

However, Mr. Baker spoke at length in opposition to a lay-off of Staff as this would seriously affect the Geriatric Program, which required much staffing and the Mentally Retarded Residents who required constant care and supervision.

He advised that to lay-off staff would put the lives of patients in danger. He also indicated that even with the Staff the facility now has, there have been some unavoidable deaths, although there was no fault found with Staff for any of these deaths.

Mr. Baker encouraged Council to render a decision on this matter at tonight's Council Session. He advised that if a reduction in Staff was necessary, then Staff lay-offs would have to be on a seniority basis. Those Staff members, he advised, could wind up on unemployment or even Social Assistance at some point in the future.

Councillor Mont requested clarification of exactly where the residents (patients) come from. He was advised by Mr. Baker that they come from:

1. City of Halifax	55
2. County of Halifax	29
3. City of Dartmouth	27
4. Colchester County	8
5. Cumberland County	10
6. Lunenburg County	10
7. Other Towns & Municipalities	40

He indicated that the larger patient caseload is from the City of Halifax.

Based on the above information and the proposals presented by Mr. Baker and Mr. Richards, Councillor Mont felt that rather than lay-off staff members, decreasing the care to the patients, the other Municipalities should be billed for the care to their patients.

Councillor Poirier advised that Mr. Richards had a letter from the Provincial Department of Social Services advising that this is what the Municipality should do. She read this letter to Council.

However, Mr. Wilson advised, that while the Municipality could very well bill these other Municipalities for their patients, he felt there would be a difficulty in collecting the money and questioned what would be done with the patients in the meantime.

Mr. Meech advised that from researching the Homes for Special Care Act, he found the Municipality has the ability to charge a per diem rate to other Municipalities. However, he advised this would be playing into the hands of the Province who will continue to decrease funding expecting Municipalities to raise the necessary funds themselves.

Mr. Meech further indicated his opinion that the Municipality had a clear cut case to go back to the Province, requesting that they take over 100% of the cost of the facility. He advised that he has reviewed a copy of the Order in Council in 1976-77 when the facility was taken

over by the Social Services Department from the Department of Health. He advised that this Order makes no mention of "approved" costs but refers to operating and capital costs of the facility. He advised that prior to making any staff cut-backs at the facility, the Municipality should persue this committment from the Province.

He advised that this move was made by the Province in '76-77 because it was felt that they could get more money from the Department of Social Services than they could from the Department of Health.

He cautioned against levying a surcharge because he felt there would be difficulty in collecting this money even if court action were taken.

Councillor Mont advised that the Municipality should be looking at making a strong presentation to the Province to operate this facility, giving them total responsibility for it, especially if they felt they could operate it adequately with a 6% increase.

Councillor Wiseman was in agreement with this suggestion.

Councillor Poirier spoke in opposition to any staff lay-offs due to the subsequent suffering by the patients. However, she did not see how any of the recommendations could be supported, as no Municipality in Nova Scotia would agree to pay this surcharge. She also was in agreement with Councillor Mont's suggestion that the facility be turned over to the Province.

Councillor McInroy also spoke on this issue advising that he did not agree with the levying of a surcharge. He felt that if the Provincial Government had accepted 100% responsibility for the operating and capital costs of the facility, they should pay that amount and not be putting a limit on what 100% is. He advised that if a surcharge was levied at all, then it should be the Province who administers such a levy and not the Municipality. He advised that the Municipality is presently managing the facility on behalf of the Province. If then, the Province wants to decrease the level of service and the Municipality is not in agreement with this decrease, then the Municipality should no longer manage the facility.

Subsequent to further discussion:

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

"THAT Halifax County Council appoint a committee to meet with the Minister of the Department of Social Services and the Premier to request them to either increase the funding to cover the projected deficit at the Halifax County Rehabilitation Centre for the 1983-84 fiscal year or to takeover the facility."

Motion Carried.

It was agreed by Council that this Committee should make it perfectly clear to the Minister and the Premier that the Municipality is not willing to continue the management of the Halifax County Rehabilitation Centre without the proper funding. It was felt that it was grossly

unfair to cut back the programs and service to the people who reside in the facility at the present time, especially since these people lead a fairly simple life now.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Oceanview Manor

Mr. John Morrison of Oceanview Manor came forward at this time to present budget information relative to the Special Care facility.

Mr. Morrison advised that Oceanview Manor was also the best facility of its kind in the Province of Nova Scotia and quite possibly East of Ontario, due to the financial support from the County of Halifax.

He distributed to Council a brief statement of expenditures and revenue for the facility which forecasted a deficit of approximately \$223,597 for 1983.

However, he pointed out that there were many variables which could change this deficit. They were:

1. If there is less than 97 percent bed occupancy each day.
2. If there is more than 97 percent bed occupancy every day or some days.
3. If the rate of \$56.82 per day was charged.
4. If staff were laid off and the level of care to residents was lowered.
5. If the Government comes up with more money.
6. Other.

Mr. Morrison explained that the administrators of Oceanview Manor are primarily concerned with the quality of care to the residents of the Manor. He advised that once staff are laid off, the quality of care goes down.

