

you situate your building lengthwise as opposed to horizontally, you might save cost of the land and impact the neighbourhood a little less by the actual orientation of the building. Maybe that is the rationale behind it; to promote buildings to be located on the highway so that there is not so much visible, if it happens to be an obnoxious kind of use or something like that.

Councillor Topple: Regarding item A. Could that be for a single family and does it mean that I would have to put in a separate parking space beside my driveway? It says exclusive of front yard, etc.

Ms. Smith: It can be for a single family and is one parking space.

Councillor Topple: What if there is a garage there?

Ms. Smith: Then the garage would be for parking. This amendment is really no amendment as those are the same requirements as we have now.

Councillor Topple: Perhaps the solicitor can advise whether it should have something there to clarify that parking space includes a garage.

Solicitor Cragg: Maybe I read it differently than you do Councillor Topple; I think it would include a garage as a parking space.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: I read it that: you should have one parking space exclusive of the front yard, entrance or driveway, but that you can also park in those areas as well.

Councillor McCabe: Do we here in the Municipal Building comply with these new regulations or do we comply with the City of Halifax regulations.

Solicitor Cragg: We are situated in the City of Halifax and must abide by their regulations.

Councillor MacKay: If a single dwelling had a basement apartment in it or if one family had two cars, technically we could not put both cars in the driveway, is that correct? If that were true I would see many problems down the road, if someone wanted to build a duplex and rent one half.

Ms. Smith: This is no change from the present By-Law, section 11.

Councillor Topple: How do you determine where the driveway begins and where it ends if there is no garage on it and it is all driveway?

Solicitor Cragg: It starts from the boundary line which is shown as set back some distance from the road itself. You would go from there to the front portion of the home. That is all exclusive property and there would be no parking provided in that area. The rationale behind that can be found in the Building By-Law which tries to set forth that all new houses be set in a line up the street. If you had one house ten feet from the road, and have a ten or eight foot long car parked there, part of it could be sticking out in the road.

Councillor Topples: So nothing beside the house can be considered driveway?

Solicitor Cragg: It could be driveway if the driveway went right to the back, and it is just one dwelling opposed to one dwelling with several dwelling units contained in it.

Councillor MacDonald: When the By-Law came into effect 25 - 30 years ago, most people would only have one car. Now would be the time to change the twenty (20) foot line to where ever the distance is to the property line where you could legally park your cars. Would it be logical to extend that to forty (40) feet?

Ms. Smith: All I am illustrating here is the size of the parking space which is eight (8) by twenty (20) feet. I am not showing any kind of dimension of the lot.

Councillor MacDonald: Could we change the By-Law to allow two cars in a driveway?

Solicitor Cragg: There is a distinction between a dwelling and a dwelling unit. In the 1980 National Building Code, it makes this distinction very clear. The dwelling unit is, not a dwelling but a portion of a dwelling, such as a room which is rented out to a boarder or a self-contained unit or something along those lines. So this particular dwelling in Ms. Smith's presentation could contain up to three dwelling units and still be governed by this subclause "A".

Councillor MacDonald: Then you can park more than one car legally.

Solicitor Cragg: Yes, that is correct.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: I think the wording is what is throwing everyone off. Perhaps this can be changed.

Ms. Smith: If you would like to put more parking spaces in, that is up to yourself. These are only minimums.

Solicitor Cragg: These amendments are not only dealing with units presently in existence, but as well without such restrictive covenants within our By-Law we would not be able to tell a new Developer what he has to put on the grounds.

Councillor Lichter: I have some difficulty with the explanations from the solicitor, particular as to what a driveway is. I have difficulty with "A" where it says "exclusive of the driveway" and also "B" "exclusive of the driveway". I think at one point Mr. Cragg explained that if you pushed that particular driveway in behind the house, then all that is a driveway.

Solicitor Cragg: What Ms. Smith and I were stating is that the driveway could be pushed to the very back line but if it is just one dwelling with no dwelling units contained in it, the last 8' X 20' portion would not be part of the driveway but would be a parking space.

Councillor Lichter: So, it would be the last 8' X 20' foot space that would be considered a parking space. What about a driveway that goes up one side of the house and comes down the other side of the house.

Solicitor Cragg: Any portion from the two front lines aft, would be considered driveway.

Councillor Lichter: I would not like to see By-Law Officers enforcing this Parking By-Law for want of something better to do, just because a car is not lined up with a house. I don't think that "exclusive of the driveway" is a necessary part of this By-Law. I can see "exclusive of front yard and entrance" but not "driveway". I don't think you would want to prosecute anybody for that kind of a violation. If that is the case why bother having it in the By-Law.

Solicitor Cragg: If we were to take that out, that 8' X 20' would not be part of the driveway. You would then be saying that the driveway stops in front of the house, which in fact it doesn't.

Councillor Wiseman: We are trying to enforce something that is unenforceable. On most streets that I know, cars are parked in the driveway. When you have two cars in the household you are put in a position of having to create another parking space exclusive of the driveway and the front yard, so it will also create hardship for existing homeowners, if I am understanding the By-Law correctly.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: I am inclined to agree, especially in view of Councillor Lichter's comments and as I stated before, it may just be a matter of changing the wording of the By-Law. I realize, as it is stated here, if you lived in one house and parked more than one car in the driveway, you would be breaking the law, although I am sure it would never be enforced, and therefore, why bother putting it in the By-Law at all.

Councillor MacKay: The way I read it is, that a dwelling containing not more than three dwelling units shall contain one parking space but doesn't limit how many cars you can park there. You only require one space but you can park four cars or six cars, so we wouldn't be enforcing how many cars are parked in the driveway. The thing we would be enforcing, is how many parking spaces you must require per dwelling unit and it would not apply to existing dwellings but only to newly created ones.

Solicitor Cragg: I think the real concern is parking of vehicles in front of the house. You can park as many cars there as you want. These are minimal requirements. The requirements proposed this evening are virtually identical, in this case, to those presently incorporated in the By-Law.

Councillor MacKay: In any part of these proposed amendments, it would not take into consideration and reflect upon parking requirements for buildings already in existence. It would only take into consideration newly developed structures.

Solicitor Cragg: Yes, except those which are presently in our By-Laws.

Councillor Lichter: I still have difficulty because of the Building By-Law. Occasionally this Council has approved a lesser side-yard clearance than eight feet and it sounds like quite a reasonable request at times. Now does it mean that if we approve this particular By-Law there will be no possibility whatsoever to have anything less than a minimum of an eight foot side-yard clearance, regardless of what the situation is. If we approve a seven foot six inch side-yard clearance, then you cannot provide the eight foot driveway or parking space anywhere other than this lower portion of the driveway, closer to the road.

Solicitor Cragg: That is under the assumption that both side-yard clearances are less than the minimum.

