

concerns regarding the overcrowded school situation. Mayor Kelly indicated that the school should be complete by May of 1994. Mr. Farrell urged Town Council to reject this proposal, "especially the convenience store."

Bruce Yeo - 22 Village Crescent

Mr. Yeo expressed concern regarding safety of the children travelling to and from Paper Mill Lake and to the convenience store. Mr. Yeo suggested that some type of crosswalk system would have to be in place and that a three lane highway would not work. Mr. Yeo questioned the reason for the filter berm system. Mr. Swanson indicated that the system is one of the environmental control measures that will "provide equal or better protection than 100 feet of undeveloped land." Ms. Lane stated that the filtration system will enhance the protection of the environment. Mr. Yeo raised concern that the silt will be flowing into Paper Mill Lake because "the siltation pond is upstream and silt flows downstream." In response to Mr. Yeo's inquiry regarding upkeep, Mr. Zwicker reported that it is the Town's responsibility to maintain the berm system when the development is complete.

Mr. Yeo suggested that the Town start a Bedford Village Resident's Advisory Committee and recommended that Town Council reject the proposal.

Brian Tomie - 25 Village Crescent

Mr. Tomie noted that he has lived in Bedford for 8 years and he has attended 12 meetings regarding this proposal. He expressed concern that "no one is listening" to the residents who have articulated their opposition to this development. Mr. Tomie also commented that he felt the proposal was "greedy" by putting so many buildings on an environmentally sensitive property. He stated that the proposal still does not comply with the MPS and should be rejected for this reason.

Marvin Silver - 78 Village Crescent

Mr. Silver noted that he made comments opposing the proposal at the September Public Hearing. Mr. Silver commented that he has seen the filter berm system behind Peers Landing and indicated that this system is failing. Mr. Silver noted his opposition to the proposal stating there was nothing in it to change his mind and this development should be rejected.

Joe McEvoy - 42 Village Crescent

Mr. McEvoy noted his objection stating that he has attended several meetings regarding this proposal, he wrote a letter to the Town and he still does not believe there are any changes. He suggested that Town Council listen to the people, read the MPS and reject the proposal.

Mrs. Moget - 86 Village Crescent

Mrs. Moget suggested that Town Council adhere to the principles of the MPS and reject this proposal. She mentioned that Bedford Village Properties designed a development that "really blends in" with the area and suggested they provide a plan similar to the one developed twenty years ago.

Ray Davies - 14 Village Crescent

Mr. Davies commented on the number of meetings he has had to attend regarding this proposal and noted that he is still opposed to it. Mr. Davies noted that he objects to the filtration system and indicated that there could be a build up of silt over time with this type of system, and after one heavy rainstorm, all the silt would flow into Paper Mill Lake.

Mr. Davies also stated that he objects to the density of the proposal as well as the increased traffic that would be generated from such a development. He recommended that this proposal be rejected and suggested the developer design an acceptable proposal.

Stefanie Stark - 26 Village Crescent

Mrs. Stark noted her objection to having a five storey building behind her house. She also raised concern regarding the amount of traffic that would be generated from this development and the danger this would impose of their children. She stated that those opposed to this proposal all have legitimate concerns and wished to have someone indicate to her why they should allow this development. Mayor Kelly responded that Town Council will be stating their opinions regarding this issue at the next Town Council meeting.

Tony Edwards - Sullivan's Hill

Mr. Edwards noted that he supports the opinions of earlier speakers opposed to the development.

Mr. Edwards commented that he is the T. Edwards from the BRAC motion read earlier and indicated that because this motion was rejected does not mean it was an approval of the development. He indicated that there was much discussion regarding this issue that is not reflected in the minutes. Mr. Edwards suggested that all committee meetings be recorded on audio tape and kept for ninety days.

Lee Stark - 26 Village Crescent

At the request of Mr. Stark, Mayor Kelly discussed the procedure to be followed when this proposal is voted on at the Town Council meeting. He explained that only if a Councillor is opposed to the proposal, he or she must state for the record why it has been rejected.

development. He indicated that there was much discussion regarding this issue that is not reflected in the minutes. Mr. Edwards suggested that all committee meetings be recorded on audio tape and kept for ninety days.

Lee Stark - 26 Village Crescent

At the request of Mr. Stark, Mayor Kelly discussed the procedure to be followed when this proposal is voted on at the Town Council meeting. He explained that only if a Councillor is opposed to the proposal, he or she must state for the record why it has been rejected.

Gloria Lowther - Peerless Subdivision

Ms. Lowther noted her objection to the proposal as it does not comply with the MPS and should be rejected for that reason.

Donna Miles - 38 Village Crescent

Mrs. Miles noted that residents from all over Bedford enjoy Paper Mill Lake and indicated that it would be a lose to the whole Town if the lake becomes more polluted. She stated that she agrees with the other residents' comments opposing this development and urged Town Council to reject the proposal.

Ray Miles - 38 Village Crescent

Mr. Miles pointed out his home on the map and mentioned that presently from his home, he could see lights on Hammonds Plain Road. He commented that if this development proceeds, 75% of the trees between his home and Hammonds Plain Road would be cut and he would be seeing the lights of several kitchens and lights from cars in the parking lot.

Peggy Roberts - 34 Village Crescent

Ms. Roberts noted that she has been a resident of Village Crescent for 18 years. She commented that Bedford Village Properties planned a "wonderful" development years ago and suggested that they could develop something "wonderful" again. She urged Town Council to reject the proposal.

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

public.

Mayor Kelly thanked all who had attended and spoken, and reminded everyone that Council will deliberate on the matter on January 13, 1993.

Public Hearing #91-18 of the Town of Bedford was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

MAYOR



CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

/gy

TOWN OF BEDFORD

Regular Session

Tuesday, January 12, 1993

A Regular Session of the Town Council of the Town of Bedford took place on Tuesday, January 12, 1993 at 7:00 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 Stephen Oickle and Councillors Anne Cosgrove, John Davies, Len Goucher, Harris Hutt, and Bill MacLean were in attendance at the commencement of the Meeting.

Staff members in attendance included Dan English, Chief Administrative Officer; Donna Davis-Lohnes, Senior Planner; Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development Control; and Rick Paynter, Director of Engineering and Works.

Peter McInroy was also in attendance for a portion of the meeting to provide legal counsel.

