

Councillor Topple: (cont'd) Commerce. By subsidizing small community like this in tourism are we not going to have each little individual community like Cole Harbour, Eastern Passage, Westphal, you name it, asking for a grant for tourist purposes? I understand there's a metro tourist council as well with the tourist bureau at the International Airport?

Mr. Bensted: There is, our own Tourist and Recreation Department are involved in this.

Councillor Topple: And this covers the metro area pretty well?

Mr. Bensted: Well to a limited extent, yes. There's very little funding from that end of it.

Councillor Topple: But it is funded by the Provincial Department of Tourism?

Mr. Bensted: Yeah.

Councillor Topple: And they do fund tourist bureaus through grant systems?

Mr. Bensted: There is Provincial funding, right.

Councillor Topple: This is why I question the need for (inaudible) to provide this sort of funding. I think it's available elsewhere and again I would have to think that Chambers of Commerce are an organization who are dedicated to help the communities -

Mr. Bensted: That name is a bit misleading because the grant will not go to the Chamber of Commerce but will go to the Tourist Association if it gets off the ground and if it doesn't get off the ground then the grant won't be paid.

Councillor Topple: My point is I thought that these organizations raised funds themselves for these purposes, not to go out and ask the taxpayers to come up with the funds.

Mr. Bensted: They have a three way funding sort of thing. That they raise funds themselves and the Provincial Government will match any funds that they get from municipal units from funding so they have a sort of three way funding.

Councillor Benjamin: Councillor Topple hit a sensitive chord here, this is like a slice of pie and it's a pie where one slice has been missing and now the Sackville Chamber of Commerce are prepared to go out and organize a tourist association to cover that slice. District 14 will be part of that Sackville Tourist Association and they're having an organizational meeting this coming Thursday and I think it's only fair, they're perhaps in a greater need of organizational funding to get started, at this time, than perhaps the existing tourist associations. I would also say that if you are opposed to one tourist association within our county then we should look at all the associations on an equal footing but I think there is a need in that these three tourist associations - (inaudible)

Councillor MacKenzie: Mr. Warden I think Mr. Bensted has covered the tourist association bit pretty well and the fact that we do receive dollar sharing on that from the Provincial Government indicates the importance of the work of the tourist associations. I don't think that there's any one taxpayer in the County of Halifax would express any opposition to any of the grants that we have listed here before us. I think back over a number of years, we have decreased that list considerably and the Finance and Executive Committee over the years have looked at this list very closely and again I would say there's a very slight increase and I'm sure that the taxpayers would receive benefits from any of these grants and they would not be opposed to them.

Councillor Deveaux: The only comment I was going to make, Mr. Chairman, well Councillor Benjamin already stated that this was brought before a recreation meeting yesterday and there was a bit of concern expressed due to the fact that Mr. Markesino and people from Halifax and Dartmouth have been involved since we got involved with tourism working in what's called the metropolitan area due to the fact there had never been an association covering the Halifax-Dartmouth Metropolitan area. But as Councillor Benjamin stated we feel that perhaps if this organization or association is formed they can work in conjunction with the County people. The other concern was that, although a motion was brought in several months ago that we get into tourism, there has never really been any guidelines laid down as to which course we should take. Along those lines, as Chairman, I'd like to say that I feel that Mr. Markesino and the other people involved certainly have come a long way in a few months. We were presented with rough brochures yesterday and they will be made up in proper form and hopefully be presented to Council and go on the market, so to speak, in early July. I think, once again, I'd say a lot has been accomplished already.

Deputy Warden Gaetz: As a member of the Finance & Executive I feel very stupid in asking this question again but I overlooked it and it did come there but I can't see the discrepancy in the hospitals. I can't see 10,000 dollars to the Dartmouth General, 3,000 to Middle Musquodoboit, 750 to Twin Oaks and 1500 to Eastern Shore Memorial. My reason for saying that is the Dartmouth General has so many more ways and means of raising money and we poor souls on the Eastern Shore and in Musquodoboit have to strive like blazes in order to keep the hospitals going. I'm wondering why we make such a big grant. I think I asked you last year but I forget what the answer was that I got.

Mr. Bensted: Well Mr. Chairman when the grants to these hospitals was considered three years ago and the dollars involved and the same ratio was used at that time with respect to their total capital funding that had to be carried by the hospital and the grants were based accordingly on the actual capital cost that there were involved in each particular hospital.

Deputy Warden Gaetz: Were they for three years? A three year period?

Mr. Bensted: Yes, a three year period. This year is the last year.

Page 15.

Councillor Williams: Are we within the budget of the money that's received from licenses or are we still having to put money from our budget into this?

Mr. Bensted: Dog control costs us money, yes, and I don't think you'll ever get to the stage where it's self supporting from the sale of licenses.

Councillor Williams: I thought it was proposed, when the SPC was hired, that we'd stay within the budget of the revenue from the (inaudible)

Mr. Bensted: No, I'm sorry sir.

Councillor Williams: I thought it was 90,000 taken in on licenses and what have you and it was going to be kept within that figure?

Mr. Bensted: No, the Municipality have never been able to keep the dog control within the revenue.

Councillor Williams: Would it be a fair question to ask then, what is it costing the Municipality?

Mr. Bensted: Well you have two figures on this page which total 116 thousand dollars being the commission paid and the cost of the control and on page 4 of the dog tax revenue is 60 thousand dollars so it is costing the Municipality something in the area of 56,000 dollars for dog control. You would have to double the license fee to attempt to break even and I would question - it's probably one of those things of diminishing returns. If you made the fee much higher then the number of dogs licensed would be less.

Councillor Lichter: The contract going to go with the SPC. They're receiving 95,000 dollars according to this budget, is that it?

Mr. Bensted: That would be an average figure. Their budget comes up for renewal at the end of this month and Finance Committee will bring a report in to Council, the next Session of Council, with respect to renewal of their agreement.

Councillor Lichter: But regardless of whether SPC has their agreement renewed or not 95,000 dollars is being budgeted for this particular purpose so control is necessary but right now my opinion is we have no control. We have a 95,000 dollar expenditure. Out of 10 calls I suppose once, at least in my district, satisfaction is guaranteed and carried out. Otherwise I feel that you're wasting a lot of money. If we let the dogs go to the dogs and not license those dogs I think we might have some saving.

Councillor Williams: I'm glad to hear Mr. Bensted say we've got to the end of the month because I think that's the time to really get our teeth into this because I have to say again that I was under the impression that Mr. Marston was hired and it was going to be done on the revenue received from the dog licenses and if it's costing the taxpayers 50,000 dollars I'd be

lying to our people because I had many complaints and people who don't have animals who are having property destroyed by animals and the first question they usually say is - well I'm paying for it on my taxes. I always tell them the people who buy the licenses are paying the shot. Unfortunately now I'm finding out I've led a lot of people down the garden path and I have to agree with my fellow Councillor. I don't figure I'm getting that type of service from SPC to warrant the expenditure of this type of money. Now he might do a good job in some districts but in mine, I have to be very honest, I don't think we get the quality service we deserve.

Councillor Topples: Could I ask what item 303 Sheep Protection act claims are?

Mr. Bensted: Yes, the claims where sheep are killed or destroyed or injured serious enough to be destroyed under the Provincial Sheep Act and the municipalities responsible for those claims. Only by dogs.

Page 16.

Councillor Eisenhauer: inaudible.