Councillor Lichter: Usually that is the case. I can see some difficulty with that and I really can't see suggesting that your car can be beside the house but not in front of the house line.

Solicitor Cragg: I think if we were not to pass this particular portion of the amendment, it really amounts to nothing because we have the identical clause contained in our By-Law at the present time. We can't amend it to allow parking in the front part because then we are not being more restrictive, but to the contrary; which we cannot do because of the advertising. So, in spite of our conversation tonight, there is nothing we can do to bring it to the state that you require.

Ms. Smith: The other point to remember is that the requirement is to provide one space regardless or exclusive of, the front yard or driveway. There is no restriction for parking in your driveway, but you have to provide another space that is not your driveway and not in the front yard. There is no restriction for having three cars parked there, if you have no space, for people to visit you or if you have two cars. It just means that you have to provide one space other than these areas.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: What I understand is that if I were building a three-apartment building I would have to state in the plan where those three parking spaces are going to be made available.

Ms. Smith: Yes, you would have to state where those spaces were going to go.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: Then if other cars were to come in and park in the driveway, there is no problem.

Ms. Smith: No, that is not what it says here. It does not say that you cannot park there. It simply says that you have to provide a parking space other than the front yard or driveway.

Councillor Margeson: Suppose the house was at the back of the lot?

Solicitor Cragg: A thirty foot setback at the rear of a lot would

certainly provide you with ample room for parking.

Councillor Margeson: You only need eight feet at the rear of the lot.

Solicitor: Yes that is correct but you still have room for a vehicle, if you have eight feet. All you have to do is have it physically laid down that you can put an eight by twenty foot spot back of the front line of the house.

Councillor Margeson: I think those last two lines should come out of that demonstration. It should read "one (1) parking space for each dwelling unit".

Deputy Warden Deveaux: According to the way I enterpret what Ms. Smith has said and what it says here, it does not mean that you cannot park cars in your driveway. What it boils down to, is that if I make application to build I have to include in those plans, an area set up for one parking space, which is all it calls for. Over and above that, my understanding is that you can park in the driveway.

Councillor Margeson: I will accept that if you are going to assume that all houses are set back thirty feet but many homes are set back further than that, mine being an example. There are many homes like that in the Country. What is the point of setting it back thirty feet when you don't have to. In my case you would make me set the parking spots behind the house and not in my front yard. I think there is something wrong with the By-Law and we should drop the last two lines.

Councillor Benjamin: I would think that this By-Law is designed for houses thirty feet from the road. Perhaps you could add to the By-Law, parking space for each dwelling unit, exclusive of the front yard, in a situation where the house is situated less than thirty feet from the road to accomodate the one set back 100 feet, would not apply. This seems to be what we are hung up on.

Ms. Smith: It doesn't matter where your house is. The parking space could be right beside it as long as it is not in the front yard. You can meet the requirements and still park in your driveway.

Deputy Warden Deveaux went to the diagram Ms. Smith had put up to explain his previous comments regarding his understanding of the proposed By-Law.

Councillor Margeson: I still have difficulty with this because a lot of places in the County have a driveway which doesn't go near the back of the house at all. They have a "U" shaped driveway. They come in, go through a little porch and leave their car there. If we are going to restrict that, then I have difficulty with it.

Councillor Smith: Concerning number "C" of a Senior Citizen's Apartments. In talking with the President of the Senior Citizens complex, he tells me that they are having quite a bit of controversey over parking spaces. There are not enough. This coincides with the complaints I have received as well. Would it be possible to change it

to read: "one (1) for every dwelling unit."

Deputy Warden Deveaux: I have had the same comments made about the Senior Citizens parking in my area but I will have to ask Miss Smith: by increasing it now, would we be making it less restrictive?

Ms. Smith you would be making it more restrictive, but whatever Council wants to make it, as long as it is being made more restrictive, is O.K. However, the CMHC standards are 20% parking requirements. In other words, one for every five units or beds. Both of the cities of Halifax and Dartmouth felt that in their experience, that was inadequate. What we are proposing sounded to them to be very adequate. The other thing to remember is that by requiring more parking spaces you are increasing costs and that these types of facilities only have peak parking requirements, such as Sunday which may be the day that everyone comes to visit, so the rest of the week the parking lots are virtually empty. This only applies to zoned areas of the county and not unzoned areas.

Councillor Smith: In the two that I am familiar with, exclusive of the one in Porters Lake, but the one in Sheet Harbour and the one in Musquodoboit Harbour, they don't have any extra land they could use for parking. All the parking area is completely taken up.

Ms. Smith: The zoning By-Law does not apply to Musquodoboit or Sheet Harbour.

Councillor Smith: I realize that, but the NSHC goes by the zoning By-Laws.

Ms. Smith: No, they don't, they have their own standards that they use, CMHC standards generally.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: Do we understand then, that when the NSHC erects one of these Senior Citizens Apartments in an area where the zoning does not apply then they don't have to abide by them?

Ms. Smith: Generally the Housing Commission goes by the CMHC standards. The reason the one in Sheet Harbour doesn't have enough parking could be because it is probably that one parking unit is required for five units or beds, which is what I stated earlier, and which is the criteria used by Halifax and Dartmouth and which is the CMHC standards. The Housing Commission very likely use that, but again our Zoning By-Law does not cover the majority of the County, in which case, particularly in Rural areas, these requirements would have no effect.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: Does that mean then, that if anyone builds an Hotel or Motel in Musquodoboit Harbour he would not have to abide by this zoning By-Law? Where do we differentiate as to where it applies and where it does not?

Ms. Smith: It only applies to zoned areas or General Building zoned areas; most of the County is unzoned.

Councillor Wiseman: I noticed that for the Elementary Schools and High Schools and so on, you seem to have taken into consideration the staff for that type of building. In other uses, have you taken the same consideration. I am thinking in particular of Hospitals where you have absolutely no relationship to the amount of parking provided for the staff in these buildings. I am wondering as well for the Senior Citizens Apartments or Homes, where there is an intensive type of care there, and you need a fair number of staff. Is there any relationship there to staffing?

Ms. Smith: Generally there isn't because that is a very arbitrary and difficult way to enforce a parking requirement. The requirements for staff changes, where you may have 15 staff today and may only need ten tomorrow, or vice versa.

Councillor Wiseman: I am surprised that in some of these institutions, more consideration is not given to that, because what happens is that the staff takes up all the parking spaces and there is no room for visitor parking.

