

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

"THAT a Public Hearing be held April 6, 1982, at 7:00 P.M. (next Council Session, due to the number of Public Hearings to be held in the next few weeks for MDP Approvals) for the rezoning application #16-81, request to zone and rezone lakeland acres subdivision located off the Beaverbank Road, district 15." Motion Carried.

Rezoning Application # 1-82

Mr. Meech outlined this item as in the Planning Advisory Committee Report, as follows: "At the March 8, 1982 meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee, a resolution was passed recommending to Council that a public hearing be held on the above-noted rezoning application on the basis that the request is in keeping with good planning practice." The suggested date in the Planning Advisory Committee Report was April 6, 1982, the next Regular Council Session, due to the number of Public Hearings to be held in future weeks for MDP Plans to be heard.

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

"THAT a Public Hearing be held April 6, 1982 at 7:00 P.M. in order to hear rezoning application #1-82, a request to zone and rezone lands of Nautical Electronic Laboratories Limited, Highway No. 333, Hackets Cove, District 3." Motion Carried.

Public Land Donations

Mr. Meech outlined this item as well, advising: "The Planning Advisory Committee respectfully recommends that the following parcels of recreational land being donated to the County be accepted as parkland by County Council. The Municipal Solicitor reports that the parkland in question is free and clear of all encumbrances and County Council is therefore in a position where it can accept title to the land. 1) Leaside Subdivision, Park Area "Walkway A" not a part of the donation; 2) Brookside Mews Subdivision, Parcel "P-1", District 4.

Subsequent to brief discussion by Council:

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

"THAT Municipal Council approve the acceptance of the following parcels of land as parkland by County Council: 1. Leaside Subdivision, Park Area (exclusive of Walkway A), District 16 and Brookside Mews Subdivision, Parcel P-1, District 4." Motion Carried.

SUPPLEMENTARY REQUEST

Warden Lawrence indicated that there was a request from the MDP Committee, that Council accept a Supplementary Report from the MDP Committee at the April 6, Council Session.

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

"THAT Council accept a Supplementary Report from the MDP Committee at the April 6, 1982 Council Session."
Motion Carried.

ADDITION TO AGENDA, RE: MDP PLANS

It was agreed by Council to discuss the Council concerns with respect to the two MDP Plans for which Public Hearings, with the intention to adopt, would soon be held; Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea and Sackville.

Council discussed the two up-coming Municipal Development Plan Public Hearings at length. The major concern of Council was the requirement of 40,000 to 80,000 sq. ft. lot requirements, specified in the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Plan for some areas in that District. Most of Council was concerned that, regardless of the Health concerns of that area, if the lots were approved at that size, other Districts of the County would require lot approvals of that size as well.

However, Staff members, Bill Campbell and Keith Birch repeatedly stressed that the plans are as individual as the areas involved and further that what is included in the Plans are specifications which have been supported by the vast majority of residents in the areas concerned. Staff also indicated that the previous MDP which had been proposed for the entire County of Halifax, had not been approved at the Public Hearing as it was not an individual plan for each area.

Staff advised that no changes could be made to the Plan documents at the present time as Public Hearings have already been advertised. However, at the Public Hearing stage any requested changes can be made.

Subsequent to the above discussion Mr. Campbell and Mr. Birch retired from Council.

ADDITION TO THE AGENDA

Percy Baker Day - Councillor Poirier

Councillor Poirier advised that on Sunday, March 21, 1982, Father Lloyd O'Neill from the Catholic Church in Cole Harbour has proclaimed a Percy Baker Day throughout the County. She further advised that a Special Mass will be held at 11:30 A.M. A number of dignitaries will be present and several presentations will be made to Mr. Baker in recognition of the work he has done for the Handicapped.

Annual Council Session - Solicitor Cragg

Solicitor Cragg advised that this Council Session has not been designated the Annual Council Session as it should be and as well a decision to adjourn the Session, not having set a tax rate, should be deferred to another date.

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

"THAT this Regular Council Session be designated the Annual Council Session and that the Annual Session be adjourned until the 20th of April, 1982."
Motion Carried.

COMPLETION OF AGENDA

It was agreed by Council that the remainder of items on the Agenda be deferred until the Subsequent, April 6th Regular Council Session.

NEW BUSINESS

Supplementary Report of Management Committee - Mr. Meech

Mr. Meech indicated there was some urgency in dealing with the Supplementary Report of the Management Committee regarding additions to the 1982 Suburban Paving Program.

Mr. Meech outlined the Report as follows: "The Management Committee received a report from the Director of Engineering and Works respecting additions to the 1982 Street Paving Program. (Copy attached). It is the recommendation of the Management Committee that the street identified in the Report be approved by Council for inclusion in the 1982 Suburban Street paving Program subject to attaining the required majority of signatures and further subject to approval of the Minister of Transportation."

The Streets identified in the Report were, as follows:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Echo Court, Lake Echo; | 2. Mallard Court, Timberlea; |
| 3. Ridge Avenue, Waverley; | 4. Teal Court, Timberlea; |
| 5. Pine-N-Oak Drive, Wellington; | 6. Walker Street, Preston; |
| 7. James Ray Drive, Porter's Lake. | |

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

"THAT Council approve the inclusion of the above-mentioned streets in the 1982 Suburban Street Paving Program subject to the required majority of signatures and the approval of the Minister of Transportation."
Motion Carried.

Deputy Warden MacKay suggested that the items not dealt with at today's Council Session be placed first on the agenda of the next Regular Council Session.

ALJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT Council adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, the Council Session adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

ANNUAL COUNCIL SESSION

MAY 4, 1982

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. Ken Wilson, Director of Finance
Mr. Gary Smith, Chief Accountant

SECRETARY: Christine E. Simmons

OPENING OF ANNUAL SESSION

The Annual Council Session was brought to order at approximately 4:30 P.M.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

"THAT Christine E. Simmons be appointed Recording Secretary."
Motion Carried.

SETTING OF 1982 TAX RATE

Mr. Wilson joined the Annual Council Session at this time to provide Council with information regarding the 1982 tax rate.

Mr. Meech first, outlined the background information with regard to this years tax rate, advising that a proposed budget for the 1982 revenue fund expenditures and revenue was prepared by each department from October to December 1981. These were reviewed by the CAO and

Director of Finance and revised. The revised budget was submitted to Council on February 16, 1982. Council as a Committee of the Whole reviewed the proposed budget and requested certain reductions. The effect of these reductions, amounting to \$1,094,400. and additional revenue or transfers from reserve was submitted to Council in a Report dated April 15, 1982. The requisition of the District School Board to the Joint Councils of Bedford and the County was reduced by \$1,800,001 resulting in a further reduction of the County expenditures by \$1,704,602.

