

THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX

PUBLIC HEARING

Monday, May 28, 1979

Present were: Councillor Baker
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor Eisenhauer
Councillor Fader
Deputy Warden Gaetz
Councillor Lachance
Councillor Lawrence
Councillor Lichter
Councillor MacKenzie
Councillor Margeson
Councillor Poirier
Warden Settle
Councillor Smith
Councillor Sutherland
Councillor Topple
Councillor Walker
Councillor Wiseman

Warden Settle opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer followed by Mr. Kelly calling the roll.

It was moved by Councillor Eisenhauer and seconded by Councillor Topple:

"THAT Mrs. Cashen be appointed recording secretary."
Motion Carried.

Warden Settle explained that this session was called to discuss two separate zoning applications and he then informed the public present of the procedure involved in public hearings.

Rezoning Application No. 8-79 - Paul W. Parsons request to rezone a portion of Lot A-2 of the Green Hill Subdivision, 5 Florence Street, Lower Sackville from R-1 (Residential Single Family Zone) to C-1 (Commercial Local Business Zone) in District Number 16.

Miss Smith of the Planning Department spoke about this application and stated that as Council could see on the map, the property is located just off Highway #1 on Florence Street near the Hillcrest Memorial Gardens and the Sackville Cross Road. Land uses in the area that are adjacent would be the Atlantic Trust building, which is across the street and it's a real estate office. There is a parking lot also at the corner of Highway #1 and Florence Street. Below Mr. Parsons' lot is the Kent Homes display. There are some single family dwellings on Florence and Margaret Street. Across the street are some commercial uses, i.e. a grocery store, a pizza shop, a denture clinic, et cetera. The zoning in the area as can be seen on the map is C-1 Commercial Local Business Zone to a depth of roughly 200 feet on either side of the main highway. The zoning on Florence Street and Raymond Drive and around that area is R-1 Residential Single Family Dwelling Zone and the Hillcrest Gardens is Parks and Institutional. Across the street is mixed residential R-1, R-2, and R-4. This illustrates roughly the depth of the C-1 zoning, the heavy dotted line there. It shows where the C-1 zoning ends on Mr. Parsons' lot so the rear portion is what is still R-1 and is what he would like to have changed. He would like to have the zoning extended, in other words, to the back part of his lot. The Planning Department is recommending approval of this application. Mr. Parsons asked for this rezoning and in his letter he stated that the commercial strip zoning in Lower Sackville has divided his property into two zones, R-1 and C-1. The division of the said property is approximately 70% commercial, 30% residential. If the commercial zoning is extended it is the intent of the applicant to provide additional parking for the office building which he has recently expanded. Mr. Parsons originally applied to have this zoning extended under Section 72(c) of the Zoning By-Law which would enable Council, under the Special Powers of Council, to extend the zoning on the property, however it was the suggestion of the Planning Advisory Committee that this go through the normal rezoning process. The dimensions of the lot are roughly 71 feet along Florence Street and it's roughly about 100 feet deep. In all, it's about 7,171 square feet. The Public Works Department has said that they can see no reason why this application cannot be favourably considered. The Planning Department's reasons for approving this application are first of all, that this is not a spot zoning, as far as they're concerned, it's merely an extension of an existing zone and it is also merely to enable the applicant to use his property to its fullest and best use for commercial purposes. The portion that is presently R-1 and cannot be used is a hindrance to him because he's expanded his building. She stated that she thought the only word of caution Planning would like to mention is that they would not recommend approval of any further extensions of commercial zoning up into Florence Street. They feel that this was a legitimate request because the lot was cut in two by the zoning but they would not recommend any further extension of the commercial into Florence Street, which is a residential community.

Warden Settle called for any questions for Miss Smith.

Councillor Poirier: Inaudible.

Miss Smith replied that yes, she thought they would probably take a similar view to that as they are taking to this, but any future -

Warden Settle thanked Miss Smith and asked for anyone in favour of this application to come forward. There was no reply. He then asked for speakers opposed to the application. There was no reply.

Councillor Fader stated that he would move that this be approved. He stated he could appreciate the stand that the Planning Department have taken on this and he certainly appreciates their concern of any further applications extending the C-1 in that particular area. He realized this is tidying up a situation here and he supports it. He'd just like to go on record supporting this motion and he supports what Planning have suggested here tonight, not to extend the C-1 any further. He also stated that he commends Mr. Parsons on the program he has carried out with this particular property. He has just completed another storey to this present building and certainly made it an attractive looking building so he would like to say at this time that he asks Council to support his motion.

It was moved by Councillor Fader and seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT Application No. 8-79 to rezone Lot A2 of the Green Hill Subdivision, Lands of Paul W. Parsons, 5 Florence Street, Lower Sackville from R-1 (Residential Single Family Dwelling Zone) to C-1 (Commercial Local Business Zone) be approved."
Motion Carried.

Amendment to the Zoning By-Law, the County of Halifax, Industrial Uses Section

Miss Smith stated that this is an amendment to the Industrial Uses section of the Municipal Zoning By-Law. It's an amendment to Section 49(e) and she read the By-Law as it reads before amending. "Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this By-Law, no person shall erect, alter, repair, maintain or use any building in whole or in part or use any land for an industrial enterprise except in an I-1, I-2 or I-P Zone. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 49(b) provisions of this By-Law dealing with non-conforming uses shall apply to industrial enterprises in existence at the time of the passing of this By-Law. The provisions of 49(b) shall not apply to an agricultural or forestry use." Now this is the amended section, this is the way it reads presently. "Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 49(b), 49(c) or 49(d) those sections shall not apply to the following districts of the Municipality: Districts 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15." Now this By-Law was implemented in 1974. (Inaudible - moved away from the microphone). She said that Planning felt that 49(e) by saying shall not apply to the following districts and then naming was a little confusing. She often had phone calls from people who didn't quite understand that the districts not mentioned in this section were the districts to which the By-Law did apply. In other words, Districts 1, 3 and 7 were the districts where you required Industrial Zoning, so Planning asked the Solicitor to revise this section of the Zoning By-Law to read as follows: "The provisions of Section 49(b), 49(c) and 49(d) shall apply to the following districts of the Municipality as amended" and then it goes on to list the districts which she has outlined in green on the second plan and those districts are Districts 1, 3, 6, 7, 7A, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20. So the areas which can be seen to be outlined in green on that plan would be, if approved tonight, would be the areas of the Municipality that would be covered by this By-Law. In other words, within those areas anyone wishing to do industrial zoning in an unzoned or generally zoned area, or in any other area, would require Industrial 1, Industrial 2 or IP Zoning. That would affect, to some degree, existing industrial uses insofar as that those that exist now in those districts without Industrial Zoning would become non-conforming in that if they ever wished to expand they would require the Industrial Zoning. She stated that she guessed that's all.

Councillor Deveaux asked if the basic reason for this rezoning is generally in order to take in the districts that weren't involved in this zoning prior to redistribution.

Miss Smith replied in the affirmative.

Councillor Deveaux asked what the difference was between I-1, I-2 and IP.

Mr. Gough stated that I-1 is Industrial Zone, I-2 is Industrial Zone that's actually Industrial Zone for radio transmitters, I-P is the Industrial Zone for the Industrial Park out in Lakeside. That's basically the three. One other point, is besides being the housekeeping duties included the portion of Beaverbank and possibly the other part of Sackville and there was also another district added which is District #8. (Mr. Gough was not at a microphone so the recording secretary found it very difficult to transcribe this portion - it may not be verbatim.)

Councillor MacKenzie: Microphone not activated - Inaudible.

Miss Smith stated that if you had an Industrial use proposed to operate in District 11, presently they could do so in the general or unzoned areas without having to have industrial zoning. Your district is not included in this. The only problem you might run into would be with the Regional Development Plan which required 100 acres for industrial uses outside the regional development boundary, so in a way that's a bit of a deterrent right at the moment for industrial uses.

Deputy Warden Gaetz stated that he didn't intend to go into this industrial zoning because he felt that this Municipal Development Plan, in process at the present time by the people concerned, and therefore he was going to leave it to them to say well, we should have industry here, there or somewhere else. Now if before that Plan is implemented, and he understands there is an industry

coming in District 9, and he asked if they had to have a special requirement. He stated that he knows it now is general building and he didn't think there were any restrictions.

Miss Smith replied that Deputy Warden Gaetz' district is also not included.

Deputy Warden Gaetz replied that he understood that but he's wondering if he's getting himself in a schmozzle by not including it. Right now he wouldn't want to specify you can have an industry here, there or some other particular area.

Miss Smith replied that she thinks, unfortunately, this was presented to Council at some earlier point and they recommended that a hearing be held and Planning were instructed to hold a hearing on only the districts she mentioned to Council. She thinks that Planning cannot add Deputy Warden Gaetz' district to that at this point.

Deputy Warden Gaetz stated that as he sees is now, industry can come in there and there's nothing can prevent them so why should he have to have industrial zoning in order to give them rights to come there. As it is now, he feels they're perfectly at liberty to come there unless we get opposition from nearby residents.

Miss Smith stated that's right, well this has nothing to do with Deputy Warden Gaetz' district, so he's perfectly safe.

Councillor Sutherland asked what the consequence might be of instituting this By-Law. He asked if we are getting a By-Law into a district which already had an industrial use in effect. It means the use becomes non-conforming at that particular time, except for forestry. In this case, he asked wouldn't it accept the operations of the Barrett Lumber Mill?

Mr. Gough replied that technically it might. (Inaudible)

Councillor Sutherland stated that what he was wondering is in fact if we have any obligation to proceed with trying to protect an industry that has operated in an area and has built up an equity in a property and he's wondering if, in fact, you know we had any obligation to proceed with a hearing. In other words, we would take the application for rezoning rather than letting the property owner come forward in a couple of years time just to apply for zoning on his industrial use.

Mr. Gough replied, that well we haven't endeavoured to identify how many industrial uses would be non-conforming. He stated that it would be an interesting exercise.

