

designated for both sides of Collector Road and on one side of the main residential thoroughfare streets and it says in the master plan that they are concrete, it doesn't say anything in the PUD Agreement. Would they be concrete sidewalks?

MR. CLARKE: Yes, they would be concrete sidewalks, they would meet the Department of Transportation's specifications for Municipal sidewalks.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Being a life-long resident of Sackville I have watched very closely the First Lakes Development in Sackville. I was a member of an active organization when it first started and was concerned about a very environmentally sensitive First Lake and anticipated a lot of siltation or pollution. I felt that we had the assurances of the Department of the Environment at that time that siltation would be very minimal, pollution would be almost non-existent. Unfortunately over the years we found that not to be true. I think that we the residents of Sackville and the Housing Commission have learned a lot of lessons out of Sackville. I think that we have evolved to a very good PUD agreement on this development but I would like to express the comment that I think that the majority of the residents of Sackville are very acutely concerned about this development and Feeley Lake and Little Sackville River and any other water way that might be involved in it. During peak rains if you are destroying a flood control plain and marshy area that has the ability to absorb and retain water you are going to experience heavy run offs and then during your drier periods that part of the land is almost dried up so that your river course is almost dry. I hope that above and beyond the PUD Agreement we have the assurances of the Housing Commission and the Department of the Environment that it will be very acutely watched and controlled and measures taken to correct any problems that may evolve.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: Mr. Clarke in the master plan there is no page marked on there the one where it states under ownership, "It will be the intention of the Nova Scotia Housing Commission all public parkland within Millwood will be deeded to the Municipality or its agencies." Unfortunately, we have not as yet made the decision as to what system will be used in taking over public lands so I would assume if a decision is made in the future and as a matter of fact, it is coming before Council in August. For instance, each district is to look after their own parkland areas then that would be acceptable to the Housing Commission.

MR. CLARKE: With what proposals will be coming out, the method of the approval and takeover of parkland in Millwood is set out in the agreement which had been negotiated between the two parties and I would assume that it would be the system that would apply.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: What would happen in this case, for instance, if tomorrow we took over a piece of parkland from Millwood if it were completed for some area and a decision was made in the future stating that each district was responsible for the maintenance of these lands. Would it be just a matter then of passing this responsibility over to the district?

MR. CRAGG: I think technically under the PUD Agreement and the By-Law itself, it is the Municipality's ownership that is in question, it is usually the Municipality that is looking after it, not particularly the district.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: How do we stand with regard to this proposal or recommendation coming before Council on Parklands next month, where does that fit in under this, or does it?

MR. CRAGG: I don't think it really does. If we sign this PUD Agreement we are bound by the terms of it. The PUD Agreement says in Section 16 that 10% shall be donated and as each Phase is developed and the appropriate approvals for the different lots and parcels including the parkland are received, it is incumbent upon the Housing Commission to deed them over to it. I think it is morally incumbent upon us to accept them.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: In the portion I am looking at, the intention of the Nova Scotia Housing Commission is that all public parkland within Millwood will be deeded over to the Municipality or its agencies. In that case couldn't its agency be a district for instance? Would that be acceptable?

MR. CRAGG: I think perhaps it could, although if you look at Section 16 of the By-Law it refers to Municipality.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: With regard to school land Mr. Clarke, I think we all realize of course the Province cost shares now to a greater extent of the land, but I have never been comfortable with the fact that regardless of that we still end up paying \$7000 or \$7500 per acre for land made available for schools when indeed we are not the ones responsible for having the schools built. You mention in the agreement, that these Phases will have to meet all environment and Highway approvals, I am sure you are probably aware, concern has expressed with the future drainage in conjunction with Millwood Development.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: Mr. Clarke, two things bother me. First of all, when you made the comment in response to Councillor Williams concerning schools and school buildings and so on, you indicated it is the developers' responsibility to provide the school site. Now it was pointed out it will be at \$7500 per acre in 1980 dollars and we don't know what happens in 1981, 1982, but it bothers me that when the private developer creates a lot, he pays taxes on it. Isn't it correct that the Housing Commission will not be paying any taxes to the Municipality until a new owner takes over an individual lot.

MR. CLARKE: Yes, that's correct.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: Those tax dollars actually are not there to support the Municipality toward building schools and that concerns me. Secondly, I came across a report, not accidentally, prepared in June 1978 by the Community Planning Division, Department of Municipal Affairs. It states simply that between May 1971 and April 1977 there

were roughly thirty-two hundred surplus lots created in the Municipality. They explain this to prove the point that the Regional Development Plan restrictions outside the boundary weren't all that bad for the people because there were plenty of surplus lots. But if you accept the fact that that's the truth, why do we have the need to have, besides those surplus lots, the government create even more surplus lots which in the document are described as lots which are too costly to develop and so it is extremely expensive to maintain for any length of time so they ought to be sold fast. Why that need when we have that many surplus lots in the Municipality even though they may be outside the boundary.

MR. CLARKE: Excuse me, I understand they are outside the boundary and that's simply a quantitative calculation. There is no indication as to their marketability in location and proximity to services and so on. The development in Millwood will reinforce the community infrastructure that is in the area now, it will help support the commercial facilities and the trunk servicing structure that's in the area. For example, there is a 3000 foot trunk sewer coming up the Middle Sackville River at the moment that is not utilized and will be utilized with the development of Millwood. It's in the metropolitan context and within the boundary. Millwood is reasonably efficient and helps us to reinforce the objectives of the regional plan and the servicing infrastructure that's in Sackville, for instance. Any further development in that area will only help public transit in the area.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: Would you care to comment at all on the fairness of no tax coming to the Municipality from these lots until those lots are actually sold.

MR. CLARKE: I would rather not comment. I'm not familiar with the total situation. I understand that the Commission has paid some grants in lieu of taxes on occasion. I'm not sure what the situation will be with Millwood so I can't really comment beyond that.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: Mr. Clarke, you referred to the reserve area, the gray area on the lower part of the map. You said at the present time in the first phase, it would not be serviceable. Is that correct?

MR. CLARKE: That's right, nor in the other phases as well.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: Well, that's what I wanted to know. I thought there was a factor that was going to make it serviceable.

MR. CLARKE: I'm sorry, I didn't explain that. The areas that can be serviced in Millwood at the moment by the trunk sewer are those areas shown in the five phases. That gray area just can't be serviced to that sewer. It's outside any servicing scheme that is in place at the moment and we'll have to await some future extension of services of the Old Windsor Highway. The second problem is its very steep contour and its difficult in getting access from the Old Windsor Highway so its just an area which we set aside and will have to be dealt with at some unforeseeable date in the future.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: Another area which has already been discussed but I would like to reaffirm it in my own mind is the parks and walkways. This would be deeded to the Municipality, Mr. Cragg, is that correct? and the Municipality would then be responsible for maintenance of these lands. I find this very difficult to accept at this time, particularly with the parks and walkways in the other urban areas of the County. There is a great problem there right now as to who is going to maintain and provide the money for the other areas. I would find this very difficult to accept. Apart from that I can see great merit in the development but I hardly think the residents of the County can be expected to help maintain the parkways and walkways.

MR. CLARKE: Yes, I think the situation there is that conveyance of the land would have to be part of the subdivision approval process, but any capital expenditures on facilities, for instance a playground or equipment which would require heavy maintenance by the Municipality, would have to be looked at in the planning stages. In the County and the Housing Commission, for example, cooperating on a particular project and some capital funds being put into it, I think the County would have to be assured of its own line, how its going to maintain and operate the facility so that the capital investment would be protected. That applies mostly to facilities. I think the land itself hopefully, can be maintained but the cost of its maintenance will be much lower than that for facilities.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: The clearing and the looking after in the summer and the plowing in the winter would all be up to the rest of the County, and the whole County to look after.

