

of the worst case, he would like to see one lot made of the two.

Mr. Don Howell

Mr. Howell inquired whether the configuration of the two lots was still the same as the original plan. Mr. Barry Zwicker indicated that they were.

Mr. Brian Tomy

Mr. Tomy indicated that he did not live in the area of the lots, but wished to inquire what was in it for the Town to dispose of these lots.

Mayor Kelly indicated that the intent was to dispose of the lots to raise funds to apply to the cost of capital projects.

Mr. Tomy suggested that Council should consider what other alternatives they may have to raise funds for capital projects.

After three calls by Mayor Kelly there were no further speakers or questions from the Public. He then inquired whether Council had any further questions or comments.

Councillor Hutt indicated a specific neighbouring lot on the map, and inquired as to its frontage. Donna Davis-Lohnes responded, noting that it was lot #72, and that the frontage was 73.12 feet, 5 feet wider than either of the two lots in question.

Councillor Davies inquired whether, during the re-zoning process, the matter had ever been proposed as an either/or situation with respect to the parking lot, from the Town. Mr. Zwicker indicated that it had not been presented that way, to his knowledge, and gave some background information as to how the lots had become surplus.

Mrs. Paula Isenor spoke, by agreement of Council, indicating to Councillor Davies that the general feeling of the Resident's Association is that they approved the sale of the lots because of the threat of a parking lot.

Mr. Barry Zwicker indicated that he had attended the Eaglewood Resident's Association meeting, and that he agreed that their reasons could be interpreted as such.

Mayor Kelly requested that Donna Davis-Lohnes prepare a report on the comparable average sizes and frontages of the lots in the area, for the information of Council.

Councillor MacLean inquired to Ms. Davis-Lohnes whether, except for the parking lot issue,

TOWN OF BEDFORD

she felt that the residents supported the sale of the lots. Ms. Davis-Lohnes indicated that they did not. He further inquired whether they had agreed to the sale just to avoid a parking lot. Ms. Davis-Lohnes indicated that she felt they did.

After three calls from Mayor Kelly, there were no further questions or comments from Council.

Therefore; Public Hearings #92-08 and #92-09 of the Town of Bedford were adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Amendments - Municipal Planning Strategy

MAYOR


CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

/sk

MEETINGS #37 and #38

TOWN OF BEDFORD

Public Hearings #92-10 and #92-11

Tuesday, September 22, 1992

Two Public Hearings of the Town of Bedford took place on Tuesday, September 22, 1992 at 8:05 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Suite 400, Bedford Tower, Bedford, Nova Scotia.

ATTENDANCE

Deputy Mayor Anne Cosgrove and Councillors John Davies, Len Goucher, Harris Hutt, Bill MacLean, and Stephen Oickle, were in attendance at the commencement of the Meeting.

Staff members in attendance included Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development (Acting Chief Administrative Officer); Bob Nauss, Director of Recreation; and Donna Davis-Lohnes, Senior Planner.

Amendments - Municipal Planning Strategy

Text Amendment - Land Use By-Law to include "single residential units" as a permitted use in the Commercial Comprehensive Development District (CCDD) Zone.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Hearings was to receive both written and verbal submissions relative to amendments to the Municipal Planning Strategy which will provide policy support for a subsequent text amendment to the Commercial Comprehensive Development District (CCDD) Zone in the Land Use By-Law. Donna Davis-Lohnes, Senior Planner, explained the purpose for splitting the Public Hearing into two separate Public Hearings, and noted that they were both duly advertised. Ms. Davis-Lohnes noted that copies of the Planning Department's report and B.P.A.C.'s August 19 recommendation were circulated in the agenda package. At the request of B.P.A.C. member Councillor Goucher, Ms. Davis-Lohnes read aloud B.P.A.C.'s August 19, 1992 Motion in which it was recommended that B.P.A.C. address the request to permit single residential dwellings in the CCDD Zone as part of the comprehensive review of the CCDD Zone and policies.

Ms. Davis-Lohnes then referred to a schematic drawing depicting all seven CCDD Zones within Bedford, and reviewed background information relative to CCDD Zones in general.

Mayor Kelly asked Council if they have any questions for Ms. Davis-Lohnes. There were none, so the floor was opened to the public.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Neil Stuart, 58 Village Crescent

Mr. Stuart indicated that he was against the amendment to the CCDD Zone. He stated that he felt a developer was trying to have the document changed to fit his development, rather than making the development to fit the M.P.S. He noted that the CCDD Zone has been sent to B.P.A.C. for review, but that no recommendation has been received back from them as yet. He stated Council was "playing games" with the planning process. He urged Council to wait for B.P.A.C. to complete their review. Mr. Stuart further stated, as Chairman of the Bedford Village Resident's Association, he was present to give the Association's position as well, that being the current move to amend the CCDD Zone was circumventing the Town's own process. He indicated he had letters from three residents on the matter. Councillor Goucher requested copies of the documents from Mr. Stuart.

Mr. Rick McCallum

Mr. McCallum stated he was against the amendment, expressing the same view that the M.P.S. is being made to fit the development rather than the reverse.

Mr. Tony Edwards

Mr. Edwards stated he has attended many meetings regarding the M.P.S., and that he is not "a fan" of the present M.P.S. document; however, he is not in favour of the amendment. He suggested that CCDD and RCDD zones should be kept separate.

Mayor Kelly spoke, noting to those present that this Public Hearing was not being held on the subject of the M1 development, but on the subject of amending all CCDD in Bedford.

Mr. Bruce Yeo

Mr. Yeo stated he was opposed to the amendment, suggesting that if the Town "does this for one developer, they will have to do it for all developers". He noted that this amendment is upsetting residents.

Mr. Don Howell

Mr. Howell stated he was against amending the M.P.S. to suit a development. He suggested the developer could apply to have the zoning changed from CCDD to RCDD, but that since the CCDD was currently under review by B.P.A.C., it makes sense to wait for their recommendation.

Mayor Kelly again reminded the public of the purpose of the Hearing, and that it was not for discussion of the M1 development.

Councillor Oickle

Councillor Oickle also suggested there seemed to be some confusion among the public; he also reminded them the Hearing was only to hear comments and questions regarding a text amendment to the CCDD section of the M.P.S.

Mr. Michael Roughneen

Mr. Roughneen inquired as to the reason why B.P.A.C. voted as it did to do a comprehensive review of the CCDD.

Donna Davis-Lohnes advised that problems within the CCDD section of the M.P.S. existed and that same had been referred to B.P.A.C. for review on July 14, 1992. Correspondence received on July 21, 1992 from Bedford Village Properties regarding a request to amend the CCDD section was also referred to B.P.A.C.