Councillor MacKenzie: Inaudible.

Miss Smith stated well if they would like to amend the Regional Development Plan, certainly, we would have no power to change it.

Councillor MacKenzie asked okay now we've had an industry that was interested in locating in his particular district and there was a hundred acres of land made available to that particular industry, could that, at a later date, be subdivided and a second industry move on that lot of land?

Miss Smith replied that that's something you'd have to have answered by the Department of Municipal Affairs. She wouldn't like to comment on that.

Councillor MacKenzie asked if she didn't know whether that could be subdivided or not? It seemed to him if you have a hundred acres of land and it's serviced for one industry it would be sensible to centralize it and put a second industry on that.

Warden Settle stated that it would seem to him this hundred acres is merely an idea to keep the industry more or less in one location rather than be scattered all over.

Councillor MacKenzie: Inaudible.

Councillor Lichter stated that Miss Smith had indicated that the districts that come under the Zoning By-Law now, for outside of those districts a hundred acres are required by the Regional Development Plan, but that's outside the Regional Development Boundary. Even if his district was to come under this By-Law it would not change that hundred acres requirement, would it?

Miss Smith replied in the negative.

Councillor Lichter replied okay, he just didn't want the implication to stay there, thank you.

Councillor Walker asked can an industrial use repair or alter the buildings that they're in? Inaudible.

Solicitor Cragg: Inaudible.

Councillor Walker stated that the point is an industrial use in his particular district would the,

say, the (inaudible) in Hubbards would be in an unzoned area. Would they have to apply for a rezoning to alter or repair that building?

Solicitor Cragg: Inaudible.

Councillor Walker asked if any consideration was given to that at all by the Planning Staff.

Miss Smith replied that well, Planning didn't change - that's the way the By-Law has read for, since 1974 and it's also applied to your district for some time. That was one of the things we were instructed to do, we only changed the last paragraph.

Councillor Walker: Inaudible.

Warden Settle: Yeah.

Councillor Walker asked if the Industrial Committee has given any consideration to (Inaudible).

Warden Settle asked if the Industrial Committee is pretty well the Pac with some variations. He then asked Councillor Lawrence to respond.

Councillor Lawrence stated that no, she was afraid they haven't. She thinks that's quite a good point Councillor Walker is raising and the Industrial Committee did not look at the wording of the By-Law in the extension of the coverage of it. They did not look at 49(b) for example, the one that you're reading from, she must admit, and she doesn't know - She doesn't think Dorothy actually answered the question about whether there'd been any difficulties with existing industrial uses, non-conforming industrial uses in districts where the industrial By-Law applies, it might have had difficulty getting building permits, for example, for repair.

Miss Smith stated that she hadn't had any zone applications in the five years that she has been here.

Councillor Lawrence stated that she couldn't recall any.

Miss Smith stated that the Building Inspector would really be able to tell you that better than she could but she's not had any applications for industrial zoning on existing industrial uses so she would assume there has not been any problem.

Solicitor Cragg: Inaudible.

Councillor Walker stated that the whole point here is he's not objecting to the zoning of the Industrial Park, as a matter of fact he is pleased to have it in his district, but there are several industrial uses (inaudible). But there are several industries in the area and he feels they need protection. He would like to see the Planning Committee (inaudible).

Warden Settle stated that there is a motion on the floor by Councillor Walker that says the entire zoning be deferred.

Councillor Lawrence: (Inaudible)...for Councillor Walker to consider is that this goes against the whole principle of non-conforming uses, which applies to every one of our zoning By-Laws. The fact that a use in existence before a zone is changed or before zoning came in can proceed along as it is for as long as it continues to exist but if there is any substantial change to it it then needs to be rezoned to conform. She doesn't think, it seems to her she supposes she is getting into legal opinions, that we could alter it for one By-Law and not for others but she would like to have the solicitor's opinion. She doesn't know whether Council could exempt, because of this By-Law, could they exempt some uses from the whole process of non-conformity or whatever.

Solicitor Cragg: Inaudible.

Councillor Lawrence stated that she thinks Councillor Walker has raised a good point about to what extent could you repair a building and it wouldn't be, you know, structurally changed, it wouldn't be enlarged. If you had to put on a new roof or something would that mean you had to rezone and she doesn't know whether the intent, when this was drafted by the previous solicitor, was to automatically bring in non-conforming uses to make them rezone, whether the Building By-Law's provision that if something is destroyed more than 50 percent then the site has to be rezoned.

Warden Settle stated that he doesn't think a new roof would -

Councillor Lawrence stated that no, but technically if it just says repair, and if you need a building permit to put on a new roof, you're caught up in the cogs of having to rezone unless there's been any rulings on how this would be applied, Section 49(b).

Solicitor Cragg: Inaudible.

Councillor Lawrence asked if the Solicitor could just read that again because that, she thinks, answers some of Councillor Walker's -

Solicitor Cragg stated that the operation or repair of any existing non-conforming building, provided that such alteration or repair will not materially increase the height, size or volume or change the use of such building or in any way contravene any provisions of this By-Law in the opinion of the Building Inspector - it starts off, so you know, if the roof blew off or something they could do it without having to -

Councillor Walker: Inaudible.

Solicitor Cragg asked if the concern is not really a legal one but one of speeding up the process.

Councillor Walker: Inaudible.

Solicitor Cragg stated that there has to be inherently a lot of discretion in dealing with such things as that. A lot of them are judgement calls.

Councillor Walker: Inaudible.

Solicitor Cragg stated that he thinks legally the process is proper and correct, it's just pretty time consuming.

Councillor Walker: Inaudible.

Councillor Deveaux stated that he'd like to agree with Councillor Lawrence. The way he reads 49(b), if he's going to erect something on a piece of land in question, he would have to presume, although not necessarily so, that there is nothing on that piece of land in which case he'd have to apply for the proper rezoning. If there is something existing on there and he wants to erect, alter or repair then he would have to presume the point Councillor Walker brought up, said it's non-conforming, in which case this is no different, as Councillor Lawrence pointed out, than many other zonings. If it's non-conforming, in many cases, commercial or various other types of zoning and he can't see us having a look at or changing this unless Council looks at non-conforming for every other type of zoning that's involved. He has no objections to that.

Councillor Sutherland stated that the point he wanted to make to Councillor Walker is the other side of the coin which says that if you establish a zone and there are several non-conforming uses within that zone then over a period of years you eventually sort of weed out the non-conforming uses and, you know, that's the other side of the coin. Councillor Walker refers to the one of the use being burned out, or something by fire and then trying to reestablish. What he's saying to Councillor Walker is if you establish a residential zone covering an area and there are several commercial uses operating within that zone okay, they're non-conforming and from the point of view they'd be undesirable in that residential zone. Now over a period of years technically some of those businesses should go out of use so you're getting back to the intended zone, the residential zone that you're trying to establish. You're eliminating those non-conforming uses, gradually over a period of time.

Councillor Topple stated that he was concerned also, as Councillor Walker is. He believes although he doesn't think we should be changing the zoning to eliminate uses. He doesn't necessarily agree with that. He thinks if we do change a zone then we should protect the use that is there and he would feel that what we really need is that section which covers damage beyond a certain percent to require a rezoning. He thinks we should change that to read that the building, no matter whether it burns right down, could be replaced to its same dimension, at least to allow that industry to continue to exist. He thinks that should apply to any zoning. That's one of the problems we ran into with that gentleman at Bedford, he thinks it was, who had the duplex under non-conforming use and had the By-Law read properly he thinks we wouldn't have put that gentleman through all the problems. He would think that's what perhaps the Industrial Committee should consider when they look at this By-Law.

Deputy Warden Gaetz stated that he was a bit confused with this industry that's supposed to be coming in District 9. He asked if they were going to be required to have a hundred acres. If it is why they're out. They might be on perhaps five acres of land, he doubts if they are. He stated that there is a meeting tomorrow night in conjunction with the Municipal Development Plan and actually perhaps this question's going to be asked of us, those 9, 10, 11, he doesn't know what other districts, but however - so he'd like to be able to give them a confirmed answer of some kind. Not taking on this industrial use zone - as it stands do we have to have a hundred acres for an industry to come in? He's a bit muddled up with this.

Warden Settle stated that he thinks that is a provincial regulation.

Deputy Warden Gaetz stated that that's what he's worried about right now.

Mr. Gough: Inaudible.

Deputy Warden Gaetz stated that that's the one he's referring to but he understands they're going to build - would you term it an industry? It's not a repair.

Mr. Gough: Inaudible.

Warden Settle stated that that sounds like a commercial operation.

Councillor Margeson stated that he's not just sure exactly how this thing will work and he'd like perhaps, to direct this question to somebody that's better informed than he is. Supposing Council agree with 49(e) and he sees District 15 is a portion of that, would that mean that we would be zoned I for Industrial 1 or I for Industrial 2 or I for Industrial P or would it be some other zone? If we accepted this and somebody came in to operate the Industrial Park, for example, in District 15?

Mr. Gough: Inaudible.

Councillor Margeson asked what zone is that outlined in green. No Zone, okay.

Mr. Gough: Inaudible.

Councillor Margeson asked Mr. Gough what they would be called.

Mr. Gough: Inaudible.

Councillor Margeson stated that something in the I zone, okay, thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

Councillor Lachance asked on a point of clarification what happens in his area, for example, where he has an Industrial use which is falling into non-use, although the plant is still there it's not under operation. I was referring to the rock quarry down on Ponderosa Drive. Could he reopen without an application to rezone?

Mr. Gough: Inaudible.

Councillor Lachance stated that by non-operation he means he's operating but not commercially. Would that be a change - if a person's cutting stone for his own use or not working at the level of full capacity?

Mr. Gough: Inaudible.

Warden Settle stated that as stated previously, this is a public hearing. He then asked if there were any letters or comments before we call the people down.