Mr. Wilson: Yes, basically there are two additional service inspectors included in that budget. Also on the revenue we have budgeted, on page 3, a recovery of 50,000 dollars for engineering services pertaining to various service areas. Sorry - I was talking about the engineering, I thought we were in the engineering section. This is the building inspection. Basically they had an increase the prior year for part of the year. They now have those people full time, for a full year. On top of that I think they have an additional building inspector trainee which is a job that they have opened.

Councillor Eisenhauer: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: There are additional bodies there but as Mr. Wilson indicated there's also some incoming revenue offsetting that in that part of the cost here is being charged against the water utility and against the sewer maintenance. Sewer maintenance and inspection.

Councillor Cosman: Just to clarify that for me are we now employing a sanitary inspector?

Mr. Bensted: No, they're not sanitary inspectors, they're inspectors to inspect house connections.

Councillor Cosman: So how many do we have extra from over last year then?

Mr. Bensted: We'll be taking on two additional people, one immediately and one when the demand is necessary. For example if the Millwood Subdivision goes ahead as planned then we would need an additional inspector in that area.

Councillor Williams: Road improvements 12,262.15, what would this be?

Mr. Bensted: These would be additional charges with respect to street pavements under the road improvement program which are recovered, we get them at a cost, yes.

Councillor Deveaux: How come there's no money laid aside for '79 for instance?

Mr. Bensted: We don't know of any anticipated dollars that we'll be spending this year. Last year there were some areas where surveying had to be carried out on the ground and those costs were spent by the Municipality but were recovered as part of the program.

Councillor Deveaux: I was wondering what would come under those last two items, 001 and 002.

Mr. Bensted: Special studies? Those would be studies that are carried out through the Provincial Department of Environment and where costs are recovered. For example in the Humber Park Subdivision a special study was carried out there. We have a request to carry out a special study in the Uplands Park Subdivision and those special studies, the costs would be recovered from the Provincial Department of Environment. We have to show them as an expenditure and also as a recovery.

Councillor Deveaux: They're liable to show up in the revenue too eh?

Mr. Bensted: Yes.

Councillor Eisenhauer: inaudible.

Councillor Toppie: I'm not clear on the last item there Mr. Bensted. Is that a special Municipal Incentives Grant project there, 20,000?

Mr. Bensted: Yes, and that was monies that was paid out of the special funds that we received under the Municipal Incentive Grant Program. That particular item was with regard to some sets of steps in the Cole Harbour area.

Councillor Cosman: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: We have set that up as an item to be recovered.

Councillor Cosman: How, from where?

Mr. Bensted: When and if the Bedford Service Commission decide to acquire it.

Councillor Cosman: So you don't have to show it this way?

Mr. Bensted: Actually that wasn't paid out until '79 so it would come in the '79.

Councillor Fader: Mr. Warden I guess I have to ask Council here, in respect to Ken Wilson, our Comptroller who's been answering some of the questions here today. Apparently he has reservations made to catch a flight

Councillor Fader: (cont'd) this afternoon and I think we have to give him some consideration. Ken has worked very hard on this budget. He received all the budgets from different departments and was looking at a substantial increase in our rate this year and has worked very hard and long along with the Finance & Executive. He has, today, given to us a rate that I think we can all live with and I think some consideration has to be given on our part with respect to Ken and a trip he has planned since last Fall, last September I believe. His wife is waiting for him at home and I think he has a commitment here with respect to being at the airport at 4 o'clock for a flight out and I think, with due respect, we should ask Council to excuse him and wish him a good trip. I think he damn well deserves everything that he has coming to him in the next few days.

Councillor Lichter: This item was discussed earlier, special studies, 50,000 dollars. Now I know that Mr. Bensted indicated that there was going to be a recovery, however my limited experience in this respect is that the information I received in the Board of Health and other meetings that these studies are being funded by the Provincial Government and the Provincial Government is going to have this study cost taken back from the taxpayers at the time when the actual project will be undertaken. Now I understand you mentioned that 50,000 dollars there, a part of that is the Humber Park study. On the revenue side, page 6, there is only 3,500 dollars mentioned. That's hardly any way for the Provincial Government to fund those costs. It may be a good way for the Provincial Government but it's not a good way for us. I wonder if there is an explanation why there is a 46,500 dollar deficit, in fact, on special studies. Page 6, Revenue from Special Studies 3,500 dollars, account number 175490. I'm comparing expenditures with revenue and if I compare it the way I understood it it should be 50,000 dollars both ways until the project is actually undertaken.

Mr. Bensted: Mr. Chairman I'm afraid that I can't answer that. You let Mr. Wilson get away 2 minutes too soon. I can assure Council is that any of these dollars that we do pay out under these Special Studies are recovered and frankly I can't answer why the figure of 3,500 dollars is shown in the Revenue in that particular account. I can assure that we do recover 100 percent of those dollars until such time as a capital program is approved.

Councillor Cosman: Harry would this not show in next year's revenue after the study is done? We're budgeting 50,000 this year and after the study is done they will come into revenue next year? Will we get reimbursed?

Mr. Bensted: Well that could be. Frankly I can't answer why only 3500 is shown and I say all I can do is assure Council that we will and do recover the total expenditure.

Mr. Wilson: (brought back) Basically that is 50 percent of the Humber Park study which we are now getting a hundred percent. The other ones, we don't know what other studies there may be but hopefully we will recover the funds for them. One of the things in last year's part of it was the Council inquiring, not opposing but inquiring into the Bedford application for town status which will probably carry on and that is not recoverable or not shareable. Now that was 17,000 dollars last year and there may be some more depending on what happens. We're allowing there in case we - for the Humber Park we're getting a hundred percent of that back.

Councillor Fader: Inaudible.

Mr. Wilson: Yes, it's in case there is anything and hopefully there won't be too much.

Councillor Lichter: I'm sorry that you had to be recalled Mr. Wilson. I won't hold you too long but I have still difficulty. Somewhere I got the figure that the Humber Park study cost 40,000 dollars.

Mr. Bensted: The study would be in the order of 40,000 dollars, yes. There's only a small portion of it that was paid last year, the greater portion of it will be paid this year.

Councillor Lichter: Yes but we're looking at the 1979 budget. If I'm expecting to get 40,000 dollars in 1979 I expect to show 40,000 dollars revenue in 1979. You know, it appears to me that the 3,500 dollars suggests that this is all we expect to get back from the government.

Mr. Bensted: No, I think that would be incorrect.

Page 18.

Councillor Lachance: Who is on full time salary with the Department of Health?

Mr. Bensted: We have two girls and we a portion part of Mr. Fawson's and Mr. Reinhardt's time.

Councillor Lachance: So they appear together as one full time person?

Mr. Bensted: Well we just show full time for the total cost which we allocate to Public Health.

Councillor Lachance: So that's 23,000 dollars in salaries divided up between Mr. Reinhardt and Mr. Fawson.

Mr. Bensted: Well part of their time is charged against it, yes.

Councillor Lachance: And the 500 dollars is two part time girls?

Mr. Bensted: Yes - well part time when needed.

Page 19.

Councillor Cosman: There was a considerable expenditure that went in under the Social Services Umbrella for the Cole Harbour Boys' Club and Girls' Club, is that tucked in here anywhere that doesn't really show or is it over with?

Mr. Bensted: No, it's included in there. If you look on Page 19-1 and the 4th or 5th item from the bottom there is an item of 17,000 dollars for grants. That is made up of three items.

Councillor Cosman: The three items are what?

