

The Course of Action necessary would be that Municipal Council recognize Lake District Recreation Association as the body responsible for providing Recreational Program Services in Sackville and further that the Nova Scotia Housing Commission Fund for Recreational Development be placed in a reserve fund with the monies ear-marked for the Development of Recreational Sites in Sackville and that Municipal Council sanction the change in roles for the Westphal-Cole Harbour and Area Service Commission and recommend changes in their governing Provincial Act.

There was only brief discussion of this recommendation in which Councillor Smith questioned whether or not the Recreation Supervisor would be paid for under the existing Recreation Budget and was advised that he/she would be as they were already an existing staff person.

PARKLAND MAINTENANCE

Maintenance of Green Areas and Walkways was identified as a priority item by many of the respondents to the survey questionnaire. Subsequent to discussion in the Urban Areas, it was determined that due to the principals of volunteerism in Recreation Site Development, that it is necessary to differentiate between Parkland Maintenance and the Development of Recreation/Parkland sites.

In the past, both Urban Areas have had large groups who have been involved in the development of Recreational Sites and it has been a policy of the Municipality to encourage this initiative among Recreational groups.

It is recommended that the Municipality initiate a policy for the development of green area sites by various community organizations, in this policy will be detailed terms of reference for site development so that volunteer action on a particular site may move quickly.

It is also recommended that the Municipality undertake the development of a parkland maintenance division to be a function of the Recreation Department. This division could make use of local personnel who are currently employed in the Urban Areas and it is recommended that the cost for personnel for parkland maintenance be recovered: 50% from the general rate and 50% by the levying of an area rate from the Urban districts. There are certain maintenance functions which will be performed in the more rural areas of the Municipality. It is also recommended that this policy for the maintenance of parkland be reviewed after one year's operation.

The Course of Action would be that Municipal Council support the policy of the development of a parkland maintenance division in the Recreation Department and that they identify criteria to clearly establish a framework for the development of parkland-recreational sites by community based organizations.

SIDEWALKS

It is recommended that the Municipal Engineering and Works Department

undertake a program for the removal of snow and the maintenance of sidewalks in the Municipality. The Course of Action would be that the Urban Services Committee be identified as the policy - making body in terms of construction and maintenance of sidewalks.

Councillor Smith required some clarification on the matter of personnel to be employed for maintenance. She wondered why presently employed people would be utilized rather than unemployed persons. She was advised by the Warden, that the seasonal workers employed by the Service Commission who worked at the rinks in the winter-time were the people discussed and further advised that in addition to these people who would now be able to work all year round, that some other people would be utilized possibly from the Provincial Summer Employment Programs. Councillor Smith felt that this part of the recommendation should not be left in its present form as she was also concerned about the recovery of the maintenance cost 50% from the general rate and 50% from the Urban rate, as was Councillor Williams.

Warden Lawrence advised in response to this concern that the Urban area would be paying twice both on the General and the Urban rate which would mean they would be picking up a substantially larger share of the cost. Councillor Lichter also advised that as a Rural Councillor he was in agreement with this method of recovery of costs.

Councillor Stewart advised that the intent was (in regard to sidewalks) that the areas having the sidewalks would be paying for the sidewalk maintenance and that as far as the personnel question is concerned it was felt that the most practical way of recovering cost for parkland maintenance was 50% on general rate and 50% on area rate with the cost of materials necessary for repairs to be picked up by the District needing them.

STORM DRAINAGE

Due to increased development, especially in the Urban areas, problems with storm water and drainage have increased and has become so serious that there is currently a joint Municipal - Provincial Task Force investigating this issue..

It is recommended that Municipal Council recognize a responsibility in the area of storm drainage and give every assistance to the Storm Drainage Task Force and that Municipal Council discuss the recommendations of the Task Force recommending its approval where appropriate. As well, it is recommended that any policy established by Council in respect to Storm Drainage should be reflected in Municipal Development Plans for the Urban areas.

The Course of Action recommended is that Municipal Council seriously consider the endorsement of the Storm Drainage Task Force Recommendations.

There was little discussion on this recommendation, although Councillor Lichter advised that he was not in agreement with the wording of the recommendation "That Municipal Council recognize "A" responsibility",

stating that it was too vague and he felt it should read "That Municipal Council give every assistance to the Storm Drainage Task Force". Councillor MacDonald advised he was in agreement with Councillor Lichter's re-wording of the recommendation.

PLANNING

A lack of proper planning was considered an important issue in the Urban Areas and although many residents concerns would be addressed by the Municipal Development Plan process, currently underway, it was felt that provision should be made for continuing local input into community planning.

The recommendations of the Urban Study were that Municipal Council should hold public hearings dealing with Urban Areas, in the specific Urban areas involved; that the MDP Plan continue to function on an informal basis to act as a forum for local input to the Planning Advisory Committee in terms of amendments or reviews of the plan (best accomplished in Sackville by having the Public Participation Committee become a sub-committee of the Land Use Development Committee of the Sackville Advisory Board); and that support be given to the Operation Mainstreet Program underway in Sackville.

The recommended Course of Action would be that Council enact a policy whereby public hearings that deal with specific urban areas are held in those areas and that Municipal Council recognize the need for continuing local input into community planning and disband the Municipal Development Plan Public Participation Committees at the end of their terms.

Many Councillors spoke on these recommendations. Councillor Poirier felt that by implementing these recommendations, more power was being taken away from Council as a whole and the Urban areas would be set up to go on their own. She felt there would be a definite split of Council into Rural and Urban. It was also her opinion that to hold Public Hearings in specific areas, where rezoning was applied for, would be costly and felt that the residents did not want this. She advised that when Public Hearings began being heard at night so that more residents could attend, no more were attending than before and that when one Public Hearing had been held in a school only two residents were present.

Councillor Topple suggested that the recommendations in this report should be looked at more positively.

In regard to the relocation of Public Hearings, Councillor Stewart advised that this was not being suggested for the Urban Areas only but for all areas and further advised that Public Hearings would become fewer with proper planning and with the implementation of the MDP Plan.

Councillor Benjamin indicated his opposition to the recommendations advising that there would be a great deal of interference for developers by retaining the Public Participation Committees and advised that it would be more expensive to hold three or so Public Hearings in

the Urban or Rural Areas on different nights (as all Council would still be attending these hearings) when by the method presently used, these three hearings could all be held on one night in the Council Chambers. He did not feel that the attendance of the residents would increase dramatically by holding the hearings in the areas where the rezoning would take place.

Councillor Lichter advised that these recommendations were not proposed to create a rift between the Urban Areas and the Rural Areas (as was felt by Councillor Poirier) but advised that the Urban Area Advisory Board was formed in the first place because of the possibility of a rift and the Urban Study Report was created to close or heal this rift. He did however, advise that he was not completely in agreement with having the Public Participation Committee consulted with each time something came up at the Planning Advisory Committee, as it would make the process more cumbersome than it has to be, and he felt that no time delays should be created, however, if you wanted to let these groups know what was going on you would have to go this route. Councillor Lichter was in agreement with holding Public Hearings in the Urban and Rural areas thereby making it easier for the residents concerned to attend as it was a goodwill gesture and not a costly one.