Subsequent to discussion with Mr. Morrison:

It was moved by Deputy Warden Margeson, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"THAT the Chairman of the Board of Management of Oceanview Manor, Councillor Walker, be included in the delegation to meet with the Minister and the Premier of Nova Scotia."

Councillor DeRoche suggested that the above motion be tabled until following discussion by Mr. Ed Mason, relative to the Social Services Budget.

It was agreed by Council that the above motion be tabled pending the discussion with Mr. Ed Mason relative to the Social Services Budget.

Social Services Budget

Mr. Ed Mason and Mr. MacNeil came forward to make their presentation to Council regarding the Social Services budget.

Mr. Mason had distributed to Council a memo and attached sheet containing financial information. He read this memo to Council, as follows:

"The Social Services Budget for 1983 has been the cause of concern for months. This concern has been related to the Provincial Department of Social Services' inability to cost share what had been projected; namely, a 6% increase over our actual costs in 1982. This could have meant an expenditure in the range of \$400,000 that would not have been shareable and would have been a total Municipal responsibility.

Recently, (January 28, 1983) encouraging communication has been received by Warden MacKenzie from the Minister of Social Services, the Honourable Edmund Morris, outlining additional efforts his Department would be making to help Municipalities meet their legislative responsibilities of maintaining persons in need. Since receiving this very recent correspondence, we have spoken with senior officials (including the Deputy Minister) within the Provincial Department of Social Services, and have been reassured that in 1983 our expenditures will be shared. This development will mean that the net cost of Social Services Program in 1983 ...will be reduced by approximately \$234,000.

While this unexpected development is encouraging, we must advise ... that restraint will continue to be necessary if the Department is to live within the projected 6% budget. Specifically, a control over the issuance of items of special requirement will still be essential. Additionally, Council must address the matter of per diem rates in Homes for Special Care that exceed the 6% level. We have already received advisement from six Homes for Special Care indicating their rates must go beyond the 6% guidelines. We have responded to these Homes indicating that the Municipality may not be in a position to honour rates that are not fully shared. To honour rates that are not completely shared would mean an additional expenditure in the range of \$100,000 that would be a total Municipal responsibility.

While the outlook for the 1983 year, in terms of our Social Services operation has improved dramatically with the recent correspondence from the Minister of Social Services, concerns within the Municipal administrative structure have not been completely satisfied; and it might be advisable for Council and Staff to address these concerns to the Minister of Social Services in whatever manner deemed appropriate."

In addition to the above information, Mr. Ken Wilson, came forward and provided Council with further financial information. He advised that the Provincial Government will share in whatever the costs are for January, February and March of 1983. Then they will take June 30th, 1982 approved amounts which is about \$450,000 less than the actuals for total 1982 and they will share in that dollar amount from April 1, 1983 until March 31, 1984. The Provincial Government also advises the Municipality to file its claims on the normal basis and they will pay those claims until that amount of money, (they have provided a global amount for their fiscal year) runs out. Therefore, if the claims equal the amount that they have set for global funding, are filed and the Municipality receives that money in 1983 for nine months, that would mean that in January, February and March 1984 they would pay no amount at all towards those claims.

He advised that basically what has to happen from an accounting standpoint is only 75% of that global funding should be considered in 1983 plus whatever they are going to pay in January, February and March 1983. The other 25% of their global funding would have to be deferred, no matter when they pay the Municipality, until January, February and March 1984.

Mr. Mason felt this would make the situation very rough in March of 1984. He felt that this concern should be expressed to the Minister of the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Meech advised that as a result of the Province's decision what they have really done is to delay the inevitable. They are, he advised just changing the format by giving the approved budget on the basis of their fiscal year. He indicated how this benefited the Municipality; in the year 1983 the Municipality will be able to get cost sharing for all its projected costs, with exception of Homes For Special Care. If the Homes for Special Care increase their per diem over and above 6%, the Municipality will be obligated to pay it, as the Province will not share in that increase.

He clarified that in 1983 the Municipality's budget will be cost shared. However, in 1984, the Municipality will be back in the same situation, if by March there are no dollars left in the approved budget; then the total amount expended in the month of March will be a total Municipal responsibility.

However, Mr. Meech expressed the hope that if this should happen, sufficient pressure will be put on the Province, so that they will find some other means to satisfy the need relative to increased costs in Social Services.

Subsequent to lengthy discussion, Council determined that the Municipality did not have as pressing an issue with the general assistance aspect of Social Services as they had with regard to the Rehabilitation Centre and Oceanview Manor. It was felt by some, that if by the end of year, the situation worsens with regard to general assistance, then the Municipality could press for more cost-sharing.

Council also discussed with Mr. Mason employment programs, such as the NEED Program.

Councillor Walker suggested using Social Assistance money for make-work programs rather than have people sitting home receiving Social Assistance which is demoralizing to most able-bodied people.

Mr. Mason indicated his opinion that perhaps this should be considered. However, Mr. Meech advised, that this question has been raised in the past. Although he would agree with the concept, he indicated that the rules and regulations, both of the Province and the Canada Assistance Plan, will not permit it. It is not possible to allocate funds from the Social Services budget for a make-work program.