Ms. Smith: The uses that are not covered in the parking requirement would be governed by Lot Coverage Requirements under the particular zone they are in, which is the only other way we have of controlling that. That doesn't necessarily mean that parking spaces are provided but just that coverage of the lot is such that, if necessary, you have room to develop them if they are required. Also, it would be too complex to develop parking standards for every conceivable use you could have and these figures are out of a model the Province uses. That model was developed from a paper on North American Standards; generally accepted standards. What it basically gives is low, average and high requirements for parking. From that we took the average or the high. Whether it is suitable for the Urban or Rural area, is difficult to assess and we chose not to go as restrictive as you might like to see in some cases just because we are dealing with both sectors and something which might be applicable in the rural area might be too restrictive in the Urban area or vice versa.

Councillor Wiseman: You also mentioned front of the building parking. I noticed in some of the sketches you presented that you are permitting that, fronting on the main road.

Ms. Smith: When I did these sketches it occurred to me that I had put some of the parking in front yards where they were not allowed. In commercial lots there is no difficulty there, but for residential uses there is no provision for designating on a set of plans that the front yard is to be used for parking.

Councillor Lichter: Concerning the idea of exclusive of driveway, it simply means that you have to draw this area on a plan and beyond that you don't have to do anything else physically? Many times in the past I have found people get upset about putting something on paper which has no significance whatsoever. A man in my district had to buy a quarter of a mile of swamp in order to get frontage to a road even though the swamp could never be filled in. If it is just paperwork why

bother to do it?

Ms. Smith: This is a problem usually seen in the Urban areas. It may be that in some cases a parking spot is not clearly defined in terms of having trees cut down. I am not sure how severely that is enforced.

Councillor Baker: How would you control parking in Rural areas; my area is partially zoned.

Ms. Smith: It does not apply to non-zoned areas and is not retroactive in zoned areas.

Councillor Smith: Regarding Commercial Uses having parking in front, what came to my mind was, what would you do in a place where there was a Church built on one side of the lot and just behind that building, off to the side, a Glebe and in front of the Glebe a parking area for the Church, what happens in a case like this?

Deputy Warden Deveaux: This would have no bearing on anything already in existence and again depends on whether this is in a zoned or unzoned area. In future building, I don't think this would be permitted.

Ms. Smith: The Glebe would be considered an accessory use of the Church and requirements for parking would be the same as the Church, which is the main use of the lot.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: We will go to the Public portion of our meeting. I would ask if anyone in the Gallery wishes to speak in favour of the amendment to the Zoning By-Law regarding parking spaces? Hearing none, I will now ask if anyone in the Gallery wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment to the Zoning By-Law regarding parking space.

Mr. Gordon Kyle 2, Birchwood Drive, Halifax,

I have a question for Miss Smith, concerning the Commercial Use of property. We have an Industrial Use and the definition of parking space here does not seem to refer either to a Private Dwelling Commercial or Industrial Use and it states that a definition of parking space, is a space exclusive of driveway, entrance or aisles for the temporary parking and storage of motor vehicles, etc. When we built our building, we provided space which only applied for our building permit and had to modify our plans to include space behind the building. In an Industrial or Commercial application, this can be quite restrictive. It can also be restrictive to someone who has a nice large lot and wants to build a house 100 feet back and doesn't particularly want to cut down the trees to provide some space beside or behind his dwelling. Perhaps the simplest way to approach this in a further amendment, as it cannot be incorporated in this one, is to say that the restricted area is so many feet back from the front line whether it be 20, 30 or 50 feet. In that case you would remove the problem and in the case of somebody who had enough land to put their house way back and then allow them to park in front, and it would simply be a question of adding in the definition of parking space

"exclusive of driveway, or aisles within X amount of feet within the property line". That would allow for people who had that extra space, to provide those parking spaces in front of their house but beyond that point which is considered a reasonable amount to have cars back from the front property line. This is particularly of interest to us in building Commercial Establishments or Industrial where we have concerns which are related to the movement of trucks, product, the layout of the plant on a piece of land which is next to a rail siding, where it gets kind of tricky and the restriction of having to put 20, 25 or 30 parking spaces behind or alongside of the property, can be a severe one and can actually make it very difficult for you to propose an optimum design to your plant, with respect to the land constraints and the boundary, so there seems to be a fairly simple way of achieving what appears to be the intent of this By-Law which I support; that is to keep the streets uncluttered or to provide space which would allow, in most cases, people to park their cars back from the street. The fact that there is no mention of how far back that restricted area begins, seems to be a little bit illogical in view of some of the houses and it doesn't matter whether or not it is retroactive or not. Thank you.

Councillor Stewart: In the Commercial and Industrial there is nothing to say that you can't park in front; it is only the first three categories which are residential where they don't want you to have your allotted vehicle space in front of the house.

Mr. Kyle: I read the definition of parking space as being exclusive of driveways or aisles.

Councillor Stewart: That does not say anything about the front yard, only the three residential categories which talk about exclusive of the front yard. The others just say exclusive of driveways, aisles, or what have you.

Mr. Kyle: I would like to have that clarified. It happened to us, we had to change our plans.

Ms. Smith: I don't know why that would have been a requirement for your building application. There could have been other reasons for that. I don't know what was in the Building Inspectors mind when he asked you to do that.

Solicitor Cragg: I don't know the particular reason for your direction. I think Councillor Stewart was correct.

Mr. Kyle: If that is true then there is no problem with regard to Commercial and Industrial parking but I do stand on my comments about the residential in that it is a very simple thing to accommodate those people, and make it possible for us to have an enforceable By-Law which makes sense and means something.

Ms. Smith: The requirements for the I-1 Zone which is the zoning designation you have, is the same as the Commercial 2 Zone. There is no provision for not allowing parking in the front yard and I do not know why you had problems, That would be something you should discuss

with your Building Inspector.

There were no further questions for Mr. Kyle.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: Is there anyone else who wishes to come forward and speak in opposition to the proposed amendment to the zoning By-Law regarding parking space? Hearing none, the floor is now open for a motion with regards to the amendment to the Zoning By-Law.

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

"THAT it be added to Section 2, Amendment to the Zoning By-Law, (xxx) "Parking Space" means an area of not less than one hundred and sixty (160) sq. ft. measuring eight (8) ft. by twenty (20) feet exclusive of driveways or aisles, for the temporary parking or storage of vehicles, and which has adequate access to permit ingress and egress of a motor vehicle to and from a street or highway by means of driveways, aisles or manoeuvring areas, and to rescind the present Sections 11 and 11(A) and substitute the new section 11, as follows:

- a) One (1) parking space for each Dwelling Unit, exclusive of the front yard, entrance or driveway.
- b) One and One-half (1.5) parking spaces for each Dwelling Unit, exclusive of the front yard, entrance or driveway.
- c) One (1) parking space for every two (2) Dwelling Units, exclusive of the front yard, entrance or driveway.
- d) One (1) parking space for each unit.
- e) One and One-half (1.5) parking spaces for each teaching classroom.
- f) Four (4) parking spaces for each teaching classroom.
- g) Where there are fixed seats, one (1) parking space for every five (5) seats, or ten (10) feet of bench space. Where there are no fixed seats, one (1) parking space for each one hundred (100) square feet of floor area devoted to public use.
- h) One (1) parking space for each two hundred and fifty (250) square feet of floor area.
- i) One (1) parking space for each one hundred and eighty (180) sq. ft. of commercial floor space.
- j) Parking area shall be three (3) times floor area, exclusive of common malls between stores.
- k) One (1) parking space for each one hundred (100) sq. ft. of area.