Mr. Roughneen suggested the timing of this Public Hearing could only be because of the request by Bedford Village Properties, and was against the recommendation of B.P.A.C.

Mayor Kelly noted that Council had voted on August 25, 1992 to call for a Public Hearing on the matter.

Councillor Goucher inquired whether Bedford Village Properties had specifically requested to have the amendment decided on by Council prior to a Public Hearing on their development agreement for M1.

Mr. Barry Zwicker responded, by indicating he was not sure.

Mr. Roughneen inquired why there was such a sudden interest in amending the M.P.S.

Mr. Zwicker indicated that the CCDD section of the M.P.S. had received very little attention at the time of the development of the M.P.S.

Mr. Roughneen inquired whether this was a usual process; that the M.P.S. was still new - could a continuing review and series of amendments be expected in the future?

Mr. Zwicker indicated that it could be expected. He noted it is not unusual to make amendments to a new M.P.S.; others have processed amendments even before Ministerial approval.

Mr. Roughneen then inquired if the public can ask for a review of certain sections of the M.P.S.

Mayor Kelly responded, noting that the review process is underway, but that it is open to public requests for review of certain sections.

Mr. Roughneen inquired as to what criteria is necessary to bring it to Public Hearing, and expressed concern regarding the process. He indicated if there is process for some, there should be process for all others.

Mr. Jim Phillips

Mr. Phillips indicated he was opposed to the amendment, and suggested that B.P.A.C. be given an opportunity to first review the document first.

Mr. Lee Starr

Mr. Starr stated he did not agree with the amendment.

Mr. Ray Davies

Mr. Davies noted Mr. Zwicker has stated the CCDD section of the M.P.S. was not well-determined or detailed, so why not conduct a comprehensive review first.

Mr. Zwicker noted he had stated the CCDD did not receive in-depth review at the time.

Ms. Beryl McCallum

Ms. McCallum stated she was against the amendment.

Mr. Brian Tomy

Mr. Tomy stated he was against the amendment. He suggested the Town has a responsibility to conduct the planning process in a proper manner, and to be seen as doing it properly. He noted that next week there will be a Public Hearing on a development that does not fit the M.P.S., and now Council is considering a change to the M.P.S. which would allow for that development.

Mr. Doug Miller

Mr. Miller indicated he was an architect/planner but was not involved in the M-1 project. Mr. Miller spoke on the general goals and objectives with respect to the zones of RCDD

and CCDD. He compared hierarchical development as opposed to exclusionary development, and suggested that including R1 in CCDD is only natural housekeeping. If this were allowed, it would then be up to the developer to demonstrate to the public that they can co-exist, and earn approval for it through a Public Hearing. He suggested it would provide additional flexibility to the developer, while still providing for public approval.

Mr. Brian Tomy

Mr. Tomy again suggested that the proper process is not apparent to the public, and that this amendment is not appropriate at this time.

Mr. Tony Edwards

Mr. Edwards again indicated that he was against the amendment.

After three calls by Mayor Kelly there were no further speakers or questions from members of the public or Council.

Therefore, Public Hearings #92-10 and #92-11 of the Town of Bedford were adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

MAYOR



CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

/sk

APPROVAL TOPICS - UPCOMING CITIZEN'S ADVISORY FORUM

By memorandum dated September 16, 1992, Mr. Dan English, Chief Administrative Officer, reported as suggested topics for the next Citizen's Advisory Forum on October 21, 1992 for approval by Council.

Mayor Kelly suggested that the four suggested topics be reviewed. It was noted that there had been a problem with time at the last meeting.

TOWN OF BEDFORD

Special Session

Tuesday, September 22, 1992

A Special Session of the Town Council of the Town of Bedford took place on Tuesday, September 22, 1992 at 9:15 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Suite 400, Bedford Tower, Bedford, Nova Scotia.

1. **LORD'S PRAYER**

Mayor Peter Kelly opened the Session by the leading of the Lord's Prayer.

2. **ATTENDANCE**

Deputy Mayor Anne Cosgrove and Councillors John Davies, Len Goucher, Harris Hutt, Bill MacLean and Stephen Oickle were in attendance at the commencement of the Meeting.

Staff members in attendance included Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development (Acting Chief Administrative Officer); Bob Nauss, Director of Recreation; and Donna Davis-Lohnes, Senior Planner.

3. **ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO ORDER OF BUSINESS**

There were no additions or deletions to the Order of Business.

4. **APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS**

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Deputy Mayor Cosgrove, it was moved to approve the Order of Business as circulated. The Motion was unanimously approved.

5. **APPROVAL - TOPICS - UPCOMING CITIZEN'S ADVISORY FORUM**

By memorandum dated September 16, 1992, Mr. Dan English, Chief Administrative Officer, reported on suggested topics for the next Citizen's Advisory Forum on October 21, 1992 for approval by Council.

Mayor Kelly suggested that the four suggested topics may be enough, since there had been a problem with time at the last meeting.

TOWN OF BEDFORD

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Davies, it was moved that Council support, for the Citizen's Advisory Forum on October 21, 1992, the four topics of:

- Youth Issues
- Seniors' Issues
- Municipal Reform
- The Development Process

The Motion was unanimously approved.

6. CONSIDERATION OF AWARDING OF TENDER - RANGE PARK

Bob Nauss, Director of Recreation, reported on the six resulting bid proposals for re-sodding of Range Park. Mr. Nauss noted that although \$22,000 had been budgeted for the project, the lowest bid, from Turfmasters, had come in at \$14,276.00. He further noted that there are other works that could be done at the park for an additional cost of \$2,000.00.

ON MOTION of Councillor Oickle and Councillor Hutt, it was moved that the contract for re-sodding the soccer field at Range Park be awarded to Turfmasters for \$14,276.00, and that other works, not to exceed \$2,000.00, be added to the contract. The Motion was unanimously approved.

7. APPOINTMENT TO COBEQUID MULTI-SERVICE CENTRE BOARD

Chosen by first ballot to serve as a volunteer on the Board of Directors of the Cobequid Multi-Service Centre was:

Ms. Arlene Palmer

8. ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION of Mayor Kelly, it was moved to adjourn the 39th Special Session of the Town of Bedford at approximately 9:20 p.m.

