

**Let us begin by acknowledging that we are gathered today in Mi'kma'ki. The ancestral, present and future territory of the Mi'kmaw people. Today, we gather with the intent followed by the living Peace and Friendship Treaties - with respect, cooperation and coexistence.**

Call to Order

The purpose of this hearing is to receive verbal and written submissions regarding Council's Draft 2021 – 2025 Town of Mahone Bay Strategic Plan.

1 Report of the Clerk

2 General Public

Does anyone present have a submission to make in respect to this proposed Draft 2021-2025 Strategic Plan?

3 Motion to adjourn the Public Hearing



**Purpose:**

The purpose of this hearing is to receive verbal and written submissions regarding Council's Draft 2021 – 2025 Town of Mahone Bay Strategic Plan.

**Background:**

At the April 13, 2021 regular meeting of Mahone Bay Town Council, Council approved the draft Public Engagement Plan: 2021 – 2025 Strategic Plan. That plan provided an outline for how the Town would engage the public on the draft Strategic Plan.

The draft Strategic Plan was posted on the Town website and members of the public were encouraged to review the draft and offer comments, participate in the Public Information Meeting, and/or the public hearing via notification on the Town website, the Mayor's newsletter, regular posts on social media, a notice posted at the Post Office, an advertisement that ran for two consecutive weeks in the Progress Bulletin, and two separate notifications sent to those who had signed up for the *Communications from Council*, and *Community Notices from the Town* notice boards on the Town's Mass Notification System, CodeRED.

A public information meeting was held online via videoconferencing on May 3, 2021 at 7pm. There were fifteen people in attendance at the Public Information Meeting, including eight members of the public.

**Notification:**

Public Information Meeting: May 3, 2021  
Notification in Progress Bulletin April 28<sup>th</sup>  
Town website, Town facebook page,  
Notice posted at the Post Office

Public Hearing: Progress Bulletin April 28, 2021  
Progress Bulletin May 5, 2021  
Town website, Town facebook page,  
Notice posted at the Post Office

**Submissions Received:**

Comments submitted to the Public Hearing were forwarded to the Council on Monday afternoon. Those comments were from: Leah Maloney; Veryan Haysom; Joy Morgan; and Mary Ellen Donovan.

No written submissions were received since that time.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Hughes

Town Clerk & Deputy CAO



## Maureen Hughes

---

**From:** Town of Mahone Bay Clerk  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 5, 2021 1:49 PM  
**To:** Maureen Hughes  
**Subject:** FW: Comment for the Public Hearing on May 10th

-----Original Message-----

From: Leah Maloney <lmaloney222@icloud.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 1:45 PM  
To: Town of Mahone Bay Clerk <clerk@townofmahonebay.ca>  
Subject: Comment for the Public Hearing on May 10th

CAUTION: This email originated from an external sender.

Good afternoon,

I have read the Town of Mahone Bay's draft of the 2021-2025 Strategic Plan. I would like to offer the following comment for the May 10th Public Hearing:

Under Table 3 of Section 3 - Environmental Leadership

3.2.2 (Shoreline and Wastewater mgmt.) and 3.3.2 (Straight Pipes etc.) - I believe these two initiatives are of the utmost importance. With regards to 3.2.2, water is a problem in Mahone Bay, whether it be an eroding shoreline or backed up stormwater drains causing flooding on the roads and properties. Timing of 3.3.2 seems reasonable but I would like to see 3.2.2 moved closer to Q1-2022 as well (and rearrange some of the other initiatives if need be and if at all possible).

Thank you,  
Leah Maloney  
49 Clearway St  
Mahone Bay

## To the Mahone Bay Town Council

### Comments on Draft Town of Mahone Bay Strategic Plan 2021-2025

The Town has requested feedback on the **Draft Town of Mahone Bay Strategic Plan 2021-2025**. My initial impression of the draft Strategic Plan was positive but having looked at it more carefully I do not think it withstands close reading and I have developed a number of concerns. The following comments summarize and explain those of my concerns that I believe warrant attention.