- l) One (1) parking space for each three hundred (300) sq. ft. of floor area.
 - m) One (1) parking space for every one thousand (1000) sq. ft. of floor area plus One (1) parking space for every twenty-five (25) feet of building frontage. (This excludes Industrial Uses located in the IP Zone.)
- Motion Carried.

Councillor MacKay: Would Ms. Smith read the wording advertised regarding Industrial Uses. I have difficulty with the addition of one parking space for every twenty-five feet of building fronting on a highway, because if you put two identical buildings on a road, one parallel to it and one horizontal to it, you could dramatically change the parking requirements of the two.

Ms. Smith: It was advertised as one parking space for every two employees.

Councillor MacKay: That could change with the use of the building. Solicitor, is it possible to amend that to make it compatible with the Commercial Uses; one parking space for every 300 feet of floor area?

Ms. Smith: The parking requirements attached to the model Zoning By-Law for the Province of Nova Scotia give a number of parking requirements for Industrial Uses; a high, low and average requirement, as well as the most common used. If you propose one parking space for every 300 sq. ft., that would be double the highest requirement used in North America.

Councillor MacKay: I would amend the motion then to read: "That Industrial Uses be one parking space for every 800 sq. ft. of floor space" and would also amend it to delete the additional, "one parking space for every twenty-five feet of building frontage".

Solicitor Cragg: We cannot just relate your amendment to the motion on the floor, but must look at it from the point of view of what was advertised, compared to the motion. The motion is more restrictive to the advertisement and your amendment to the motion would make the motion less restrictive; therefore, your amendment would not be valid.

Councillor MacKay: On that basis then, I will withdraw my amendment.

Councillor Margeson: What would you need to amend the part about going back thirty feet from the building line?

Deputy Warden Deveaux: If you amended it that way, and a person had a normal driveway, up to thirty feet would take them to the front of their house and they could not park in their driveway, whereas under the present recommendation, they can park there.

Solicitor Cragg: As well, you would be making the proposed amendment less restrictive.

Councillor Lichter: I am against the amendment to the By-Law both on semantics and the moral issue about the advertisement not being compatible with the proposed amendment. I am in support of it from item "C" to item "L" but as I disagree with "A", "B" and "M", I can't support the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Public Hearing be adjourned."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, there being no further business, the Public Hearing adjourned at 9:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

APRIL 30, 1981

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
 Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
 Mr. Gillis, Superintendent, Municipal School Board
 Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
 Mr. Ken Wilson, Director of Finance

SECRETARY: Mrs. Christine Harvey

Warden Lawrence brought the meeting to order at 1:35 P.M.

Warden Lawrence advised that this meeting had been called as the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities had been asked by the Province to respond to the recommendations and had in turn forwarded that request to the member Municipalities.

Copies of the Report of the Walker Commission on Public Education Finance were distributed to those who were not already in possession of one. As well, copies of a memo from Mr. Ken Wilson, were distributed which outlined the financial impact of the Report.

Mr. Gillis went through the 64 recommendations explaining each one in detail. Also, he briefly outlined the suggestions (not recommendations) which followed the recommendations. Subsequent to explanation of various recommendations there was some brief commentary from members of Council. However, no strong opposition was made to any of the recommendations until Mr. Gillis had completed outlining and explaining them.

In general, the majority of the Councillors were in favour of a large portion of the report. They were happy with the potential relief from the burden of existing school debt; the possibility of provincial funding for approved capital construction costs in the future, would also offer relief to Halifax County Tax-Payers. There were several recommendations in the Report which were less than satisfactory to Council.

Although most recommendations of the Walker Commission would increase the Provincial share of operating costs for the Municipal School Board there were still costs which far exceeded the level of financial support proposed in the Walker Commission Report.

Recommendation Forty-Four recommended increased rates for pupil transportation service but fell short of actual costs experienced in the Municipality. Whereas \$1.45 per loaded mile was recommended by the Commission, the Municipal School Board reported actual cost per loaded mile of \$1.90. In a Municipality the size of Halifax County with sparse school populations in its rural areas and very heavy school populations in its urban areas, the bus service required to meet the needs of school children should have about 180 buses and with the rising fuel costs and the cost of buses the Municipality would be unable to lower its costs to the suggested \$1.45 per loaded mile.

Recommendation Thirty-Two which stated that the Province will assume 100% of the existing school debt for the District Boards was a welcome recommendation providing that the assumption of debt would be based on total or gross debt charges rather than merely the eligible portions of debt charges.

Recommendation Thirty-Six in the Commission report refers to the creation of a "Provincial School Construction Committee" whose membership would be made up of representatives of each of the proposed 21 District School Boards. This Committee would make recommendations on requests for school capital construction using initially a sum of \$20,000,000 from the Province of Nova Scotia as a total budget for school construction. In the proposed reduction of School Boards from 85 to 21, the Halifax County District Board which would also include Bedford, would still have the largest school population of any Board in the Province of Nova Scotia. In 1980 Halifax County spent approximately half of the proposed budget for the entire Province on School construction. Therefore it seemed unfair that Halifax County should have only one representative on the Provincial School Construction Committee. Since Halifax County is the only Municipality in the Province whose school population is still increasing rather than decreasing, there was some anxiety from Council that Halifax County may not receive fair treatment with a committee made up of such diverse District Boards.

Recommendation Six defined membership of the proposed new District Boards of which an automatic member would be the Inspector of Schools. Council had anxieties about the difficult role which such a position would create and recommended that if the Inspector of Schools was to be a member of the School Board, that he not be a voting member. It was

felt that there could be a conflict of interest for the representative of the Provincial Department of Education considering that the balance of the Board would be equally made up of directly elected members and members appointed by Municipal Council.

Recommendation Fifty-Nine provided for a level of assistance to Regional Library Boards which would be linked to the proposed Provincial Grant. Council was unclear as to the actual intent of this recommendation and also whether or not recent briefs submitted by Regional Library Boards had been considered in this recommendation for funding. It was felt that more detail should be obtained before Council could properly evaluate this recommendation.

There was also some discussion about Recommendation One, regarding the Core Curriculum. However, Council agreed that this was the School Board's jurisdiction.

