy Payne, Director of Recreation, Parks and Tourism
Date: May 12, 2026
Re: RFP 2024-01-400 – Extension of Contract
Grub Control, Liming and Fertilizing – MARC Ballfields

Recommendation

Council authorize staff to extend the award of RFP 2024-01-400 Grub Control, Liming and Fertilizing – MARC Ballfields to Nature’s Reflections Landscaping Ltd. for the amount of \$54,541, excluding HST, for an additional two years of maintenance services as per the RFP.

Executive summary

The presence of grubs at the MARC Ballfields resulted in extensive damage to the turf leading to the full closure of one field for the 2023 season and partial closures of the remaining two. Following contracted services to treat, repair and maintain the fields in 2023, all three fields were re-opened for the 2024 season. To ensure grubs were properly mitigated and provided uninterrupted access to the fields, staff posted an RFP to seek proposals from certified landscape professionals for grub control, liming and fertilizing maintenance services. Council awarded this RFP to Nature’s Reflections Landscaping Ltd. in the amount of \$52,416, plus HST for two years. The ballfields look great due to this maintenance service, and to help ensure we avoid possible future interruptions of the ballfields it is highly recommended to extend the contract for an additional two years. On page two of the RFP document it states, “The Municipality intends to enter into a two-year contract with the successful Proponent, renewable for up to an additional two years.”

Discussion

The Municipality of the District of Lunenburg (MODL) maintains three (3) ballfields at the current Municipal Activity and Recreation Complex (MARC). These ballfields are in high demand with various ball groups and local schools using them regularly. In prior years, the MARC ballfields suffered from an infestation of grubs, which attracted a huge number of crows

causing damage to all three ballfields. In 2023, the damage was extensive enough that the ballfields were in an unusable condition and had to be closed to treat grubs and repair the damage to the fields. The treatment and repairs were successful, and two fields were able to open partway through the ball season. While great gains have been made over the last two years, ongoing mitigation and maintenance is required to avoid another infestation and ensure that the ballfield turf is strong and healthy.

Budget implications

The 2026-2027 approved operating budget includes \$66,000 for maintenance of the MARC Ballfields, which includes continuing with the grub control, liming and fertilizing of the fields. If the two- year extension is approved the 2027-2028 operating budget would also include funds to meet the terms of the two-year contract extension. The amount of the contract for 2026 is \$26,865 and for 2027 is \$27,416, excluding HST for a two year total of \$54,541.

Strategic plan

This work aligns with Council’s Infrastructure upgrades, expansion and management strategic priority.

Work plan

The awarded services will take place spring, summer, and fall of 2026 and 2027.

Alternative

Not award the two-year extension to Nature’s Reflections Landscaping Ltd. and perform fertilizing and liming in house. Staff are not certified to apply grub control products and as such, this maintenance activity would not be performed and the risk of having a grub infestation could re-occur which could lead to the closure of the ballfields again in the future.

Conclusion

The MARC Ballfields require regular annual maintenance to keep them safe and functional. Having annual grub control, liming, and fertilizing maintenance services performed by a professional landscape company with certified staff will help ensure that the turf at the MARC Ballfields is strong, healthy and able to withstand the rigours of a busy ball season. The contracted services will minimize the risk of future closures, which could result if grub activity was to happen again, causing crows to damage the fields.

Report Preparation	
Department	Recreation, Parks and Tourism
Report Prepared by	Trudy Payne, Director of Recreation, Parks and Tourism
Report Approved by	
Date Reviewed by C.A.O.	

Council
Item #7.2
May 12, 2026
T. MacEwan



The Municipality of the District of Lunenburg

Request for Decision

Report to: Council

Submitted by: Dave Waters Director of Economic Development

Date: May 12, 2026

Re: Hold Locker – SSPL Program Space

Recommendation

That Council authorizes staff to award the remoteLocker+ to Bibliotheca, to complete the South Shore Public Library program space in the amount of \$52,159.40 not including HST.

Executive summary

On March 24, 2026, Council announced the partnership with the South Shore Public Library and the Community Hub. With the new SSPL programming space there will be a new remoteLocker+ installed. A Bibliotheca remoteLocker+ is a smart, self-service pickup system that libraries use to let patrons collect their materials anytime—often 24/7—without needing staff assistance. This product is a specialized piece of equipment and pairs with the other systems within the library.

It's like a secure parcel locker but designed specifically for library items.

What it does

When someone places a hold on a book, DVD, or other item, library staff check it out to that person and place it inside one of the lockers. The system then automatically notifies the patron (usually by email or text) with a unique pickup code.

To facilitate the need for the remoteLocker+, Staff contacted Bibliotheca for an official quote. Attached are two quotes. One quote facilitates a 24-unit remoteLocker+ system (\$66,217.40) the other is for a 14-unit remoteLocker+ system (\$52,159.40). Staff spoke to Bibliotheca and

they indicated that we could start with the 14-unit locker and add the additional 10 units later if needed.



Bibliotheca Cost
14-Unit - \$52,159.40
24-unit - \$66,217.40

To facilitate this project, the District of Lunenburg applied Article 19.1.5 of Policy No. 033 – Purchasing and Tendering Policy, that ensure compatibility with existing products, to recognize exclusive rights, such as exclusive licenses, copyright and patent rights, or to maintain specialized products that shall be maintained by the manufacture or its representatives.

The current overall project is on budget with either the 24-unit or 14-unit system.

Background

Council approved the Community Hub project in the 2023/24 budget which was part of a partnership with WellTide Health to bring a new Collaborative Healthcare / Community Hub facility to the area and would see the development of a farmers' market, commercial kitchen,

event space, boardroom, café and offices. Earlier in 2025 Council conducted additional public consultation and shifted the Community Hub away from the farmers market but felt the community would benefit greatly from a community hub with an event space, café, kitchen, boardroom, programming space and offices. Council adjusted the office space to a business hub with four other partners on board and ready-to-go in the business hub.

Strategic Focus

The project aligns itself with Council's Strategic Directions of Quality of Life, Affordability and Social Inclusion.

Budget/Financial Implications

The remoteLocker+ system is for the SSPL Program Space and costs \$52,159.40 not including HST and will work with the overall Community Hub budget.

Climate Change/sustainability

N/A

Inclusion, Diversity, Equity and Accessibility (IDEA@MODL)

N/A

Strategic Communications

N/A

Work plan

This project is part of the Department of Economic Development current 5-year Strategic Plan.

Alternatives

Not proceed with the award and do not include a remoteLocker system in the SSPL scope.

Or

Move directly to a 24-unit system at a cost of \$66,217.40 not including HST.

Conclusion

Staff recommend awarding the remoteLocker system to Bibliotheca but start with the 14-unit system and if the need justifies add an additional 10 units later.

Report Preparation	
Department	Economic Development
Report Prepared by	Dave Waters Director of Economic Development
Report Approved by	
Date Reviewed by C.A.O.	



Bill To
 South Shore Public Libraries
 135 North Park Street, Unit B
 Bridgewater NS B4V 9B3
 Canada

Ship To
 South Shore Public Libraries
 135 North Park Street, Unit B
 Bridgewater NS B4V 9B3
 Canada

Quote QUO-CA04905

Date 1/23/2026

Customer: C000042-CA

Payment Terms: 50% on Order, 50% on Ship Net30

Quote Expiration: 2/23/2026

Sales Rep: Jean-Simon Boivin

Memo (External): Indoor lockers - Option 1(Towers: 3, 2, 1, 3)

Item	Quantity	Net Price	Net Extended
Freight White Glove Service SHP000002-000	1	7,475.00	7,475.00
remoteLocker 100 v3 central tower inc. RFID (black) RML000001-000	1	21,386.80	21,386.80
remoteLocker 110 v3 10 locker tower (black) RML000013-000	2	10,800.40	21,600.80
remoteLocker 105R v3 4 locker tower with returns (black) RML000007-000	1	11,010.80	11,010.80
remoteLocker v3 smart controller RML000043-000	1	1,389.60	1,389.60
remoteLocker™ - Side covers SLR001050-000	1	540.00	540.00
Subscription: libraryConnect™ LINK subscription - 1 license / device - Optional SWR000080-000-SUB	1	330.40	330.40
Introduction to remoteLocker - Optional EDU020011-000	1	1,490.40	1,490.40
Introduction to libraryConnect LINK - Optional EDU040020-000	1	993.60	993.60
		Subtotal:	66,217.40
		PST:	0.00
		GST:	9,270.44
		Total:	75,487.84
		Currency:	Canadian Dollar

Additional Details



After 60 days, Bibliotheca, reserves the right to revise quote.
Freight charges are estimated, actual charges will be billed.
AMH systems will be invoiced at 50% order placement, 40% shipment, 10% at acceptance
All prices including Service and Maintenance do not include any applicable sales tax.
A copy of Tax Exemption Certificate is required with purchase order for all tax exempt customers
A 20% restocking fee, in addition to in-bound and out-bound shipping, will be charged for all returns.

<https://www.bibliotheca.com/en-ca-terms-of-sale-agreement/>

GST/HST N° 859257321RT0001

Submit Purchase Order by fax to 877-689-2269 or by email to orders-ca@bibliotheca.com.

Accepted By: _____

Accepted Date: _____

Customer Purchase Order Number: _____



Bill To
 District of Lunenburg
 10 Allée Champlain Drive
 Cookville NS B4V 9E4
 Canada

Ship To
 South Shore Public Libraries
 135 North Park Street, Unit B
 Bridgewater NS B4V 9B3
 Canada

Quote QUO-CA04905

Date 3/10/2026

Customer: C000042-CA

Payment Terms: 50% on Order, 50% on Ship Net30

Quote Expiration: 3/27/2026

Sales Rep: Jean-Simon Boivin

Memo (External): Indoor lockers - Option 1(Towers: 3, 1, 2)

Item	Quantity	Net Price	Net Extended
Freight White Glove Service SHP000002-000	1	5,607.00	5,607.00
remoteLocker 100 v3 central tower inc. RFID (black) RML000001-000	1	21,386.80	21,386.80
remoteLocker 110 v3 10 locker tower (black) RML000013-000	1	10,800.40	10,800.40
remoteLocker 105R v3 4 locker tower with returns (black) RML000007-000	1	11,010.80	11,010.80
remoteLocker™ - Side covers SLR001050-000	1	540.00	540.00
Subscription: libraryConnect™ LINK subscription - 1 license / device - Optional SWR000080-000-SUB	1	330.40	330.40
Introduction to remoteLocker - Optional EDU020011-000	1	1,490.40	1,490.40
Introduction to libraryConnect LINK - Optional EDU040020-000	1	993.60	993.60
		Subtotal:	52,159.40
		PST:	0.00
		GST:	7,302.32
		Total:	59,461.72
		Currency:	Canadian Dollar

Additional Details



After 60 days, Bibliotheca, reserves the right to revise quote.
Freight charges are estimated, actual charges will be billed.
AMH systems will be invoiced at 50% order placement, 40% shipment, 10% at acceptance
All prices including Service and Maintenance do not include any applicable sales tax.
A copy of Tax Exemption Certificate is required with purchase order for all tax exempt customers
A 20% restocking fee, in addition to in-bound and out-bound shipping, will be charged for all returns.

<https://www.bibliotheca.com/en-ca-terms-of-sale-agreement/>

GST/HST N° 859257321RT0001

Submit Purchase Order by fax to 877-689-2269 or by email to orders-ca@bibliotheca.com.

Accepted By: _____

Accepted Date: _____

Customer Purchase Order Number: _____

Council
Item #7.3
May 12, 2026
T. MacEwan



The Municipality of the District of Lunenburg

Request for Decision

Report to: Council

Submitted by: Dave Waters Director of Economic Development

Date: May 12, 2026

Re: Community / Business Hub Furniture and Replacement Millwork

Recommendation

That Council authorize staff to award the contracts for furniture and replacement millwork for the Community Hub and Business Hub projects to The Collective in the amount of \$136,397.77, Office Interiors in the amount of \$28,068.91 and Wintergreen in the amount of \$15,446.19, at a total cost of \$179,912.87 (excluding HST), as outlined in this report

Executive summary

Over the past four months staff have worked with the South Shore Public Library and project designers to lay out the furniture and replacement millwork requirements for both the Community Hub and Business Hub. To facilitate the best long-term options for the municipality, Staff looked at several factors when choosing the required pieces and designated vendors for the projects.