Approximately 75 residents were present.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - #49 - Regular Session - December 8, 1992
#50 - Public Hearing - December 15, 1992
#51- Public Hearing - December 15, 1992
#52- Public Hearing - January 6, 1993

ON MOTION of Councillor Cosgrove and Councillor Davies, it was moved to approve the minutes for Regular Session #49 - December 8, 1992; Public Hearing #50 - December 15, 1992; Public Hearing #51 - December 15, 1992; and Public Hearing #52 - January 6, 1993, with the following amendment to the minutes of Public Hearing #51 - December 15, 1992:

d Councillor Davies excused himself from this Public Hearing (#92-17) for reasons of possible conflict of interest. ''

The Motion was unanimously approved.

4. ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO ORDER OF BUSINESS

The following additions were made to the Order of Business :

Item 10.4 Metropolitan Authority - Citizen's Advisory Committee for recycling -
Councillor MacLean

5. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS

ON MOTION of Councillor Cosgrove and Councillor MacLean, it was moved to approve the Order of Business as amended. The Motion was unanimously approved.

6. DEFERRED BUSINESS/BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES - NIL

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND MOTIONS ARISING THEREFROM

7.1 **Public Hearing - Dec.15/92 - #92-16 - Development Agreement Application - 29
Central Street/#2 Balsam Street**

Councillor Goucher excused himself from this matter as he was not in attendance at the Hearing.

By memorandum dated January 7, 1993, Donna Davis-Lohnes, Senior Planner, provided further information and clarification with respect to the type and height of a fence to be constructed between the two properties in question. Staff's recommendation was also included in the report.

ON MOTION of Councillor Cosgrove and Councillor Davies, it was moved that Town Council approve entering into a Development Agreement to permit the conversion of the existing non-conforming commercial building located at #2 Balsam Street to a single dwelling unit and the subsequent subdivision of the lot as per the Application request. The Motion was unanimously approved.

7.2 Public Hearing - Dec.15/92 - #92-17 - Development Agreement Application - Site 3.2 - Waterfront Development Project

Councillor Goucher excused himself as he was not in attendance at the Hearing and Councillor Davies excused himself from participating in this matter, for possible conflict of interest.

By memorandum dated January 7, 1993, Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development Control, provided Staff's recommendation for an amendment to Development Agreement #92-01 by including a Clause (j) under Section 3.

ON MOTION of Councillor Cosgrove and Councillor Hutt, it was moved that Development Agreement #92-01 be amended to include an additional clause under Section 3, being Section 3(j) which would read as follows:

"The development of a Clock Tower/Public Viewing Station to a maximum height of 150 feet located in conjunction with the Commercial Development Site being 3.2 and the public park being Parcel WP. The Tower is to be constructed consistent with the plans and renderings attached and forming part of this Agreement as Schedule "G"."

The Motion was unanimously approved.

7.3 Public Hearing - Jan. 6/93 - #92-18 - Development Agreement Application - Parcel M-1 - Bedford Village

By memorandum dated January 7, 1993, Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development Control, provided an attached copy of a draft Development Agreement and staff reports regarding Parcel M-1, in addition to Staff's recommendation for the Development Agreement.

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Cosgrove, it was moved that Town Council reject the Application for a Development Agreement with Bedford Village Properties for Parcel M-1.

Councillor Goucher spoke to the Motion, reviewing events pertaining to this Development Agreement which have occurred over the past year. He read aloud from the introduction to the M.P.S. in reference to the public participation process, and the role of the Planning Advisory Committee, Public Hearings and other Town advisory committees. He noted that at Public Hearings, during which approximately 40 people spoke, almost without exception, against the development, and B.P.A.C.'s

and B.W.A.C.'s negative recommendations. He suggested that if the development is approved, it will be "killing the concept of public participation" in the Town of Bedford.

Councillor Goucher went on to specify, and read aloud, particular policies in the M.P.S. that he felt the development did not meet. Those noted were:

- Community Development Objective - refers to small town identity; sense of community.
- Commercial Objective - refers to the minimizing of intrusion upon existing residential neighbourhoods.
- Policy C-8 - refers to conservation of the natural environment. Councillor Goucher stated in his opinion this development represents total overuse of land; excessive use of land.
- Environmental objective - refers to minimizing the impact on the natural environment and unique distinctive character of the Town.
- Policy E-8 - refers to restricting buildings to 100 feet from water courses. Councillor Goucher noted that staff have referred to the standard that applies to RCDD (50 feet) not that of a CCDD. He stated that this is an important policy and this is the first test of same. He also read from General Provisions, #21, clause B, which also refers to the 100 foot buffer for buildings within commercial zones. He suggested that if "we lose on this policy, there will never be a 100 foot buffer in any commercial zone anywhere in Bedford."
- Policy E-14 - refers to environmentally sensitive areas. Councillor Goucher noted that an Environmental Assessment has been called for before and was refused until the development was approved. He noted that one Councillor called an area resident regarding the possibility of requesting an Environmental Assessment and deferring approval of the development. He stated that it was too late now; that it was now time to make a decision.
- Policy Z3 - refers to bulk and scale compatibility. Councillor Goucher questioned why buffers and screening are needed if it is compatible to the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Concern with respect to safe access onto Bedford Hills Road.
- Concern with respect to storm water run-off into Paper Mill Lake. Councillor

Goucher asked who will pay if the pollution controls don't work.

- Concern with respect to adequate street networks.
- Impact on environmentally sensitive areas.

Councillor Goucher also questioned a statement made by Mr. Archie Hattie, of Bedford Village Properties, during a public information session, that moving the apartment buildings closer to the lower density section of the development would affect the marketability of the lower density single family homes. If this is true, he asked, then what about the marketability of the existing abutting single family homes 75 or 80 feet away?

Councillor Goucher raised objections to the proposed neighbourhood convenience store, which he indicated was not permitted in a CCDD zone. He referred to Appendix B, Table 3.

Councillor Goucher stated that people are frustrated, and that Council should listen and act on the requests of the public to not approve this development. He again suggested that public participation, as defined in the M.P.S., is in a lot of trouble. He stated that a deferral for an Environmental Assessment at this time is not acceptable and that Council should either turn down or approve the development now.