MR. CLARKE: Certainly if the Municipality intended to plow them in the winter that would be the responsibility of the Municipality.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: Well don't you feel that if people are living around them and they have walkways that they would expect it.

MR. CLARKE: Well they may wish to have a program of hiking on perhaps natural trails and perhaps even using them as cross country ski trails in the winter. That is somewhat the system in Forest Hills at the moment.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: I think that is a very important thing to have ironed out before we come to decision because there are many dollars involved.

WARDEN LAWRENCE: Perhaps you could use the map on the wall to outline exactly how many walkways there are. There doesn't seem to be many to me, unless I'm misreading the map.

MR. CLARKE: Another intention was to reduce them. The major walkways now are from Feeley Lake down through to where it intersects with Little Sackville River and then which would parallel the river down the length of the development and connect with the Municipal use sites. Millwood is a smaller land Assembly. It's also blessed with this central spine of a river valley and the lake. So the walkways we are

going to build simply are the one along the river and the one connecting to the lake.

COUNCILLOR MACKENZIE: This property at the present time is owned by the Housing Commission, is that right.

MR. CLARKE: Yes.

COUNCILLOR MACKENZIE: So this means that we are not getting any tax revenue from this particular property at the present time.

MR. CLARKE: Yes, I believe that is correct.

COUNCILLOR MACKENZIE: So if we decide tonight not to approve this development we would never receive any tax dollars from it unless the Housing Commission were able to dispose of it, is that right.

MR. CLARKE: Unless there is an alternate plan.

COUNCILLOR MACKENZIE: I think we are finding that what the Housing Commission are doing is spending Nova Scotia tax dollars to provide development that is very attractive for people to move into. One of my concerns is that this has a bearing on some of the rural areas of the Municipality, whereby, the people are moving into those areas that are very attractive as far as housing is concerned and, therefore, drawing up any revenue that may be in some of the rural areas for our emergence and business people. This is a concern also mentioned by Councillor Williams about the school situation. I am surprised there are not people here from the other Municipalities surrounding us opposing this type of development because we know what is happening to schools within the more urban areas of the cities. We can see that there are many classrooms that are vacant at the present time. I feel people are moving out of the cities as well into those very attractive propositions within the County. I suppose a few years down the road we can look at this particular area becoming incorporated that we'll also have the Housing Commission back at the County wanting to move out farther with the same type of development.

There being no further questions for Mr. Clarke, Warden Lawrence stated that the Hearing would proceed with the Staff Report. She thanked Mr. Clarke. Warden Lawrence stated that Mr. Campbell and Ms. Spencer were going to outline the Staff Report.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Madame Warden, the staff have prepared a report dated July 15, 1980 entitled The Development Agreement. Before specifically going into the report I would like to bring up a couple of points in reference to these addressed to Mr. Clarke. One is the walkways and parkland areas. Staff in their negotiations specifically requested a reduction in the number of the walkways, because we found in the Forest Hills development and the previous Sackville development there was a proliferation of walkways which we knew with the increased cost of energy etc., would cost a lot to maintain. If we could get a reduced number and still have a very efficient system it would be much better. In terms of the green areas that are outlined in green on the

actual map, number eight, some Councillors mentioned the draft policy paper that is now before Council on maintenance, we specifically included a policy in that paper recommending that Council encourage service commissions to take over the maintenance of those lands if indeed that was economically viable for them to do so. Councillor Stewart mentioned Section 5 in the last paragraph where there was mention of the Municipality taking over the roads and street cleaning, I would request that if Council does deem to approve this tonight that they do make a motion to exclude that particular sentence from the Agreement. It is not included because the Municipality does not provide street cleaning. Those were two of the points that I wanted to bring up. On your desks are two maps from the Agreements previously forwarded to you, which were revised to locate the alternate school site exactly within Phase 1. The one that you received on July 15 had that alternate school site shown on the parkland and that was an error and the revised maps show that site adjacent to one of the main streets in that neighbourhood in Phase 1. Mr. Clarke has gone over much of the background information on Millwood and what it is actually composed of, therefore, I am going to address myself to two specific items that are of great concern to staff and have been throughout the negotiations for the Millwood Agreement. The first is storm drainage which a number of Councillors mentioned. Staff are very concerned about the storm drainage and the maintenance and control of storm drainage within Millwood particularly due to the location of this development, that is at the head waters of the Little Sackville River and much of the development, particularly the Municipal Use development, will be occurring in the flood plane of that Little Sackville River and possibly reducing the absorption capability of the soil and increasing the flow of the Little Sackville River. This would cause problems downstream. In the report we mention that Council is aware of this special joint Provincial - Municipal task force working on the storm drainage. They have identified Millwood as a potential problem area if inadequate storm drainage plans are not prepared and for this reason staff have requested that the actual agreement refer to the overall approval of the development by the Department of Environment before any work is to proceed. We hope that is sufficient to prevent any problems from occurring. Staff would really prefer to see that a detailed storm drainage plan be done for the whole development. The second item is on page 3 of our report, and refers to the capacity of the sewage system. The Public Works Department has indicated that at present there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the Millwood development. However, if Millwood is approved and does go ahead as scheduled then other development within the serviceable boundary of Sackville can only proceed if an infiltration inflow reduction program is carried out by the Municipality. I have put a map on the wall showing a blue line representing the approximate location of the Municipality's serviceable boundary and it locates in red the proposed Millwood development. We are pointing this out to Council because it is very important. Without this infiltration inflow reduction program, further approvals of subdivisions within the total system may not be forthcoming.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Will the Engineering Department make a presentation on the infiltration problem so that we may ask questions on this?

MR. CAMPBELL: They are here to answer any questions but they were not going to make a specific presentation.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: I have talked to Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Wdowiak and members of your department before with regard to the infiltration problem which supposedly now exists in the Sackville Lakes Development area. I think the infiltration problem that we presently have is something we are going to have to live with over a long period of time, if not for ever. Personally I think any future projections of future development of Sackville are going to have to take this into consideration and judge our capacities and our projections on that. With regard to the Mill Cove treatment plant the present capacity is 2.5 million gallons and is being doubled to 5 million gallons. Will that not handle the capacity of Millwood plus all the future development within the serviceable boundaries that would take in Sackville, not only Sackville but Bedford also.

MR. CAMPBELL: Either Mr. Gallagher or Mr. Wdowiak may want to answer that. What we are referring to in the report is the capacity not of the actual treatment plant but of the trunk line feeding that treatment plant. In other words, the treatment plant expansion has been approved but the bottle neck is getting the sewage waste to that plant. There is a limited capacity to that trunk line and it is being affected by infiltration and that infiltration has to be reduced or should be reduced through a program in order for further development to go ahead. It is the trunk line that we are speaking about.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Okay, taking the capacity of the main trunk sewer at the present time, adding on projected flow from Millwood, and allowing your normal percentage for infiltration, would it still not accommodate Millwood, plus the other foreseeable development within the serviceable boundary.

MR. CAMPBELL: There is capacity within the trunk line for the development of Millwood to proceed. However, for other development to proceed, that is infilling other lands within the Sackville serviceable boundary, an infiltration reduction program would have to occur in order to allow for the development to go ahead. I can't speak on the detailed engineering aspects but perhaps you would like Mr. Gallagher or Mr. Wdowiak to answer some specific questions.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Assuming that the PUD is ratified for Millwood that would exclude development of Phases 11 and 12 as may be presented by the Nova Scotia Housing Commission. Am I correct on that assumption?