The elements that were considered were;

- Quality and long-term life of the equipment
- Look and feel
- Requested items from the South Shore Public Library
- Designer input, and
- Cost

All elements are provided under either provincial standing offer pricing or Kinetic GPO pricing to ensure competitive pricing was received.

The following tables detail items that are needed for the Community and Business Hubs, by recommended vendor and including costs. Staff looked at various vendors under both the provincial standing offer and Kinetic GPO. The three preferred vendors were; The Collective, Office Interiors and Wintergreen. All products were reviewed but not all vendors had the same items so direct product by product comparisons were not always possible. Using provincial standing offer and Kinetics allowed staff to ensure costs were pre-vetted.

The Collective

Name	Qty	Unit Price	Total
Chairs for small meeting room	5	\$ 296.88	\$ 1,484.40
Kid chairs Armless	4	\$ 241.78	\$ 967.12
4 - person table 20H with legs	1	\$ 608.22	\$ 608.22
Boardroom Table16 person	1	\$ 5,012.70	\$ 5,012.70
Credenza Boardroom	1	\$ 1,452.12	\$ 1,452.12
High Back Tilter chair	16	\$ 431.24	\$ 6,899.84
power modulers for large boardroom table	3	\$ 331.96	\$ 995.88
Adjustable height desk Flex Space	1	\$ 1,219.87	\$ 1,219.87
Chairs for staff tables	8	\$ 139.56	\$ 1,116.48
Staff Lounge tables	2	\$ 523.65	\$ 1,047.30
Side chair for flex office	1	\$ 196.42	\$ 196.42
Side Chair for Marks Office	1	\$ 196.42	\$ 196.42
Side Chair MODL Dave	2	\$ 196.42	\$ 392.84
Adult lounge chairs	4	\$ 392.47	\$ 1,569.88
Chair for Flex Space downstairs	1	\$ 431.24	\$ 431.24
Chair for SSPL Office	1	\$ 431.24	\$ 431.24
Chair for Welcome desk	1	\$ 431.24	\$ 431.24
Accessible workstation / wheelchair desk	1	\$ 1,165.53	\$ 1,165.53

Coffee table	1	\$ 908.58	\$ 908.58
Study tables	6	\$ 592.70	\$ 3,556.20
60" dia Round Top	11	\$ 309.16	\$ 3,400.76
Armchair, Fabric seat, sled	45	\$ 224.95	\$ 10,122.75
Armless, Fabric Seat, sled	45	\$ 180.62	\$ 8,127.90
LITE_LIFT TABLE Dolly	1	\$ 350.72	\$ 350.72
Popcorn Chair Dolly	1	\$ 477.99	\$ 477.99
Study chairs Gamers Zone and Discovery zone	6	\$ 431.24	\$ 2,587.44
Double quiet pod with table	1	\$ 17,369.00	\$ 17,369.00
Double quiet pod Acc	1	\$ 21,541.00	\$ 21,541.00
Chairs for quite pods	3	\$ 255.00	\$ 765.00
Install Quite Pods	1	\$ 8,750.00	\$ 8,750.00
Guest chair SSPL Office	1	\$ 196.42	\$ 196.42
Task chairs Maker Space Table	6	\$ 367.10	\$ 2,202.60
Millwork Boardroom	1	\$ 5,861.25	\$ 5,861.25
Millwork Counters Discovery Zone and Gamers Room	1	\$ 2,289.24	\$ 2,289.24
Millwork Upstairs Staff Lounge	1	\$ 9,812.72	\$ 9,812.72
Installation Millwork	1	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00
Furniture Delivery and Installation	1	\$ 9,459.46	\$ 9,459.46
			\$ 136,397.77

Office Interiors

	Qty	Unit Price	total
Adjustable height desk MODL upstairs	1	\$ 2,900.00	\$ 2,900.00
Adjustable height desk MODL Upstairs	1	\$ 2,900.00	\$ 2,900.00
Bookshelf	1	\$ 454.48	\$ 454.48
Bookshelf	1	\$ 454.48	\$ 454.48
Credenza Meeting small boardroom	1	\$ 930.28	\$ 930.28

Lounge chairs	13	\$ 280.09	\$ 3,641.17
Bookcase Unit	2	\$ 1,151.28	\$ 2,302.56
Credenza for Gamer Zone 2	1	\$ 930.28	\$ 930.28
Bookcase Unit	2	\$ 1,151.28	\$ 2,302.56
Credenza Kids zone	1	\$ 930.28	\$ 930.28
Adjustable height desk L shaped SSPL -	1	\$ 1,574.00	\$ 1,574.00
Under desk cabinet for SSPL desk	1	\$ 657.80	\$ 657.80
Modesty panel	1	\$ 136.24	\$ 136.24
Adjustable height desk L shaped Flex office	1	\$ 1,574.64	\$ 1,574.64
Meeting Table for with center power	1	\$1,925.14	\$ 1,925.14
Round Table 30" X 29"	1	\$715.00	\$ 715.00
Installation and delivery	1	\$3,740.00	\$ 3,740.00
			\$ 28,068.91

Wintergreen

Name	Qty	Unit Price	Total
Couch three	2	\$ 2,499.94	\$ 4,999.88
Couch two	1	\$ 1,749.95	\$ 1,749.95
Floor seat	4	\$ 182.95	\$ 731.80
Table with Power	1	\$ 719.95	\$ 719.95
Lounge chairs	1	\$ 529.95	\$ 529.95
Curved Couch	1	\$ 1,399.95	\$ 1,399.95
Couch	1	\$ 1,149.95	\$ 1,149.95
All-in-one Kitchen	1	\$ 2,384.96	\$ 2,384.96
F16" wobble Chair Orange	3	\$ 209.95	\$ 629.85
Table with power	1	\$ 1,149.95	\$ 1,149.95
			\$ 15,446.19

Total Furniture and Millwork replacement is \$179,912.87

The millwork quoted by The Collective saves the Municipality \$28,696.79 off the previous RCS quote of \$925,600 making the Phase II RCS Fitup quote \$896,903.21.

Background

Council approved the Community Hub project in the 2023/24 budget which was part of a partnership with WellTide Health to bring a new Collaborative Healthcare / Community Hub facility to the area and would see the development of a farmers' market, commercial kitchen, event space, boardroom, café and offices. Earlier in 2025 council went back out for additional public consultation and shifted the Community Hub away from the farmers market but felt the community would benefit greatly from a Community Hub with an event space, café, kitchen, boardroom, programming space and offices. Council adjusted the office space to a business hub with four other partners on board and ready to go in the Business Hub.

Strategic Focus

The project aligns itself with Council's Strategic Directions of Quality of Life, Affordability and Social Inclusion.

Budget/Financial Implications

The furniture and replacement millwork is \$179,912.87 not including HST and will work within the overall Community Hub budget.

Climate Change/sustainability

N/A

Inclusion, Diversity, Equity and Accessibility (IDEA@MODL)

N/A

Strategic Communications

N/A

Work plan

This project is part of the Department of Economic Development current 5-year Strategic Plan.

Alternatives

Not proceed with the awards and work to secure alternative pricing. We do run the risk of not having furniture and millwork ready for the completion date of September 2026.

Conclusion

Staff have completed a thorough review of furniture and millwork requirements in collaboration with project partners and designers, ensuring selections meet functional needs, design intent, and long-term durability while remaining cost-effective through pre-vetted procurement mechanisms. The recommended vendors provide the best overall value based on quality, suitability, and pricing. Proceeding with these awards will support project timelines and ensure the Community Hub and Business Hub are fully equipped for their anticipated completion in September 2026. Delaying approval may result in procurement challenges and potential impacts to project readiness.

Report Preparation	
Department	Economic Development
Report Prepared by	Dave Waters Director of Economic Development
Report Approved by	
Date Reviewed by C.A.O.	

To: Mayors and Councillors of MODL, Town of Bridgewater, Town of Mahone Bay
From: Jill Rafuse
Date: April 20th, 2026
Subject: Recommendation from MJSB regarding MJSB Office Relocation

This memorandum requests the Council’s approvals of a supplemental budget allocation for **MJSB’s office relocation to WellTide** in the amount of **\$17,661 for the increased rent** in 2026-27 with the funds being funded by MJSB’s partners and the upset amount of **\$337,675 (includes non-refundable HST) for the fit-up which is proposed to be funded through the MJSB Reserve**. The costs for the relocation were not included in the current budget given the MJSB budget was presented and approved prior to the approval of the relocation.

Table 1 shows the proportionate amounts requested to be approved by the MJSB partners based on the allocation of the cost of the office space to each shared service team and the proportionate shares in the MJSB Agreement.

Table 1 - MJSB Office Relocation - Supplemental Budget Request

Current Rent	Aberdeen	\$ 43,638	Included in Current Budget
Planned Rent	WellTide	\$ 78,960	Approved by MJSB Board
Annual Difference		\$ 35,322	

Assuming Occupancy for October 1st, 2026 – 6 months (50%)

Proportionate Shares Based on MJSB Agreement	MODL	\$ 6,305	Supplemental Budget Request
	TOB	\$ 5,497	
	TOMB	\$ 1,570	
	MJSB	\$ 4,289	
	2026-27	\$ 17,661	

The Municipal Joint Services Board approved the following motions on March 25th, 2026:

Moved by Councilor Oickle, seconded by Councilor Conklin, to approve the relocation of MJSB staff from their current office space. Carried.

Moved by Councilor Oickle, seconded by Councilor Conklin, to authorize the MJSB to enter into a five-year lease agreement for approximately 2000ft² of office space with the owners of the WellTide facility (option 2) as per the rates quoted in Appendix C. Carried.

Moved by Councilor Oickle, Seconded by Councilor Fougere, to authorize a termination notice to the current landlord to end the existing lease at 210 Aberdeen to correspond with the rent commencement date at the WellTide facility (option 2). Carried.

Moved by Councilor Oickle, seconded by, Mayor Lohnes-Croft, to Approve the required budget amendment to support the transition to the new facility and terms of the new lease. Carried.

Enclosed is a copy of the memo and report tabled at the MJSB Board meeting. The lease agreement is for a five-year period which represents an ongoing commitment. All the other options considered were more expensive and status quo is not an option.

Warm Regards,

Jill Rafuse
Chief Operating Officer

Cc: Mayor David Mitchell, MJSB Board Chair
Dylan Heide, CAO Town of Mahone Bay
Tammy Crowder, CAO Town of Bridgewater
Tom MacEwan, CAO MODL

Council
Item #10.2
May 12, 2026
T. MacEwan



Recommendation to Council

To: Mayor Elspeth McLean-Wile and Council

From: Chair and Members, Planning Advisory Committee

Date: May 5, 2026

Re: Recommendations to Council

The Planning Advisory Committee, in session on May 5, 2026, made the following recommendations to Municipal Council:

“that the Planning Advisory Committee approves the revisions recommended by planning staff noted in the Discussion section of this report for inclusion in the third and final draft of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law as amended at the May 5, 2026 meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee”.

Respectfully submitted,

Chair & Members
Of the PAC

/sb

Attachments

Council
Item #10.2.1
May 12, 2026
T. MacEwan



The Municipality of the District of Lunenburg Information Report

Report To: Mayor and Municipal Council

Submitted By: Ella Gindi, Planner II

Date: May 12, 2026

Re: Planning Advisory Committee Proposed Recommendations to Council - Draft #2
Municipality-wide Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an overview of the amendments proposed to the original motion by the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) during its May 5, 2026, meeting regarding Draft #2 of the Municipality-wide Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Land Use By-law (LUB).

Background

Planning Staff presented a Summary of Changes report to the PAC on May 5, 2026, outlining proposed revisions to Draft #2 of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for inclusion in the third and final draft of the documents.

During discussion of the proposed revisions and Planning Staff recommendations, the PAC proposed two amendments to the original motion.

Discussion

PAC proposed change: Policy AGR-4

PAC proposed an amendment to Draft #2 Policy AGR-4 of the proposed Municipal Planning Strategy relating to the subdivision of lands within the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone.

Policy AGR-4 currently states:

“Council will, through the Subdivision By-law, minimize the fragmentation of agricultural lands considered as having significant agricultural potential by limiting the subdivision of lots to a

maximum of two lots per calendar year up to a maximum of six lots total from a lot as it existed on the effective date of the approval of this Plan”.

The PAC proposed removing the two-lot-per-year limitation to permit the maximum of six subdivisions allowed under the policy to occur at any time.