Councillor Smith was in agreement with Councillor Benjamin on this issue and also felt that it would be too expensive to hold Public Hearings in the outlying areas when several could be dealt with at one time at the Council Chambers. She also questioned how the members of the Public Participation Committee would be paid, if at all, and was advised by the Warden that all work would be voluntary once the MDP Plan has come to an end. Warden Lawrence also advised that it was the intention to cluster Public Hearings as was presently the case; holding several in one evening but clustering them geographically.

REDISTRIBUTION

Elizabeth Murphy outlined the problems of political redistribution as well as the recommendations of the working groups in the Eastern and Sackville area and the recommendations of the Urban Area Advisory Board and the Course of Action contained within the report.

The Eastern Working Group recommended that District 7, Cole Harbour, be divided to provide two Councillors from that area. It was felt that the most appropriate form of redistribution for the area would be a line running North-South following Forest Hills Drive, Cumberland and Colby South to the Boundary of District 6. It was further recommended that the two Municipal Districts be called Cole Harbour East and West, and as well, that the numbering system referring to the Cole Harbour - Westphal Districts be retained, such that Westphal would be District 7A, Cole Harbour East would be District 7B and Cole Harbour West would be District 7C..

The Sackville recommendations were that the North-South boundary of District 18 be moved west to the Sackville River which would accomplish the objective of including Upper Sackville with its community of interest in District 19. It was felt that the East-West Boundary

between District 18 and 3 be revised to route 103 and that since over 2000 additional people would be included in District 19, that the three existing districts be revised into four, equalizing the population per district.

The Urban Advisory Board in discussing the proposed changes in both areas, recommends support for the Eastern Working Group recommendations. However, because of a number of factors in Sackville, including the size of the surrounding districts, the Board could not support the proposed change. The Urban Area Advisory Board agreed with the realignment of boundaries for size between the three existing Districts 16, 19 and 20 with the concept of Upper Sackville being associated with the Community of Sackville.

There was little discussion of these recommendations as they had already been forwarded to the Redistribution Committee of the Policy Committee.

POLICE

Elizabeth advised that the people surveyed were dissatisfied with the level of service provided by the limited number of personnel available, as it does not meet the needs of an Urban Community.

It was recommended that Municipal Council forward a request to the Attorney General of Nova Scotia for an increase in the number of R.C.M.P. officers located in the Urban Areas to lower the police officer - citizen ratio closer to the Nova Scotia Provincial average and that Municipal Council consider the possibility of hiring additional By-Law Enforcement Officers to enforce all By-Laws.

The recommended Course of Action was that Municipal Council endorse the above mentioned recommendations, forwarding them to the Attorney General, and consider increasing the number of qualified By-Law Enforcement Officers who would work in conjunction with the R.C.M.P.

There was a good deal of discussion of these recommendations. Councillors Gaetz and MacDonald enquired as to how these By-Law Enforcement Officers were paid and were advised that they are paid on a salary basis by the Municipality.

Councillor Williams was not certain that more By-Law Officers were required but was advised by Mr. Meech that what they would be doing, would be taking some of the workload from the R.C.M.P. who are now responding to By-Law Enforcement calls which is not really their duty. He further advised that they would be working in conjunction with the R.C.M.P. expertise to ensure that they are used to their maximum potential. How many By-Law Enforcement Officers would be needed was not specified as the recommendation was merely to consider hiring more By-Law Enforcement Officers after evaluating how much increased service would be received for the additional cost.

Councillor MacKay, in regard to By-Law Enforcement Officers, advised that there were three things to consider: 1) effectiveness of the

By-Law Enforcement Officers, 2) the cost, and 3) the potential. He advised that the Provincial average ratio of R.C.M.P. to resident population was one officer to 900 residents. He advised that in the cities of Halifax and Dartmouth it was approximately 500-600 to one; in Sackville it was approximately 1800 to one and in Cole Harbour it was 2200 to one. Therefore, Councillor MacKay as well as the majority of Council was in agreement with the need for additional R.C.M.P. Officers.

Councillor Smith was very concerned with the amount of responsibility the By-Law Enforcement Officers had. It was determined that they do have the power to lay a charge against someone but that they are not able to arrest anyone and carry no equipment with which to protect themselves. Councillor Smith wondered how they would handle a situation where they were not recognized as a Law Enforcement Officer while trying to carry out their duties. She was advised by Mr. Meech that this would be a personal thing and would depend entirely on the nature of the Officer. Mr. Meech also clarified that By-Law Enforcement Officers were ultimately responsible to Council but that they were responsible to the Municipal Clerk on a day to day basis.

SCHOOLS

Elizabeth outlined the recommendations of the Urban Advisory Board in relation to Schools. It was recommended that the Municipal School Board formulate a policy and procedure to obtain public input prior to making major decisions on capital construction or alteration of school boundaries; developing a closer relationship between residents, the Municipal School Board and the Municipal Council, and that the guidelines concerning bussing be reviewed so that no unnecessary bussing takes place. It is also recommended that the Municipality evaluate the available maintenance personnel and programs with a view to upgrading both and that a Committee of the School Board Representatives and Representatives of Municipal Council be formed to consult on future population growth and school sites.

It was requested that the Council endorse these recommendations and urge their approval by the Municipal School Board.

There was little discussion of these recommendations as they did reflect many of the issues which had been discussed by Council in the past and they were basically for recommendation to the School Board.

TRANSIT

Elizabeth advised that Transit was considered to be a priority item in the Urban Areas as the residents of the Eastern Area expressed dissatisfaction with Transit while Sackville residents, though not dissatisfied with the level of service, had expressed considerable concern regarding the cost of transit.

It was recommended that MTC undertake a study of the current routes within Halifax County and attempt to lessen the debt load associated with them and that Public input be included when determining Transit routes.

It was requested that Council forward a request to the MTC to undertake this evaluation of routes and also that they include public input into their transit decisions.

There was no discussion of these recommendations as Council was generally in agreement with them.

SACKVILLE ADVISORY BOARD

Elizabeth Murphy defined the Sackville Advisory Board and advised that it was recommended that the Sackville Advisory Board be recognized by Municipal Council as the consultative and advisory body in Sackville and that the Sackville Advisory Board be supplied with a grant, from area rate funds levied to cover their operating costs.

WESTPHAL-COLE HARBOUR AND AREA SERVICE COMMISSION

Elizabeth advised that the Service Commission itself, and the general public had noted that the Service Commission Executive had a great deal of responsibility for a volunteer organization, and the objective of the Urban Area Advisory Board recommendations was to more closely identify the Service Commission with the Municipal Administration and attempt to clarify and update the Service Commission Act. The Urban Area Advisory Board suggested that the Department of Municipal Affairs investigate and evaluate the Service Commission areas of responsibility to clarify the relationship between the Municipal Council and the Service Commission confirming that the ultimate responsibility for approval of the Budget rests with the Municipality.