Councillor Cosgrove also spoke in favour of the Motion. She suggested that this experience has shown that the M.P.S. is not a document for the citizens of the Town of Bedford, given that through all the citing Policy C11 of the M.P.S., in reference to a "permanent buffer" and "separation distance". She indicated that this meant existing or new trees of six feet in height, not a six-foot fence as provided in the Development Agreement. She also cited Policy C8, which refers to the unique features of the site, conservation of the natural environment, relationship with adjoining or existing use - apartment building next to R1 residential district and stated that as a Councillor she has reviewed the proposed use and considers that the above were not being sufficiently addressed. Councillor Cosgrove suggested that berms with filtration systems and six-foot fences are not conservation of the natural environment.

Councillor Cosgrove also expressed concern that a convenience store could attract undesirable loitering and vandalism, as has been the case at a nearby store. She added a concern with video games.

She also expressed that the concerns of the abutting and area home-owners, who have spoken directly to the developer, have "fallen on deaf ears."

Councillor Cosgrove stated that she agreed with Councillor Goucher that the matter should not be deferred any further, and that a decision is required now.

Councillor Hutt spoke against the Motion. He noted that the process on this matter has been long and controversial. He further noted that the problem with a lack of space in Bedford schools has been a problem for a long time, not just a recent one, and will probably go on as long as there is development in Bedford.

Councillor Hutt also pointed out that, although he has sympathy for the surrounding residents, this parcel of land is one of a few left that is zoned so as to permit apartment buildings.

In reference to buffering, Councillor Hutt noted that this development has provided good buffering with natural vegetation, and that most other apartment developments have none.

In reference to environmental matters, Councillor Hutt noted that Pat Lane and Associates, an environmental consulting firm, has stated that the filtration system designed to protect the water systems on the land will do a better job than a 100 foot setback would without a filtration system. He indicated that this is an expert opinion, and he has to trust it.

Councillor Hutt stated that he had no choice but to support the development as it appeared to comply with the M.P.S.

Councillor MacLean then spoke against the Motion, indicated that one person at the Public Hearing had "crystallized" what he considered to be the main problem in their comments. That is, that before anything else took place, and Environmental Assessment should be done. Councillor MacLean suggested that when the M.P.S. was completed, this land was zoned CCDD, which permits apartment buildings, and if the land is considered to be environmentally sensitive now, it should have been taken into consideration at the time of the making of the M.P.S., and not zoned CCDD.

Councillor MacLean stated that although he felt the M.P.S. is not perfect, and needed review, it had been thoughtfully created and voted on by Council 7 to 0, and Council is committed to following the rules.

Councillor MacLean noted that he could not recall anyone specifically asking for an environmental impact study in the past, but he did recall that most people at the Public Hearings spoke against the development, and with valid reasons and points. However, he felt that most had indicated that they were not against development, just

this development, and the question was that something should be allowed to be built on that land, but what? Councillor MacLean pointed out that the land does have many brooks and marshy areas, and a wide range of topography; it is difficult to develop. He indicated that he, too, felt the density was too high for the land, but that this needed to be addressed and defined through the M.P.S.

Councillor MacLean indicated that he would like to see this matter deferred to allow for a full environmental analysis to be done, to determine what, if anything can be developed there, and that Council be guided by the results of it.

He went on to note that a convenience store does attract young people to gather, but that this need to gather should be addressed through providing more and better youth facilities in the town, such as at the new school. He noted that he had been the only one to vote for an enlarged gymnasium at the new school.

Councillor MacLean stated that he could not support the Motion.

Mayor Kelly noted to Councillor MacLean that the M.P.S. had not been passed by a vote of 7 to 0; the vote had been 5 to 2, with Councillor Goucher and Mayor Kelly voting against it.

Councillor Goucher responded to Councillors MacLean and Hutt's comments, noting first that an Environmental Assessment had been called for by B.W.A.C. and B.P.A.C. very early in the process, and that it was not a new idea. Further, he noted, Mayor Kelly had made suggestions in the past regarding review of the M.P.S., but Council didn't support it.

He again urged Council to make a decision, yes or no, and to not defer the matter again. He noted that the residents deserved a decision now.

There was a further brief discussion between Councillor MacLean and Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development Control as to whether or not an Environmental Assessment has been asked for before, and whether one would be carried out if had been requested. Mr. Zwicker indicated that he could not recall a specific request, just comments regarding the environmental "study" that has already been completed.

Councillor Cosgrove stated that she did recall it being brought forward at B.P.A.C. and by Mike Horwich at B.W.A.C., and that she did not vote for the development at the B.P.A.C. level because of that reason. She further noted that a presentation by Mike Horwich had been made to Council on the subject, with specific requests for an Environmental Assessment.

Councillor Davies then spoke to the Motion. He noted that the process has been long and difficult, but the important thing is that there has been a process, and the people of Bedford have been heard. Councillor Davies referred to the subject of "rights" of the residents and the developer. He noted the "intent of the M.P.S.", and that, rightly or wrongly, the M.P.S. was approved on the basis that a CCDD designation could conform within an environmentally sensitive area if proper controls were taken. He further noted that an environmental protection plan and a contingency plan has to be put in place prior to any development beginning. Further, independent testing of water quality will take place.

Councillor Davies suggested that the main question was whether the development meets the **intent** of the M.P.S., and whether the Municipal Board would view it that way too, since the public have their right of appeal, should the development be approved. He indicated that he felt that it does, and that he supports the development.

Deputy Mayor Oickle spoke to the Motion, indicating that there were some things about the development that he was not personally comfortable with, but that he agreed with Councillor Davies in that he must view the development in accordance with the intent of the M.P.S. He noted that the CCDD zone allows apartment buildings.

With respect to environmental concerns, Deputy Mayor Oickle noted Section 25 of the Development Agreement, in which there are a number of clauses pertaining to the protection of the environment. Specifically, he noted and read aloud sub-clauses (b), (c), (g) and (h).

Deputy Mayor Oickle stated that he could not support Councillor Goucher's motion, and had no intention of deferring a decision.

The Motion was put to the meeting and was LOST. (Councillors Cosgrove and Goucher, and Mayor Kelly voted in favour; Councillors Hutt, MacLean, Davies and Deputy Mayor Oickle voted against the motion.)

ON MOTION of Councillor Hutt and Councillor MacLean, it was moved that Town Council agree to enter into a Development Agreement with Bedford Village Properties for Parcel M1, subject to the amendment of Section 25 of the Agreement, to include the following sub-clauses (i) and (j) which have been agreed upon by the proponent:

- (i) *The Developer agrees to engage P. Lane & Associates to prepare an Environmental Impact Study and to develop a*

detailed Environmental Protection Plan which would include the designing of all protection measures to be utilized during construction, phasing, amount of exposed areas, etc. This report would then become Appendix "D" to this Development Agreement.