The following motion was carried unanimously by PAC:

Moved by Mr. Mailman, seconded by Councillor Smith to amend the motion on the floor to include removing the two per year limit on the number of subdivisions in the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone to permit the total number of subdivisions allowed to occur at any time. Carried unanimously.

PAC proposed addition: Prohibiting Cluster Development in the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone

The PAC also proposed a revision to a staff-proposed addition to the final draft relating to cluster development permissions within the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone.

The PAC proposed prohibiting cluster development within the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone.

The following motion was carried unanimously by PAC:

Moved by Mayor McLean-Wile, seconded by Councillor Bell to amend the motion on the floor to prohibit cluster development in the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone. Carried unanimously.

Planning Advisory Committee Recommendation

The following motion was carried unanimously by the Planning Advisory Committee on May 5, 2026:

Moved by Councillor Bell, seconded by Keith Drysdale, that the Planning Advisory Committee approves the revisions recommended by planning staff noted in the Discussion section of this report for inclusion in the third and final draft of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law as amended at the May 5, 2026 meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee. Carried unanimously.

Report Preparation	
Department	Planning and Development Services
Report Prepared by	Ella Gindi, Planner II
Report Approved by	
Date Reviewed by C.A.O.	



The Municipality of the District of Lunenburg Request for Decision

Report to: Planning Advisory Committee

Submitted by: Rosemary Young, Planner I

Date: April 28, 2026

Re: Municipal-Wide Land Use Planning Project - Resident Feedback on Draft #2

Recommendation

That the Planning Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the revisions recommended by planning staff noted in the Discussion section of this report for inclusion in the third and final draft of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law.

Executive summary

The Municipal-Wide Land Use Planning Project has been ongoing since 2020 and is nearing the final stages. After the release of a second draft of the planning documents in February 2026, public engagement for Draft #2 of the Municipality-Wide Land Use Planning Project was carried out between March and April 2026, providing residents with multiple opportunities to review the proposed Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Land Use By-law (LUB) and share feedback.

The purpose of this report is to summarize the public feedback received on Draft #2 of the planning documents, communicate recommended changes for a third and final draft of the planning documents, and provide an updated work plan outlining the remaining steps of the project.

Background

Launched in 2020, the Municipal-Wide Land Use Planning Project has focused on creating new planning documents, including the Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Land Use By-law (LUB), and introducing municipal-wide zoning to guide development, support community

needs, and meet the province’s mandate for land use planning across Nova Scotia. Some zoning already exists in MODL, with seven Secondary Planning Strategies and Land Use By-laws. These include the communities of Blockhouse, the Village of Hebbville, Hemford Forest, Oakland, Osprey Village, Riverport and District, and Princes Inlet and Area. There are also Coastal Protection regulations that apply to properties along the coast, Cluster Development regulations, and a Subdivision Bylaw.

Project History

The first draft of the Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Land Use By-law (LUB) was released for public review in March 2025. Following the release of the first draft of these planning documents, Council directed planning staff to revisit the approach initially taken so that the documents would more closely reflect minimum planning. This led to a series of public engagement activities over the spring and summer of 2025, which concluded with a What We Heard Report presented to Council on October 27, 2025. Council held multiple workshops to discuss what changes Council wanted to see in a second draft of the planning documents. In these workshops, planning staff summarized the public input they received on specific topics, and asked Council to provide direction on how they would like to proceed with Draft #2. After several months of continued work, on February 17, 2026, the second draft of the Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Land Use By-law (LUB) were released to the public.

Public Engagement 2026

Engagement Activities

On February 17, 2026, the second draft (Draft #2) of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law were published to the Municipality’s Engage webpage, along with several supporting resources, including a summary of changes from Draft 1, an explanation of the project, and a set of Frequently Asked Questions. The documents were discussed at a Council meeting on March 10, 2026, kicking off a period of engagement on the Draft #2 documents. Throughout March 2026, Facebook was used as a primary channel to promote land use planning open houses, drop-in sessions, and the release of the updated documents. The campaign focused on encouraging residents to attend in-person and virtual engagement opportunities and to review the proposed changes. A total of 10 Facebook posts were published during the reporting period. The table below showcases some metrics for the Facebook activity:

Metric	Result
Total Posts	10
Total Impressions	39,866

Average Impressions per Post	3,987
Total Reactions	87
Total Comments	2
Total Shares	75
Total Clicks	988
Average Clicks per Post	99

Posts achieved strong reach and click-through activity, indicating awareness-building and interest in learning more about land use planning updates.

Following the March 10 Council meeting, planning staff hosted 8 public information sessions in the Municipality, including one virtual session:

Location	Date & Time	Number of Participants
LaHave Fire Hall	March 12 6-8 pm	24
Municipal Services Building	March 18 3-7 pm	9
New Germany Legion	March 19 6-8 pm	58
Municipal Services Building	March 23 3-7 pm	3
Virtual	March 25 1-2 pm	4
Municipal Services Building	March 30 3-7 pm	12
Northfield Fire Hall	April 1 6-8 pm	68
Big Tancook Island Recreation Centre	April 8 11:30-1 pm	16
Total		194

The community open houses consisted of a short presentation and an informal Q&A period where residents could speak to planners about how the proposed zoning might impact their property. Residents could view their property and the proposed municipal-wide zoning framework on large maps placed around the event space. At each event, there were a number of handouts that residents could take home with them, including one-pagers highlighting the main purpose and permitted uses of each proposed zone. Additionally, residents could pick up zoning maps picturing the proposed zoning framework for the Municipality and/or their specific community. Planning staff also set up a display in the lobby of the Municipal Office for residents with handouts, maps, and the proposed documents. Public input was collected through multiple channels, including email, an online comment tool, and a physical comment box at the open houses. Planning staff received a total of 27 emails, 7 online comments, and 13 physical comments from the open houses. The [Appendix](#) lists the verbatim feedback received during this phase of public engagement.

Engagement Outcomes

At a high level, residents at the open houses seemed to feel as though Draft #2 was a better fit for the Municipality than the first draft. Feedback on Draft 2 included a mix of general comments, questions, and suggestions. Participants provided input on specific policies, and how the documents may apply in practice. Comments also included both positive feedback on the process and detailed concerns about certain provisions. For example, some participants commented on environmental policies related to wetlands, watercourses, and watershed protection. Some referred to the importance of these protections, while others focused on how they are applied. Comments related to agriculture included references to farmland protection and food production. Participants also raised differing perspectives on livestock.

Some participants referenced approaches used in other jurisdictions, such as limits on the number or type of animals. Others raised concerns about requirements such as setbacks or fencing and how these may affect farming practices. Questions were also raised about how the by-law applies to small-scale or personal-use activities, such as backyard chickens or hobby farming, and whether these uses are clearly defined. Comments also referred to mapping, including the need for clearer legends, labels, and context. As indicated in the [Appendix](#), staff also received a number of comments about the coastal protection regulations that are currently in effect.

Tancook

The open house on Tancook Island required a unique approach, as planning staff heard during the first phase of public engagement that residents of the Tancook Islands would like to see more tailored zoning and land use regulations that reflect the Islands' unique context. This sentiment was different from the general sense that emerged from the mainland communities, where residents wanted a minimum planning approach. As a result, during the workshops with Council, Council indicated that they would initiate a future planning process for the Tancook Islands, intended to protect their unique characteristics and land use patterns.

In response to this commitment, planning staff created a different format for the Tancook open house. This included two feedback frames focused on future preferred engagement methods and timing, as well as two posters asking open-ended questions: "What do you love about living on the Tancook Islands?" and "How would you like to be engaged"? Participants were invited to share their input using sticky notes and tokens. These questions aimed to better understand how to effectively engage with Tancook Islands residents in future phases of the project, including identifying preferred methods, formats, and timing for participation.

What do you love about living on the Tancook Islands?

Residents emphasized the Islands' quiet, private, and close-knit character. Many value the strong sense of community, respect among neighbours, and connection to the land.

Key themes included preserving privacy (including private roads), maintaining low levels of development (e.g., no RV parks or large campgrounds), enjoying natural qualities such as fresh air and dark skies, and recognizing the Islands as unique within the Municipality.

How would you like to be engaged?

Participants expressed interest in a variety of engagement methods. Suggestions included ongoing engagement opportunities (“all ways”), walking tours, surveys, and in-person presentations, indicating a preference for both interactive and accessible formats.

Feedback Frame 1: Best time of year for engagement

The most preferred times for future engagement were early summer and late summer, each receiving the highest number of tokens. Spring and late fall were also identified as viable options, though with less support.

Feedback Frame 2: Preferred methods for receiving update

Email was the most preferred method for receiving updates. In-person communication also received notable support, followed by mail and social media. Phone contact had limited interest, and no participants selected the Engage page as a preferred option.

Report Purpose

This report summarizes the public input received throughout these engagement activities and outlines the proposed edits for the third and final draft of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law.

Discussion

The table in this section summarizes the suggested changes for a third draft, based on public and staff input and the input from Council and members of the Planning Advisory Committee. The table leaves out minor edits around spelling and grammar, even though they will be updated in the final draft. The final column indicates whether planning staff are recommending the change. The recommended changes listed reflect what can reasonably be completed within the scope and timeline of this project.

Definitions		
Summary of suggested change	Source	Is planning staff recommending this change?
Clarify definition of recreational vehicles	Planning staff, public, and PAC member	Yes (see more below)
Clarify definition of tiny houses	Planning staff, public, and PAC member	Yes (see more below)
Include definition for places of assembly such as wedding venues	Planning staff	Yes
Add definition for flankage	PAC member	Yes
Add definition for sleeping unit	PAC member	Yes
Clarify definitions of tourist accommodations and short-term rentals	Planning staff	Yes
Adjust definition of site plan approval and development agreement in LUB to reflect description in MPS	PAC member	No
Replace definition of "Farm Supportive Use" with "Agriculture Use" to more explicitly permit a variety of agricultural uses	Planning staff and public	Yes
Update definition for ordinary high-water mark as described in Land Surveyors regulations	Planning staff and PAC member	No
Add "repair" and "maintenance of equipment" to the definition of "Heavy Equipment Sale and Rentals"	Planning staff	Yes
Zoning and Land Use Permissions		
Summary of suggested change	Source	Is planning staff recommending this change?
Add more controls for light and heavy industrial uses in the Rural General Zone	Public	No
Adopt a more tailored approach to regulating campgrounds and RV parks	Public	No
Remove properties from Rural Agricultural Potential Zone (RU-2)	Public	No (see more below)
Remove the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone (RU-2) from the zoning framework	Public	No (see more below)
Remove area in Green Bay from Conservation Zone	Public	Yes

Add the Blue Rocks Commons to the Conservation Zone	Planning staff	No
Clarify which use(s) the minimum density in the Mixed Use Serviced Zone applies to (e.g., residential only) (Section 12.2.1)	PAC member	Yes
Simplify and standardize the requirements of Sections 12.3-12.8 of the Mixed Use Serviced Zone	PAC member	No
Ensure that tourist accommodations with a certain number of sleeping units are subject to a water study, similar to the requirement for high-density residential development on unserviced land	PAC member	No
Development Standards		
Summary of suggested change	Source	Is planning staff recommending this change?
Decrease the elevation requirement of the Coastal Flood Risk Area	Public	No (see more below)
Reduce requirements for development permits for certain uses such as solar collector systems (e.g., no location plan)	Public	No
Expand number of days before development permit is required for a recreational vehicle from 90 days	Planning staff and PAC member	Yes (see more below)
Reduce or revise 100m setback distance from watercourses for grazing farm animals in Protected Watershed Overlay	Public	No
Reintroduce livestock limits	Public	No
Add flexibility for redevelopment projects regarding the parking requirements of the Mixed Use Serviced Zone	Planning staff	Yes (see more below)
Generalize the screening requirement in the Mixed Use Serviced Zone beyond a vegetative screen	PAC member	Yes
Add flexibility for undersized lots in the Protected Watershed Overlay, like the flexibility for inland watercourses and wetlands	Planning staff and public	Yes (see more below)
Decrease setbacks and vegetative buffers from inland watercourses and wetlands	Public	No
Increase setbacks and vegetative buffers from inland watercourses and wetlands	Public	No