He further advised that the total reductions including a transfer of \$1,200,000 from the reserve for education would allow a commercial tax rate of \$1.53 and residential tax rate of .79 per \$100 of assessment. He indicated that if Council wishes to retain the same tax rates as in 1981, (Commercial \$1.53 and Residential \$.82) then only \$900,000 would need to be transferred from reserve for education.

It was the recommendation of Mr. Meech and Mr. Wilson that the 1982 general tax rate be the same as 1981 and not be reduced.

In regard to this recommendation a Report contained in the agenda advised:

1. The transition grants from the Province to compensate for the loss of Bedford is reducing each year and will be finished in 1984.
2. Recovery from Urban areas for interest and principal paid on their behalf in the early 1970's will be fully recovered in 1983.
3. Any transfer from reserves to retain current tax rate will automatically increase the next years tax rate if there is nothing left in reserve to be transferred the following year to revenue.

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

"THAT the 1982 tax rate remain the same as in 1981; Commercial \$1.53 and Residential \$.82, utilizing \$900,000 from the education reserve fund."

Deputy Warden MacKay questioned Mr. Meech as to whether the budget, as proposed, included the request from the Bedford-Sackville CAMR for a grant in the amount of \$60,000 to be paid \$20,000 per year over three years.

Mr. Meech advised that this expenditure was not included in the budget but that the budget could be dealt with at this time, as presented and the amount could be paid at the end of the year, and included in the 1983 budget although expended at the end of 1982. He also advised that the motion approved at the Management Committee for this expenditure hinged on the fact that the amount to be paid from the Province of Nova Scotia had to be confirmed first. Although this confirmation is expected, it has not yet been received. He also advised that even though the project may proceed as planned the funds may not be required until year-end and as previously mentioned, could be paid out of the 1983 budget, if necessary.

Deputy Warden MacKay agreed that he would support the motion as presented.

Councillor Lichter, however, was not supportive of the motion at this time, for the following reasons:

1. He had requested information from Staff regarding the comparison of the Planning Staff Compliment between 1974 and 1981; he advised that he had not received this information but had received some verbal communication from Mr. Birch indicating that there was no comparison due to changes in the departmental structure. He advised that his decision regarding the budget would depend on the information he requested.
2. He required additional information regarding the amount of full and-or part time staff included in the 1982 budget before he could approve or disapprove of it.
3. He felt there was an error in the Report contained in the agenda with regard to the amount of money struck from the District School Board budget; he advised that the Report indicated an amount of \$1,800,001 when in fact, he thought it should read \$1.81 million.
4. He was concerned about the Industrial Commission Budget, indicating that many expensive reports had been produced lately, using high quality paper and covers. Councillor Lichter indicated that while the Reports contained valueable information and were extremely comprehensive, the information would be just as impressive on plain, inexpensive paper.

Mr. Meech answered some of the above concerns; he advised in regard to the alleged error, that there was no error, although the figures were confusing. He advised that initially, at the Joint Council Session, a motion to strike \$1,800,000 from the District School Board Budget had been defeated. Subsequent to several other defeated motions, the Council members had wished to vote on the motion again but could not put it back on the floor due to parliamentary procedure which does not allow a defeated motion to be put back on the floor. Therefore, the motion was put on the floor with a one dollar higher figure in order to accomplish the same thing as would have been the intent of the previous motion.

In regard to the comparison between the staff of the Planning and Development Department between 1974 and 1981; he advised that the point Mr. Birch had been attempting to make in his verbal conversation with the Councillor was that in 1974 there had been no decision taken to do the Municipality's planning in-house. Mr. Meech further advised that in 1974 there was a Development Control Section and a Building Inspection Section.

In terms of the amounts provided in the 1982 budget for new positions, Mr. Meech advised that in the case of the Engineering and Works Budget, paid by the general tax rate, there is provision for a Storm Drainage Engineer. However, he pointed out that at the present time there is approval within the staff compliment for the Engineering and Works Department for a Design Engineer which had not been filled to date. He

advised that it was the intention to replace that position with the Storm Drainage Engineer. As well, a technician was required to go along with that function, resulting in one new position over what has already been approved by Council.

He also advised that there was a new position in the Engineering and Works Budget relative to sewer maintenance operation. However, that is being covered in the Budget for the serviced areas, by the Environmental Services Rate.

Mr. Meech indicated the only other new position, arranged between the Municipality and the School Board, is the Secretarial Steno support for the Purchasing Co-ordinator. This has not been finally worked out as yet. He advised that if this position does remain within the Municipality's administrative structure, the School Board will be paying a share toward the cost for this Position.

He also advised that with respect to sums of money in the original budget submission to Council, part-time assistance has been substantially reduced. He further indicated that there would be some minor savings in the Planning & Development Department as a number of people had left in the past few months and those positions have not yet been filled. Therefore, there will be a period of transition. As well, recently, in the Finance Department it had been decided that should any employee leave, the position would not be re-filled. Instead, a part time person would be hired to perform those duties, when required.

Councillor Deveaux supported any additions to Staff in the Engineering and Works Department due to the problems experienced in the serviced areas with respect to water and sewer maintenance. He agreed there was a requirement for additional staff in these areas and in the area of storm drainage flooding. He also supported the work of Mr. Denny, the Industrial Promotions Officer.

Mr. Meech further advised that the report requested by Councillor Lichter with regard to Planning Staff was not yet ready due to the enormous amount of work and overtime put in by Planning Staff regarding the annexation hearings. He advised that this Report would be forthcoming in the near future.

Councillor Deveaux spoke again advising that there were few, if any Municipalities in the Province who had been able to keep their tax rate at its 1981 level, or to have the option to lower it. He, therefore, commended Staff on a fine job done on the 1982 tax rate.

Councillor Lichter spoke again clarifying his position with regard to Staff, advising that the figures presented to PAC six weeks ago indicated that in 1974 the workload was three times as much in the Development and Building Inspections Departments as it is today. He agreed that more people may be needed in the Engineering Department but felt that the Municipality had to review where it needed the extra people.

In regard to the Industrial Promotion he indicated his high regard for Mr. Denny, but expressed his opinion that there is a definite difference between Promotion and Information to Council. He felt that information to Council did not have to put on expensive paper and between expensive bindings although this would be warranted if it was information presented to entice business into the County.

Mr. Meech indicated that should the tax rate be approved today and as a result of the Staff Report coming forward next week, Council wished to take action regarding Staff, there would be nothing preventing them from doing so.