1 Introduction The very first sentence (which I recognize is not part of the draft plan) caught my attention. (The sentence reads: “The Town of Mahone Bay elected officials' role is to plan for and provide the mechanism to meet residents' and businesses' needs.”) Setting aside my understanding that it is the role of Council which matters, not that of individual councillors; and setting aside the question of whether there is one mechanism that will meet the needs of both residents and businesses; and setting aside, for the moment, my belief that the principal role of Council is community governance, I question the idea that councillors occupy their positions in order to meet the needs of businesses. I ask Council to reconsider this description of its role with a view to deleting the reference to “businesses”. Business is an activity and businesses are entities involved in commerce or commercial enterprises. Local government is for people and should not privilege one specific category of people's activities over others. If Council insists on meeting the needs of businesses it should explain why its role does not also require it to plan to meet the needs of recreational organizations (and I note that recreation is completely missing from this document), charities, not-for-profit community organizations, service organizations and faith communities – to mention those that come most immediately to mind. I ask you to consider that the role of council is to develop sound public policies and programs that meet the needs of citizens.

2. I question the Mission statement. I do not see the mission of local government as being the delivery of services. I believe the mission of Council must always be to provide good governance for the well being of the people of the community (in other words, its role is to exercise local authority for the common good). Taking the draft plan as a whole, the issue of governance appears to be a tail-end concept that is only there to meet expectations for growth. (See section 2.3.) For me governance is primarily for the well being of the community and not to serve as a primary engine for growth. To the extent that governance involves service delivery, it should focus on public services and be clear that the provision of public

services is only one, albeit important, function of the Council. I ask Council to reconsider this mission statement. In doing so, I recognize that because the draft mission to deliver services permeates much of the remainder of the draft plan, this is a big ask. I suggest that if Council wants to prioritize provision of public services that it does so while consistently recognizing that the provision of public services is only one aspect of good governance.

3. In the same vein, I question the heavy emphasis on service delivery in the statement of Core Values. The need to be explicit about core values is not because the Council delivers local public services but because it entrusted with the power to exercise authority over us, hold and use community assets wisely and for the good of all, and to act in the community's best interests. Given that there is a need to describe what it is that Council and staff are doing in accordance with this list of principles or values I very much prefer to describe what Council and staff are doing as "ethical, environmentally sound, economically viable and socially responsible governance". That for me should be the core activity that requires core values rather than 'timely and collaborative service delivery'. Perhaps, cutting to the chase, Council might consider deleting the words "in the timely and collaborative delivery of services and support to" and replacing them with "all that they do in the governance of".

If you are not interested in cutting to the chase and want to hang onto the current formulation of what Council and Staff are here for, I have the following additional problems that I believe should be dealt with: What is "support" in this context and how is it distinct from "service"? If service is the supply of things like utilities, does support imply the supply of money? Assuming Council is irrevocably committed to service delivery as its mission and as the context within which it wishes to lay out its core values, at a minimum the services must be identified as public and as being only one component of good governance – as I have already said. Beyond that, I do not think adding the descriptors 'timely and collaborative' to service delivery is helpful. Doing so makes time and collaboration definitive of public services and gives them pre-eminence over other values – I would, for example, hate to think that timeliness is more important than equity or fairness or that either of those values would be traded off in order to achieve timeliness. I tend to think that collaboration is a principle or value along with Accessibility etc. The concept of "collaborative delivery of services" is both ambiguous and unusual. (If, for example, the Town installs a 5G network, who does it collaborate with in delivering the 5G service? Does this mean the Town will use its utility to deliver 5G and facilitate a community co-operative for 5G that will not gouge us or simply collaborate with Bell?) When it comes to the delivery of public services I prefer good value for my tax dollars to

collaborative delivery. Better descriptors might be “excellent,” “affordable” or “sustainable” but, and this is the important point, descriptors are not necessary or particularly helpful and should be deleted. Assuming deep attachment to either or both of these terms, “timely” could be incorporated in the first sentence under Sustainable Municipal Services and “collaboration” could be included in the list of principles or core values.