It was also noted that the Report left out any mention of School Trustees - their powers and their responsibilities. In particular Halifax County, which still has Boards of Trustees throughout the Municipality has had anxiety about the School Area Amounts which can be recommended at annual ratepayers meetings under provision of the Education Act. It was felt that since the intent of the global funding concept of the Walker Commission was to provide a comprehensive level of assistance from the Province to Municipalities, it seemed inappropriate that a request to the Municipal School Board for additional taxation could be decided by as few as three rate-payers at an annual meeting. Council and the Municipal School Board had repeatedly requested that the Department of Education reconsider this provision in the Act, without success, and Council felt that the omission of any mention of the powers and roles of the Boards of Trustees should be rectified before the Commission Report received Provincial approval.

Subsequent to discussion of the Walker Commission Report, Mr. Wilson outlined his memo regarding the financial impact of the Report, advising of the savings to the County annually. He advised that had the Report been in effect in 1981, the County would have paid two million dollars less for the education of its children.

Warden Lawrence advised that she would prepare a Draft Position Paper outlining Council's feelings on the Walker Commission Report which could be reviewed and amended at the Next Council session, May 5, 1981.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Committee of the Whole session adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, Council adjourned at 4:05 P.M.

I N D E X

Acadia School -----	19
Annual Council Session -----	37
Bridge Commission Meeting -----	8-9
C. P. Allen High School -----	1-6&33
Correspondence -----	7&20
Chief Building Inspectors Report -----	17&29
Canada Week -----	23
Constitutional Reform -----	25-26&27
Cable T. V. - Districts #9 & #10 -----	36
Dog By-Law - Amendment -----	32
Director of Development Report -----	33
F.C.M. Resolutions -----	28
F.C.M. Conference -----	32
Green Areas - Moody Park Subdivision -----	29
Legay Fiberglass Ltd. - Public Hearing -----	16
Lake District Recreation Assoc. - Lease -----	24
Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary -----	1&18
Motion - C. P. Allen High School -----	1-6&33
Motion - Approval of Council Minutes -----	7&18&19
Motion - Correspondence -----	7&20
Motion - Public Education Finance Conference -----	7
Motion - Reed Career Services Advertisements -----	8
Motion - Bridge commission Meeting -----	8-9
Motion - Space Requirements Administration Offices -----	9-11
Motion - Transit -----	11-15
Motion - School Bus Conveyance -----	15
Motion - Planning Advisory Committee Supplementary Report -----	16
Motion - Public Hearing, Re Legay Fiberglass Ltd. -----	16
Motion - Management Committee Supplementary Report -----	16-17
Motion - Re-naming of John A. MacKay School -----	17
Motion - Chief Building Inspectors Report -----	17&29
Motion - Adjournment -----	17&37
Motion - Acadia School -----	19
Motion - Canada Week -----	23
Motion - Lease, re Lake District Recreation Assoc. -----	24
Motion - Constitutional Reform -----	25-26&27
Motion - F.C.M. Resolutions -----	28
Motion - Planning Advisory Committee Report -----	28
Motion - Green areas, Moody Park Subdivision -----	29
Motion - Management Committee Report -----	29
Motion - Temporary Borrowing Resolutions -----	30&31

Motion - Policy Committee Report -----	31
Motion - Taxi By-Law Amendments-----	31&32
Motion - Dog By-Law Amendments -----	32
Motion - F.C.M. Conference -----	32
Motion - Senior Citizens Week -----	32
Motion - Director of Development Report -----	33
Motion - Municipal Treasurer -----	34
Motion - Redistribution Committee -----	36
Motion - Cable T.V. - District 9&10 -----	36
Motion - Annual Council Session -----	37
Public Education Finance Conference -----	7
Planning Advisory Committee Supplementary Report -----	16
Public Hearing - Legay Fiberglass Ltd. -----	16
Planning Advisory Committee Report -----	28
Policy Committee Report -----	31
Recording Secretary - appointment -----	1&18
Reed Career Services Advertisements -----	8
Redistribution Committee -----	36
Space Requirements - Administration Offices -----	9-11
School Bus Conveyance -----	15
Senior Citizens Week -----	32
Transit -----	11-15
Temporary Borrowing Resolutions -----	30&31
Taxi By-Law - Amendments -----	31&32

COUNCIL SESSION

APRIL 7, 1981

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Ken Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. Gerry Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mayor Francene Cosman
Mr. Dan English, C.A.O., Bedford
Deputy Mayor Tom Innis, Bedford
Councillor Bosko Loncarevic, Bedford
Councillor Arnold LeGree, Bedford
Councillor David Lugar, Bedford
Councillor Keith Roberts, Bedford
Councillor John Tolson, Bedford

SECRETARY: Mrs. Christine Harvey

OPENING OF COUNCIL - LORD'S PRAYER

Warden Lawrence opened Council with the Lord's Prayer at 2:05 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

"THAT Mrs. Christine Harvey be appointed the Recording Secretary."
Motion Carried.

MEETING WITH BEDFORD - C.P. ALLEN SCHOOL

Mayor Cosman opened the discussion between the two Councils, regarding the C. P. Allen School Capital Debt, thanking the Municipal Council for the opportunity to speak on the subject. She further expressed her

opinion that the report of the Walker Commission on Public Education Finance would put a different light on the problem as one of the recommendations of the report was to join together the Bedford and Halifax County School Boards and as well recommends taking over the capital debt on the school.

Many members of Halifax County Council felt that to base any decision or agreement on the Walker Commission would be premature at this stage and felt that the problem should be dealt with based on present circumstances. As well Councillor Wiseman and Mr. Meech indicated that the report had not clarified how much of the capital debt would be taken over, if the recommendation went through.

Several options, to the problem of paying the capital debt on the school were suggested. The first, as suggested by Councillor Lugar of Bedford, was that yearly negotiations take place between the two Councils with a contribution towards the construction costs of C. P. Allen on the basis of student population at the school, or, based on assessment, which it would be if the Town were still part of the Municipality.

Mr. Meech indicated that this would be fine if Bedford was willing to share in the capital debt of all schools in the Municipality based on assessment or student population but that he did not consider it to be fair to isolate C. P. Allen School in that manner, as Halifax County's tax share of Capital debt applied to all schools within the County. He further indicated that the present position with regard to the C. P. Allen school is more or less based on a year to year procedure as there is no provision for any sort of penalty if Bedford were to suddenly build a school of their own and opt out of any agreement whether it be a five or ten year agreement.

Deputy Warden Innis, from Bedford indicated that as yet they had seen no figures relating to the agreement.

Mr. Meech clarified that the projected cost for the school, after provincial cost sharing would be approximately \$270,000 yearly. He indicated that Bedford's share of this amount, if based on a proportionate student population, which is 35 - 40%, would be about \$108,000 per annum.