Standardize setbacks and vegetative buffers for inland watercourses and wetlands	Public	No
Clarify language around additions to non-conforming structures near inland watercourses and wetlands to align with other provision for non-conforming structures	Planning staff and public	Yes
Establish a minimum setback for undersized lots near wetlands and inland watercourses	Planning staff	Yes
Policy Changes		
Summary of suggested change	Source	Is planning staff recommending this change?
Consider adding a policy to the Parks and Open Space Dedication section of the Municipal Planning Strategy to enable land swaps as an option for dedication	Public	No
Add policy to the Municipal Planning Strategy to align with Policy 103 of Active Transportation Policy	Planning staff	Yes
Add a policy to limit the location and size of cluster developments in the Rural-Agricultural Potential Zone (RU-2)	Planning staff and public	Yes (see more below)
Change phased timing policy for subdivisions in the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone to reduce costs and allow all (6) permitted lots to be created during one subdivision process	PAC member and public	No
Process Changes		
Summary of suggested change	Source	Is planning staff recommending this change?
Change requirement for notification to property owners from 100m to 300m	PAC member	Yes
Increase height at which no development permit is required for a fence from 6' to 8'	Public	Yes
Clarify that no development permit is required for the cutting and splitting of wood	Public	Yes
Non-substantive text changes		
Summary of suggested change	Source	Is planning staff recommending this change?
Add description of the purpose of each zone to the documents	PAC member	No
Clarify that the setbacks for new residential uses near livestock operations do not just	Planning staff	Yes

pertain to the livestock operations that existed prior to the regulations coming into place		
Adjust language inconsistencies (e.g., tiny house or tiny home)	PAC member	Yes
Adjust inconsistencies regarding conversion from metric system to feet	PAC member	Yes
Make sure fencing height requirement is consistent throughout document	PAC member	Yes
Clarify language to specify that setbacks and buffers apply to <i>all developments</i> adjacent to a significant inland watercourse	Planning staff	Yes
Update population projections in Section of Municipal Planning Strategy to reflect MODL-specific statistics produced by the Housing Market Study completed in Fall 2025	Planning staff	Yes
Adjust language surrounding the size requirement for home-based businesses in the Rural Residential Zone to more closely reflect the Building Code	Planning staff and public	Yes
Clarify what uses are permitted as home-based businesses in the Rural Residential Zone	Planning staff	Yes
Clarify that a personal office, studio, or the instruction of one student at a time would not require a development permit	Planning staff	Yes
Fix scaled tourist accommodation numbers (make it 13+) in Permitted Uses Tables	Planning staff	Yes
Add water utilities to permitted uses table for clarity (PW-1)	Planning staff	Yes
Non-substantive map changes		
Summary of suggested change	Source	Is planning staff recommending this change?
Add inland watercourses and wetlands to interactive zoning map	Planning staff and PAC member	Yes
Add inland watercourses and coastal labelling to Schedule B – Environmental Constraints Map	Planning staff and PAC member	Yes
Change numbers on inset zoning maps to distinguish from District numbers	Planning staff and public	Yes

Recreational Vehicles

Definition

During this engagement process, the public, planning staff and a PAC member flagged some concerns about the definition of recreational vehicles in Draft #2. In Draft #2, a recreational vehicle is defined as a “a vehicle used for temporary accommodation for recreational uses such as travel and vacation, or seasonal temporary habitation and does not include a tiny home on wheels”. As vehicles are not inspected under the Nova Scotia Building Code Regulations, it is important to ensure that recreational vehicles used for human habitation meet certain standards. As a result, planning staff recommend changing the definition of a recreational vehicle to the following in Draft 3: “a vehicle intended to be used for temporary accommodation such as travel and vacation, or temporary habitation that has been manufactured to meet CSA-Z240 RV or CSA-Z241”.

Number of Days

Members of the public and Council highlighted a potential policy gap with the provisions for the habitation of recreational vehicles. In Draft 2, individuals would be allowed to inhabit a recreational vehicle for 90 days before a development permit would be required. Both the public and Council have indicated that this could place an unnecessary burden on individuals who are using a recreational vehicle for seasonal camping or recreational purposes. Planning staff recommend expanding the number of days before a development permit would be required for the habitation of a recreational vehicle from 90 days.

Tiny Houses

The public, planning staff and a member of the Planning Advisory Committee identified an opportunity to refine the definition of a tiny house in Draft #2. In Draft #2, a tiny house is defined as “a dwelling unit that is 37 square metres (398.3 square feet) or less in building area and may be on a permanent foundation or on wheels”. However, Building Inspection advised that structures on wheels cannot be inspected under the Nova Scotia Building Code Regulations and may pose a risk to the safety of residents and neighbours. As a result, planning staff recommend changing the definition of a tiny house to “a dwelling unit that is 37 square metres (398.3 square feet) or less in building area and is on a foundation”. This would allow for tiny houses on various types of foundations, including but not limited to screw piles, slab, or blocks.

Adjusting or removing the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone

Members of Council and the public provided some comments about the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone.

First, there was a comment that the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone does not include all of the active farmland in the Municipality. However, Draft #2 has a policy stating that Council will consider applications to add additional lands to the Zone from owners of properties with established agricultural uses. This would allow active farmland that may not be captured by the soil class criteria to be zoned Rural Agricultural Potential if the landowner chooses, as opposed to the Municipality attempting to identify and zone all the active farmland in MODL.

Second, there have also been comments that the Zone is too restrictive for certain properties. For example, some properties that may have fallen within the Lakeshore Residential Zone in Draft #1 are now proposed as the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone, since Council directed planning staff to remove the Lakeshore Residential Zone from the zoning framework. These properties would fall within the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone in Draft #2 because they meet the established criteria – lands that are larger than four hectares and consist of at least 60% Class 3 soils.

This change reflects more of an oversight in Draft #1, where the Lakeshore Residential Zone, a zone meant to protect MODL's lakeshores, was given more weight than the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone where the two zones conflicted. The Lakeshore Residential Zone should not have been prioritized over the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone in Draft #1. Planning staff do not recommend removing any properties from the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone because it is important to apply the established criteria for the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone consistently.

Elevation requirement of Coastal Flood Risk Area

Some residents requested that the elevation requirement of the Coastal Flood Risk Area be revisited through this process. Planning staff do not recommend changes to the coastal regulations at this time. An annual coastal report was just presented to Council in January and confirmed that the regulations are working as intended. Council has also established a policy to formally review the Coastal Protection Regulations every five years. This ensures that any updates are made in a structured and evidence-based manner, including consideration of new scientific data and best practices. Additionally, the public was not informed that the coastal regulations may be reconsidered through this Municipal-Wide Land Use Planning Project and have not been given opportunity to review or provide input on the existing regulations in that context.

Redevelopment projects in the Mixed Use Serviced Zone

Planning staff noted a potential gap in the provisions for developments in the Mixed Use Serviced Zone. Draft #2 of the Land Use By-law (Section 8.1.2) currently states: “Where a lot has frontage on a street, parking and loading areas must be located in the rear yard”. However, this requirement may be difficult to meet for redevelopment projects in the Mixed Use Serviced Zone, particularly if they only involve changing the use of an existing structure or redeveloping an existing structure. To address this, staff recommend adding a provision that allows discretion for redevelopment projects on lots that are already developed in the Mixed Use Serviced Zone.

Flexibility for undersized lots in the Protected Watershed Overlay

Planning staff and members of the public identified an inconsistency with the setback requirements for inland watercourses inside and outside the Protected Watershed Overlay. Draft #2 prohibits development within 30 horizontal metres (98 feet) of the ordinary high-water mark of significant inland watercourses that are located within the Protected Watershed Overlay. In Draft #2, undersized lots adjacent to inland watercourses and wetlands outside of the Overlay are allowed some flexibility from the setbacks, subject to certain rules. For consistency, staff recommend incorporating a similar allowance for undersized lots in the Protected Watershed Overlay.

Cluster Developments in the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone

In Draft #2, cluster developments would be permitted in the Rural-Agricultural Potential Zone without limitations to the size or scale of the development. Members of Council raised that this could conflict with the Statement of Provincial Interest regarding Agricultural Land, which aims to protect agricultural land for the development of a viable and sustainable agriculture and food industry. To address this potential conflict, planning staff recommend adding a policy to the Municipal Planning Strategy that places some conditions around cluster developments in the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone, in addition to the general development criteria that all cluster developments are subject to. These conditions may include a maximum number of 12 residential units and a conservation design style where residential buildings, lawns, on-site services, and accessory structures are located on the lot to minimize the fragmentation of valuable agricultural lands. In addition, planning staff recommend requiring that cluster developments in the Rural Agricultural Potential Zone minimize the potential for conflict between residential and agricultural uses through the creation of a natural buffer with adjacent agricultural uses.

Work plan

This report will accompany a presentation to PAC. If PAC passes the motion outlined, planning staff will follow the work plan below to finalize the land use planning documents and conclude the project, subject to Council’s direction:

Timing	Deliverable
May 5	Presentation to PAC
May 12	Presentation to Council
June 10	First Reading
June 22 (Tentative)	Public Hearing and Second Reading
July 16 (Tentative)	Documents sent to Province
August (Tentative)	Provincial review period

Alternatives

The Planning Advisory Committee may choose to propose that Council consider alternative revisions to Draft 3, different to what has been recommended by planning staff in the final column of the table in the Discussion section of this report. If alternative revisions are proposed, depending on the extent of the proposed changes, project implications may include delays to the project timeline and/or inconsistency with the provincial requirements and public feedback.

Recommendation

That the Planning Advisory Committee recommend that Council approve the revisions recommended by planning staff noted in the Discussion section of this report for inclusion in the third and final draft of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law.

Conclusion

The Draft #2 engagement phase focused on accessibility, transparency, and providing residents with meaningful opportunities to participate in the planning process. Recommended revisions for a third and final draft of the planning documents are based on the input of planning staff, Council, members of the public, and members of the Planning Advisory Committee. These changes consist mainly of housekeeping edits and adjustments for clarity.

Report Preparation	
Department	Planning & Development Services
Report Prepared by	Rosemary Young

<<Date of Report>>

Page 14

Report Approved by	Reid Shepherd, LPP, MCIP
Date Reviewed by C.A.O.	

Copy

Appendix

Method of Collection	Contact	Comment	Attachment
Open house	N/a	Not in favor of a RV park on Tancook. Roads need new signs.	No
Open house	N/a	Wetland & watercourse (lakeshore) setbacks should be the same distances	No
Open house	N/a	Big picture: Procedures must be in place to ensure all decisions are made "through the lens of climate change". Generally agree with the "simplification" process i.e. 17 zones to 9. Caution must be used to ensure mechanisms are in place to ensure respect to all land owners i.e. noise, odor, etc.	No
Open house	Mary & Gerald	Thank you for your help.	No
Open house	N/a	Zoning map should include a key to the abbreviations used to designate zones eg Ru = Rural General	No
Open house	N/a	Agriculture – animal protection + ethical practice. There need to be limits on the # + type of livestock.	No
Open house	N/a	Wetlands are a major concern for us. We see infilling along several waterbodies + wetlands. Why is this continuing to happen?	No
Open house	N/a	Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I prefer a 50 foot setback for lake lot housing development. I can understand more for river or ocean. - When renovating an existing property on a lake that is already within the new setback I would like to be able to renovate "no closer to the waterline" rather than "furthest from the waterside" 	No
Open house	Robin	Draft #2 – so comprehensive, impressive + the entire process of engagement – very thorough. Thoughtful, impressive.	No
Open house	N/a	Indian Path Common is in the Riverport District but is not designated as a recreation area.	No
Open house	N/a	Home-based business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why 164 square feet and not 215 square feet as per building permit? - Could it be increased sq ft wise if you met accessibility regs? 	No
Open house	Gillian	I think there should still be restrictions of number of livestock per acre as in the 'animal unit' restriction. This would be for animal & neighborhood protection.	No