- (j) *The Developer agrees to be responsible for maintaining the filter walkway system until all construction adjacent to that portion of the filter walkway is completed and the outside filter along that section is cleaned or replaced as appropriate.*

Mayor Kelly asked for legal counsel Peter McInroy's opinion with respect to the Motion, as to whether it should be a Motion with a separate Motion to amend the Development Agreement, or one Motion with the amendment included. Mr. McInroy indicated that the above Motion was sufficient.

Councillor Goucher spoke to the Motion, reminding Deputy Mayor Oickle that approximately 40 people spoke against the development at Public Hearings, and there had been negative recommendations from the Town's advisory committees. He stated that he felt if this Motion is passed the public process in Bedford will "die". He further stated that he has served on Town Council for five years and felt very "ashamed" by the outcome of this matter.

Councillor MacLean noted that it had been a very difficult and painful process. He indicated that he had heard many speak against the project as it existed, with particular concern regarding the environment; however, he indicated, he feels these concerns have been addressed. Through Clause 25 and the amendments proposed this evening.

Mayor Kelly permitted a member of the public to ask a question of Council. He inquired if the development does not pass the environmental review, will the public process begin again if a substantial amendment is required. Mr. Barry Zwicker responded, indicating that the Development Permit will not be issued if a substantial amendment to the Agreement is required due to the environmental review, and the approval process will begin again. Legal counsel Peter McInroy also concurred.

The Motion was put to the meeting and was CARRIED. (Deputy Mayor Oickle, Councillors Hutt, Davies and MacLean voted in favour; Councillors Goucher and Cosgrove, and Mayor Kelly voted against the motion.)

Councillor Goucher served a NOTICE OF RECONSIDERATION for the next Regular Session.

Deputy Mayor Oickle questioned the purpose of a Notice of Reconsideration when the mover had earlier requested a decision on the matter this evening. Mayor Kelly noted that a Notice of Reconsideration was in order.

Town Solicitor Peter McInroy was asked for an opinion as to whether a Notice of Reconsideration can be made twice with respect to the same subject matter. Mayor Kelly noted that there has been a substantial change made to the original Development Agreement, to which the first Notice of Reconsideration had applied.

Mr. McInroy indicated that the decision as to the validity of the nature of reconsideration could go either way if challenged in a Court of Law.

*ON MOTION of Councillor Cosgrove and Councillor Goucher, it was moved that Policy E8 of the Municipal Planning Strategy be reviewed and clarified by staff and the Bedford Planning Advisory Committee. **The Motion was unanimously approved.***

Councillor MacLean commended Councillor Cosgrove for raising this suggestion and moving forward in correcting some of the perceived problems with the M.P.S.

8. PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS

8.1 Mr. Greg Isenor - Proposed Sale of Peregrine Lots

Mr. Isenor noted that he lives on Peregrine Crescent and was speaking with the agreement of some neighbourhood residents. He indicated that he was in general agreement in principal with selling parkland by the Town to raise funds, but that he was concerned with the size of the lots, the setbacks and the size of the frontage. He stated that he would like to recommend that the two lots be made into one larger lot, in order that a larger home could be well-placed on the lot.

Mr. Isenor went on to note that while the square footage of the lots is similar to others in the neighbourhood, the elevations make a difference in usable space. He further noted that residents have agreed to allow the lots to be sold for development, and would like to have input as to how they are used.

Mayor Kelly thanked Mr. Isenor and noted that this matter will be on the agenda for the January 26 Council Session.

8.2 Bedford Board of School Trustees - Community School Facilities

Ms. Jan Gerrow, Chairperson for the Bedford Board of School Trustees addressed

Council with respect to possible enhancement of the new elementary school facility, and a previous Motion by Council taken on September 15, 1992 to not fund the project at this time, due to financial constraints.

Ms. Gerrow reported that the project, which is estimated to cost \$1.5 million, could receive funding through the Provincial Sport and Recreation Commission in the amount of \$350,000, and local fundraising could raise as much as \$150,000. This would leave \$1 million required by the Town and taxpayers.

Ms. Gerrow suggested that the Town was missing an opportunity to build the enhanced facility now, rather than reconstruct the school at a later date, or building a completely separate facility. She noted the need in the community for this type of facility, and reported that scheduling for spaces for recreation and cultural events in Bedford are full and inadequate. She further noted that a survey conducted by the Bedford Economic Development Commission had showed that residents were mainly satisfied with life in Bedford with the exception of educational and recreational facilities, which, it was felt, were lacking. Ms. Gerrow also pointed out the factor of population increases in the past and future, and the number of youth in Bedford who, in the near future, will require suitable facilities.

Ms. Gerrow went on to further expand on the financial benefits and aspects of the project, and noted that Government Services has indicated that the project will not suffer any delays in construction should the Town of Bedford reconsider the enhanced facility in the near future. Ms. Gerrow suggested that Council tour Tallahassee Community School. She noted that, with the help of the Director of Finance, Ron Singer, it has been calculated an additional \$30.00 per year in taxes for every \$100,000 in value of residential homes would be sufficient to support the \$1 million funding necessary. She urged Council to reconsider their earlier response to the Minister of Education.

Mayor Kelly thanked Ms. Gerrow and noted that Council is currently awaiting a Recreation Advisory Committee report on the project and will add the matter to the agenda of the January 26 Council Session.

Deputy Mayor Oickle served a Notice of Rescission for the January 26 meeting on the Motion approved by Council on September 15, 1992.

8.3 Ms. Susan Warman - Proposed Crosswalk Guard - Meadowbrook/Pleasant

Ms. Warman was present to speak on behalf of residents regarding a proposed crosswalk guard at Meadowbrook and Pleasant streets. She reported that she has witnessed several near accidents recently at this intersection, due to vehicles having

difficulty stopping at the bottom of the hill on Meadowbrook. She urged Council to consider the request.

Mayor Kelly thanked Ms. Warman and noted that Council will request additional information and the matter will be on the agenda for January 26.

8.4 Pleasant Street Residents - One Way Street Designation

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Foy were present to speak to Council regarding the decision made to designate Pleasant Street a one-way street. Overheads were shown of their major points on the matter.