Mr. Bensted: The three items would be the Cole Harbour Boys' and Girls' Club of 12,000 dollars, Family Planning of 3,000 and the Volunteer Help Line of 2,000.

Councillor Cosman: Perhaps then, when we get to 19-1, someone would enlarge on the Cole Harbour Boys' and Girls' Club so we can do 19 first?

Mr. Bensted: Yes.

Page 19-1.

Councillor Cosman: Would you care to clarify what Cole Harbour Boys' and Girls' Club is and why it needs 12,000 dollars?

Mr. Bensted: Okay. Perhaps the name of Cole Harbour Boys' and Girls' Club is a bit misleading in that the Boys' and Girls' Club that is operated under that name is a club that operates - I guess the name club is a misnomer too - but it operates in a subdivision off the Caldwell Road and this subdivision was developed a few years ago when Imperial Oil sold off a number of houses that they had owned for a number of years at Woodside and these buildings were relocated in this subdivision and they are owned or occupied by families in the lower income level and there was quite a problem in that area with respect to boys and girls in the area and the boys' and girls' club was established to attempt to generate a program which would keep the children involved off the streets and out of troubles that they were getting into. This has been included in the Social Assistance budget because it's a program that is deemed to be a benefit, directly or indirectly, to Social Assistance with respect to the children involved and by including it in their social assistance budget then it is eligible for cost sharing through the Provincial and Federal governments.

Councillor Cosman: Is this 12,000 the figure after cost sharing?

Mr. Bensted: No, that's the total figure, so that the 12,000 dollar grant would mean a direct cost to the Municipality of 3,000 with 9,000 being funded through the Provincial/Federal agencies.

Councillor Cosman: And the 3,000 does not come out of an area rate in Cole Harbour (inaudible).

Mr. Bensted: No, it comes out of our general budget.

Councillor Cosman: Well I don't agree with that. I didn't agree with it last year when I realized it was in the budget and I missed the budget session and I just want to record that I don't agree with it this year either.

Warden Settle: The Boys' and Girls' Clubs, you know, they are not just a title, they're under the Boys' and Girls' Clubs of Canada and Nova Scotia and they are recognized by the United Way, you know, so they are an official body, it's not just a title. There was a lot of voluntary work

Warden Settle: (cont'd) went into this. Volunteers built a building there for approximately 50,000 dollars which no funds except - I think some Provincial funds went into it but it was a concentrated effort to uplift that particular area, as Mr. Bensted states, and I think they've done a pretty good job of it.

Page 20.

Councillor Lichter: 261 302, Municipal Development Plan 110,000 dollars proposed budget. I understood at one time that it was going to be proposed to be 150,000 dollars.

Mr. Bensted: That is correct, 150,000 still is the budget. 40,000 of that is included in the salary figure on the top of the page.

Councillor Topple: 303, Special projects in Bedford/Sackville, is that part of the studies that were mentioned before Mr. Bensted?

Mr. Bensted: No, that was part of the original Municipal Development Plan. 302, 303 and 304 were all part of the total program.

Councillor Topple: 304 then, what does that entail?

Mr. Bensted: That was a study carried out by the consultants as part of the Municipal Development Plan with respect to the existing planned service area, the boundaries, the capability of the systems within those boundaries and the capacity presently in the systems and the expected capacity with total development et cetera. Those costs were all cost shared.

Councillor Deveaux: The question I was going to ask, that 304, that actually cost 99,000 last year didn't it?

Mr. Bensted: Yes.

Page 21.

No questions.

Page 22.

Councillor Topple: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: Insurance is in regards to any parklands, public lands that are owned by the Municipality and cover programs that are to be carried out under our Recreation Department's liability coverage.

Councillor Topple: And memberships, what memberships.

Mr. Bensted: That would be membership fees for our Recreation Department belonging to recreation associations.

Councillor Topple: (inaudible) I notice we show a budget for '78 and in 1979 we show a 95 percent increase. 196,000 up to 381,000.

Councillor Deveaux: (inaudible) This is not taking in the cost sharing here I presume, from the Provincial Government?

Councillor Wiseman: Just on the insurance, that insurance covers only those properties owned by the County that are having sort of a public program (inaudible).

Mr. Bensted: Yes, that's right.

Councillor Eisenhauer: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: Well that actually is the money that Council allots to the different districts out of the funds and in order to satisfy the auditors we have to show it as an expenditure.

Councillor Eisenhauer: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: Yes it does, that's where it comes from but I say in order to satisfy the auditors we have to show it coming in on one hand and going out on the other hand so it's shown as an expenditure but it's really monies that are expended out of other funds.

Councillor Eisenhauer: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: They will be, yes, but we have to show it as an expenditure after the fact in order to satisfy the auditors in preparing the financial statements. At the end of '79 there'll be a similar item.

Councillor Eisenhauer: inaudible.

Councillor Deveaux: On 22-1 we were budgeted last year on recreation on 196 and last year it was 286 - we're proposing 381 but if I remember correctly I think our actual County budget, as I stated earlier, was around 100 thousand anyway.

Mr. Bensted: If you look at 271, 305 and 307 and if you look on page 6 in our revenue you will see that there is offsetting revenue amount equal to those. We administer the programs but there is no actual dollar cost to the Municipality.

Councillor Topple: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: No, that's the total cost of the program but if you look on page 6 in the Revenue, under 175 711 you will see a 60,000 dollar revenue which offsets the 305 and 712 140,000 which offsets the 307.

Page 23

No questions.

Page 24.

Mr. Bensted: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, just a note of explanation of the special capital from revenue shareable where we show a million dollars in

Mr. Bensted: (cont'd) the budget here, that is recovered from the Province under the shareable program and there is a revenue on page 6, account 770, 750,000 dollars and on page 8 an item of 350,000 so that capital expenditure does not affect the budget. These capital expenditures will not be spent unless the Province does approve the cost sharing on each individual item of that budget.

Councillor Lichter: The annual Counsel session that we held on Tuesday April 17th contained the School Board budget. I did a bit of comparing with this particular part of the expenditures and the way I see it, somewhere the School Board did cut 477,000 dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. Bensted: Yes, that's correct.

Councillor Lichter: Any way that we could know what particular items were cut so that we could see just what actually happened from the original budget to this budget?

Mr. Bensted: Basically the cuts, as I recall it, were in three areas. One was in the amount of dollars that the School Board were recovering from additional sharing from the Province with respect to secretary's salaries. There was elimination of a program with respect to library aids which was a new program which was non-shareable in the order of 70,000 dollars and I think basically the balance of it was in the area of maintenance expenditures.

Councillor Lichter: There are two items on the School Board budget if I may just ask a couple of questions. One is Summer School and that represents 186,000 dollars budget for 1979. At April 17th Council Session, that's not one of these pages because we don't have the details from the old budget, but I just wondered about the Summer School an the benefits of Summer School. I know that most municipalities no longer hold Summer Schools. I know that sometimes we send our own students into Halifax/Dartmouth and Halifax County to take summer courses and I think 186,000 dollars is a questionable amount of money to spend on something students have not done during the year and try to do in four weeks to six weeks time. But I leave it at that. There's another item that I was kind of concerned about, not because I don't want to see staff room furniture being replaced but I was wondering at the 10,000 dollar cost of doing that and that is, again, in the School Board budget April 17th as it was presented to us.