MR. CAMPBELL: Phases 11 and 12 are now outside the serviceable boundary shown in this map. Staff has been asked by the Chief Administrative Officer to prepare a report on Phases 11 and 12. We are now in the process of preparing it.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Phase 12 and part of Phase 11 is. If there were a trade-off of lands, Phase 11 and 12 to development around the Second Lake in lieu of it would the present projections of capacity be able to

MR. CAMPBELL: That is a question that we are looking into. If we are saying that if Millwood goes ahead then no other development can take place then the same is true for all development and that even includes switching development boundaries. It refers to all lands within that serviceable boundary and if Millwood goes ahead then all lands will be affected. If you try to bring in lands from outside that or switch them around, that wouldn't matter.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: So basically, what the stand of the Planning and Engineering Departments would be is, that if Millwood is approved it would effectively freeze any development within the serviceable boundaries of Sackville and Bedford.

MR. CAMPBELL: If Millwood is approved. What happens in approving it is that it omits a certain part of the serviceable area for development. Now as Mr. Clarke referred to the development of Millwood takes place over a ten year period. About the engineering aspects of approvals going ahead I can't answer those questions.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: At the present time we have an infiltration identification program going on and I also believe that we have a commitment from the Nova Scotia Housing Commission that when areas are identified and isolated they will provide the funds for rectification of the problem.

MR. GALLAGHER: Madame Warden and members of Council. At the time the Municipal Development Plan was being undertaken, flow measurements were made to identify the capacity of the trunk sewage system. It was brought to light that there was sewer charging on the trunk sewer on the Sackville end of the trunk sewer in two places. And a third one was found on the lower reaches. The trunk sewage system was designed on the basis of one fall slope in view of fact of the well point system for dewatering for the installation of this system. It was designed on a one shot basis. At the time plans were being made for the trunk sewage system in the twelfth hour it came to light, and our consultants were asked to have a look at this and these landholdings and the trunk sewage system was modified to take care of those plans. That is shown in the plans by Canadian Base Limited in which the area is cross-hatched and it shows where the provisions were made for the extra area. Over and above that there were other lands which were purchased by the Housing Commission which are not included either in the first conception or the second. In the recommendations handed down by the consultants it was felt that the inflow measurements which were taken were minimal ones. It advocated that an overall inflow reduction program be carried out. It refers to infiltration inflow and there is a distinct difference in as much as infiltration indicates that something that infiltrates through the ground and finds its way into the pipe. The subsequent monitoring that has been done by our Department shows that this is a flashy occurrence in which minutes after these heavy rainfalls we are getting excessive flows into our storm sewage system. This indicates that our storm sewage system is being used partially as a storm sewage system. We have been monitoring

over the past year the within house staff and it has been a slow undertaking in as much as the monitoring is only carried out and can only be used at the time that we get the appropriate rainfall. I have been talking to Council before and I have advocated that we should now be getting down to calling the shots as they are and that we are not moving fast enough on this situation. The inflows that we are getting can't be tolerated and shouldn't be there. We feel that they can be offset. We are moving too slow on this and something has to be done about this situation. We are advocating that until something is done we should be curbing development until we start to show some results on the recovery of the capacity on our sanitary sewage system which our consultants now feel we can obtain. That is the situation. Now as regards to the reasons for this, the systems are designed by professional engineers, inspected by field staff, we ourselves carry out inspections. We have records of inspections and flow measurements taken. We are responsible for the inspection as far as the building and we don't know at this time what is happening. One thing we do know is that it shouldn't be in and it can't be allowed to continue.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Do you have a commitment from the Nova Scotia Housing Commission in the Sackville Lakes area after you identify the infiltration that they will provide the funds to rectify the problem?

MR. GALLAGHER: The Housing Commission intimated that. In all fairness to the Housing Commission in any other instances where there have been deficiencies they have been there to ensure that they were rectified. Now as regards to the particular development of Millwood, I feel we have an obligation in this regard inasmuch that I, as your representative in the Engineering Department, may have been one of the chief advocates. One of the reasons the Housing Commission purchased the Millwood lands was that I was asked whether or not there was any reason why development couldn't take place in those lands. As a matter of fact, previous to them being purchased, and because of the plans which at that time were being formulated by the previous owner, we extended 1800 feet of trunk sewage system which is laying dormant.

COUNCILLOR STEWART: I have two concerns. Mr. Gallagher, is this infiltration inflow reduction program of which you are speaking in effect and if so, who is doing the work?

MR. GALLAGHER: We've been doing some monitoring of flows for which we purchase monitoring equipment which is installed in manholes in strategic locations. A weir is built with a V-notch wier and there is a clock mechanism which records inflow. The actual physical work of repairs and so on has not been initiated. Indications seem to be that our sanitary sewage system might be being used by people that have sump pumps and other things even though there is a trunk deep storm system being provided in the area where we are experiencing inflow.

COUNCILLOR STEWART: Then you monitor it now but to actually fix it is going to require time, resources, money and so on. Who would normally be having to approve such a program and who would fund it and who would do the work?

MR. GALLAGHER: This decision would have to be made by Council when they are presented with the facts.

COUNCILLOR STEWART: Pending that happening or not happening, what you are saying then is simply that if you approve this, that cuts the options for any other development in essence, around the area. That's the basic caution.

MR. GALLAGHER: It minimizes it, there are exceptions, for example there is an infilling that can be taking place, one or two lots here and there.

COUNCILLOR STEWART: Mr. Campbell, you and many others including myself have major concerns about the whole idea of downstream storm drainage etc. You have indicated that was one of your prime concerns in your report yet you have had input in drafting the agreement. Paragraph 11 in the Agreement apparently takes into account there has to be a Department of Environment approval of the whole thing in advance before the Phase by Phase approval. Do you still feel that there should be further changes to the Agreement in this regard that you would suggest that are not incorporated there now.

MR. CAMPBELL: The inclusion of the overall approval of the Department of Environment was made at a late date. In fact, almost four weeks ago that particular clause was included by the Planning Advisory Committee at the recommendation of Mr. Birch. Mr. Birch at that time indicated that given the situation and the amount of negotiations that had gone on it was difficult at this time to require a complete deferrment of the development pending a detailed storm drainage master plan to be developed. He said he would prefer to see, and I concur with him, a detailed storm drainage plan done but he would settle for the approval of the Department of Environment from a storm drainage point of view prior to the Municipality approving any of the Phases in development. Originally, or upwards of five weeks ago the Agreement was only written so that the Department would only approve individual Phases and quoting in his original discussion here this evening, he said that it is a very complex development and I agree with him and, therefore, we need a comprehensive approach to it and having Department of Environment approve it section by section is not a comprehensive approach.

COUNCILLOR STEWART: Does the Department of Environment staff feel that, given the requirement that they have to approve the whole concept first, is that a positive step? Do they feel they can actually look at the proposed plans and make an assesment?

MR. CAMPBELL: The whole development was presented to the Department of Environment over the past years of negotiating the agreement. What has been received from them are merely comments on the development stating what the devloper should do as he proceeds in developing. No approval was ever forthcoming from them on it. Specifically the Department of Environment is probalbly not aware that the clause is in there.

COUNCILLOR STEWART: You feel that this clause will prevent the problems which Forest Hills, for example, which has helped aggravate

the downstream of Forest Hills. In other words the Colby Village problems.

MR. CAMPBELL: That depends upon the amount of detail that the Department of Environment and the Housing Commission agree to put into the actual approval.

COUNCILLOR WISEMAN: Bill, when will the Environment study be available, is there any indication at all?

MR. CAMPBELL: The way it has been done is that clause has been put in the agreement. As I say the Department of the Environment is not aware that the clause is in there. The Planning Advisory Committee in negotiating upwards to five weeks ago said that is the way we are proceeding, not being able to get an approval from the Department of Environment immediately before the present Public Hearing then we will require that approval by the Department of Environment before the Municipality will approve any Phases within the development.