Councillor MacDonald spoke in support of any required increase in Staff especially in light of the findings of the Storm Drainage Task Force. He felt that extra Staff would be required in this field for some time, to eliminate problems experienced with regard to Storm Drainage.

Councillor Adams also spoke briefly in support of the Industrial Promotions Operations in the County, advising that all publications were produced at a minimum cost to the Municipality.

Deputy Warden MacKay supported the motion on the floor wholeheartedly. He was pleased that the County had been able to maintain services at their present level without increasing the tax rate. He also supported the work of the Industrial Promotions Officer indicating that the salvation of the Municipality would be through industrial tax dollars and not residential.

Councillor Wiseman also spoke in support of the motion on the floor indicating her opinion that the Municipality had achieved a great deal by holding its tax rate at the same level as last year. She indicated her regret that the School Board Budget had had to be cut; however, she was still supportive of the motion on the floor.

Councillor Gaetz supported the rate although he felt the budget was very tight. He did indicate that he would prefer to see the School Board budget increased; his main fear was the reduction of School Bus Courtesy Runs.

Councillor Benjamin felt that Council should take into consideration Councillor Lichter's request for information before voting on the motion. However, in regard to the School Board budget, he indicated his opinion that a satisfactory compromise had been reached subsequent to many long hours of deliberation between the Councils of the Town of Bedford and the County of Halifax.

Councillor Eisenhauer also spoke in support of the motion on the floor although he was concerned with the cuts which had to be made to the School Board Budget.

Councillor Eisenhauer also advised in regard to Councillor Lichter's concern with the Planning Department Staff, that the budget for the Planning Department in 1981 had been less than the Budget in 1978 considering the fees paid to the project planners versus the salaries paid to Staff.

Councillor McInroy felt there was no direct relationship between the Municipality's Budget and the School Board Budget. He urged Council to deal with the Municipal Budget and 1982 Tax Rate. Councillor Topple spoke briefly in agreement with the comments of Councillor McInroy.

Councillor Walker spoke briefly in support of the concerns expressed by Councillor Lichter.

Subsequent to the above discussion, the question was called on the motion.

Moved by Councillor McInroy, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"As written previously."
Motion Carried.

Subsequently,

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

"THAT Council approve the 1982 Area Tax Rates as submitted by the Finance Department."
Motion Carried.

The above motion was carried subsequent to clarification by Mr. Meech with regard to the Sheet Harbour Swimming Pool.

He advised, that some months ago, there was discussion at the Management Committee level relative to the Management of the Swimming Pool in Sheet Harbour, District 11. As a result of that discussion, there was to be consideration given to the levying of an area rate of five cents per \$100 of assessment for 1982 to assist in defraying the deficit which had been accumulated. It was the understanding that the deficit could be repaid over a five year period. However, a Public Meeting was to have been called in the community to give the residents the full facts and figures regarding the operation.

This meeting has not been held to date; therefore, that area rate is not included in the 1982 area rates for District 11. However, Mr. Meech indicated that subsequent to the Public Meeting being held in District 11, a request may come to the next Council Session to levy the additional area rate for 1982.

Councillor Margeson, as well indicated, that although in agreement with the motion to approve the area rates, he did intend to approach his residents at a Public Meeting March 5, in regard to the proposed purchase of additional acreage in the vicinity of the new Beavercreek Junior High School for Recreation Purposes. He indicated that, at present, his area receives little benefit from Recreation which his District pays into.

ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the above discussion, the Annual Council Session was adjourned.

M I N U T E S & R E P O R T S

O F T H E

T H I R D Y E A R M E E T I N G S

O F T H E

F O R T I E T H C O U N C I L

O F T H E

M U N I C I P A L I T Y O F T H E C O U N T Y O F H A L I F A X

A P R I L C O U N C I L S E S S I O N

T U E S D A Y , A P R I L 6 a n d 20 , 1982

&

P U B L I C H E A R I N G

M O N D A Y , A P R I L 5 , 1982

&

J O I N T B E D F O R D & H A L I F A X C O U N T Y C O U N C I L S E S S I O N S

T H U R S D A Y , A P R I L 15 a n d 22 , 1982

PUBLIC HEARING

APRIL 5, 1982

MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - BEECHVILLE-LAKESIDE-TIMBERLEA

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. Keith Birch, Director of Planning & Development
Mr. Bill Campbell, Planning Supervisor, Policy Division
Mr. Brant Wishart, Planner
Ms. Valerie Spencer, Planner
Mr. Chris Reddy, Planner
Ms. Dorothy Smith, Planner
Mrs. Cathy MacKay, Secretary, Planning & Development
Mr. Neil Franklin, Franklin Services Ltd.
Mr. Peter Herschorn, Franklin Services Ltd.
Mr. Robert Fournier, PPC
Mr. Dan Campbell, PPC
Mrs. Helen Darrington, PPC
Mr. Conrad Marsh, PPC
Mr. Brian Jollymore, PPC
Mr. Alan Ruffman, Resident, Ferguson's Cove
Mr. Gary McFeeders, Resident
Mr. Ray MacGillivray, Chairman, PPC
Mrs. Joudrey, Resident
Mrs. Johnson, Resident
Mrs. J. Delemare, PPC
Mr. & Mrs. Cox, PPC
Mrs. J. Coates, PPC
Mr. & Mrs. C. Boyd, PPC
Mrs. C. Pelrine, PPC
Mr. Stewart McInnes, Q. C.
Mr. K. Fitzgerald, Developer
Mr. Jollimore, Jollimore's Auto Body
Mr. C. Conrad, Conrad's Auto Body

SECRETARY: Christine E. Simmons

OPENING OF PUBLIC HEARING

Warden Lawrence brought the Public Hearing to order at 7:00 P.M. with The Lord's Prayer.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the Roll.

PUBLIC HEARING

Warden Lawrence then outlined to those present in the Council Chambers, the procedure for the Public Hearing.

REPORT ON WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS - MR. KELLY, MUNICIPAL CLERK

Mr. Kelly advised that one written submission was received by the Executive Office regarding the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Municipal Development Plan. This correspondence was from the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Public Participation Committee and expressed general support for both the Plan and Zoning By-Law.