MAYOR

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

MEETING #40

TOWN OF BEDFORD

Public Hearing #92-14

Tuesday, September 29, 1992

A Public Hearing of the Town of Bedford took place on Tuesday, September 29, 1992 at 7:00 p.m. in the Lion's Den, LeBrun Centre, 36 Holland Ave., Bedford, Nova Scotia. Mayor Peter Kelly presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Deputy Mayor Anne Cosgrove and Councillors John Davies, Len Goucher, Harris Hutt, Bill MacLean and Stephen Oickle were in attendance at the commencement of the Meeting.

Staff members in attendance included: Rick Paynter, Director of Engineering and Works; Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development; and Donna Davis-Lohnes, Senior Planner.

There were approximately 80 residents in attendance.

Development Agreement Application - Civic #171 Hammonds Plains Road - Parcel M-1 Bedford Village

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Hearing was to receive both written and verbal submissions relative to a Development Agreement Application for the above.

Mayor Kelly spoke to the public present, stating that, in response to a number of phone calls he has received, he wished to assure the public that there are "no done deals" on this matter, and that Council will decide on this matter after hearing from the public.

Mr. Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development, provided a brief overview of the proposed development. He noted, referring to a series of large colour drawings at the front of the room, that there are three main components to it: Commercial - one 5,000 square foot building, one two-storey, 10,000 square foot building, and one 40,000 square foot building that has the footprint of a 15,000 square feet zero lot line; Residential - three 36 unit buildings; and an optional area which could be either 20 single family homes or 44 townhouses, depending on the outcome of a proposed amendment to the CCDD portion of the M.P.S., which would allow single family homes to be built in a CCDD area.

Mr. Zwicker also noted that there will be a combination fencing, of different heights, and landscaping buffering the development from the adjacent residential area. The two brooks which run through the property will be protected by a system of berms which would provide retention and filtering of storm water before it enters the brook. A walkway path will be built on top of the berms. Mr. Zwicker also indicated that sidewalks will be built along Bedford Hills Road and Hammonds Plains Road, since the initial presentation there has been a slight modification made to the driveways. Two of the previously planned driveways will be consolidated into one, and a previously two-way driveway will be changed to a one-way in, thereby improving the long-term efficiency of traffic flow to and from the Bedford Highway and Hammonds Plains Road.

Mr. Zwicker referred to the drawings, noting the consistent architecture. He also reported that Staff have reviewed the sanitary, sewer and storm water systems, and have found them to be satisfactory.

Mr. Zwicker stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed development is consistent with the M.P.S. and the CCDD zone provisions.

Mayor Kelly then asked Council whether they had any questions for Mr. Zwicker.

Deputy Mayor Cosgrove asked for clarification of the total number of driveways. Mr. Zwicker indicated that there are a total of three.

Councillor Goucher requested that a ratio percentage representing the square footage of residential compared to commercial, including parking lots be calculated. Mr. Zwicker indicated that he will provide the figures at a later time, subsequent to the Public Hearing.

Councillor Goucher then inquired as to the future maintenance of the berms and walkways system, and who will be responsible for ensuring that they are functioning properly.

Mr. Zwicker indicated that once the development has been completed and discharged, the Town will assume that responsibility.

Councillor Goucher then suggested that he would like to see a performance bond or letter of credit posted for the purpose of providing a guarantee with respect to pollution control, the water control system, and of site disturbance.

Mayor Kelly inquired whether this is a normal request, and if it is easily included in the development agreement. Mr. Zwicker indicated that the Town has taken security before, and it is not out of the ordinary.

Councillor Goucher then inquired with respect to snow clearing. Mr. Zwicker indicated that there are areas provided on site for snow to be piled, and that the melting snow will drain through the berm system and into the brook system.

Councillor Goucher inquired whether the accumulation of oils on the surface of the parking lots was considered a matter of concern. Mr. Zwicker indicated that he was not aware of any specific measures but he would check further and report back to Council.

Councillor Goucher then inquired with respect to an environmental assessment. Mr. Zwicker indicated that Appendix A in the information package was a report from P. Lane and Associates, which indicated that the proposed filtration walkway system, with a 50 foot buffer zone between the development and the stream course, would be more affective than a natural 100 foot buffer zone without the filtration system. He further noted that P. Lane and Associates have indicated that there are three conditions that should be met, and that these conditions are part of the proposed development agreement.

Councillor Goucher pointed out that this was not a complete environmental assessment. Mr. Zwicker indicated that an environmental analysis or study was conducted, and that the letter from P. Lane represents a report based on that analysis. Mr. Zwicker further noted that Policy C-8 does not require a full environmental assessment, it calls for an environmental study.

Councillor Goucher raised a point that the analysis had indicated that two apartment buildings and the parking lots would interfere with the 100 foot set back. He went on to inquire whether the proposed convenience store was allowed, and cited Table 3, Appendix B of the CCDD as evidence that it does not. Mr. Zwicker cited the Land Use Bylaw permitted uses within CCDD as evidence that they are allowed. Councillor Goucher noted that the wording was "neighbourhood **commercial**" not "**convenience store**". Mr. Zwicker reviewed in detail the permitted uses within the CCDD Zone which provides for convenience stores.

Mayor Kelly inquired about Policy C7 of the M.P.S., and Mr. Zwicker noted that Policy C7 also makes allowance for convenience stores within CCDD's.

There were no further questions from Council for Mr. Zwicker, and Mayor Kelly invited the proponent, Mr. Archie Hattie of Bedford Village Properties Ltd. to speak.

Mr. Hattie thanked Mayor Kelly and Council for the opportunity to speak, and to present the proposed development, named "Brookshire". He briefly noted that the sensitive land issues have been addressed; there is a suitable and attractive building mix; and that the development is compatible to the surrounding neighbourhood. He then requested that Mr. Tom Swanson of Alderney Consultants present the project in more detail for Council.

Mr. Swanson noted that he has attended three presentations of the proposed development to B.P.A.C. and one to B.W.A.C. He further noted that 40 changes have been made to the original concept plan, as a result of addressing the concerns raised at these meetings.

Mr. Swanson indicated that he would like to highlight 4 main areas of the plan: density, the environment, the park area, and public safety.

With respect to density, he noted that there will be 8.5 to 10.5 units per acre, which is less than half the density allowed within the present RMU Zone in the Town. He further noted that a development of multiple unit housing, located beside the M-1 parcel, has 25.5 units per acre and it is not considered by area residents to be obtrusive or overly dense.

With respect to environmental sensitivity, Mr. Swanson noted that further environmental analysis will be done, following the production of a more detailed design, which would be done following approval of the development concept. He further noted that filter walkway system is considered superior, and exceeds the requirements for environmental protection. Mr. Swanson also noted that only one driveway will cross the brooks, and the concept is using the existing ground conditions and levels as they are, rather than attempting to level the property.