COUNCILLOR WISEMAN: So you feel by bringing the hearing here tonight without this information we have enough protection in that Agreement to approve the concept.

MR. CAMPBELL: With that condition within the Agreement and as I say if they do a very comprehensive study, yes, I would prefer to have that study in front of Council when you are reviewing the development then you know exactly what is going to happen with that development. We do not have it and we hope that the overall approval by the Department of Environment will allow protection for the Municipality.

COUNCILLOR WISEMAN: Do we have no controls at this point if we approve the development? Do we have no controls whatsoever about the degree of comprehensiveness of the control offered by the Department of Environment?

MR. CAMPBELL: The only way that I could suggest is that you require that approval be brought before Council and have it reviewed by Council prior to the development proceeding.

COUNCILLOR WISEMAN: What I am looking at now in the PUD Agreement now is it seems to me, in Section 17 starting on page 12, there is a great deal of control with regard to excess infiltration or over-utilization of the system as far as the PUD is concerned for Millwood. Is there not?

MR. GALLAGHER: Yes!

COUNCILLOR WISEMAN: So there is good control there. You mentioned before that no further development outside of Millwood could proceed or at least only infilling could proceed but that is only until the present infiltration is corrected, is that not true?

MR. GALLAGHER: That is correct.

COUNCILLOR WISEMAN: We are looking at a positive step now with the Housing Commissions offer of funding to control this or rectify this situation. We are looking at the possibility of having this infiltration cleared up are we not.

MR. GALLAGHER: Yes, it should start as quickly as possible. While we are speaking on this matter and we are referring to it as infiltration we in staff are more or less convinced that what we are getting here now is inflow. It may well be that some of remedial measures that have to take place will be more on legislation in which people will have to be informed that we have sanitary sewage legislation which prohibits the use of our sanitary sewer for rain water leads, foundation tile, and sump pumps. We just have to back it up.

COUNCILLOR MACDONALD: Mr. Gallagher I was wondering if you have found any particular areas where the infiltration is being caused from.

MR. GALLAGHER: We have found one or two sources of infiltration.

COUNCILLOR MACDONALD: I mentioned to Mr. Clarke and I will mention it again that it is very important that no pipes in the Millwood development be covered in unless we are sure there is nothing other than sewage going into this.

COUNCILLOR MARGESON: I recall at a meeting with Mr. Clarke and Mr. Birch both present that the subject of acceptance for handling storm water was that if as each Phase is developed the Housing Commission along with the Department of Environment will provide a detailed plan for acceptance for handling storm water and if this isn't forthcoming then that is the end of it. So we do have control on it and I would think that that's a matter we can say is within our hands.

MR. GALLAGHER: I think though, and this might be an opportune moment to stress again what I have stressed before that at some time this Municipality is faced with coming to grips with what happens to these storm drainage systems. There has to be some authority in control of them whether it is the Provincial authority or whether it is the Municipality eventually people pay for them. This is one of our shortcomings at this particular time.

COUNCILLOR EISENHAUER: Yes, Warden I would like to dwell further on the inflow of water into sewage system. Early in 1980 we were rather concerned about the Millwood project if it went underway because of several things, one being the sewer system. The one question that came up was do we in fact have to expand the Millcove sewer treatment if we did not approve Millwood and the answer at that time was we would have to expand the treatment plant.

MR. GALLAGHER: That is correct.

COUNCILLOR EISENHAUER: That Millcove would be a benefit because it would help us with some increase in taxes. When I saw the staff reports which simply states the Public Works Department has commented that there is presently sufficient capacity however, it must be pointed

out that the servicing of the total lands within the serviceable boundary is contingent upon an infiltration inflow reduction program being adopted to reduce flows to an acceptable level in order to allow infilling of the land. That to me seemed to be a pretty alarming statement, based on the fact that early in the year the equipment had been in the Forest Hills area before we took over that sewer system and that we could expect an additional 12 months before we could identify the areas in Sackville. We did hope that the problem area would be identified and corrected at least with the Millwood development. Now my question is how long has the monitoring devices been in Sackville and what type of program. If they haven't been there for the full 12 months, I would like to know, and what type of additional program should we take to step up the program we have in existence now.

MR. GALLAGHER: I think we have eight instruments and we loaned two. With these, you are dependent upon getting a flow of water which would give you the type of information that you require. There is a period in which you get dry weather flows and then you want what we would refer to as an equivalent storm. There are different rain falls which don't affect the capacity of the trunk sewer very much. Identification will go on for a few years. You won't do it all in the one year. We have done a considerable amount of it, it's a matter of setting up a program and identifying and repairing and then moving to another section of it and so on. Now to come back to the treatment plant at Millcove under dry weather conditions, under dry weather flows, is an ideal situation in which we got no infiltration other than what is allowed its exceeded its capacity.

COUNCILLOR EISENHAUER: I would like to see us be a bit more positive saying that in order to allow a sufficient infilling that we would have to step up our program of monitoring and correcting inflows.

MR. CAMPBELL: One of the things which might be causing confusion here is there is no inflow infiltration reduction program that has started. This would have to be approved by Council so that is why it was brought out in the report that has to be done, or there has to be an approval to spend money in order to reduce the inflow into that system. There is only a monitoring program going on now to find out what is going on in the system.

COUNCILLOR EISENHAUER: Is the warning that it would be based on the maintenance, if we found an inflow problem it would not be a maintenance type of operation and therefore we would increase our capital debt?

MR. GALLAGHER: We have to identify what the problems are, then identify what corrections are going to be made and how it will be financed.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: Mr. Gallagher, prior to the abandonment of the Public Works Committee last fall, as a member of that Committee, I was given to believe that an infiltration reduction program would be commenced in the near future as a result of the monitoring that had taken place. I also understood that this program would be cost-shared

to an extent by the Housing Commission.

MR. GALLAGHER: No, the infiltration reduction program as such, but first of all you have to identify this and we have started a monitoring program which is a slow process, has not been started.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: On the former committee given figures as to how much infiltration was taking place, the monitoring had already been done at that time.

MR. GALLAGHER: The monitoring which was being done was in recognition of what was happening in the trunk sewer, it had only been done in three places. The actual monitoring now is to determine area by area working down through the system from the upper reaches down or from the lower reaches up just where this is occurring and we have been doing some of this monitoring in Forest Hills and in Sackville. Actually as regards as actual remedial measures there is very little done other than our own maintenance people. What I am saying now is okay we have done some monitoring and we got some information together now and it is the time to say let's identify where the problems are and rectify it.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: Mr. Campbell, if a normal subdivision approval is applied for in the urban area, what is the average waiting period?

MR. CAMPBELL: Urban subdivisions depending on their size normally go through quite quickly. An individual lot in a serviced area can go through as fast as three weeks. A bigger subdivision where you are dealing with 60 or 80 lots would have a lot of pre-engineering and they go preliminary, tentative, and final plans would take a considerable length of time.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: In 7B of the proposed Agreement it stated that the Municipality shall approve or disapprove the subdivision within 30 days of the date received by the County. I would presume this is possible as each Phase as proposed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, that is also a requirement of the Planning Act. However, the Municipality has the opportunity that if within 30 days it finds something wrong with that subdivision plan or there are problems with engineering or public lands or whatever we can inform the Housing Commission and settle those problems beyond the 30 day period.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: In the proposed Agreement Section 9C in the last portion...The Commission or its agent or independent contractor etc. It gets down to...shall comply with By-laws of general application that relate to construction and installation of sewers including but not to limit the generality of the foregoing. I wish someone could explain to me that one regarding the Blasting and Dangerous Materials By-Law.