Mr. Kelly also advised that prior to the Public Hearing, he had been given a note regarding Gary Jollimore's Auto Body Shop. This note was signed by: A. B. Johnson, W. M. Joudrey, R. Joudrey and Pearl Johnson. Mr. Kelly advised that a presentation respecting the Auto Body Shop would be made during the Public Hearing.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR

Mr. Neil Franklin (with Mr. Peter Herchorn), Resident of Halifax: Mr. Franklin advised that his Company, Franklin Services Ltd., was situated adjacent to the Lakeside Industrial Park and he stated that he was present to support the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Development Plan and Zoning By-Law on behalf of the Company. He did, however, express one concern the Company has with the Plan; the Plan calls for a dissection of the Company's property between residential and light industrial. He was not in opposition to such designation but indicated that it may have certain ramifications for the Company in view of the fact that the whole property is subject to litigation and hopefully a settlement with the Nova Scotia Power Corporation. He advised that if the Plan goes through as proposed the property would be classified, north of the CNR Track industrial, and south of the CNR Track as residential.

Mr. Franklin outlined the areas in question on an aerial photograph he had brought with him. The map was then circulated to all Council members.

Mr. Franklin advised that his company would like to see a reserved classification or a mixed use category on the property owned by his Company.

In response to questioning from Councillor MacDonald, Mr. Franklin advised that representatives from his Company did not attend any of the Public Participation Meetings.

Mr. Robert Fournier, resident of Timberlea: Mr. Fournier advised that he was a resident and land-owner in Timberlea as well as a member of the Public Participation Committee. He advised that many of the decisions made by the Committee and the Residents, reflect the Rural nature of the communities, which the residents presently enjoy and wish to maintain. Also, in regard to the minimum lot size in certain areas of the plan, of 80,000 sq. ft. with the potential of zoning down to 40,000 sq. ft.; this was also a decision of the PPC and Residents, due to the past history of health related problems in those communities. He advised that the Public Participation Committee Meetings were well advertised and held almost weekly, at which all residents were welcome to attend and at which these decisions were up-held. He advised that the meetings were an exercise in working democracy. He also advised that there was a complete lack of personal or monetary interest; in other words, the decisions made in the Plan, were made because it was felt they were for the betterment of the future of the communities, rather than because the people making those decisions had something to gain.

Mr. Fournier summed up his presentation, advising that the assistance of Ray MacGillivray and Stefan Fekner was invaluable and that the Plan was the resident's response to the Municipality's questions and the needs and wishes of the communities.

Mr. Conrad Marsh, Vice Chairman, PPC: Mr. Marsh endorsed the statements of Mr. Fournier with regard to the necessity for large lot sizes, advising that the Committee did not desire to regress now to the situation the Community has been in for so many years and fought so hard to eliminate. He advised that the Residents wanted to get the area cleaned up and to keep it that way; in order to maintain a higher health standard, it was felt that the community needed the larger lots. Another area of contention was the infilling of private roads; these would be those roads which are going to be serviced. The persons owning land on those private roads would be able to build on them and thus, be in a position to pay the frontage they will be billed for.

Mr. Marsh indicated that perhaps everyone is not completely satisfied with what has been brought forth in the documents; however, it is the best that could be presented to please the vast majority of persons involved.

Mr. Dan Campbell, resident of Greenwood Heights Subdivision: Mr. Campbell indicated the following three points which he felt were important to the Municipal Development Plan:

1. "Plan", the word plan itself, indicates controlled development, which will prohibit strip development such as that displayed along the Herring Cove Road, from occurring in Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea. Yet, the plan does permit for a commercial core area, where community members can meet, shop and socialize.

2. The Plan has addressed the individuality of the three communities which, although working together, still require their individual customs and concerns to be considered, thus, maintaining their separate identities;
3. The Plan has been well formulated by the PPC and Municipal Staff and satisfies the desires of the majority of persons possible.

Mrs. Helen Darrington, resident of Beechville: Mrs. Darrington advised that she had been attending all Public Participation Meetings since the beginning of the MDP process along with other members, Mr. & Mrs. Herman Cox, Ms. Jean Wright, Ms. Levina Harris, Mr. Ted Rutherford and her husband, Leslie Darrington. She advised that they have agreed with the plan but due to their proximity to the Industrial Park and due to industry already in Beechville, she felt they had special concerns, regarding truck routes, and non-conforming commercial businesses. She advised that the plan adequately addressed all these concerns and they were, therefore, very impressed with the plan and urged that Council support it.

Mr. Brian Jollymore, resident of Lakeside: Mr. Jollymore indicated that he was a member of the Public Participation Committee. He spoke at length in favour of the Plan reiterating some of the previous comments of other speakers. However, he directed a large percentage of his comments to the progress made in relation to planning for Mobile Home Housing which he felt was one of the stronger points in favour of the Plan. He advised that there has been difficulty in the past in situating a mobile home on one's own property; rather they have been forced to locate in Mobile Home Parks. The proposed MDP Plan for the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea area allows certain areas for persons to set up Mobile Homes on their own property.

Mr. Alan Ruffman, Ferguson's Cove: Mr. Ruffman advised that he did not live in the plan area but he had sat on the Planning Advisory Committee when the County first attempted to produce a Municipal Development Plan for the entire County. At various public hearings and public meetings, at that time, it had been made clear that in order to develop adequate plans, the areas in question had to be dealt with individually. He felt that the process the County has been involved in for the past several years, resulting in several MDP Plans including this one presented tonight, was the correct way to go about it. Mr. Ruffman was in support of the Plan but requested the following amendment to it: "designate lands in the area of Quarry Lake and Susie Lake as park or conservation lands."

Mr. Gary McFeeders, resident and homeowner in Greenwood Heights Subdivision, Timberlea: Mr. McFeeders advised that he was not a member of any Committee, although he did attend several meetings and followed the planning process which he found to be quite open and well attended. He advised that for all meetings he did not attend he had received notices and there was absolutely no attempt to hold meetings that were not public knowledge. He also advised that in speaking with citizens on his own street in the past several days, the desire was expressed that he also speak on their behalf in favour of the plan as they could not be in attendance tonight. He also advised that himself

and his neighbours were in favour of the large lot sizes due to the health problems encountered in the past. The citizens in the area felt that these health problems would either be eliminated or curtailed by the requirements of the plan.