Mr. Kelly replied that he had one letter dated May 28, 1979 and addressed to the Municipal Clerk, Mr. Kenneth Meech. "Please be advised I am unable to attend the public hearing on the Industrial Zone this evening. I wish to continue to have my district included in this as it has in the past. Sincerely Francene Cosman, Councillor District 17."

Warden Settle then asked for anyone in the audience who was in favour of this amendment to come to the microphone. Hearing no response, he then asked for anyone from the audience who was opposed to come to the microphone. Hearing no response, he then stated that it is now a matter for Council to decide.

Councillor Walker stated that he's not down on the application itself. He feels it's a good thing. As a matter of fact, he feels that his district has saved some lot of difficulty since it's been in. His point is there's a lot of alterations he would like to make to it and how he would go about doing that he would ask -

Solicitor Cragg stated that we can always amend it further but we're in a position tonight where certain districts will have this amendment applied to them. You can opt out but you cannot opt in tonight.

Councillor Walker stated that by no means did he want to opt out. He just wants some improvements, that's all.

Warden Settle stated that all you want, he believes, is some protection to your present.

Solicitor Cragg stated that there can always be future amendments. Say this passes tonight, there can always be further amendments.

Warden Settle stated that he wants to be assured. He just doesn't want to talk about it tonight and forget about it.

Solicitor Cragg stated that any By-Law is amendable at any time.

Councillor Walker asked how does he go about getting this back into the Committee level, back to

Planning and back to the Industrial Committee.

Solicitor Cragg asked without passing it tonight?

Councillor Walker stated without passing it tonight. He feels a stall at this point would probably push this whole issue along a little further.

Solicitor Cragg stated that there are several motions - you can have one to postpone, defer, defer to a Committee.

Councillor Walker stated that probably a motion just to defer it back to the Industrial Committee for their feelings on it and probably some other amendments that could be implemented into the Zoning By-Law as such. So move Warden.

Warden Settle stated that we have a motion to defer this back to the Industrial Committee.

Councillor Lawrence asked if there is a seconder for that motion first of all. She will vote against this motion to defer, not because she's opposed to the idea of considering alterations to this By-Law but she thinks the reason we're here tonight is that some districts discovered that they were not covered by the provisions of this By-Law and had previously thought they were. There is at least one whole new entire district who wanted to opt into the coverage of this By-Law and she would urge the rest of Council to pass this amendment to the Zoning By-Law tonight perhaps to be followed by a recommendation to the Industrial Committee or Planning Committee or whatever, that either of those committees look at possible future improvements or changes to this By-Law to make it clearer and to make it fairer but she would think that some districts who want the coverage of this By-Law would be most unhappy at the prospect of waiting, perhaps another month or so, before they could get that coverage.

Councillor Eisenhauer stated that he can't support the motion either because first is that Councillor Walker's territory is now in effect and therefore by deferring the motion it does not change his status but it certainly is going to affect his own, one half of District 18, and he thinks that to change the wording of 49(b) is certainly going to be under debate as well because we do have some potential operations that, if expanded, can get out of hand and we certainly don't want to take the teeth out of the By-Law. But he would vote against the motion because it would leave the rest of us shorthanded in the meantime while we go back into further debate.

Solicitor Cragg stated that if he could just clarify what he said to Councillor Walker. We can refer to it, if you want, but the substance of the amendment cannot be changed other than a district that is shown as opting in, in the proposed amendment, can opt out. No one else can opt in and that's all that can be done. We can't change what we have advertised in any way, shape or form. It can be referred and discussed and discuss further amendments at some future time. The amendment as advertised is going to have to be as is except that some district can opt out.

Councillor Deveaux stated that he can't support the motion either on the same basis as Councillor Lawrence and Councillor Eisenhauer stated. You know, he's like to see, with all due respect to Councillor Walker's motion, he would like to see Council approve this this evening and then Councillor Walker can bring in a motion, he doesn't know if that can be done this evening, but certainly, if not, at the next Council Session that it be referred and reviewed by the PAC and Industrial Committee or whichever committee he wishes to refer it to and bring back a recommendation for changes at that time.

Councillor Topple: Inaudible. (Microphone not turned on).

Warden Settle stated that he supposed all we can have is some agreement. He's sure the PAC would - he asked if that was agreeable as a seconder.

Councillor Lither said yes, he maybe a bit late but he just wanted to put this whole thing in perspective. He believes two months or so ago we debated this topic extensively in Council. At that time he was given the courtesy to stay out of it because he wanted his district out of it on the basis of what the people were saying. He doesn't think he has the right now to take any particular Councillor and his district that wanted to be under this particular By-Law and defeat their intention when they had good intentions bringing this to us. So he has to support the passing of this particular amendment.

Deputy Warden Gaetz stated that just how is this going to go, those people who are very much concerned so far as planning and rezoning and what not concerns with the County now. It looks to him as though we might be jumping the gun. Those people now are in the process of bringing a recommendation to us as far as all the zoning is concerned, he understands they are, so it doesn't appear to him that until we hear from some of those people, and we are holding meetings, we're holding one now Thursday night, he thinks we have to attend on tomorrow evening concerning how the people think in our area so eventually they'll be able to present their views to Council as a whole. It kind of seems to him that we're sort of rushing the growler here. He doesn't know, perhaps he's all confused in what he's saying. He was certainly wholeheartedly behind

Councillor Walker in that it be deferred for the time being or referred to the Industrial Committee, he thinks, for further consideration. Now he's really confused tonight whether he should support this or not.

Warden Settle stated that he thinks there has been some agreement that the Industrial Committee will take a look at, perhaps, some revision of the non-conforming uses, which he believes is what Councillor Walker is basically interested in.

Councillor Sutherland stated that for the benefit of Deputy Warden Gaetz, maybe he would try and clarify what they're saying. If you're district comes in under this By-Law and what it means is that before industrial use sets up you're required to have a public hearing on industrial use in your district. It's not going to change a thing. In other words, as it stands now, ten chances to one there will be no public hearings for the people to voice their opinion. If you accept this By-Law as being part of your district then you are required to have a public hearing on the industrial use. Okay?

It was moved by Councillor Lawrence and seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT Section 49(e), Industrial Uses Section of the Zoning By-Law be hereby amended and the provisions of Section 49(b), 49(c) and 49(d) shall apply to Districts 1, 3, 6, 7, 7A, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Walker and seconded by Councillor Topple:

"THAT the matter be referred to the Planning Advisory Committee and the Industrial Committee to consider concern expressed re the approval."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Sutherland and seconded by Councillor Topple:

"THAT Council adjourn."
Motion Carried.

I N D E X

Attached Housing By-Law - Public Hearing - Motion -----	18
Bedford Service Commission - River Management Board - Motion -----	1
Bedford - Approval of Land Donation - Motion -----	3
Building Inspector - Approval of Report - Motion -----	3
Bedford - Letter re Controlled Access Highway - Motion -----	17
Board of Public Utilities - Application- Motion -----	19
Beaverbank-Kinsac Elementary School - Submission - Motion -----	20
CUPE Local 1083 - Approval of Agreement -----	7
Director of Planning and Development - Report re Municipal Development Plan Meeting - Motion- -----	3
Dog Constables - Appointment - Motion -----	6
Director of Planning and Development - Approval of Report - Motion -----	17
Dog Constables - Appointment - Motion -----	21 - 22
French Program - Cost Sharing - Motion -----	4
Finance and Executive Committee - Approval of Special Report - Motion -----	20 - 21
Finance and Executive Committee - Approval of Report - Motion -----	21
Illegal Dumps and Rodent Control - Report - Motion -----	6 - 7
Issuing Resolution - Approval re DREE Projects - Resolution -----	21
Letter - From the Minister of Municipal Affairs - Motion -----	2
Letter - Re Dump Sites and Rodent Control - Motion -----	7
Letter - To the Metropolitan Transit Commission re Funding - Motion -----	8 - 9
Letter - Re Roadside Spraying - Motion -----	9
Law Enforcement Officer - Appointment - Motion -----	21
Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary -----	1
Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary -----	8
Motion - Approval of April 3rd Council Minutes -----	1
Motion - Approval of Revisal Sections -----	1
Motion - Bedford Service Commission re River Management Board -----	1
Motion - Re Letter from the Minister of Municipal Affairs -----	2
Motion - Letter re Stocking of Lakes -----	2
Motion - Amendment re Massage Parlour Zone -----	2
Motion - Letter re Spraying Policy -----	2
Motion - Review re Spraying Policy -----	2
Motion - Report from the Director of Planning & Development re Municipal Development Plan Meeting -----	3
Motion - Approval of Planning Advisory Committee Report -----	3
Motion - Report from Councillor Poirier -----	3
Motion - Approval of Public Hearing re Application #8-78 -----	3
Motion - Approval of Land Donation Oakmount Park - Bedford -----	3
Motion - Approval of Planning Advisory Committee Supplementary Report -----	3
Motion - Approval of Building Inspector Report -----	3
Motion - Approval of Public Works Committee Report -----	3
Motion - Approval of Municipal School Board Report -----	4
Motion - Cost Sharing re French Program in Schools -----	4
Motion - Involvement re Maritime Energy Corporation -----	4 - 5
Motion - Additional Funding re Regional Transit -----	5
Motion - Meeting re Municipal Spraying Officials -----	6
Motion - Appointment of Dog Constables -----	6
Motion - Report re Illegal Dumps and Rodent Control -----	6 - 7
Motion - Letter re Dump Sites and Rodent Control -----	7
Motion - Approval of Agreement re CUPE Local 1083 -----	7
Motion - Adjournment -----	7
Motion - Adjournment -----	22
Motion - Approval of April 17th Public Hearing Minutes -----	8
Motion - Approval of April 3rd Council Session Minutes -----	8
Motion - Letter to the Metropolitan Transit Commission re Funding -----	8 - 9
Motion - Letter re Roadside Spraying -----	9
Motion - Report re Sackville River Watershed Advisory Committee -----	10 - 13
Motion - Approval of the SPC Report -----	13
Motion - Meeting for Application re Public Utilities Board -----	17
Motion - Approval of Warden's Report -----	17
Motion - Approval of Director of Planning & Development Report -----	17
Motion - Approval of Planning Advisory Committee Report -----	17
Motion - Letter re Controlled Access Highway Bedford -----	17