IN-CAMERA DISCUSSION

Subsequent to further discussion regarding the general assistance budget, the following motion was made:

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

"THAT Council go In-Camera to further discuss the situation relative to Oceanview Manor."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, Council held In-Camera discussion relative to Oceanview Manor for some 30 minutes.

It was then agreed to Come Out-Of-Camera.

At this time, the motion, moved by Deputy Warden Margeson, seconded by Councillor Adams previously, relative to including Councillor Walker in the delegation to meet with the Minister of Social Services and the Premier of Nova Scotia, was withdrawn and the following resolution was put on the floor in its stead.

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

"THAT the members of the delegation to meet with the Minister of Social Services and the Premier of Nova Scotia, regarding the Halifax County Rehabilitation Centre and the General Assistance Budget, be Warden MacKenzie, Councillor Poirier, Councillor Mont and Mr. Ken Meech, Chief Administrative Officer."
Motion Carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT the Special Session of Council adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, there being no further business, the Special Council Session adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING

FEBRUARY 14, 1983

PRESENT WERE: Warden MacKenzie, Chairman
Deputy Warden Margeson
Councillor Poirier
Councillor Larsen
Councillor Gaudet
Councillor Baker
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor DeRoche
Councillor Gaetz
Councillor Bayers
Councillor Reid
Councillor Lichter
Councillor MacKay
Councillor Eisenhower
Councillor MacDonald
Councillor Wiseman
Councillor Mont

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. Bob Gough, Director of Development
Mr. Mike Hanusiak, Staff Planner

SECRETARY: Christine E. Simmons

OPENING OF PUBLIC HEARING - THE LORD'S PRAYER

Warden MacKenzie brought the Public Hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. with The Lord's Prayer.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the Roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Warden MacKenzie advised Council that minutes of February 1, 1983 Regular Council Session had been circulated to all Councillors via their mailboxes. He requested that Councillors take the opportunity to read these minutes so that they may be approved at tomorrow evening's Council Session.

PUBLIC HEARING

Warden MacKenzie outlined to those present in the Council Chambers, the procedure to be followed for the Public Hearing.

Rezoning Application No. RA-SA-21-82-20Staff Report

Mr. Gough advised that Rezoning Request No. SA-21-82-20, submitted by the Nova Scotia Housing Commission was a request to rezone Lots MT-1-B, MT-1-C, MT-1-D and MT-1-E, Phase 9 Sackville Development, located on Smokey Drive Lower Sackville, District 20, From R-4 (Multi-Unit Dwelling) Zone to R-1 (Single-Unit Dwelling) Zone.

Mr. Gough also advised that this rezoning request had been duly advertised, as per the provisions of the Planning Act and no correspondence had been received, either in favour or in opposition to the request.

Mr. Gough proceeded to outline the Staff Report providing a description of the Lot and Surrounding Area. (Please refer to Report for Detail). Mr. Gough also utilized an overhead projected map to more clearly identify the area.

He further advised that the stated purpose of the request of the applicant, Nova Scotia Housing Commission, is to allow the lots to be developed for single family housing.

The Staff Report noted that prior to the adoption of the Zoning By-Law for Sackville, the properties in question were zone R-4 (Residential General) Zone under the Municipality's zoning By-Law No. 24. Under the designation, single family units were permitted. In speaking with Staff of the N.S.H.C., it was learned that the intention has always been to maintain the ability to develop either single family or multi-family units on the properties. However, at the time the new zoning By-Law was being adopted they did not realize that the new R-4 zoning would not permit single family dwelling units. Thus the need for the rezoning.

It was the recommendation of the Planning and Development Department that the proposed rezoning be approved for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rezoning is in conformity with Council's desire to give priority to single family dwelling units within the Urban Residential Designation. This desire is clearly expressed in policy P-30 of the M.D.P.
2. The proposed rezoning is in conformity with all applicable criteria outlined in policy P-104.
3. Under the present R-4 zoning each of the subject properties is eligible for a three-unit dwelling. In light of the fact that staff feel a series of triplexes would be appropriate for the Smokey Drive Area, the proposed rezoning is seen as promoting a more harmonious development strategy.

Questions From Council

None.

Speakers in Favour

None.

Speakers in Opposition

None.

Motion From Council

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

"THAT Rezoning of Lots MT-1B, MT-1-C, MT-1-D, and MT-1-E, Phase 9, Sackville Development, Located on Smokey Drive at Sackville, from R-4 (Multi-Unit Dwelling) Zone to R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone be approved by County Council."
Motion Carried.

Rezoning Application RA-TLB-20-82-02

Mr. Gough advised that Rezoning Application No. RA-TLB-20-82-02, submitted by Mr. & Mrs. Gordon Fudge, was a request to rezone Lot G7 of the Robert Fournier Subdivision located on Highway No. 3. at Timberlea, District 02 from R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone to R-3 (Mobile Dwelling) Zone.

Mr. Gough advised that this application had also been advertised as per the provisions of the Planning Act and that no correspondence had been received either in favour or in opposition to the request.