With respect to public safety, Mr. Swanson reported that the proponent has proposed the construction of a school-bus bay, a transit-bus bay, and sidewalks. They have also proposed a pedestrian activated crossing of the Hammonds Plains Road at the Bedford Hills Road intersection.

With respect to the park area, Mr. Swanson noted that the proponent is contributing 43% of the land for public parkland, building 1/2 mile of public foot paths, and re-locating the existing playground to another site on the property all at the developer's expense.

Mr. Swanson went on to review the types of changes the proponent has made to the original concept plan. He noted:

- the reduction of a 10,000 square foot building to a 5,000 square foot building
- the reduction in the number of driveways
- a modification to the location of an apartment building
- fences to stop headlights from shining into abutting properties
- low-level lighting in the parking lots

Mr. Swanson indicated that while there were other concerns that they were not able to respond to as much as was liked, all requests were given consideration, and at the expense of the proponents. Mr. Swanson reported that the process has been long and hard, but that

he has never worked with a client as accomodating to public concerns as Bedford Village Properties. He noted that Bedford Village Properties has gone out of it's way to make the project acceptable, and meets the letter and the spirit of the M.P.S.

Mr. Swanson stated that he recommends the acceptance of the proposed development.

Mayor Kelly thanked Mr. Hattie and Mr. Swanson for their presentation, and asked if Council had any questions for Mr. Swanson.

Mayor Kelly inquired with respect to need for future traffic lights. Mr. Rick Paynter, Director of Engineering and Works, responded, indicating that traffic warrant counts would not justify signalization at either Brookshire Court or Bedford Hills Road.

There were no more questions from Council, and Mayor Kelly opened the floor to the public.

SPEAKERS

Mr. Ted Hooey

Mr. Hooey questioned Mr. Swanson with respect to the percentage of land which will be developed. Mr. Swanson indicated that approximately 60% of the land would be built on, the rest was to be designated parkland; or, 11 acres other than parkland would be built on. Mr. Hooey then inquired why the rest of the land would not be developed, and was it because it was not developable. Mr. Swanson indicated that some of it **was** developable. Mr. Hooey asked if statistics were not actually being used to disguise the fact that 100% of the amount of **developable** land was being developed. Mr. Swanson answered that he did not feel that was true.

Mr. Hooey then addressed a question to Mr. Hattie. He recalled that Mr. Hattie had stated that Bedford Village Properties had shown complete willingness to comply with the M.P.S.; however, the minutes of the June 3, 1992 B.P.A.C. reflect a discussion in which B.P.A.C. members indicated that they felt the development agreement was not in compliance with policies E8, C14, and C3.

Mr. Hattie responded, suggesting that that was the **opinion** of B.P.A.C. members, but that Town Staff do not agree with that opinion.

Mr. Hooey went on to state that he was against uncontrolled development; opposed to the reduction of the quality of life that would occur; opposed to the increase in traffic that would result in that area; opposed to the change in density that would occur; and did not like to be made to feel on the defensive with respect to this matter. He reminded Council that

B.P.A.C. and B.W.A.C. have already recommended non-approval, and urged them to listen to the Town's advisory committees, not to Staff.

Marion Stewart - 58 Village Crescent

Mrs. Stewart commented that she had lived at the above address for 14 years. She noted that her husband Neil was not able to attend, so she would speak in his place. She stated that they had no choice but to speak against the development.

Mrs. Stewart read from page 42 of the M.P.S., and on policies C8, C11 and E8, indicating such wording as "Council **shall** prohibit" and "Council **may** consider". She suggested that Staff downplayed the negative aspects of the development, and ignored Town advisory committees, such as B.P.A.C. and B.W.A.C. in preparing their report.

Mrs. Stewart went to to state that the M.P.S. is being made to fit the development, rather than the opposite, and that this is not a good development; it is over-utilization of the land and does not comply with the intent of the M.P.S. She suggested that if Bedford Village Properties had shown **real** concessions, and did not wish to develop every foot of land, they may not have this type of opposition. Mrs. Stewart urged Council to reject the development agreement.

Mr. Don Howell

Mr. Howell questioned Mr. Swanson with respect to the development density ratio that had been indicated previously. He pointed out that three 36 unit apartment buildings were planned to be built on a 3.5 acre area of land, and that this translated into a much higher ratio than was stated. Mr. Swanson responded, noting that he had been indicating the total density over the whole area, and that the footprint of the three buildings had been reduced to allow for more public land or open space.

Mr. Howell urged Council to "look into the future of Hammonds Plains Road". He noted the future development of the Waterfront, and other large developments in the area, which will also greatly increase the traffic in the area. He suggested that Hammonds Plains Road will have to become four lanes wide, and that this will bring the front of the buildings and parking lots closer to the road. He noted that Hammonds Plains Road will become the only entranceway into Bedford, and suggested that Council consider whether this is what they want people to see first as they enter Bedford. He further suggested that the plans should be changed to suit the future.

Mr. Bruce Matchowsky

Mr. Matchowsky inquired as to when the decision allowing single family homes in a CCDD

zone would be made. Mr. Barry Zwicker responded, noting that the amendment proposal to CCDD zones could be deliberated on by Council on October 13, 1992 or a subsequent meeting of Council. If the decision was negative, then there would be no single family homes in this development, rather there will be townhouses.

Mr. Matchowsky inquired whether the townhouses would have their own private lots, or would the surrounding parkland become their yards. Mr. Zwicker indicated that they would be built on approximately 2,000 square foot lots, and that there would be some private land behind each building. He also indicated that there would be no further intrusion into the open space with the change to Town Houses.

Mr. Matchowsky observed that along with the 147 apartments on the neighbouring lot, the total number of apartments in the area would be 250, and that this would make it a high-density area. He inquired about the possibility of any other CCDD land in the area being developed, making the density even higher. Mr. Zwicker noted that the parcel of land across Hammonds Plains Road is zoned RCDD, which allows for a total of 6 units per acre.

Mayor Kelly clarified later that there **was** another parcel of land of 25 acres, further up Hammonds Plains Road, which is owned by Bedford Village Properties, and zoned CCDD.

Mr. Matchowsky went on to suggest that a traffic light should be installed for crossing Hammonds Plains Road, given the increase in traffic that would result. He cited the example of the new traffic lights in front of Sunnyside, which, he suggested, took having a few accidents occur before they were installed. He stated that he hoped it would not take an accident happening before lights were put in at this location.