Mr. Foy stated that many users and residents of Pleasant Street are unhappy with the decision, which was made without consultation or notice to the users. The Street includes seniors residing in an apartment building at 21 Meadowbrook and churchgoers at St. Ignatius. He indicated that it has caused major disruption and safety problems.

Mr. Foy further pointed out that although the purpose of the one-way designation was for the protection and safety of school children walking to school, children are not using the street during the hours of 8:00 am and 4:00 p.m, or in the evenings, weekends, holidays and summer.

Mr. Foy suggested that since there has never been an accident or injury in 75 years, this has been an over-reaction to the problem. In addition, the one-way designation has caused vehicles to drive faster because they do not have to look out for on-coming cars at the top of the hill.

Mrs. Foy reported that she took a traffic count from her house on December 15, 1992, before the one-way designation, between 8:15 a.m. and 9:05 am. The results were shown on an overhead. Mrs. Foy indicated that most of the cars travelling up Pleasant Street were carrying children to school, instead of the children walking. Overheads with other traffic count figures taken after the one-way designation were also shown.

Mr. Foy suggested that another solution would be to post new speed limit signs of 10 m.p.h. along Pleasant Street.

A petition and a letter from residents of 21 Meadowbrook were circulated. Mr. Foy stated that they are requesting that Pleasant Street be restored to two-way traffic.

Mayor Kelly thanked Mr. Foy and noted that the matter will be on the agenda for

January 26.

Councillor Davies served Notice of Rescission for January 26 respecting the Motion approved on December 8, 1992.

8.5 Mr. and Mrs. Blue re - One Way Street Designation

Mr. Blue spoke to Council, noting that the decision to make Pleasant Street one-way had been a recognition of area parents concern for the safety of their children. He pointed out that by Mr. Foy's figures, it has reduced traffic on the street by half. He protested the suggestion that most parents drive their children to school.

Mr. Blue suggested that, while it may be true that there has been a record of 75 years of safety on the street, taking steps to enhance safety is "like buying an insurance policy before something happens, not after."

In response to a suggestion by Mr. Foy that the sidewalks along the Bedford Highway should be utilized, Mr. Blue pointed out that five, six and seven year olds walking tend to not pay attention to their surroundings and would have to cross at least two busy streets without the benefit of a crossing guard.

Mr. Blue indicated that he was open to suggestions for another way to ensure children's safety in this area that won't cause other residents as much disruption.

Mayor Kelly thanked Mr. Blue and noted that the matter will be on the agenda for discussion by Council on January 26.

Councillor Goucher left the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

9. MOTIONS - NIL

10. NEW BUSINESS

10.1 Citizen Advisory Forum - Establishment of Date and Topics

By memorandum dated January 8, 1992, Mr. Dan English, Chief Administrative Officer, provided information on a proposed third Citizens' Advisory Forum on Wednesday, February 17, 1993 along with possible topics for discussion.

Mayor Kelly noted that while the first forum had been successful, the second one had not been well-attended. He suggested that the set format may be too restrictive and inquired whether a new, more open concept should be tried.

This was discussed and also whether a third forum should even be scheduled, given the amount of time and involvement required of staff. Mr. English reported that requests for suggestions from the public as to topics for discussion through the Blueprint has resulted in very few responses. In response to a question from Councillor Cosgrove, he indicated that Resident Associations have been targeted with respect to possible topics. He also suggested that people could be intimidated about speaking at an open public information type session as opposed to the current round-table discussion concept. He suggested that one table could be left open for miscellaneous subjects.

ON MOTION of Deputy Mayor Oickle and Councillor Davies, it was moved that Bedford Town Council proceed with the 3rd Citizens' Advisory Forum, to be held on Wednesday, February 17, 1993 at the Lions Den. The topics to be discussed are: Seniors' Issues, Municipal Reform, the Development Process and Environmental Issues.

Councillor Davies suggested that, in addition to the regular advertising of the forum, specific invitations should be sent to groups and resident associations.

Mayor Kelly suggested that if the 3rd forum is not successful in this format, then Council should consider a new approach.

There was some discussion with respect to requesting Mr. Bill Hayward, the newly appointed "Commissioner" to speak on Municipal Reform and answer questions at the Forum. Mr. English indicated that he did not think Mr. Hayward would be available, and that he may not be ready to speak in any detail at that point in time. He noted that it was planned that members of the Municipal Reform Advisory Committee will attend. Councillor Cosgrove suggested that a U.N.S.M. representative would also be beneficial. She also suggested that the best-informed people are Town staff, and she would not like to see committee members sitting as resource people on that topic.

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

10.2 Proposed Change in Signage - 102 Highway

Mayor Kelly referred to correspondence received from Mr. Phil Burns of A.J. Hustins Enterprises Ltd. with respect to the possible relocation of the Blue Highway sign from its present location to one north of the #118 Highway turn-off.

ON MOTION of Councillor Davies and Councillor Cosgrove, it was moved that the proposed relocation and slogan be referred to Bedford Heritage Advisory

Committee, Economic Development Commission, Bedford Board of Trade and Heritage '80 for review and recommendation. The Motion was unanimously approved.

10.3 Snow Removal/Salting Operation

By memorandum dated January 7, 1993, Mr. Rick Paynter, Director of Engineering and Works, provided an additional information report on the winter snow removal/salting operations managed by the Engineering and Works Department.

Mr. Paynter indicated that the report is for the information of Council and inquired whether the program was considered satisfactory, or whether Council had any questions.

Mayor Kelly inquired whether it was true that each contractor is given a limited amount of salt to work with, until it runs out.

Mr. Paynter indicated that this was not true, and that the rate of application is fixed. He went on to explain further how and when roads are cleared and salted given different conditions such as heavy snow fall or icing. He also explained that a "bare pavement approach" is taken with arterials and hills. Hills are given additional salt attention. He confirmed to Councillor Davies that Bedford is responsible for every street and artery under its jurisdiction.

It was agreed by Council that Staff should continue with the present level of service.

10.4 Citizen's Advisory Committee on Recycling - Councillor MacLean

Councillor MacLean reported that community response to the Metropolitan Authority's recycling program has not been as great as desired, and the Authority has requested each municipality to appoint individuals to a Citizen's Advisory Committee for the purpose of encouraging and informing residents on the program.