Recommendations were made in the following five areas:

1. REPRESENTATION

- a) That an equal number of representatives be elected from each electoral district involved in the Service Commission area.
- b) That the Service Commission Executive determine the number of representatives from within each district with a review to be undertaken every three years.
- c) That the option of having a member from one District representing a district they do not live in be discontinued and all representatives live in the District they represent.
- d) That the Municipal Councillors from each District involved in the Service Commission Areas be non-voting members of the Service Commission Executive thereby having notices, agendas and minutes of all meetings forwarded to them and have the right to attend all meetings.

2. BUDGETING

- a) That the Service Commission Executive be able to draw on the available expertise of the Municipal Staff in preparing their

budget.

- b) That the budget of the Service Commission be presented to the Councillors of the areas involved and the Chief Administrative Officer of the Municipality at least three weeks prior to the annual general meeting of the Service Commission.
- c) That the Chief Administrative Officer and Councillors review and comment on the budget, returning their remarks to the Service Commission Executive.
- d) That after the Service Commission budget is approved by the membership, it proceed to Municipal Council with a request for approval and the setting of an appropriate area rate.
- e) That the Service Commission Executive be provided with monthly statements of their accounts, and receive financial guidance on request.
- f) That since in practice, the Service Commission Executive has little involvement in the provision of street lights, garbage collection and disposal, and sidewalks, that those services be provided directly by the Municipality.

3. FIRE DEPARTMENTS

- a) That the Policy regarding the level of Fire Protection, that is the number of people hired and the location of stations, remain as is with the Service Commission.
- b) That any collective agreement with the District 7, 7A Fire Department should be negotiated by the Service Commission Executive with the Chief Administrative Officer or his representative as a member of the negotiating team, if requested by the Service Commission Executive.

4. RECREATION

- a) That the Service Commission be identified as the prime policy - making body in the field of recreation.
- b) That the Municipality transfer its Recreation Co-Ordinator for Districts 7 and 7A to the area, where she will act as Recreation Co-Ordinator for the various groups in the area.
- c) That the Recreation Co-Ordinator work closely with and be responsive to the Service Commission.

5. PARKLAND MAINTENANCE

- a) That the Municipality establish a County Maintenance Division as a function of the Recreation Department.
- b) That the development of sites be at the initiative of the Service

Commission, with input from the other community-minded groups, in consultation with the Recreation Co-Ordinator. The maintenance of these sites, once completed, will be the responsibility of the Municipality.

- c) That the County maintenance division make use of the rink staff of Scotia Stadium during the summer months.
- d) That the cost of Parkland Maintenance be recovered half by the general rate and half by the Urban rate.

It was recommended by the Urban Area Advisory Board that Municipal Council endorse the above stated recommendations and forward them to the Department of Municipal Affairs with a request to revise the Westphal-Cole Harbour and Area Service Commission Act where appropriate, thus serving to outline areas of responsibility of the Service Commission as it relates to Municipal Council.

Councillor Stewart pointed out some additional clarification regarding the decision of the Urban Area Advisory Board regarding the setting of Service Commission Area Rates. This clarification was contained in the Appendix, page 30 in the second paragraph.

"A certain amount of confusion has resulted from the Service Commission's request of the Municipal Council since it has been interpreted that the Service Commission itself is setting the area rate. For this reason, the Urban Area Advisory Board has recommended that the Department of Municipal Affairs investigate, evaluate and thereby clarify the Service Commission's responsibilities and authority as it relates to Municipal Council. The Urban Advisory Board feels that the ultimate responsibility for a part of the tax rate should lie with the Municipal Council and that the Service Commission Act should reflect this."

Councillor Smith also requested some clarification with regard to information contained within the appendix. The statement she did not fully understand was as follows: "In practice, the Service Commission has had very little to do with these three services (street lights, garbage collection and disposal and sidewalks), so the recommendation is made to amend the Service Commission Act to turn these services over to the Municipality regardless of the Urban Rate Concept."

Mr. Meech advised the Councillor that at the present time the cost of those three services are included in the area rate levied by the Service Commission, although in practice the Municipality administers and maintains these services. Now instead of the rate being levied by the Service Commission it will be levied by the Municipality but will remain only an area rate.

Councillor Smith was interested to know how the Service Commission had obtained the jurisdiction to levy an area rate in the first place and was advised by Warden Lawrence that they had received this power through special legislation.

URBAN AREA RATES

Elizabeth advised that the concept of Urban Area Rates for like services has been endorsed by the members of both working groups and the Urban Area Advisory Board; however, the details have still not been worked out and the Councillors involved support the idea with reservations.

It was recommended that Municipal Council support in principal the County Finance Department Report on Urban Area Rates which would be advantageous for the 1982 Budget Year. It is further recommended that the Urban Area Rate Concept be referred to the Urban Services Committee.

Councillor MacKay advised that the concept of Urban Area Rates for like services would reduce overhead costs to the residents involved. He also felt it would be of benefit as the Urban Councillors would have more input into decisions regarding these services.

On behalf of the Sackville Working Group Councillor MacKay expressed his appreciation to all those involved in the Urban Study with special thanks to Elizabeth Murphy.

Councillor Stewart added his thanks to all involved with the study on behalf of the Eastern Working Group, adding the name of Mr. David Nantes, M.L.A. to those involved. He further advised that the intent of the recommendations contained within the report was to improve services to the Urban Areas as well to improve Urban-Rural communications and added that what the Urban Area Advisory Board and the Working Groups were looking for was approval of the Report on principal as the individual recommendations would ultimately come back to Council for specific approval before implementation.

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

"THAT the Urban Study Report be deferred until the June 2, 1981 Council Session."

See Motion to Amend.

Deputy Warden Deveaux felt that what was needed was another meeting to further discuss the recommendations.

Councillor Margeson recognized and thanked Mr. Meech as well as the other participants in the study and made an amendment to the motion, seconded by Councillor MacKenzie:

"THAT the Urban Study Report be deferred until the July 7, 1981 Council session, subsequent to completion of Budget meetings and the Annual Council session."

Motion Carried.

Councillor Stewart spoke against the amendment to the motion.

Councillor Gaetz questioned whether any thought had been given to conducting a Rural Study but was advised by the Warden that this Urban Study had been considered a priority item and had originated when the Forest Hills Residents Association had made application to the Public Utilities Board for annexation to the City of Dartmouth, and this, shortly after the Town of Bedford had incorporated. She felt that the Municipality would be much the poorer if it lost its Urban areas.