He advised that the stated intent of the applicants, Mr. & Mrs. Gordon Fudge, was to enable them to keep their mobile home on this lot as a permanent use.

Mr. Gough advised that the property in question was purchased by the Fudges in the early fall of 1982. At that time, their intention was to locate a mobile home on the site as a temporary construction use while their new home was being built. However, their plans have now changed to a point where they would like to locate the mobile home on a permanent basis. Thus, rather than sell the property in favour of a site with an existing R-3 zoning, they have opted to seek a rezoning.

Mr. Gough proceeded to outline the portion of the Report which gave a description of the site and the surrounding area, (please refer to the Staff Report). In addition to the information on the Report, Mr. Gough utilized an overhead projected map to more clearly identify the surrounding area.

In view of the fact that a Municipal Development Plan is in effect in the communities of Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea, Mr. Gough advised that the avenue by which Council may entertain and approve the requested rezoning is set forth in the MDP, as follows:

"...rezonings for single mobile homes in the Residential Designation will be permitted." (p. 31). In this regard, Policy P-20 of the Plan states, "Notwithstanding Policy P-13, it shall be the intention of Council, to require an amendment to the zoning by-law for any mobile home subdivision or single mobile home in the Residential Designation."

The Staff Report continued, advising, "In order to ensure that a proposed rezoning will in no way jeopardize either the spirit of the Municipal Development Plan or the quality of life in the planned area, Council has directed that all rezoning applications have regard to those considerations outlined under policy P-89 of the Plan."

It was the recommendation of the Department of Planning & Development that this application be approved, based on the following considerations:

1. The proposed rezoning is in conformity with the intent of the Plan as required under section (i) of the Policy P-89.
2. The site on which the mobile is to be located is suitable in terms of its size, grade and ability to accommodate an on-site septic system. This is an essential point for consideration as directed by section (iv) of Policy P-89.
3. In light of the fact that there is only one single family dwelling unit in the immediate vicinity of the subject property, the proposed rezoning is not anticipated to create an incompatible land use situation with the remainder of the R-1 Zone.

This completed the Report of the Department of Planning & Development.

Questions From Council

Councillor MacKay questioned whether, if at some time in the future, Mr. & Mrs. Fudge wished to construct a single family dwelling on this lot, could this be accomplished under an R-3 Zone without the necessity of having another application.

Mr. Gough indicated that this would be possible; however, Councillor MacKay indicated a previous, similar experience which occurred in Sackville whereby another Hearing was necessitated. Mr. Gough advised the Councillor that this would have been prior to the implementation of the Municipal Development Plan in Sackville.

There were no further questions from Council for Staff.

Speakers in Favour

None.

Speakers in Opposition

None.

Motion From Council

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

"THAT the Rezoning of Lot G7 of the Robert Fournier Subdivision located on Highway No. 3, at Timberlea, From R-1 Single Unit Dwelling) Zone to R-3 (Mobile Dwelling Zone, be approved by County Council."

Motion Carried.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Public Hearing adjourned at 7:16 P.M.

I N D E X

Arsenic Filter Units -----11
Aerotech Business Park - Land Expropriation -----16 - 17

Blasting By-Law -----7 - 8 & 27 - 28

Capital Grant -----12 & 28 - 30
Chief Building Inspector's Report -----31

Dartmouth General Hospital - Meeting -----11
Director of Development Report -----27
Deed Transfer Tax By-Law -----28

Halifax County-Bedford District School Board Meeting-15

Institute of Public Affairs Seminar -----31 - 32

Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary -----1 & 14
Motion - Approval of Minutes -----1 - 2 & 15
Motion - Letters & Correspondence -----2 & 15
Motion - Power Increase -----2
Motion - Meeting re South Shore Tourism Association -3
Motion - Appointment of Municipal Building Board
 Members -----3 - 4
Motion - Planning Advisory Committee Report -----4 & 18
Motion - Municipal Development Plan Process -----4 - 7
Motion - Public Land Donation -----7
Motion - Policy Committee Report -----7 & 27
Motion - Blasting By-Law -----7 - 8 & 27 - 28
Motion - Urban Services Committee report -----8
Motion - Urban Services Sub-Committee -----8 - 9
Motion - Pedestrian Crosswalk -----9 - 10 & 32 - 33
Motion - Meeting re Dartmouth General Hospital -----11
Motion - Arsenic Filter Units -----11
Motion - Speed Limit Reduction -----11
Motion - Capital Grant -----12 & 28 - 30
Motion - Adjournment -----13 & 35
Motion - Meeting re Halifax County-Bedford District
 School Board -----15
Motion - Meeting re Waverley Ratepayers Association
 Representative -----16
Motion - Aerotech Business Park, Land Expropriation -16 - 17
Motion - PUD Application -----18 - 23
Motion - Expanding the MDP Program -----23 - 25
Motion - Access to Lands West of the Beaverbank
 Connector -----25 - 26
Motion - Public Hearing -----27
Motion - Director of Development Report -----27
Motion - Deed Transfer Tax By-Law -----28
Motion - Metropolitan Authority -----30 - 31
Motion - Chief Building Inspector Report -----31
Motion - Institute of Public Affairs Seminar -----31 - 32