Motion - Public Hearing re Attached Housing By-Law -----	18
Motion - Public Hearing re Application #7-79 -----	18
Motion - Request for Report re Regional Parks -----	18
Motion - Approval of Planning Advisory Committee Supplementary Report -----	18
Motion - Public Hearing re Application #11-79 -----	18
Motion - Approval of Public Works Committee Report -----	18 - 19
Motion - Application re Board of Public Utilities -----	19
Motion - Approval of School Capital Program Committee Report -----	20
Motion - Submission re Beaverbank-Kinsac Elementary School -----	20
Motion - List re Unsatisfactory Products -----	20
Motion - Approval of Finance & Executive Committee Special Report -----	20 - 21
Motion - Approval of Finance & Executive Committee Report -----	21
Motion - Appointment of Law Enforcement Officer -----	21
Motion - Appointment of Representative re Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities Conference -----	21
Motion - Appointment of Dog Constables -----	21 - 22
Planning Advisory Committee - Approval of Report - Motion -----	3
Public Hearing - Apporval re Application #8-78 - Motion -----	3
Planning Advisory Committee - Approval of Supplementary Report - Motion -----	3
Public Works Committee - Approval of Report - Motion -----	3
Public Utilities Board - Meeting re Application - Motion -----	17
Planning Advisory Committee - Approval of Report - Motion -----	17
Public Hearing - Attached Housing By-Law - Motion -----	18
Public Hearing - Application #7-79 - Motion -----	18
Planning Advisory Committee - Approval of Supplementary Report - Motion -----	18
Public Hearing - Application #11-79 - Motion -----	18
Public Works Committee - Approval of Report - Motion -----	18 - 19
Recording Secretary - Appointment - Motion -----	1
Recording Secretary - Appointment - Motion -----	8
Revisal Sections - Approval - Motion -----	1
Regional Transit - Additional Funding - Motion -----	5
Regional Parks - Request for Report - Motion -----	18
Resolution - Approval of Temporary Borrowing re DREE Projects -----	21
Resolution - Temporary Borrowing re Booster Pumping Station, Bedford -----	21
Resolution - Issuing Resolution re DREE Projects -----	21
Stocking of Lakes - Letter - Motion -----	2
Spraying Policy - Letter - Motion -----	2
Spraying Policy - Review - Motion -----	2
Sackville River Watershed Advisory Committee - Report - Motion -----	10 - 13
S.P.C. - Approval of Report - Motion -----	13
School Capital Program Committee - Approval of Report - Motion -----	20
Temporary Borrowing - Approval re DREE Projects - Resolution -----	21
Temporary Borrowing - Approval re Booster Pumping Station, Bedford - Resolution -----	21
Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities - Appointment of Representative - Motion -----	21
Warden's Report - Approval - Motion -----	17

THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX

MINUTES OF MAY COUNCIL SESSION

Tuesday, May 1, 1979

Warden Settle opened the May 1st Session at 2:00 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer followed by Mr. Bensted calling the roll.

It was moved by Councillor Baker and seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT Mrs. Sandra Cashen be appointed as recording secretary."
Motion Carried.

Mr. Bensted took a moment to advise Council that he and his wife spent 14 days at Orlando, Florida and they appreciated the holiday very much but on arrival home, Nova Scotia looked very good to them.

Councillor MacKenzie mentioned the accident which took place involving Councillor Williams. He stated that the reason for the accident was the fact that he had bought an 8 foot fibreglass boat and it was due to that particular size and make of punt that Councillor Williams almost lost his life and there should be a law against those size fibreglass boats being sold.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT the Minutes of April 3rd, 1979 Council Session be approved."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Lachance requested that he be allowed to add an item to the Agenda and Council agreed. The item was regarding the closing of illegal dumps within the Municipality to be dealt with at the end of the Agenda.

Councillor Benjamin suggested that Council should have a report pertaining to the situation at the Correction Centre and asked that that be on the Agenda for today. Councillor Cosman stated that she would vote against that and as it requires unanimous consent by Council it may not be added to the Agenda.

It was moved by Councillor Walker and seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT the following revisal sections be approved: 7A, 8, 9, 10, 12, 18 and 20."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Walker and seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT the new agreement with CUPE 1083 be approved."
(See deferral)

Councillor Deveaux stated that at the last meeting it was agreed that Council would be given some details as to the agreement.

Mr. Bensted suggested that if Council were to go into detail it should go 'in camera' because it is under negotiation. While there is tentative agreement it should not be discussed in public until it is approved.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT this item be deferred to the last item on the Agenda."
Motion Carried.

Mr. Bensted stated that some items of correspondence are on the Agenda and he has also received a request from the Bedford Service Commission requesting permission to appear before Council at the next session with respect to the proposed River/Lake Management Board for the Sackville River.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT the Bedford Service Commission be heard at the May 15th Session re proposed River Management Board."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Cosman spoke of the letter from the Department of Municipal Affairs from the Minister about contract zoning. She stated that it mentioned that they will be meeting with Council at some point later this year and that part of the County submission would be to address the question of contract zoning. She asked if this had been turned over to the Planning staff or who is looking after the submission Council will make.

Mr. Bensted answered that each Municipality will be contacted and advised as to when they will be able to make a submission before the Committee. No official communication has yet been received.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT the letter of April 11, 1979 from the Minister of Municipal Affairs be referred to the Planning Advisory Committee and ask them to come back with recommendations."
Motion Carried.

Solicitor Cragg advised that he just received a letter from the Solicitor for the Dept. of Municipal Affairs and they advised that they could not recommend that Council be given the authority to contract zone until Council has a plan.

Councillor Margeson noted that in the letter from Ross Alexander, the Recreational Fisheries Biologist, Fisheries and Environment Canada are not endowed with a lot of money. They would like to broaden the scope of their program and would be looking to County Council for some encouragement and perhaps Council should go to the provincial Minister of Environment recommending the stocking of lakes in and about this area.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson and seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT a letter go to the provincial Minister of Tourism with a copy to the federal Minister of Fisheries encouraging the continual program of stocking lakes."
Motion Carried.

Councillor McCabe inquired whether an acknowledgement of the letter to the Premier has been received regarding the increased cost of power and energy. Mr. Bensted replied that the letter had been written and an acknowledgement had been received from the Minister of Labour but nothing had been received from the Premier.

Councillor MacKenzie said he was quite concerned about the letter received from Mr. Holgate. He feels it should be pointed out to such people that there are many areas of the Municipality that are not served by any department of any Directors such as they have on the Eastern Shore and on the South Shore. He inquired where Council received the suggestion or recommendation that a Department of Tourism be established.

Mr. Bensted replied that the suggestion came from the floor of Council and was approved by a resolution of Council. He stated that a letter was being written to Mr. Holgate advising him that the program being embarked upon will not interfere with any existing programs but will serve some areas which are not covered by any of the Area Associations.

Councillor Lachance noted that this department has no budget and it does not involve any substantial amount of money from the Municipality.

Councillor Deveaux stated that at the last meeting of the Recreation and Tourism Association, the heads of Eastern Shore and South Shore Tourist Association attended and the problems, hopefully, were ironed out. They had no objection, at that time, to some work being done in the urban area where the efforts will be concentrated.

There was more discussion regarding the subject of this letter.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Topple:

"THAT the Solicitor be instructed to prepare a draft amendment to the Commercial Zoning By-Law re proposed "Massage Parlour Zone" for submission to Council."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Topple stated that he is not satisfied with the reply by L.F. Kirkpatrick of the Nova Scotia Power Corporation to Council's letter regarding the spraying of transmission line rights-of-way in the County.

It was moved by Councillor Topple and seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT a letter be sent to the Minister of Environment with a copy to the Premier and Mr. Kirkpatrick requesting the Department to review the policy re spraying by the Nova Scotia Power Corporation."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Eisenhauer and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT pending a review of the spraying policy by the Nova Scotia Power Corporation, that any time spraying is carried out the public be so advised, particularly near residential areas."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Walker and seconded by Councillor Williams:

"THAT the report of Councillor Poirier re her visit to the Emergency Measures College be received."
Motion Carried.

There was much discussion regarding the schedule for public meetings to be held regarding the Municipal Development Plan.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman and seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT the Report of the Director of Planning re Public Meetings regarding the proposed Municipal Development Plan be approved as amended."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Wiseman stated that as far as the Sackville Councillors are concerned they feel it would be more beneficial to have one meeting in Sackville rather than to split them up into three districts so they would like that meeting for Sackville to be held at Knox Church Hall on June 14th.

Councillor Cosman suggested that July 4th would be a better date for the Bedford public meeting.

Mr. Gough of the Planning Department advised that all of the meeting places, with the exception of Knox Church are Municipal Schools and all those dates have been tentatively agreed on. The Planning Department sees no reason, if the school is available, that the times could not be changed. Clearance is required by the Board of Education and the school administrators.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT the date of the Bedford meeting be changed to July 4, 1979."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman and seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT the date for the public meeting for Sackville be moved to June 14, 1979."
Motion Carried.

There was a great deal of discussion between Councillors and the Director of Planning, Mr. Gough, with regard to the amount of time and expense which was involved in the public meetings.

It was moved by Councillor Lawrence and seconded by Councillor Eisenhower:

"THAT the Report of the Planning Advisory Committee be approved."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Eisenhower and seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT a Public Hearing re Application #8-78 be held on May 28, 1979 at 7:00 p.m."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Eisenhower:

"THAT Council accept title to parcel P-1, Oakmount Park, Bedford subject to checking of title by the Solicitor and subject to the district being responsible for future costs of improvement and maintenance."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Lawrence and seconded by Councillor Topple:

"THAT the Supplementary Report of the Planning Advisory Committee be approved."
Motion Carried.