Councillor MacLean recommended that one person from each of: The Board of Trade, The Citizens Against Incineration group, and B.W.A.C., be sought to sit on this Committee of the Metropolitan Authority.

Councillor Davies inquired why a member of B.W.A.C. was suggested. Councillor MacLean suggested that B.W.A.C. is specifically interested and concerned with environmental issues.

ON MOTION of Councillor MacLean and Councillor Cosgrove, it was moved that The Board of Trade, The Citizens Against Incineration, and B.W.A.C. be approached prior to January 26, 1993 to recommend one person each to sit on a Metropolitan Authority Citizen's Advisory Committee for Recycling. **The Motion was unanimously approved.**

Councillor Hutt left the meeting at approximately 10:20 p.m.

11. **REPORTS**

11.1 **COMMITTEES/COMMISSIONS/BOARDS**

11.1.1

Heritage Advisory Committee

A. **Annual Report**

The report was tendered for review and approval by Council.

B. **Street Naming Policy**

Councillor MacLean noted that B.H.A.C., in cooperation with Heritage '80, have revised the Street Naming Policy. Copies of the revised Policy were included in the package.

ON MOTION of Councillor MacLean and Deputy Mayor Oickle, it was moved that Town Council approve the revised Street Naming Policy as advanced by B.H.A.C. and Heritage 80. **The Motion was unanimously approved.**

C. **Town Historian**

Councillor MacLean reported that it has been recommended that the group Heritage '80 be appointed as Town Historian. They have been asked about the proposal and have accepted.

ON MOTION of Councillor MacLean and Deputy Mayor Oickle, it was moved that Heritage '80 be appointed as Town Historian. **The Motion was unanimously approved.**

Councillor MacLean also tendered B.H.A.C.'s 1993/94 Budget for inclusion in the upcoming Budget deliberations.

11.1.2

Planning Advisory Committee - Deferred

BPAC Information Report - Deferred

11.1.3

By-Law/Policy Advisory Committee - Deferred

A. **Proposed Policy - Roadside Improvement Works - Deferred**

B. **Sewer Installation Policy #24201 - Deferred**

11.2 DEPARTMENTAL - Deferred

11.2.1

Finance Department - Information Item - 1993 Assessment Roll - Deferred

12. CORRESPONDENCE

12.1 **Citizens Against Incineration - Proposed Metropolitan Waste to Energy Facility - Deferred**

12.2 **Request for Funding - Environmental Partners Fund Program - Mr. Kaufmann**

Included in the agenda package was information regarding a presentation created by the West Street Performers called "Old Man Mister Hill". The topic of the play is the preservation of the environment. The play is planned to be presented at all elementary schools, and will involve the children to increase their awareness of the environment.

Mayor Kelly noted that the group has received funding from several sources, including \$10,000 from the federal Environmental Partners Fund program. They are requesting a donation from the Town of Bedford.

ON MOTION of Deputy Mayor Oickle and Councillor MacLean, it was moved that the Town of Bedford provide a contribution to the West Street Performers in the amount of \$100.00. The Motion was unanimously approved.

13. MOTIONS OF RECONSIDERATION - NIL

14. MOTION OF RESCISSION - NIL

15. NOTICES OF MOTIONS - NIL

- 16. DEPARTMENTAL INFORMATION REPORTS - Deferred
- 16.1 Fire Chief's Monthly Report - Month of November, 1992 - Deferred
- 16.2 Building Inspector's Monthly Report Month of November, 1992 - Deferred
- 17. QUESTIONS - NIL
- 18. ADDED ITEMS - NIL
- 19. ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION of Deputy Mayor Oickle, it was moved to adjourn the 53rd Regular Session of the Town of Bedford at approximately 10:30 p.m. **The motion was unanimously approved.**

MAYOR



CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

/sk

MEETING #54

TOWN OF BEDFORD

Regular Session

Tuesday, January 26, 1993

A Regular Session of the Town Council of the Town of Bedford took place on Tuesday, January 26, 1993 at 7:00 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

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

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

Approximately 45 residents were present.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - #53 - Regular Session - January 12, 1993

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Davies, it was moved to APPROVE the minutes for Regular Session #53 - January 12, 1993.

The Motion was unanimously approved.

4. ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO ORDER OF BUSINESS

The following changes were made to the Order of Business :

- Item 14.1 Rescission - Community School Enhancement - changed to Item 5.2
- Item 14.2 Rescission - One-Way Designation - Pleasant St. - changed to Item 8.5
- Item 6.4 School Trustees re Enhanced School - changed to Item 5.3
- Item 6.6 One-Way Designation - Pleasant St. - changed to item 8.4

The following additions were made to the Order of Business:

Item 6.3 UNSM Goals and Strategy - Councillor Cosgrove

The following deletions were made to the Order of Business:

Item 6.3 Sale of Peregrine Lots (Deferred until February 9, 1993)

5. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

5.2 Rescission - Community School Enhancement - Deputy Mayor Oickle

ON MOTION of Deputy Mayor Oickle and Councillor Goucher, it was moved to RESCIND the following Motion from September 15, 1992:

ON MOTION of Councillor Davies and Councillor Hutt, it was moved that, due to financial constraints, the Town is not able to proceed at this time with the community school facilities.

Deputy Mayor Oickle stated that his reason for the rescission was because of the Province's stand on Municipal Reform; the Town of Bedford will be affected, but it is not known at this time how. He further noted that this is a great opportunity for the Town to acquire additional recreational facilities which will inevitably be required, but may not occur in an amalgamation.

Councillor Goucher indicated that he did not share this reason; he felt that the matter of the enhanced school facility needs to be discussed further, and innovative forms of financing should be sought.

Councillor MacLean also spoke in favour of the Motion.

The Motion was unanimously approved.

5.3 Bedford School Trustees re Enhanced Elementary School

Councillor Goucher noted that Council has met recently with respect to this matter, but due to the fact there are a number of questions to be answered, and as Councillor Hutt is absent from this meeting, he suggested further discussion on this

matter be deferred until the next meeting.

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Davies, it was moved to DEFER Item # 5.3 - Bedford School Trustees re Enhanced Elementary School until February 9, 1993. The Motion was unanimously approved.