Councillor Lawrence: Speaking to the issue of the Summer School I'm sure Councillor Lichter is aware that in Halifax County we are operating under a system called continuous progress. One of the basic premises of this idea is that children in school are not necessarily kept back a year for some difficulties they might be having in one particular subject, that the whole pass/fail idea is modified considerably so that children can make progress at varying rates of speed, according to their capabilities and I think that for Halifax County to abandon the Summer School is to abandon an essential part of our efforts to implement a continuous progress system within the Municipality's schools and, as you say, other municipalities do take advantage of the Summer Schools we offer and we of the Metro area's Summer Schools as well. There is a good exchange between courses offered

Councillor Lawrence: (cont'd) between the two cities and the County so that children who need one particular course can usually find it somewhere and are encouraged to look around. We're not duplicating a whole set of Summer School courses, a replica of the two cities, there's cooperation there. One of the things that we've started in the last couple of years and it's being expanded this year is an elementary reading program. A three week program for elementary children. It's not on a pass/fail basis, it doesn't have scores at the end of it and it's entirely voluntary and the staff has been monitoring the effect of that and it's been an extremely popular program and a program with great benefits to children who are having reading difficulties and we feel that that's a really good thing to do and I'm pleased that we're expanding that. That's just one aspect of our Summer School.

Councillor Deveaux: Under 001, special capital from revenue. What does that take in?

Mr. Bensted: These are expenditures for capital that may not be shared by the Provincial Government. For example sometimes on school construction we run into an item that has to be taken care of after the contract has been completed and which is not shareable by the Province.

Councillor Deveaux: Is there any reason why that figure has tripled? It seems to be quite high as compared to 1978.

Mr. Bensted: That is expenditure for capital items that the School Board has requested for cost sharing through the Province, separate and apart from their maintenance program. These are special projects and if they're approved by cost sharing by the Province then we would go ahead with them and those dollars would be recovered, as indicated a minute ago, from revenue from the Province of 750,000 dollars and 350,000 dollars from our reserve for that purpose.

Councillor Deveaux: Do you have any idea what comes under that?

Mr. Bensted: Yes, there are capital expenditures for school buildings, school grounds, furniture and equipment for schools replacing existing furniture and equipment et cetera.

Councillor Deveaux: Where does the expanded French program come under this, is it included in the 12 million?

Mr. Bensted: Yes, whatever cost there is with the French program would be in the 12 million. Now at the present time, in this year's budget, there is no cost to the Municipality, it is shared but the School Board were indicating earlier that it may be, if they go ahead with the program, necessary in future years for some costs to the Municipality.

Councillor Deveaux: I understand this coming September that it's going to cost the Municipality considerably more than it has in the past year, is that right?

Mr. Bensted: The Municipal School Board would be coming back to Council at that time for approval of the dollars.

Page 25.

Councillor Eisenhauer: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: That would be the garbage operation. It would include the landfill and the pickup but the cost that we pay, and we pay on a user basis, in other words the only cost to the Municipality with respect to the landfill is the use that we make of it and we pay a tonnage charge for every time it goes in.

Page 26.

Deputy Warden Gaetz: inaudible.

Mr. Bensted: Those dollars, the twenty-six and twenty-six one is the interest and the principal payments and then those are recovered through the operation of Ocean View Manor, the same as the Rehab Centre et cetera.

Councillor Cosman: inaudible.

Councillor Topple: This interest here, are these interests on loans or borrowings of the different areas?

Mr. Bensted: Yes.

Councillor Topple: What is the 601, Dartmouth 1960 and prior?

Mr. Bensted: That would be a case of annexation with Dartmouth and they're responsible for any liabilities occurring from annexation so in a case where there were schools constructed and loans still outstanding then Dartmouth has to repay that to the Municipality.

Councillor Topple: In other words 13,600 would be recovered from Dartmouth?

Mr. Bensted: That's right, that's the interest. On the next page you'll see, under 601 again, is the principal payments. Councillor Cosman that would be, the Bedford Fire Hall would have been with respect to a loan that the Bedford had with respect to some construction at the Bedford Fire Hall and this would be - the first item on Page 26 is the interest payment and then on Page 26-1, 5,000 would be the principal payment. 513 - I will have to be honest with you and check that for you Councillor Cosman, get that information for you.

Page 27.

No questions.

Page 27-1.

Deputy Warden Gaetz: inaudible.

Page 27.

Mr. Bensted: These are simply monies recovered that are shown under expenditures, Mr. Warden.

Page 28.

No questions.

Warden Settle: That completes the review of the estimates, both expenses and revenues.

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

That approval be granted to the following rates for 1979.
Residential .99 cents, Non Residential 1.80. Motion Carried.

Councillor Fader: inaudible - microphone not activated. What I'm trying to say is next year we have to honour these bonds that have been granted to us and if you'll note in this budget today that there is a portion of them there but there was enough revenue to cover them without increasing the rate. Now I would say that Council next year, Finance & Executive, will be responsible for putting this budget together again, in my opinion you're going to have a hassle. I don't think that the increased assessment next year is going to help that much. I think that, really, I know it's fine and great to build new schools and to do this and to do that but I think they're going to haunt us. They're haunting us now and I think they're going to catch up to us in the near future and Ken Wilson has been warning me of this for some time, that we are really going to feel it next year so it might be this Council, it might be another Council, but it certainly will have a job on their hands and I think I have to echo the voice of Councillor MacKenzie who said the Municipality, in the last few years, has been doing very well. We've been able to reduce our rate every year and we have but this year we didn't reduce it, we managed to hold it at the rate that we set last year, 99 cents residential. I think that next year, I don't know, with the White Paper coming out and many other issues, I feel really that we are going to be faced with an increase next year. That's why I'm looking at it. I'm not only preparing myself as a Councillor, I'm preparing myself as a taxpayer in the Municipality.

Area rates

Councillor Margeson: The firefighting Kinsac and North Beaverbank. The rate of 18 cents to be levied on all assessments in Kinsac and we left out the word Middle in there so it should be Middle and North Beaverbank.

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

That the General Area Rates be established for 1979 as per amended list.

Motion carried.

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

That Area School Rates be approved for 1979 as per attached list. Motion Carried.

Councillor Cosman: Would perhaps Mr. Bensted correct me if I'm wrong but I thought our assessment was 89 million and not 95 as stated on this sheet. Which is correct?

Mr. Bensted: I would say that the assessment shown there would be correct.

Councillor Cosman: The computer print-out that I have says 89.

Mr. Bensted: I haven't checked the figure myself but I would think what is shown as 95 would be correct.

Returning Office

Warden Settle: The next item is the appointing of a Returning Officer.

Mr. Meech: Yes Mr. Warden, that's in line with the provisions of the new Municipal Elections Act as we reviewed today with John Cameron. Under that Legislation it now provides for the appointment of a Returning Officer who, in effect, is the person that's responsible for all the administrative co-ordination of the election procedures. My recommendation would be that we appoint a staff person, Gerry Kelly, as returning officer to coordinate that function.

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

That G.J. Kelly be appointed as Returning Officer in the forthcoming Municipal Elections. Motion Carried.

Councillor MacKenzie: Mr. Warden is there extra remuneration for Mr. Kelly for this position or is this part of his staff salary?

Mr. Meech: We would hope to be able to set it up on the basis that it would be part of his normal duties however if it becomes necessary, when we get into the process, then possibly we'll have to discuss that with him but at this point in time we would hope to do it as part of his normal function.

Councillor MacKenzie: Those dollars would come out of the budget of the Municipality?

Mr. Meech: That's correct, yes.