Mr. Ray MacGillivray, Chairman of the PPC for the Communities of Beechville, Lakeside and Timberlea: Mr. MacGillivray read to Council a letter he had submitted to Mr. Kelly, Municipal Clerk. This letter went into detail indicating the Public Participation Committee's support for the draft Municipal Development Plan for Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea. The reasons for this support were identified as follows:

1. "The Planning process was clearly community based and hence, permitted as complete a "public participation process" as could be achieved;
2. A service boundary within which the community will expand on central sewer and water has been identified;
3. A series of commercial areas have been identified based on existing land uses and future opportunities. In particular, a larger commercial area has been identified in Timberlea which is intended to be the major commercial focus;
4. Existing commercial uses have been identified and encouraged to the extent that they will not negatively affect adjacent existing or future residential areas;
5. Low density residential areas are protected; however, ways and means of allowing higher density housing has been accomodated through permitting amendment to the Zoning By-Law;
6. Special provisions have been included in order to provide for mobile home development on single lots;
7. Industrial development has been encouraged to take place in the Lakeside Industrial Park and resource lands outside of the existing and proposed built up areas. Specific protection has been given to the community of Beechville in order to limit industrial encroachment;
8. A flood plain area along the Nine Mile River has been identified as well as a conservation area which includes a back-up water supply, being the lands of Halifax Public Service Commission;
9. Truck Routes have been identified and in particular, it is requested that the proposed four laning of the No. 3 Highway from Beechville to the intersection with Highway No. 103, not be undertaken. More particularly, the community would like to see the Department of Transportation complete a Transportation master plan for the area."

Mr. MacGillivray also indicated one item, which would require a minor change in the documents; the issue had arisen in the last two weeks and therefore was not included in the documents as presented.

"This item deals with subdivision and development on private roads which will be serviced with sewer and water. The Committee would like Council to make the necessary changes to permit those persons with lands on private roads to create subdivisions for infilling purposes where sewer and water services will become available."

Mr. MacGillivray then recognized the following PPC Members for the support given him in the past eighteen months, as follows:

1. Councillor Poirier
2. Colin Marsh
3. Mrs. Darrington
4. Mrs. Harris
5. Brian Jollymore
6. Ted Rutherford (Not Pres.)
7. Mrs. Kelson (Not Pres.)
8. Mrs. Joanne Delemare
9. Mr. Cox
10. Mrs. Cox
11. Jeannie Coates
12. Dan Campbell
13. Mr. Boyd
14. Mrs. Anita Boyd
15. Cathy Pelrine
16. Bob Fournier

Mr. MacGillivray also thanked Halifax County Planning Staff for their expertise and assistance in formulating the plan; in particular, Mr. Bill Campbell and also Mr. Stefan Fekner who would soon be leaving the employ of the County of Halifax.

Mrs. Joudrey and Mrs. Johnson, residents of Timberlea: Mrs. Joudrey advised that herself and Mrs. Johnson (who came forward with her), were residents on a private road in Timberlea closely situated to Mr. Jollymore's Auto Body Shop. She advised that they were speaking in favour of the Plan and in particular of the plan's intent to make Mr. Jollymore's Auto Body Shop a non-conforming use. Mrs. Joudrey related problems experienced by her family and that of Mrs. Johnson with respect to a build up of parked cars along the roadside in front of their homes and noise and odor pollution emanating from the Auto Body Shop. Mrs. Joudrey urged that Council approve making Mr. Jollimore's Shop non-conforming and explained that Mr. Jollimore would be coming forth later in the Public Hearing to request a special exemption from the zoning which would make him a nonconforming use.

In response to questioning from Council, Mr. Bill Campbell of the Planning Department advised that the Plan and Zoning By-Law do make the Auto Body Shop owned by Mr. Jollimore a non-conforming use. However, he advised that the Planners would like to deal with this issue later this evening.

This completed those arguments in favour of the Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Laws for Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION

Mr. Stewart McInnes, Solicitor, on behalf of Mr. K. Fitzgerald: Mr. McInnes advised he was a resident of Halifax and was speaking on behalf of Mr. Fitzgerald, a Developer in the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea area. He advised that Mr. Fitzgerald was in general support of the

Plan but that he was concerned with the large lot requirements for his own land at Rockwood Hills Subdivision, a Subdivision of approximately 170 acres on the north side of Fraser Lake, Timberlea. Mr. McInnes advised that Mr. Fitzgerald had been unaware of the impact of the plan on his lands until very recently, which is the reason he has not, todate, taken part in discussions of the plan. He advised that Mr. Fitzgerald purchased the lands in 1968, at which time he employed CBCL to do a subdivision lay-out. At that time, the requirement for a lot was approximately 15,000 sq. ft. and at the request of the Municipality, a few years later, he increased the lot sizes to approximately 20,000 sq. ft. It was anticipated that the best interests of the County and potential residents in the Subdivision would be served if the lots were made larger than that and, therefore, the last subdivision plan he has provided for County approval, indicates an average acreage of about 24,000 sq. ft., 4,000 over the required minimum health-standard limit.

Mr. McInnes advised that the first phase of Mr. Fitzgerald's Suidivision contemplated 60 lots and he has received tentative approval for the first phase; the first phase is about one-third of the total land area of 170 acres. Unfortunately, Mr. Fitzgerald has encountered some delay in receiving final approval because of access and highway requirements.

He further advised that the present proposal requires a minimum square footage of 80,000 sq. ft. per lot, which is four times the amount he was allowed to have in the last planning legislation for this area. Mr. McInnes indicated his understanding that this is the largest square footage minimum requirement for any area in the County of Halifax; more than what is required for a Service Station or any commercial operation. He advised that across the lake from the subdivision site, the sq. ftg. minimum is 40,000 sq. ft.

Mr. McInnes indicated that the result of such a large sq. ftg. requirement, is that Mr. Fitzgerald would have to sell his lots for a minimum of \$40,000 dollars to recover his investment. Todate, he has spent in excess of \$25,000 in engineering fees, having done those twice to comply with the request of the Municipality. He has spent \$70,000 to install a road and there are other services he must put in place. Approximately \$100,000 in total has been expended todate and if the 80,000 sq. ft. lot requirement is passed, then those expenditures are wasted.

It was therefore, the request of Mr. McInnes, on behalf of his client, Mr. Fitzgerald, that he be permitted to continue his development on lots of the Department of health standard size.

Mr. McInnes pointed out the land in question on a land use map, in the Council Chambers.

Councillor Toppie questioned Planning Staff as to the reasons for land across the Lake from Mr. Fitzgerald's Development being zoned to permit development of lots from 40,000 sq. ft. Mr. Campbell indicated he would prefer to address this item subsequent to completion of the Public hearing portion of the meeting. However, he advised that the land in question was outside the existing cigar-shaped community of Beechville-Lakesdie-Timberlea and there is no access to the sites.