MR. CAMPBELL: This is merely to indicate and have it clearly within the Agreement that, even though this is a PUD which is under special legislation in a special By-law, other permits would be required.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: In other words they still have to conform the same

as everyone else in regards to that By-Law.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes that is correct.

COUNCILLOR BENJAMIN: I am anxiously waiting to hear the general public respond and provide a lot more subjects that we perhaps are overlooking as Councillors. Mr. Campbell as you look at the overall plan particularly Millwood here you look at many Malls as I would interpret the amount of land provided for commercial use. So we are more or less adopting the plan. I would think that in the County we are going to have a series of neighbourhood malls. I am thinking of what is in the Town Centre in Sackville. I am wondering from a planning point of view should there not be some provision for a larger mall in one area rather than have a series of small neighbourhood type of malls. In other words I am looking for something like we have in the cities of Halifax and Darmouth where a sizable amount of land was put aside for commercial use.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes and your first statement is correct. The Housing Commission has indicated two commercial sites in the development. They are small and meant for local shopping, convenience shopping areas. The idea of developing a shopping mall size of development in talking perhaps 25 acres of land is not the type of development that we would recommend in a neighbourhood development such as Millwood. In fact we would encourage that type of development to occur in the existing developing commercial area on the Old Windsor Highway, the Number 1 Highway in Sackville. There is a considerable amount of commercial land available for development. Large tracts there are existing shopping centers. We would prefer to encourage that concept in this early stage of the evolution of Sackville that is to decentralize the commercial to outside this development.

COUNCILLOR BENJAMIN: Going on to another area and that is of course we have been talking extensively about the flooding or the possibility of runoff. I hope that we are not going to have what we had in First Lake as was mentioned here before. And I hope also that we are not putting the water downstream so that we have repercussions from Union Street flooding in the Bedford area. It looks to me as though everything seems to hinge on costs. We look at the additional need for schools, the additional bussing, the additional buildings that will be required and yet we will not recoup any tax dollars until the property is sold which I think means an outlay of money from the County before we really get a chance to recoup back the monies from the taxes. This is undoubtedly one issue but we see walkways, and bikeways, and that is a new one. I don't know what bikeways are or how extensive this will be. I noticed in the report they were quite wide, 51 foot width in some areas and I am sure it is not going to be completely paved but I mean it will certainly be a strip that will be hard surface. Now this will have to be covered by snow removal. This is costly to the County or to the local area. County planning staff is extensively engaged in the work of Millwood along with others. The Public Works Department has also been noted that they are going to have additional need for personnel for monitoring the storm sewers, the school board is certainly going to be busy and all this is adding up to County costs

which leads me to believe we should go to the Municipal Affairs for some sort of grants in lieu of taxation if this thing gets off the ground. There has been no real financial outlay as to the impact on the County, I haven't heard anything tonight that leads me to believe anything other than that we are going to be taking this on as we do other projects hoping that we get taxes down the road to offset the costs. Should we not do this particularly when this County is going into the limit of their capabilities to borrow. We are coming to the point we are going to jeopardize other projects down the road unless we have some financial assistance from the Province and I think that should be an area that County staff should recommend direction to Council so that we will be able to financially withstand this along with other expansion such as may happen over in Colby Village. This isn't the only project we have on stream and new schools will be required. Is there not consideration given to this down the line through your consultation with the Province or some sort of grants in lieu of taxation.

MR. CAMPBELL: In negotiating the actual agreement with the Housing Commission there were never any discussions on grants in lieu of except in regard to recreational development and that has already been mentioned by Mr. Clarke. The issue of the financial viability of the residential development such as this was brought up some months ago and determining the financial viability of a residential development is a very complex thing especially when you are dealing with a rural Municipality because of the cost sharing. I think the report on Sackville was an indication of the complexity of writing a financial statement on the implications of development. There was never any mandate to approach the Millwood development from that point of view. We were approaching it clearly from a planning development point of view without looking at the financial implications. The Municipality has never had a policy of judging developments on their financial basis. If in fact, the County had a policy of doing that surely we would approach them from that aspect.

COUNCILLOR BENJAMIN: In looking at even the school question on a regional basis the apartment ratio in the city of Halifax and Darmouth is almost getting to the point of almost entirely being used up. That means the family type with school age children will make up the majority of 1700 odd which will be in the first Phase. It has been a trend in the past anyway that most of the young families are the ones looking for homes and they move outside of the metro area where they can afford to live. Now if this is the case and we look at the existing school space available, as Councillor Williams mentioned before, some of the city schools have vacant classrooms and we are plugging our classrooms to the extent that we have to keep on building. I think that it is realistic to go to the Province and ask them for even greater assistance but perhaps I am wrong here.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: I am a little confused on two or three matters. The problem of making the trunk sewer either bigger or the infiltration smaller is going to cost money. At one point the question was asked where is the money going to come from. Will it be a decision of Council or will it be an area rate.

MR. GALLAGHER: When I said it was a decision of Council presumably any modifications carried out as regards to sewer would have to be borne by the people it is serving. Right now we have an overall sewer maintenance rate for the various areas.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: Would you anticipate that this would be a very expensive project?

MR. GALLAGHER: Well, we don't know the causes of it yet. I'm not just being evasive now.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: No, I'm getting the impression that there are many things that we are not just sure about, not just you, but generally.

MR. GALLAGHER: We can't be sure until we identify what the causes are.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: Another thing that was mentioned was consultants. Who I wonder would pay for the consultants?

MR. GALLAGHER: Here again the decision would be made by you people as policy makers.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: I understand that if it were to go ahead that everything else would be curtailed or pretty well everything else as far as development in the Sackville area. Is that correct?

MR. GALLAGHER: We would have to limit that which can be done and it will become judged on its merits as to infilling.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: It seems to me that the Housing Commission would be playing a little bit of an unfair game to other residents and owners and developers under these conditions.

MR. GALLAGHER: I don't necessarily see it that way, only to the extent that possibly the Housing Commission by the very nature of it being the largest subdividor that they have done the preponderant amount of work and they are the ones possibly that are going to be affected the most initially.

Warden Lawrence pointed out that we have ex-Deputy Mayor of the City of Halifax, Margaret Stanbury, in the audience. Warden made mention of the painting received by the County from the Sackville Advisory Board as a Centennial gift and memento. She then called for speakers in favour of the Planned Unit Development agreement.

MR. RON BARKHOUSE: Madame Chairman, Councillors, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, in following suit and in keeping with Madame Chairman's remarks I am here on the behalf of the Sackville Advisory Board. I would like to address the Council in support of the Millwood development. My name is Ron Barkhouse, I am a resident of Sackville and more particularly Beaver Bank. I am a member of the Land Development Committee of the Sackville Advisory Board. Madame