Karen Quigley

Ms. Quigley noted that she was one resident whose property abuts the development. She commented on the magnitude of commercial and residential development, which would result in increased traffic, decrease the level of safety, an increased impact on the school system and pollution, and a negative impact on the esthetic value of the area.

Ms. Quigley went on to comment on the sensitivity of the environment, and the fact that the streams on the property drain into Paper Mill Lake. She expressed concern regarding possible oils spills from cars, refuse, and exhaust, all of which could have an effect on the water and air quality. She suggested that there would be an increase in storm water accumulation due to development of the land, which would wash into the streams and lake. Ms. Quigley suggested that Council should "strongly consider" having an environmental **assessment** done, not just a study.

Ms. Quigley also pointed out that while the proponent has stated that they are developing

to a density which is only half of what is allowed, she felt the question of density should be considered a "site specific" one. She further indicated that she felt that the impact of a high density commercial development can only be assessed by a full environmental assessment.

Janice Cruikshank

Ms. Cruikshank expressed concern regarding the proximity of the convenience store to the school bus stop and public beach. She further stated that she felt the matter of storm water and melting snow had not been adequately addressed.

Mr. Marvin Silver - 78 Village Crescent

Mr. Silver stated that he was against the development for reasons concerning the under-capacity of the Mill Cove Sewage Treatment Plant, the extra strain on the education system and the environment. He indicated that he had "no confidence" in the walkway berms handling the water runoff capacity. He noted that he has seen Jack Lake Brook turn brown in recent years, though he did not know the reason.

Mr. Michael Horwich

Mr. Horwich noted that he was Vice-Chair of B.W.A.C., and that he was pleased that the Mayor had stated that the development was not a "done deal". He stated to Council, in his opinion, the development was **not** in conformity with the M.P.S.

Mr. Horwich went on to remind Council that B.W.A.C. had urged that Council not approve the development, and that B.P.A.C. had also voted against it. He suggested that if Council takes a "hard look" at it, they will find something that does not fit the M.P.S.

Mr. Horwich noted that everyone present so far is against the development for reasons such as increase in traffic, noise and the environment. He further noted that he has seen many environmental studies and assessments in his experience, and that the P. Lane document was not what he considered to be an environmental study. Mr. Horwich pointed out that Staff had indicated in their report that the "essence" of the P.Lane report was to be found on page 5 (of the P.Lane report); however, Mr. Horwich said he felt the essence was in the recommendation of the report, ie. that there was insufficient information available at this time to make a complete analysis.

Mr. Horwich noted that the filter walkway system was an idea from an engineering firm, and that the Town should ensure that it is developed properly. He further noted that the M.P.S. states "that an environmental study shall be done", and that the Town's approach is to give approval of the development, then study the impact it will have on the environment.

Mr. Horwich also stated that he felt the "staggered" building approach was done to meet the minimum requirements of the M.P.S., not because of environmental sensitivity. He indicated that if the development met the requirements of the M.P.S., there would be no opponent to it.

Mr. Horwich also expressed concern regarding property values and a danger of contamination of the streams and lake system. He urged Council to not trade off an increase in the tax base against the environment. He suggested that, in his experience, it is possible for streams to move; that is why there is a 100ft set back requirement in the M.P.S.. The 50 foot set back proposed will be "a squeeze", suggested Mr. Horwich.

Mr. Horwich urged Council to listen to their advisory groups.

Cathy Raymond - Village Crescent

Ms. Raymond stated that she was present to show solidarity for her neighbourhood, of which most of the residents were opposed to the development. Ms. Raymond commented on the uniqueness of the neighbourhood. She suggested that Council put aside the statistics and look at the pictures at the front of the room: they depict a high-density development and every inch of developable land has been developed.

Ms. Raymond stated that she did not understand the fact that the Town's advisory committees are against the development, and yet, the staff are "pushing it". She stated that she was asking the Town's elected officials to vote against the development, on behalf of the Bedford Village neighbourhood.

Gloria Lowther - Peerless Subdivision

Mrs. Lowther expressed concern regarding making the M.P.S. fit the development, and how the M.P.S. seems to be open to interpretation and a number of policies are not being conformed to. She expressed a desire for neighbourhood stability, and urged Council to consider the rights of the present residents.

Mrs. Lowther indicated that she was not totally opposed to the development, but was concerned about the separation of the buildings from the water courses, and that the convenience store could become a 24 hour operation.

Mrs. Lowther inquired to Mr. Hattie whether Bedford Village Properties had any committed clients for the development. Mr. Hattie responded, indicating that the market studies indicate that there is sufficient potential for the development, and that he has various clients who are interested, but nothing firm.

Ms. Francine Cosman

Ms. Cosman stated that when she moved to the area, it was zoned all R1 and she has seen the zoning changed several times since then. She stated that she was opposed to the development, as the proponents have failed to demonstrate a need for the proposal, or that it would have any benefit to the Town.

Ms. Cosman suggested that Council was "jumping the gun" by holding this hearing before B.P.A.C.'s review of the CCDD zones. She noted that the M.P.S. hearings have only recently ended, and that she felt it had resulted in a new "waterproof" plan, so why was Council already conducting Hearings on making amendments to it.

Ms. Cosman recalled that in 1980 there had been a "freeze" placed on apartments on Rutledge St., and that 250 apartments along Hammonds Plains Road was too high of a density. She expressed concern regarding the impact on schools, and whether there was any plans for provisions for daycare and an in-house play area for the additional children that will move to the area.

Ms. Cosman indicated that she had serious reservations with respect to the convenience store. The hours of the store had already been changed from 7 - 11:00 to 7:00 - 12:00, and that it could become 24 hours in the future. She stated that a new convenience store was not needed in that area, and that there had not been a satisfactory answer as to whether it fits with the M.P.S. She noted a specific concern regarding the selling of cigarettes, beer and liquor to underage children.

With respect to the playground, Ms. Cosman noted that it had been in it's present location since 1978. She wondered whether the convenience store would be near to the new location, and if it was, suggested that it should be fully fenced for security reasons. Ms. Cosman also questioned the 40% donation of land for public use, and whether it was all usable.

With respect to education concerns, Ms. Cosman noted that there was a school meeting being held this same evening. She noted that parents and students have put up with overcrowding for a long time, and that Council should re-assess the numbers of possible new students that will result from this development.

Ms. Cosman also raised concern regarding the dumping of storm water into Beaver Pond. She noted that there is flow between Beaver Pond and Paper Mill Lake, and that the dirty storm water will not be isolated from the lake, which is already getting dirtier every year. Ms. Cosman stated that she was surprised there was no Department of Environment report conducted.