Councillor MacKenzie: I had another name in mind, Mr. Warden, and that was Mr. Bensted.

Mr. Meech: Well I might add that we did have discussions on that and Mr. Bensted has other commitments, is not in a position.

Councillor Poirier: I just wondered, once this Returning Officer is appointed and then there's a special day of instruction, is this one day for the whole Council or how does that work?

Mr. Meech: We haven't really sat down and established that but probably it may require that we hold a number of these schools in certain areas but that would be part of the responsibility.

Councillor Poirier: But this won't be for some few days to come up. I'll be out of town for a few days and I just don't want to miss it.

Mr. Meech: What will happen in practice, I would say, once we get the machinery started Mr. Kelly will be in touch with all the individual Councillors and ask them for a list of names as to persons they would like to have appointed in their particular districts for enumerators.

Councillor Lachance: I don't know about Mr. Kelly having to contact Councillors to set this up because some time ago we submitted a list of people, according to the practice that we had last year.

Mr. Bensted: Presumably the same policy would follow this year, that you would be providing Mr. Kelly with the names and then Mr. Kelly will be dealing direct with the individuals.

Councillor Cosman: inaudible.

Mr. Meech: Not at this point but very shortly now with the appointment of the Returning Officers. We'll have to sit down very shortly now and work out those details as to when they will actually take place but at this point in time no, we don't have a tentative schedule as to - but it's something that's going to have to be looked after very quickly.

Councillor Cosman: But it is firmed up that we're having a training day.

Mr. Meech: Oh yes, definitely and the other thing is, as you're aware, I guess everyone has received a copy of that booklet that was just produced by the Department of Municipal Affairs to assist the individual enumerators and how they will vote it and I think, for the most part, it will probably be a day of instruction and for the most part it will relate to that particular document and respond to any questions that individuals may have.

Mr. Meech: Mr. Warden at the June 5th Session of Council a report had been submitted with respect to the remuneration of enumerators in the upcoming election. At that time it was decided to defer the matter until we held the Session today with Mr. Cameron so it would be now in order, I would assume, to bring it back on the floor and either approve or disapprove or amend.

Councillor Lawrence: As I recall it was 25 cents a name, 25 dollars for expenses or some such category as that? And what else?

Mr. Meech: It was essentially the same as the Provincial scheme. I think there was one change, from ten to fifteen dollars.

Councillor Lawrence: fifteen dollars for the training session was that?

Mr. Meech: The recommendation was that the enumerators for the 1979 election be paid at the rate of 25 cents per name plus expenses of 25 dollars plus expenses of 15 dollars for a day of instruction if a day of instruction is held.

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

That the schedule of rates for enumerators as submitted be approved. Motion Carried.

Councillor Lichter: Warden and Councillors I'm looking at the rural areas and when you try to collect names at 25 cents per name I don't see any difficulty with that, however when you compare it with the urban area you realize that the expenses certainly don't cover at all the expense the person would incur. In my area, and I'm quite sure in many other areas, you have to travel 20, 25 miles or more before you can get a hundred to two hundred names. If you go into one apartment block in Bedford, Sackville or any other place in the urban area you can do exactly the same thing with practically no car expense. I would like to see that somehow we change it to a reasonable mileage. If that presents some difficulty then I think the reasonable mileage should be somehow approved by, if Council sees fit, by the individual Councillors in the area because I certainly don't feel that I could expect people to go out and enumerate in 25 dollars expense.

Councillor Cosman: inaudible.

Council Lichter: A mileage expense would be given or on top of 25 dollars and each Councillor could sign a voucher for a reasonable amount of mileage. Now I think in your area you will say okay, it's unreasonable to say that 200 miles were travelled. In my area it may not be totally unreasonable. I think that we have to depend on the honesty of the people who will be doing the enumerating and I think I could depend on those people that I will be recommending and so will you in your area. But I think that somehow we would have to have control on that and I really don't want to split the urban from the rural but I would like to see that these people are not asked to burn up in gas what they receive in names, if you see my point. On 25 dollars you're not going to travel all that far.

Councillor Lawrence: I think that my enumerators would probably, at a maximum, have to travel maybe 10 miles, even assuming they're going back twice. Perhaps we could have a mileage standard for enumerators who travel over so many miles in the course of enumerating their district because I don't know that that's realistic or relative. I'm in a rural area but it's not that far flung. Could we have a standard saying those enumerators who travel over 25 miles in the course of enumerating, or any number that anyone wants to suggest, so that we don't get claims for the mileage expenses when the mileage travelled is minimal.

Councillor Lichter: Inaudible - microphone not activated.

Councillor MacKenzie: Mr. Warden just to tidy it up I think that they should be paid the mileage rate that is being paid to all Municipal employees, not the 20 cents.

Mr. Meech: It's around 26.

It was moved by Councillor Lichter and seconded by Councillor MacKenzie?

That the motion be amended to provide mileage allowance for all miles above 20 driven. Motion Defeated.

Councillor Margeson: Is it not possible to use the list, for example the Federal Government just had an election, is it not possible to use that revised list and an enumerator wouldn't have to travel all those miles if they used the telephone. Is it not possible? Are you not allowed to use that list any more?

Mr. Meech: Well it would just be my thought that in the rural areas what probably will happen is, even though it may say that it has to be enumerated, in practical terms I would think what's going to happen is people who are aware of the people that reside in a particular property no doubt will just fill it out and include them on the list. There's a greater possibility for that in the rural areas than there is in the urban areas because naturally people have a tendency to know one another moreso in the rural areas than they do in the larger urban centres.

Councillor Margeson: And we're having a greater opportunity, according to Mr. Cameron this afternoon, to swear people at the polling booth which they didn't have in the other one. Are we allowed to use the list or not?

Mr. Meech: Well technically the list can only be used -

Councillor Margeson: If the boundaries coincide is it possible to use the list?

Mr. Meech: Yes it is, if the boundaries coincide but I guess there'd probably be very few cases where the boundaries actually coincide completely.

Councillor Smith: It is my understanding, Mr. Warden, that we are definitely not to use the list. That if we're enumerating you had to go from house to house and if people weren't at home then they had to return. That's my understanding of enumeration. Being a person who's taken part in enumeration these were the dictates that were dictated to us.

Warden Settle: That's true enumeration, there's no question about that.

Councillor Smith: So if someone fails to enumerate properly there should be a penalty for it, that's my opinion of it.

Councillor Topple: Do I understand that we're proposing a 25 dollar expense fee plus the mileage allowance?

Warden Settle: For people who travel over 20 miles.

Councillor Topple: I can't accept that because no governments will pay that kind of an expense allowance. They'll pay you one expense allowance but here we're talking about two and I feel that if we're paying the full rate - now the reason I say this is if you travel a hundred miles you're talking over 50 dollars just for expenses. Not counting the 25 cents per name and I would suggest that a lot of people would jump into that sort of thing, I know I would because I don't get that kind of money on expense allowance. I think it's one or the other. I think we should go to the mileage in the the rural areas perhaps and the 25 dollars a day expenses in the other areas.

Councillor Deveaux: Generally those were my comments Mr. Chairman. I can't go along with two rates and we're talking about 20 miles. I'm sure even a person in a rural is easily going to travel 20 miles and the ones that probably don't make sure that they get over the 20 mile limit to begin with.