Index
February Council Session
Page 2

Motion - Taxation re Recreation and/or Community Facilities -----	33 - 34
Motion - Thanks re Recreation Department -----	34
Motion - Titles of Senior Officials -----	34
Motion - Transit Shelters -----	34
Power Increase -----	2
Planning Advisory Committee Report -----	4 & 18
Public Land Donation -----	7
Policy Committee Report -----	7 & 27
Pedestrian Crosswalk -----	9 - 10 & 32 - 33
PUD Application -----	18 - 23
Public Hearing -----	27
Recreational Community Use Facilities - Taxation -----	33 - 34
South Shore Tourism Association - Meeting -----	3
Speed Limit Reduction -----	11
Transit Shelters -----	34
Urban Services Committee Report -----	8
Urban Services Sub-Committee -----	8 - 9
Waverley Ratepayers Association - Meeting re Representative -----	16

REGULAR COUNCIL SESSION

FEBRUARY 1, 1983

PRESENT WERE: Warden MacKenzie, Chairman
Deputy Warden Margeson
Councillor Walker
Councillor Poirier
Councillor Larsen
Councillor Gaudet
Councillor Baker
Councillor DeRoche
Councillor Adams
Councillor Gaetz
Councillor Reid
Councillor Lichter
Councillor Snow
Councillor MacKay
Councillor McInroy
Councillor Eisenhauer
Councillor MacDonald
Councillor Wiseman
Councillor Mont

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. Keith Birch, Chief of Planning & Development
Ms. Valerie Spencer, Supervisor, Planning - Policy
Division

SECRETARY: Christine E. Simmons

OPENING OF COUNCIL - THE LORD'S PRAYER

Warden MacKenzie brought the Council Session to order at 6:00 P.M. with The Lord's Prayer.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the Roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

"THAT the Minutes of the January 17, 1983 Public Hearing be approved."
Motion Carried.

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

"THAT the Minutes of the January 18, 1983 Regular Council Session be approved as amended."
Motion Carried.

LETTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

It was moved by Councillor Snow, seconded by Councillor Mont:

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

Letter From City of Sydney

A letter had been received from the City of Sydney in regard to the increase in Power Rates. This letter advised that at the regular meeting of Sydney City Council, January 13, 1983, a resolution protesting the increase in power rates had been adopted as this increase was not in line with the Government's stand on increase guidelines of 6 and 5 percent for the next two years.

The City of Sydney Council felt that this increase would place hardship on the unemployed, those on fixed income, and people on low income and would further be a burden on municipal welfare which would be passed on to the taxpayer.

This letter requested that Halifax County Municipal Council endorse this resolution.

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

"THAT Halifax County Council strongly protest the 32 percent increase approved by the Public Utilities Board and demand Premier Buchanan and the Cabinet reduce the power rate increase to 6 per cent in 1983 and 5 per cent in 1984, in line with Provincial and Federal Guidelines."
Motion Carried.

The above motion was carried subsequent to discussion in which the following Councillors indicated their opposition to it:

Councillor McInroy - Councillor Mont - Councillor Wiseman. These Councillors were opposed to the motion based on the fact that the Power Corporation is not in the business of making money but to provide power to the Province; it was felt that if the rates had to be raised in order to break even then there was little that could be done about it. Councillor McInroy felt that the only action which could be taken in this regard would be to find a less expensive method of supplying power to the Province.

Letter From the Nova Scotia Power Corporation

A letter had been received from the Nova Scotia Power Corporation in acknowledgement of the Municipality's letter of January 19, 1983 regarding overvoltage protection devices.

This letter was for information only.

Letter From the South Shore Tourism Association

A letter had been received from Margaret Campbell, Executive Director of the South Shore Tourism Association requesting time on the Council Agenda, to report on the activities of the South Shore Tourism Association, in the near future.

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

"THAT an invitation be extended to Margaret Campbell of the South Shore Tourism Association to attend the February 15th, 1983 Regular Council Session in order to report to council on the activities of the Association."
Motion Carried.

Letter From Reverend Kenneth Vaughan

A letter had been received from Reverend Kenneth Vaughan in support of Council's reaction to a motion placed on the floor at the January 18th Council Session which would have ensured that senior citizens would go to Ocean View Manor, regardless of their desire to locate in any other facility. This motion had been submitted by Councillor Deveaux who was concerned about the projected deficit at Ocean View Manor should there continue to be empty beds at the Manor.

This letter was for Council's information only.

APPOINTMENT OF MUNICIPAL BUILDING BOARD MEMBERS

A letter from Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor was included in the agenda; this letter related the terms of reference of the Municipal Board Members, advising that it was time to reappoint the existing members, Messrs. Harrigan - Chairman, Dillman and Holman, or to appoint new members.

However, he advised that the existing Board Members have provided exemplary service to their appointed positions and are all very worthy appointees to the Board. He indicated in his letter that all Council who have appeared before the Board have expressed a complete satisfaction with the way the members conducted the Hearings and rendered their decision.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Margeson, seconded by Councillor Baker:

"THAT the three existing members of the Municipal Building Board be reappointed for a one-year term, pending verification of their places of residence." Motion Carried.