With respect to economic impact, Ms. Cosman stated that she had a problem with the fact that the Economic Development Commission had first recommended the text amendment to allow R1 in CCDD zones. She suggested that this was not the E.D.C.'s role, and that the Commission's Terms of Reference should be reviewed.

Ms. Cosman went on to list the number of vacant spaces at Village Centre, Canada Trust Court, Oakmount Centre, and the Colour Your World mall. She stated that there was no economic impact information to say that there was not an over-abundance of commercial space already. She urged Council to listen to B.P.A.C. and B.W.A.C., and that Staff's opinions should not be considered above the advisory committee's recommendations.

Ms. Cosman stated that the promise of a single family neighbourhood at Bedford Village will be broken with this development.

Joe McEvoy - 42 Village Crescent

Mr. McEvoy stated that he was opposed to the development because it was not a good development, and represented "obscene greed" and condescension from the proponents. He indicated that he was present because he was afraid that Council doesn't hear enough about the opposition to the development.

Mr. McEvoy also stated that he "feared" the Town was for any kind of development if it increased the tax base. He said he hoped Council has the wisdom to see through the falseness, and that the proponent will see that there is a better use for the land.

Mr. Bruce Yeo

Mr. Yeo read section C8 of the M.P.S. aloud, and stated that, in his opinion, the two adjoining 36 unit buildings were in conflict with the M.P.S.

Mr. Yeo circulated a photograph showing a washed-out section of a walkway-filter berm located near Mill Court. He stated that he was concerned that they "don't work". He inquired as to the distance between the edge of the parking lot to the trees, and the distance of the filter berm to the stream. Mr. Swanson responded, indicating that the berm will be "woven" between the trees, and that smaller trees will be cut down to allow for this; however, he did not recall the exact distances questioned.

Mr. Yeo then inquired as to where the space was provided for snow removal. Mr. Barry Zwicker responded, noting that there was space provided around the perimeter of the parking areas. Mr. Yeo stated that, in his opinion, there was not enough room for snow, and was concerned that the owner of the property will eventually cut down trees to provide space.

Mr. Yeo suggested that there will be a heavy load on the proposed filtration system and that the 100 foot buffer should be adhered to. He further noted that he had spoken to a real estate representative regarding property values, and that his indication had been that there will be no effect in the short term on values, but when houses adjacent to the development go up for sale, and buyers hesitate because of the proximity of the development, the prices will go down.

Mr. Yeo stated that he was opposed to the development.

Mr. Ray Davies

Mr. Davies stated that he was opposed to the development. He inquired with respect to the first presentation of the proposal, which has since changed because it did not meet the requirements of the M.P.S., and if there was a copy of it available. Mr. Barry Zwicker responded, noting that no formal written submission was made for any other proposal, and that no copies exist in Town offices of previous presentations by Bedford Village Properties Limited to Council.

Mr. Davies inquired about a fire department report in which the Fire Chief had expressed some additional concerns. Mr. Zwicker indicated that it was included in the information package, and was available to the public and Council.

Mr. Davies expressed concern regarding the corner store and the increase in traffic, and the fact that Bedford Hills Road was not a collector street. Mr. Davies also expressed concern regarding the 50 foot buffer. He stated that he felt it may end up being "whittled" down further.

Mr. Rick McCallum - 18 Village Crescent

Mr. McCallum commented on the increase of the vacancy rates (in Metro Halifax) from .9 % to 5.2% over the past 8 years, which, he suggested, showed that there was already an oversupply. He suggested that the new buildings will look good at first, but if it remains largely vacant it will not look good in a few years.

Mr. McCallum then read aloud from a 20 year old brochure on the Bedford Village plan.

He pointed out that the 40 changes which had been made to the proposal would not have been necessary if the proponents had read the M.P.S. in the first place. Mr. McCallum suggested that the buildings were closer to the abutting properties than was depicted in the drawings. He noted that the homes on the abutting properties were built on the back one-third of the lots. He stated that common sense should indicate that the development does not "go with" the surrounding homes.

Lee Stark - 26 Village Crescent

Mr. Stark noted that he is in the construction business, and that he is surprised that the Environment Department is not involved. He stated that, in his experience, much mess is created on a construction site, and that it should be monitored at all times to see what happens to the streams and water courses.

Mr. Stark reported that when he bought his property, there was an assurance of a 100 foot buffer between his property and any future development of the M1 parcel. He stated that he had not visualized having three apartment buildings built 50 feet away. He noted that the development was proposing to build the highest density buildings closest to the abutting single family homes, rather than the opposite.

Mr. Stark questioned whether the Departments of Highways and Health would become involved. He stated that he did not feel it will be a safe environment for children to walk to the park.

Al Hilliard - Mill Run Crescent

Mr. Hilliard stated that he was pro-development if it was good development, but that he did not feel this was a good development.

Mr. Hilliard suggested that the pictures make the development look good, but that, in his experience, most developments don't look as good once they are built.

Mr. Hilliard expressed concern regarding water quality and the 50 foot tree buffer. He indicated that he felt the berms will not work, and that the water quality in Paper Mill Lake is already not what it was just two and a half years ago. Mr. Hilliard noted that the 50 foot buffer looks good on paper, but that, in his experience, buffers do not last and that 10 - 15 feet will be lost to windfall.

Mr. Hilliard indicated that residents had elected people they felt they could trust, and that he urged Council to listen to B.P.A.C. and B.W.A.C. He stated that he had confidence that the Town Council will "come to their senses" and not allow the development as proposed.

Maria Hays

Ms. Hays indicated that she was not against development, but that she was opposed to **this** development.

Ms. Hays went on to speak favourably about the neighbourhood, and how many people would like to be able to live there. She noted that she had heard one councillor state that

the development would be great for the tax base. Ms. Hays stated that she would like Council to know she felt this was not a good reason to agree to the development.

Mr. Brian Tomie - 18 Village Crescent

Mr. Tomie suggested that Council use the benefit of hindsight, and ask the developers to re-think their proposal, especially when it is on sensitive land. He suggested that the developers may not feel very welcome tonight, but, he pointed out, no-one had said they were against development per se.

Mr. Tomie urged Council, during deliberation on this matter, to vote with the conscience of the people, to not ignore hindsight, and to do what is best for the benefit of the community.

Mr. Tomie then addressed the proponents, suggesting that the development process requires negotiation and being sensitive to the community. He suggested that they may be surprised if they were to sit down with the community to get their ideas and input.

