

Mr. Laybold: Yes.

Vincent MacCulloch: I am here on behalf of MacCulloch and Company Limited to present my comments to Council on the proposed Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Law for the communities of North Preston, Lake Major, Lake Loon, Cherry Brook and East Preston.

For many years, MacCulloch and Company has acted as a developer of real estate. Its' experience has essentially been in the residential field, and our developments have proceeded on good planning principles, keeping the best interests of the community in mind.

The Company owns many land holdings within the County of Halifax, one of these is situated within the Plan Area of the proposed Municipal Development Plan for the communities of North Preston, Lake Major, Lake Loon, Cherry Brook and East Preston.

The property is 185 acres in size and lies between the communities of Lake Major and East Preston. I have included a map as part of this brief which shows the general boundary of the property. It fronts on Trunk Highway No. 7 and extends northward along the eastern bank of the Little Salmon River as far as Crane Hill Road (approximately 20' back from the Crane Hill Road).

The property is presently undeveloped. It is currently zoned R-4, (General Residential Zone), with the exception of a small portion in the northeast of the site which is unzoned. The existing R-4 zone permits all types of residential land uses plus a variety of commercial, institutional and recreational land uses. The permitted lot sizes at present would be in accordance with the Provincial Department of Health standards for on-site sewage disposal systems i.e. a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet and 40,000 square feet along watercourses; The proposed Municipal Development Plan for the communities of North Preston, Lake Major, Lake Loon, Cherry Brook and East Preston is attempting to strive for a balance between the management of a water resource and the continued improvement and growth of the communities affected. For the most part, MacCulloch and Company are in agreement with the Plan policies which are proposed to achieve this goal. However, there are certain portions of the proposed Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-law to which we must, as a residential real estate developer and good corporate citizen, take exception.

The proposed Municipal Development Plan designates the property as a resource area which recognizes only primary industries as acceptable land uses. The proposed zoning which is to be applied to this designation is the mixed resource zone, MR1. This zone permits, by right, only agriculture and related uses, forestry and related uses, community centres and religious institutions. Residential uses are only allowed as ancillary uses to the permitted primary industries. The proposed lot size in the MR1 zone is five acres with a minimum of 300' of road frontage. This proposed designation and zoning if adopted would result in a severe down-zoning over what presently exists in our property. It would detrimentally affect the development flexibility and

development capability of our land holdings.

Several specific points must be mentioned to emphasize why the proposed resource designation and mixed use zone are not appropriate for the MacCulloch property. Firstly, the Municipal Development Plan states that the Resource area contains parcels of Class 3 and Class 4 agricultural soils on which primary agriculture and forestry shall have a preference over all other land uses, Policy P-64. Class 3 soils are in existence in a portion of the northern part of our property, the vast majority of the site contains agricultural soil classification No. 7 according to the Canada Land Inventory, Soil Capability for Agriculture. This means that "soils in this class have no capability for arable culture or permanent pasture".

Secondly, it appears that much of the Class 3 soils that do exist on the property are on such a slope as to make most types of agricultural production very difficult or impossible.

Thirdly, the Canada Land Inventory for forestry capability indicates that the property contains land having severe limitations to the growth of commercial forests. Specifically, the lands are shallow to bedrock, stoney, excessively or poorly drained or have poor moisture holding capacity and low fertility.

A resource designation on the MacCulloch property then would restrict this development to uses that for the most part are either impractical or impossible. It would mean a freeze on the land for a little more than wilderness, preservation purposes. MacCulloch and Company purchased the property primarily for a long term residential development and we maintain today that the highest and best use to which this property could be developed is for residential purposes. There are several reasons for this:

1. Surrounding and nearby land uses are primarily residential in nature also commercial uses and agriculture uses are also present.
2. Excellent access to the property is available from trunk No. 7 in the south and Crane Hill Road in the north.
3. The property also steep in places is more suited to residential type developments than to agricultural and forestry.
4. One of the primary aims of the proposed Municipal Development Plan is to attract residents back to the area. We feel that by including residential development from our property and from all other land within the resource designation, this aim is somewhat of a conflicting statement and counter-productive to the Plan's goal.
5. It would appear to us that now is the proper time for this land holding to be considered for development purposes and that appropriate zoning designation should be applied within the guidelines of the proposed Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Law.

In conclusion, I would like to outline the recommendations respecting

the MacCulloch property which we feel should be incorporated into the proposed Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Law for the communities of North Preston, Lake Major, Lake Loon/Cherrybrook and East Preston.

1. Amend the Municipal Development Plan to include the MacCulloch property in either the Mixed Use Designation or the Residential Designation.
2. Amend the Zoning By-Law to reflect the use designation proposed in point 1 above, for example, for the Mixed Use Designation zoning should be the rural settlements, for the Residential Designation, the zoning would be the residential, R-2 Zone.

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to present these comments to you. I trust they will be given due consideration in your future deliberations.

Councillor Baker: How much land does MacCulloch Company have?

Mr. MacCulloch: Approximately 185 acres.

Councillor MacKenzie: Mr. MacCulloch, do you plan on developing in the 185 acres that you now own on the No. 7 Highway. I'm familiar with the block of land that you mention.

Mr. MacCulloch: Mr. MacKenzie, perhaps that question, as most of you know, we have been accumulating land over the years and most of our land had been for future use. We were land banking as the land became available as people had been approaching us to buy up their land.

Due to the circumstances, over the past year or so, things are changing and we are not at the present time buying any more land. In fact, we do have some land, several parcels of land for sale on the market that we feel some time in the future we will have to settle my brother's estate and we will have to part and patch somewhere and whether it comes through the sale of some of our land or through other ways, which ever happens first. We do have a sign on the property at the present time for sale if someone is interested, we will talk to them.

Councillor Topple: How long have you owned this piece of property Mr. MacCulloch?

Mr. MacCulloch: Probably around 10 years. We bought it from the LaPiere people. Originally it was LaPiere and Mrs. LaPiere married a Saulnier and it was from the Estate.

Councillor Topple: Part of that property is presently zoned, is it not?

Mr. MacCulloch: I believe it is zoned R-4. Now they want to change it to agricultural of course.

Councillor Topple: Mr. MacCulloch, once again, I would question the

logic behind the proposed zoning of MR1, lets hope that research and consideration would be given to this presentation.

Mr. MacCulloch: I believe what the Plan is trying to do is create a buffer zone through the two areas. But I hope that it is not at our cost.

Warden Lawrence asked for futher speakers in opposition. Hearing none, she declared the public portion of the hearing closed.

Warden Lawrence: I would ask staff, perhaps Bill Campbell or Keith Birch or both to come down and address the points that have been made by Mr. Kelsey, Mr. Joudrey, Messrs Conrad, Mr. Laybold and Mr. MacCulloch. Perhaps if we could have some discussion on the particular problems they raised, particularly difficulties they are anticipating. Basically, this public hearing is to hear objections, Council having announced its intention to adopt this plan and Zoning By-Law we were here particularly to hear objections. Although its always nice to hear good news as well. Perhaps from a staff point of view possible remedies or the possible alternatives could be raised by these people.