The issue was temporarily deferred so that staff could verify the residency of each of the three members; in particular the residency of Mr. Dillman was questioned as it had been questioned at the Planning Advisory Committee meeting. However, subsequent to Staff's investigation during the Council Session, it was verified that Mr. Dillman and all other members of the Board were residents of Halifax County.

Therefore, the above motion was passed.

REPORT OF THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

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

1983 Municipal Development Plan Process

Ms. Valerie Spencer, Supervisor of the Planning Policy Division joined Council at this time to outline the proposed 1983 MDP Process.

Attached to the Planning Advisory Committee Report was a comprehensive discussion paper regarding the 1983 MDP process. The purpose of this paper was to recap the Municipality's MDP process to date and to outline some considerations for the next step.

The Discussion Paper outlined the three stages of the MDP process as follows:

Stage 1	Priority 1	Plan Area A	Sackville
		Plan Area B	Cole Harbour-Westphal
		Plan Area C	Eastern Passage-Cow Bay
		Plan Area D	Timberlea-Lakeside-Beechville
Stage 2	Priority 2	Districts 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18, 19	
Stage 3	Priority 3	Districts 10, 11, 12, 13	

Note: All of Stage 1 has been completed as well as a plan for North Preston, Lake Major, Lake Loon-Cherry Brook and East Preston area.

Ms. Spencer advised that the decision to include certain districts in each of stages 2 and 3 was based upon two factors - the districts included in stage 1 and the work which had recently been completed by the Special Rural Task Force.

Ms. Spencer reviewed the Discussion paper in detail and recommended that Districts 5, 18, 19, 15 and 14 be the first of the stage 2 areas to be planned as the most coverage can be gained in the least amount of time by proceeding with these areas and that they represent a major portion of the Municipality's developing area.

The recommendation of the Planning Advisory Committee was that the next stage of Municipal Development Plans include districts 14 (as one area) 18, 19 and 15 (as one area) and District 5 (as one area).

The PAC Report continued, advising:

"It was understood by the Committee that the above would be the first stage of the Fringe area planning and that each plan would be developed within its own time frame. Therefore, it will not be necessary to complete all three plans before beginning work in the remaining areas. The remaining portions of the Fringe area will commence with the completion of the first plan.

There were a number of issues discussed by the Committee with respect to the 1983 Municipal Development Plan process as follows:

1. Councillor Larsen requested that Districts 1 and 3 be the next plan areas considered when the first of the Stage 2 plans is completed.
2. The Committee basically agreed with the staff suggestion that the monitoring committee (MDPC) be altered for the next process. It was suggested that the Planning Advisory Committee be the key monitoring body meeting once every two weeks, with each PPC (Public Participation Committee) on an individual basis. This will create a time saving in that each PPC will not have to devote time to issues that may be creating problems for other PPC's thereby allowing each PPC to proceed as quickly as they feel comfortable. It was also felt that this will allow greater representation of the plan area by more residents from all communities. The Committee suggested that the Councillor for the areas being planned be included as part of an expanded P.A.C. when his-her district is being discussed.
3. The Committee agreed that the Public Participation Committee structure should alter from that of the past process in that more emphasis should be placed on encouraging members to be chosen at the public level at the time the process is being introduced to each district. This can be facilitated by having general public meetings to explain the process and invite participation of all residents.

The Committee also discussed implementation of the existing Municipal Development Plans. It was felt by some Committee Members that implementation of the existing policies is not being carried out. Others were satisfied that many of the plan's policies are in fact being implemented. It was agreed by the Committee that the policies would be looked at with a view of setting a procedure in which to deal with further implementation (the Committee has requested that this item be discussed at its next regular meeting). As staff pointed out, in some instances, implementation only required that a letter be written whereas in other policies, there was a demand for financial assistance, studies, etc.

The Committee was informed that the Policy Division has sufficient staff to carry out both the commencement of Municipal development plans for stage 2 as well as carrying out implementation on a regular daily basis, of the existing plans with the exception of requirements for major resource studies.

The Committee looked at the number of staff and professional planners within the Policy Division in terms of the foreseeable workload and were generally satisfied that staff were capable of handling the workload.

In light of the possibility of off-shore development, the Committee discussed staff's recommendation that the Eastern Shore should be dealt with as a single plan area. There was some concern expressed by members of the Committee that the Eastern Shore was not recommended to be planned in the first part of Stage 2."

Subsequent to the general review of the Planning Department's Discussion Paper and the Planning Advisory Committee Report;

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

"THAT Council accept the recommendations of PAC (That the next stage of Municipal Development Plans include Districts 14 - as one area - 18, 19 & 15 - as one area - and District 5 - as one area) and permit PAC, Councillors and PPC's to proceed with the planning process."

(See Motion to Amend)

Several Councillors also expressed the concern of the PAC regarding the Eastern Shore being planned in the latter part of stage 2 instead of the first part.

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

"THAT the first part of stage two of the MDP process include Districts (14), (18, 19 & 15), (5) and (8 & 9)."
(See motion to refer.)