Mr. Tomie indicated that the Town of Bedford is really a pro-development town, if it is good for the Town, but that it is time to stop bad development on behalf of common sense.

George Hamilton - 49 Village Crescent

Mr. Hamilton expressed anger with respect to the development. He stated that he felt the development does not fit with the plan of the Town; that it is ugly and the pictures are a misrepresentation.

Mr. Hamilton read aloud from a copy of the old Bedford bylaws with respect to density. He also quoted from the CCDD "...shall emphasize the unique features of the site, with the emphasis on conservation". He suggested that the filtration berms were not conservation of the streams, and indicated that he was against the reduction of the 100 foot buffer.

Mr. Hamilton suggested that Town Council should be able to make this kind of decision on their own, without conducting Public Hearings, just by reading the M.P.S. and seeing that the development is not acceptable.

Stephanie Casey - 15 Village Crescent

Ms. Casey advised she had two daughters ages 4 and 6 whom she hoped would become future residents of Bedford. She advised she wanted her daughters to see she went on public record as saying she was opposed to this development.

TOWN OF BEDFORD

Stephanie Stark - 26 Village Crescent

Ms. Stark referred to the pictures at the front of the room, indicating the location of her house in the picture. She noted that her house is located near the back of the lot, as are the neighbouring houses, which are staggered backwards. She indicated that the proposed apartment buildings would be much closer than was depicted to her house; that the picture was not realistic. She invited Council members to walk in her backyard and see for themselves how close the proposed buildings would be.

After three calls by Mayor Kelly there were no further speakers or questions from the public.

Mayor Kelly thanked all who had attended and spoken, and reminded everyone that Council will deliberate on the matter on October 13, 1992.

Therefore, Public Hearing #92-14 of the Town of Bedford was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.



MAYOR

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

/sk

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS

PRESENTATION - MAIN STREET STUDY

MEETING #41

TOWN OF BEDFORD

Special Session

Tuesday, October 6, 1992

A Special Session of the Town Council of the Town of Bedford took place on Tuesday, October 6, 1992 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Suite 400, Bedford Tower, Bedford, Nova Scotia.

1. LORD'S PRAYER

Deputy Mayor Anne Cosgrove opened the Session by the leading of the Lord's Prayer.

2. ATTENDANCE

Deputy Mayor Anne Cosgrove and Councillors John Davies, Len Goucher, Harris Hutt, Bill MacLean and Stephen Oickle were in attendance at the commencement of the Meeting.

Mayor Kelly joined the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Staff members in attendance included Dan English, Chief Administrative Officer; Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development; Donna Davis-Lohnes, Senior Planner and Ron Singer, Director of Finance.

There were approximately 10 - 15 residents present.

3. ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO ORDER OF BUSINESS

There were no additions or deletions to the Order of Business.

4. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Davies, it was moved to approve the Order of Business as circulated. **The Motion was unanimously approved.**

5. PRESENTATION - MAINSTREET STUDY

By memorandum dated September 28, 1992, Donna Davis-Lohnes, Senior Planner, presented a final report from John Dobbs and Associates, and reported that Mr.

Dobbs, in addition to property owners within the study area, were in attendance at tonight's meeting to review the concept plans and study results.

Mr. Zwicker noted that Donna Davis-Lohnes would briefly review the essence of the Mainstreet project, and how it had evolved to the study stage for this particular area. He asked Council to agree to a suspension of the Rules of Order for tonight's meeting, in order to allow the property owners that were present, to speak. Council agreed to this request.

Ms. Davis-Lohnes, in review, noted that the concept of a Mainstreet Commercial Zone had been developed at the time of the last M.P.S. review and was included in the M.P.S. in an attempt to revitalize and re-develop a section of the Bedford Highway into a smaller scale, pedestrian-oriented part of the Town of Bedford. She displayed an overhead which outlined the sections along the Bedford Highway which are zoned Mainstreet Commercial, including properties on both sides of the street, from the Sackville River Bridge to Sobey's.

Ms. Davis-Lohnes reported the main reason for the development of the concept was concern regarding the nature and scale of commercial developments over the years in Bedford, ie. automobile-oriented strip malls, and a general concern for this particular area which used to be the main commercial area of Bedford, and has now declined. There were also concerns with respect to the nature of the Bedford Highway itself.

Ms. Davis-Lohnes further reported on what the concept means. She noted the following:

- encouraging a mix of residential, general retail, and office space in buildings that encourage a relationship with the street, ie. close to the street, two story buildings;
- re-development of existing buildings, but retain the residential elements of them.
- continuous development, without gaps.

She suggested the way in which this could be achieved would mean, basically, three things:

1. Be pro-active by demonstrating what the Town would like to see happen, ie. architectural studies of the potential of existing properties, such as is being presented tonight;
2. Cooperation between the Town and the property owners. Ms. Davis-Lohnes

noted that Planning Staff have met with property owners on a number of occasions;

3. A desire and committment on the part of the Town.

Ms. Davis-Lohnes gave reasons why this should be done:

- revitalization of this area, to make it a place for commercial and residential people to meet;
- economics;
- produce a commercial area that fits perceptions about the scale of the Town.

She suggested that a particular market, ie. small scale specialty stores, could be tapped into, and that this is a unique opportunity.

Mr. Barry Zwicker inquired whether there were any questions from Council for Ms. Davis-Lohnes, and there were none. Mr. Zwicker then introduced Mr. John Dobbs.

Mr. Dobbs, with the use of overheads and coloured renderings, presented an architectural study of a section of the area, which included several buildings in the area of the Jennifer Allan Interiors building.

He noted there are several difficulties with this area, but that it is land-rich and a good commercial location. He indicated three residential properties at the rear of the area, which are currently zoned Mainstreet, and suggested these buildings should be re-zoned RCDD, consolidated, and developed into a high-scale residential development.

Further, the "Mr. Transmission" building and the old "Green Gables" store could be upgraded to attract small specialty shops.

Mr. Dobbs went on to further explain his renderings, how traffic might flow, parking, etc. He explained that, generally, the buildings in this area can be upgraded and made into a more cohesive unit for a relatively small cost. He suggested that funding might come from sources such as the provincial Mainstreet program and the Town, but that the Town's contribution could be in the form of assistance to the property owners, not money. He further suggested the Town could place a moratorium on business occupancy taxes until the development is completed.

Mr. Dobbs then answered questions from Council.

Councillor Goucher indicated he felt the renderings were excellent, and inquired whether Mr. Dobbs had any other ideas with respect to the "Mr. Transmission" building. Mr. Dobbs explained it would not be economically viable to totally re-build, and that the only option is to use the infrastructure that exists, such as is depicted.