4 The list of core values itself is OK. The core values that are listed are more appropriate to governance generally than to the specific function of service delivery. I realize the list has to be selective, not a laundry list. Personally I place a high value on the principles of transparency, prudence, respect, trust and intergenerational sustainability in the context of governance and wonder at their exclusion. Equally important, is to read the document to see what values really do lie at its core as opposed to those that it says it espouses. Reading this document as a whole I think that its core value is “growth” and that almost everything the Town is doing is being done in the service of growth. I will return to this below. In any event, I ask Council to reconsider the Core Values statement and the list of principles related to good governance, not just service delivery.

5 In the first sentence under Sustainable Municipal Services I recommend inserting “public” before “services” and replacing “prosperity” with “well-being”. In section 1.1, I wonder how increasing (read growing) demand improves performance? In the strategic actions under heading 1.1, I wonder how increasing (read growing) demand will transition away from fossil fuels or promote sustainability. Why increase demand? What about helping people use less energy? If increasing demand were so important then I would expect to see the fourth bullet reference expansion of infrastructure.

In the strategic actions under heading 1.2 in the line “Transportation systems including streets and sidewalks,” I suggest replacing “streets”, which are an utterly obvious inclusion, with “bike routes” and adding “trails”, which are perhaps a little less obvious.

6 I find section 1.3 hard to follow. Given that this section is about improving accessibility, as per the heading, I have tried to read the section through that lens. I interpret the first sentence as meaning that Council plans to “Establish new and renovated public infrastructure so as to meet current accessibility standards; increase usage of Town facilities and public spaces by people with disabilities; and improve access by all citizens to ongoing public engagement.” Is that what you intend? I also find the first bullet in this section hard to follow. I suggest this might

Tom 2021-5-6 5:29 PM

**Comment [1]** : Why increase demand? What about helping people use less energy. Growth in what? GDP? Population? Governments generally need to focus on wellbeing. On quality not quantity. We should be measuring what percent of our people have enough to eat, adequate housing, access to education, etc.

be clearer if written to say “Develop and implement an operational plan in accordance with the framework of the Lunenburg County Accessibility Plan approved by Council on \*\*.” (I could not find that approval.) I also have a question about the second bullet. It is clear enough on its own but, in the context of the section, leads me to wonder whether what you really intend to support is “barrier-free healthy living?” In table 1 the references to Project 1, Project 2 and Project 3 are opaque. This problem recurs in Table 2. Generally I do not know how to read or understand the tables – there is no key to the meaning of the different coloured cells, for example.

7           With reference to the heading Equitable and Inclusive Growth I ask why “growth” rather than “development” or better yet, community well-being? Growth in what? I suggest governments generally need to focus on wellbeing; on quality of life not simply increasing quantities of everything. Why are you not interested in Equity and Inclusion period? We should be measuring what percent of our people have enough to eat, have adequate housing, have access to day-care, have access to quality, affordable post-secondary education and training, etc. I suggest you delete the word “Growth” in the heading and replace it with “Community”. I suggest you delete the word “growth” in the first sentence under this heading and replace it with “life”. I suggest you delete “Growing” in heading 2.1 and replace it with the subject at hand “Equitable and Inclusive”.

I paused at the phrase “including investment in core infrastructure and services” in the first sentence and wondered why it appears here and what would be lost in the strategic plan if it were deleted. Was investment in services and infrastructure not effectively covered under the first strategic priority? It was there implicitly. (How do you have sustainable municipal services other than by investing in them and how do you replace and upgrade utility infrastructure without investing in it?) Why is expanding existing infrastructure to support planned growth an issue in equity and inclusion under this section rather than a matter of fairly, equitably and sustainably meeting increasing demand under section 1.1?