Chairman, with your permission I would like to explain the Board which I represent. The Sackville Advisory Board is made up of a group of concerned residents of the area dealing with the issues that pertain to our community. The Advisory Board is made up of 17 members including our five Municipal Councillors from Districts 15, 16, part of 18 and 19 and 20, our member of the Legislative Assembly for Sackville is also part of our Board, our member of Parliament is also part of our Board, we have a secretary-treasurer, and two directors that are elected by the electors for each district. So that comprises 17 people in total. Perhaps the aims or objectives of this Advisory Board would be to enter into discussion or debates or dialogues on issues of the community and to give our Councillors a broader in depth feeling of the community so therefore they can better wisely make their decisions. In my discussion tonight I would like to dwell on several points. The first one is the economics of Millwood for future business development. As we are all well aware, housing starts and construction in general is down across Canada and Nova Scotia and more particularly in our own Municipality. I have seen figures that Halifax County is down some 44 percent over past years. Some of these reasons we know are: high interest rates, surplus of housing, and lack of available serviced land. However, in part this has been relieved due to a drop from 20 percent down to 13-14 percent. We feel that the surplus of housing generated some two to three years ago has been used up and indeed we seem to be heading for a housing shortage in the next 12 months. Especially in the low and medium income bracket which basically the majority of our County is made up of. Basically all we have to do is to take a drive throughout our County and look at the 'For Sale' signs and if you have been observant over the past years I would say we are down considerably in 'For Sale' signs and perhaps even as much as 100 percent over previous years. Indeed if our off-shore resources and other major anticipated developments do take place we certainly will be faced with a severe housing problem. Even if we sense the interest rate has resolved itself and the surplus perhaps has been used up we still have one large problem that remains unsolved. That is availability of serviced land. This is where Millwood plays a very, very important role. Without this serviced land being made available to low and medium income people, then with all other factors in favour of an upswing in development, serviced land is going to curtail any progress to be made in our County. The second point I would like to make is on the economics of Millwood in past and present business from their point of view. In the past few years Sackville has had some fairly large businesses settle in our area; shopping centres, a car dealership, our famous fast food outlets. Our local business has grown and I am sure that in the feasibility study of locating in the Sackville area that Millwood certainly played a considerable role. As a matter of fact, I would suggest that whether it went ahead or not, probably the prospect of Millwood coming in was an important issue. I am certain that there are other businesses wanting to locate and pending the entries of the population of Millwood being made available that they are sitting on the burner. Also our two new industrial parks which certainly will become more attractive by the entries and population due to Millwood. All of these things add up to a very important thing and that is we need Millwood to stabilize the businesses that are there that projected Millwood coming on stream and

to increase business to the County and we certainly need business to reduce the residential tax. The third point is on the economics of Millwood from the present Sackville point of view. I believe that Sackville, like any business, has certain fixed operational costs and this will not vary in proportion to the increase of revenue generated. Like a business, heat, light, telephone, power, administration, secretary, boss and what have you does not double when you double your sales. The commodities that we now have in Sackville such as sewer maintenance, fire hydrants, pollution, main trunk sewers, treatment plant, and extensions thereof, present schools, even new schools scheduled, fire departments, transit, recreation, highway maintenance, street lighting and sidewalks. All of these things are now in existence or are projected and are reflected in our rates. We feel that by increasing Millwood we are going to be increasing the revenue of Millwood perhaps by a dollar and perhaps our costs will only be 50 cents. This increase in revenue to the County should indeed hopefully decrease the present resident tax rate or at least make it stable as it is presently. Even if it makes it stable it certainly is a reduction because I am sure with all of the studies and the things we heard here tonight in the discussions if this takes place without Millwood then Sackville residents are certainly going to have an increased burden in their taxes. Most important and significant to the taxpayers of Sackville and the County and Province is that significant funds have already been spent in land acquisition and services, from which is absolutely no revenue generated in return. Therefore, to the residents of Sackville area, Millwood is important to help distribute the tax burden over a greater number of people. In regards to planning, and I am sure the people of Sackville are concerned about Planning. We all know that Millwood has been kicked around and knocked around and discussed, studied, debated for several years. All departments involved in this project have had ample time to make sure that proper planning has been included in Millwood. I believe this has been done. In reading over your master plan and other detailed information such as the land use plan, your open space concept, your community concept, your pedestrian system, your sanitary and storm services, water and sewer and so on, I think these have been carefully thought out. Consideration and experience is demonstrated in good planning. Perhaps some of the errors and omissions and bad experiences of the Sackville Lakes development have been somewhat corrected in Forest Hills and now we have perfected our new Millwood development. Surely that past experience has taught us something and we can deal with the Millwood development as a separate unit and improve immensely on this new development. Therefore, in the planning of Millwood we believe the people of Sackville are looking forward to and feel quite comfortable with the increased population. Keeping in mind the experience and knowledge gained in past developments we believe that this will create a new community which we will all be proud of. In summary the immediate beginning of Millwood is important to us because: a) to provide serviced lots for a growing need for housing especially in the low and medium income brackets, b) an economic boost to give a shot in the arm for the lagging construction industry and create jobs, c) to support business and attract new business to our County, d) because of the amount of money already spent in the land purchase and trunk services revenues should be generated to help offset this cost and,

e) to help stabilize the ever increasing tax burden of the present by dividing the burden amongst more people. Millwood is a well planned community with sufficient monies spent to warrant priority of development over any other unplanned area. In conclusion, we the members of the Sackville Advisory Board, being elected to represent the people of Sackville area, do fully endorse the immediate start up of a new planned community of Millwood as outlined in your presentation. I thank you very much for the opportunity to address this Council.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: I just want to point out that more housing development will not necessarily help reduce your tax rate, particularly when it comes to requirements for schools. That is where the majority of tax dollars go and all things being equal you know it may even out, but in most cases that is what causes the tax dollar to rise.

MR. BARKHOUSE: I agree, but taking into consideration we now have the Industrial Park approved on the Cobequid Road and hopefully another one up around the Beaver Bank area that we are going to attract industry. However, there is still our costs that are spent for Millwood that we are presently sharing the burden of and the relationship to schools. Under this proposal Millwood can help the burden in our schools by people coming in.

COUNCILLOR BENJAMIN: I took little exception to your statistical reports as to the availability of housing in the area. You haven't been over to the arsenic country. I don't think you realize what we have over there. Where did you get your statistics? Is this something your association delved into or is it your own intrepertation of what you viewed around the area or has it been a Provincial survey or something?

MR. BARKHOUSE: It is sort of a combination of everything. The majority part is my own assumption, my own feeling that we certainly discuss in a broad sense amongst our board, but if you have been reading the paper particularly the real estate section in the Chronicle Herald not so long ago, it stated that housing starts were down some 44 percent. All the real estate companies that we talked to just don't have listings to sell.

COUNCILLOR TOPPLE: I question the remark Mr. Barkhouse makes about the 'For Sale' signs on housing I think he is completely wrong there. If he uses the real estate people's remarks about no listings that is one of their tactics in getting listings.

MR. JOE MAUND: My name is Joe Maund and I represent the Sackville Chamber of Commerce. I would like to speak in support of the Millwood project. I would like pay a little tribute to Martin Gallagher and his staff in the Public Works Department. During the last 10 years or more that I have been associated with Sackville I have certainly gathered the impression that they have been doing a very fine job of watching many things and while there have been a few things that they have not been able to watch it is because they have been understaffed and the work load is quite considerable. However, the inflow spoken about

tonight is, I suggest, to do with the First Lake development and not particularly relevant to Millwood. In connection with the Department of Environment knowing or not knowing about this clause which was put in the PUD, there is little doubt that they are very much aware of it because they had representatives sitting in the gallery at the time that that clause was put into the Agreement. The Chamber of Commerce is particularly mindful of the need for more people living in the area to pay for the services which are already in the ground and not having very much use made of. It may not reduce our taxes but it will certainly be a factor in stabilizing them if we can get more use out of the pipes that are already in the ground. As far as the real estate market is concerned in Sackville they certainly can confirm what Ron Barkhouse said. The availability of housing is at quite a low level compared to the last five years. In addition to that probably even more important is the almost unavailability of serviced lots. Now we can go outside the serviced area and there is a fair amount of land, but in the serviced area there are very few lots available and the ones that are there are very undesirable. We do have a need for serviced lots. We talked about the market for housing. We have an industrial park coming into Sackville. I was told today that on Monday the tenders will be called for the servicing of that park and it is anticipated that before 12 months pass we will have tenants starting to build in that industrial park. One of the absolute necessities to make that park successful is going to be the availability of some serviced lots to build homes. Any business that is seriously considering setting up shop in a community wants to know what is available in the line of homes and if the situation as it exists today still exists 12 months from now we will have a major hurdle to get over to make our park the success which it should be. Some businesses which were established there thinking that Sackville would come on stream just as soon as First Lake got built up were counting on the population of Millwood to make their businesses viable. We have lost some businesses, there have been some businesses that have gone under simply because they didn't have a sufficiently large market. We need Millwood to keep them alive. And in the same breath we must say that a goodly percentage of the residents of Sackville are tradesmen connected with housing. Today, a good many of them are completely unemployed and they are scrounging for whatever jobs they can find. We do need Millwood, we need it badly, we need it to accommodate the new industrial park, we need it to put the people who are living there to work, we need to keep the business which is there viable. On behalf of the Chamber I very sincerely solicit your support for this program. Thank you.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: I notice here that there are a few spots for commercial in the Millwood development. Will this be a shopping center type of thing. Is this the type of business you are talking about.