Subsequent to discussion it was felt by some members of Council that the whole issue of the inclusion of Districts 8 and 9, or a portion of Districts 8 and 9 should be referred to the Planning Advisory Committee for further investigation regarding the impact on cost and staff resources to include these Districts in the first part of stage 2.

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

"THAT the whole issue be referred back to the Planning Advisory Committee to discuss the impact on staff resources, cost, etc. of the inclusion of Districts 8 and 9 in the first part of stage 2 of the MDP process."
Motion Defeated.

Therefore the question was called on the amendment:

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

"As written previously."
Amendment Carried.

Subsequently, the question was called on the motion as amended.

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

"THAT the next stage of Municipal Development Plans include Districts 14 (as one area), Districts 18, 19 & 15 (as one area), District 5 (as one area) and Districts 8 & 9 (as one area) and that PAC, Councillors and PPCs be permitted to proceed with the Planning Process."

Motion Carried.

A great deal of concern in Council was made evident in regard to the impact this would have on staff resources and on additional costs to complete and implement the plans.

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

"THAT Staff prepare a Report to Council regarding the implications of the above motion on staff resources and additional cost."
Motion Carried.

Public Land Donation

Mr. Kelly outlined the Planning Advisory Committee Report advising that it was the recommendation of the Committee that Park Parcel P-8, Recreational Land, of the Colby Village Subdivision, Cole Harbour, being donated to the Municipality under the provisions of the Planning Act, be accepted as parkland by Halifax County Council. It has been reported by the Municipal Solicitor that the parkland in question is free and clear of all encumbrances and Council is therefore in a position where it can accept title to this land.

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

"THAT the Municipality accept title to Park Parcel P-8 of the Colby Village Subdivision, Cole Harbour, File No. F-554-82-7 as Municipal Parkland."
Motion Carried.

POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

It was moved by Councillor Snow, seconded by Deputy Warden Margeson:

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

Blasting By-Law

Mr. Meech outlined this item advising that the Policy Committee had reviewed the Blasting By-Law and had discussed, in particular, a licensing procedure for the purchase and use of blasting materials. During this discussion it had been revealed that a previous request had been sent to the Minister of Labour to investigate the possibility of establishing a licensing procedure covering the purchase and educated use of explosives.

It had been reported to the Committee by staff that New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland have an education program and subsequent examination to pass before being granted a license to use explosives.

Subsequent to discussion, it was the recommendation of the Policy Committee that another letter be written to the Minister of Labour requesting the Province to establish a licensing procedure covering the purchase and educated use of explosives.

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

"THAT a letter be written to the Minister of Labour requesting the Province to establish a licenising procedure covering the purchase and educated use of explosives."
Motion Carried.

Subsequent to the passing of the above motion, Councillor MacKay indicated that his main concern in referring the issue to the Policy Committee was that some precautions and stipulations be imposed on those persons to whom the Engineering Department grants Blasting Permits.

Mr. Meech advised that this was already practiced by the Engineering Department to a certain degree, who would more readily give such a permit to an established contractor, while investigating more closely a less experienced, newer contractor before granting a blasting permit. He advised that there is a section of the By-Law which already gives this discretion to the Engineering Department.

URBAN SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

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

"THAT the Urban Services Committee Report be received."
Motion Carried.

Appointment of a Sub-Committee

Mr. Kelly outlined this item to Council, advising that it was the Committee's recommendation to Council, for approval, that a sub-committee of the Urban Services Committee be established for the purpose of negotiating an agreement with the Town of Bedford relating to ownership and responsibility for the ongoing operation and cost-sharing of the sewer system.

The Committee recommended the appointment to this Committee of Warden MacKenzie, Councillor MacKay and Councillor MacDonald.

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

"THAT Warden MacKenzie, Councillor MacKay, and Councillor MacDonald be appointed as members of a sub-committee of the Urban Services Committee for the purpose of negotiating an agreement with the Town of Bedford relating to ownership and responsibility for the on-going operation and cost-sharing of the sewer system."
Motion Carried.

Prior to the passing of the above motion, the Deputy Warden questioned whether any agreement reached would be approved by Council and was advised by Mr. Meech that it would be brought to Council for consideration.

Councillor Eisenhauer questioned Mr. Meech as to whether the PUB has come down with a decision as to who owns the sewer system since Bedford has become a Town and also whether they would be paying their share based on assessment.

Mr. Meech advised the Councillor that no further decision relative to ownership has been made. He also advised that one area of contention has been that some members of the Town of Bedford Council feel that they are the owners of the system. However, the Municipality does not agree with this and is billing the Town of Bedford on the basis of assessment. However, it is an outstanding issue that Bedford is only paying on the basis of design capacity regarding the internal collector system. He further advised it had been agreed some time ago, that the Municipality is billing the Town of Bedford maintenance on the basis of actual costs incurred by the Municipality's maintenance personnel.

Councillor Larsen felt that it should be the Town of Bedford Staff and the Municipality's administrative staff who deal with this problem and not a sub-committee of any committee. However, Mr. Meech advised that he had been contacted by Mr. Dan English, Town Administrator of the Town of Bedford, who had informed him that the Town Council had appointed a sub-committee to deal with the negotiations.