There was discussion between Councillors regarding the Task Force Main Street Program.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Topple:

"THAT the Report of the Building Inspector be approved."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT the Report of the Public Works Committee re Street Paving with the addition of Panorama Lane, Bedford be approved."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Lachance and seconded by Councillor Poirier:

"THAT the Report of the Municipal School Board be approved."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Lachance noted that the report speaks for itself and it's a tough pill to swallow and he suggested that all members of Council read it and re-read it. The School Board has attempted to outline the alternatives that are open. Although it was a wise move it was also a costly move and with money being tight the overall picture must be looked at. He feels that it would be advisable, from an academic point of view, to continue the program and expand upon it as outlined but the cost is very high. From a monetary and political point of view the worth of the program to the Municipality must be looked at.

Council discussed the contents of this report at length.

Councillor MacKenzie suggested that a reserve fund, in some way, should be started to upgrade high schools in the Municipality.

Councillor Wiseman suggested that remedial teaching should be looked after before French is considered for grades 4 to 6.

Councillor Lachance responded that these arguments are valid but by taking away the French education system it does not necessarily mean the money would be re-allocated for another program. The money was set up specifically for the purpose of teaching French. Whether it is taken or not taken. If it is not taken then the money is lost.

Councillor Deveaux objected strenuously to the contents of the Report of the School Board and spoke at length against the funding for French Language instruction.

Councillor Williams voiced his disapproval of the report. He stated that it was unfortunate that the program will cost the County more money and people in his district have already paid out of their own pockets so that they may have their children acquire the French language but the schools in his district do not have the program.

Councillors Lawrence, Baker and Topple spoke on the subject and Councillor Lachance responded. He stated that there is a record of schools which are lined up in identification of the need to introduce this program into the schools and have had a positive response from parents and students to the program. He stated that the School Board is trying to keep the matter up front and present all the facts and figures before Council. Council has the option to disallow the funds which would be their portion of the continuing program and thereby rule out the program. The School Board is pushing for the program because it's a need that has been identifying and serving a need which the people have indicated they want.

Councillors Smith, Fader and Margeson spoke of the pros and cons of the program.

Warden Settle reminded Council that they were only asked to approve this report.

It was moved by Councillor Lachance and seconded by Councillor Lawrence:

"THAT Council write to the Union of Municipalities and the School Board Association of Nova Scotia asking that the provincial Department of Education be requested to make the French Program from Primary through Grade 6 made a full cost sharing program under the Foundation Program."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT Council adjourn from 4:30 until 6:00 p.m."
Motion Carried.

Council reconvened at 6 p.m. and Mr. Bensted called the roll.

It was moved by Councillor Lawrence and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT the following resolution as amended re Maritime Energy Corporation and possible nuclear plants be adopted: 'Be it resolved that the Council write the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy and all Halifax County MLA's respecting opposition to this Province's involvement in the Maritime Energy Corporation if this involves nuclear plants or nuclear waste facilities in Nova Scotia unless adequate public hearings are held to discuss the potential health, environmental and economic hazards.'" ('opposition' to read concern') Motion, as amended, Carried.

Councillor Lawrence noted that it must be obvious that this is a topical issue right now because of the amount of coverage which had been given to the Harrisburg incident.

Councillor Lachance inquired whether there is enough knowledge at the moment that the public are in a position to respond to a public hearing.

Councillor Cosman pointed out the many hazards connected to such nuclear projects.

Councillor Williams stated that he could not support the motion. He said we have the second highest energy cost in Canada and the facts must be faced. He felt the senior level of government would not allow the Province to enter an agreement which will be detrimental to the health of the people of the Province.

Several Councillors expressed their views concerning nuclear power plants for energy and the pros and cons, hazards, unknown consequences and alternate sources of energy.

It was moved by Councillor Walker and seconded by Councillor Williams:

"THAT the word 'opposition' in the original motion be amended to read 'concern'."
Motion Carried.

Council adjourned for public hearing.

Council resumed after public hearing.

Councillor Deveaux spoke of funding for the new Regional Transit System, particularly in his area, in the past several months he brought in a motion that some of the money that was allotted to Bedford and Sackville be split throughout the County. Not being successful in that he holds no animosity towards Bedford and Sackville. He may have to opt out of the system unless more funds are made available to cost share in the program.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux and seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT the Minister of Municipal Affairs be requested to provide extra funding towards Regional Transit System for Eastern Passage, Cole Harbour, Herring Cove and Harrietsfield."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Williams asked if he hadn't just read where the Provincial Government had recently funded the Regional Transit System and Councillor Deveaux replied that that money was already spent and what he is requesting is additional money.

There was further discussion between Councillors.

Councillor Deveaux brought up the subject of education costs. Prior to the election of 1974 Mr. Regan promised that the Province would take over all education costs. Since that time our present Premier mentioned that fact over the years, between 1974 and 1978. It seems that the property owner is the one who is paying the largest share of the education costs.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux and seconded by Councillor Topple:

"THAT a letter be sent to the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Education requesting that the Provincial Government take over all costs of education."
Motion Defeated.

Councillor Lichter said that there are certain areas in Nova Scotia referred to as the amalgamated areas in which there is no area rate for education. They are not getting the kind of education under those jurisdictions as the people in Halifax County. If the Provincial Government should take over the cost of education all areas would be facing the same kind of hardships. The students in Halifax County are enjoying far more advantages in education than those in other areas.

Councillor Eisenhower stated that at the moment the Province has taken over one hundred per cent of the residential shareable costs but not that of the commercial costs.

Councillor Deveaux replied that the Province determines which is shareable and which is not and perhaps it's still costing the County more money than before the shareable cost was taken over.

Councillor Topple suggested that one of the problems the Government is faced with is lacks of funds and in that regard he suggested that it be suggested to them that they take the money out of the Atlantic Lottery and the Provincial Lottery.

There was further debate between Councillors concerning the pros and cons of the Provincial Government assuming all education costs in the Province.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux and seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT a letter be sent to the Premier and to the Leader of the Opposition requesting that the funds derived from the recent increase in liquor and tobacco be used to reduce power costs in Nova Scotia."
Motion Defeated.

Councillor Eisenhower replied that if Council suggests this the Provincial Government could then suggest that the County apply their Dog Tax towards reducing the costs of power.

Further debate took place between Councillors before a vote on the motion was taken.

Councillor Benjamin introduced the subject of Municipal Spraying. He stated that this is an old item which was brought before Council in November in which Council decided to send a letter to Municipal Spraying Company requesting that a meeting be set up with two Councillors of the area. A reply has not been received from that company to this date. This company has caused many hazards, such as the colour of the water in the area, the problem of the trucks, the problem of the dust, the problem of the blasting and the effect that it's having on the nearby residents. It seems to him that District 14 is made up of gravel pits and crusher operations. There have been many problems because adequate controls have not been placed on these industries.

There was considerable discussion between Councillors regarding these operations.

It was moved by Councillor Benjamin and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT a letter be sent to Municipal Spraying officials requesting a meeting with Councillors Cosman and Benjamin with respect to their operation on the Bedford - Waverley Road."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Topple and seconded by Councillor Margeson:

"THAT the following persons be appointed as issuers of dog licenses:
District 7A - Mrs. Iona Elms and Mrs. Melva Harold
District 1 - Daniel Whittier
District 15 - Bill Buck, David Matthews, David Buck, Mark Matthews, Jamie Clarke, Robert Little, Ricky Dean, Harold Fenwick, Sandy Merrigan, Cathy Nicoll, and Mary-Lou Cann."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Lichter asked if any decisions had been reached on the appeal cases re capital charges re sewers and Mr. Bensted advised that Finance and Executive Committee will be meeting Monday and will be making a decision on the appeals at that time.

Councillor Lachance advised Council that the rodent population in his district is in excess of that which the Department of Health considers to be a normal or acceptable standard of rodents and it came to his mind that out of 21 districts there are only about 7 districts that have an accepted garbage disposal program hauling to the landfill site, which means that there is a substantial number of districts with illegal sanitary landfill sites or dumps within the districts other than the ones that go to the landfill site. The problem is that with that number of dumps operating in the area it's a question which relates to health affecting the Municipality as a whole. There have been a number of diseases in the area which are attributed directly to the population of rodents. Having recognized the problem Councillor Lachance feels that Council should try to get to the bottom of it and clear it up as soon as possible. He has requested the secretary of the Board of Health that he request a report from the provincial Department of Health re the closing of these types of dumps and proposing a program of rodent control. This report is to be coming to the Board of Health at the next meeting. The usual way in which this would proceed is that it would go to the Board of Health who would review it and make a recommendation and send it to Council. Council would then refer the report back to Finance and Executive because there is a question of dollars involved. Finance and Executive would deal with that and would then send it back to Council to be dealt with.

It was moved by Councillor Lachance and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT the Board of Health be requested to refer to the Finance and Executive Committee the Report from the provincial Department of Health with respect to illegal dumps and rodent control in Halifax County."
Motion Carried.

Councillor MacKenzie advised that his district has its' own garbage collection and disposal program and he feels that if they get into some other type of garbage disposal it will mean a tremendous cost to the taxpayers in his district. He doesn't feel that it is reasonable for people in Ecum Secum to have to carry their garbage to Sackville for disposal.

Councillor Topple reminded Council that Councillor Lachance was speaking of illegal dumps.

Councillor Smith stated that any dumps that are operating in the County are illegal because they cannot get a license to operate.

There was more discussion between Councillors regarding this problem before the question was called.

Councillor Williams suggested that Councillor Lachance visit the next meeting of the Board of Health for further information and suggestions to meet the problems which he has.