Open house	Hester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farming land protection, in my opinion, is a start but not enough to keep developers from taking farmland to build subdivisions - Restrictions needed re: lighting – Cookville has taken away all stars in upper Northfield to the South. - Lighting can point down, not up! - Protect farmland! Food has to come from somewhere! 	No
Engage site	N/a	So my property is really not MY property? I can't do what I want without permission.	No
Engage site	N/a	Re boathouses. A joy of Nova Scotia living is water access. With structures such as boathouses. Remove unnecessary restrictions, wording preventing owners from simply enjoying summers on the water. Environmental standards are set by other agencies.	No
Engage site	N/a	Hello, I went down to the Lahave River to participate in the talk, but no one was there. Please explain.	No
Engage site	N/a	Thank you for the opportunities input. I attended Monday, March 30, 2026 to seek clarification on permitting livestock operations within the RU zone. Please ensure the bylaw and table of permitted uses explicitly list livestock operations. Thank you.	No
Engage site	N/a	Just notice on the mapping that an area in Green Bay is highlighted in green referring to a protected area. Natural resources removed that from the protected area 10 years ago as it was never done properly. You should update you mapping.	No
Engage site	N/a	Hello,	No
Engage site	N/a	Hello, I am writing to express my concern regarding the Draft #2 Commercial & Industrial Uses in RR zones. I purchased my property with the intention of having a home-based art studio and craft workshop, which seem to not be permitted in this draft.	No
Email	Alison	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I just wanted to share some thoughts with regard to the recent email from Jonathan Veinotte.</p> <p>I've attached screenshots from the Mushamush area from Draft 1 and 2. It appears that an unintended result of simplifying zoning is that some of the areas around lakes that would have been a mixed zone of rural ag potential/lakeshore residential (even if undeveloped) are now zoned completely rural agriculture potential in Draft 2.</p>	Yes

		<p>My understanding was that Council's intention was simplified but also, in most cases, less restrictive zoning. Unfortunately, for some lakeshore properties, the result is much more restrictive because now they would likely have to apply for rezoning in order to subdivide for cottages. This exceeds the intention of the lakeshore residential zone, which was to lessen the impact of development on the lake with larger lot sizes.</p> <p>This may also be the case for parts of New Canada Lake, Randall Lake, Covey Lake, and Blysteiner Lake-- I would have to take a closer look at the sizes of the properties and whether they have road access.</p> <p>This is not intended to give any direction, but just a heads up about the concerns that I will raise at the Council table when it comes back to us. If you can offer any clarification on my current understanding before then, that would be greatly appreciated.</p> <p>Best, Alison</p>	
Email	Jonathan	<p>Hello Planning Department,</p> <p>I am following up from the meetings on the most recent draft #2 for the municipal wide land use planning.</p> <p>I am not in favor of some of this draft, mainly the rural agriculture potential zone. I have some property that this will greatly affect the future potential for development. This change will greatly affect some of the areas within MODL. I will highlight the "potential farmland" and not land that is currently being farmed. Our Mayor has said to me numerous times "that we have to protect our farm land".</p> <p>I am a registered farmer with the NSFA and have been involved in farming all my life and farming as part of my business since 2010 with Christmas trees and hay production in West Northfield. I do agree that yes local farmland is important for our future but this proposal is not going to protect so much land that is currently being farmed. I cannot believe that farms</p>	No

		<p>within MODL that actually put food on peoples tables will not be included or affected by these changes. So that is not protecting very much active farm land. Of the land that I am farming, these maps capture less than half and I expect that is the same through out the rest of MODL.</p> <p>I own [redacted] which will be affected by these changes. Neighbouring property's close by [redacted] and [redacted] are also listed on the mapping to be potential farmland but to me are very different, lower elevation, rocky, less soils, low wet land and don't have near the potential as farmland. I would offer for anyone to come see these differences in person and shows the data that these maps were made from are not accurate. My property on and near lake mush a mush in 2018/19 was subdivided as some of my Fathers last wishes for myself and two brothers to have lots on the lake. A subdivision and engineered road to get to three lots was needed, approved and created, Allen Evrin Lane in Lower Northfield. These 3 lots currently have an assessed value of 1.1 million added to the MODL tax base. This change reduced a 38 acre piece of "potential farm land" to 34 acres with 3 lots now paying much more in yearly taxes. This would not be possibly under the new proposal in draft #2, and this will keep others from doing to same. Subdivision's aren't always for big development and developers to sell. In my situation as a kid I spent a lot of time at my Grandparents cottage on Silver cove road and now I have space for my daughter to do the same. These changes will keep land in the future from family members looking to build a home or enjoy their families land, land that is not currently being farmed.</p> <p>Farm land for the future may be more important than the current reality but there may be more suited places for it. An example is what used to be the Cook farm, a dairy farm in Cookville that is now the Walmart and area, heavily built and highly assessed within the MODL. Some of these areas that have been zoned for potential farmland may best suited to offer more growth to the MODL in the future. Some of this potential farm land would be great for farming in the future but currently the costs to make it into farmable land do not justify making more. Some of these lands near the TOB, lakes and rivers or major highways may serve as better future development potential.</p> <p>So many farms locally have downsized or no longer actively farming. This could change but instead of what I feel is punishing us for owning this "potential farmland" I would ask council to look at this differently. So many farms have just disappeared, the dollars and cents. From</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>costs of running things getting higher by the year, on maintaining or replacing equipment, buildings, other farming necessities, land values, etc. A better way to approach this may be to offer farmers some benefits or help to continue farming. Things like funding to repair farm buildings, offer property tax breaks on buildings used for farming, funding to help bring back fields that have grown up or to create new farm land, etc.</p> <p>The next problem, there is a lot of land within the MODL that is inactive farm land but it is rated as farming and owners have zero property taxes. Any land not being used for farming proposes should be subject to appropriate property taxes and if that were to happen that would encourage farming activities to restart and continue.</p> <p>I do hope you reconsider the rural agricultural potential farmland restrictions and consider ways to promote and encourage farming within the MODL,</p> <p>Jonathan Veinotte</p>	
Email	Jonathan	<p>Good evening. After talking with you tonight Elspeth and with Edgar the other night in West Northfield, I wanted to send this note.</p> <p>A thought around farm land with the latest land use documents that are being created. For cases where existing/operating farms are not listed as farmable land, could those existing operations not be the reason that the land is deemed farmland? AKA grandfathered in? Also in cases where land is transformed into a farming operation, could there be a process offered where new farm operations can apply to have the land deemed farmable? Just a thought and would be happy to discuss further.</p>	No
Email	Sandra	<p>Dear Council Members,</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding several elements in Draft #2 of the Municipal Planning Strategy. While I appreciate the significant work that has gone into this document, I am increasingly worried that the direction of the plan feels more urban than rural, and may not reflect the lived realities, traditions, and needs of residents in the Municipality of the District of Lunenburg.</p> <p>I would like to expand on 3 areas in particular—environmental regulation and the Protected Watershed Overlay—because these sections illustrate how the draft may unintentionally impose urban-style controls on a predominantly rural municipality.</p>	No

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The environmental regulations, including the extensive 20-metre watercourse setback and the mandatory 15-metre vegetative buffer, are unusually strict for a rural area. These measures may be appropriate in dense or urbanized settings where development pressure is high, but in MODL they risk creating unnecessary hardship for rural landowners. Many rural residents have responsibly used their lakeshore land for generations without harming the environment. Applying large, uniform setbacks may unintentionally penalize responsible landowners while offering little measurable benefit in low-risk or historically stable areas. 2. The introduction of the Protected Watershed Overlay (PW-3), which includes new rules for livestock fencing near watercourses, is also concerning. Regulating livestock fencing through land-use policy is not common practice in rural Nova Scotia. Farmers and rural landowners have long managed their livestock responsibly under provincial environmental guidelines and agricultural best practices. Embedding fencing rules into zoning adds a layer of regulation that feels more urban in nature and may interfere with long-standing agricultural traditions. It also raises questions about how these rules will be enforced and whether they will apply uniformly, even in areas where livestock pose no measurable risk to water quality. 3. I would also like to raise a serious concern regarding the printed version of the draft that was distributed to residents. The paper copy I received ends at Section 12.8, and does not include Part E — including Section 18.12, which outlines the non-conforming (grandfathering) protections for existing landowners. This section is critical for understanding how current uses and structures are treated under the new regulations. Its absence from the printed draft prevented me, and likely many others, from seeing that these protections exist. I am requesting clarification as to why Part E was omitted from the paper copy, and I ask that the Municipality ensure all future printed materials include the full document so residents can make informed comments. <p>These three examples highlight a broader pattern: the draft plan introduces a level of regulation and technical detail that feels more suited to an urban municipality. For a rural area like MODL, where residents value autonomy, flexibility, and the ability to use their land in practical ways, this approach may not be the best fit.</p> <p>I respectfully ask Council to consider whether the current draft aligns with the rural character of our municipality and whether some of these policies could be simplified, adjusted, or</p>	
--	--	--	--

		reconsidered to better reflect the values and realities of the people who live here. Thank you for your time and consideration.	
Email	Shelley	<p>Below is my feed back/concerns about Draft #2 of the Municipal Planning Strategy. My overriding comment is that the plan is still too restrictive in many areas and moves the municipality forward to quickly from our current state. Significant improvements have been made from Draft #1, but the overall feel is that we are moving away from a rural plan to an urban one.</p> <p>For example, In the protected Watershed Overlay - which includes many areas that are already heavily developed around lakes in the watershed. The rule for "Fencing for grazing farm animals must be setback at least 100 metres" is an excessive distance and does nothing to encourage farming or food sustainability. I am not saying an intensive farming operation with 100+ animals, but people with hobby farms and smaller number of livestock should be considered. When you compare it to the developments of houses, septic systems, road run off, slit from housing/cottage developments which only needing to have a 30 metre setback.</p> <p>MODL residents value the ability to have enjoyment of their properties and the ability to use their land as they always have.</p> <p>Also, I am concerned about the future cost of managing these new requirements. I hope my feedback is considered and that adjustments are made.</p>	No
Email	Angela	<p>It is my understanding that the above-mentioned property is being zoned <i>Agricultural Potential (RU-2) due to its classification of Class 3 Soil.</i></p> <p>The majority of our property is forested. The province's forests grow primarily on shallow, acidic, often stony and nutrient-poor soils derived from glacial till, often underlain by bedrock and dominated by podzolic soils. Podzolic soils are generally not suitable for conventional agriculture due to low nutrient availability and high acidity. Nova Scotia's forest soils are often labeled as marginal or unsuitable for traditional agriculture. Topography is often the primary reason for differences in soil classification within a local landscape. We have two zones that are very steep and again would not be suitable for agriculture. The property in general is sloping which would require specialized management to prevent runoff and erosion.</p>	No

		<p>Our property also consists of several areas that are swampy. Land consisting of swamps is generally not classified as Class 3 soil. Under most agricultural land classification systems, such as the Canada Land Inventory (CLI), swampy land is typically classified as Class 5, Class 6, or Class 7 because the limitation of "excess water" (subclass W) is too severe for conventional agricultural field crops.</p> <p>In summary, the majority of our property would not be considered Class 3 soil. We were advised that we could provide soil analysis results to the Township at our own expense in order to change the zoning. You are shifting the onus on us to prove what kind of soil we have yet there is nothing provided by the Township or Province to prove what soil we do actually have. I think it is unfair to rezone someone's property without factual evidence and then dump the cost on the owner to prove otherwise. I believe our property is best suited to be zoned as Rural General (RU) and I am asking for your consideration of this request before the zoning is officially changed.</p> <p><i>Other Feedback:</i></p> <p>The limit of subdividing your property to 2 lots a year doesn't make sense and in the long term would cost more to the property owner. What is the difference between subdividing 2 or 6 lots at one time? I generally disagree with limits being set at all. I honestly believe that large parcels of land are only being protected in the Province to best serve big developers and not to protect the land for agriculture.</p> <p>I do not understand what the 100m barn setback accomplishes. You can smell manure from great distances. It all depends on which way the wind blows. If someone <i>new</i> to rural life builds a house in the country and complains about the smell or animal noises when they build next to a farm then perhaps they should have done their due diligence. This setback should not even exist or at least be reasonable in my opinion.</p>	
Email	John	<p>First: Great job with this! The Northfield open house was very informative.</p> <p>Minor things with the draft:</p>	No

		<p>[5.2.1 d] No permit required for fences that do not exceed 6' in height: Consider increasing to 8'. In my experience, deer fencing must be 8' to be effective. I doubt that you want to require a permit for that. Either modify the definition of fencing to exclude stock- or wildlife-exclusion fencing, or increase the height limit.</p> <p>[7.40.1] "solar collector systems will be considered an addition to a structure and will require a development permit": Development permits are described in [6.1.1 Lot Plan Requirements] stating that "Every application for a Development Permit must be accompanied by a plan drawn to an appropriate scale and showing:" (many requirements listed). These requirements greatly exceed what is needed for a solar system, and MODL is not going to require all that information. So, perhaps the description of a development permit can be edited to state that permits for some types of development will require only a subset of information.</p> <p>Inland wetlands. How map was developed not as clear as it might be. Schedule B maps don't show road names or lakes, so they are very hard to navigate. It would be nice if inland wetlands were shown in the interactive map, but that is by no means essential.</p> <p>Thank you for conducting a first-rate process.</p>	
Email	David	<p>Sir:</p> <p>I am contacting you concerning information I have seen with respect to the proposed MODL coastal flood maps, and their arbitrary Red Zone designations. I own property at [REDACTED] in Bayport, and am directly impacted by same. If passed, the latest changes would now include virtually my entire property in a flood zone, and render it undevelopable, would most probably make it difficult for me to sell the property, as financing and insurability would reasonably be issues, and would negatively impact any selling price.</p> <p>A bit of history:</p> <p>The property is actually two separate parcels of land. The main parcel, including the house and garage, was the original property. The second is a small parcel that borders on NS332, and is also linked to a couple of smaller parcels that connect to my neighbour's properties on both</p>	No