I found section 2.1 a bit confusing. I was left with the sense that while the strategy has yet to be developed it has been pre-determined. I think you can make it a lot clearer and demonstrate inclusiveness and leadership by saying that you will develop and implement a Mahone Bay Housing Strategy with supply, adequacy, affordability and equity as its focus through a barrier free, inclusive and meaningful process of community consultation.



8 I have been puzzling over the first strategic action under heading 2.1. I really do not understand the process that is being outlined. I think this is saying that Council will wait for the Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) and Land Use Bylaw (LUB) to be finalized and then make it conform to the Strategic Plan. This puzzles me because I understand that the Strategic Plan is an internal Town document to guide Council and staff which can be changed from year to year while the MPS and LUB have the effect of law, bind the public in addition to Council and its staff, and remain in effect for at least 10 years or until replaced through the prescribed process. In other words, I understand the MPS and LUB to take formal or legal precedence over the Strategic Plan. If that is correct then the statement that the MPS and Land Use By-law will align with the Strategic Plan complicates and pre-empt the Plan Mahone Bay process and seems like an error. Clarity about the relationship between the Municipal Planning Strategy and the Town's Strategic Planning is required with respect to both process and substance. To be specific: Which takes precedence, the MPS and LUB or the Strategic Plan? What is the process for amending the Strategic Plan, if any? And precisely how does Council intend to proceed in order to ensure that the two sets of documents are consistent and do not conflict? (Table 2 says nothing about alignment.)

9 I question title 2.2 Provide Equitable Services to Support Growth. Does Council really intend to imply that the provision of equitable services is contingent on, or related in some way to, the issue of growth - as in 'no growth, no equity'? The Council and Town should be providing equitable services, period. In fact the Town should be equitable in all it does, not just in relation to the provision of services. The ensuing statement says nothing about equity and for that reason should be deleted. I suggest that an appropriate statement about the pursuit of equity in the governance of the Town might say something like:

“Dedicate ourselves to creating an equitable community by facilitating inclusive participation of Indigenous peoples and low-income, minority, disabled, immigrant and other disadvantaged or overburdened communities in meaningful community engagement and by offering them opportunities to shape public programs, public services and community development in ways that respond to their needs and reflect their values and aspirations.”

Does the first strategic action mean that those who are unable to pay will get fewer, lesser or different services? I hope that is not what is intended. Do you mean, rather, that you will review fees, levies and charges for Town services and align them with the ability of residents to pay? The fourth statement is not pertinent to community equity or, if it is, you should explain how.

10 With respect to heading 2.3, I would expect governance to meet expectations quite independently of the concept of growth. In the first sentence under this title do you mean to govern according to Council's values whatever they may be from time to time or to do so according to the mission, vision and values of the Strategic Plan?

11 Environmental Leadership - The first sentence of the third strategic priority troubles me because it does not say what the standards and commitment to environmental protection are being incorporated into; does not identify the relevant standards; and does not refer to the governance work or activities that are engaged.

As I understand it the subject here is "growth management" (which is a large and complex field of governance involving the use of a number of different techniques, the principal ones being land use planning and land use controls, to ensure that services are available to meet the needs of a fast growing population.) Given the heading, I expected that the subject would be governance for the achievement of environmental excellence. Instead it seems to me that this strategic priority underlines once more the imperative of growth, that the balance and responsibility being pursued relate to managing the supply of public services, and that environmental protection is relegated to a third order consideration in the process. This is anything but environmental leadership. Environmental leadership should, at a minimum, put preservation and remediation of our environment at the head of the sentence and then say how it will be achieved - for example, by ensuring that Town decisions to approve, permit or carry out development promote a responsible and balanced relationship with our environment and incorporate progressive environmental protection and management standards.