Mr. Campbell requested a 15 minute recess to which Council agreed.

Warden Lawrence: Perhaps I could ask either Keith or Bill to outline the implications of them, or Valerie, which ever.

Councillor Baker: I notice on this paper that MacCulloch Company was not included in the adjustment, was that given any consideration?

Warden Lawrence: We are going to get an explanation of the process now from Miss Spencer who was there.

Valerie Spencer: What was basically done from the sheet you have before you, is some additional amendments. The first one is in respect to Mr. Joudrey who is currently operating a fur farm, a Chinchilla Ranch and is doing some manufacturing, or whatever. We recommend that Appendix B of the Zoning By-Law be changed to add his property to a number of other properties where there are currently commercial operations of an agricultural nature. The exemption that would be given to him would allow him to continue to operate his business in the state it is right now, if he wishes to expand that, then he will do so by contract with the Municipality. We have talked to Mr. Joudrey regarding that and he is in agreement.

The Second Amendment, to the Zoning By-Law is that the Zoning Map Schedule "A" is amended in three places in response to the people who were concerned about a machine shop, a glass shop (glass cutting) and a small engine repair. The Zoning Map will be changed on three properties and the property numbers are there before you, to a C-2 Zone. That will allow the house, the business to exist. It will allow certain expansions of that business without any special provisions in terms of contract developments. That kind of zone is given to a number of other existing commercial operations which would not otherwise be accommodated by the plan and again, the property owners - this has been

discussed with them and they are in agreement.

The Third Amendment is a very minor amendment in support of the gentleman who wished to proceed with a glass cutting operation. That is simply to clarify the definition of the types of service shops that are permitted in the C-2 Zone. There was a problem with whether or not his business was indeed some kind of a manufacturing operation. It is not, it is a service shop, and we have made this quite clear by adding the words and glass shop into the definition.

Warden: Councillor Baker's point was Mr. MacCulloch's difficulties with the 185 parcel.

Bill Campbell: Mr. MacCulloch and MacCulloch and Company submitted this brief. We discussed this with him this evening and brought points forward that we though dealt with the lands in question. I'll point out those lands so that Council is aware of where they are. A parcel of land adjacent to the Salmon River and along the #7 Highway. Right now it is as Mr. MacCulloch has indicated it is MR-1 Zoning and it is designated Resource. There are a couple of options already open in the plan for MacCulloch property. Policy #115 of the Plan on Page 68 refers to the requirements of Council to consider amendments to this plan when (and I refer especially to 115.11) after any provincial 100 series highways are constructed within the plan area. That area block of land that I just pointed out is we feel within the path potential alignment of the #107. Therefore, when that alignment is decided and as it is constructed, Council would have to consider an amendment to the Plan and at that time we should deal with that larger block of land. Secondly, and perhaps most important, is Policy 116. This reads that Plans immediately adjacent to a given land use designation as shown on the future generalized land use map may be considered for rezoning to permit uses which are similar in nature to the uses provided for by the given designation without requiring an amendment to the plan providing that the intends of all other applicable policies of the plan are satisfied. Therefore, Mr. MacCulloch's property abuts an area designation which allows residential development and has an R-2 Zone and it abuts a small portion of that same land in another area. It also abuts a portion of the residential designation, the Mixed Designation in the East Preston Area. Therefore, Mr. MacCulloch at any time would be able to apply for a rezoning for those lands at which time perhaps the developer would be able to put a proposal forward for a development at this stage there does not seem to be any. We would not recommend any amendments to the Plan or Zoning By-Law, we feel it has been dealt with.

Councillor Smith: I can see where this is brought forward before the plan has been implemented and even accepted, why someone who is coming forward is not able to have their lands amended the way that they want, instead of coming at a later date for rezoning, which is just going to cost the Municipality.

Bill Campbell: The Chief argument against changing the zoning now is one, that we are dealing with a 185 acre parcel of land in considering the other matters we are considering this evening, the acreage of the

land and the type of zoning that we have allowed have already been utilized in the plan, and they are very small parcels of land, totalling maybe 11 acres or so. But the effect this evening of changing 185 acres is a substantial change from the actual intent of the plan, especially where there are two policies which already accommodate that land and would allow that developer to come forward when any proposal is prepared or the alignment of the #107 has been decided upon. The question of an amendment to the plan at the time of the #107 is a Shall Policy, in other words, Council Shall consider an amendment, so there is a guarantee there that Council would indeed look at that area again once the major impacting factor on that area would be decided upon by the Department of Transportation. It is mainly the scale of the zone change at this time.

Councillor Smith: That means more study at extra cost to the Municipality.

Bill Campbell: The Developer would have to put forward his proposal and it would be the same type of rezoning process that now is involved, except now it would be different. We would have a Municipal Plan to weigh and measure the rezoning to see whether in fact a rezoning to another residential zone such as the R-2 or R-1 would be appropriate.

Councillor Benjamin: I'm wondering in this amendment, does this comply with the hearing that was held tonight, are we permitted to amend it to this degree?

Bob Cragg: These are amendments which are allowable by virtue of the provisions of the Planning Act dealing with sections 15, 1 & 2 which says the time and place set for consideration of Council written objections to the adoption, amendment, revision or repeal".

Councillor Benjamin: This question pertains to the public committee that has been dealing with this, are they going to be allowed to have a reaction to this amendment, or are we just overriding the wishes of the committee after going four years in study and allow a sudden at a whim of one night, we don't allow them to react to an amendment that would affect their community.

Bill Campbell: When we were discussing this with the land owners, Mr. McMemeny of the Lake Major area was with us at the time, that's all I can give you as a degree of support. We have used the Joint Action Committee in the various amendments in our process of changing of the plan.

Councillor Wiseman: I was just wondering, we were able to make some changes because some people were able to come here tonight and make their views known, I was just wondering what, or if there are other people that feel they are "hard done by", and have not really realized it yet, is there going to be an Act open to them afar from this public hearing?

Bill Campbell: When you achieve a plan, you hope that you acquire an input from most residents. We have identified certain uses such as a

salvage yard and these uses this evening. I think we have accomplished getting a relative compromise at the most contentious issues whether all people will be satisfied, I can't guarantee that. There are provisions for entering into contracts, provisions for a use that has become non-conforming, they could apply for a rezoning that would suit them. There is a provision under the Planning Act for that to occur. There may be some uses that will not fit with the intention of the plan. That is one of the purposes of the plan.

Warden: Councillor Poirier, Contract Zoning, which we are not allowed to do at this point, becomes feasible with the adoption of the plan which would allow for the tailor-made reaction of a given situation.