Councillor Sutherland: Warden I have a solution that might help assist us here. I think maybe what we should do is just up the ante on the expenses so we're claiming actual expenses that could vary from ten dollars up to a hundred, whatever the case might be. I think maybe that's all we have to do in terms of actual expenses. We can cover the additional mileages Councillor Lichter is concerned about in expenses.

Mr. Meech: Mr. Chairman my only other observation is, as I understand it this suggestion came about as a result of looking at the Provincial rates. I take it then that even for the gathering of the Provincial election lists they don't pay any mileage above the 25 dollar fee and they must be able to attract people to do it.

Councillor Lichter: I don't know how satisfied people were with the Provincial list, I don't know how satisfied they were with the Federal list. Listening to Mr. Cameron I don't think they were all that satisfied. It is quite conceivable that those lists were not prepared properly because these people did not go out and enumerate. You can do that sitting at home.

Mr. Meech: Yes, that's correct. On the other hand with the mileage there's naturally going to be an incentive to go back two times. Just as an example if you have 5 or 6 people who are 15 or 20 miles away there's actually a built-in incentive to go back twice.

Councillor Poirier: Doesn't it say that if the person's not home they can get the information from a neighbour? Doesn't it say that in -

Solicitor Cragg: inaudible. Mike not activated.

Councillor Poirier: (inaudible) I think I would like it to be explicit which way it's going to go. Councillor Margeson said it's easy to swear

Councillor Poirier: (cont'd) people in but I'm not in favour of this. I think if we're going to have enumerators I think they should enumerate. In my own district last time there were a number of people came in and they weren't on the list and they got very annoyed with waiting and they left so I think we should have to make this clear one way or another.

Councillor Deveaux: Are you allowed to make an amendment to an amendment? I was going to, if Councillor Lichter was agreeable, change the thing to a flat 50 dollars in lieu of 25 because if you're going by mileage as far as I'm concerned it's going to be nothing but a schmozzle.

Councillor Sutherland: May I suggest to you that I think the only counter-argument for the rural areas is the fact that if I personally were doing enumeration and I knew that John Doe and his wife and daughter lived 15 miles away and I knew he lived up there I'm not going to drive up there. If I get paid for it I will.

Councillor Eisenhower: (inaudible) Now maybe if we say 15 dollars per poll then that covers the greater distance that you're going to travel so therefore my 15 dollars, if it's 15 dollars, go ahead to 30 dollars. Because I should have incentive in case I have trouble in getting a worker in one particular poll area.

Mr. Meech: A quick reaction would be I think it would have to be on the basis of polling division.

Councillor McCabe: Mr. Warden has there been any difficulty getting enumerators in the past?

Warden Settle: Well we always had Revisers. I don't know whether the change of name makes any difference or not.

Councillor McCabe: I don't think we've had too much difficulty and I believe that even in the rural areas they'd be doing a reasonably good job.

Councillor Williams: I think that the enumerators will feel a lot happier than they have in the past. I've been in a few of these dog fights in the last few years and the fact that we've come up with 25 cents per name is going to make a lot of people happy and 25 dollars expenses. I am concerned, I don't know how many training sessions there would be. I would say that people travelling from West Dover to the Municipal Building 15 dollars isn't that big an incentive and we would have to have those people come in that distance but I've got to say, quite frankly, that the whole package is a hell of a lot better than what we have been used to and I think the enumerators will be quite happy that we are taking a step forward.

Councillor Eisenhower: I will support the first motion before the floor. (inaudible).

Mr. Meech read the amendment to the original motion and Question was called on the amendment.

Amendment defeated.

Mr. Meech read the original motion.

Question was called on the main motion.

Motion carried.

Councillor Smith: I was just wondering can we deal with the fee for nomination day today? Right now it's 200 dollars. Come nomination day that's what we have to come up with unless it gets to the Minister of Municipal Affairs before a certain date. Can we deal with that today?

Warden Settle: That's up to Council, I guess. It's not on the Agenda.

It was moved by Councillor ? that Council adjourn.
Motion defeated.

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

That a by-law be established to reduce the deposit for candidates to 100 dollars.

Motion defeated.

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

That the matter of Deposit for candidates be reconsidered.

Motion defeated.

It was moved by Councillor Fader that Council Adjourn.

Motion carried.

MINUTES & REPORTS

of the

THIRD YEAR MEETINGS

of the

THIRTY - NINTH COUNCIL

of the

MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX

APRIL COUNCIL SESSION

TUESDAY, APRIL 3rd, 1979 & APRIL 17th, 1979

SPECIAL COUNCIL SESSIONS APRIL 9th, and 17th, 1979

PUBLIC HEARINGS - April 9 , 1979.

Council agreed that Bill Campbell would be the recording secretary.

Warden Settle informed Council and the gallery how the hearings would be held and asked the Planning Department to introduce the application.

Mr. Gough, Director of Planning introduced Application No. 26-78, Joseph Canavan which was to rezone the Lands of J. Canavan from R-1 to R-4 in Bedford.

Warden Settle then asked those in favor of the zoning to come to the microphone and state their case.

My name is Peter McKeigan and I'm a lawyer representing Joseph Canavan who is here with me in support of this application. When I finish my presentation if you have any questions that I am not able to answer then I am sure Mr. Canavan will be able to assist you.

The property in question is to be used for a 28 unit 2 bedroom residential apartment building. Mersey Construction has had considerable knowledge in the construction of apartment buildings in the area for a considerable period of time. They have built a number of buildings in Clayton Park, some of which they are just finishing, they have been in the housing business, building houses in Forest Hills, Windsor and Bridgewater.

I think it is important for Council to have some familiarity with the land topography of the site to properly assess the impact on the neighbourhood. The map in the staff report gave you a conceptual idea of how the location of this lot fits in with the location of the other lots. It does not give you a view of what the building will look like when it is completed. The 15 degrees general sloping embankment referred to by staff was somewhat steeper, I believe. The building is going to be on the back end of the property behind the tree buffer which is presently full growth trees. These are proper mature trees, acting as a proper buffer between this building and the surrounding area. The building will be somewhat lower than the street line and when you are standing in the street perhaps the top few stories will be visible above the street line which is basically the same as a single family residence. I think it is important to keep that in mind.

Having had an opportunity to review the staff report, I think there are three questions we are asking here today. First, is an R4 zoning desirable in this area, does it fit in with the existing integrity of the surrounding community? Secondly, if an R4 use is undesirable what type of accommodation do you want? Thirdly, the question of servicing in particular the sanitary sewer design primarily as a result of these public works comment. When you are considering these questions I think you must consider what the zoning is.

The project must be considered from the standpoint of the public welfare of all property within the immediate district and to the Municipality. There are two criteria. The immediate district of Oakmount Drive and the larger interest the Municipality of the County of Halifax. It is important to recognize that zoning is basically negative in its effect in the community by this I mean it does not prevent undesirable uses but it does not create desirable uses. It may prevent an abattoir from going in on Oakmount Drive but it will not ensure that there will be a \$100,000.00 house.

Spot rezoning, which is what this application is, becomes an acceptable change when it is related to the general welfare of both the district and the Municipality at large. Again the two criteria, the district and the Municipality. The three spot rezonings which I mentioned in a previous letter is that it is an overused expression. It is easy to grab onto and say a spot rezoning is not best. That is not the case, in fact. The Municipality does not have a Master Plan. And even though the City of Halifax has a Master Plan, the city of Halifax have undertaken an extensive planning program which is consisting of nothing but spot rezonings. Indeed the proposed land use map looks more like a zebra or a leopard with spots all over the place and changing the use is becoming an accepted tool and a desirable tool.