It was moved by Councillor Lachance and seconded by Councillor Topple:

"THAT Council direct a letter to the Minister of Health and the Minister of Environment to advise what type of assistance their departments would be able to provide the Municipality with respect to reclaiming dump sites and rodent control."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson and seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT Council go into Committee of the Whole."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Eisenhauer and seconded by Councillor Margeson:

"THAT Committee of the Whole go in camera."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson and seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer:

"THAT Committee of the Whole go back in to Council."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Eisenhauer and seconded by Councillor Lawrence:

"THAT Council approve the proposed Renewal Agreement between CUPE 1083 and the Municipality of the County of Halifax."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Walker and seconded by Deputy Warden Gaetz:

"THAT Council adjourn."
Motion Carried.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX.
MINUTES OF COUNCIL SESSION
Tuesday, May 15, 1979

Warden Settle opened the May 15th Session at 2 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer followed by Mr. Bensted calling the roll.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT Sandra Cashen be appointed as recording secretary."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Sutherland and seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT the minutes of April 17th Public Hearing be approved."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Baker and seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT the minutes of April 3rd Council Session be approved as amended." (See Motion to Amend) Motion Carried.

Councillor Cosman noted that two thirds down page 1 should read 'Steering Committee for the formation of the Halifax County Municipal Development Plan' and it should state that the Chairman of the Committee is Councillor Pat Lachance. The next paragraph should be clarified as the Steering Committee members being appointed by the Warden. Page 7 regarding remuneration, there was a request for a recorded vote and the recorded vote is not reported in the minutes. Page 8, at the top of the page there was a motion that an item be referred back, that should read 'be referred', it's improper English.

Items to be added to Agenda:

Councillor Wiseman - Task Force Main Street and Budget re Sidewalks
Councillor Eisenhauer - Industrial Zoning and Boundary Lines
Councillor Cosman - Appointments for Dog License Sales and Sewer Fields
Councillor Deveaux - Unsightly Premises and Community Schools
Councillor Topple - Election Lists
Councillor McCabe - Highways
Councillor Baker - Control of Outboard Motors on Long Pond
Deputy Warden Gaetz - Small Businesses.

Councillor Wiseman noted that the Revisal Section is not on the Agenda and asked if that was to be covered today.

Warden Settle replied that the Election Act is before the Law Amendment Committee.
It was moved by Deputy Warden Gaetz and seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT the Agenda be closed."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Cosman noted that there is a letter from the Board of Trade as well which she circulated.

Councillor Sutherland questioned whether a specific request had been made to the Minister of Municipal Affairs with respect to additional funding for the extension of the transit services. He asked if a specific request was made for demonstration project funds or was the Minister just asked to provide some special assistance.

Mr. Bensted stated that his understanding of the resolution in Council was that additional funding had been requested.

Councillor Sutherland suggested that demonstration funds would be the practical approach.

Councillor Deveaux noted that the Minister mentioned additional transit service would, in his opinion, be for a new run, however, not being able to speak for the Minister, he isn't aware of what he means. Apparently the Metropolitan Transit Commission is the vehicle responsible for receiving application for extra funds. He stated he is not happy with the answer and he needs some more money regardless of where it comes from.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux and seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT a letter go to the Metropolitan Transit Commission requesting funding for demonstration projects in Eastern Passage, Cole Harbour and Herring Cove."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Lichter noted that there are two letters in the Agenda concerning roadside spraying. He expressed his concern about the spraying program that the Department of Agriculture has been carrying on for a number of years, at least in his District. There are documented cases of actual harm caused by this spraying to human beings and to livestock. Approaches have been made to the Department of Agriculture, to Premier Buchanan and to the Ombudsman with no luck. Everyone kept referring to the Minister of Agriculture. Councillor Lichter feels that the situation is quite serious, even though relevant departments claim that the chemicals are not poisonous. As a chemist, Councillor Lichter doesn't think there is any chemical that's non-poisonous. In a concentrated quantity, any chemical, even sodium chloride, common salt, can be harmful. The people who have been affected either directly or indirectly by livestock have been given the runaround by government departments. Councillor Lichter wrote to the Minister of Agriculture and has not received a reply.

It was moved by Councillor Lichter and seconded by Councillor Cosman:

"THAT a letter be sent to the Minister of Agriculture requesting roadside spraying be discontinued or at least controlled in areas where humans exist and/or where livestock graze. In addition, that the Minister be urged to compensate those owners who have reported and documented sufficiently that such roadside spraying caused harm to livestock and humans."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Williams stated that the Department of Highways, to his knowledge, do not spray any longer since they brought the cutters in and Councillor Lichter replied that it is the Department of Agriculture that is doing the spraying and the last spraying was July 4, 1978. He is afraid that the same thing will happen this coming July.

Councillor Lawrence inquired if this had anything to do with weed control and stated that the report of the Weed Inspector is in the back of the Agenda reporting on specific weeds in specific locations.

Councillor Lichter stated that he is not objecting to the selected kind of spraying where livestock cannot be affected. When a truck goes on the road and sprays indiscriminately, this is the type of spraying to which he is objecting.

Councillor Toppie reminded Council that there was a letter from the Department of Highways which stated that they do not spray along the highways themselves, but the concern that they should have, moreso than this, is with the Power Corporation who said they will not stop their spraying on their rights-of-way and they spray all over the country, affecting wildlife and cattle. The reply from the Department of Environment is of concern to Councillor Toppie where they say they are responsible to ensure the operations associated with biocide use in the Province are carried out in a manner which prevents undue degradation of the environment but he wonders whether they're concerned about people.

Councillor McCabe said he would support the motion of Councillor Lichter but he is not optimistic about it. He was assured by those concerned that the spray is not harmful.

Councillor Lichter replied he doesn't care who hires the Department of Agriculture to spray the roadside and asked Council to support his motion and if it gets nowhere he stated that he's going to start the most lengthy publicity campaign through the newspapers that he can get.

Councillor Smith stated that in the correspondence on the Agenda of May 1st, there is a letter from the Honourable Tom McInnes in reply to a letter from Council in which he indicates that spraying has been stopped since 1977 along the roadside and she feels that the area concerned should be spelled out.

Warden Settle replied that this spraying was being done by the Department of Agriculture rather than by the Department of Highways.

Deputy Warden Gaetz inquired whether any livestock had died from this spraying and Councillor Lichter replied that he has a veterinarian's finding's on two sheep. Both of them indicate that the animals were healthy up to one day when they were examined and the next day they were dead.

It was moved by Councillor Walker and seconded by Councillor MacKenzie:

"THAT Council adjourn for supper from 5 to 6:30 p.m."
Motion Defeated.

It was moved by Councillor Lichter and seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT sandwiches be brought in from 5:00 to 5:30 p.m."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Sutherland asked if the supplementary information to the water utility for the rate adjustment is just for information purposes at this stage and Mr. Bensted said there should be a resolution by Council.

Submission by the Bedford Service Commission re Sackville River Management Board:

JACK N. BATHURST: Mr. Warden, Councillors, the problems relating to the environment to the Sackville River Basin have been going on for some considerable time and I think the way that Councillor Lichten illustrated the frustration he's feeling about being bounced from Department to Department, the Bedford Service Council have felt the same thing over the Sackville River problems. And so, in fact, the Committee which I was asked to form, was really born out of frustration at a lack of action on the plumbing problems in Bedford and the siltation of the Bedford Basin. We've had continuous representations at the Bedford Service Council meetings over a period of 3 to 4 years, dozens of letters have been written to the Department of the Environment, various of our provincial departments, Central Mortgage and Housing, Nova Scotia Housing Commission, Ministry of the Environment, Federal Department of Fisheries, Department of Transport and all the time there's been a complete runaround on this thing and so this Committee, as I say, was born out of a sense of frustration. Shortly after we started we did get a letter, or a copy of a letter from some friends of the Department of the Environment, which referred to another matter which Council itself had been pressing for and that was the establishment of a Sackville River Management Board. I have a copy of a letter here where the County Council passed a resolution in January 1978 that the Province of Nova Scotia be requested to set up a Sackville River Management Board with representation on the Board from Halifax County and I gather that the Council received a response on February 6, 1978. We were very interested at that time and in July 1978 Councillor Cosman came with me to see the Deputy Minister of Environment and we raised this question with him then and, I'm not privy to Council's correspondence but to the best of my knowledge, I don't think that Mr. Carter has even bothered to acknowledge our visit or even to reply and so you can see the type of frustration with me. Then the letter that was brought to my attention is dated March 22nd, 1979 where again, which is apparently a reply to a letter from Mr. Bensted dated March 6th regarding the establishment of a Management Board of the Sackville River Basin which would be similar in nature to the Shubenacadie/Stewiacke River Basin Board. This letter points out that the Shubenacadie/Stewiacke River Basin is considered to be of national importance and therefore it qualifies under a Federal Program to establish the Board but the Sackville River doesn't and so the letter goes on, and I'll read it to you: "as an alternative to the establishment of a Federal/Provincial Board under Federal River Basin Program, I would suggest that Halifax County might wish to consider authorizing the establishment of a VOLUNTARY advisory body similar to the Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board which has been quite instrumental in developing and enhancing the water and related resources to meet a variety of needs for the residents of Dartmouth. Such a body could contain representation from the business community, academic groups, scientific institutions, environmental organizations, recreational clubs and interested citizens. I believe that such a group could be of great assistance to the County in fostering development that would maintain and enhance water and related resources in the Sackville River Basin." That was signed Roger S. Bacon. That letter led us to re-examine our position in the scheme of things. I'll read off now what the objectives of the Sackville River Watershed Action Committee was and is still: 'To preserve and/or improve the environmental quality of the Sackville and Middle Sackville Rivers, including all lakes and waters within the watershed area of these two rivers, the flood drain and that area of Bedford Basin affected by the discharge from these two rivers.' The composition of the Committee was that two members would be appointed by the Bedford Service Commission, there'd be two members from the Bedford Basin Yacht Club and, because we felt that this was a sort of regional matter there would be four members from the Sackville/Beaverbank area and the secretary of the Committee will be the Clerk Treasurer of the Bedford Service Commission. We had our first meeting to try and get started and organize ourselves and plan a campaign. At that time our intention was to try an action-oriented pressure group on provincial federal and municipal authorities to try and get some action on some of the many studies and recommendations that were being put into place and to make ourselves heard over the improvement, or preventing a further deterioration I should say, of this blighted waterway and its encroaching environment. But then when we saw Roger Bacon's letter it came to our attention that perhaps a change in direction would be a good thing because if, and I can't presuppose what the Council's decision would have been, if the Council chose to act on Roger Bacon's letter and create, as he suggests here, a VOLUNTARY ADVISORY BODY, then perhaps being in position as we were we could change course and suggest to Council that we might be the nucleus of that voluntary advisory board to give Council a chance to establish it. With that in mind, we got Mrs. Manzer, who is the Chairperson of the Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board, to come to talk to us and bring us literature on what the Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board does. Remember, Roger Bacon proposed them as being an example of what the County might model on. When we saw and heard her I think it became very obvious that before we could go ahead with any given course of action we'd have to come to Council to discuss the matter openly with Council and to find out whether, in fact, Council would be happy or would be willing to give us recognition as the official voluntary advisory body on the Sackville River. The reason we had to do this is that as an advisory body we are useless without professional and technical expertise. We have in mind one or two people from BIO, Civil Engineer, Legal, Hydrological fields whom we feel would be willing to work with us as a committee or be part of our committee so it would be a reasonable technical and professional capability to provide advice. I'd like to stress that the idea of the thing is to be supportive to Council. It is not, in any way, to try and usurp Council's authority. It's not intended in any way to take on any decision making role, it is purely an advisory role. We thought that by changing course and coming to this advisory position, if Council recognizes as such, similar to what the Dartmouth City Council recognizes the Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board, then as an advisory board we would be, hopefully, in a position to