Councillor Lichter: Mr. MacCulloch's land, nearly 200 acres was zoned R-4, at least until this plan was approved. It will be zoned MR-1. Just looking down the road, you indicated that there are certain options present, at the same time, we do have some experience with public hearings. You heard Mr. MacCulloch indicate that because of circumstances that particular piece of land presently is for sale. Tonight we approve this plan assuming that somebody purchases this property, no doubt one or two of the Councillors and the Planning Department people, when the new owner comes for a rezoning back to R-4, are going to bring up the point "well you walked into it, well knowing that it was not R-4", so how do you expect two days ago, the value of that nearly 200 acres of land had to be substantial with that kind of zoning. As soon as the Minister approves this plan, that particular piece of land is going to be far less valuable. If anybody purchases that piece of land in the hope that he is going to get it rezoned, that person is going to hear the argument that "you knew what it was when you purchased it, why did you bother doing it"? I am a bit concerned about it. I kind of feel like Councillor Smith feels, that here we have the opportunity to make an amendment, perhaps the public should be given an opportunity to indicate just how detrimental it would be to their feelings and to their four years of planning. I don't think that we should just throw out the idea of amending this portion of the plan without hearing from the public and assume that some day somebody will be able to come forward for a rezoning because there are no guarantees that those rezonings are going to go the way that person wishes.

Bill Campbell: I will try to respond to Councillor Lichter's comments. First, the land was zoned R-4 and would be changed to a zone of MR-1 which is Resource-related. Secondly, the type of rezoning process when instigated with a plan is much different than Council has in the past experienced. In fact, the plan is quite clear on what to consider in a rezoning or what Council should consider in considering a location for a rezoning and the zones that that person could apply for at this stage are very clearly indicated. There wouldn't be an R-4 Zone because this is a different By-Law than the one we have now. You would be allowed an RS-1 Zoning which is a mixed zone or an R-2 Zone which are both concentrating on single family residential development. Basically, the person would be aware that they can apply for those two things. Whether or not the ownership changes shouldn't have anything to do with what happens at the rezoning. The intent of the plan is clear and therefore the rezoning should be relatively clear as to what

direction Council should take. The various recommendations would be dealt with by the Planning Department. Now when rezoning applications are made, the Planning Department staff recommend a report on it, they will have to consider the plan policy. Now when you get a Council report we try to pick out of the air in some cases comments and recommendations based on no policy whatsoever, but just past experience. I think it will be a substantial difference.

Councillor Lichter: So what you are really saying, is that right now, the plan is practically dictating to the Council they will have to look on that rezoning favorably.

Bill Campbell: No, it points out very clearly, that what in fact can be applied for, but it doesn't guarantee that Council will give one decision one way or the other. It doesn't point that far. It tells the developer and the public what the potential of that property is in terms of existing by right uses and by rezoning and by contract. That is very clear, anything else would require an amendment to the Plan, which is a more detailed process.

Councillor Lichter: Since that guarantee is not there as you have just stated, I would be far happier if we did consider, at least, amending the plan now rather than risk the possibility of Council not going that route even though the Plan gives that kind of direction to Council.

Keith Birch: When the final alignment of the highway is known, Council shall review the Land Use Designation in light of that highway alignment, which opens up other possibilities. It dictates to Council that you shall be examining the Land Use in that area.

Councillor MacKay: On the same vein as Councillor Lichter, I can appreciate that the new owner or present owner may apply for rezoning, that Council shall review upon realignment of the #107 Highway. But at the same time, I have a great deal of difficulty with "shall" and "may". If I were anybody because they are a big developer or they are a small individual, I think they should be all treated equally. I believe that if a person has parcel of land with the present allowance on it, that we should not, in this case become more restrictive. I appreciate that that's allowed under the present Planning Act, it can become more restrictive, it cannot become less restrictive than advertised. At the same time, I can't appreciate that it would be the same thing as a commercial business where we revert to residential even though it falls under the non-conforming use, it's a kind of comparing apples with oranges, so to speak. I think that that person who has a parcel of land with the present zoning, with a present capability of a specific use, I don't think, in mind anyway, that we should change that, I think it should remain at the present level of zoning. I think that when a motion is made, I would certainly have to make that.

Warden: Could I ask staff what the most compatible residential zoning would be for the land in relationship to it's current R-4?

Bill Campbell: That's a difficult question to answer. If the person or developer was applying for rezoning, he could apply for two zones.

That would be the R-2 Zone and RS-1 Zone. The R-2 Zone is a little more restrictive, it does not allow as many mixed uses in the area. The RS-1 Zoning is a little bit more general and it allows some commercial operation, more than in the R-2 Zone. It's difficult to make a recommendation. We would recommend that it stay as it is and that it not be changed.

Ken Meech: Under the present zone, R-4, I assume that the RDP provisions apply. What can the property owner do, in the R-4 zoning in terms of development.

Bill Campbell: That piece of property now comes under (prior to the plan being adopted) it would come under the Regional Development Plan and only be allowed to be developed on the basis of one lot per year along the road and then 20 permits per year. Once the Municipal Development Plan comes into force, the development would be allowed to continue on an unlimited basis. There would be no permit restrictions in terms of numbers.

Councillor Stewart: Am I right in saying that the reason you don't want to change it now is because there is no concrete proposal for development for one lot of land for development of that size? Is that the essential reason, or is it in fact the actual use itself that you could have under the varying designations?

Bill Campbell: No, it's not the specific uses of it, it is the fact that the land is in the path of essential alignment, that it is in between the two communities of East Preston and Cherry Brook and that it is a large block of land and that a major change should not be made at this time, it should be considered in a rezoning, which could get into a lot more detail, because the plan has taken three years to develop.

Councillor Stewart: Are you saying that Mr. MacCulloch at this point, or previous to this point, had a concrete proposal for this development of land, that your response might be different. In other words, that the type of zoning that he would wish might be possible had he had some committment to take some particular action.

Bill Campbell: Again, that's a difficult question to answer, because if a specific development had been proposed, I think we would have taken it into consideration. Whether or not there is the alignment question that always enters into it and the fact that it is in between the two communities. Again, I am getting into questions here that are very, very, difficult to answer from a general planning point of view. We would not recommend the changes. Thereby, maintaining the intent behind the Plan to have the Resouce Designation there and to ensure that any further changes to it only occur through a process that would allow a detailed manner. If there was a proposal available for it, it would probably be residential, but that's hard to say. We would have been aware of that. I suppose that Mr. MacCulloch could have said that yes, he was planning to develop it tomorrow and I don't think that would have made any difference to us this evening.

Again, they are very difficult questions to answer. The same as dealing with small C-2 Commercial amendments that we made this evening where the owners were saying that they might want to have some type of use in the future. These are very difficult things to deal with.