Although he thanked all persons who had participated in the Urban Study, feeling that they were quite sincere in their efforts, Councillor Williams spoke briefly in opposition to the Study stating that it was his feeling that too many dollars had been spent on the Study and that there were too many unanswered questions for Rural Councillors. He also felt that some of the recommendations would not be beneficial to the Municipality as a whole and suggested that when the Report is dealt with again at Council that the cost of implementation of the recommendations be included.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Therefore, the Committee of the Whole adjourned at 5:40 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING RE ADOPTION OF MDP -
NORTH PRESTON, LAKE LOON, LAKE MAJOR AND EAST PRESTON

May 25, 1981

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

Also Present: Mr. K. Birch, Chief of Planning and Development
Mr. B. Campbell, Supervisor, Policy Section
Ms. V. Spencer, Planner

Secretary: Ms. Virginia Veinot

Warden Lawrence called the meeting to order AT 7:14 p.m. and asked Mr. Meech to call the roll.

Warden: Members of Council and residents of Halifax County and other interested persons. This is a historic evening in our Municipality. We are here to consider the adoption of a proposed Municipal Development Plan and the Zoning By-Law for the areas of North Preston, Lake Major, Lake Loon and East Preston. I am sure, as all the members of Council are aware, this is the process that has been going on with extensive discussion at the local level for several years now, really for almost four years now. So we are here to perhaps bring to a conclusion and I hope a successful conclusion, a process that has involved a great many people in our Municipality and is in their interests and therefore in the interests of all of the Municipality of Halifax County. In some ways this public session is perhaps a public meeting but it has been called a public hearing and will be conducting it somewhat like a rezoning hearing in that we will have, first of all, any input from staff. I think everyone on Council has a document which proposes minor amendments to the Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Law and I will ask staff first of all to outline those minor amendments and we will discuss those. Then I will open up the public hearing for anyone who wishes to make representation in favour of the adoption of the Municipal Development Plan and the Zoning By-Law, followed by anyone who wishes to speak against some of the parts of the Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Law and then the public hearing aspect of the meeting will close and Council will discuss at length the objections to the plan and I would hope that we can come to a conclusion this evening.

Mr. Birch: Thank you Madam Warden, Council. I am here to phrase from

a gentleman some time ago, to invite you to take a small step which in fact for the County will be a large step. I think you will find that it will assist the County and the local area in the Lake Major area in the foreseeable future. The document you have in the form of a memorandum before you is to indicate that there are amendments which are required - minor amendments - to the Subdivision Regulations and Building By-Law in order to amend the Plan and then some further amendments which have been identified since the notification went in the newspaper with the document - they have arisen in that period between the advertising of the public hearing and the arrival of today's date. Now I am going to ask Bill Campbell, the Supervisor of the Policy Section, to explain these amendments to you. Thank you Madam Warden.

Bill Campbell: Madam Warden, Members of Council, as Mr. Birch has indicated there are a number of amendments here that we are bringing forward. Most of them are minor amendments that are necessary for example, part 1A. Part 1 deals with amendments to the subdivision Regulations. Part 1B deals with amendments to the Building By-Law which are minor amendments merely to implement the Plan. I will not go into detail at all since the Plan has been discussed at Council and the Zoning By-Law - the specifics of those amendments would not be necessary for Council to be specifically aware of. I would like however to bring your attention to page 5, Part 2A - Amendments to the Municipal Development Plan. Since that was put in the paper a number of items have come before the Planning Department either through discussions with Municipal Affairs or residents who have called in and we have suggested a few amendments which would make the document more consistent with the intent of the community plan.

The first of these is that an existing salvage operation was missed in the area and after looking at the operation and talking with the Joint Action Committee it was felt that it was consistent with the plan to allow this operation to be in existence and to make it conforming by exempting it from the requirements of the Zoning By-Law and to permit expansion through contract. This has been discussed with the Joint Action Committee who are in agreement with that.

Number 3 on that Section, same page, deals with the changing of the wording within the Plan to recognize again the existence of this operation and the application process that goes through the Board of Public Utilities or Commission of Public Utilities.

Number 2 on that same page deals with Policy 78 of the Plan and that changes the setback requirements on water courses outside the watershed area. If Council remembers, within the watershed there are very specific requirements of setbacks from watercourses for uses for development within that area. Outside that watershed area there were some requirements as there are now for 100 foot setbacks. After talking with the Joint Action Committee we feel that should be reduced to 25 feet but that is more consistent with what we are dealing with in the urban area plans.

Finally, number 4, within the original draft of the Municipal

Development Plan a portion of land in the southern part of Frog Lake that was designated a resource designation and in printing new copies, etc. it inadvertently got changed and we would like to change that back to the resource designation that it was intended to be. Another minor change.

I did not want to go into the rest of the proposed amendments. These are amendments that are mainly in correcting errors in wording, definition, etc. after discussions with Municipal Affairs.

If there are any questions on those, of course, I would go over them.

Bill Campbell: Part 2B on Page 8 there are amendments to the Zoning By-Law and of course if you change your plan as we are recommending in those first four amendments. These are amendments which would be necessary to the Zoning By-Law to implement those and that is true for number 1, 2 and 3 which allow the implementation of those changes which I just mentioned. Number 1 dealing with the existing salvage yard. Number 2 dealing with the 25 foot setback and number three dealing with an area requiring a specific amendment to the zoning map and the south end of Lake Eagle through a call in response to a question of subdivision we found there was a road at the end of Lake Eagle that was a public road and wasn't indicated on our transportation map and was not maintained. That led us to look in more detail at the actual zoning of that. It was zoned MR-1 (resource) which is a more restrictive zone and we felt that since there was a potential public road there that we felt that zoning should be changed to residential and in fact we talked to the Joint Action Committee about that and they agreed to that and we also put it on the transportation map.

Warden Lawrence asked for speakers in favour of the application to come forward.

Jim Henneberry, Chairman Public Participation Committee for the Westphal Cole Harbour Area: In opening I would like to congratulate the Joint Action Committee, the residents of the area and members of the Municipal Council, as well as the Province, for having had the foresight and understanding which brings forth such a plan as this. The Cole Harbour - Westphal Public Participation Committee heartily support the results of the long and diligent work performed by all members of the Community and we also feel that the fate of this plan is an indication of the fate of our own and the other plans now underway in the Municipality.

As I am sure all members of Council are aware this plan was initiated as a means of ensuring that the Communities involved could continue to grow without having a negative impact on Lake Major and Long Lake. These lakes, of course, are the long term water supply, not only for the City of Dartmouth but also, both the Cole Harbour - Westphal plan area and also the Eastern Passage plan area. The choices are very clear in this matter, the area can be allowed to develop in a haphazard form or this plan can be adopted. Without the plan an appropriate solution to the long term servicing of the area, we can expect to pay higher water bills throughout the eastern area, principally because

with inappropriate development within the watershed area, the water quality of Lake Major can be expected to deteriorate and a drinking water treatment plant would have to be installed. The Cole Harbour - Westphal plan area has a projected ultimate population of some 39,000 people within a serviceable boundary. All of this population will draw its water from the Dartmouth system and the retention at a high level of water quality in that system is essential to the health of future residents as well as those now living in the community.

The plan you are now considering seems to have successfully dealt with the potential difficulties between the two seemingly divergent goals of watershed management and community growth. This is a very important achievement.

The Cole Harbour - Westphal plan is adjacent to the plan area under consideration here and the Public Participation Committee has within its draft plan designated abutting areas in a manner which would be compatible with land use permitted in the North Preston, Lake Major, Lake Loon, Cherrybrook and East Preston Plan. As you can understand from this, we are quite confident in the wisdom and good will of Council and believe that the adoption of this plan is in the best interests of all eastern plan residents.

Matthew Thomas, Chairman of the East Preston Ratepayers Association, also a member of the Joint Action Committee: You have certainly heard our proposal over the last three years. I must say we have been involved in this thing and at this particular time, we in the Prestons believe that it is a good plan to govern our future. We would just hope that tonight you will see fit to adopt the plan that is before you.

I just might like to add that over the past three years we have seen things come about that this plan addresses with regards to transportation, education, agriculture which we are in dire need of upgrading, which your staff have addressed and who will continue to assist us in the outcome of the ongoing programs that we have set up. Programs such as the monitoring committee which monitors the education system of the Preston area, also with respect to what we have done in regard to agriculture in the area, rodent control program and we would just hope that tonight that with the adoption of this plan that this type of program can continue.

Mac McMenemy, Member and former Chairman of the Joint Action Committee, former Chairman of the Lake Major Residents Association: Actually this has been a four year process and we have been quite excited that we have gotten the plan to this stage. The Lake Major and Long Lake areas are already serving the residents of the city of Dartmouth, portion of the City of Halifax, North Preston draws a portion of its water from Long Lake, so we are certainly interested in the quality control of the water. We are also interested in having support from our communities and the fact that it took us four years indicates that we have been trying to get that kind of support. Any kind of a plan is not going to have a hundred percent co-operation, there is always going to be a group of individuals or an individual that would see a plan in

some way inhibiting them from using their land or their property in a manner that they have grown accustomed to using it. However, I think that our plan with its roots firmly based in the community, a great deal of public participation gave everyone an opportunity to express their point of view and to gain support for that point of view. If we did not have this plan I would suggest to you that we would be involved in another plan; the one that Mr. Henneberry is currently chairing and that covers the Westphal - Cole Harbour areas, those portions that aren't included in our own plan for Lake Major. I think we are looking for your support. We know that when you read that plan you are going to see that there are things in there that are talking about money but I think if you read those closely you will see that most of that money is coming from Federal and Provincial sources and that the County is being basically asked to support it in terms of a moral kind of support assisting us in making the representation to the levels of government that would be necessary in order for us to get the funds to carry on the projects that we have in mind. I don't think anyone should look at this as being a costly venture to the County, certainly any kind of planning will probably have some effect in terms of staff or in terms of the things the staff will be doing, but I don't think in terms of an out and out outlay of money that we have in this plan any intention of asking for large, substantial sums of money to be spent in the area by the County. We are well aware of the County's fiscal position at this time.

Ray DeRoche, Vice-Chairman of the Westphal Cole Harbour Area Service Commission: I have been asked to represent the Service Commission Executive here this evening to express our endorsement of the Plan as being the first step in an overall approach to a situation which has been long outstanding in the total area. We are most definitely in favour of the plan and the aspect of it being the implementation will provide control and effective development of the total area and this is a good start for what will eventually become to be a Municipal Development Plan for the total County.

Warden Lawrence asked for further speakers in favour of the adoption of this plan? Hearing none, she asked for anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the adoption of this Plan and Zoning By-Law.

Wayne Kelsey: I am here in a private capacity and I represent Texas Downey who is operating a salvage yard at North Preston. I am pleased to see that you decided to recognize his business and will amend the wording of the plan to include the continuous operation of his salvage yard operation and to allow his application to the Public Service Commission to go ahead.

So my objection initially was on that basis but now that has been taken care of my objection is more general. I, in the past five years, have represented a number of people from the area of North Preston primarily on applications under the Land Titles Clarification Acts and as a result I have become, and I think I am, as familiar with the land and with the problem both from a subdivision zoning point of view, and other aspects as perhaps anybody else - any other lawyer in the Halifax - Dartmouth area with the exception of Mr. Weldon. If this subdivision

or this development plan goes ahead I see it as just a number of headaches for me if I am to continue representing the people in that area in an effort to clarify titles and eventually bring about some development from that point of view and what I mean is the Act under which these applications are made was passed years ago, almost exclusively with this particular community in mind but also with a view to application to other communities. It has been nothing but utter and complete frustration, it is a very simple process but the complications, the frustrations and the hold up take place at the administrative level. There are applications under this Act and I am giving an example, it is possible to start an application and complete it within three months - waiting all of the waiting periods built into the application. There are many applications that take seven and eight years on an Act that was particularly designed to be expeditious and submerely in its effect and the frustration comes at the level of the administration.

Now if you adopt the plan with the kind of limitation that will be built into it for this particular community, and I am speaking primarily of North Preston since I know that community the best, there are going to be severe limitations on the kinds of land use that can be made of the people that presently have businesses and they will be frozen in their present stage of operation. Mr. Downey was carrying on a salvage yard and he is just one individual. There are other individuals who may have had plans for their own particular land. They may have had initiatives similiar to Mr. Downey. They will not be permitted to do the kinds of things they want to do with their own land. The effect of this development plan will be that it will be very effective in freezing or eliminating the kind of development that could produce or bring about economic benefit to the community and the net effect is not withstanding this plan, I expect that many infractions will continue and what you will get over time is a series of unwarranted and undesireable development. Certain aspects of development are unenforceable. If somebody wants to do something and if they want to do it bad enough they will go ahead and do it. But this development plan will be effective in eliminating and freezing and preventing the kinds of operations for example a salvage yard if someone wants to establish a salvage yard this plan will be very effective in preventing that from happening and it can be done so without great effort. The kinds of licenses and things that would be required simply would not be issued and that would be the end of it. But there are other kinds of development, other kinds of land use that are not compatible with what you are hoping to have with this Development Plan that are totally unenforceable and over time, I think what you will see is that you will not have the kind of economic development that the community needs and has always been looking forward to. You will get a multiplicity of undesireable and unwanted development that is basically unenforceable and the County knows that it just doesn't have the resources to enforce many aspects - even of their present By-Laws. They simply do not have the staff nor the capability. The existing By-Laws are totally unenforceable except in situations where you need some sort of permit or some sort of license in order to proceed. The kind of developments that are not within existing By-Laws where those kind of requirements are not needed -

simply cannot be enforced and I repeat, that the net effect of this development plan is that it is going to eliminate the kind of development that particularly North Preston needs.

I think they should have open and clearly loose control in this and I think this is a very arbitrary and crude way of protecting the water source. The same objectives can be achieved with a plan that would have built into it a bit more sensitivity and from my experience I can tell you dealing with the Administrators and Bureaucrats, there is no sensitivity. They meet the letter of the law whether they understand it or not, they turn someone down to a reasonable request or a reasonable application and I have had numerous experiences. There are people in this room who know that on occasions I have even had to go to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia to get a simple license which was permitted under the By-Law. That is what you are going to inherit if you implement this type of plan. You are going to inherit all the kind of bad decisions, all the kind of buck passing, all the kind of bureaucratic nonsense that goes along with it and the net effect is going to be, I think, in the the interest of North Preston, detrimental and secondly, it is going to mean that there is going to be tremendous additional cost and I give you one example. If some young person wants to get a start in life he goes out and buys a trailer and eventually leaves this in a couple of years and builds a house. Well they can't just buy a trailer under this new plan, it has to be on a permanent foundation. Well they may not be able to afford a permanent foundation or they may only have intentions of keeping the trailer for a period of time until they can construct a house and naturally they do not want to put it on a permanent foundation. They can't do it under this existing plan. It is going to mean either additional costs or it is just going to be an unnecessary cumber and whether it is on a permanent foundation or not - what real difference does it make to the overall community. I think there should be greater discretion within the community to make the kind of decisions to determine what development should take place and what should not.

I know that if this plan goes forward there is going to be some bureaucrat here at the County saying no you don't come under Section such and such or Section Sub-section such and such and that is going to be the end of it whether he understands it or not or whether he appreciates the philosophy of the whole thing. It is just going to be a lot of red tape and a lot of headaches and I can tell you from the existing By-Laws, the existing legislation, there is enough and I dread the thought of the whole thing because from my point of view it is just going to make what are basically simple problems complex, very costly and protracted unnecessary.

Councillor Toppie: Are you living in the community of North Preston?

Mr. Kelsey: No, I indicated that I do not live in the Preston area but I represent an individual who does.

Councillor Toppie: Are you speaking on his behalf?

Mr. Kelsely: I was speaking inititally on his behalf and I indicated

at the outset that I was representing Mr. Texas Downey. His interests are no longer in jeopardy because you have accepted the amendment and his business will be allowed to continue.

Councillor Topple: Have you ever attended any of the committee meetings in the area?

Mr. Kelsey: I have no standing or no status, I have not been invited, I am not a member of the community and therefore I haven't taken the liberty to attend these meetings.

Councillor Topple: Do you realize that the planning process here was carried out by the communities. This was the wish of the communities.

Mr. Kelsey: I realize it was, but I know a lot of people in North Preston as I am in frequent contact with them and discussed the watershed issue and many other problems almost on a weekly basis almost without exception and many of the people that I have talked to do not know what the process is. They know there is a number of meetings going on, they don't know what the outcome is, they have never seen the plan, they don't understand the plan and they have never been told what the full ramifications of the plan are.

Councillor Topple: The only thing is - listening to you, you have made a lot of insinuations perhaps that you assume this or that will happen but do you have any concrete evidence that it will happen.

Mr. Kelsey: I am going from the past and I know everyday I have a series of headaches from bureaucrats at one level of government or another. They have no sense of urgency and no sense of cost.

Councillor Topple: Are you speaking of after a plan was in place or before a plan was in place.

Mr. Kelsey: I am talking about existing By-Laws.

Councillor Topple: Existing By-Laws but with no plan of development.

Mr. Kelsey: No, I mean it comes into the thinking of a general plan you have to operate under and the By-Laws and what not.

Councillor Topple: We have never had one in Halifax County unfortunately and it appears that the Prestons are going to be the fortunate ones which will give them some guidelines and will permit them to do things that perhaps they haven't been able to do before.

Mr. Kelsey: I can't see that because basically there has really been nothing up to now and the sky has been the limit. The effect of this development program is that there will be very severe limits, very clear limits.

Councillor Topple: I have one other question because I am interested. You talked about Clarification of Titles, do you see the plan as having any after effect on people clarifying their titles or should it not

help.

Mr. Kelsey: It should not have any effect because it is totally different but I don't know what Regulations, what By-Laws will flow from all this. I haven't seen the By-Laws. My purpose, as I say in coming here, was simply to represent Mr. Downey as a request that his operation be exempted from the Development Plan. I am not familiar with all the By-Laws that have arisen. In fact, this has only come to my attention just recently in this connection.

Councillor Wiseman: Yes, from what you are saying it seems to me that you definitely object to the plan, do you object to the whole plan, specific parts of it and if so what parts of it do you object to as it covers many facets of the day to day living and development of that community.

Mr. Kelsey: I agree with the general philosophy. I believe that the kind of uncontrolled development that has gone on for years simply is in nobody's interests in the community and it is certainly not in the interest of the community nor the surrounding communities. There has to be development and it has to be controlled and it has to be planned and because many of the problems that I encounter almost on a weekly basis are these types because of the less development and what would normally be a very simple situation and becomes a complex situation because of lax development in the past. People have been able to build wherever they want, setbacks not uniform. My objection is the kind of things that will just add costs to the fact of just simple living in the community and for a person making a home for himself or trying to carry on a business - a lot of this is build into the plan and I think if you handle it in a very administrative way it tends to be done in a very insensitive way but this plan is going to eliminate a lot of that.

Councillor Wiseman: Well I would say you are not going to have the problem certainly with some of the By-Laws and the amount of work and effort that has gone into the creation of this plan by the people from those communities one would expect that those restrictions and limitations are being placed there by the people to prevent the types of development that has gone on in the past. They don't want that type of development. They want some control to ensure they have their community the way they want it to be.

Mr. Kelsey: I don't think they want haphazard development. Nobody in communities wants that. They don't want the kind of restrictions. If someone wants to put up a service station would they be able to do it under the plan in North Preston or a mechanic shop - you can't do it. All kinds of gravel on the surface of the land, someone wants to set up a crusher or quarry - could they do it - no. These kinds of limitations are being placed on the community.

Councillor Wiseman: Well if you haven't read the plan how do you know that you are not able to set up a service station, gravel quarry or whatever.

Mr. Kelsey: Well, I read enough to know that you wouldn't be able to

do that. In the areas that I am talking about - the major part of North Preston - which takes in about 99% of it is small gulley that is excluded.

Councillor Adams: I find it a bit unfortunate to hear that you have not read the plan yet you say that you do see severe limitations to existing industrial uses in the community of North Preston. I wonder how you would propose that we develop a community without a plan.

Mr. Kelsey: I am not suggesting that you develop a community without a plan. I said that the haphazard development that has gone on is not in the best interests, the plan is severely restrictive. You are limiting the entire community greatly. The kind of choices they can make for the use of their own land is too severely limiting.

Councillor Adams: Are you aware that the people made those choices themselves.