be partners before decisions rather than to be an action body chasing and opposing decisions. One of the things that the Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board Chairman pointed out to us was that the City Council and/or its committees are very often called upon to make decisions on matters which do require a lot of investigation and as such they require a lot of time. Councillors have many, many other things to do and so Councillors are not always in a position to devote the amount of time needed to reach the correct, considered decision. The Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board acts as the investigatory body for the Committee of Council or the Council itself and reports back to them. Council or the Committee then deliberates on the question; Council for the Committee discusses the question and then Council of the Committee makes the decision, but it is an important decision. So I think this sums up our thinking in a nutshell. We also had an input from the Canada/Nova Scotia Flood Damage Limitation vehicle. Mr. Jones who is the Manager of that organization, Nova Scotia Flood Damage Reduction Program. They're currently mapping flood planing areas of 12 river basins in Nova Scotia. The Sackville River is being done as of this moment. That effort is detailed maps showing the hundred year flood probability area and the twenty year flood probability area. Incidentally, there is rather a technical point here which, in my ignorance, I didn't really understand. The meaning of the word a hundred year probability, according to their jargon, doesn't mean that you're only likely to get a flood of that magnitude once in a hundred years, it means that there is a one percent chance of that type of level of flood occurring and the same with the 20 year flood plane, there is a five percent chance of that flooding occurring, so that's just a little clarification, I think, on the terms 20 and 100 year flood planes. They are producing, as I say, these maps. I understand that once they have produced this the intention is that government financing bodies such as CMHC, the Nova Scotia Housing Commission, will not grant any loans for financial assistance for the construction or for any construction within the 20 year flood plane limit but they find out that they cannot stop self financing construction being placed in that zone. They also point out that people or firms who choose to erect and set up in that zone, after the areas have been designated, would not be eligible to disaster relief should there be any claims against flood damage and things like that. But that is only the teeth, apparently, they can put into this. Now I don't want to get into too many of the pros and cons, I do want to concentrate, at this stage, in trying to find out whether we, as a committee, should now be considering recruiting a good base of expert advice as membership. The Dartmouth Lakes Commission is 16 members - I'll read out shortly what their composition is - and whether Council will be prepared to then recognize the Sackville River Watershed Action Committee as an advisory body, in which case I would assume that we would change our title to being the Sackville River Watershed Advisory Committee. I would like to stress that we're not asking for one red cent from the Council. This would be, as its name implies, a VOLUNTARY body. We would hope to be able to supply Council with technical and professional advice to the limited capabilities of our own membership. Of course, if major studies were required, being a voluntary organization, any major studies would be outside the scope and realm of possibility of such a committee but then I don't think that that would be any different to what it is now where the Planning Advisory Committee or your various other committees, if they do need to engage consultants to do specific studies have to do it. Now the Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board - of course it is officially recognized by the Dartmouth City Council - the officers of the Board are as follows: The Board shall have a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman to be elected from amongst its members. Meetings - they've set up meetings. Relationship to the Council (this is the Dartmouth one), the Board shall make recommendations to City Council solely in an advisory capacity. All plans and programs affecting city lakes and their environment shall be referred to the Board for their consideration and recommendations to City Council. In other words, City Council undertakes to discuss matters affecting the lakes and the waters with the Board to see what their recommendations are. Then they've got relationship to City boards and departments. A member of Council shall also be appointed by the Mayor to serve on this Board. Well in our case, at the moment, being the Bedford Service Commission we have managed to coerce our Councillor, Francene Cosman, to be a member of our present committee, but the rest of this Board, in order to maintain the necessary balance between essential expertise and citizen representation each of the following institutions shall name appointees from their professions: Bedford Institute - a biologist, Defence Research Board - a physical scientist, the Nova Scotia Barristers' Association - a lawyer (inaudible), Nova Scotia Research Foundation - a chemist, Dartmouth Board of School Commissioners - a practising teacher. And then each of the following organizations shall name an appointee: Community Planning Association, the Dartmouth Y, the Owl's Club, various recreational groups who use the lakes and things like that. Now I'm not saying that we must necessarily have to follow this but I'm putting this forward as an illustration of the broad base of community interest and technical and professional persons on the Board. So really, to come to the conclusion here of what I want to say, the initial instances, is that if Council chooses to act upon Roger Bacon's letter and establish a voluntary advisory body we feel that the Bedford Committee established at the moment would become redundant but as we are in being we feel that we are quite capable of changing direction, changing our name and composition to meet the criteria which Council would set. This then raises the question that Mr. Bensted raised in his reply to us - and he said "I am not quite sure what you are asking for in requesting Council to give official recognition to the Sackville River Watershed Action Committee. Are you asking Council to recognize the existence of this committee through the Bedford Service Commission or are you asking Municipal Council to officially establish this Commission?". Now this again, is a thing I can't answer. The letter from Roger Bacon infers that the Council would establish a voluntary advisory body and I'm sure, if the Council wish to carry it that way, then the Bedford Service Commission would definitely end or disband or disengage itself from the existing committee and then would transfer its allegiance to this Council. I think I have spoken enough here on this point of principle to start with. There are other points. I don't know whether it's generally known that (inaudible) Sackville River watershed is (inaudible). It starts, as you know, in Hants County, Mount Uniacke and there are a total of 14 lakes plus unnamed small bodies of water and marsh areas which are affected by the Sackville and Middle Sackville Rivers. The siltation on Bedford Basin, it is

now grown to giant proportions. I have some aerial photographs if any Councillors want to see it, but there's no sense in Bedford getting involved in dredging Bedford Basin, of course that's rather like taking an aspirin for the toothache, soon the aspirin wears off and you've got the toothache back. As soon as the dredging is finished it comes back again. We've got to tackle the thing at source and this is why we moved into what we call a multiple community thing and approached Councillor Wiseman, who I understood approached other Councillors from the Sackville area in getting a committee established. For the information of Councillors I will read out the names of the people on the Committee. From the Bedford Service Commission is myself as Chairman. I inherited this job, incidentally, by the course of the Planning Committee. There is Dr. Fuller and Mrs. Marg. Chapman. From the Bedford Yacht Club there is Mr. James O'Hagan and Mr. Bill Roy. From Sackville there is Mr. Denny Baxter, a nurseryman, Mrs. Ann Merritt, Mr. Fred Allen who is here with me today and Mr. Bob Harvey. We have established a liaison with SEPA. Mr. Don Adams from SEPA was at our meeting last night. We discussed the problem of overlap, of duplication of effort between ourselves and SEPA. Don Adams from SEPA emphasized that he thought there was no overlap at all in the aims and ambitions of the two bodies, theirs was a broader base than ours and in any case Mr. Fred Allen is a member of SEPA and he's also a member of our committee. So in essence, ladies and gentlemen, what I'm seeking is whether Council is prepared to give a decision or, if not a final decision, a decision in principle which will enable us to proceed in one direction or the other. We are most anxious to proceed along the lines of a cooperative effort to achieve the best environmental preservation of the Sackville and Middle Sackville Rivers and everything it represents to the various communities affected by it. Thank you very much.

Councillor Lachance stated that he thinks it's very commendable of Mr. Bathurst to come forward for this group and undertake such a project and if more people in the County would undertake that type of thing, set themselves up as an advisory group to assist in the overall planning of Halifax County Council would be far ahead of the game.

Councillor Cosman spoke of the intention of the Sackville River Watershed Committee and people with whom they have spoken who have a great deal of expertise.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT Council recognize the establishment of the Sackville River Watershed Advisory Committee by the Bedford Service Commission as its official advisory committee on the Sackville River and its watershed." (See Motion to Refer)

Councillor Lachance commented that he questioned the words "recognize it as its committee". Why not a committee, because another group may come along in the future which may take on a different role but which may overlap and he wouldn't want Council to be in a position of listening to only one official group.

Jack Bathurst: I'd just like to make a small comment on the clarification of this. I didn't mention that we were a committee established by the Bedford Service Council and therefore we are answerable to the Sackville Community Association or anybody else as of this moment that is the question Mr. Bensted raised in his letter. It is, in essence, the question that I'm asking here. We can either continue as an arm of the Bedford Service Commission, cooperating as we are at the moment with membership from the Sackville area and then, through the Bedford Service Commission, act as an advisory group to this Council or this Council can act on Roger Bacon's letter and decide to establish its own Sackville River Advisory body, in which case we would suggest disbanding our thing and moving over to a committee on its own or subcommittee of the Planning Committee or whatever, however you'd like to organize it. I don't think recognizing would mean you couldn't recognize anybody else because if we are the Sackville River Management Committee or the Sackville River Conservation Committee, whatever it comes out to, you can only have one body responsible for advising you on a topic of this type and nature. It doesn't mean to say you can't have another watershed area, Pockwock area or something like this set up. Or even, if you find this works, asking this body to expand its mandate to some other areas. But it is the initial start.