Councillor Stewart: I'm just scanning my mind to see if there is a difference of the exemptions proposed for the small land owners compared to this block and there seemed in my mind that there was some difference in that the individuals, in parts 1, 2, & 3 actually have an existing use and what they wanted apparently was not in conflict with the plan. In other words, it didn't hurt the community from a people point of view and it didn't hurt the water resource. It appears that it is logical. I'm just trying to see what's different in this big block of land and so far what I was trying to rationalize myself was the fact that since it is a big block of land and there is no proposal to do anything with it, that it's best left in what apparently is the ideal use until the owner, whether the present owner, or the future owner comes up with a concrete proposal for development, which can be looked at on it's own merit. I can relate in a way to some of Councillor Lichter's remarks that often in effect I know I have sometimes sat on occasion under our present planning process where we have no plan and often someone would in fact have a parcel of land that they would wish to do something the zoning didn't have. Clearly, if they came and bought it anyway, they are taking their chances. I'm trying to get in my own mind that this is not the case. In fact, that in future, whoever owns that land, if there is a concrete proposal to do something with it, it is not in conflict with the intent of protecting the water resource and fostering better communities there, that the Council would look favorably on the thing on it's own merits. I'm not sure that what I'm saying is in fact what you (Bill Campbell) are saying.

Keith Birch: The bottom line right at this point in time is the 1/1/20 under the Regional Development Plan. The moment this plan is adopted, that Regional Development Plan control is lifted. If this is put into R-2, for example, you can have unlimited development there immediately, which would significantly impact those communities. What we are saying is, until the situation is resolved in that area, that this piece of land should be in this category, but the owner is entitled under the Plan, without an amendment to the plan, to submit a development proposal for rezoning. Or, that Council will, when the highway alignment is finally decided, shall then again consider the amendment. Under the ground rules and being fair and reasonable, that should be done within a reasonable length of time, not five years after the fact. So, there are those two opportunities subsequently arising, he, on his own initiative, or Council on their initiative within a reasonable amount of time, once the final alignment is known. So it is not as though you are putting it in limbo for a considerable period of time.

There are two opportunities there and then we can examine the impact that it will have on those two communities. An impact which it would not now have, because of the restrictions of the Regional Development Plan.

Warden Lawrence: In affect, the MR1 is to be used as a holding Zone, is it not?

Bill Campbell: To some extent, however, there is a definite need for that type of land that Resource Designation in the community to allow agricultural operation, extract facilities, etc. to take place. It has a very important function within the total community because those types of uses are generally not allowed in the zoning categories.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: If indeed the land in question remains R4, it would be restricted to the Regional Development Plan of one lot per year. Would that apply to all the remainder of the lands in question once this plan is approved. I understand that this plan is going to supersede the Regional Development Plan Regionals is that correct.

Bill Campbell: I think what was meant by that comment was that once the Municipal Plan comes into force, yes, the Regional Development Plan Regulations will no longer be affecting that area.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: I'm not talking about that area, I'm talking about this plan in particular. Once that goes into affect, that would supersede the R.D.P.

Bill Campbell: Yes, and there would be no number limited on the amount of development permits that could be issued within that plan area. That same thing affects all the Urban areas that we are dealing with now.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: My only concern about changing the zoning, whether it's a holding zone or not, certainly has no reflection on the owner. It doesn't really matter as far as I'm concerned who the owner is, but I really feel that even though he is given the perogative to apply for rezoning in the future as was stated, there is no guarantee that he will receive that rezoning at that time. Based on that, I feel that a person's land is his domain, or whatever. I really feel that we are enfringing on the person's rights. It appears to me that when Mr. MacCulloch made a presentation he would be quite happy with the present R-4 zoning. Based on that, I really feel that we would be enfringing on his rights by changing it.

Councillor Topple: The comments made about this Plan when it goes into effect, it is an MDP for that particular area. I think that Mr. MacCulloch did mention that he would like that piece of land to remain out, as it is. At present, if it were excluded from the plan, then it would remain under the Regional Development Plan. If that land were excluded it would remain as it is under the present restrictions of the Regional Development Plan.

Bill Campbell: That is correct, and he would not be able to apply for a rezoning use consistent with the adjacent designations.

Councillor Topple: I wonder if he realizes that he would not be in the Plan and would have to go through a rezoning process which is more restrictive possibly than going through the Plan process.

The other question I have is for anyone from the Joint Action Committee. If there were other land holdings in the Plan area of such a size that there was any objection to, were they accommodated in the Plan Process. There was nobody else here tonight with any major holdings who had anything to say one way or the other that I can see. I wonder if anybody could comment on that. I think this is the only one we heard objections on in that size.

Councillor Topples: I realize the City of Dartmouth has large land holdings, but they are all restricted in the way that the City of Dartmouth wants them restricted, in that they are in the Watershed. I was more concerned with anybody who might be just outside the watershed and again, I would ask was Mr. MacCulloch not aware of this. Was Mr. MacCulloch aware of the fact that this was the designation on his land?

Bill Campbell: I think that MacCulloch and Company were in when the first draft came out and discussed some of the policies it contained. They knew the Plan was being discussed and they knew, in fact I had over that period of time, calls from Mr. MacCulloch, wondering whether the draft was finalized and whether they could get copies, etc. This happened throughout the plan process.

Councillor Topples: The other thing I would suggest is that perhaps excluding that piece of land, it is more restricted than to have it included in the Plan. That is the way I view this right now. It's restricted under the Regional Development Plan and if it's left out of this plan. If it was included something could happen, is that correct?

Bill Campbell: That is correct, if he was excluded from the plan area, he would not be able to apply for the rezoning. He would be in effect only allowed to develop on the 1/1/20 basis per year. He would not be in another Municipal Development Plan process unless the alignment went through which may necessitate opening up the review of that designated area around the MacCulloch land or when we did the Municipal Development Plans for the fringe areas after the Urban areas.

Warden Lawrence: We don't at this time, have a motion to adopt the draft Municipal Development Plan and the Zoning By-Law in any shape or form. I am still entertaining questions on this particular issue, but I need a motion.

Councillor Smith: The question was asked a while back, what the present uses of the R-4 as to what is allowed.

Bill Campbell: The R-4 Zone is a general residential that allows all residential uses, multiple family developments and some business uses, it is a very extensive zone. It is much more general R-2, Institutional type uses, multiple family, grocery stores. We stress the fact that that area is under the Regional Development Plan now and it is limited in its capability to develop and a potential for rezoning, which would not be there if excluded from the actual plan area. I would like to stress that fact, because there is some discussion in terms of excluding it. I don't think that would be beneficial to the actual plan, because you would put a 185 acre vacant

piece of land which is not controlled through the plan document.

Councillor Smith: That was sort of my point, the zoning as it now is, plan and they were allowed to develop on a year basis, it could be more developed than probably if it was included.

Bill Campbell: The land would develop according to health standards and the sizes of lots on septic tanks and wells and the density of development would be the same either way. The speed of development might change. Under this the speed in which that would take place, could increase over the 20 per year.

Councillor Stewart: It is not serviced in that area at all. That makes quite a difference if you take all the restrictions off the 200 acres. I think we can all relate to the point that we don't want to put more restrictions on somebody than exists right now, but it seems to me from what Mr. Campbell is saying, that in effect, the existing R4 zone is very restrictive. The one lot per year and I would assume that if this was taken out of the plan and left R-4, then it would automatically fall under the Cole Harbour - Westphal Plan because right across the other side is the plan, and I would assume the intent of the Cole Harbour/Westphal Plan is to try to be compatible with this one. In discussions with the owner, did you go over these trade-offs, in effect, that under present conditions things might be worse?

Warden Lawrence: If there are no other specific questions from Council, we need a motion on the floor subject to the adoption of the plan.

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

"THAT that we adopt the Lake Major Municipal Development Plan with the Zoning By-Law and amendments as arrived at tonight, including the appendix received, indicating the amendments, be approved."

Motion Carried.

Warden Lawrence: I think we have had a good and thorough discussion tonight and heaven knows, we have had very good and thorough discussions in the past, both in the communities and in Council. May I, on behalf of Council and on behalf of the Municipality, thank everyone who has participated in this effort. It really has been a worthwhile effort and I hope that this plan will continue to provide guidance to the communities as you want them.

Thank you very much for attending.

Councillor Adams: I have been requested on behalf of the North Preston Ratepayers Association and the North Preston Representatives of the Joint Action Committee to make a statement before we adjourn. They would like it made clear that the expressed concerns of Mr. Wayne Kelsey in opposition to the Lake Major Plan were not necessarily those of the majority of the North Preston residents. I convey that statement with all due respect to Mr. Kelsey's profession and his right

to oppose.

It was moved by Councillor Stewart:

"THAT the Public Hearing Adjourn.
Motion Carried.

I N D E X

Acadia School - Report -----	5-6
Bridges - Protection -----	1-3
Beaverbank Elementary School -----	7-8
Budget Sessions -----	13-14
Chief Building Inspection Report -----	21
Cobequid Industrial Park - Public Hearing -----	29
Committee of the Whole Session -----	30
Com-Serve Appointment -----	41
Derelict Vehicle Program -----	20
Director of Development Report -----	40
Emergency Funding Provisions -----	7
Emergency Measures Act -----	36
F.C.M. - Appointment to the Board of Directors -----	18
F.C.M. - Appointment of Delegates -----	18-19
Graham Creighton School - Water & Sewer -----	16
Hampton Gray Project -----	11-13
Halifax County Industrial Commission By-Laws -----	36-38
Industrial Commission By-Laws -----	20
Industrial Commission - Appointment of Members -----	39-40
Lower Sackville Junior High School -----	8-10
Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary -----	1&22
Motion - Protection, Re Bridges -----	1-3
Motion - Hours, Re Tourist Information Centre -----	3-4
Motion - Approval of Minutes -----	5
Motion - Letters & Correspondence -----	5&23
Motion - Report, Re Acadia School -----	5-6
Motion - Municipal School Board Report -----	6-7&27-28
Motion - Emergency Funding Provisions -----	7
Motion - Elementary School, Beaver Bank -----	7-8
Motion - Junior High School, Lower Sackville -----	8-10
Motion - Public Meeting, Re proposed schools -----	10
Motion - Walker Commission Report -----	10
Motion - Planning Advisory Committee Report -----	11&29
Motion - Public Hearing, Re PUD agreement, Re Industrial Machinery Limited -----	11
Motion - Management Committee Report -----	11
Motion - Hampton Gray Project -----	11-13

Motion - Budget Sessions -----	13-14
Motion - Transit -----	14-16
Motion - Water & Sewer, Graham Creighton School -----	16
Motion - Policy Committee Report -----	16&32
Motion - Roadside Spraying Program -----	16-18
Motion - Appointment of Weed Inspector -----	18
Motion - Appointment to the Board of Directors, F.C.M.--	18
Motion - Appointment of Delegates, F.C.M. -----	18-19
Motion - Tax Deduction, Re Volunteer Fire Departments --	19-20
Motion - Derelict Vehicle Program -----	20
Motion - Policy Committee Supplementary Report -----	20&36
Motion - Industrial Commission By-Laws -----	20
Motion - Chief Building Inspectors Report -----	21
Motion - Adjournment-----	21&41
Motion - Approval of Council Minutes -----	22
Motion - Sackville Expressway -----	29
Motion - Public Hearing, Re Cobequid Industrial Park----	29
Motion - Committee of the Whole Session -----	30
Motion - Management Committee Supplementary Report -----	30
Motion - Appointment of Municipal Solicitor -----	31
Motion - Sidewalk Construction Program -----	32
Motion - Snow Removal -----	32
Motion - Appointment of Municipal Auditors -----	32
Motion - Recreational Services, Sackville -----	32-33
Motion - Proposal, Re Municipal Building -----	33-35
Motion - Provincial Operating Grants -----	36
Motion - Emergency Measures Act -----	36
Motion - Halifax County Industrial Commission By-Laws --	36-38
Motion - Appointment to Industrial Commission -----	39-40
Motion - Director of Development Report -----	40
Motion - Appointment to Com-Serve -----	41
Motion - Deferral of Annual Session -----	41
Planning Advisory Committee Report -----	11
Public Hearing - PUD Agreement, Re Industrial Machinery Ltd.	11
Policy Committee Report -----	16
Policy Committee Supplementary Report -----	20
Public Hearing - Cobequid Industrial Park -----	29
Provincial Operating Grants -----	36
Recording Secretary - Appointment -----	1&22
Roadside Spraying Program -----	16-18
Recreational Services - Sackville -----	32-33
Sackville Expressway -----	29
Sidewalk Construction Program -----	32
Snow Removal -----	32
Tourist Information Centre - Hours -----	3-4
Transit -----	14-16
Volunteer Fire Department - Tax Deduction -----	19-20
Walker Commission Report -----	10
Weed Inspector - Appointment -----	18

COUNCIL SESSION

MAY 5, 1981

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Ken Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. Gerry Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. Lloyd Gillis, Superintendent of Municipal School Board
Mr. R. J. Allen, Chairman, Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission
Mr. J. L. Kay, General Manager, Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission
Mr. Michael Broomfield, Eastern Shore Tourist Association
Mr. Alex Jacobsen, Acadia Home & School Association
Mrs. Alex Jacobsen, Acadia Home & School Association

SECRETARY: Mrs. Christine Harvey

OPENING OF COUNCIL - THE LORD'S PRAYER

Warden Lawrence opened the Council session with the Lord's Prayer at 2:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

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

HALIFAX DARTMOUTH BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. R. J. Allen, Chairman of the Halifax Dartmouth Bridge Commission

and Mr. J. L. Kay, General Manager of the Commission were present to address Council on the serious matter of pier protection for the two bridges, the A. Murray MacKay and the Angus L. MacDonald. Mr. Allen distributed and outlined a presentation which is summed up as follows:

Pier protection has been a serious concern of the Bridge Commission since 1975 but has become a pressing necessity with the construction of the Fairview Cove Container Terminal scheduled for completion in early 1982 which would dramatically increase both traffic & tonnage under the bridges, and also in light of the two recent marine collisions which recently damaged bridges at Tampa Bay, Florida and Vancouver, causing a large loss of life at Tampa and huge financial losses in both locations.

Mr. Allen's presentation illustrated how easily such a collision could occur in this area and how hazardous, expensive and inconvenient it would be for the area. He further illustrated how such a collision had almost become a reality when an oil rig under construction at the Halifax Shipyards had broken loose during Hurricane Blanche and had come close to hitting the MacKay Bridge.

He explained that what was needed to secure protection for the piers was protective rock berms or islands around the eastern piers which would force out of control vessels to either run aground or be deflected prior to hitting the bridge supports, at an estimated cost of approximately \$3 million.

Mr. Allen further advised that although the Federal Government has given every assurance that they are concerned about bridge safety, they have not been prepared to share in the cost and have stated in a letter from Mr. Pepin to the Chairman of the Commission their feeling that any additional protection required is the total responsibility of the bridge authorities involved. The opinion of the Bridge Commission is however, that Ottawa, as the principal financial contributor and owner of the new container terminal cannot absolve itself of responsibility especially since the urgency for pier protection is increased with the construction of the terminal by the National Harbours Board; it is an integral part of the project and should be paid for by the Developer. As well, the Commission has the full support of the Province of Nova Scotia who is willing to participate in cost sharing.

The Bridge Commission feels that the support of Halifax County Council would strengthen the request for financial support and asked that Council pass a resolution, addressed to the Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin, Minister of Transport Canada, in support of the Commission's request for financial assistance and to persuade the Government of Canada to accept some responsibility for protection of the bridges.

This completed the presentation of the Halifax Dartmouth Bridge Commission.

Several Councillors, in addition, to the other arguments presented by the Commission in support of pier protection, felt that any problems with the bridges resulting from a marine collision would adversely affect convoys trying to leave the Bedford Basin in a wartime

emergency. Other Councillors had some questions for Mr. Allen and Kay, in respect to original cost sharing by the Federal Government, which apparently was NIL, and administrative matters such as the payment of rent for the Harbour bottom where the piers set and any regulations pertaining to marine traffic, etc.

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

"THAT Halifax County Council send a letter to the Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin, Minister of Transportation, along with a copy of the presentation by the Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission, with a copy of the letter and the presentation also to the three local MP's, whole-heartedly endorsing the Halifax-Dartmouth Bridge Commission's request for financial assistance from the Government of Canada and that the Government of Canada accept some responsibility for pier protection for the Angus L. MacDonald and A. Murray MacKay bridges."
Motion Carried.

Mr Allen & Mr. Kay retired from the meeting.

EASTERN SHORE TOURIST ASSOCIATION

Mr. Michael A. Broomfield, Executive Director of the Eastern Shore Tourist Association was on hand to give his annual presentation to bring Council up to date on tourism developments in the County.

The first and major part of the presentation was a slide show, set up to give Council a visual presentation of the various festivals, and other tourist attractions in Nova Scotia. In his commentary during the slides, Mr. Broomfield brought out the following points:

1. Tourism is a business which brings at least \$10,000,000 into the Province of Nova Scotia yearly by way of taxation alone.
2. Tourism is the third largest industry in Nova Scotia behind Manufacturing which is first and Construction, second.
3. Tourism is worth \$111,000,000 a year to Nova Scotia in terms of new money coming into the Province.
4. Tourism is a huge business which generates no water or air pollution and requires no export.
5. Tourism is a benefit for many people; fisherman, restaurant-owners hotel/motel owners, camp ground-owners, golf clubs.
6. Nova Scotia is an area of prime tourist attraction, bringing people from all over for fishing, festivals, beaches, our reputation for fine seafood restaurants, as well as having many different types of countryside all in one province; Valley areas, Sea Shores and the Cabot Trail.

These were only a few of the points which Mr. Broomfield expressed in his presentation. He went on to state that the Department of Tourism is the leader in bringing people to the province and that they have a budget of \$2 million which is low in comparison with that of other businesses in the Province.

The second part of Mr. Broomfield's presentation was list of fourteen different areas in which the Eastern Shore Tourist Association has been of service to Halifax County. This list was summed up stating that the Maritime Resource Management Services consultants report on tourism on the Eastern Shore shows and increase of 24% in "guest days" and 36% in camper parties" which was of great encouragement to them. Incorporated into the report was a request for Council's support this year so that the Eastern Shore Tourist Association could continue in generating employment, income and municipal revenue for the tourism industry.

Councillor Benjamin interjected at this point to express his concern that the only Tourist Bureau in District 14, located at the Halifax International Airport had cut back its operation by two months for this year and were planning to operate only in the months of July and August during the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

It was moved by Councillor Benjamin, seconded by Councillor MacDonald

"THAT Halifax County Council send a letter to the Provincial Minister of Tourism expressing concern and dismay at reduction of the hours of the Tourist Information Centre at the Halifax International Airport in 1981 and urging him to extend their hours at least to four months in 1981."
Motion Carried.

Councillor MacKenzie requested whether Mr. Broomfield might be able to improve Tourist Bureau facilities through his office, to which Mr. Broomfield advised he could not as in 1976 the Department of Tourism had cut back on spending with regard to Tourist Bureaus and authorized that no more Bureaus be opened. He advised that the Department of Tourism pays only for the operating costs of existing bureaus as well as the salaries of the people working in them through the Provincial job core. The Province also picks up the cost of printing and distributing brochures; this, he advised was made possible by the efforts of the Eastern Shore Tourist Association.

Mr. Broomfield advised that in three weeks time there would a good opportunity for Nova Scotia to sell itself at a trade show called "Rendevau Canada 1981" which was held last year in Winnepeg, another large city the year before and which was being held this year in Halifax. He advised that this was a \$75 million trade show which would draw British, German, Japanese, Americans, Canadians, etc.

Mr. Broomfield wound up his presentation thanking Council for its support of the Eastern Shore Tourist Association in the past and requesting that it continue to support them.

Mr. Broomfield retired from the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

"THAT the minutes of the March 17, 1981 Regular Council Session, be approved."

Motion Carried.

Councillor MacKay advised that there had been an item in the March 17 Council minutes with regard to his term on COMSERVE. This was in regard to appointing someone else to take his place, however, he advised that this item had not yet been dealt with, and was advised that it would be taken care of at the end of the Session under New Business.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

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

"THAT the Letters and Correspondence be received."

Motion Carried.

The one and only letter was from Thomas J. McInnis, Minister of Nova Scotia Department of Transportation advising that a highway between Pennant and Terrance Bay would cost a great deal of money and it would be difficult to give it any priority at the present time as there were other major projects being considered for the immediate future.

Councillor Williams was not happy with this response from the Minister and felt that another letter should go to the Minister explaining the school transportation problem, which might possibly put it in a different light and he also felt that a copy of the letter should go to the Minister of Education.

Deputy Warden Deveaux suggested requesting the School Board staff to obtain facts and figures on the conveyance costs for the students in that area to be transported to Halifax and to defer this issue until then.

It was agreed to defer this issue until the next Council Session when this information could hopefully, be available.

ACADIA SCHOOL - MRS. JACOBSEN

Mrs. Jacobsen introduced Mr. Alex Jacobsen, Chairman of the Acadia Home and School Association who presented to Council a proposal regarding the recent issue of the Acadia School for Council's and Mr. Lloyd Gillis' consideration.

Mr. Jacobsen read the three-page proposal in full which outlined the initial problem, the School Board's decision to close the School, and the objections raised by the Acadia Home and School Association to this proposed closure. They offered another solution to the problem; a change in the school boundary between Hillside Park School and

Sackville Centennial School which would allow all students who presently walk to school to continue to do so, thereby avoiding any additional busing costs. The boundary line for Hillside Park School, if moved to include Kaye Street up to and including Oakland Drive, Prince Street as far as Tilley Court, Howland Drive, Howland Court, and Skyridge to Dickie, would provide the student population to fill the new addition to Hillside Park School, thus reducing the student population at Sackville Centennial to a level which would see the elimination of the portables and make classroom addition unnecessary and leave spare classroom facilities at both schools. If this were done, the only necessary improvement to Sackville Centennial would be a gymnasium. Also if this proposal were adopted there would be a lesser need for buses, and the area would have three schools of an acceptable standard and would save the residents a great deal of tax money.

It was determined that this report had not as yet gone to the School Board although Mr. Lloyd Gillis was in possession of a copy of it.

SCHOOL BOARD REPORT, RE: ACADIA SCHOOL

Mr. Gillis advised that the proposal presented to Council by the Acadia Home and School Association was based on the premise that the school is to be closed. He indicated that this was no longer the case; as a result of the decision to build an elementary school in Beaver Bank it is now the intention of the School Board to leave Acadia School open but to reduce the student population of the school by approximately one-third. The Acadia School will become a primary to six school for the students in the immediate area who walk to the school. The one third removed from the school will be from the Sackville Manor and will be relocated to the expanded facility at Hillside Park. The portables presently at the Acadia School site will be removed and the basement will be restored to its original form with some improvements.

Councillor MacKay felt that the proposal of the Acadia Home and School Association should at least be looked at to see if it was at all feasible.

Subsequent to a great deal of discussion on this issue, especially in regard to the various student populations and the bussing problems:

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

"THAT the School Board be requested to consider the proposal made by the Acadia Home and School Association and report back to Council."

Motion Carried.

MUNICIPAL SCHOOL BOARD REPORT

This item was #11 on the agenda, but it was agreed by Council to bring it forward as Mr. Gillis was already present.

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

"THAT the School Board Report be received."
Motion Carried.

Mr. Gillis outlined the three items in the report which included: the Graham Creighton - Water Supply, the Beaver Bank Elementary School (New) and the Junior High School (Sackville - Beaver Bank Area).

He advised that in response to a request from the Management Committee to assist in the funding of the provision of a Municipal Water Supply for the Graham Creighton School, the Municipal School Board wished to confirm that they guarantee to commit \$35,000 toward the project. They have at the same time, through the Council Report requested Council to make application to the Province for funding under Emergency Funding from the Province which will pay for the Municipality's share at \$35,000. If the Board cannot get this Emergency Funding then it is prepared to find it in its Maintenance Budget to come up with the \$35,000.

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

"THAT Council endorse a request for funding from the Province under the Emergency Funding provisions."
Motion Carried.

There was some brief discussion of this topic as Councillor Margeson was not aware of the water problem at Graham Creighton School and Councillor MacKenzie advised that there were similar problems at the Duncan MacMillan School in Sheet Harbour and at the Tangier Elementary School and nothing has been done as far as providing a better water supply there. Therefore, although he was supportive of the motion in regard to Graham Creighton School, he requested that consideration be given to those two schools in his district which had been plagued with the same problems, particularly for the summer months, for a number of years.

The next item was in regard to the Beaver Bank Elementary School. The School Board requested approval, further to its Report to Council of February 17, 1981, for a twelve room elementary school, ten rooms for regular classes and two for special education services, with related facilities, to be located in Beaver Bank, District 15, to accommodate Beaver Bank Elementary students, primary to six only.

It was moved by Councillor Margeson:

"THAT the School Board proceed with the construction of the Beaver Bank Elementary School with a size that will satisfy the needs of the students."
Motion Lost.

Councillor Margeson advised that he wanted the school to be 16 rooms, the School Board wanted 12, he felt a compromise could be reached at 14 rooms, but felt that this indecision should not hold up construction of the school. However, it was determined that even if a motion was made that did not concur with the size recommended in the School Board Report, that a definite size had to be incorporated into the motion.

Therefore the motion was lost for want of a seconder.

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

"THAT Council support the School Board decision and approve the construction of a twelve room elementary school with related facilities to be located in Beaver Bank, District 15 to accomodate elementary students, primary to six."

Several Councillors spoke on the motion. Councillors Smith and Topple were against the motion as the recommendation from the School Board would allow a twelve room school to be built, but would be structurally designed to permit the future addition of four rooms if necessary, whereas the motion on the floor was for a twelve room school only and would not have the engineering provisions which would allow additions as recommended by the School Board.

Councillor Margeson was against the motion and felt that even if the school was built with these engineering provisions allowing for future addition, it would take five years to get such an addition once requested. He advised that he was trying to avoid the same problems encountered in the following two schools which he gave as examples of poor planning:

1. A. J. Smeltzer - This school had not even been completed before it was determined that additions to its size were needed.
2. Bell Park - This school required additions upon being opened.

Councillor Stewart and Deputy Warden Deveaux supported the motion as put on the floor by Councillor Wiseman. Councillor MacDonald also spoke in defense of the motion stating that the 16 rooms which had originally been discussed were to have housed Sackville Heights students who were now to remain at their own school. He, therefore, felt the additional four rooms were not necessary and did not have to be included in the motion at the present time.

Councillor Wiseman felt that the School Board recommendation came as a result of extensive investigation and effort and further indicated that to request four additional rooms, if necessary, was too vague and would make the municipality look as if it does not know what it wants.