The floor was then opened to the public.

One property owner noted he has wished to do something for a long time, but had felt that, independently, nothing could be done. He indicated he approves of the idea of working together. He inquired about the small stream which runs through the rear of the properties, and suggested that the "Mr. Transmission" building could be made less like a strip mall if it were "stepped" up with the contour of the land.

Mr. Dobbs indicated his feeling that the stream, however unattractive it is now, can be made a feature, or it can be buried. He suggested that with decking along the river, a wine bar or coffee shop that opens onto the deck, would have an added attraction and it would help the viability of that establishment.

With respect to the "Mr. Transmission" building, Mr. Dobbs again indicated that any re-construction of the building would not be economically viable, and that they are "locked into" what currently exists.

One resident indicated that she felt it was a beautiful presentation, and inquired how to get the "ball rolling", since no one person can do it alone.

Mr. Dobbs suggested that, first, a cooperative agreement must be arrived at between the owners and Town Council must agree to re-zone the residential buildings. He suggested the possibility of placing covenants on the land.

Ms. Davis-Lohnes also responded, indicating that tonight was the first step; the architectural study will generate interest and act as a catalyst. She noted the Economic Development Commission is aggressively talking to potential buyers about the vacant buildings in the area.

Mr. Barry Zwicker also noted that the E.D.C.'s role is to market the Town, and that this is an opportunity to "get the ball rolling".

Ms. Helen Graham-Gromick spoke, reporting that the provincial Mainstreet program has given "preliminary" approval for up to \$35,000 to \$40,000 funding, with a plan from the property owners. Specifically, the funding would be approximately \$10,000 for each of three to four businesses in this area. She noted that this was very timely,

and that application is required by February.

Ms. Peggy Draper spoke, indicating that it was exciting to see the drawings. She inquired about the viability of possibly building a second storey on the Mr. Transmission building, for apartments or office space, which, she suggested, would serve to make the building more architecturally attractive.

Mr. Dobbs indicated there would be "probable potential" to adding a floor, and agreed that it would add to it architecturally.

Mr. Zwicker suggested that this presentation was a concept only, and is open to suggestions.

One resident inquired about the residential buildings. Mr. Dobbs explained that the buildings had no commercial value, and he suggests they be re-zoned and consolidated into approximately 19 high-quality rental units.

Councillor Goucher indicated he agrees with the two suggestions made with respect to the "Mr. Transmission" building, ie. stepping up with the grade and adding a second storey. He inquired to Ms. Graham-Gromick about the percentages of the funding from the Mainstreet program. She indicated it is from 30% to 50% of costs, depending on what is proposed to be done.

Councillor MacLean suggested that this is an exciting opportunity. He noted he had seen a similar building to the Mr. Transmission building in Mahone Bay, changed with paint and other decorative means into an attractive building. He indicated he felt this project was great for the community.

One resident expressed concern with respect to the properties across the road to these buildings, noting they were "not the same" kind of buildings, and questioned when and how they might be tied into the entire concept.

Mr. Zwicker indicated that the plan was to obtain a response from Council on this section, and to do the same for other targeted sections on both sides of the road, in turn. He noted that Staff recognise this type of project should not be done in isolation, and that work must be done with respect to the buildings on the other side of the street.

One resident inquired whether fiscal figures on the "Mr. Transmission" building were available. Mr. Dobbs indicated that they were, and that he had done figures based on the cost to buy the property and fix it up as part of his report.

Mr. Zwicker further noted that if anyone is interested, Staff are willing to take the estimate figures to a higher level.

There were no further questions, and Deputy Mayor Cosgrove thanked Mr. Dobbs for his presentation.

6. **CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL - TEMPORARY BORROWING RESOLUTIONS**

By memorandum dated September 28, 1992, Mr. Ron Singer, Director of Finance, presented for Council's consideration Temporary Borrowing Resolutions to facilitate the necessary financing required for a portion of the 1992/93 committed Capital Program.

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Hutt, it was moved that Council approve the Temporary Borrowing Resolutions totalling \$562,000, and that the appropriate documentation be forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval. The Motion was unanimously approved.

7. **CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL - 1991/92 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

By memorandum dated September 25, 1992, Mr. Ron Singer, Director of Finance, presented the Audited Financial Statements for the Town of Bedford, respecting the transitional fifteen month term ending March 31, 1992.

Mr. Singer apologized that the statements were late, indicating there were several factors which contributed to this, one of which was that the Audit Committee was unable to meet very often during the summer months.

ON MOTION of Councillor Oickle and Councillor MacLean, it was moved that Council accept the 1991/92 Audited Financial Statements as tabled.

Councillor Davies requested clarification with respect to "Trade Payables", noting this will have an impact on future budgetary considerations.

Mr. Singer briefly explained the requirement by Municipal Affairs to record accrued employee benefits as a payable, for which, currently, no funding is allocated within the 1992/93 Budget. He indicated there was a very small likelihood of paying out this money in the next five years. He suggested a portion of this be transferred from the surplus.

TOWN OF BEDFORD

Councillor Goucher noted that this is a "bookkeeping entry", and agreed that amounts could be transferred out of surplus from time to time.

The Motion was put to the Meeting and was unanimously approved.

Mr. Singer then indicated a second recommendation in the Staff report regarding the appointment of the Town's registered Municipal Auditors for the year 1992/93.

Councillor Goucher noted that the firm of Levy Casey MacLean has dealt with the Town for the last ten years, know the Town's procedures, and have not over-charged the Town. He indicated they have given good value for the money charged. He suggested if the contract was tendered, another firm may be found who will be less expensive initially, but this may not be worth the time and trouble it will take to have them become as familiar with the Town's procedures as is Levy Casey MacLean.

Mr. Singer also noted that Staff had conducted a survey of audit fees two years ago, and it was found the Town was being charged the lowest fees at that time. He indicated Town Staff work well with the staff from Levy Casey MacLean, and they have no complaints about them. In response to a question from Mayor Kelly, he noted the fee for last year was \$15,000, (15 month period) with this year's expected to be \$10,000.

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Oickle, it was moved that the accounting firm of Levy Casey MacLean, Chartered Accountants, be appointed as the Town's registered Municipal Auditors for the year 1992/93.

The Motion was unanimously approved.

8. ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION of Mayor Kelly, it was moved to adjourn the 41st Special Session of the Town of Bedford at approximately 8:35 p.m.

MAYOR


CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER