

MR. HINES: I am not certain. I think the Planning Department would have that correspondence. I believe it was back in March or April. It was April 8th

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Is Mr. Gaunce present tonight?

MR. HINES: Yes he is.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Is he planning to make any presentation himself?

MR. HINES: He hadn't planned on it. He will certainly answer any questions that you would have for him.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: I am not speaking pro or con at this time. There is one comment that I would like to make. I was approached by Dr. Gaunce somewhere in the later part of June or the first part of July asking my thoughts on having that land re-zoned. I am very dismayed to say the least that at that point in time I had been led to believe or assumed that the application hadn't even been started. In view of the facts, I feel a person would probably lose any support he might have had.

MR. HINES: I miss your point Councillor.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: The point I was trying to make is, I was either led to believe or assumed from the discussion with Dr. Gaunce that the application had not even been submitted or started to be processed at that point.

MR. HINES: I was doing all the communication my self with the Planning Department. Dr. Gaunce did know when the application was initially made, but perhaps in some comment you were misled.

COUNCILLOR MACDONALD: Yes Madame Warden, Mr. Hines do you think it is a good idea to go from R-1 to C-2? Would you like to have someone come next door to you and set up a commercial business?

MR. HINES: If you are talking about principles my home is not backed by C-1 and C-2 zones. Perhaps if it were I might have different thoughts about it.

COUNCILLOR MACDONALD: This is another reason. The people are surrounded now why would you want to deteriorate their residential and home life anymore by a commercial development?

MR. HINES: I live in Bedford and when I completed that application that the Town of Bedford sent around and I looked at all my answers I said I was obviously a real businessman. The answers I had given tended to lead toward development of business. That is basically my philosophy.

COUNCILLOR MACDONALD: If this rezoning went through I am certain that the two remaining houses left on the street would before too long be for sale. You are not only thinking about Davis Street there is also

the street behind it. All together these two streets have beautiful green areas and I don't think it should be disturbed.

MR. HINES: You have your thoughts on the subject and certainly it is unfortunate that you have the vote.

Warden Lawrence then asked if there were any more questions for Mr. Hines and being none, she thanked Mr. Hines. Warden Lawrence then asked if there were any other speakers in favour of the rezoning application three times. She then asked for speakers opposed to the rezoning.

HAROLD LAVAGIE: Your Honour Warden Lawrence, Chief Administrator, County Clerk, Councillors, and the members of the gallery. I think that as a result of the petition I had signed in regards to opposition to re-zoning these Lots 55 and 56 to C-2 all the members I would say with the exception of four or five are in attendance.

WARDEN LAWRENCE: Sir could we have your name and address.

HAROLD LAVAGIE: My name is Harold Lavagie and I live on 23 Hillside Court which is the street directly parallel to Davis Street. I have some of my own personal objections as to why the rezoning should not take place. The first one being, the effect on my own residential dwelling. I live directly behind the bank on Davis Street shown on the map. We are surrounded now by commercial. We certainly don't want commercial development up in this area. Once that happens we will be completely surrounded. It kind of strikes me why he would call it Enterprises Limited, because the terminology Enterprises, as I understand it, from a business point of view means that ten years down the road that property could be sold and anything could go in there. We just don't want this to happen on our street which is basically Hillside Court that I live on and I think we have all our members of Hillside Court and I can speak for quite a few of the people that are not here. Basically that is my personal objection for having it re-zoned to C-2. I definitely have no objection to operating a dental clinic from a principle residence if Dr. Gaunce plans to live there because then the place is secure and we don't have to worry about break-ins. This is another reason we would prefer that he open his dental clinic under R-1. This takes into consideration the drugs that would be on the premises. The commercialization that is developing around the area is certainly another deterrent to a lot of the residents. There is also plenty of space at the Downsview Mall for a dental clinic. If Dr. Gaunce is concerned about finding a place we have a member in attendance who would love to sell him a building right on the Sackville Main highway. The original Liquor Store that has closed in Sackville near the Cobequid Road I think eventually will become a Professional Centre. The thing I'm not able to understand that why the property that is presently zoned R-1 has to be rezoned. There would be no need for any hearing at all if Dr. Gaunce would live there. We plan to pursue this as far as we can if we have to. I have got a copy of the Planning Department's rejection and I think 90 percent of their reasons are our reasons. I think all the people in the gallery as residents will vouch for the things that I have just

said. I feel there has not been perhaps enough consideration given by Dr. G.N. Gaunce Enterprises Limited to the area that he is attempting to rezone. I think he is breaking that core line. Once that core line begins to break up it just keeps going further and further and eventually we will be living in a parking lot. I just am 100 percent against rezoning it to C-2. If there are any questions I would be willing to try and answer them.

Warden Lawrence then asked if there were any questions for Mr. Lavagie from the Councillors.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: Yes, Mr. Lavagie, you indicated that you would be perfectly happy with Dr. Gaunce living in the apartment or in the house and operate from there his professional business. Now I don't know whether I am correct or not but I believe under the Income Tax laws he can very easily declare that particular property to be his legal residence and yet not live in it at all. As long as he declares that one his primary residence. Perhaps the solicitor will answer me, if he makes such a declaration under the Income Tax Act could he use that dwelling even though he may not live in it all year long?

MR. HINES: In other words you are saying he would use that strictly as an income property for a tax write-off.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: Well if he declares it his principle residence then actually for income tax purposes the home is the one that becomes capital gains tax property.

MR. HINES: I don't think he can declare that as a principle residence if he is not living in the property.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: I just wondered what your opinion was on it but I would also like to hear our solicitors opinion.

MR. CRAGG: Warden I am not exactly sure what the answer is but I think Mr. Hines is right.

The Warden then stated that Mr. Birch wished to speak on this subject.

MR. BIRCH: The income tax laws are Federal laws and this is a Provincial statute and I believe that Provincial statute would rule here.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: This gives me a variety of opinions. However, I think it is comparable to a case where somebody might have a home in which he lives six months of the year and the rest of it he lives down in Miami. It is still his principle residence.

MR. LAVAGIE: What would the problems be in declaring his other residence.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: That problem I don't think is of concern to us. That would be his concern. The reason I asked that is even if that happened and you indicated that you would be happy if he lived there.

If he went away on a vacation the break-in problem which you are referring to still exists. In fact, you hear of homes broken in when someone goes out to a movie. I don't think that that is an overriding factor in the decision making process. The other question I want to ask you is how much of a nuisance do you actually find the existing Sackville Drive-In?

MR. LAVAGIE: It is a terrific nuisance right now.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: And if contract zoning was legal at the present time you indicated you would be happy with that contract zoning approach.

MR. LAVAGIE: If it was legal, yes.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: So basically its the rezoning that bothers the people you represent.

MR. LAVAGIE: Yes.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: Madame Warden, at the present time they would have no objections if the gentleman in question resided there and ran an office or a clinic as proposed. I assume under the present zoning there is no regulation covering this. Mr. Birch could you answer that.

MR. BIRCH: That is correct. This type of clinic has no zoning to cover it.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: It would have to be zoned C-1 or C-2.

MR. BIRCH: Not if he resided in the building and carried out his business.

COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX: He could reside in the house and carry out the business as proposed.

MR. BIRCH: That is correct.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any other questions for Mr. Lavagie. Being none, she asked for further speakers in opposition to the rezoning.

DON PULSIFER: My name is Don Pulsifer. I live at 6 Hillside Court which is adjacent to the street in question. I perhaps have been living in this area longer than any others in the immediate area. I am one of the older residents of the subdivision, having lived there approximately 20 years. Personally, I am very opposed to this application and I think basically it has been covered by the Planning Department. The points they made I think are excellent particularly with the emphasis on the precedent that would be set if these two lots were rezoned. I have heard, told, perhaps because I have been one of the older residents of people operating other businesses from their homes on Irene Avenue. I have questioned this with our Councillor, I particularly don't think it is right we live in a residential R-1

zone. When we purchased our homes we were given rules and regulations, on my deed it stipulates what I can do and what I cannot do with my property. Mention was made of the Drive-in Theatre. Since I have been there I have seen problems with young people and older people alike. Particularly you notice a very bad situation developing with the Flea Market held on Sunday. I think it is just out of hand. The police are having problems with parking, the people are having problems with many things. Even with the Commercial development on the Highway side of this street there is a question mark. I have been told by various realtors that our property has been devalued as a result of this commercial development. If we do not stop this, for what reason could the Councillors turn down an application for someone wanting to develop the adjacent lots to the ones in question here tonight. You can see it eroding. I perhaps am not as close to the source of the problem as the people living on Davis Street. I felt that I should speak here tonight, I was asked to attend and it is only because I was one of the older residents. As a matter of interest I was instrumental in surveying the property, the subdivision, that is these lots in question, originally. These are my points. I think that it has been well covered by the Planning Department. I think the point has been well made by Mr. Lavagie and I just don't think it should be rezoned.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any questions for Mr. Pulsifer.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Mr. Pulsifer you related that there were people operating out of their homes. As I see the By-Laws, and I stand corrected by the solicitor, that if anything was there prior to 1972 when the rezoning was done it is still legitimate to operate there under the non-conforming use. Anything else, the only categories that can fit into that is a Doctor, Dentist, Lawyer, Architect and there is one more. I don't think that any other businesses would be able to locate unless they found a nonconforming use. With regards to Dr. Gaunce if he were to reside within the residence and operate his business from there, would you have any personal objection to him doing so.

MR. PULSIFER: I would be personally opposed to it yes. With reference to the points I made regarding the businesses operating in the subdivision, to me there is no great hardship because they operate. The point that I am making is that it is an R-1 subdivision and I was told by a Councillor all businesses in operation before the zoning were to stay in business but those coming after would be illegally operating. My point is that any business, regardless of what type of business, I just don't feel they should be operating in a residential area.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: Yes Madame Warden. If I understood you correctly Mr. Pulsifer you indicated you lived in the area 20 years. At the time when you moved to the area what was the zoning.

MR. PULSIFER: The zoning was R-1.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: The zoning for Lots 55 and 56 came into being in 1972. I think probably the rest of the area was zoned R-1 in 1972 as

you moved in there was any zoning. Would someone from the Planning Department clarify that.

DOROTHY SMITH: That is correct.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: The reason I am pointing it out is because when you indicated that you were one of the oldest residents and you moved in the area and you had certain restrictions in your deed and you knew that it was an R-1 zone. I think that statement in itself is probably not the correct statement because this report indicates that 1972 was the time of the zoning to R-1.

MR. PULSIFER: In my deed it states the area zoned R-1. It also states that the only building that I can have on my property is a garage. I am not even permitted to have a workshop. To build a workshop I have to put double doors in it so it could be used as a garage.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: The second question concerns the value of your homes. You indicated that the value of your home and the rest of the homes and perhaps this is not a relevant question. Many times when the Councillors consider which way they vote do consider what happens to the value of the home. Would you tell me whether or not this particular dental office and the existence of the drive-in could this take the value of the house down any further. I firmly believe that the Sackville Drive-in being adjacent to it certainly must have affected the value of the home quite drastically.

MR. PULSIFER: This point is well made. I had my home advertised for sale approximately eight years ago and when it went on the market one of the first questions was asked was the proximity of the Sackville Drive-in Theatre was it a hardship to my family. The reason I was asked this question the people coming in to buy the house was this going to be a deterrent. I also feel that had my property not been close to the Drive-in Theatre and in fact I mentioned the commercial development on the main street, if it wasn't that close I feel that my property would be valued higher than what it is today.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: Would you say, if this Council rezoned this particular Lots 55 and 56 that would further reduce in your opinion the value of your home.

MR. PULSIFER: I do.

Warden Lawrence then asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Pulsifer. Being none, she called for further speakers in opposition of the rezoning.

AUSTIN OAK: Madame Warden, Councillors. My name is Austin Oak and I live at 32 Hillside Court and from the points that have been covered here this evening I really have very little more to say. I would like to speak for what I consider my vested rights as a recent homeowner as opposed to Mr. Pulsifer who has been there some time. When I purchased the property I did in fact check that the adjacent properties were in fact residential. At that time some of the ones showing off Beaver

Bank Road were in fact lots adjacent to the Drive-In. I was assured they would be built single family residential which would then provide a buffer in all directions. In the years since I have been there with the build up of residential properties particularly on the Beaver Bank Road, the problem with the drive-in from my point of view has decreased. In fact the other residential properties have provided a bit more of a buffer. If such a rezoning was approved there would be no stipulation or constraints on Dr. Gaunce to resell the property at any time despite the fact he now intends to open an office there. Therefore I feel that the rights of the homeowners who recently bought property on the current zoning stand. Any change to that current zoning would not only possibly devalue the property we own it would be an infringement on what I consider one of the principle reasons for buying the property.

Warden Lawrence asked Mr. Oak to show the Councillors exactly where he lived. Mr. Oak complied. Warden Lawrence then asked if there were any questions for Mr. Oak.

Warden Lawrence asked for further speakers in opposition to the rezoning.

RON WATSON: My name is Ron Watson and I live on 19 Hillside Court I just want to back up my fellow speakers with everything they said and I just want to point out that I believe there is enough commercial real estate in Sackville on both sides of No. 1 Highway that I don't think there is any need of moving back in off the main highway. I have lived there since September of 1971 and the property that I live on is R-1 so I know it was zoned prior to 1972. I just feel that I want to back up my fellow speakers here tonight.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any questions for Mr. Watson.

Warden Lawrence asked for further speakers in opposition.

MARSHA GIBBONS: My name is Marsha Gibbons. My husband and family and I live right next door to the property that Dr. Gaunce has just bought and we have had extreme problems with the drive-in. With my brother-in-law living in the old property and cleaning up the garbage we really kept up the property. When we built there 12 years ago there was no mini-mall, no Bank of Montreal, or K-Mart across the street. There were three beautiful homes. When they dug out those properties to put in this mall we were left on the street with a big embankment to go over. If it hadn't have been for the people on the other side of me digging out the culvert to make another place some children in a car would have gone down over it. Finally we got the County to put a guard rail up. My feelings on the rezoning is that it is just going to cause more problems with this property especially if there is no one living there. Myself, I have seen kids break in to the house next door while the people have been in it watching T. V. The Mounties have been called repeatedly and in the last few years granted it hasn't been as bad but there still is many problems. I have nothing against Dr. Gaunce living there and operating as a dentist, but I also know of a factual case in Nova Scotia where a dentist came to a Public Hearing

just as this and promised people faithfully that he wouldn't change the structure or anything and after it was rezoned and I don't know that much about the different classifications of rezoning but I do know that someone was there at that meeting that I know extremely well and now on that property is a building which looks nothing like the homes that are around it. Another thing that I am extremely nervous about is in the future if the drive-in goes and this property is rezoned commercial the homes around can be pushed right out. That is what happened to the three homes in front of us. The first person sold and then the other two were sort of pushed out. We just don't want to move and I really believe in live and let live but this is something that is awful important to me. Another thing is the additional traffic. We have enough traffic on that street on account of the drive-in. That's all I have to say.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any questions for Mrs. Gibbons.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any further speakers in opposition of the rezoning.

TONY DECOSTE: My name is Tony DeCoste and I live right on the corner of Davis and Irene . I just want to back up all the fellow residents that spoke. I also think there is enough commercial in that area. I think all it is going to do is, if those two lots are commercialized cause more commercializing in that area. I think it is going to spoil the whole area. I think there is enough traffic on the street as it stands now with the drive-in and I think the mini-mall in front of us I think we have plenty there, we don't need anymore.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any questions for Mr. DeCoste.

COUNCILLOR MACKENZIE: Madame Warden, just one question with regard to traffic. There has been mention of a lot of traffic on Davis Street going into the Sackville Drive-in. Is there any other entrance to the Sackville Drive-in?

TONY DECOSTE: Yes, there is. As a matter of fact Davis Street is not really an entrance to the Drive-In, they just make it an entrance.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any further questions. Warden Lawrence asked if there were any further speakers in opposition to the rezoning.

CATHERINE KEYO: My name is Catherine Keyo and I live at 31 Hillside Court. My property abuts the Lots 55 and 56 in question. I feel that I would like to give support to those who have spoken before me. I too, support all that they have said, because I feel that it would be detrimental to our properties to have this rezoned to C-2.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any questions for Mrs. Keyo.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any further speakers in opposition to the rezoning.

GARY MOSSMAN: My name is Gary Mossman and I live at the second house on Davis Street. I am down to back up my fellow residents in the area. Tony here said that there is a bad situation in regards to traffic. If that is going to be result of rezoning on that street I don't want it.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any questions for Mr. Mossman.

COUNCILLOR MARGESON: Thank you Madame Warden, and friends. Gary just as a point of interest, if Doctor Gaunce had his office would that be objectionable to your point of view, as an R-1 zone.

GARY MOSSMAN: Not as an R-1 zone.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: Yes, your Honour. You seem to be stressing the fact there is going to be more traffic, would a dentist office really create that much more traffic there.

GARY MOSSMAN: There would be more people coming up there. Our street is not paved so that is another reason.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: I don't know, I think the people going to a dentist wouldn't be racing in and out. It would be just driving to the business.

GARY MOSSMAN: Would you want one beside your house.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: A dentist office.

GARY MOSSMAN: As a C-2 lot

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: I live in a General Building Zone

GARY MOSSMAN: If you were in a Residential zone.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ; I can't say I would oppose a dentists office.

GARY MOSSMAN: I am not opposing the dentist's office. I don't want to see a C-2 zoning there.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: It bothers me that the traffic is stressed.

GARY MOSSMAN: It is going to push the rest of our families out also. It is going to change all of our lots.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: There is a problem there. Emphasis seems to be on the traffic.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any other questions for Mr. Mossman.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any further speakers in opposition to this rezoning three times. There being none, she closed the Public part of the Hearing and declared she was open to a motion.

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Councillor Wiseman:

"THAT the rezoning application No. 13-8, request to rezone lots 55 and 56 of Irene Davis Subdivision, Davis Street in Lower Sackville be rejected."

Motion Carried.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any speakers on the motion.

COUNCILLOR WISEMAN: Yes Madame Chairman, I think the cry from the people has come across loud and clear. They don't want the area rezoned to C-2. The properties on Davis Street are acting as a buffer for Hillside Court. The people on Davis Street don't want the C-2 rezoning it will be setting a precedent for the further development of the commercial area. I think one of the points that has been brought up whether you would want your friendly neighbourhood dentist living next door to you if there was a dental office that was zoned C-2 the building can deteriorate but if a professional is living in that building then the odds are that the building would be maintained in a proper residential type of facade. I think the objections are reasonable and therefore I support the rejection of the rezoning bid.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: Madame Warden before this comes to a vote I would like to explore two other possibilities and probably the Planning Department or the Solicitor could help me with this. Contract zoning is illegal in our Municipality. I am trying to take a look at that illegality. Is it illegal because we have been told it is illegal or is it illegal only by precedent because there was one case in which we have given contract zoning and an appeal followed and as a result the Appeal Board said it was illegal.

MR. CRAGG: To oversimplify it the Supreme Court has told us that contract zoning is not a tool that is available to us.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: So in other words we simply cannot even risk having a contract zoning even if it is not appealed. The second possibility concerns that not too long ago it was Mr. Birch's idea that it is possible to put two zones on one particular lot. Is there any possibility that the R-1 zone could remain and the C-2 zone could be given only for this specific purpose.

MR. BIRCH: If C-2 zoning is put on top you would then have available for development all the R-1 zoning and all the C-2 zoning. It still doesn't allow the avenue your trying to explore to allow a dentist office and restrict it to just that specific purpose.

COUNCILLOR LICHTER: I think with those two answers I certainly am ready to vote in favor of the motion. I pushed for the Public Hearing for the main purpose that I would like to hear the facts and I want to have Council know that I would certainly urge Council in the future to have petitions presented at the Public Hearing stage and not to PAC. This was my main concern and this is why I wanted a Public Hearing. If these petitions are presented to PAC it almost amounts to a Public Hearing which PAC does not have the mandate to hold. I am quite

satisfied that Dr. Gaunce still has an avenue.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: Did I understand that one gentleman said on his deed he was in R-1 zone and could not operate a business. I just was wondering if that would be a form of contract zoning.

WARDEN LAWRENCE: I imagine that it would be a covenant in a deed that would restrict a certain type of developing.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: I was just wondering if it clearly stipulates on his deed.

COUNCILLOR MACKAY: Madame Warden, against the motion even though when the motion was put forward to Council that the Hearing be held I spoke in favor of it as Mr. Lichter did. At the time we both stated that Dr. Gaunce have his day in court so to speak. The residents here tonight have spoken fairly that they are strongly in opposition to it without any question or reservation to it in my mind. I think they are just in trying to retain the atmosphere of the residential neighbourhood. I think Dr. Gaunce took at chance when he bought on spec, you take the risk at that time of not achieving your goals. I think he may move away and who knows what else may locate there. All the financial, there is no question that businesses are having a hard time and businesses are borne by the user. Dr. Gaunce may use his purpose for his dental clinic if he resides there and the solution might be for Dr. Gaunce to sell his present residence and move in there and locate his business there if that would be his desire. It would also protect the residents under these circumstances. As far as traffic, I don't know. Summing up the whole situation on my behalf I can't see at this time supporting the application to rezone and must be in favour of rejecting the application.

Warden Lawrence asked if there was any further discussion on the motion.

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Public Hearing adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Public Hearing Minutes

August 25, 1980

PRESENT WERE: Councillor Walker
Councillor Williams
Deputy Warden Poirier
Warden Lawrence
Councillor Baker
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor Stewart
Councillor Adams
Councillor Gaetz
Councillor Wiseman
Councillor Smith
Councillor MacKenzie
Councillor McCabe
Councillor Lichter
Councillor Benjamin
Councillor Margeson
Councillor MacKay
Councillor Eisenhauer
Councillor MacDonald

Warden Lawrence opened the Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. Meech then called the roll.

Warden Lawrence stated that there was one rezoning hearing to be dealt with, this being Lot 21 of the Afton Water Subdivision on Lakeview Avenue, Springfield Lake in Middle Sackville, Rezoning Application 15-80, to T (Mobile Home Park Zoning).

Warden Lawrence asked the Planning staff to outline the details of the staff report.

MS SPENCER: As the Warden has mentioned this is a request to rezone Lot 21 of the Afton Water Subdivision. This has been advertised according to the Planning Act. To date no correspondence has been received by the Planning Department either in favor or against the application. The applicant, Mr. Wayne Dalrymple, currently resides on Lot 21 of Afton Water Subdivision on Lakeview Avenue, Middle Sackville. He lives in a mobile home. This mobile home recently became a non-conforming use when a portion of Lakeview Avenue was rezoned to R-2, a residential two family dwelling zone. In order to release his home of that non-conforming status and also provide for the possible construction of a permanent dwelling in the future, Mr. Dalrymple has requested that a T (Mobile Home Park Zone) be added to the existing R-2 zone. That the two zones appear simultaneously on his lot. If approved this application would permit the following uses: a single family dwelling with or without a basement apartment, a two family dwelling or a mobile home. Ms. Spencer then outlined the area with the use of diagrams. The Planning Department would like to recommend that this rezoning be approved. It appears that Mr. Dalrymple's request is very logical and very reasonable. At the time of the original Springfield Lake rezoning, which was initiated by the residents of that area, Mr. Dalrymple, supported his neighbours request and he believed at that time it would afford him the same kind of protection that it would his neighbours. Unfortunately the zoning By-Law does not have the same interpretation of Mobile Homes as does

the applicant. In short it is felt by the Planning Department that both the intent in the original rezoning request by the residents and the intent by Mr. Dalrymple's request is to secure good quality low density housing. On that basis we would recommend approval.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any questions for Ms. Spencer. Being none, she declared the public part of the hearing open and explained the procedure. She then called for any speakers in favour of the rezoning.

MR. DALRYMPLE: I am Wayne Dalrymple and I live on Lakeview Avenue, Lot 21. Recently I have signed a petition but I didn't fully understand the petition. All I am asking for is approval for my own protection, for my mobile home that if so desired I can put another mobile home on my lot or build a single family dwelling. Other than that I have not much more to say.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any questions for Mr. Dalrymple.

COUNCILLOR GAETZ: Yes, Your Honour, it says 15,000 sq. feet. You have sewer and water there, I thought you had to have 20,000 for septic tank and disposal.

MR. DALRYMPLE: I have my own water and sewage.

Warden Lawrence asked if there were any further questions.

Warden Lawrence then asked three times for speakers in favour. There being none, she then asked for speakers in opposition. There being none, she declared the public part of the hearing closed. She then asked for a motion on this.

MR. DALRYMPLE: May I thank the Council for their approval, Mr. Bill MacDonald, Mr. Eisenhauer and Mr. Murdock MacKay.

It was moved by Councillor Eisenhauer, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT Application No. 15-80 to rezone the lands of Lot 21, Afton Water Subdivision, Springfield Lake to T (Mobile Home Park Zone) be approved."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Williams:

"THAT the Public Hearing adjourn."
Motion Carried.

I N D E X

AUGUST COUNCIL SESSION - 1980

Bay Road Fire Department - Loan - Motion -----	5
Black Cultural Society Presentation - Motion -----	9
Clayton Developments Ltd. - Notice of Appeal - Motion -----	4
Chief Building Inspectors Report - Motion -----	4 & 16
Comfort Allowance - Motion -----	5
Conflict of Interest Legislation - Motion -----	6
Capital Projects - Motion -----	12
Dartmouth Home for Special Care - Motion -----	6&13-14
Eastern Passage Treatment Plant - Odour - Motion -----	18
Fish Promotions - Letters - Motion -----	17
Grants to Organizations - Approval - Motion -----	4-5
Gertrude Parker School - Parking Area - Motion -----	5
Grant - Cathedral Church of All Saints - Motion -----	15
Grant - Black Cultural Society - Motion -----	16
Highway #107 - Meeting - Motion -----	4
Halifax County Industrial Commission - Terms of Reference - Motion	5
Highland Park - Parkland - Motion -----	10
Industrial Development Report - Motion -----	9-10
Labour Relations Information Service - Motion -----	12-13
Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary -----	1 & 8
Motion - Approval of Minutes -----	1 & 8
Motion - Letters & Correspondence -----	1 & 8
Motion - Signatures Re Annexation of Shearwater -----	2
Motion - Acquisition & Maintenance of Parklands -----	2 - 3
Motion - Sackville Lakes Development & Forest Hills Ownership -----	3
Motion - Planning Advisory Committee Report -----	3&10
Motion - Public Hearing, Re application #15-80 -----	4
Motion - Meeting, Re Highway 107 -----	4
Motion - Planning Advisory Committee Supplementary Report -----	4
Motion - Notice of Appeal, Re Clayton Developments Ltd. -----	4
Motion - Chief Building Inspectors Report -----	4&16
Motion - Management Committee Report -----	4&14
Motion - Approval of Grants to Organizations -----	4-5
Motion - Parking Area, Re Gertrude Parker School -----	5
Motion - Management Committee Supplementary Report -----	5&15
Motion - Loan, Re Bay Road Fire Department -----	5
Motion - Policy Committee Report -----	5&12
Motion - Comfort Allowance -----	5
Motion - Policy Committee Supplementary Report -----	5&12
Motion - Terms of Reference, Re Halifax County Industrial Commission	6
Motion - Subdivision By-Law, Re Lot Approval -----	3-4

cont./...2

Motion - Conflict of Interest Legislation -----	6
Motion - Draft U.N.S.M. Constitution -----	6
Motion - Dartmouth Home for Special Care -----	6
Motion - U.N.S.M. Delegates -----	7
Motion - Adjournment -----	7&18
Motion - Letter, Re Mr. Green -----	9
Motion - Black Cultural Society Presentation -----	9
Motion - Industrial Development Report -----	9-10
Motion - Parkland, Re Highland Park -----	10
Motion - Draft Amendments, Re Zoning By-Law-----	10-11
Motion - Letter, Re Public Utilities Board Decision -----	11
Motion - Director of Planning & Development Report -----	11
Motion - Property Tax Exemptions -----	12
Motion - Capital Projects -----	12
Motion - Labour Relations Information Service -----	12-13
Motion - Letter, Re, Minister of Social Services -----	13
Motion - Representation, Re Dartmouth Homes for Special Care Board	13-14
Motion - Temporary Borrowing Resolution -----	14
Motion - Award of Tenders -----	15
Motion - Tax Reduction, Re Eastern Passage & Cow Bay Lions Club --	15
Motion - Grant, Re Cathedral Church of All Saints -----	15
Motion - Tax Reduction, Re East Preston Day Care Centre -----	15
Motion - Tax Reduction, Re South Shore Regional Recreational Association -----	15
Motion - Grant, Re Black Cultural Society -----	16
Motion - Municipal School Board Report -----	16
Motion - Request, Re Provincial Cost Sharing -----	16
Motion - Policing, Re Mobile Home Parks -----	17
Motion - Study, Re Senior Citizens Housing Hubbards Area -----	17
Motion - Letters, Re Fish Promotions -----	17
Motion - Street Lights -----	17-18
Motion - Letter, Re Sackville Post Office -----	18
Motion - Taxi By-Law -----	18
Motion - Odour, Re Eastern Passage Treatment Plant -----	18
Policy Committee Supplementary Report - Motion -----	5&12
Parklands - Acquisiton & Maintenance - Motion -----	2-3
Planning Advisory Committee Report - Motion -----	3&10
Public Hearing - Application #15-80 - Motion -----	4
Planning Advisory Committee - Supplementary Report - Motion -----	4
Policy Committee Report - Motion -----	5&12
Public Utilities Board Decisions - Letter - Motion-----	11
Property Tax Exemptions - Motion -----	12
Provincial Cost Sharing - Motion -----	16
Policing Mobile Home Parks - Motion -----	17
Shearwater - Signatures, Re annexation - Motion -----	2
Subdivision By-Law - Lot Approval - Motion -----	3-4
Senior Citizen Housing - Study Re, Hubbards Area - Motion -----	17
Street Lights - Motion -----	17&18
Sackville Post Office - Letter - Motion -----	18

Temporary Borrowing Resolution - Motion -----	14
Tenders - Award - Motion -----	15
Tax Reduction - Eastern Passage & Cow Bay Lions Club - Motion ---	15
Tax Reduction - East Preson Day Care Centre - Motion -----	15
Tax Reduction - South Shore Regional Recreational Association --- Motion -----	15
Taxi By-Law - Motion -----	18
U.N.S.M. Constitution - Draft- Motion -----	6
U.N.S.M. Delegates - Motion -----	7
Zoning By-Law - Draft Amendments - Motion -----	10-11

THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX

MINUTES OF JULY COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, August 5, 1980

Present Were: Warden Lawrence Deputy Warden Poirier
 Councillor Walker Councillor Williams
 Councillor Baker Councillor Deveaux
 Councillor Stewart Councillor Topple
 Councillor Gaetz Councillor Smith
 Councillor MacKenzie Councillor McCabe
 Councillor Lichter Councillor Benjamin
 Councillor Margeson Councillor MacKay
 Councillor MacDonald Councillor Wiseman

Also Present: Mr. G.J. Kelly Mr. R.G. Cragg
 Mr. J. Markesino Mr. K. Birch

Warden Lawrence called Council to order at 2:00 p.m. and opened with the Lord's Prayer. Mr. Kelly called the roll.

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

"THAT Cathie Beveridge be appointed as recording secretary."
Motion carried.

Warden Lawrence introduced Elizabeth Murphy, Staff Co-Ordinator, Urban Area Study and she outlined briefly Ms. Murphy's job duties.

It was moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT the minutes of June 17, 1980 - Regular Council Session, June 23, 1980 - Public Hearing, June 23, 1980 - Committee of the Whole, June 30, 1980 - Public Hearing, July 7, 1980 - Public Hearing, July 8, 1980 - Regular Council Session and July 15, 1980 - Regular Council Session be approved."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Stewart, seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT the letters and correspondence be received."
Motion Carried.

Upon questioning by Councillor Stewart, Warden Lawrence briefly outlined her trip to Ottawa and her meeting with the Minister of National Defence regarding the removal of the tracker squadrons from Shearwater. She stated that the Minister is looking at the possibility of getting some more tracker aircraft for Shearwater. She told the Minister of her concerns with regard to unemployment, the impact on schools, taxes, et cetera.

There was some discussion regarding the report of the press that Dartmouth

could annex or expropriate part of Shearwater.

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

"THAT the issue of the number of signatures needed for annexation of Shearwater or separation be referred to Policy Committee for report back to Council."

Motion Carried.

Councillor Benjamin voiced his concerns with regard to reports that the City of Dartmouth has expressed interest in annexing the Airport.

Warden Lawrence outlined the background of the Report re Acquisition and Maintenance of Parklands.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT the Report re Acquisition and Maintenance of Parklands be accepted."

(see motion to amend)

Several Councillors questioned Mr. Markesino and Mr. Birch regarding this report. Mr. Markesino described the type of maintenance the County would be responsible for and stated that he felt the budget would be sufficient and that the County could have substantial savings in the cost of labour if the County took over this responsibility. Several Councillors voiced concern over the cost to their districts and how the service would be paid for. Councillor MacKay felt that voluntary labour from members of the community might be lost if such a move were made. Mr. Birch stated that this report was only policy and that it would be up to Council to determine the costs to each district. Councillor Deveaux questioned whether the County would be liable if any of the parklands were hazardous. Solicitor Cragg informed Council that the County would indeed be liable.

Councillor Lichter opposed the motion due to the fact that the costs to the taxpayer were unknown. He also felt that the demand for these maintenance services would be terrific, everyone would want to have improvements made.

Councillor Margeson asked if this would be paid for through an area rate and the Warden stated that this would be discussed by the Policy Committee.

There was a great deal of discussion on this matter.

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

"THAT the motion be amended to say that maintenance costs for parklands be borne by individual districts."

(see motion to amend)

Councillor Wiseman asked that if the County doesn't own the lands, the Nova Scotia Housing Commission doesn't own the lands, the Provincial and Federal Governments don't own the lands, then who does? Solicitor Cragg stated that the Housing Commission was going to register the deeds to the green areas of Sackville Lakes Development and Forest Hills and the County has no choice but

to accept them.

It was moved by Councillor MacKay and seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT Halifax County acknowledge ownership of the green areas of Sackville Lakes Development that were deleted from the Nova Scotia Housing Commission lands."
(see motion to amend)

It was moved by Councillor Stewart, seconded by Councillor MacKay:

"THAT the motion be amended to include Forest Hills."
(see motion to defer)

It was moved by Councillor Lichter, seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT this item be deferred pending the report of the Urban Area Advisory Committee."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor MacKay:

"THAT Halifax County Council acknowledge ownership of Sackville Lakes Development and Forest Hills."
Motion Carried.

Warden Lawrence called a short recess and Council reconvened at 4:30 p.m.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor Lichter:

"THAT the Planning Advisory Committee Report be received."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Lichter recommended that Council approve this report.

It was moved by Councillor Lichter, seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT in the Subdivision Planned Area the Subdivision By-Law be amended to read two lots per year rather than one lot per year and that this amendment be forwarded to the Minister for approval."
(Motion Carried - see below for recorded vote)

Councillor Stewart inquired if there wasn't already a Task Force dealing with urban areas.

Mr. Birch, Chief of Planning and Development spoke briefly on this matter and requested a two week deferment to give Planning Staff time to develop a report on the ramifications of such a move.

After a great deal of discussion, it was moved by Councillor McCabe, seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT the motion be amended to read three lots instead of two."
(Motion Withdrawn)

Recorded Vote on Motion

For: Councillors Margeson, MacKay, MacDonald, Benjamin, Lichter, McCabe, Smith, Gaetz, Deveaux, Baker, MacKay, Williams, Walker, Deputy Warden Poirier

Against: Councillors Topple, Stewart, Wiseman, Warden Lawrence.

It was moved by Councillor Benjamin, seconded by Councillor MacKay:

"THAT a Public Hearing be held August 25, 1980 with respect to Rezoning Request No. 15-80, Lot 21, Afton Waters Subdivision, Lands of Wayne Dalrymple, located on Lakeview Avenue at Middle Sackville, to T (Mobile Home Park Zone. District 18."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Topple, seconded by Councillor Benjamin:

"THAT Council request a meeting with the Minister of Transportation and the Council of the City of Dartmouth to discuss the proposal respecting Highway 107, Little Salmon River to Loon Lake."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz, seconded by Councillor Topple:

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

It was moved by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT the Municipal Solicitor be instructed to represent the best interests of the Municipality with respect to the Notice of Appeal - Clayton Developments Limited."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT the Building Inspectors Report re: Lesser Setback and Side Yard Clearance be approved."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Poirier, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Report of the Management Committee be received."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Poirier, seconded by Councillor MacKay:

"THAT the grants to Organizations be approved for the year 1980."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Benjamin expressed concern regarding the contribution made by the County to Dartmouth General Hospital. He felt this amount should perhaps be increased from \$10,000 to \$15,000. for three years due to the increased

occupancy rate by County residents.

It was moved by Councillor Benjamin, seconded by Councillor Wiseman:

"THAT the grant to Dartmouth General Hospital be increased from \$10,000 to \$15,000 for three years."

Motion Withdrawn.

Councillor Benjamin agreed to withdraw his motion provided that Council look into increasing this amount next year.

Councillor Walker requested that the requests for grants from Bonny Lea Farm and the Anglican Youth Camp be looked into by the Management Committee for report back to Council at the next Session. Warden Lawrence stated that Bonny Lea Farm and the Anglican Youth Camp would be considered by Management Committee for report back to Council at the next Session.

Discussion took place with regard to the proposed improvements to the Gertrude Parker School. Councillor Benjamin felt that parking areas need not be paved.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT the proposed changes to the parking area - Gertrude Parker School be approved."

Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor MacKenzie, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Supplementary Report of Management Committee be accepted."

Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT a loan to the Bay Road District No. 3 Fire Department in the amount of \$30,000 to purchase a new pumper truck be approved."

Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT the Policy Committee Report be received."

Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor MacKay:

"THAT the request from the Halifax Senior Citizens Housing Corporation Limited that the comfort allowance for residents in receipt of Municipal Social Assistance in Homes for Special Care be increased from the present \$40.00 per month to \$50.00 per month be approved."

Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor MacKenzie, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Supplementary Report of the Policy Committee be received."

Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor MacKenzie, seconded by Councillor Margeson:

"THAT the report and terms of reference of the Halifax County Industrial Commission be placed on the August 19, 1980 Council Agenda."
Motion Carried.

Solicitor Cragg stated that the proposed legislation with respect to the U.N.S.M. Conflict of Interest Act is in order. He outlined the proposed changes and stated that the requirements in Sections 16, 17, 18 and 19 are unduly restrictive and should be repealed and replaced. He also stated that if a matter came up for discussion that a Councillor had some interest in, then that Councillor would then have to record his interest in a central record of disclosure.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Councillor MacKay:

"THAT the Municipal Council endorse the proposed Conflict of Interest Legislation."
Motion Carried.

There was a great deal of discussion surrounding the motive of the U.N.S.M. in wanting to become incorporated.

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Councillor Wiseman:

"THAT the draft U.N.S.M. Constitution be approved in principle and that the U.N.S.M. be requested to give their reasons for incorporating."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson:

"THAT Councillor Smith be appointed as Halifax County's representative on the Board of the Society responsible for the construction and operation of a 110 bed Dartmouth Home for Special Care."
Motion Lost for want of a Seconder.

Councillors expressed great concern over the impact this new Home for Special Care would have on the County's facility, Ocean View Manor. Councillor Walker also inquired who would subsidize this new facility. Councillor Topple stated that the area is over-bedded now without adding a new facility.

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

"THAT this item be deferred pending further detailed information from the Minister of Social Services."
Motion Carried.

Councillor MacKay stated that as the facility would be constructed anyway, it would be to the County's advantage to have a member on the Board.

Warden Lawrence circulated the list of voting and non-voting delegates to the U.N.S.M. for 1980 - 81.

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

"THAT the list of delegates to the U.N.S.M. Annual Conference be accepted."
Motion Carried.

Deputy Warden Poirier took the Chair.

Councillor Topple raised the matter respecting the duties of the County By-Law Enforcement Officer and expressed concern about the back-up of the By-Law Enforcement Officer by the R.C.M.P. Solicitor Cragg outlined the duties of the position and stated that the only Police Force we have in the County is the R.C.M.P.

Councillor Williams requested that the matter be deferred until the Chief Executive Officer returns.

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

"THAT the matter of the County Constable be deferred until next Session of Council."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz, seconded by Councillor MacKenzie:

"THAT Council adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Council adjourned at 7 p.m.

Council Session Minutes

August 19, 1980

PRESENT WERE:	Councillor Walker	Councillor Smith
	Councillor Williams	Councillor MacKenzie
	Deputy Warden Poirier	Councillor McCabe
	Warden Lawrence	Councillor Lichter
	Councillor Baker	Councillor Benjamin
	Councillor Deveaux	Councillor Margeson
	Councillor Stewart	Councillor MacKay
	Councillor Topple	Councillor Eisenhauer
	Councillor Adams	Councillor MacDonald
	Councillor Gaetz	Councillor Wiseman

Warden Lawrence opened the Council Session at 2:00 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. Meech then called the roll.

It was moved by Councillor MacKay, seconded by Councillor Baker;

"THAT Sherryll Hussey be appointed the Recording Secretary."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT the minutes of the August 1, 1980 Council Session be approved."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT the Letters and Correspondence be received."
Motion Carried.

Warden Lawrence introduced the first piece of correspondence dated August 1, 1980. This letter was received by Mr. Kelly from Mr. J. Michael Forrestall in response to Mr. Kelly's letter expressing concern over the proposed transfer of two Tracker Squadrons from C.F.B. Shearwater to Summerside P.E.I. Warden Lawrence advised that in discussion with Mr. Forrestall he had indicated that the Minister of Defence was looking into possible retrieval of older aircraft which would keep a limited surveillance at C.F.B. Shearwater. However, no further correspondence had been received in the interim.

Warden Lawrence introduced an additional piece of correspondence. This letter concerned the attendance of Mr. George Green at the International Gathering of Town Criers at Lyme Regis. This letter was in appreciation of his attendance and described the events which took place.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT a letter of commendation be sent to Mr. Green congratulating him on his success."

Motion Carried.

The Black Cultural Society Presentation was unavoidably postponed.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor Walker:

"THAT Council hear the Black Cultural Society presentation on September 2, 1980."

Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT after the presentation by the Black Cultural Society on the 2nd of September the matter of a grant be referred back to Management for a recommendation to Council."

Motion Carried.

Warden Lawrence thanked Councillor McCabe for his hospitality in showing her around the Halifax County Exhibition. She also mentioned that Councillor Wiseman had won a number of first prizes for flowers.

Councillor McCabe replied that he appreciated the opportunity of showing the Warden around.

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

"THAT the Sub-Committee - Industrial Development Report be received."

Motion Carried.

Councillor MacKenzie outlined the background to the report and named those that were involved in the preparation of the report. Councillor MacKenzie stated that there were many areas of interest within the Municipality as regards to industrial development. Councillor MacKenzie voiced concern with industrial development in the far reaches of the Municipality in that it is not easy to have development proceed in those areas. He stated that in view of the possible offshore oil development that these far reaches should be in fact investigated. Councillor MacKenzie outlined some of the recommendations embodied in the report. The major recommendation was to engage the services of an Industrial Promotion Officer. Councillor MacKenzie stated that the Minister of Development indicated that this proposal would be cost shared. Councillor MacKenzie voiced his delight in being involved in the resurrection of the Industrial Commission. Councillor MacKenzie stated that the last page of the report sums up the situation. Councillor MacKenzie stated that he felt that with an Industrial Promotion Officer that facts and areas for development would be readily available as they are not a present. He also stated that he felt this should be provided to the Municipality immediately.

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

"THAT the recommendations embodied in the report of the Sub-Committee, Industrial Development be adopted."
Motion Defeated.