Councillor MacKay stated that he did agree that a year to year negotiation could take place with Bedford and the County of Halifax with regard to the Capital Debt of this School but he felt that the Municipality should stand firm on its original position with regard to the amount to be shared, which would be based on the proportionate share of students from Bedford attending the school.

Councillor Benjamin also felt that the arrangements for repayment of the capital debt for the C. P. Allen School were fine as they were and wished to know he reasons why Bedford did not wish to comply with these arrangements.

In addition to the effect the possible implementation of the Walker

Commission Report of Public Education Finance may have on the issue, as already stated, there were several other reasons why Bedford did not like the present arrangement, which were as follows:

1. one of the more major reasons was that these terms of repayment were setting a precedent, as never has a Municipal unit requested that another Municipal unit assist in the repayment of debt charges for a facility which is not within its Municipal boundaries.
2. Bedford was paying a tuition fee for the students to go to C.P. Allen, much the same as the Municipality pays a fee for some of its students to go the Halifax Schools. In the case of the Municipality it was not also paying capital costs to Halifax City.
3. If Bedford had not separated, they would not be asked to pay so large a share but would be paying on the basis of assessment.
4. By paying the capital costs on the School they were paying on the principal of an asset for which they would never obtain control. The Bedford Council pointed out that if they were paying for a house they would eventually own it whereas in this situation they would receive no benefit from the payment of these monies.
5. It was also pointed out that the Municipality had received monies from a transitional grant, when Bedford had split from Municipality.
6. They further pointed out that though the Town had a low capital debt, which they felt was being taken into consideration in the present terms of payment, this was not a fair justification for the high payments, because they would be incurring an extremely high debt load over the next year or so due to setting up their own Police Force as well as a highway maintenance department.

There were many reasons why Bedford was dissatisfied with the present terms of repayment of the capital debt on the C P Allen School but those listed above were the major reasons discussed at this session.

As far as setting a precedent was concerned, Warden Lawrence stated that really there were two precedents being set here, 1) ownership in a school being vested in a Municipality of which it is not situated. The Warden clarified that Bedford did not want to own the School; 2) the request for capital cost sharing is the second precedent for which the Municipality's reasons have been made clear, or will be today.

Regarding the tuition fees, the Municipality's tuition fee for its students to go to Halifax schools was \$2,750 per student while the Municipality is charging Bedford only \$2,055 per student.

The fact that had Bedford not separated they would be charged by assessment value had no bearing on the Municipality's decision as Bedford did separate and as already stated, if they were paying on

assessment they should be paying a percentage of all Hlaifax County schools and not isolating C. P. Allen.

Councillor Wiseman clarified the point in regard to paying the principal on a facility for which no ownership would be obtained. She stated that in most cases when a school is no longer suitable for use which is usually long after its captial debt is paid it is given to a community organization of some sort who maintains it. Therefore, it really is not clear in whose hands the asset is. She also stated that in the case of C. P. Allen it will still be a usable school in twenty years when the debt is paid off. Many Muncipal Councillors felt quite strongly that the school would probably belong to Bedford eventually and there was a great deal of concern expressed in this regard.

Regarding monies received by the Municipality from the transitional grant, Mr. Meech advised that the Municipality did receive some reimbursement in calculation of the transitional grant using the gross debt charges. However, at the time the school had not been completed or financed.

Regarding the Town's low capital debt, Bedfrod Council was assured this was not taken into consideration when the terms of repayment were determined. Further to this Mr. Meech pointed out that the Municipality were allowing the Town to use its cost sharing formula which was saving them a great deal of money. Without this cost sharing formula the Town of Bedford would pay approximately 40% of \$900,000 and receive 40% of that amount back, which would be a much larger sum than \$108,000.

Subsequent to the above points lengthy discussion took place in regard to alternate methods of repayment of the capital debt on the C. P. Allen School.

In addition to Coucillor Lugar's previous suggestion of paying on a year to year basis, based on either assesment (12%) or student population (35 - 40%), and renegotiated at the beginning of each calendar year, several other alternative suggestions were made.

1. Councillor Legree, of Bedford, suggested paying on the interest only and not on the principal which would decrease the yearly payment to about \$80,000.00.
2. Councillor Loncarevic felt that the capital debt should be called another name to lesson the strong feelings against the payments; supplementary fee, for example.
3. Councillor Tolson of Bedford, expanded on Councillor Legree's idea, suggesting that we look at a five year payment on the interest only, paid proportionately on the basis of student population. Councillor Benjamin further expanded on this idea stating that it should not be a terminal agreement but that there should be options to renew.
4. Councillor Tople had suggested that both Councils go back to the

PUB and ask them to reconsider their original decision, perhaps bringing about a reversal decision.

There were extremely lengthy discussions on all of the above suggestions which resulted in several motions being put on the floor.

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

"THAT the original motion regarding the capital debt charges on the C. P. Allen School, which was endorsed by Council March 16, be deferred until July 2, 1981, and that in the meantime, the Warden of Halifax County, the Mayor of the Town of Bedford, the administrators of both Municipal Units and an appointee of the Provincial Department of Education, look into the situation and bring forth recommendations for repayment of the capital debt and the use of the C. P. Allen School."
Motion Defeated.

Councillor Margeson felt that this would have given Bedford a full year of operations and an opportunity to determine where their costs would be for the year.

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

"THAT the Warden, Mayor and the C.A.O.'s get together within one week to discuss in detail the specific proposal of paying the proportionate share of the interest on the capital debt for 5 years rather than on the principal and that this arrangement be renewable after five years."
See Motion to Amend.

It was amended by Councillor Stewart, seconded by Councillor Tople:

"THAT should the School ultimately go to Bedford's ownership that the County be reimbursed for the portion of principal it has paid."
Amendment Defeated.

Councillor Lichter felt that the amendment had been defeated because it had not been stated clearly enough. Therefore, he wished to change his motion to include: if and when Bedford wished to take over this School, that negotiation of replacement costs take place; however, Councillor Benjamin, the seconder of the motion was not in agreement with this proposed change. Therefore, Councillor Lichter withdrew his alteration to the motion.

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

"As written previously."
Motion Defeated.

As this motion was defeated, Warden Lawrence advised that the original motion, endorsed by Council March 16; "That the tuition agreement between Bedford and the Municipal School Board be for a term of five

years, providing the Town of Bedford is prepared to share the capital debt on the school proportionate to the student population proviso that this agreement be concluded by March 16." Warden Lawrence advised that this date had been changed to include today's meeting. The Warden further advised that both Councils should review all of today's suggestions, possibly reconsider their decisions and come up with alternate recommendations.

Mayor Cosman was not satisfied with the outcome of the meeting between the two Councils and suggested that the two Councils go to Arbitration possibly to the Department of Education and stick with their binding decision.