		<p>sides, and was the original right of way for the highway. This originated when NS332 was originally paved somewhere around 50+ years ago. Previously there was a small inlet from Lower South Cove, which is fed by a small stream. The original road ran inland and around the cove. When the road was paved, instead of running up around the cove, it was run straight through, with a culvert placed under the road. That created a small pond, which exists today, and which drains into Lower South Cove. This small lot was actually discovered by my lawyer when my late wife and I purchased the property in 2013. The Province wasn't even aware of it until they were approached, looked into it, and the small parcel was purchased from the Province at that time by the seller, and transferred to me.</p> <p>This property has never had a flooding issue since it was built back in the 1960's, with one exception. In 2019, when Hurricane Dorian came through, at high tide, everything backed up, the pond overflowed, and for a short period, perhaps a couple of hours, we had some flooding in the basement, less than a foot of water. As the tide receded, the water drained, and yes, there was some relatively minor damage.</p> <p>Coming out of Covid, and as the Province was given some funding by the Federal Government, the Province decided to repave NS 332 from Lunenburg to Riverport, including widening it for bicycle paths on either side. They also, at that time, replaced many of the culverts. At one point, at a public meeting arranged by our MLA, Susan Corkum-Greek, I spoke to the Divisional Director from Public Works, and asked him whether the culvert from the pond on our property was going to be replaced. He was unaware of it, but we agreed to meet, along with one of their engineers and look at it a few days later. At that time, it was clear that there was an issue with the culvert (we could not locate either end, but could see water coming out through the rocks on the shore side), and he agreed they would replace the culvert. Several days later, I got a call from someone at Public Works telling me that there was nothing wrong with the culvert and they were not going to replace it. I contacted my MLA's office, and asked if the Province wanted to be defending a lawsuit for failure to mitigate in the event of another flood, if they did not replace the culvert when they had the opportunity, and had the equipment there. A couple of days later, crews showed up and a new large concrete culvert was installed. As it turned out, the original culvert was a creosote timber box culvert that was totally rotted out, collapsed, and mostly blocked with sediment.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Following that, when Hurricane Fiona came through, under the same high tide conditions, I checked, and the water level in the pond was a good 3 to 4 feet lower than it had been during Dorian, and everything was draining properly, with no risk of flooding, and no actual flooding. It was obvious that the one flooding incident this property has seen was a direct result of the culvert situation, and had nothing to do with "climate change" or "rising water levels".</p> <p>I would also note that several years ago, again at a public meeting arranged by Susan Corkum-Greek, related to MODL flood mapping, I remember one of the representatives from MODL, in response to a question, replying that they were not experts so had asked the folks at one of the climate activist groups, I believe it was Climate Action, for their opinion. You can appreciate that opinion was somewhat biased by the beliefs and objectives of that organization.</p> <p>Based on what I have seen so far since I moved here in 2013, and some of the discussions I have had with long time residents in the area, which is where some of the history came from, needless to say I don't have much faith in the information, and projections, and blatant assumptions, from MODL.</p> <p>Initially, several years ago, MODL came out with a flood plain map that showed the pond had a potential to flood, and a hundred year flood could come close to the house. Now, as I see in MODL's latest map, virtually my entire property is now included in the "Red Zone". That does not consider the change to the culvert, with the only flood this property having ever suffered being the result of the province having failed to maintain the old culvert, the repaving of 332, which raised it several inches, but does now include, despite no engineering studies, or reliable scientific information, the arbitrarily 1 meter of potential flooding that MODL decided to add to their previously questionable flood map, and is set to declare my entire property an area of known flooding, or a coastal red zone, or a severe hazard. That action by MODL will seriously impact the value of my property, my ability to sell it, and any potential selling price.</p> <p>In addition, considering that the value of my property will be significantly reduced if MODL takes this action, may I assume that my property taxes will be reduced accordingly.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>For the record, I am opposed to the arbitrary increase in "potential" water level, and for that matter, I question even the original flood zone projection, and will hold MODL responsible for any damages I may suffer as a result.</p>	
Email	Keith	<p>Chasidy, Reid</p> <p>Please find attached my comments on the second draft of the Land Use Bylaws and Municipal Planning Strategy (at least as of today). Not too much that stands out, more clarifying questions/comments. Didn't want to send this out tomorrow as you would definitely think it was a joke. Then again, maybe it is. You decide.</p> <p>The team has definitely put a lot of work into these two documents and should be commended. Way easier read than Draft 1 and less restraining.</p> <p>If you have any questions on the comments, please reach out. I am in town until April 5 and then heading out to Mexico for a much needed break and back on April 20.</p> <p>Take care!</p>	Yes
Email	Jay	<p>UPDATE: DOUBLE standard, MODL hired an engineer for Freshwater flooding but is also trying to impose setbacks on freshwater property owners without letting the engineer finish the review.</p> <p><u>Municipality of the District of Lunenburg is currently operating under a massive, unscientific double standard that is costing homeowners their life savings?</u></p> <p>For inland, freshwater lakes and rivers, MODL hired professional engineers at Dillon Consulting to provide a peer-reviewed, stamped, scientific report on flood zoning. But here is the devastating catch. They are about to pass these sweeping freshwater setback rules without actually receiving the final, peer-reviewed documents from Dillon Engineering.</p> <p>Please also forward this email to anyone you know who has a creek or river on their property or lives on a lake. Push back on the new bylaw Draft 2.</p> <p>And for the Lunenburg County coastline? Where the financial stakes are massively higher? The municipality has already imposed an extra meter Red Zone setback without a single peer-reviewed, stamped document from a coastal engineer.</p> <p>Let's look at the actual data regarding what destroys homes in our province.</p>	Yes

		<p>In 2023, historic wildfires completely burned down and destroyed over two hundred homes across Nova Scotia. Specifically, one hundred and fifty homes were lost in the Halifax area... and roughly sixty homes were destroyed in the Barrington Lake fire.</p> <p>In contrast, look at the historic July 2023 flash floods. While that storm dropped 250 millimeters of rain, insured damage to infrastructure and basements, floods rarely result in the total structural destruction of hundreds of homes the way our wildfires do.</p> <p>Yet, instead of focusing on verified science and balanced adaptation, unqualified zoning planners bypassed the Nova Scotia Government's actual engineering data, invented an extra meter of coastal elevation, and pushed it through.</p> <p>Because of this un-stamped guesswork, coastal property owners are seeing their Loan-to-Value ratios slashed to fifty percent. Homes are sitting unsold for over a year. Insurability is at immediate risk.</p> <p>Before MODL locks this into law, we must ensure they have STAMPED Certified backing before introducing the setbacks and law. MODL Planning department needs to be PEER reviewed. Call MODL and ask: Do you have the STAMPED ENGINEERS reports for the Extra Coastal Protection Act meter and do you have the Engineers report for Freshwater Flooding? If NOT, why are you planning on imposing the SET BACK now? STOP the SECOND Draft Bylaws until the RIGHT work is done. MODL - 902.541.1325.</p> <p>When you call, please use a recording device and ask them.</p> <p>Please ask them if they are a qualified MODL member to answer these 2 questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you have a certified engineer's stamp approving the extra meter? 2. Do you have a certified engineer's stamp in place that does not provide setback recommendations for the Freshwater courses bordering Lunenburg property owner properties. <p>https://modlredzone.com - 51 added to the Petition, please share.</p> <p>Newest Video, with more insight. Please share it on your social media to help push the message.</p> <p>YouTube: https://youtu.be/PqdA12nbW3U?si=ahRMoKSQ3UCzprQ2</p> <p>Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/hook.d.properties</p> <p>instagram - https://www.instagram.com/hookdhomes/</p> <p>We also sent this email "attached" to Dal & Waterloo faculty requesting their assistance.</p> <p>Thank you, J</p>	
--	--	--	--

Email	Ama	<p>Thank you for your response. I appreciate you taking the time.</p> <p>I understand that the coastal protection regulations are in place and based on broader environmental assessments. However, my concern remains that the flooding issues affecting my property are not theoretical or driven by long-term climate projections, but rather by very concrete, local infrastructure challenges that have not been adequately addressed.</p> <p>In my case, the issue is not simply elevation or proximity to coastal risk zones, but how water is being managed on the ground—particularly drainage, maintenance, and surrounding infrastructure. These are factors that can significantly influence flooding outcomes and should be considered alongside broader modelling.</p> <p>I would therefore appreciate a closer, site-specific review of my property, taking these practical conditions into account. I'm happy to reconnect with you or your team to walk through the details and ensure the situation is properly understood.</p> <p>The correct PID is [REDACTED]</p>	No
Email	Laurel	<p>I am a homeowner at [REDACTED] Indian Point. Having lived in Indian Point for 31 years and raised my children here, I have made many friends and still enjoy the neighbourhood.</p> <p>I would like to give my input on the land use regulations that are being drafted:</p> <p>I had a lengthy and helpful conversation with Rosemary Young, who forwarded me further information which helped me understand what is currently being proposed.</p> <p>I have two comments; the first is general. I think the rural general land use plan is much too "general". I would like to see more restrictions on light and heavy industrial use.</p> <p>Here is why. Across the road from us is an industrial site at [REDACTED] which would fall under "excavation, construction and landscaping services". It has been expanding and developing over the past five years or so and is dramatically changing the nature of this part of Indian Point. It is one company who had acquired several adjacent lots, creating a huge</p>	No

		<p>presence in a quiet, residential neighbourhood. There is year round heavy truck traffic and construction noise which has changed a rural neighbourhood to a light/ heavy construction zone. The trees have all been cleared so nothing masks the large number of dump trucks and other heavy equipment.</p> <p>I think this kind of operation should fall under a development permit process that would require setback, maintenance of the trees (which would help reduce noise) and maintain the green aspect of the area.</p> <p>I appreciate that this is a local business and provides employment and services for the community. I believe it could have been developed as a much less intrusive site with planning regulations.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Laurel Darnell Indian Point, NS</p>	
Email	David	<p>I am a resident of Feltzen South and reside at [REDACTED]</p> <p>The property was constructed in 2023/24. permit number [REDACTED] The set-back from the high water mark was 23 meters. Occupancy permit was issued on 26 November 2024.</p> <p>As I am 81 years old, I was relying on a reverse mortgage through the CHIP Programme for my retirement income. After I paid to have an appraisal carried out (required by CHIP) they informed me that they will not hold a mortgage because the property has been designated a flood risk as per MODL.</p> <p>Will there be compensation to me and other waterfront owners because of all the proposed changes?</p> <p>Thank you for your attention regarding this very important matter</p> <p>David Bishop [REDACTED]</p>	No