Councillor Topple questioned Councillor MacKenzie as to whether Tourism had been considered. Councillor MacKenzie replied that it had not. Councillor Topple voiced the opinion that perhaps this should be promoted as there are areas in the County where other industry could not be promoted. Councillor MacKenzie agreed. A number of Councillors voiced the opinion that perhaps the position of Industrial Promotion Officer could be handled by a staff member along with their other duties. Other Councillors felt that the job necessitated a full time employee. Mr. Meech voiced the opinion that at present he could think of no one on staff who would not only be qualified for the position but have the necessary time to take on such an assignment. There was discussion on whether this item should be referred to either the Management Committee or the Policy Committee.

It was moved by Councillor MacKenzie, seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT this matter be sent to Policy for consideration of the policies governing the entire proposal and that the matter of engaging an Industrial Promotion Officer be referred to Management at such a time when all other matters pertaining to the policies have been investigated and decided upon."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Topple, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT the Planning Advisory Committee Report be received."
Motion Carried.

Mr. Meech outlined the items in the report.

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz, seconded by Councillor Lichter:

"THAT Park area 14, Highland Park Subdivision, Hammonds Plains be accepted by County Council for public use."
Motion Carried.

The Second Item was for Council's information. This item was the positive decision concerning Council's approval of the rezoning of the Lands of Edward Godbout excluding a small parcel of land.

Councillor Deveaux voiced that he was not in favor of this approval as he felt this was spot zoning and that it had been his hope that the Provincial Planning Appeal Board would reverse this decision.

It was moved by Councillor MacKay, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT a Public Hearing be held to consider the draft amendments

to the Zoning By-Law on September 22, 1980."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Topple asked the Solicitor if it could be possible that a condition be put in the R-1 zone in regards to Daycare that the majority of the residents agree to this before it were initiated. The Solicitor stated that he saw no reason why some condition could not be put in. Councillor Margeson agreed with Councillor Topple and suggested that an amendment be made previous to the Public Hearing. Mr. Cragg stated the proposals could be amended at the Public Hearing or in fact that if the proposals were approved that any resident wishing to make an appeal in opposition could be in attendance at any subsequent Public Hearing. Councillor Topple stated that his concern was that restrictions in By-Laws at the present are not being enforced.

Councillor Margeson stated that as a member of the Planning Advisory Committee he would bring the matter of modifications to the Amendments up at the Planning Advisory Committee meeting.

It was moved by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT a letter be sent to the Public Utilities Board requesting that any decision affecting the County be made known to the Municipalities involved in advance of the media and further that a copy of this letter be forwarded to the Premier and also to the MLA for that area."

Motion Carried.

Warden Lawrence explained the circumstances behind the motion. Councillor Stewart voiced his concern stating that he hoped the Board of Public Utilities would take the responsibility for the problems that are going to develop in such areas as schools.

Councillor Margeson stated that he felt that a letter should be sent to the people of the area from Councillor Stewart stating that he had appreciated them being in the County and bidding them farewell. At the same time perhaps this letter could include a note from the new Alderman for that district in order to let the people know who to get in contact with from this time on. This would be excellent for Public Relations.

It was moved by Councillor Topple, seconded by Councillor MacKenzie:

"THAT the report of the Director of Development be received."
Motion Carried.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Wiseman:

"THAT the Policy Committee Report be received."
Motion Carried.

Mr. Meech outlined the items in the Policy Committee Report.

The first item, Dartmouth Home for Special Care, was an information item.

The second item concerned the matter of establishing guidelines respecting applications for Property Tax Exemptions. The Policy Committee reviewed this and made recommendations to the Management Committee in dealing with such applications.

It was moved by Councillor Toppie, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT the recommendations put forward by the Policy Committee concerning applications for Property Tax Exemptions be adopted."
Motion Carried.

There were some questions on how church organizations would be assessed. Mr. Meech stated that the property on which the place of worship is located is exempt. However, if a particular church organization had a community hall possibly that would not be automatically exempt.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the supplementary report of the Policy Committee be received."
Motion Carried.

Mr. Meech outlined the Supplementary Report.

The first item dealt with cost of over runs in Capital Projects. The Policy Committee requested that the staff have a monthly report on capital projects including a commentary by staff on possible over runs. This item is for information purposes.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Margeson:

"THAT this report on capital projects be approved for preparation."
Motion Carried.

The second item deals with the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities, Proposed Establishment of a Labour Relations Information Service.

It was moved by Councillor Lichter, seconded by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the County of Halifax respond positively to the questionnaire re the proposed establishment of a Labour Relations Information Service by the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities

with the understanding that it will be purely for dispensing information and not negotiating service."

Motion Carried.

Mr. Meech stated that the reason for the emphasis on the information was due to a wish on the Policy Committee's part not to give the impression that the U.N.S.M. should negotiate contracts et cetera. Councillor Stewart expressed concern over the cost to the County. Mr. Meech replied that the cost to the County would be nil as the idea behind this is to have all the contracts on file that have been negotiated by the various Counties in the Province of Nova Scotia. However, Mr. Meech did think that perhaps a slight increase in membership rates may occur as a result. Mr. Meech did state that if it became such that the U.N.S.M. did raise costs prohibitively then the County could decide to drop membership in this association.

Councillor Deveaux suggested that a pre U.N.S.M. conference on resolutions would be of benefit to the County. Warden Lawrence agreed with this.

Mr. Meech outlined a letter addressed to Warden Lawrence concerning the questions raised by the Policy Committee on a request to have an appointment to the Dartmouth Homes for Special Care.

Councillor MacKenzie voiced the opinion that he did not see what involvement Halifax County had in Dartmouth Homes for Special Care.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT the letter from the Minister of Social Services be received."

Motion Carried.

There was discussion on the matter of the facility being private. Mr. Meech stated that the Province planned to set up a corporation under the Societies Act and that the facility would be non-profit. Councillor Benjamin gave history regarding the Homes for Special Care in Dartmouth. Councillor Benjamin stated that the Minister was going to set up a new Homes for Special Care Society and what was being asked at the present time was for a representative on that Society. He expressed concern over the opening of the door for Dartmouth to have representatives on County Boards of this nature.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor MacKay:

"THAT Councillor Smith be the representative to the Dartmouth Homes for Special Care Board."

Motion Defeated.

A number of the Councillors were concerned over the costs to the Municipality not only as possible grants to this new facility but also the deficit which is being funded by the County presently at Ocean View Manor which will only be aggravated by this new facility. Councillors also voiced concern over the location of the facility.