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

"THAT the motion just read by Warden Lawrence, the original motion endorsed by Council March 16, be deferred for one month to provide an opportunity for the Mayor, Warden, two C.A.O.'s and a representative from the Department of Education to review all of today's suggestions."
Motion Defeated.

Councillor Smith questioned whether it would be possible to amalgamate the motion made by Councillor Lichter, seconded by Councillor Benjamin and the amendment proposed by Councillor Stewart and seconded by Councillor Topple, and have both Councils work on this new motion within the week.

There was some discussion on whether or not this was a legal motion as both the amendment and the motion had been voted on and defeated. Councillor Smith indicated however, that there had been a word in the original amendment that had not been agreeable and if that word could be eliminated it was possible that something could positive could come of it.

Councillor Williams asked for a ruling on whether or not this motion was in order and Solicitor Cragg advised that even though it was a good motion and had a perfectly valid mover and seconder (seconded by Councillor Margeson) that he would have to rule it out of order.

Several Councillors were unsatisfied with this, Councillor MacKay wished to Move, "THAT the Warden, Mr. Meech, Mr. Wilson and the Counterparts in the Town of Bedford sit down together and come back with a mutually agreeable solution within the next month.

Before a seconder could be determined for this motion, it was ruled out of order by the Solicitor.

Still unhappy with this, Councillor Adams suggested rescinding all previous motions in order to make Councillor Smith's motion legal. However, this suggestion met with much opposition and the session was adjourned at this point for a one-hour supper break.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Deputy Warden Deveaux:

"THAT the minutes of the November 24, 1980 Public Hearing, the November 24, 1980 Committee of the Whole, the January 12, 1981 Public Hearing and the February 17, 1981 Regular Sessions be approved and THAT the March 3, 1981 Regular Session be approved as amended."

Motion Carried.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

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

"THAT the correspondence be received."

Motion Carried.

The first item of correspondence was a letter to Warden Lawrence from the Commission on Public Education Finance advising that the report of the Commission on Public Education Finance will be ready for presentation to the Minister of Education by March 31, 1981 and that copies would shortly afterward be forwarded to School Boards and each Municipal Council as well as to some professional organizations who have contributed to the report.

The letter also advised that a provincial conference was planned for April 14 and 15 at St. Patrick's High School in Halifax where the report will be reviewed in detail and explanations and rationale for the various recommendations provided. Discussion will be encouraged and changes and suggestions for improvement discussed.

The letter was an invitation to attend this conference and stated that the fee would be \$15.00 per delegate. Also, the letter requested that any interested parties inform the writer, Mr. John R. Levangie, Secretary, as soon as possible and further advised that late registration was available at the School Tuesday, April 14 at 10:00 continuing until the conference began at 2:00 p.m.

Mr Meech indicated that it would definitely be advisable to have some representation at this conference.

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

"THAT all interested Councillors who wish to attend this conference be permitted to go and that the \$15.00 fee be paid by the Municipality."

Motion Carried.

It was further indicated by the Warden that if a Councillor was planning to attend, they should advise the Warden's Office or the Executive Office no later than Friday to give an indication of how many can be expected from the County, regardless of the late registration clause, for the purpose of sending an advance cheque.

The second item was a letter of acknowledgment from the Planning Act Review Committee acknowledging receipt of the Municipality's position on a number of matters relating to the proposed review to the Planning Act.

This letter was treated as information only.

The third letter was from the Advertising Standards Council to Mr. Kelly. This was in regard to the complaint against Reed Career Services and gave the Toronto Advertising Standards Council's opinion on this advertisement and stated it was evident that this advertisement did not violate the Canadian Code of Advertising Standards and therefore the Advertising Standards Council does not feel that further investigation or input on its part is necessary.

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

"THAT the School Board be approached to see if they have had any requests from residents for equipment, resulting from Reed Career Services advertisements on television."
Motion Carried.

The next item was a letter from Mr. Gillis, Superintendent of the School Board advising Council that the Municipal School Board has been in regular contact with the Department of Education for the last two years regarding the need for additional vocational school facilities. The study completed in 1979-80, he advised, was now being updated as joint undertaking of the Municipal School Board staff and the Department of Education staff.

This letter was treated as informatin only.

The next item was a letter to Mr. Kelly from the Nova Scotia Municipal Energy Project advising that the assembled data is now being used to compile an energy use profile for the Municipality which will then be compared to those of the other Municipalities participating in the study as well assessed for areas where energy-saving measures will be most promising. The letter also advised that the work would be completed in the next few months and that they may soon be in contact with Mr. Kelly to discuss aspects of the Municipality's energy use as the analysis progresses.

Mr. Meech advised, in response to a question from Councillor Margeson that this was a project of the Provincial Government which had initially asked the Municipality if it wished to participate as a sample Municipality, which was agreed upon, as the cost was to the Provincial Government.

The following item was a letter from Mr. R. J. Allen, Chairman of the Halifax Dartmouth Bridge Commission requesting permission to address Municipal Council on the serious matter of Bridge Pier Protection for the two Bridges connecting Halifax and Dartmouth.

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

"THAT Mr. Allen be permitted to address Council on this serious matter."
Motion Carried.

The eighth letter was from the President of the Nova Scotia Federation of Senior Citizens and Pensioners, Mr. Fred Wildsmith lending support to the Homemakers program which is now available through cost sharing with the Province.

Mr. Meech indicated that the Municipality of the County of Halifax has for some months been a participant in the program and are providing this service to the residents of the Municipality.

The ninth letter from the Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission extending an invitation to the Warden and members of Council on behalf of the Federation for Religious, Racial and Ethnic equality, for attendance at the special showing of the film, "The New Klan", at the Lord Nelson Hotel, April 9, at 12:30 P.M. The letter also indicated that they would like the invitation to be extended to Police and Education Officials coming under the jurisdiction of Council, as well. The letter from the Director of the Commission, Mr. George F. McCurdy, also indicated that a response advising the number of interested persons, should be forwarded.

As the showing was only two days away, Warden Lawrence advised that interested persons call the County Building no later than tomorrow.

This completed the general correspondence, although Warden Lawrence advised she had received considerable correspondence regarding the recommendations for Municipal Office Requirements. This, she advised would be dealt with during discussions of that topic.

At this point in the meeting Councillors Smith and Adams requested reconsideration of Councillor Adams, previous proposal to rescind all previous motion with regard the C. P. Allen School issue in order to legalize Councillor Smith's earlier motion which had not been ruled upon as yet by the solicitor.

Solicitor Cragg indicated that a motion could be made to rescind any previous motion but that Councillor Smith's motion could not be considered at this time because it had not been in order.