Lets look at the staff report or the Planning Advisory Committee report. The PAC report in item No. 1, states that this spot rezoning could possibly be the thin piece of a wedge in the gradual alteration of the stability and character of the residential neighbourhood. In item No. 2 it goes on to say that it could encourage similiar applications for R4 zoning to permit medium density development although there is a considerable amount of R4 zoned property in Bedford. However, if you continue to look at the staff report on which those particular suggestions originally derived the staff report continues to say that the rejection of this application is not to be construed as an overall rejection of the medium density development in Bedford and other places in Bedford may be considered more suitable to this use. It is a little difficult for me to put these statements together.

They are saying on one hand we don't want the development and on the other hand they are saying it might be able to have rezoning somewhere else and have this type of development. And then they are saying spot rezoning is bad. I am not entirely sure what they are getting at and I am not entirely sure they know what they are getting at. They are obviously not totally in disagreement. I point out to you again that the site of this property is acceptable and agreeable to what I call low density development.

I want to point out at this time that this particular lot of land is not acceptable for single family dwellings. This is primarily due to a number of reasons one of which being the tremendous engineering difficulties on the site. For servicing, you would have to pump your storm sewer and your sanitary sewer up the grade to the street where the system is. This is not feasible to single family but is certainly feasible in an apartment complex of the type here proposed. And the systems that they have today are certainly very efficient and should cause no difficulty.

The staff report uses the phrase medium density in texts that I read medium density means up to 200 persons per acre. High density would be 10 or 20 storey building. We are talking about a 28 unit apartment building, which is roughly 60 people. We are not even half suggesting the medium density definition.

Looking again at the PAC report and the staff report, they talk about increased traffic on residential streets. Well lets first look at the character of the area.

Immediately behind the property is the Midas Muffler Shop, a large service station. Down the road there is a Department of Highways bulk plant for salt storage together with a field office, which I might add at the moment seems to me to be somewhat desirable to have a salt plant just down the road from you at least you would be sure that your street would be the first plowed and first salted in the winter which would help alleviate any traffic in the winter months. In any event the area has commercial surroundings.

There are about 15 single family dwellings in the immediate area of Oakmount and the street which runs off of it. Oakmount Subdivision has of course many single family dwellings, but in the immediate vicinity, only a very few single family dwellings. An apartment building of the type we are considering, again keeping in mind it is four stories in height not 20 stories, would blend itself in very well with this type of development and it in itself will act I suggest as a good suitable buffer between what you have below which is commercial and heavily commercialized area, and the single family dwellings which you now enjoy.

We are not in the middle of a residential neighbourhood we are on the fringe of a residential neighbourhood and we are on the fringe of a commercial neighbourhood and that is where you want an apartment complex and that is what we are proposing. I think the important thing in looking at the character of the area the critical factor is to determine the compatibility of the new structure and how it asserts it's own significance on the **land** scape as I pointed out this development will act as a buffer. It will be an asset to this community, it will provide an increased assessment base in the area, it will provide apartment uses which are lacking in the immediate area of Oakmount.

I drove around there the other day and the apartments are on the other side of the No. 1 but in the immediate area I would say within a mile of Oakmount Drive I didn't come across any other apartment buildings.

Lets look at traffic. It is a very contentious point and one which received comments in the petition and in the various reports accordingly. I have been on this site in two cases, and I have not come across a great deal of traffic. I found a number of cars on Rockmanor Drive and Scotia Drive, which seem to be the main roads leading to Highway No. 2 and Highway No. 1.

Now if you look at the plan in front of you you will notice that Oakmount Drive is considerably larger than the other streets in the Oakmount Subdivision. I would term it a collector road with nothing to collect. It stops about 1/2 mile down the road where the Department of Highways is located. At best it is serving 20 units, 20 single family units at present, the rest of them as I understand it, go down to the Waverley Road which takes them down to Highway No. 1. They do not go down Oakmount Drive. Now if you look at your plan you will see roughly 20 odd units that could conceivably use this road. If each of these 20 units have 3 car trips a day what are you talking 90 or 100 vehicles a day on Oakmount Drive. When we complete the development there will be 50 or 60 cars a day extra - about 150 cars - thats not a substantial amount.

In discussions I have had with professional planners about such a traffic flow in a residential community I have received figures ranging from 1000 to 1500 cars. We aren't approaching that amount. We have 150 perhaps 155 cars. There is quite a difference. I cannot for the life of me see how we are going to have a traffic problem. I understand as well that when Laurie Redden completes the Oakmount Subdivision in the future the traffic from that part of the subdivision will be going down the Waverley Road.

The staff report the PAC report talks about other undeveloped areas in Bedford, R4 uses. While this may be true as I pointed out I did not see any other apartment buildings in the vicinity of our particularly proposed development. It seems to me that this type of accommodation is needed in this community.

The concept of clustering all your residential single family uses in one area and your commercial in another, apartments in a third, is not getting the same support that it did 10 or 15 years ago. The planning process has progressed substantially and now there is a recognized planning concept that you can have a mixture of uses. It's not the type of use that decides whether they should be segregated, it is how the uses are matched together. And that is why as I pointed out in the beginning of my presentation, it is necessary to understand the type of development we are proposing, it is compatible with the type of single family in the area. As I pointed out, I don't believe staff had at its finger tips when it was processing the application, knowledge that the building was four storeys in height. If you look at the staff report, you come back with the idea we are going to have a tower of twenty storeys. This is not the case.

The final point that rates considerable concern is the sewer design criteria of the 18 persons per acre which is referred to in the Planning Advisory Committee Report and the staff report. The Department of Public Works has indicated that the design density for the existing sanitary sewer could not support medium density development in the area. However, if you look at the staff report, the quotation states that "this lot of land abuts Oakmount Drive in Bedford and is capable of being serviced with sewer and water. The intended use of this one acre piece of land is to construct an apartment and in view of the fact that the sewer design criteria of 18 persons per acre in Bedford would be exceeded by this type of use and the zoning application should be denied." I point out members of Council and Mr. Warden, the comments are not the same. Maybe the Planning Advisory Committee feels that that is the best way to interpret this and that is certainly up to them, but I do not feel that they are not saying the same thing. I think it is important to recognize that your staff says the lot can be serviced. When that system was designed ten years ago, it was prepared on the basis that when the entire area of Bedford was developed, they designed the system to accommodate 18 persons per acre. In fact, the number of acres in Bedford times 18 would determine the number of people in Bedford. That is a far cry from saying that this one lot should only have 18 people on it.

It seems an ironic problem that my client received a \$6,000 bill the other day for sewer on the property and is now coming to ask Council to allow us to use it. In discussions with your Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Hefler, it is my understanding that if the rezoning is allowed, a building permit will be issued for this development. I expect, or I see from the petition before us, that there are residents who are concerned. I am not entirely sure that they are aware of what is going on. I think it is important that residents voice their concern, but the concerns they have noted are the same concerns in the staff report, and I think we rebutted them today.

Councillor Cosman spoke and said Mr. Warden I would just like to point out to Mr. MacKeigan and members of Council, that if they look at page two of the staff report, it shows Oakmount Drive, and it shows Highway No. 1. It makes Oakmount Drive look rather pregnant in size and makes Highway No. 1, which is actually four lanes, look very tiny. The plan is not to scale. Oakmount Drive on this map looks twice as large as Highway No. 1, which is currently a four-lane highway. You cannot go by how the map looks, in relation to the size of

Oakmount Drive. Now, Mr. MacKeigan, you mentioned that you felt the staff report made it look like you were talking about a highrise building, and no where in this report is that implied in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. MacKeigan spoke and said, Councillor Cosman, what I was referring to is the way the land lies, and the size of the proposal. What I am saying is the lot slopes quite substantially which will act as a buffer, and the building is only four storeys in height.