Email	Crystal	<p>I was asked to forward the attached letters to Councillor Chasidy Veinotte on behalf of Louise Strickland of Blue Rocks and Elaine DeMone of Garden Lots.</p>	Yes
Email	Jay	<p>URGENT: Before You Vote—MODL Ignored Terrifying Insurance Warnings - reports from Engineering firm CBCL Ltd.</p> <p>Dear Mayor Elspeth McLean-Wile and Members of MODL Council, Before Council proceeds with any further votes or amendments regarding the Municipal-Wide Land Use By-law, we urge you to address a glaring factual error in your coastal planning strategy. Specifically, the rule forces new coastal builds to sit nearly 1 extra meter higher, ignoring measured scientific recommendations gathered for the <u>present day</u>, the <u>year 2050</u>, and the <u>year 2100</u>, which was provided by CBCL Ltd to protect current homeowners. You are removing Insurance for all homeowners in the REDZONE. You have removed the insurance Program in place to protect thousands of homeowners with the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements. WHY?....</p> <p>We all want to protect our coastlines. However, by pushing this extreme restriction, MODL has ignored the foundational science, gone completely overboard, and overlooked terrifying warnings from national insurance and housing bodies. This unstudied decision is already destroying the property value of thousands of Nova Scotians.</p> <p>Here are the verifiable facts:</p> <p>1. The Financial Nightmare: Mortgages and Insurance Why is being placed in the exaggerated "red zone" caused by this 1 Extra Meter so terrifying for property owners? Because of how the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and the Insurance Bureau of Canada (IBC) view flood zones. <u>which MODL has now adopted as a REDZONE.</u></p> <p>National insurance bodies and the federal government have modernized their frameworks—including the rollout of the National Flood Insurance Program and updates to the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements (DFAA). Under these policies, properties forced into high-risk hazard zones face severe consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Insurance: Homes in these zones face extreme private insurance premiums or total denial of coverage. • No Disaster Relief: High-risk builds will be ineligible for federal disaster financial assistance. • No Mortgages: If a property cannot be insured, a bank will not issue a mortgage for it. 	No

		<p>By pulling thousands of properties into this unstudied red zone expanded by this extra meter, MODL is effectively making these properties uninsurable and unmortgageable. You are taking land that families have invested their life savings into and making it financially worthless.</p> <p>2. The Science and the "Hurricane Juan" Mistake</p> <p>When the Nova Scotia Government prepared its coastal protection strategies, they relied on rigorous coastal mapping by the highly respected engineering firm CBCL Ltd. Council must be fully informed of what was actually in their reports before enforcing this extra meter. <u>Who did MODL hire to contradict CBCL Ltd. findings?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Hurricane Juan Fact: MODL planning management staff cannot suggest that CBCL Ltd. failed to consider Hurricane Juan. The comprehensive modeling produced by CBCL Ltd. absolutely factored in historical data from Hurricane Juan to determine maximum upper-bound storm surges. • The Expert Finding: Even when factoring in those massive historical storms alongside aggressive sea-level rise projections for the year 2100, the CBCL engineering reports showed that we need to prepare for extreme water levels around the 3.02-meter mark in our region. • The MODL Mistake: Instead of following the 3.02-meter expert recommendation, MODL arbitrarily added almost an entire extra meter on top of it, creating the extreme 3.97-meter rule. <p>Adding an extra meter doesn't just mean building a house a little higher. Because land slopes, raising the restriction by a full meter dramatically expands the restricted "red zone" map inland. By ignoring the experts and pushing this boundary up by 1 Extra Meter, MODL has instantly turned thousands of safe, developable properties into restricted flood zones.</p> <p>3. Our Questions to Council Prior to Your Next Steps</p> <p><u>This bylaw was implemented without consulting economists or property scientists. We urgently need Council to answer the following questions on the public record:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where is your proof? Did MODL receive a specific report from CMHC or the IBC approving the decision to push the boundary up by 1 Extra Meter, knowing the financial ruin it would cause to insurability? 2. Who pays for the lost value? What is MODL's plan for compensating the thousands of families whose land has been rendered uninsurable and valueless by this unstudied rule? 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>3. Will you pause this? Will Council immediately pause enforcement of the 1 Extra Meter rule, return to the 3.02m scientific baseline modeled by the province's experts, and conduct a comprehensive Economic Impact Study?</p> <p><u>Our community relies on you to make decisions based on verified facts</u>, not guesswork or incorrect assumptions about historical storm data. We look forward to your prompt response and to working together on a fair, science-backed workaroud that protects our coast without bankrupting your residents.</p> <p>Here is the current petition, which is growing hourly as more "<u>Lunenburg County</u>" residents learn about this overreaching, financially harmful mistake that you can and should fix. Petition - https://modlredzone.base44.app AI-generated information on YouTube. - https://youtu.be/QE0A--pavyM?si=c4t7v-IGOTv3id6V Please get 3rd party advice from an expert with the right license, or call CBCL Ltd and discover what the previous counsel did. The county is lucky, we did not suffer a hurricane or other water-based disaster. That would have been and still could be a financial disaster when the FEDS have protection in place that you have removed from thousands of residences. We can't help by second-guessing all your new bylaws with this example of, "internal overreach". We feel it's only fair that you consider hiring third-party, impartial professionals to study and peer-review your proposed new bylaws.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jason & Genniene Sutherland</p>	
Email	Carmella	Good afternoon, can you please confirm receipt of this letter for the Mayor and my Councillor Chasidy Veinotte. I have been trying to find more information on this as well if you could send along details or links to where the information is on your website.	Yes
Email	Bob	<p>After listening to the meeting on March 10,2026, I would like to comment on one particular topic of the session which was RV Parks and Campgrounds.</p> <p>As an owner of several properties located in District 1 and a property owner who was impacted by the Coastal Protection regulations implemented by MODL, that I once again feel that the MODL is trying to use Municipal Wide Planning to deal with the community concerns of RV Parks and Campgrounds.</p>	No

		<p>I agree with Counciller Cathy Moore who stated that where RV Parks and Campgrounds are not part of the provincial requirements for planning then why is this even being discussed at this time and if so, why are other issues not being dealt with here at the same time?</p> <p>As Counciller Edgar Burns commented at an earlier session, soon MODL will have " A Shiney New Noise Bylaw" to deal with the issues that arise from RV Parks and Campgrounds.</p> <p>My personal view is that MODL should be sticking to the Provincial Requirements for zoning and not clouding the process to deal with isolated district issues and residents who do not want change in their "unzoned" area.</p> <p>I would also like to point out that at the opening of the meeting Reid Shepherd clearly stated "What is there today can stay" but yet when Counciller Pam Hubley, District 4 mentioned an existing Campground in District 4 it was stated that it would have to be dealt with individually as it is currently not operating as one. I would suggest that if it has sites marked, and signage then it is indeed a campground as that would be its last primary use. Perhaps the owners have reasons for not having it open?</p> <p>I urge council to deal with the Provincial Statements of Interest and deal with community conflict through the appropriate by-laws, rules and regulations.</p> <p>Respectively submitted Bob Clark - District 1 Property Owner</p>	
Email	Alex	<p>Can I ask an unrelated follow up question?</p> <p>I just got a letter with concerns about the new coastal protection regulations and how it affects folks on the coast.</p> <p>Generally speaking I am in support of taking more meaningful steps to protect our coastline, but they did mention that this might affect my ability to get refinanced or access insurance. I look at the map to figure out if we are affected at [REDACTED] but we are right on the edges of the maps I looked at. Living in [REDACTED] would we be at risk of losing our mortgage or insurance?</p>	No

Email	Ama	<p>As a resident and taxpayer in your district, I am writing to express my serious concern regarding the "Designated Coastal Protection Area" mapping that is about to be incorporated into the new Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Land Use By-laws.</p> <p>I have recently learned that MODL has expanded the Province's worst-case 2100 sea-level rise projection (3.05 m) into a much broader 3.97 metre "red zone." By releasing this extreme mapping without conducting an economic impact assessment on existing homeowners, the municipality is effectively reducing property values. Financial institutions and insurers are already using these maps to lower loan-to-value (LTV) ratios and increase premiums—impacting everyday Nova Scotians who rely on their home equity for retirement and financial security.</p> <p>Furthermore, by significantly restricting the economic use of coastal properties, MODL may be exposing the municipality to legal risk under the Supreme Court of Canada's precedent on de facto (constructive) expropriation (<i>Annapolis Group Inc. v. Halifax Regional Municipality</i>). Property value cannot be removed without appropriate compensation or recourse.</p> <p>Before proceeding to Final Reading of the new MPS by-laws, I respectfully request that Council take the following immediate actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopt the Provincial Sliding Scale Discontinue the use of a hypothetical long-term disaster scenario to guide present-day decisions. Update public mapping to reflect the Province's realistic timelines (present day, 2050, 2100), so lenders and buyers can properly assess current risk. 2. Introduce a Mapping Override Process Include a formal mechanism in the by-laws that allows property owners to submit certified "ground-truth" data from a Nova Scotia Land Surveyor to correct inaccuracies in provincial LIDAR mapping at the individual property level. <p>Residents should not bear the financial consequences of what appears to be an administrative mapping issue. I ask that you confirm this matter will be addressed at the upcoming PAC meeting in March 2026.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sabrina Ama Lorenz Address / PID Number: [REDACTED]</p>	No
Email	Conrad	Hello,	Yes


		<p>See attached. Sending this letter with the expressed support and consent of 8 additional constituents of MODL who will hold current sitting council responsible for their reckless implementation of these bylaws without consideration of economic impact. We strongly urge the implementation of these bylaws be cancelled or amended.</p> <p>Signed: Conrad Mosher</p> <p>With additional support of and consent from: Darlene Mosher - district 8 Christopher zinck - district 3 Julia Mosher - district 3 Perry Zinck - district 3 Debbie Zinck - district 3 Louise Acker - district 8 Heather acker-district 8 Kevin Acker - district 8</p>	
Email	Gillian	<p>Thank you for the interesting and helpful open house which I attended on 18th March last. I would respectfully disagree with the decision to remove all limits on livestock numbers and setbacks. As a recently retired shepherd I know that the 'animal unit' approach is well accepted in other jurisdictions and protects animals from overstocking and possibly inhumane conditions.</p> <p>This approach was certainly covered in the Nova Scotia sheep association rules and regulations and hopefully is addressed by other livestock associations. I was told that there was local disagreement on the proposed restrictions but I would argue that is not a sufficient reason for retreating from humane bylaws which promote good husbandry and ultimately less problems for farmers, animals and the general neighborhood. We should accept that there are possibilities/ probabilities resulting from lack of reasonable restrictions. These problems are only likely to increase with climate change involving drought and flooding.</p>	No
Email	Samy	<p>Dear Mayor McLean-Wile and Councillor & Councillor's</p> <p>Attached is my concerning letter requesting you consider that damaging position the previous council members have put in my asset / property. Kindly respond with your intentions and the directive within what Council can do to insure my property is not devalued.</p>	Yes

		Respectfully, Samy	
Email	Nathaniel	Please see attached the letter to be heavily considered.	Yes
Email	Maureen	<p>Good afternoon Reid, and all others.</p> <p>Thank you for the reply and understanding of the situation.</p> <p>From your response: "a simple change could potentially be around the difference between a tiny home being on wheels (can't be inspected) to one that sits on posts/foundation (would have to meet the Building Code)."</p> <p>That does sound like an easy and effective change for them in general. If that also includes the occupancy permits rules, I think it would be very effective.</p> <p>If the 2 are implemented it would also take care of the other concern of whether or not septic was approved as they would have to have provide that to you for it all. So, again, another thing that could be solved.</p> <p>RV's in parks staying long term set up on blocks so it is a very easy change for the person wanting to do it also.</p> <p>If all things you have in place also takes care of the number of them of them per property, then I think you are looking great.</p> <p>My only other question is this following: I know inspections on buildings under a certain square footage are not required to get permits, sheds , etc. Does this also apply to those that are going to be lived in full time, and with that intent in mind? With the boom of tiny home living, which I actually think is fantastic as long as it is done right, there should be something in place for that. (it may already be done and included, forgive me if I am behind please.) .</p> <p>Thanks also for responding as able, to my second part. I am not crazed about speaking with them, but will bring it to their attention in case that part hasn't been done. Even if it was done, I am not sure how NSCC could give an approval on something that does not have plans for a set amount of rooms. (I am referring to a septic being approved, or built,</p>	No

		<p>according to the number of rooms in a house/building). That will be an interesting bit of info gathering and learning at least. Lol.</p> <p>I really appreciate everyone's interest and super response. I have seen the push back and ire that many have over the zoning, etc. I am one that appreciates it all and sees the benefits and I think all of you have done an excellent job with it.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Maureen</p>	
Email	Maureen	<p>So sorry to bother you all again, but I thought of something else pertaining to the village of THOW's in Simpson's corner.</p> <p>Has it been checked to see if there is an approved septic and water? All the units do have their own washrooms as well as he has a main unit with the "kitchen" .</p> <p>I would more than likely need a foipop for that info myself and if they did not submit a building permit application to MODL because they are bypassing it, does anyone know if that important part is done?</p> <p>Thanks again,</p> <p>Maureen</p>	No
Email	Maureen	<p>He Reid.</p> <p>I am writing to list a few details of our conversation the other day, as you asked.</p> <p>It was a pleasure speaking with you Reid, and I appreciate the info you offered along with your ear which I am sure I tired out! Lol.</p> <p>I also spoke with Graham Hopkins yesterday as well and he too was very informative and helpful.</p>	No