Mr. Kelsey: I would be be very surprised. I haven't met one person from North Preston who did and as soon as this thing came to light I have discussed it with everyone that I have met. They either did not know about it or did not know the effects. Not one was fully aware of the ramifications of the plan.

Councillor Adams: How would you say that we could control the water resource that will eventually serve all communities including the cities and at the same time maintain a community life style.

Councillor Adams: You have to control what you are going to do around the water mass, do you not?

Mr. Kelsey: There are many ways you can control the water use and the water quality without the rather arbitrary way that this plan is doing. This is a very arbitrary way, and I think there should have been more discretion.

Councillor Adams: Four years of planning is not very arbitrary is it?

Mr. Kelsey: I am saying that the net result is - there could have been many hours gone into this thing, but I am saying what were're faced with and what were going to have is very arbitrary in its effect, and I don't know how it applies to other communities with respect to North Preston, it will place very severe limitations on what the people can do with their own land. I was very shocked to see some of the signatures on this Development Plan. I just couldn't believe some of the signatures I saw.

Councillor McKay: Mr. Kelsey, I think that probably from my understanding of your comments that probably you could pull back your horns just a wee bit, in that, first of all, I got the impression that you weren't in favor of a Plan probably, period. And that you probably favor "the sky's the limit", the open and loose control as you suggested before, but I see that you since clarified that situation. The first question that I have to ask is the Land Title Clarification

Act, in what restrictions would you see this Municipal Development Plan placing on that, or more hinderances, as you had suggested before?

Mr. Kelsey: I haven't seen the By-Laws, all I saw was the Development Plan and the general zoning of the area. It doesn't restrict, I think I indicated in earlier comment that this plan should be indifferent or the Land Title Clarification Act should be indifferent to what effect this Plan has because it won't affect the subdivision, the subdivision that takes place or that you can achieve through this particular Act even defies the existing Subdivision By-Laws.

Councillor McKay: Mr. Kelsey, I think that in my limited experience I have seen that there is probably no Plan that you are going to come forward with that is going to be infallible because they are prepared by people, and I think that people in the nature of themselves are infallible and that you are always going to have some people that are not going to agree with it. When I obviously see the residents of the area coming forth with a vast majority of them being in favor of it, the public participation in the neighbouring communities coming in favor of it, probably (and I am using this as an assumption of the City of Dartmouth being in favor of, because I haven't noted any objection), but they are aware of the plan and they must be in favor of the plan or they would have been present here tonight. Without plans or laws, we do not have any clause that governs people, that's why we come forth with them. In my limited experience, usually where I see the cases involved is when we have lawyers and bureaucrats going in tooth and nail. The bureaucrat is trying to hold back and the lawyer, he is trying to find the loop hole, that is where I usually see cases developed.

Councillor MacDonald: Mr. Kelsey, you state your client has been looked after in the process of this plan. I think there have been other people or other particular persons that had commercial businesses that wanted to be looked after, and if they had had input into this plan, they probably could have been accommodated, the same as your client, so I don't see why anybody could be left out if they really wanted to have their particular business or whatever looked after in this plan properly.

Mr. Kelsey: I have a feeling that there are other businesses that will be affected and I find it rather odd that I have to come here to represent one individual. What about all the other individuals that have businesses.

Councillor Adams: Mr. Kelsey keeps referring to severe limitations, as a result of this Development Plan which was done by the people. I wonder how you can compare it with what you see now as severe limitations to what we had back in 1976 with no buildings permitted in the communities. Should we revert to that By-Law and do away with the planned development whereby we can build?

Mr. Kelsey: That argument says nothing. You eliminated that By-Law, why go back to it. Because you had something bad, or even worse in the past, why invite something almost as bad in the future?

Councillor Adams: How can you say that restriction is better than permission?

Mr. Kelsey: I'm saying that the kind of restriction that you're placing on these communities is unnecessarily the type. You could protect the water quality, you could protect Lake Major, you could protect the water supply without being so severe in your restrictions. I think you could achieve the same objectives to the same degree without the kind of limitations that you are placing on the community. I guess I am very conservative in my attitude, I believe a man's house is his castle, his land is his to do whatever he wants except when it interferes with the public interest. If the public interest is not affected, if you don't need to severely restrict the man's land to protect water quality, then do it as least you can.

Councillor Adams: I'm sure that was the interpretation of the planning group.

Mr. Kelsey: It won't be the planning group that will be implementing the thing. It will be the administration here at the County. The Joint Action Committee will be long gone when these By-Laws and Regulations are being enforced. The Joint Action Committee won't be paying the bills. The Joint Action Committee won't be putting foundations under trailers. If the people are going to pay, they are going to pay in terms of lack of control, lack of their own property. I'm not in favor of that.

Councillor Topple: Just one comment, I think (to Mr. Kelsey), eluding to what Councillor Adams just said, about the By-Laws, when that By-Law was rescinded, the communities decided to do something to try and provide or protect the water supply and at the same time have development. I think you will find that if the communities didn't come up with this plan, the City of Dartmouth had the power to walk in there and take over that water supply and restrict and/or stop any development in that community whatsoever under the Water Act. Under the Town Act of around 1901 where they had the power to take the water out of any lake and restrict anything around it.

Mr. Kelsey: From a political point of view, that wouldn't be possible.

Councillor Topple: I disagree. I think when you talk about a population the size of the City of Dartmouth and the City of Halifax, you may find it a bit different. I think the thing is the community should be commended on the effort they put into coming up with a solution.

Mr. Kelsey: The community was forced against a wall. This watershed thing came on them very quickly, very suddenly without any warning. All the studies were done, all the planning was done without any consultation with the communities. Then this freeze was slapped on. Then they had to do something and they fought back. They had to do something. This whole thing was planned out of crisis, that makes for bad planning.

Councillor Topple: I think it was the water supply that decided under the old Planning process or the desires of the cities to have a vast water supply, they had to and they decided that this community had to have restrictions on it that could not allow it to develop.

Mr. Kelsey: A crisis situation was created and the people responded. I think that kind of situation makes for bad planning.

Councillor Topple: Whether or not it was a crisis, the City of Dartmouth co-operated and did concede to allow the development that the people wanted. I think we can't lose sight of that fact.

Charlie Joudrey, 75 Lake Major Road: I am bordered on one side by the properties of Roy Laybold and on the other side by the Conrad family. We all have one common concern, although I will let them speak for themselves if they wish.

I have a farming operation at the present time. The business has been in operation for eleven years; two years at the present location; the previous ten years in the same area, but it was in an area which became zoned as R-2 which prohibited my expansions so I moved to this area. Prior to purchasing this property, I checked with the County to ensure what the zoning was on the property and it was General. That was one of the factors contributing to the purchase of the property. Right now the proposed plan proposes that my property be rezoned to R-2. I am in the process of expanding and I am quite concerned that the possible rezoning to R-2 will inhibit my ability to build buildings or enlarge the operation. Until recently it was an operation of farming only and it was primarily raising of animals and pelting them and selling the pelts. In the past year we've developed into manufacturing the pelts of the animals to saleable items which at the present time is being sold on the retail market. We hope to expand as a wholesale market. This could quite possibly require more expansion, more buildings or a shop, or what have you. For this reason, I would like the area which we live in to be reconsidered and not to be included in the proposed zoning of tonight to be passed for the whole area. In closing, I would like to say that I am not against the zoning as such, I believe we all need a plan, I am only speaking on behalf of the parcel of land that I own. I would like further consideration to this.