MR. MAUND: No not particularly, what I am talking about are the businesses which are established. For instance, Downsview and the Town Center both have a great deal of empty space.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: That is what I meant, would there be more going into Millwood to make the problem even worse?

MR. MAUND: I think what's indicated in the plan there for businesses in Millwood are strictly the small local stores around the corner type of things, which are necessary in any area of any size at all. But, in addition to that they add businesses to all the other establishments for several miles around.

COUNCILLOR STEWART: Mr. Maund, both you and Mr. Barkhouse have remarked on how Millwood would help commerce in your area and I certainly would agree with that, but, you both implied that the development itself would help pay for services already there and I am not sure the right impression is being created on this count per se. The taxes do not recoup all the costs, surely most of the costs would be yet to come. They would be schools, the actual servicing, they would be this, that, and the other thing. Really the industrial base that may come and is there would be a plus but I think residential developments on purely a monetary basis and their own tax revenue are a minus they are not a plus.

MR. MAUND: That's probably true Councillor Stewart, in so far as the residential expansion only is concerned. But in this instance we already have a lot of the pipes in the ground that we are paying for whether anybody is using them or not. So that some of the costs have already been paid. I know there are other costs which will come on stream. But, I think the more important part actually in this is if we don't get a housing development it is going to work very strong against our industrial park.

MR. PAUL HYLAND: My name is Paul Hyland, I live at 59 Belshire Drive in Lower Sackville. I am a self employed accountant with my business located in Sackville and presently I am a Commissioner with the Nova Scotia Housing Commission for the Province of Nova Scotia. Also I am a director of the Sackville Advisory representing district 16. I wish to speak in favor of the development of Millwood project in Sackville being proposed by the Nova Scotia Housing Commission. Over the years the Housing Commission has endeavored to identify housing requirements for the Province and has attempted to meet these requirements. In doing this the Commission has found it advantageous to purchase large tracts of undeveloped land and develop them in bulk creating savings on development costs which are in turn passed on to eventual purchasers. Also in meeting identified requirements the Commission has endeavored to meet housing market demand for persons earning moderate incomes. Millwood is such a development as identified under the general information outlined in the master plan report before you this evening. In 1976 the Commission purchased 434 acres on this site and proceeded to initiate development plans. The final master plan is before you this evening and has been studied and reviewed by your staff. Millwood is a good development for anyone who will decide to live there. All necessary facilities for comfortable urban living have been identified and included in the planning. School sites have been provided for with the cooperation and consultation of your School Board. Sidewalks, parklands and playgrounds have been included in the overall plan. Recreational facilities in parklands have been carefully planned with the Commission being committed to capital funds for such development. Further a large part of development 55 acres has been

planned for a large park, Feeley Lake Park, and the upper end of Feeley Lake has already been committed to the Association of Boy Scouts for their use. This park will prove useful to the entire community of Greater Sackville and the County as a whole and not just for Millwood residents. Full services are well planned in this development including street paving, curbs and sidewalks and water and sewer services. Millwood residents will participate with the rest of the immediate community of Sackville with such facilities as the community arena, Metropolitan Recreational Field, and Riverview Recreational Field. Also two shopping centers in Sackville will provide retail outlets for shopping purposes. In summary Millwood will become part of the Greater Sackville area. To alleviate any effect in Halifax, Millwood will be developed in five stages over an eight to ten year period. This development will be dependent upon periodic reassessment of serviced lots needed. As for immediate concerns for the County such as school construction, the construction of the new Elementary and Junior High in the Beaver Bank Road area will handle future students from this part of the development. This will allow the Municipality of the County of Halifax more than sufficient time to have all necessary plans in place to meet any demands put upon them because of Millwood. As for boundaries Millwood lies within the present service boundaries set by Halifax County some 10 to 12 years ago. As well it is within the Dartmouth Regional Development Boundary which was set in 1975. In fact, this Council saw fit several years ago to extend its trunk sewer system some 3000 feet into this proposed development area and of course this trunk sewer although now in place, is not in use. As for environmental concerns these have been carefully considered. The PUD Agreement has been amended to ensure the Nova Scotia Housing Commission during development of Millwood will meet all present and future requirements of the Department of Environment and will seek renewed approval at each stage of development. This will cover any unforeseen environmental problems that might happen during this development. As for costs to Municipal taxpayers, the major servicing costs will be recovered in lot sales and any extra servicing costs will be paid for by the purchaser with no direct costs to the present taxpayer. However, it should be pointed out that this site as it now is and has been is a liability to the County of Halifax. Since 1976 the County has not collected any taxes on this site and further the cost of installing the 3000 feet of trunk sewer has and is being paid by present taxpayers with no return on their investment. The County receives no grants in lieu of taxes on this site from the Housing Commission or any other Provincial government agency. However, fully developed Millwood will generate approximately one million dollars annually in taxes at present rates for the County of Halifax. Millwood will also prove to be a development where the Housing Commission can more effectively apply present programs it has such as the lease-purchase program where homeowners with family incomes under \$20,000 can work to obtain their homes. Serviced lots are required for this program. Millwood will be a good place to live for future homeowners I suggest. However, during the next few years Millwood will be of direct benefit to hundreds of tradesmen, contractors and building suppliers. The overall economic impact of Millwood will be in the area of 80 to 100 million dollars. This impact has been anticipated for some years and any further delay will prove very unfeasible for some of

these businesses. Local shopping centres and retail outlets have been waiting for this development. Increased population will mean increased business, and increased business will mean increased business assessment for the County tax roles. With Bedford now separated from the County any increase in commercial assessment is badly needed. Any concerns that the County Councillors might have had about Sackville separating from the County if allowed to grow must now realize that following the release of the recent study done by Municipal Affairs that it is not feasible at the present time for Sackville residents to seek separate status. And in fact, the report stated an increased cooperation by the County and its urban residents will prove beneficial to all concerned. Your Council has already taken steps to address itself to this cooperation by the formation of an Urban Committee and I am sure that this will prove successful. Councillors, Millwood is a good development which has been designed to meet future housing needs and as a bonus will assist to meet present economic needs in the private sector. In this Centennial year I am sure as Councillors from all the County of Halifax you would want to be part of any effort to have the County grow and prosper in the future. The Millwood development can be part of this effort and thus is good for the County and its residents I urge you tonight to vote in favor of this development. Thank you very much.

COUNCILLOR TOPPLE: Mr. Hyland you mentioned that Millwood is not going to cost the County taxpayers anything and then you turned around and said that the land is sitting there not producing any taxes because the Housing Commission do not give grants in lieu of taxes or pay taxes. But, in fact the truth is that the County is already bearing the burden of Millwood and of all the other tax free lands that the Housing Commission owns. In some cases in my area we had an increase in the are rates because the Housing Commission took over lands. Do you not think the Commission should pay taxes the same as any other developer until he developes the land.