There was further discussion between Councillors and Mr. Bathurst with this regard.

Councillor Lawrence noted that Council had been speaking of this for 40 minutes and it is an important item.

It was moved by Councillor Lawrence and seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT this issue be referred to the Planning Advisory Committee and Staff for a report."
Motion Carried.

Councillors Sutherland, Cosman and Wiseman spoke in opposition to the motion to refer.

Solicitor Cragg advised Council that if they intend to give any sort of official status to advisory committees or if they're going to establish a committee of Council it must be looked into in more detail and give it terms of reference, who is going to be on it, who is going to appoint members and who will be appointed.

It was moved by Councillor Cosman and seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT Council recognize the existence of a Sackville River Watershed Advisory Committee as established by the Bedford Service Commission."
Motion Carried.

The Report of the SPC re Dog Control was read by Mr. Marston and several Councillors questioned him regarding the payment of dog licenses and control of dogs at large.

Councillor Lawrence questioned Mr. Marston with respect to the number of personnel employed by the SPC in the areas of the County.

Councillors requested that more patrols be made by the SPC van.

Mr. Bensted assured Council that this year is better than last year and next year should be better than this year.

Councillors requesting information regarding the costs of the services and Mr. Marston explained the expenses of animal control.

Councillors Topple and Lachance noted that there had been much improvement in their areas.

There was a great deal of discussion regarding problems caused by dogs running at large and unlicensed dogs.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson and seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT the Report of the SPC be received."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Smith asked if the next item on the Agenda could be dealt with before supper break.

Presentation by the Eastern Shore Tourist Association and the South Shore Tourist Association.

Catherine Cox: Good afternoon everybody. My name is Catherine Cox, I'm the Executive Director of the South Shore Tourist Association. Mr. Broomfield and I have been asked to come and speak to you this afternoon on the tourist industry of Halifax County and, of course, specifically the sections of Halifax County that lie in our jurisdiction. I look after the South Shore Section which is the section from the Halifax City Limits west to the Lunenburg County line. I also happen to look after Lunenburg County, Queens County and Shelburne County as well. As most of you are probably aware when we talk about the tourism industry we're discussing a resource industry. It was declared as such last fall by the Premier of the Province and there has been established a Legislative Committee in the House of Assembly to deal strictly with tourism. We're also talking about the third largest industry and hence the third largest employer in the Province of Nova Scotia. It is second only to manufacturing and construction and when you consider the fair amount of manufacturing and construction that goes on in this Province as related to tourism you're talking about a sizeable industry. The tourism industry last year contributed three hundred and thirty million dollars to the economy of Nova Scotia, which means approximately 4.5 percent of the gross domestic product so basically we're not really talking peanuts when you're talking about tourism. Tourism had about a 2 percent increase in visitation last year in the Province of Nova Scotia. It's not as prosperous as we would have liked it to be but we did experience about a 15 percent increase in revenue and I suppose if you were to take inflation into consideration, you're looking at about 7 or 8 percent of real growth. All right now, what does the South Shore Tourist Association do specifically about the tourism industry in our area, for it's most importantly, Halifax County. We are an organization that is made up of operators. Our directors are all operators in the tourism industry. We also have representatives from our Municipal Councils as well. We have three subcommittees operating within the region all reporting to the South Shore Tourist Association. Now to get to the specific projects, last year, in the area for promotion the South Shore Tourist Association (inaudible) 60,000 copies of this brochure which received international distribution and it promotes the entire region of the South Shore and as you'll note there's a picture of Peggy's Cove on the front of it. We also advertise in New England and Canadian newspapers encouraging visitors to come to the South Shore region. We answer approximately two to three hundred inquiries for information on local CKBW radio station informing visitors in the area of the majority of things that they were to see and do hopefully trying to encourage them to stay within the region longer. Halifax County got equal amount of coverage as did Lunenburg, Queens and Shelburne County. We're hoping that we're going to be able to expand this radio program this coming year and make it a little bit more elaborate and more captivating and also be able to expand radio promotion outside of the region because continuously we want to try and attract more visitors into the area. We also design a package tour of the south shore region which included Halifax County of course, it's an important part, because it's both the start and the finish of the Light-house Route. We marketed this package tour to a hundred and fifty tour wholesalers in Canada and the United States. We conducted a training seminar for the members of our Tourist Bureau, or for Tourist Bureau staffs. There are six municipal tourist bureaus in the South Shore region, unfortunately not one in Halifax County that comes under our control. We also made a visual slide presentation of the South Shore region to the Provincial Tourist Bureau staff people so not only

would they know what was going on on the South Shore but they would actually be able to see picture of it and better inform the visitors that were arriving at the entry points into the Province and hopefully send more traffic our way. We also distribute our member's brochures for them throughout the South Shore region as well as assisting them with Provincial distribution and National as well and we arranged for a group of two families to have their photographs taken throughout the South Shore region to increase the file of photographs maintained by the CRC, which get used in various different forms of promotion both provincially and by the Provincial Tourist Association. There was, last year, a series or 2, in particular, job corps employees that were working at an awareness program who were informing the tourist operators and their employees in the various attractions and facilities within the region so they, in turn, would be able to better inform the tourists and hopefully retain the visitors in our area longer. Not only is it important to bring people into the area but it's important to keep them there because the longer they're in the region the more money they spend and that, basically, is the name of the game, because the more money our operators make and the more prosperous the tourist industry gets in the South Shore region the higher the taxes are for the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the greater revenue you have. This year we have once again produced this brochure, 60,000 copies, and given it the same distribution, international, as we did last year. We're also working on developing, for next year, a much larger brochure for the South Shore region, one probably about 62 pages which will incorporate a series of day trips for all four counties as well as a lot of other general information and advertising as well. We hope that we will still be able to produce a small promotional brochure that will act as a come-on to visitors, to attract visitors in our area. As I mentioned before, we're attempting to expand our radio program and radio promotion we've been doing. We've also revamped our newsletter to our members so they're better informed of the activities, not only of the Tourist Association but also of various government agencies and programs so that they can improve their business. We've developed what we call the Shore Exchange, which is a little bit of a copy of the Atlantic Canada Plus idea. We're trying to encourage our members to keep the business in Shelburne, when we've got a visitor coming up towards Halifax, to send them into the City of Halifax, that's our competition. I want them to refer visitors to operations in Halifax County which is still within the region and still part of the South Shore Tourist Association. Basically we'll keep them in the family. We also have a Federal Job (inaudible) operating in the region. We've got five employees and they're acting as information gathering and dispersing officers basically as well as conducting a number of series of seminars to tourist bureau staff people. We've got one person in particular working in Halifax County and the rest of them are spread throughout the region. Now that's the sort of a promotional aspect of the work that the South Shore Tourist Association has done. We also get involved in the area of development because not only are we concerned with promoting the tourism industry, we want to see it grow and expand and prosper. Like all the other tourist regions we administer a ten thousand dollar attractions and events incentive grant, try and encourage festivals and events to get off the ground and expand their programs. Unfortunately we have not been particularly successful in encouraging events in Halifax County however, we do finally have an extremely active director in the South Shore Tourist Association here in Halifax County and we're hopeful that we're going to be able to develop more in this area. We also administer a grant program for our Municipal Tourist Bureaus as well, unfortunately this doesn't affect Halifax County so much. Now what we have done in the other three areas, in Shelburne, Lunenburg and Queens County we have developed what are called destination area committees. The committees act as subcommittees of the South Shore Tourist Association and their primary objective is to develop means and ways of retaining visitors within their area. We are also working with the director that we have for Halifax County, we're hoping that we're going to be able to develop a similar type of group in Halifax County that will act like a subcommittee to our association that will enable us to do a lot more in the way of referral business, develop activities within the County, provide more facilities and attractions for visitors, more activities for them to do, work out in the area of evening entertainment, et cetera, et cetera. That's going to be a long range thing that we're going to have to work on as the years go by. We are also in the process of reviewing a development plan that has been introduced to us by the Department of Tourism. It's a development plan for the industry of the South Shore region. Now we will be working in a close conjunction with the government so that there will be joint cooperative industry and government input into this development plan, basically it's a projection as to where we want to see tourism going within the South Shore region for the next five to ten years. In conjunction with that the tourism sector of volunteer planning is also working on a similar project and both of these projects will be coordinated together. I've also been appointed as a member of a committee to investigate the entire tourism information system in the Province. It will be basically acting as a steering committee in providing guidelines. Mr. Broomfield will also be having input in this committee as to what direction we want to see tourist information go in the province, how we can best handle - best deliver information to visitors who are coming into our province, how we can combat the problems of getting them off the limited access highways, the 100 series, and down into the byroads. Of course one of the considerations has always been to do something about that close to useless tip site up at Tantallon and turn it into possibly a manned tourist bureau. These are the sort of things that we'll be considering in this. Now the tourism industry in the South Shore receives representation of various other provincial bodies through the South Shore Tourist Association. For example, the Tourism Industry Association of Nova Scotia through the Tourism Sector of Voluntary Planning. The Executive Directors of the Tourist Association hold regular monthly meetings with the Deputy Minister of Tourism when we talk about just doing everything under the sun except dog licensing, I must admit. They also receive representation on the Provincial Advisory Committee, on the Hospitality Food and Beverage Industry which is investigating primarily the education of the (inaudible) for the industry. And we do have some contact with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion on tourism. We deal primarily through the provincial Department of Tourism. Over the last year the South Shore Tourist Association has