6. DEFERRED BUSINESS/BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

6.1 Jack Lake Development Boundary Issue

By memorandum dated January 21, 1993, Mr. Rick Paynter, Director of Engineering and Works, and Mr. Barry Zwicker, Director of Planning and Development Control, presented a joint Staff Report on the Mill Cove Treatment Plant Expansion and Capacity Allocation.

Mr. Zwicker addressed Council, and with the use of overheads, reviewed the report. He noted that a request from the N.S. Department of Housing and Community Affairs to include Jack Lake lands, Second Lake lands and the remainder of Millwood Subdivision lands, within the primary serviceable development areas of Bedford and Sackville as a result of increased capacity that will be available following the completion of the expansion of the Mill Cove sewage treatment plant, had prompted a review of the S.T.P. capacity and expansion.

Mr. Zwicker reviewed a table showing the Service Capacity Allocation for Bedford and Sackville. He noted that a basis of an average of 18 persons per acre, including commercial and industrial developments, is used to determine capacity requirements. With the present total capacity of 5 mgd, of which Bedford is allocated 1.75 mgd (but is actually using 2.1 mgd), the plant is running to capacity. At the present rate of development in Bedford, by the time the first expansion is complete Bedford will require 2.86 mgd, but will only be allocated 2.45 mgd. Future expansions to 7.00 mgd and then 9.00 mgd will just be serving to "catch up" with use in a high-growth scenario.

Mr. Zwicker reported there is a major infiltration problem, and that 65% of the flow in Bedford, in wet weather, is infiltration run-off. He noted that, with expansion, the new systems will be tighter, but that an infiltration reduction program is needed.

Mr. Zwicker suggested there are three options to consider:

- Buy more capacity from the County - increase from 35% to 40%. This would involve higher Capital costs and \$6.00 to \$7.00 per gallon for the extra capacity. It was noted, however, that extra capacity would not likely be

available since the County will need all of its capacity;

- Control development in Bedford;
- Reduce infiltration; reinstate the infiltration reduction program to find the problem areas and establish costs for betterment. Earlier estimates had indicated a cost of \$160,000, or \$1.20 per gallon.

Mr. Zwicker indicated these solutions would put Bedford in a position to consider accepting lands outside the development boundary during the expansion from 7 mgd to 9 mgd; however, at this time, there is no room for Jack Lake until the year 2000 at the earliest.

Mayor Kelly noted that profits from the development of Jack Lake will come to the Town, and inquired whether there had been any negotiation with the Province for "up-front" costs. Mr. Zwicker noted the increases in infrastructure costs, which have been negotiated for, but not for the S.T.P. expansion. Mayor Kelly suggested the next step would be to submit the report to the Province for further discussion and negotiation.

Mr. Zwicker suggested that perhaps the next step should be to conduct an analysis to determine the best area for further development in Bedford.

Councillor Davies inquired whether the County has conducted a similar study, with respect to the amount of infiltration in its system. Mr. Zwicker indicated they have recently, and their figures are indicative of an equal or greater problem. Mr. Paynter noted they have already carried out some reduction work, but it is not known what their future plans are. Councillor Davies suggested that if the larger users of the S.T.P. (County) are not worrying about correcting infiltration problems, and are pushing for the expansion, then should Bedford worry about it when we will have to pay for the expansion anyway.

Mr. Zwicker pointed out the County staff is presenting a similar report to its Council, and the infiltration problem may become an issue for them as well; however, Bedford is already 20% over capacity. He suggested that an interim strategy, pending the S.T.P. expansion is needed, and indicated that Staff will be bringing forth information on such a strategy in the near future.

It was agreed that further information and figures, including County figures, will be brought forth at a future meeting.

6.2 Petroglyph Advisory Report

By memorandum dated January 21, 1993, Jenifer Tsang, Planner, reported Staff's comments following review of the Final Report of the Bedford Petroglyph Advisory Committee.

Mr. Zwicker, in reviewing the staff report noted the culmination of the report was the result of a request by Council that Staff review the Petroglyph Report's recommendations with respect to any implications and methods of implementation.

Councillor Goucher inquired when Staff envisaged the Town acting on the remaining acreage. Mr. Zwicker indicated Staff did not suggest it had to be the Town that acted on acquiring the remaining acreage; it could be the Province or the Federal government. However, he noted, it is Staff's feeling that action should be taken very soon.

Councillor Goucher inquired about any response as a result of correspondence with the Minister of Northern and Indian Affairs. Mayor Kelly reported that a response had been received yesterday, and will be followed up after tonight's meeting, but it is unclear from the letter as to what the Ministry is prepared to do.

Councillor Goucher suggested the report be tabled, a copy sent to the Native Council of Nova Scotia, and other Native groups and representatives, and that clarification on the letter from the Ministry of Northern and Indian Affairs be sought.

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Davies, it was moved to DEFER further discussion on the Petroglyph Final Report, pending clarification of the intent of the Minister of Northern and Indian Affairs. **The Motion was unanimously approved.**

Deputy Mayor Oickle raised an inquiry as to item #5 in the Staff report, and Mr. Zwicker indicated he would provide this information.

6.3 UNSM Goals and Strategy - Councillor Cosgrove

Councillor Cosgrove circulated copies of the Draft Strategy for the UNSM in Municipal Reform Process, and read the Goal of Strategy and Possible Actions aloud.

Mayor Kelly stated that Bedford Town Council, based on the information to date, opposes amalgamation and has struck a committee to study the cost implications to the Town. He reported that a meeting with the Commissioner has been set for

February 8, 1993. As well, a meeting with the Mayors and C.A.O.s of Halifax, Dartmouth, Bedford and Halifax County has been set for February 10, 1993. The intent of all is not to support amalgamation, but the work has just begun.

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Davies, it was moved that Bedford Town Council support the Goals and Strategy for UNSM in Municipal Reform Process. **The Motion was unanimously approved.**

Councillor Cosgrove requested a copy of the Motion be sent to Mr. Sylvester Atkinson, President, UNSM.

6.5 Proposed Crosswalk Guard - Meadowbrook/Pleasant

By memorandum dated January 20, 1993, Mr. Rick Paynter, Director of Engineering and Works and Town Traffic Authority, presented a response to a request for the establishment of a crosswalk and a crosswalk guard across Meadowbrook Drive at the Pleasant Street intersection.