12 Under the heading Reduce Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions, I suggest adding "greenhouse gas" after "reduction in". I am interested that in the fourth bullet the solar garden is an "e.g." I understand the Town is committed to the solar garden under its GHG reduction plan with installation commencing this year, i.e., this is no longer an example but a large strategic commitment. In environmental terms, however, I think it a mistake to green-wash this development by calling it a garden. I also wonder why, as a way of decreasing what will be a significant environmental footprint or (given the penchant for 'growth') increasing solar production, the utility does not consider putting solar on any suitable roof or at very least encouraging people to install solar rather than discouraging it?

Heading 3.2 refers to community adaptation but the primary action relates to protection of only one natural feature of our community. In the face of the climate

crisis adaptation and protection have very different connotations and call for very different policies and actions.

In the second strategic action I have a fundamental objection to the notion of shoreline as infrastructure and wonder what you are really driving at. While I am pleased that the Town will Practice Stewardship of Our Natural Environment I am concerned that the stewardship will extend only to the water quality of the harbor and health of the urban forest. There is so much more to the natural environment of our Town than those two things, including integrity of the shore line, water quality of Ernst Brook and Mush a Mush River and their environmental and aesthetic services, wetlands, soils, air quality, plant life, insects and wildlife. I am worried that protecting the health of the urban forest does not extend to protecting its size. It is an urban feature that is shrinking not growing. The GHG Reduction Plan target of no net loss of trees should be adopted in the Strategic Plan. I am pleased to see commitment to an urban forest management plan. The inclusion of parks is a no-brainer. Far more important is to include private land.

I am not in favour of land acquisitions in the Oakland Watershed. This is an ill-advised use of public resources because land acquisition as a means of watershed protection is unnecessary. Land uses in the watershed are already restricted and specially regulated so as to protect the lake as a source of drinking water; far better and more affordable than buying premium land would be to improve the regulatory regime's protection of the watershed. The Town will never acquire all the land in the watershed or be able to afford to do so. If ownership is the chosen route to protection of the water utility's supply and effective regulation is neglected, the water supply will always be at risk until the town acquires total ownership of a very large area at significant cost – a very distant eventuality.

In table 3, line 3.1.1, given that the GHG Reduction Action Plan has been approved I would have thought operating initiatives should commence in Q3 2021 in accordance with that plan and not be delayed to Q1/2023. But, as I have said, I have difficulty following the tables.

Respectfully submitted,

Veryan Haysom

195 Fairmont Street, Mahone Bay

7 May 2021

## Maureen Hughes

---

**Subject:** FW: Mahone Bay Strategic Plan 2021 - 2025

---

**From:** [jmorgan@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:jmorgan@ns.sympatico.ca) <[jmorgan@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:jmorgan@ns.sympatico.ca)>

**Sent:** Saturday, May 8, 2021 5:03 PM

**To:** Town of Mahone Bay Clerk <[clerk@townofmahonebay.ca](mailto:clerk@townofmahonebay.ca)>

**Subject:** Mahone Bay Strategic Plan 2021 - 2025

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender.

Hello,

I just wanted to make a comment on the Strategic Plan prior to the meeting on May 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>. I understand that not every specific detail is noted in the Strategic Plan but I also know there is ongoing discussion regarding biking in / through Mahone Bay that I don't see specifically mentioned in the Strategic Plan ... possibly it is part of the work to be completed along the waterfront (living shoreline, straight pipe) or discussions with TIR.

TIR is incorporating bike lanes in recent work they have completed ie Chester Basin area and it is my understanding they are going to continue to incorporate bike lanes in future work. For example Chester Basin to Western Shore and from the Lunenburg direction heading toward Mahone Bay. I can only assume that they will continue to include bike lanes as the road improvements approach Mahone Bay. I am sure that Mahone Bay is aware of ongoing work and future work. It would very unfortunate if Mahone Bay did not continue this work through the town of Mahone Bay. This could be accomplished with the addition of bike lanes through town, reducing speed limits in town, improving the intersection at the monument (all or some sort of combination of noted items). The rail trail is of course also an option but does not really tie in with access to and through town, for example if you take the rail trail you actually miss the town of Mahone Bay and all it has to offer to both residents and tourists, and the continuity with the TIR bike lanes is also lost.