Warden Lawrence: Mr. Joudrey, did you say you were speaking for your neighbours, Conrads and Laybolds, is that right?

Mr. Joudrey: Yes Madam, that is right.

Warden Lawrence: Are they also engaged in farming?

Mr. Joudrey: No, they are not. I'm not speaking on their behalf, I'm speaking for myself only, but they are my neighbours. We have kind of a problem with the proposed zoning.

Councillor Topple: Mr. Joudrey, how many acres of land do you have there?

Mr. Joudrey: Approximately 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ acres.

Councillor Topple: You are right on the Lake Major Road.

Mr. Joudrey: Yes, my property is bordered on one side by the Lake Major Road and on the other side by the Crane Hill Drive.

Councillor Topple: But you would be in favor of some type of zoning that could accommodate your type of operation?

Mr. Joudrey: Yes Sir.

Councillor Topple: You are not opposed to zoning?

Mr. Joudrey: I'm not opposed to zoning, I'm not opposed to the plan in general, I'm just opposed to the proposed zoning for the particular parcel of land that I live on.

Councillor Topple: Presently you are in the General Zone that allows you to do or carry on the operation you have?

Mr. Joudrey: Yes Sir.

Cecil Conrad 129 Lake Major Road: I border Mr. Joudrey and the other two houses on the other side are both owned by Conrads. I'm here because of the zone that we are going to be handed when the plan goes through. I would like to see a change. I have worked for a glass company for 18 years, I learned my trade and I bought quite a bit of machinery which I have stored in my basement. I was born right across the road from where I live and my grandfather and great-grandfather had all owned the land there. My point is some day shortly, I would like to build a building that I could put this machinery in and make use of it. Under the new Zoning By-Law, I'm to be out of business. All I am asking is to leave it as it is, or zone it to some zone that I can make use of the six acres of land that I have worked for the last 30 years. I'm not against the plan in any way. I think we need a plan and we need a good plan. This is all I have to say.

Warden: Mr. Conrad, did anyone ever approach you in the process of this planning as to what your wishes were?

Mr. Conrad: Yes, I have attended a good many of the meetings, I had Mr. Porter out to the house and at first they had the land zoned, I think, Environmental. They zoned, I think, residential and I was of the understanding at that time that I could build a building on that land, which I find out now that I'm not going to be allowed to build a building that I can put my machinery to use. Right now, I guess 60% of the land my father used for farming, but the little bit of farming I have done is what I helped my father with and I work out every day, some day I would like to make a living at home.

Deputy Warden Deveaux: I was just wondering, Madam Warden, is there anyone who can elaborate on these cases or reasons why apparently proposed to become zoned in a manner in which the owner says they

aren't in favor of. If this plan is approved tonight, does that zoning in effect (well I know they can appeal) will that zoning be taking affect contrary to the wishes of these two gentlemen?

Warden Lawrence: I am accumulating a number of questions and requests that people are raising and I would assume that at the end of the Public Hearing Session that Council would want to consult with staff as to what the options are for the particular difficulties being raised here. I think it's perfectly valid that we do want to know what the options are.

Councillor Topple: Mr. Conrad, are you representing your father as well as your brother?

Mr. Conrad: I am representing my father and my brother next door. My father was going to come tonight and he couldn't make it and he said that the way we wanted things would suit him fine. I have another brother here, he may want to come down and have something to say under the same issue I have.

Councillor Topple: How many acres in the three holdings?

Mr. Conrad: My father has 3 acres, my brother has approximately 1 acre and I have about six acres of my own land. I have three acres the house is on and I bought three acres next door to me. If this new plan goes through, I don't know if I will even be allowed to build a double garage.

Councillor Topple: You're talking about 10 acres.

Mr. Conrad: Yes 10-11 acres.

Councillor Topple: You're not opposed to the plan are you?

Mr. Conrad: No way, I'm all for the plan, there was a lot of hard work went into the plan and I been there at meetings when I should have been somewhere else, but I always like to represent anyone that's doing work. I think it was a misunderstanding really, when Mr. Porter was out to the house, when he changed it from Environment to R-2 Zoning.

Councillor Topple: But you're not interested in establishing a gravel operation, a trucking operation, or anything of that nature?

Mr. Conrad: I don't want no big trucks or back hoes or anything that's going to make a noise, I just want a little quiet community and with this machinery I bought, I could work there all night and nobody outside could hear it going. So there would be no noise whatsoever. If I set this glass machinery up that I have, I might want to sell a little, no big operation.

Councillor Topple: You are now in the General Building Zone?

Mr. Conrad: I am now.

Councillor Topples: You are what, three generations in the General Building Zone.

Mr. Conrad: Yes, three or four generations we have been there.

Councillor Wiseman: One question that was in my mind to Mr. Conrad, what was the type of business that you wanted to carry out from that location?

Mr. Conrad: Mirrors, glass shelves, installing windows, etc. There would be no mess outside.

Councillor Wiseman: Just a C-2 zoning would suit your operation fine as far as you would be concerned.

Mr. Conrad: What I have heard, I haven't really read the full By-Laws of it, but I got a quick look at it and I think I'm not going to be 100% satisfied, but I would like to see it. It seems kind of ridiculous, but I have six acres of land there and my father and my brother and Mr. Joudrey and another chap all live on the one block of land and we all, more or less are looking for the same type of zone. I can't see any reason why we couldn't get something to suit us all. We don't all want something different,

Mr. John Conrad: I live at 157 and I am Cecil's brother, but I bought a parcel of land at 132 Lake Major Road. Some day I plan on living there. I would like to have it zoned to accommodate a small machine shop. I am a machinist by trade. If I could have a small machine shop approximately 50' x 50', I can't see why I couldn't be able to build it. My brother has said most everything else.

Earl Laybold, Crane Hill Road, bordering Charlie Joudrey: I have a small engine repair, some day I hope to be made into a business and the way the land is presently zoned, R-2, I would be restricted to build it larger, that is why we would like to keep it a General Zone.

Councillor Topples: Mr. Laybold, what acreage do you have there?

Mr. Laybold: Just one acre.

Councillor Topples: You are presently operating this business, are you not?

Mr. Laybold: Yes, a small engine repair.

Councillor Topples: Your concern is that you could operate under a nonconforming use, but if anything happens, a fire or anything, you are out of business.

Mr. Laybold: From what I heard, I couldn't rebuild.

Councillor Topples: You would agree to the type of zoning that would accommodate the Conrads?