Mr. Paynter spoke to Council, noting that, as indicated in the report, the Traffic Management Group supports the establishment of a crosswalk on Meadowbrook Drive, but at the intersection of Douglas Drive rather than Pleasant Street. It is also the conclusion of the Group that if the crosswalk was established with the recommended overhead RA-5 sign/light assembly, then a crosswalk guard would not be required.

Councillor Goucher spoke in support of the report, indicating he felt the recommendations were accurate, and that a crosswalk guard would be redundant.

ON MOTION of Councillor Goucher and Councillor Cosgrove, it was moved that Council accept the report and recommendations of the Traffic Authority and Traffic Management Group as submitted. **The Motion was unanimously approved.**

6.7 Ratification - Town Appointments to Metropolitan Authority - Citizen's Committee on Recycling

Mayor Kelly reported three nominations for the Committee had been received.

ON MOTION of Deputy Mayor Oickle and Councillor MacLean, it was moved that the following nominations from Bedford for the Citizen's Committee on Recycling be ratified:

Mr. Mark Coffin - Bedford Board of Trade
Marvin Silver - Citizen's Against Incineration
Al Chiasson - Bedford Waters Advisory Committee

The Motion was unanimously approved.

7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS AND MOTIONS ARISING THEREFROM - NIL**

8. **PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS**

8.1 **Mr. Fred Hall - Citizens Against Incineration - Request for Funding**

Mr. Hall reviewed the past activities of the organization, and outlined the groups request for funding. He reported that the group would like to print a brochure for circulation on the alternatives to incineration. In addition, they have requested a Dr. Paul Kinetter to speak at C.P. Allen High School in the near future. The costs for printing and distribution of the brochure, as well as airfare for Dr. Kinetter totals \$847.00.

In addition, the group is making these requests:

- room for advertising in the Bedford Blue Print
- use of a sound system for C.P. Allen
- help in setting up chairs etc.
- a large screen projector for the showing of videos

Mr. Hall then showed a 15 minute video of Dr. Kinetter speaking to a representative of a County in Florida that has an incinerator. When it was finished, he asked for Council's support in bringing alternatives to incineration to the Town.

Mayor Kelly thanked Mr. Hall for his presentation, and indicated that Council will consider the requests at the next meeting.

A resident of Lakeview, Ms. Joanne Kelly-Dwinell, was then given permission, by consensus of Council, to speak. Ms. Kelly-Dwinell noted that, as a resident of Lakeview, she lives less than 1 kilometer from the proposed site of the incinerator, and her children attend C.P. Allen High School.

Ms. Kelly-Dwinell raised questions with respect to the incinerator. She asked if "scrubbers" would be used; where will the landfill for the toxic ash be located; and

what will be done if there is not enough waste to maintain the capacity of the incinerator.

She suggested that while reducing, recycling and re-using is being encouraged by other sectors of government, the incinerator encourages the opposite. She asked why Bedford hadn't considered the alternatives put forward by the City of Halifax.

Ms. Kelly-Dwinell then read from a list published by the German Environment Ministry of 5 advantages of incineration and 12 disadvantages. She noted that the German Environment Department has closed down several incinerators since the publication of this list.

Mayor Kelly thanked Ms. Kelly-Dwinelly. Councillor Goucher suggested that a copy of her presentation and questions be sent to Metropolitan Authority for response. He inquired whether the matter would be under discussion or decision by the Authority on February 9, 1993. Mayor Kelly reported that an appeal is currently being heard by the Supreme Court, with respect to the incinerator, and that the issue of the contract is proposed to be discussed at the Metropolitan Authority meeting on February 9.

8.2 Mr. Warren Hutt - One-Way Designation - Pleasant St.

Mr. Hutt spoke to Council, indicating that he felt Council was about to reverse their decision to make Pleasant Street one-way, and he wanted to address the issue before any decision was made.

Mr. Hutt noted that he was a resident of the area, a motorist, jogger and walker. He noted that while Pleasant Street has 30' right of way, it is only about 18 feet wide. He suggested that brush growth and vegetation along the sides of the road could be cut back, to create a safer walking environment, so that pedestrians (children) can get off the street. With respect to snow clearing, he suggested that all the snow be piled on one side of the road, or taken away.

Mr. Hutt reiterated that Pleasant Street is very narrow, and that the safety of the children is paramount.

8.3 Mrs. Marie-Claire Blue - One-Way Designation - Pleasant Street

Mr. and Mrs. Blue also spoke to Council with concern that the one-way designation on Pleasant Street will be reversed. Mr. Blue noted that the most important factor to consider is the safety of the children, and that a 90 name petition agreeing with this had been submitted to Council. He indicated that Council should not reverse

their decision without addressing this concern.

Mr. Blue also suggested the clearing of brush from the road-side, and also adding a gravel sidewalk with possibly some type of barrier between it and the road. He again suggested that Council consider sidewalks along Pleasant Street, noting that the sidewalks along Rutledge Street are an improvement, but are not a complete solution.

Mayor Kelly thanked Mr & Mrs. Blue for their presentation.

8.5 Rescission - One-Way Street Designation - Pleasant Street - Councillor John Davies

ON MOTION of Councillor Davies and Councillor Cosgrove, it was moved that the following Motion from December 8, 1992 be RESCINDED:

ON MOTION of Deputy Mayor Oickle and Councillor Cosgrove, it was moved that Council authorize the Director of Engineering to change Pleasant Street to a one-way street from Rutledge Street down to Meadowbrook Ave.

Deputy Mayor Oickle spoke against the Motion, noting that a lot of time had been spent considering the matter, and a decision had been made based on the safety of the children. He noted that Pleasant Street is very narrow, parking is allowed on one side, and there is a blind hill.

Councillor Davies stated that a presentation made by Mr. and Mrs. Foy at the last meeting had pointed out that the decision had resulted in safety concerns for other residents. In addition, there had been no input from those residents. Councillor Davies reported he has spoken to many of the residents, and they have indicated their willingness to work out a solution and offer their input, even if it means that Pleasant Street remains one-way. It has been suggested, he noted, that perhaps the one-way should be in the other direction.

Deputy Mayor Oickle suggested that, instead of reversing the decision now, it could be left as is while other solutions are being considered.

Councillor Davies indicated he was not convinced the current situation was safer.

Councillor Cosgrove spoke for the Motion, indicating that a previously-raised suggestion that an alternate route for the children would be to use the sidewalk along the Bedford Highway is not viable. She reported that she walked the route herself, and agrees that it is not safe. She further reported that, as a result of the