I will admit I am becoming a biker. I bike not just for recreation and exercise but also to reach my destination of Mahone Bay ... the pharmacy, the post office, the grocery store, the coffee shops, the bakery, and the bike shop so the continuation of the bike lane would be extremely important to me. I do not take the rail trail to reach my destination as it is not the direct route to Mahone Bay, I take the road.

Your website also includes a biking survey to be complete during the month of May. Yet your Strategic Plan will go to council prior to the survey being completed so I question how biking is to be incorporated into your Strategic Plan. Biking is an activity that not only promotes physical fitness but also our mental well being; I sincerely hope Mahone Bay is taking this into consideration to promote a healthy lifestyle for your residents. Mahone Bay attracts many people from other municipalities and tourists from outside our province, we already have some of the best biking and beautiful routes in the province; just think what Mahone Bay can accomplish by providing and promoting safe biking access to and through our town. Mahone Bay will not only continue to be a top tourist attraction but could promote the town as a top biking destination ... I'm sure the restaurants, the B&Bs, the shops would appreciate the benefits as well.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,

Joy Morgan  
219 Crandall Road  
Mahone Bay

## Maureen Hughes

---

**Subject:** FW: Public hearing - 2021-25 Strategic Plan Submission

---

**From:** Mary Ellen Donovan <[mellendonovan@gmail.com](mailto:mellendonovan@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 8, 2021 4:27 PM  
**To:** Town of Mahone Bay Clerk <[clerk@townofmahonebay.ca](mailto:clerk@townofmahonebay.ca)>  
**Subject:** Public hearing - 2021-25 Strategic Plan Submission

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender.

Dear Ms. Hughes:

This is intended as a submission to the public hearing set for Monday, May 10th, 2021 regarding adoption of the 2021-25 Strategic Plan. Mahone Bay has become the biking hub for all of Lunenburg County. It is a natural hub because so many relatively quiet routes have a logical start and end point in Mahone Bay. And contributing to that natural hub reality are the wonderful cafes and restaurants that finish off a morning or afternoon ride.

I note that the Strategic Plan calls for work to commence in 2021 on the Straight Pipe project. As a regular visitor to Mahone Bay primarily for biking purposes, I am hoping that the straight pipe replacement project as part of the paving reinstatement will include provision for a bike lane from the monument to Oakland Rd. I appreciate that the CBCL study proposes that the bikers be diverted from the #3 but that routing does not provide sufficient directness to result in a change in user behavior for those starting a ride behind the Pharmacy or from the Community Centre and on to Indian Point via Oakland Rd. A bike lane along this segment of the #3 will reduce the potential of vehicle/bike conflict.

Of even greater importance is the need for a bike lane along the road to Maders Cove. Riders tend to be very nervous using this segment of road, particularly newer riders. The speeds tend to be higher along this stretch of road than along the #3

approaching Oakland Rd so paved shoulders along this stretch are even more important than those going to Oakland Rd..There is some indication that the Department of Transportation & Active Transit will be repaving in that area but of course are not responsible for repaving within the Town boundary. Efforts are being made to encourage TIR to put a paved shoulder from the Town boundary to Maders Cove making it critical to finish the job by paving a shoulder from the town line to the monument along that road. The biking traffic in Mahone Bay is growing and adds to the vitality of Mahone Bay as a destination. Enhanced infrastructure can only help Mahone Bay grow as a biking centre.

Any consideration that could be given to the above as part of the 2021-25 Strategic Plan would be appreciated.

M.E.Donovan  
62 Sprucebank Lane  
Marriott's Cove



ReplyForward

M.E.Donovan