Mr. Gary Jollimore, Jollimore's Auto Body: Mr. Jollimore advised that he was not opposed to the entire Municipal Development Plan for the communities of Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea, but that he was opposed to the proposed zoning of his land which would make his Auto Body Shop a non-conforming use, thus rendering his business closed in the event of a fire destroying in excess of 50% of his business or if he was taken ill for a period of more than six months. In answer to some of the problems with his business, he advised: "My garage was inspected by the Department of Manpower and Labour Safety Committee, and only three things were found to be wrong with it; there was no proper first aide kit on the premises, the wiring on the furnace was not fitting and a metal cabinet to contain the paint was needed. In regard to the blockage of the driveway, cars are only there for a short time subsequent to being moved upon request." He further advised that he had a petition signed by 120 residents in the immediate area, who are not opposed to his business. Mr. Jollimore also advised that he had no wish to expand his business and no room to do so, but that he only wanted to remain in business to the extent that he is now operating. He, therefore, requested the proper zoning to put him in a conforming status.

In response to questioning from Councillor Baker, Mr. Jollimore advised that he had been operating his business in that particular location for six years and in response to comments from Councillor Lichter, he advised that there were houses on the road when he located there six years ago; everything was the same as it exists at present.

Mr. Charles Conrad, Conrad's Auto Body Shop: Mr. Conrad advised that he was the owner of a small Auto Body Shop in Timberlea and he advised that he lives adjacent to people directly involved in the Public Participation Committee.

Mr. Conrad indicated that he was in favor of the overall plan, but that he was opposed to the zoning of his property to a non-conforming use. He indicated that he would have been in attendance at the PPC Meetings, had he been able to spare the time; however, he advised that his business takes too much of his time to attend such meetings. He spoke at length in support of his business and urged that Council reject the recommendation to zone it non-conforming.

Mr. Conrad, utilizing the land use map, indicated the location of his land, for Council's information.

During brief, heated, discussion, it was determined that Mr. Conrad's Auto Body Shop was dealt with by the PPC who wished to zone it to non-conforming due to problems experienced with noise and undesirable materials in use at the shop and also due to problems experienced with regard to Unsightly Premises, incorrect permits, etc.

This completed the presentations of Speakers in Opposition to the Plan.

Subsequent to the above, Council recessed for one-half hour.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF AND MOTIONS FROM COUNCIL

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

"THAT Municipal Council approve and adopt the Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Law and the changes to the Subdivision Regulations and Building By-Law as indicated in the April 5, 1982 memo from Mr. Keith Birch, Chief of Planning & Development, to the attention of Warden and Council, and inclusive of all pertinent council approved amendments addressing the submissions brought forward this evening."

(See Motions to Amend.)

Prior to any amendments being put on the floor, Councillor Poirier wished to extend to her fellow Councillors and the residents in the Council Chambers, the sense of achievement and pride she felt in having this MDP and Zoning By-Law dealt with this evening with so much Public Participation and involvement. She indicated that the Plan, as presented this evening, had attempted to accomodate the concerns of everyone. With respect to the few concerns with it, she expressed her hope that these concerns could be dealt with to everyone's satisfaction.

Councillor Poirier also indicated that, as the Public Participation Committee had chosen land belonging to herself, for the commercial core area, she felt it would be in order to exempt herself from the vote on the motion to approve or disapprove the Plan and Zoning By-Law. She also advised that this particular parcel of land had been chosen as it was in the very centre of the community.

Council AGREED to exempt Councillor Poirier from a vote on the motion to avoid any possible conflict of interest.

1. Submission from Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Public Participation Committee

The Committee requested that the Plan be amended to permit subdivision and development on private roads which will be receiving municipal sewer and water services. Mr. Campbell advised that this provision is similar to that proposed for the Eastern Passage area where sewer and water services were installed on certain private lanes. It is a reasonable request to permit the full use of land and municipal services. He advised that this amendment to the plan will permit an amendment to be made to the Zoning By-Law to identify the private lanes in question when the installation of central services is completed. Staff's recommendation:

"Approval".

It was amended by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor McInroy:

"THAT the MDP & Zoning By-Law be amended to permit subdivision and development on private roads which will be receiving municipal sewer and water services."
Amendment Carried.

Prior to the passing of the amendment, Councillor Lichter spoke briefly indicating his support for the amendment but advising that this plan and the plan proposed for Eastern Passage-Cow Bay has not addressed private roads which do not have municipal sewer and water services. He felt, that as indicated by Mr. Birch on previous occasions, the Plans should address this issue. He also advised that when planning is begun for Fringe and Rural areas, he will expect this issue to be addressed for private roads without sewer and water services.

2. Submission by Mr. Franklin of Franklin Services

Mr. Campbell advised that Mr. Franklin had indicated that the land of Franklin Services Limited is covered by I1 and R1 Zones. This is accurate and has been done for a specific reason; the land north of the rail line is zoned industrial due to its proximity to the Lakeside Industrial Park and the land south of the rail line has been zoned R1 in order to prevent further encroachment on the community. Mr. Franklin had requested that a holding zone or mixed use zone be extended to the the property in the vicinity of Middle Lake and Lovett Lake, (Lakeside Industrial Park.)

Staff recommend: "Rejection of this request."

It was AGREED by Council that the above request of Franklin Services Limited be rejected and that the motion not be amended to refelt any change in the documents.

3. Submission of Mr. Ruffman

Mr. Campbell advised that Mr. Ruffman had indicated the designation of conservation or parklands may be more of a regional planning consideration than one of immediate Municipal concern. In order to fully implement his request to designate lands in the area of Quarry Lake and Susie Lake as park or conservation lands, a request to amend the Regional Development Plan would have to be made. This particularly since the applicant suggested that the conservation zone be extended. This zone prohibits development, indicating that broad application would require subsequent purchase by a public authority. As Mr. Ruffman has recognized, the Plan could be amended in the future to identify parkland in this area, if population growth in the region warrants this action and if alterations to regional park policy are subsequently made.

The recommendation of Staff: "Rejection of Mr. Ruffman's request."

It was AGREED by Municipal Council that Mr. Ruffman's request be rejected and that the Plan and Zoning By-Law not be amended to reflect any change in this regard whatsoever.

4. Submission by Mr. McInnes on behalf of Mr. K. Fitzgerald

Mr. Campbell reiterated Mr. McInnes' request as follows: "To permit continued development on 20,000 square feet."

The recommendation of Staff: "Council is informed that the Public Participation Committee has upheld the large lot requirement in the Resource Designation throughout the process. If Council wishes to accomodate Mr. Fitzgerald's request to continue to develop at Department of Health standards, a reduction of lot sizes in the Zoning By-Law from 40,000 to 20,000 square feet would be required. It is recommended that the review process be retained in this area but that final lot sizes be determined by health standards, and that tentatively approved lots be zoned to 20,000 sq. ft."