Councillor Cosman spoke and said, you mentioned four storeys. I hope you realize Halifax County has a 35-foot height restriction on buildings. You mentioned that the site was not suitable for a single family dwelling. Architects can design single family dwellings literally on stilts.

Commercial areas are not in the residential neighbourhood, Midas Muffler is down on the No. 1 Highway; it is not sitting flush in the subdivision itself. Perhaps Highways did a boo boo when it built Oakmount Drive as a place for it to go with salt and sand trucks, but that is the way it is at the moment.

Councillor Cosman spoke and said, I have a question for Mr. Canavan "When you and I met here prior to making your application, all you said you were interested in was getting your dollar value out of the land, and it didn't matter to you how you got it as long as you got it. Do you still feel that way?

Mr. Canavan replied, first of all, I don't recall the statement. Secondly, I am certainly interested in getting my dollar value out of it; but I'm interested in seeing what is going up there, and I do know the type of building that is going up there, and I knew that before I even applied for rezoning.

The Warden asked, are there any further questions for Mr. MacKeigan or Mr. Canavan?

Councillor Topple spoke and said, Mr. Canavan, was this property zoned R-1 when you purchased it?

Mr. Canavan spoke and said, it was open zoning when I purchased it. It was a part of the land which is now Oakmount Subdivision. Councillor Topple spoke and said, it was open zoning. Mr. Canavan replied, yes. Councillor Topple asked, what do you mean by open zoning--not zoned. Mr. Canavan replied, yes, unzoned, any use except mobile homes. Councillor Topple said, you didn't object to the zoning at the time when it was rezoned. Mr. Canavan replied, I sold the block of property which is now known as Oakmount Subdivision. It was Redden Brothers Developments. They rezoned it to R-1, Single Family Zoning. Councillor Topple spoke and said, one other question for Mr. MacKeigan with respect to the statement that fifty or sixty people would make it one person per bedroom. I say it would be more like 220 people.

Mr. MacKeigan replied, if I could Warden, I would just like to make a couple of responses to Councillor Cosman. Firstly, I think that some original thinking is needed to subdivide that lot into a single family lot. The cost would be an exorbitant amount for a house you could certainly get in other areas of the County for the same amount. Secondly, I have done legal work for Mersey Construction for the last three years and know that they certainly

would not have entered into an agreement to buy it unless they felt it was developable property, and they are going to have to put an apartment on it to do so. Thirdly, I want to point out that this County Council and every Council must be consistent in the way you approach the Zoning By-law and administer it. Now I have been in front of this Council before, and I have seen this Council approve a Shopping Centre in Colby Village. Now this Council is telling me they have a problem with a four-storey apartment building.

Councillor Toppie spoke and said, point of order, Mr. Warden, I don't think the Council has decided that this is an undesirable.

Mr. MacKeigan replied, Oh, I appreciate that I'm simply responding to what I felt was a concern to Councillor Cosman. I think that the relative thing is that there must be consistency in the way we look at it. Good development is good development no matter where you put it. My argument here today is that this is good development.

Councillor Margeson said, is it possible that you have a sketch or something of this building here that we could look at to get some idea of what you propose.

Mr. MacKeigan replied, the only thing we have is the picture of a similar building in Clayton Park. This is not a design of the apartment we are proposing, but it is another construction of Mersey Construction.

Mr. MacKeigan is asked if he is aware of the staff report, he replies that he is and when asked if he is aware of the Engineering comments, he replies that he is also aware of this. He says he has spoken with Mr. Gallagher of the Engineering Department, and the report that Mr. Gallagher is referring to was done approximately ten years ago. It says that when Bedford is fully developed, it can accommodate 18 persons per gross acre. Mr. MacKeigan goes on to explain that that is not necessarily 18 persons on each acre as long as the end result is not more than 18 persons per gross acre. Mr. MacKeigan says that he does not feel the system is overused at the present.

Mr. MacKeigan is asked if he has any plans which show the contours of the land. He replied that he does not and went on to say that it is quite steep especially at the rear of the property where it goes down to the Midas Muffler Shop, and the property would have to be fenced.

Councillor Sutherland expressed to Mr. MacKeigan that he could accept his theory that there has to be or should be a residential mix, however, Councillor Sutherland felt that this was a little after-the-fact when one considers that the neighbourhood is 85% or more developed. He also stated that he feels that people who buy into the neighbourhood should have an idea of what the neighbourhood will look like in five to ten years.

Mr. MacKeigan says that mixed use is not bad. What is bad is an incompatible use, and he feels that this is a compatible use to the neighbourhood.

Mr. MacKeigan went on to say that this development is a fringe of this subdivision and can be considered a buffer on that property. He did not feel that anyone could take a plan and say this is where we will be in five to ten years.

Councillor Williams addressed a question to Mr. Gallagher who was in the gallery. He asked if this development is approved tonight, and notes that if it leaves the door open for other such developments, what bearing will this have on the services in the area.

Mr. Gallagher explains the design which was used when the sewer was put in the area and also explains that due to the close proximity of the Sackville River and the difficult engineering conditions a decision had been reached on this proposal. He went on to say that there seems to be a trend today to get the maximum out of the minimum. He said that this is why the design criterion of 18 persons per gross acre is used.

Mr. MacKeigan asked Mr. Gallagher if this study was done ten years ago and Mr. Gallagher replied that it was. Mr. MacKeigan then pointed out that the property was not zoned ten years ago. The property was unzoned and as such would allow any use. He added that the property was rezoned to R-2 in 1972 and therefore when the program was done the property would have been capable of being developed.

The Warden then asked for any other persons who would be interested in speaking in favour of this application.

There were no further people who wished to speak in favour of this application. The Chairman then asked for speakers in opposition of this rezoning application.

Mr. George Miller of Redbank Road, Oakmount Park Subdivision, Bedford, spoke in opposition of this rezoning. Mr. Miller informed the Council that he is the spokesman for the residents of the Oakmount Park Subdivision. Mr. Miller presented a petition signed by the residents of the area in opposition to this proposal. The petition totalled 134 names, and represents 92% of the householders of Oakmount Subdivision. He pointed out that the neighbour who Mr. MacKeigan spoke to who was in favour of this proposal was in some way related with the sale of the lot of land. There were only two residents in the whole of the subdivision who refused to sign the petition.

Mr. Miller outlined the concerns of the residents of the area as being that the residential character of the subdivision would be destroyed by rezoning. It would have a serious impact on the value of the properties within the subdivision. Such a spot rezoning would set a precedent whereby other spot rezonings would take place. It would create another Clayton Park which is why many of the residents have moved here to avoid living in such a development. There would be increased traffic and increased traffic has already taken place in this area. None of the roads within the subdivision have sidewalks which, and the increased traffic, would cause a hazard to young children. There is also the noise factor to be considered. There are already inadequate educational facilities in the area and the high school students are now subject to shifts. This proposal would cause an increase in the already overcrowded conditions. The residents agree with the Planning and Development and their comments made in the staff report. Councillor Cosman at this time asked the people on whose behalf this brief had been made, to stand, and they did.