MR. HYLAND: Land that is now in the hands of the Housing Commission does not have grants in lieu of taxes. My feeling is that the purpose of the Housing Commission when it goes in and purchases, or expropriates in some cases, lands for this type of development it is for an interim period of time. It was never designed to be a long period of time.

COUNCILLOR TOPPLE: But getting back to my point you mentioned that it is not going to cost the County taxpayers anything. In fact, it is already costing the County taxpayers because they are subsidizing the lower price on those lots. Everyone of us has had to pick up that loss on taxes on those lots and there are thousands of acres.

MR. HYLAND: In most cases though it was undeveloped land.

DEPUTY WARDEN POIRIER: This 3000 feet of trunk sewer, I would like to know the history of this. Was this specifically for Millwood and if it was for Millwood isn't this a little unusual to put a sewer line in before something is even approved.

MR. GALLAGHER: The previous owners of this land before the Nova Scotia Housing Commission bought it had made plans to develop this land and we projected our trunk sewer to take care of that.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: I kept hearing about this pipe in the ground all night and now I know what it is. I tried to get a pipeline extended in my area last week for 300 feet and I was shot down. Everybody says that the pipeline is not being used. Whoever is bordering that property certainly has paid frontage for that pipeline I would assume regardless if it is being used or not. Okay, if people move in there I don't see what difference will occur except that you are getting more people to hook into the line. However, the line itself has already been paid for by frontage or should have been. The same applies in Cole Harbour and I know in my area there are a lot of trunk lines that have not been used yet and may not be used in effect for 10 or 20 years. They are part of the system that had to be laid to complete the sewer system in my district and other districts.

MR. HYLAND: The thing to realize is this is an extension, and if development wasn't going to be put in there there was no need to put it in. It would have been less of a cost to everyone else involved in Sackville.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: I realize that it might have cut your pollution cost down a bit, now I don't know how much. Over your whole system the difference in cost would be minimal.

MR. HYLAND: Councillor Deveaux, the thing to remember though is that if it wasn't there the County Council would now have to look for the funds and it would be more expensive in a way. It is all in place.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: We won't have to build a school in Millwood due to these two schools being built in Beaver Bank. Is this what you are saying?

MR. HYLAND: These particular schools are off the moratorium now with those in place. I am talking about the first Phase, we are talking about a five phase project over an eight year period. In the first Phase those schools coupled with a school in Middle Sackville that is being retired because of the new Hamilton School being built, that Middle Sackville school I suggest could be used for an interim period be renovated for a moderate cost and utilized for the students in Millwood. Councillor Gaetz this development will take place over a period of time and I don't think it is going to be an immediate burden on the school system.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: You think these schools will be able to absorb the children. Do we need those schools now?

MR. HYLAND: Yes, we do.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: We have a lot of run-down schools in the County and everybody wants them updated. Here we are going in debt to build new

schools which as far as I can see right now we don't need.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: What are you going to do with the children in Millwood? The only thing I can see is that we are going to be faced with building two new schools.

MR. HYLAND: There has been quite an extensive study done on school enrollment by the Housing Commission in cooperation with the Municipal School Board. These statistics have been incorporated into the master plan.

COUNCILLOR WILLIAMS: You are speaking about the school staff. The Minister of Municipal Affairs in his report states there will be an increased demand for junior and senior high schools in the Sackville Lakes Land Assembly. We are presently in a financial bind. In looking toward the future a possible two schools will be needed for the area. This will cost approximately 12 million dollars. I think this should be considered if approval of this PUD agreement is given.

MR. HYLAND: I think the point is that we have for the last five to six years had little or no expansion. In the original plan for Sackville the Sackville Lakes development and any other planned developments in the County there was projected increased population and growth to continue in a normal fashion. This stopped when Phases 11 and 12 were put on the back burner by this Council and then it carried on from there. We have had a five year lag and that is what I wish to impress upon Council.

MRS. ANNE MERRIOT and MR. DONALD AMBER: Madame Chairman, Councillors, Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Anne Merriot, I am Chairman of the Sackville River Advisory Board. I have with me this evening Mr. Donald Ambler who is the Vice Chairman of the Board and a Hydrologist with Environment Canada. Although the Sackville River Advisory Board supports the development of Millwood as such we do have grave misgivings about several areas of the proposal with regard to their effect on the Sackville River system. With a drainage area of over 4000 acres the Little Sackville River is an extremely important asset. Millwood with an area of about 10 percent of the total could have a profound effect on the entire acreage as well as land downstream of the Sackville River. For this reason we feel that stringent regulations must be formulated and adhered to when developing those Phases of Millwood which touch on the River or any streams or lakes which feed into it. We are pleased to note the stated desire of the planners to conserve large areas of the river banks and lake shores as parkland. This alone necessitates measures to maintain the integrity of the proposed buffer zones and to eliminate as far as possible any siltation or pollution to the river. The Sackville River Advisory Board is prepared to work with County Council and the developers to draft a mutually satisfactory set of guidelines for this purpose. The areas we considered to be most delicate are areas slated for infilling and eventual townhouse or apartment development. We do not know to what extent infilling will change the contour of this site as we do not have present or proposed elevation figures. However it would seem logical to expect the land to be higher than peak flood level of the river.

This therefore unless handled very carefully would present heavy possibilities of siltation during the infilling operations and the two years of settling required before any development can take place. One deterrent to siltation is the proposed buffer zone. Here again we would like some clarification. The proposal states the buffer will be 50-100 feet wide, it does not however tell us whether this is in total or if it is the amount to be preserved on each bank. If this is a total the possibility exists for one river bank to contain a higher percentage of the total leaving the other bank virtually unprotected. If such should happen in the case of areas being filled, heavy siltation during the infilling, settling and development phases could be disastrous for the river. Even after construction is completed the increased runoff volumes associated with any development combined with large areas of pavement usually associated with a parks development will necessitate siltation controls. We feel it is very important that buffer zones be maintained at sufficient depth to successfully perform their intended function which is to provide a natural drainage and filtration system for surface runoff. We have infact noted under environmental concerns that no building will be allowed within 200 feet of lakes or 100 feet of major water courses. However, for a buffer zone to be effective the top soil and vegetation must remain intact. No building within 100 feet does not automatically curtail disturbance of vegetation or topsoil. The idea of the waterway park is commendable again however we wonder if the proposed walkway-bicycle path is intended to be enclosed by the buffer zone or on its outer edges. If it is to be enclosed we feel that a seven foot strip of pavement will seriously harm the integrity of the buffer to place seven feet of pavement which is wide enough to drive a car through will require the destruction of at least twenty feet of the buffer area and I'm probably being very conservative with that figure. Again if the buffer zone depth is variable the loss of twenty feet could be a large percentage. Added to this loss would be increased velocity of runoff from the pavement. If the walkway-bicycle path will be enclosed by the buffer zone we feel that design and materials used must be compatible with the proper functioning of the buffer zone. Another concern is the proposed bridge over the river as part of Millwood Drive. Here we would ask that the design of the bridge be such that constriction of the river channel will not result insignificantly higher water velocities. We would ask that the construction be carried out in such a way as to keep siltation to an absolute minimum. In Sector D we note provision for what is called private open space and reference to a requirement that natural areas be provided along minor water courses. We understand these minor water courses to be intermittent streams, although dry a large part of the time it must be remembered that these streams have prime importance in times of peak runoff. We do have fears that allowing private ownership might be detrimental to the viability of these streams. The viability of these streams becomes even more important when we note that they are included as part of the storm sewer system for the development. Needless to say the storm sewer system as outlined in the proposal is of major concern to us. The venting of storm drainage directly into the river and its feeder streams as well as Feely Lake must be handled with as much caution as is humanly possible. Any error here could cost us more than we are willing to pay. This river is subject to flood at any time of the