Mr. Campbell further advised that as discussed in the Plan, the main concern is to retain the process of review of development which takes place on septic tanks. Therefore, the minimum requirements of the Department of Health are of primary importance for residential development. If the review process is successful, minimum health and other requirements based on environmental consideration would have to be met.

It was amended by Councillor Eisenhauer, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"THAT lot sizes in the total plan area remain at 80,000 retaining the review process, to allow the possibility to zone down to 20,000, subject to the conditions of the Departments of Environment and Health."

Amendment Carried.

It was amended by Councillor Lichter, seconded by Deputy Warden MacKay:

"THAT all tentatively approved lots be permitted to develop by the Department of Health standard size of 20,000."

Amendment Carried.

5. Submissions of Mr. Jollimore and Mr. Conrad

Mr. Campbell outlined the request of Mr. Jollimore and Mr. Conrad which was to amend the Zoning By-Law to remove non-conforming status of their respective Autobody and Autobody Repair Shops. He further advised that in general, commercial uses on Highway No. 3 are permitted to expand by contract. Mr. Conrad's shop was not included due to historical problems as voiced by the Public Participation Committee. However, limiting the use to its existing size and nature may allow it to be used without additional problems. In the case of Mr. Jollimore, Mr. Campbell indicated, that this use is not located on Highway No. 3. In general commercial uses away from the highway and in future and existing residential areas have not been given commercial zoning. However, as Mr. Jollimore's property is currently used to its fullest extent, and as Council was informed by Mrs. Joudrey, the primary concern is to stop the business expanding further, this use can be contained within the existing building. The recommendation of Staff:

"Council is informed that the non-conforming status was specifically recommended by the PPC. If Council wishes to fulfill the applicant's requests, and substantially adhere to the wishes of the Public Participation Committee, staff recommend that the two operations be deemed

permitted uses to the extent to which they presently exist. This would not permit expansion of the uses but would make them conforming uses."

It was amended by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor McInroy:

"THAT the two operations, Jollimore's Autobody and Conrad's Auto Repair Shop, be deemed permitted uses to the extent to which they presently exist; not to permit expansion of the uses but to make them conforming uses in the community."
(See Motion to Amend).

It was amended by Councillor Lichter, seconded by Councillor Smith:

"THAT the above Amendment also pertain to the other two existing Auto Body and Auto Repair Shops which staff have previously indicated are on the Greenhead Road."
Amendment Defeated.

Subsequently, the question was called on the previous amendment.

Amended by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor McInroy:

"THAT Jollimore's Auto Body Shop and Conrad's Auto Repair Shop, be deemed permitted uses to the extent to which they presently exist; not to permit expansion of the uses but to make them conforming uses in the community."
Amendment Carried.

Subsequently, the question was called on the original motion, as amended:

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

"THAT Municipal Council approve and adopt the Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Law and the changes to the Subdivision Regulations and Building By-Law, as indicated in the April 5, 1982 memo from Mr. Keith Birch, Chief of Planning & Development to the attention of Warden and Council, and inclusive of the above Council approved amendments."
Motion Carried.

Mr. Campbell also mentioned a matter about which citizens in the Gallery had questioned Councillor Poirier, during the break period; this was regarding a Recreation Trail on the Plan. He advised this was a concept only and is related to the development of a Recreation Master Plan which would involve further public input before anything further is done in the Community in this regard.

On behalf of Council, Warden Lawrence thanked all citizens in the Council Chambers, for attending the Hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Gaetz:

"THAT the Public Hearing to adopt the MDP and Zoning By-Law for the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea Area, adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, the Public Hearing adjourned at 10:35 P.M.

JOINT COUNCIL SESSION BETWEEN THE TOWN OF BEDFORD
AND HALIFAX COUNTY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

APRIL 15, 1982

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mayor Francene Cosman, Town of Bedford
Councillor Tolson, Town of Bedford
Deputy Mayor Roberts
David Lugar
Basko Loncarevic

SECRETARY: Mr. Dale Reinhardt

The Joint Session of Council was brought to order at 2:00 P.M. The purpose of the meeting was to attempt to decrease the School Board budget for 1982.

Subsequent to lengthy discussion of the proposed budget, the following motions were proposed and discussed:

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

"THAT the Councils of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the Town of Bedford agree to delete the excess cost as contained in the Halifax County-Bedford, District School Board budget."
Motion Defeated.

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

"THAT the Councils of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the Town of Bedford agree to delete \$2,000,000.00 of the excess costs as contained in the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board budget."

Motion Defeated.

It was moved by Councillor Wiseman, seconded by Deputy Mayor Roberts:

"THAT the Councils of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the Town of Bedford agree to delete \$1,500,000.00 of the excess costs as contained in the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board budget."

Motion Defeated.

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

"THAT the Councils of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the Town of Bedford reconsider the previous motion regarding the deletion of \$2,000,000.00 of the excess costs as contained in the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board budget."

Motion Defeated.

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

"THAT the Councils of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the Town of Bedford agree to delete \$1,800,000.00 of the excess costs as contained in the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board."

Motion Defeated.

It was moved by Councillor Walker:

"THAT the Special Joint Council Session of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the Town of Bedford adjourn"

Motion Defeated.

It was moved by Deputy Mayor Roberts, seconded by Deputy Warden MacKay:

"THAT the Councils of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the Town of Bedford agree to delete \$1,650,000.00 of the excess costs as contained in the budget of the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board."

Motion Defeated.

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

"THAT the Councils of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and the Town of Bedford agree to delete \$2,000,001.00 of the excess costs as contained in the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board."

Motion Defeated.

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

"THAT the meeting between the Councils of the Municipality of the County of Halifax and The Town of Bedford adjourn until Thursday, April 22nd, 1982 at 2:00 P.M."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, the Special Joint Session of Council adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

JOINT COUNCIL SESSION BETWEEN THE TOWN OF BEDFORD
AND HALIFAX COUNTY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

APRIL 22, 1982

Present Were: Municipality of the County of Halifax
Warden Lawrence, Chairman
Councillor Walker
Councillor Poirier
Councillor Baker
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor McInroy
Councillor Topple
Councillor Gaetz
Councillor Smith
Councillor MacKenzie
Councillor McCabe
Councillor Lichter
Councillor Benjamin
Councillor Margeson
Deputy Warden MacKay
Councillor MacDonald
Councillor Wiseman

Town of Bedford
Mayor Cosman
Deputy Mayor Roberts
Councillor Lugar
Councillor Legree

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer, County
of Halifax
Mr. D. English, Chief Administrative Officer, Town of
Bedford
Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. Ken Wilson, Director of Finance
Mr. L. Gillis, Chief Executive Officer, District School
Board

SECRETARY: Virginia Veinot

Warden Lawrence brought the Council Session to order at 2:05 P.M.

DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET

Warden Lawrence advised that the purpose of the meeting between the two Councils was to reach an agreement on the amount of unrecognized costs to be cut from the School Board Budget. She pointed out that the

agreement between the two Councils stated that 80 percent of those in attendance at the meeting had to be in favour of a motion before it could be approved.

Mr. Gillis, Chief Executive Officer of the District School Board, advised that the Board was prepared to live with a cut of approximately 1.2 million dollars and he proceeded to outline possible areas that could be affected by such a reduction in the budget. Some of the areas that would receive reductions would be pupil transportation - special trips, pupil/teacher ratio, special education classes, music - instrumental program and evening recreation programs.

After considerable discussion on these types of cutbacks, it was moved by Councillor McCabe, seconded by Councillor Lugar:

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 1.2 million dollars."

This motion was defeated with 13 in favour and 7 opposed.

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

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 1.75 million dollars."

This motion was defeated with 13 in favour and 5 opposed.

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

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 2 million dollars."

This motion was defeated with 11 in favour and 9 opposed.

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

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 1.5 million dollars."

This motion was defeated with 9 in favour and 11 opposed.

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

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 1.8 million dollars."

This motion was defeated with 15 in favour and 5 opposed.

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

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 1.65 million dollars."

This motion was tied with 10 in favour and 10 opposed.

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

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 1.72 million dollars."

This motion was tied with 10 in favour and 10 opposed.

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

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 1.7 million dollars."

This motion was defeated with 14 in favour and 6 opposed.

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

"THAT the unrecognized costs of the District School Board Budget be reduced by 1,800,001. million dollars."
Motion Carried.

There were 16 in favour and 4 opposed to the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

April Council Session 1982

I N D E X

Affirmative Action Program -----	24
Capital Grants -----	24-25
Chief Building Inspector's Report -----	26
Committee Structure and Council Salaries - report -----	35-40
Dolphin Property - sale -----	27
Derelict Vehicle Program -----	47-48
Education Act - Amendments -----	17
Enumerators Fees -----	49-50
F.C.M. Conference - Council Delegates -----	50-51
Garbage Collection - Common Area Rate -----	30-32 & 40-42
Halifax - Dartmouth Post Commission - Letter -----	3
Halifax County - Bedford District School Board - report --	5
Halifax County Industrial Commission - Representation ----	28-30
Inmate Volunteer Work Program -----	49
Liquor Control Act - Letter -----	16
Lakeside, Black Point Fire Department - Union Contract ---	23-24
Lake Eagle Drive -----	48
Motion-Appointment of Recording Secretary -----	1 & 34
Motion-Approval of Minutes -----	2
Motion-Municipal Development Plan Committee Report-----	2
Motion-Letter re Tourist Associations -----	3
Motion-Letter re Halifax-Dartmouth Post Commission -----	3
Motion-Halifax County-Bedford District School Board Report	5
Motion-Report re Taxation of Recreational and/or Community Facilities -----	5-8
Motion-Transit Costs, Herring Cove -----	8-10
Motion-Per Capita Grant re Transit -----	10
Motion-Transit Advisory Committee -----	10
Motion-Water Supply Policy -----	10-11
Motion-Staff Vacations and Holidays -----	11-14
Motion-Meeting re Nova Scotia Fire Fighters School -----	14-15
Motion-Draft Submission re Volunteer Fire Services -----	15
Motion-Letter re Liquor Control Act -----	16
Motion-Amendments re Education Act -----	17
Motion-Parkland -----	18
Motion-Suburban Paving Program -----	18-19
Motion-Mileage Rates -----	19
Motion-Approval of Rezoning Application #16-81 -----	20-21
Motion-Approval of REzoning Application #1-82 -----	21-23
Motion-Sackville Fire Department Union Contract -----	23

Motion-Lakeside, Black Point Fire Department Union Contract -----	23-24
Motion-Affirmative Action Program -----	24
Motion-Capital Grants -----	24-25
Motion-Radio Communication System -----	25
Motion-Relocation of R.C.M.P. Detachment -----	25-26
Motion-Chief Building Inspector's Report -----	26
Motion-Sale re Dolphin Property -----	27
Motion-Appointment of Returning Officer -----	27-28
Motion-Representation re Halifax County Industrial Commission -----	28-30
Motion-Common Area Rates for Garbage Collection -----	30-32 & 40-42
Motion-Study re Water & Sewer Services Harrietsfield -----	32
Motion-Letter of Congratulations re Councillor Margeson --	32-33
Motion-Adjournment -----	33 & 53
Motion-Report re Committee Structure and Council Salaries-	35-40
Motion-Provincial Operating Grants -----	42
Motion-School Area Rates -----	44-45
Motion-Rocky Lake Quarry Operation -----	45
Motion-Public Hearing re Undersized Lots -----	46-47
Motion-Derelict Vehicle Program -----	47-48
Motion-Lake Eagle Drive -----	48
Motion-Inmate Volunteer Work Program -----	49
Motion-Enumerators Fees -----	49-50
Motion-Sidewalk Construction Agreement -----	50
Motion-Council Delegates re FCM Conference -----	50-51
Motion-Resignation of Warden -----	53
Motion-Election Procedure for Warden -----	53
Nova Scotia Fire Fighters School - Meeting -----	14-15
Parkland -----	18
Provincial Operating Grants -----	42
Recording Secretary - appointment -----	1 & 34
Rezoning Application #16-81 - Approval -----	20-21
Rezoning Application #1-82 - Approval -----	21-23
Radio Communication System -----	25
R.C.M.P. Detachment - Relocation -----	25-26
Returning Officer - Appointment -----	27-28
Rocky Lake Quarry Operation -----	45
Staff Vacations and Holidays -----	11-14
Suburban Paving Program -----	18-19
Sackville Fire Department - Union Contract -----	23
School Area Rates -----	44-45
Sidewalk Construction Agreement -----	50

Tourist Associations - Letters -----	3
Taxation of Recreational and/or Community Facilities - Report -----	5-8
Transit Costs - Herring Cove -----	8-10
Transit - Per Capita Grant -----	10
Transit Advisory Committee -----	10
Undersized Lots - Public Hearing -----	46-47
Volunteer Fire Services - Draft Submission -----	15
Water Supply Policy -----	10-11
Water & Sewer Services - Study re Harrietsfield -----	32
Warden - Resignation -----	53
Warden - Election Procedure -----	53