		<p>I am including my MLA , Cathy Moore and our Mayor, as well so that all are aware of this and with the hope that they too will discuss with anyone necessary to come up with a solution to this.</p> <p>What I discussed with both of you was my concern about rentals on wheels, especially where it concerns Long Term Rentals, which have more legalities, rules and regs on them.</p> <p>Speaking with Graham I learned that IF a building/room/rental is on wheels, the municipality and building inspections and occupancy permits, are not applicable. I understood this to mean that it then becomes a provincial responsibility in some way, but I am incorrect on that I have found. I have since realized that Municipalities can correct this on their own by introducing the appropriate zoning or bylaws to cover rentals and homes on wheels. This would fix that issue without even having to involve the provincial govt. Departments.</p> <p>I also learned during this conversation that others have complained about one particular property I speak of which is offering multiple rentals out of a tractor trailer that has never had any inspection to ensure it is safe for people to live in. As Graham put it, the wheels take away his ability to inspect what that person is renting to people.</p> <p>When speaking with you, Reid, you explained to me that MODL did not want to make rules on homes on wheels as they don't want to restrict things too much in light of the current housing situation. (please forgive me if my wording is not quite right, or please correct me when and if wrong.). I do understand that to a degree, but not if it opens up issues and concerns and not if it blocks the ability of MODL staff to do their jobs and duties pertaining to it. If MODL is getting calls and concerns about this, but cannot respond fully because MODL has nothing in place, then that is unfair to residents who have concerns, your staff who have to respond but cannot act, and also to those residents who are in situations that could cause harm to them in various ways.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>I also feel there is a difference in one THOW on a person's own land with that person living in it full time, compared to someone putting multiple units on a property they don't live on, or in, and is being offered as a long term rental(s) business.</p> <p>MODL should be more diligent on this when they know that the residents in these "rentals" could be at risk in all ways, safety being at the top of the list. THOW's (tiny homes on wheels) are in a grey area, therefore the leases may not be effective, and the insurance may not be effective. Both of which, I am quite sure, are requirements for offering Long Term Rentals in NS. (again, I am not a pro here and may not be fully correct. I appreciate corrections).</p> <p>I am wondering, since the zoning is not in stone yet, that you take a look at this issue and see if there is something that could be done to help with it by way of: zoning or land use. ? OR perhaps it may require a By Law. ? Perhaps you don't have to outlaw them completely but instead put a limit on the number per property, as well as/or, a limit on commercial use/rental business.?</p> <p>I am quite sure that anyone that owns a home and property would not appreciate a field full of tractor trailers with multiple units and no inspections next to them, if you put yourselves in that position. Not to mention all the other concerns that go with it.</p> <p>I will say again, as I did in voice, I am not here to get folks in trouble that is not my aim, but I am concerned that folks may could be harmed in various way, due to the lack of rules concerning this.</p> <p>I am going to put the link to the site where the rental is being offered. I will also put some info below that I have read and why I question this and have concern about it.</p> <p>Thanks again for your time and help in our phone call, it's appreciated!</p> <p>I hope to hear, or see more, on this subject in some form and will thank you in advance for any corrections or changes that you might have in response.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Maureen Mulcahy </p> <p>This is one of the multi rental buildings on wheels being rented around simpsons corner. The link is below for the whole ad and all pics.</p> <p>https://www.facebook.com/marketplace/item/1525163288706626</p> <p>This is another one of his THOW's being offered in the same site by the looks of the ad. Which makes it seem he will be doing a village of them. Lol. : https://www.facebook.com/marketplace/item/1393705765711477/?referral_code=undefined</p> <p>—</p> <p>This is some of the info that I have read. Perhaps some of it may contain some helpful info on how others are dealing with THOW's, to develop something that works for our municipality. (THOWs), as they often fall into a legal grey area between RVs and residential dwellings. While Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) and other rural areas allow small homes on foundations or as accessory units, THOWs are generally restricted to mobile home parks or campgrounds rather than being allowed as primary residences on residential lots. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation CMHC +3</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>This is from East Hants on THOW's. As you can see they allow THOW's, but only as accessory to an existing property and only one per. Perhaps this may be a less restrictive idea. "5.2.9. Tiny Homes on Wheels as an Accessory Dwelling Unit A development permit may be issued to permit a tiny home on wheels as an accessory dwelling unit providing the following requirements are met: a) A tiny home on wheels shall be located in the side or rear yard and shall adhere to the same side and rear yard setbacks as the main dwelling unit; b) There is a limit of 1 tiny home on wheels per property; c) The tiny home on wheels shall use existing on-site services or shall provide approval from Nova Scotia Environment for an alternative grey water and/or sewage treatment system. https://www.easthants.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Part-5-Rural-Zones.pdf</p> <p>The following also has info from which I am basing my opinion on. The most pertinent part is the Safety and inspection requirements as per the residential tenancies act.</p> <p>When I spoke with them about this, they stated that they only take complaints/concerns about unsafe rentals directly from the tenant. Therefore, they are not responsible to handle concerns/complaints such as this from others.</p> <p>"Offering a lease on a long-term rental for a mobile tiny home in Nova Scotia that has not been inspected is highly risky and likely violates several provincial and municipal regulations. The key legalities surround safety, land-use zoning, and provincial/municipal housing standards</p> <p>Key Legal and Safety Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and Inspection Requirements: The <i>Residential Tenancies Act</i> and provincial building codes require that rental accommodations meet minimum safety standards. A tiny home that has not been inspected lacks proof that it is safe for habitation, particularly regarding electrical, plumbing, and structural integrity. • Occupancy Standards (By-law M-200): Municipalities, such as Halifax (HRM), have by-laws that outline the minimum standard to which residential buildings, including rentals, must be maintained. An uninspected unit is unlikely to have a, or comply with, the required maintenance plan. • Rental Registration (By-law R-400): If the tiny home is located in Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM), the property must be registered with the Residential Rental Registry by April 1, 2024, or it is considered a violation, punishable by fines of up to \$10,000. This process requires declaring the unit's compliance. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dangerous and Unightly Property: If a complaint is made, an uninspected unit might be classified as a "dangerous and unsightly property". • Lease Enforceability: While a lease is a contract, an illegal dwelling cannot be legally rented. If a tenant discovers the unit is not properly inspected or authorized, they could potentially void the lease, request a rent refund, or vacate without penalty, and the landlord could face serious fines from the residential tenancies board. Halifax Regional Municipality +4 	
Email	Art	<p>Jeff - I note the paragraph re boathouses in the Draft. I see no point in restricting their private citizen pleasure uses. As long as they conform to environment rules established by other government agencies such as those responsible for oceans & waterways. The draft says what can go in them. Why ? To what end ? I see toilets specifically mentioned. Their use is restricted near the water by other agencies. Unneeded. Double regulation. Additionally they are an evolving technology. Modern electric or gas toilets have no residue & are environment friendly. - Art</p>	No
Email	Chuck	<p>I have also set a copy of this to Chasidy my rep for Dist 10. I am also forwarding a copy to you.</p> <p>Please let me know you have received it.</p> <p>Thank you Chuck</p>	Yes

Council
Item #11.1.1
May 12, 2026
T. MacEwan



The Municipality of the District of Lunenburg Information Report

Report To: Municipal Council

Submitted By: Ruth Wawin, Tourism & Event Development Officer

Date: May 12, 2026

Re: Service Impacts of Discontinuing In-Person Visitor Information Services

Background

On March 3, 2026 council directed staff to discontinue summer visitor services and the Mobile VIC Pop-Up Program, while retaining tourism funding, and to return with options for its future use, including a potential tourism strategy.

This report outlines the service reductions and operational impacts associated with the decision not to hire seasonal staff to support summer visitor information services, including impacts to pop-up delivery and other tourism-related functions.

Financial Implications

The following chart outlines the originally proposed tourism-related budgets for the 2026–2027 fiscal year, along with a brief description of the expenditures supported within each budget. Not all budgeted items will be implemented as proposed, reflecting Council’s direction to discontinue summer visitor services including the Mobile VIC Pop-Up Program.

	2026/2027 Budget
Revenues	
VIC Revenues	\$6,000.00
Grant- Tourism Students	\$2,100.00
Expenses	
Special Projects	\$15,000.00

Tourism Marketing	\$35,000.00
VIC Wages & Benefits	\$41,000.00
Visitor Information Services	\$3,000

VIC Revenues (\$6,000)

This revenue is provided through a provincial funding program administered by the Tourism Industry Association of Nova Scotia (TIANS) to support the delivery of visitor services.

Grant-Tourism Students (\$2,100)

Budgeted revenue representing the approximate annual funding received through the Canada Summer Jobs program to support the hiring of a tourism student.

Special Projects (\$15,000)

This budget supports the Municipality's \$5,000 contribution to the South Shore Tourism Co-op. It also provides funding for events such as Family Fun Day, as well as special initiatives throughout the year, including planned celebrations at Miller Point Peace Park to recognize the accessible kayak launch and trail upgrades, an event at Indian Falls highlighting recent park improvements, and a partnership with the Town of Bridgewater to support the September Paddlefest event. The budget further allows for flexibility to support additional opportunities as they arise.

Tourism Marketing (\$35,000)

This budget supports the promotion of the Municipality as a tourism destination through a range of marketing initiatives. This includes annual licensing fees for the municipal tourism website, including the ShowMe Map platform and WordPress, as well as the design, updating, and printing of key tourism materials such as the MODL tourism brochure and Trail Map. Additional costs include the distribution of brochures to Visitor Information Centres across the province, including both municipal materials and those of local tourism operators. The account also supports professional photography to develop high-quality promotional assets, contributions toward partner initiatives such as the Petite Rivière Art & Craft Society map printing, and paid advertising through channels such as radio and social media. Funding is also used for the production of MODL-branded promotional materials, including banners and branded merchandise used for outreach and engagement activities.

VIC Wages & Benefits (\$41,000)

This budget was previously allocated to support two full-time seasonal staff (35 hours per week from May until end of the Aug) and one part-time staff member (approximately 10 hours per week from September to March), responsible for delivering visitor information services, including Mobile VIC operations, social media, and tourism-related support functions.

Visitor Information Services (\$3,000)

Operating budget to support the delivery of visitor services, including supplies, promotional materials, signage, and equipment required for Mobile VIC Pop-Ups and related activities.

The following outlines the service-level impacts resulting from discontinuing the Mobile VIC operations.

Service Impacts

Eliminated Services:

- Mobile VIC Pop-Ups
- In-person visitor engagement

Impacted Functions:

The following impacts reflect the reduction in staffing resources previously supported through the VIC Wages & Benefits budget.

- Event Calendar: Staff will no longer proactively identify and upload events. Events will only be added through public submissions.
- Email, Social Media, and Phone Inquiries: Response timelines may be extended due to limited staff resources.
- Social Media: Posting frequency on Facebook and Instagram will be reduced.
- Website: The annual review of business listings will not be completed. New blog content highlighting tourism activities is also unlikely to be developed this season.
- Business Outreach and Visits: In previous seasons, staff visited businesses throughout the Municipality to support direct engagement with operators and promote local businesses through social media. While staff will continue to deliver brochures to key locations, the number of businesses visited and highlighted on social media during peak season will be reduced.

Brochure distribution will continue, with the delivery of tourism materials to tourism operators and Visitor Information Centres now being completed by the Tourism and Event Development Officer instead of a team of two seasonal staff.

Conclusion

The decision to discontinue summer visitor services and the Mobile VIC Pop-Up Program for the 2026 season will result in a reduction in direct visitor engagement and associated service levels, while core tourism marketing and information services will continue within existing staff capacity.

This change results in approximately \$44,000 in previously allocated funds remaining uncommitted, including \$41,000 budgeted for staffing and \$3,000 for visitor services. When accounting for \$6,000 in anticipated VIC revenues and \$2,100 in funding through the Canada Summer Jobs program, the net uncommitted amount is approximately \$35,900.

These funds present an opportunity for Council to consider alternative tourism priorities, such as the development of a tourism strategy. Council may also wish to consider advancing a broader regional discussion on the future direction of tourism through the Regional Growth Management Committee.

Report Preparation	
Department	Recreation, Parks & Tourism
Report Prepared by	Ruth Wawin, Tourism & Event Development Officer
Report Approved by	
Date Reviewed by C.A.O.	