Due to an unreceptive response from Councillor Poirier, Councillor Adams moved to defer this item until the "New Business" section of the agenda, at the end of the Council Session.

SPACE REQUIREMENTS - COUNTY OF HALIFAX

Warden Lawrence advised that including a letter received today, she had to-date, received 11 pieces of correspondence in regard to this item, as well as a petition delivered by Deputy Warden Deveaux and further advised that she had responded to all but the one received today and had sent copies of the letters and her responses to the appropriate Councillors from whose districts the letters had arrived. The letters

were from:

1. Secretary of Board of Trade, Musquodoboit Harbour & District.
2. Secretary of the United Board of Trade, Moshers River.
Secretary of the Committee of Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Community.
4. Captain Dareff, postal address , Armdale (Councillor Baker advised that this letter was on behalf of Herring Cove area).
5. River Community Centre Association, Moshers River.
6. Mrs. Beatrice Richardson, Terrance Bay.
7. Marilyn Press, Press Insurance Services, Mooseland.
8. Mrs. Alice Brophy, Lower Prospect on behalf of the Community.
9. Eastern Halifax Co. Volunteer Fire Dept., Mosers River.
10. Miss J. E. Colburt from Cole Harbour.
11. Mr. Glen Nagle, District 9A Volunteer Fire Dept., West Lawrencetown, Porter's Lake (received today).

All of the above correspondence was in opposition to the construction of a new Municipal Administration Building in a new location.

The petition delivered by Deputy Warden Deveaux, was also in oposition, and is summarized as follows:

"We are in opposition to relocation of the Halifax County Municipal Building until all other avenues have been explored, including application to the City of Halifax for rezoning in order to expand the present facilities and wish that cost be given prime consideration, along those lines prior to any decision taking place. Further, should it be deemed necessary to relocate, a site be chosen to ensure the Municipal Building remains within the confines of Halifax County boundaries for a relatively long period of years to come, thus, not an area such as Sackville which has on occasion indicated its wishes to either incorporate or adopt some method of self-government".

It was moved by Deputy Warden Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Williams:

"THAT the issue of the Space Requirements for the County of Halifax Administration Offices be referred back to the Policy Committee for further consideration regarding the correspondence and petition received and that all avenues be explored prior to any final decision or or recommendations being made."

Councillor Williams felt that the County of Halifax was not in a financial position to go ahead with such a costly project at this time and indicated that he too had a petition signed by numerous people who had taken the trouble to go to his establishment, which is quite far from the city, to sign this petition and stated that this particular petition had not been circulated thourgh any street or area.

Several other Councillors spoke on the issue, among these were Councillors, Stewart, Walker, Topple and MacKenzie who felt that due to the concern expressed by the residents of Halifax County via these petitions and through their correspondence, and in light of the other alternatives for space requirements, such as; adding on to the present

Municipal Building or utilizing space presently being occupied by the School Board, Library and Provincial Assessment Office. Council Topple also felt that the question of sub-offices might have some bearing on the matter and Councillor Stewart advised that the completion of the Budget meetings would also have some bearing on the issue.

Among those Councillors opposed to referring to the Policy Committee the issue of Space Requirements, were Councillors Eisenhauer, MacKay, MacDonald and Lichter. It was their general feeling that the issue had already been discussed at the Policy Committee level and no recommendations had come forth and it was their opinion that nothing more could be accomplished at the Policy level.

Councillor Poirier indicated that some open discussion today might be a good idea, to give the Policy Committee some idea of how Councillors felt on the subject.

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

"THAT the issue of space Requirements (of any kind) be deferred until December of 1982."

Motion Defeated.

The previous motion moved by Deputy Warden Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Williams:

"As written previously."

Motion Carried.

RECOVERY OF TRANSIT COSTS

Warden Lawrence suggested that Councillor Eisenhauer open the debate as he had made a motion the last time the issue was discussed, "That Transit Cost be recovered on the general rate", and his motion had been deferred.

Councillor Eisenhauer began by giving some of the history of Transit in Halifax County. His main concern was that if the cost for Transit were to go on an area rate, the service would have to be cut back while the need for transit is getting greater due to the economic pollution factors, the high cost of gas and the maintenance cost for highways. It was his hope that Transit Service would spread throughout the County rather than decrease. He asked, that for this reason, that Council consider the general rate.

Councillor Lichter was extremely opposed to the general rate stating that it was very good to say that eventually service would be extended throughout the county but advised that this would only increase the deficit. Extending service to Musquodoboit Harbour for example, would, in his opinion, probably double the deficit. He felt that the transit future, with the amount of deficit they have, would look as follows:

1. Drop transit where deficit is created.
2. Pay for the deficit for your own area either through an area rate

or a combined urban area rate.

3. Or, continue to recommend to Councillors who will not get any service in their areas, that they will eventually get something and that they have to pay for it on a general rate.

Councillor Lichter had figured what the cost would be in various areas where there was little or no service if they were to go along with a general rate.

1. \$18,930 out of taxpayers pockets for Councillor Walker's District.
2. \$16,332 for Councillor Poirier's District.
3. \$42,267 for Councillor Benjamin's District.

He also advised that the cost per year for a house assessed at \$30,000 would be \$23.40 for the user of transit under a combined urban area rate. Under the general rate it would cost the same household approximately half that amount or \$12.00. Therefore, for a mere saving of \$12.00 these areas were asking Councillors in areas that have no service at all, to take money out of the pockets of their tax payers. He further advised that when he had explained the situation to the people of his area they had been definitely set against this proposal.

Councillor Eisenhauer advised that his concern was for people such as the elderly and students who have no method of transportation and who need transit, the only way to accomodate and protect these people and ensure that they can get around is to put the cost for Transit on a general rate.

Councillor MacKay stated that it was his experience that when people were offered a service they wanted it but did not want to pay for it. He asked to be put on record as stating that when the bus came up from Bedford to District 16 the doors could close and reopen when the bus got to Districts 18 and 20. He did not feel that the cost for Transit should go on the general rate as that would increase the pressure for improved level of service. It was his opinion that the cost should be recovered via a combined general rate for half of the deficit and be put on a district rate for the users of the service so that the Districts using the service would be paying a proportional share of it.

Councillor Wiseman advised that transit was identified as the greatest need in Sackville but with the rates being charged the whole system in Sackville which in turn will jeopardize possible expansion of this service throughout the rest of Halifax County. She indicated that it was difficult to justify a general tax rate but that some assistance was definitely needed if transit was to remain accessible to all people in the County.

Councillor Benjamin indicated that the requirement for Transit in his District was minimal. If District 14 had a high level of service then the general rate would be the way to go but if he was to vote in favour of the general rate it would not guarantee a high level of service. He felt that a user-pay rate would be more advantageous from his point of view. He also advised that he would be reluctant to vote for a