Subsequent to this discussion, the motion:

Moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"As previously written."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Margeson requested a notice of reconsideration at the end of the Council session.

The next item in the School Board Report dealt with the Beaver Bank Junior High School. The recommendation of the School Board was that

Council approve the construction of a twenty room junior high school, with related facilities, to be located in the Glendale - Beaver Bank Road area. In addition to regular junior high students, the school would be designed to accomodate special education students currently accomodated at Middle Sackville School.

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

"THAT this issue be tabled until the June 2, Council Session at which time, some people from the Beaver Bank area can make a presentation to Council with regard to the desired location of this school."

Motion Defeated.

This motion was defeated because the majority of Council felt this was similar to a motion to defer and it was the general consensus that this would delay the construction of the school.

Councillor Margeson felt this was quite unfair in light of the presentations made by other groups of people before this Council; he could see no reason why his people should be denied that same privilege. Councillor Margeson requested a notice of reconsideration at the end of the Council Session.

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

"THAT Council approve the School Board recommendation that a 20 room Junior High School be constructed, with related facilities, in the Glendale - Beaver Bank Road area, to accomodate, in addition to regular Junior High Students, the special education students, presently accomodated by Middle Sackville School."

In response to a question from Councillor Eisenhauer, Mr. Gillis advised that if this motion was approved by Council, that the Municipality would have no further requirement for the space in the Sydney Stephen High School which presently houses some of the County's TMH students.

Mr. Gillis further advised Councillor MacDonald that renovations to the Middle Sackville School would be made, but just enough to maintain the school this year.

Mr. Gillis, in answer to a question from Councillor Margeson, indicated that it was not the School Board's decision to select a site for any school but that it was their jurisdiction to recommend a general area, which was done in the case of the Junior High. Council would then select a physical site within the boundaries recommended by the School Board. He further indicated to Councillor Margeson in regard to the location of TMH students in that school, that this suggestion had met with the approval of the parents of those children.

Subsequent to this discussion a vote was taken on Councillor Wiseman's motion.

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

"As previously written."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Topple, in agreement with Councillor Margeson felt that the School Board did not communicate enough with the residents of an area when faced with a decision as to where to put a school.

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

"THAT the School Board call a Public Meeting in any area or community in which a new school is being proposed or when changes are proposed in the school program."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Gaetz spoke against the motion stating that when a lot of people get involved in something like this, it only makes the decision harder, everyone wanting the school located in a different area. He felt the School Board was the best body to make such a decision, using its best judgement to locate schools as centrally convenient as possible. Deputy Warden Deveaux was in agreement with Councillor Gaetz.

Councillor Stewart spoke in support of the motion. It was his feeling in opposition to Councillor Gaetz's opinion, that public input was important in making these type of decisions.

Also speaking in defence of the motion were Councillors Wiseman, MacDonald and Margeson.

Mr. Gillis retired from the meeting.

WALKER COMMISSION REPORT ON PUBLIC EDUCATION FINANCE

Although this item was not on the agenda, it was agreed by Council to deal with it now.

Warden Lawrence submitted to Council copies of a Draft Position Paper in regard to the Walker Commission Report which was to be forwarded to the Minister of Education as soon as possible. The Warden read this paper to Council and subsequent to some general discussion of it several slight revisions were made.

Councillor Topple expressed his concern in the rising cost of Education in contrast to the poor results the County is getting in its Education system.

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

"THAT Council approve this draft position paper including the revisions made today and that it be forwarded to the Minister of Education."
Motion Carried.

Subsequent to this issue Council adjourned for thirty minutes for supper.

ITEMS DEFERRED FROM APRIL 21 COUNCIL SESSION

Budget - Councillor MacKay

It was agreed to defer this item for one-half hour as not all Councillors had yet returned from supper.

Beaver Bank School- Councillor Margeson

This item had already been dealt with and notices of reconsideration were to follow at the end of the Council Session.

REPORT OF THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

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

The only item in this Report was in regard to the proposed Cobequid Industrial Park in Windsor Junction, District 14. It was the recommendation of the Committee that Council set a date for a Public Hearing June 22, 1981 to consider a planned unit development agreement between the Municipality of the County of Halifax and Industrial Machinery Limited for the purpose of developing an Industrial Park to be located in Windsor Junction.

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

"THAT a Public Hearing be held June 22, 1981 at 7:00 P.M. as recommended in the Report of the Planning Advisory Committee to consider a planned unit development agreement between the Municipality and Industrial Machinery Ltd. to develop an Industrial Park in Windsor Junction."
Motion Carried.

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

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

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

The first item in the Report dealt with the Hampton Gray School Project. Mr. Meech outlined the report and advised that the Committee's recommendation was that Council approve the Municipality sponsor two students for this project at a total cost of \$840.00 on the condition that the outstanding pledges for the project as of May 11th have not provided the required balance to make the project possible.

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

"THAT Council sponser two students for the Hampton Gray Project at a total cost of \$840.00 on the condition that the outstanding pledges for the project as of May 11th have not provided the required balance to make this project possible."

This motion was amended by Councillor Margeson, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT each Councillor contribute \$40.00 towards this \$840.00, as well, as Mr. Meech and Mr. Cragg."

Several Councillors felt it would be a better idea to spend the money from their own pockets rather than take it from the pockets of the taxpayers. However, they did not like the idea of having it taken from their pockets more or less by order and publicly. Also it was felt that Mr. Meech and Mr. Cragg should be exempted from the amendment altogether.

There was a great deal of discussion about the motion, the amendment and the project in general.

Councillor Lichter felt that the goals of the trip could be accomplished just as well at home within the Municipality or the Province but that going as far as Florida was not necessary. Several Councillors agreed with this stating that some of the children in the Municipality that are not handicapped may never get out of their own province, let alone make it as far as Florida.

However, Councillor MacKay felt that children that are not handicapped in any way have a better opportunity to do so and Councillor Wiseman indicated that this project had initiated great public response last year and this being the Year of the Handicapped in which the same response was desired, would be a good time to send them again to Florida. In this way the public would be exposed not only to what the handicapped cannot do but what they can do which is the main goal of the Year of the Handicapped, world-wide.

The Councillors who spoke out against the PRINCIPAL of having money taken from them in this manner were: Councillors Stewart, Gaetz, Williams, Poirier and Smith. All these Councillors agreed that they would rather have it paid by themselves than to take it from the taxpayers. However, they felt this situation would only get out of hand if they allowed it to proceed this evening. Each and every one of these Councillors were prepared to donate to this worthy cause but not in public and not in this manner; it was preferred to make donations under their own terms. It was felt that a better idea would be to pass a hat around and have each Councillor donate what they wanted without setting it out in a motion and making it mandatory.

Councillor Tople amended the amendment, seconded by Councillor Lichter:

"THAT Mr. Cragg and Mr. Meech be exempted from the amendment."
Amendment Carried.