RESOLUTION, RE: PEDESTRIAN CROSSWALK, COLE HARBOUR ROAD

Contained in the Agenda was a resolution for Council's approval, required by the Department of Transportation for the establishment of a pedestrian crosswalk in Cole Harbour.

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

"Whereas by virtue of the Motor Vehicle Act, it is enacted that the Department of Transportation of the Province of Nova Scotia shall be responsible for the establishment of pedestrian and school crosswalks at those locations within the Province of Nova Scotia duly approved by the aforesaid Department for such a purpose; and Whereas the Department of Transportation of the Province of Nova Scotia requires that any requests made of the aforesaid Department to establish such a crosswalk within the County of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia, be in the form of a Resolution duly passed by the Council of the Municipality of the County of Halifax; And Whereas it is deemed expedient by the Municipality to establish a pedestrian crosswalk in the vicinity of Civic Number 1109 Cole Harbour Road in Cole Harbour, in the County of Halifax in the Province of Nova Scotia; Be it Therefore Resolved that the Municipality of the County of Halifax do hereby request that the Department of Transportation of the Province of Nova Scotia establish, with all due speed and dispatch, a pedestrian crosswalk in the vicinity of Civic Number 1109 Cole Harbour Road in Cole Harbour, in the County of Halifax, Province of Nova Scotia."

Motion Carried.

Prior to the passing of the above resolution, Councillor Gaetz questioned whether this was mandatory for all crosswalks.

Mr. Meech advised that this was a result of a recent communication from the Department of Transportation in which they requested that this procedure be followed at all times in the future.

REPORT, RE: METROPOLITAN AUTHORITY

This item had been placed on the agenda as a result of a request of Councillor MacKay; however, he had earlier been informed by Mr. Kelly that this Report was not yet available and should be referred to the subsequent Council Meeting. It was also brought to light that Councillor Mont, a County Representative on the Metropolitan Authority was intending to give Council a Report relative to the activities of the Metropolitan Authority, at the next Council Session.

Therefore, it was agreed by Council that both these items, the Report on the Metropolitan Authority, as it related to the Correctional Centre and Councillor Mont's up-date on recent activities of the Authority, which should include this item, would be brought forward at the next Regular Council Session.

It was also the suggestion of the Deputy Warden that in connection with the Report on the Metropolitan Authority, there should be something on the agenda relative to Solid Waste Management.

This was taken under advisement by Staff.

ADDITION OF ITEMS

FCM Resolutions - Warden MacKenzie

Warden MacKenzie reminded Councillors that any resolutions to be submitted to the FCM Secretariat in time for the annual FCM Meeting, would have to be received in the near future.

Special Meeting, February 3, 1983 - Warden MacKenzie

Warden MacKenzie also advised Council that a Special Meeting would be held February 3, 1983, at 7:00 P.M. to deal with the Budgets of the Social Services Department, the Rehabilitation Centre and Oceanview Manor.

At this time Councillor Larsen indicated his awareness of a recent communication from the Minister of Social Services, which advised that additional funding for Social Services would be forthcoming; this would lessen the severity of the Municipality's outlook on the Social Services forecast for 1983.

Mr. Meech advised that staff had also been made aware of this new information and would bring it forward at the Special Meeting.

Crosswalk Markings - Councillor Adams

Councillor Adams requested that a Staff Report be forthcoming at the next Council Session explaining why the Municipality is paying for crosswalk markings; he felt that it was the Department of Transportation who should be picking up this cost.

Council debated this issue briefly, in agreement with Councillor Adams' concerns.

It was agreed by Staff that this issue would be investigated further and that a Report should come back to the next Council Session in this regard.

Dartmouth General Hospital - Councillor Adams

Councillor Adams and Councillor DeRoche expressed the opinion that someone from the Board of the Dartmouth General Hospital should be invited to attend a future Council Session to make a presentation in solicitation of Municipal Financial Assistance for the 1983 fiscal year, as previously agreed upon by Council.

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

"THAT representatives of the Finance Executive of the Dartmouth General Hospital be invited to attend the first Council Session in March to make a presentation relative to the Hospital's requirement for financial assistance in 1983."
Motion Carried.

Investigation of Arsenic Filter Units and the Utilization of Capital Grant Funds for the Purchase of These Units - Councillor MacKay

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

"THAT the Policy Committee investigate the possible allocation of Capital Grant Funds for the purchase of Health-Approved Arsenic Filter Units in Rural Areas where the capital grant funds are not otherwise allocated to Water and Sewer Projects."
Motion Carried.

Speed Limit Reduction - Councillor Snow

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

"THAT a letter be written to the Department of Transportation requesting that a feasibility study be conducted regarding the reduction of the speed limit from the present limit to 50 to 60 kilometers per hour along the Number 2 Highway from Laurie Park to the Bicentennial Highway."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Snow indicated that there were a number of schools and recreation facilities in this area which is traversed by a number of school-aged children. It was his opinion that, for this reason, the speed limit should be reduced in this area.

Request for Capital Grant - Councillor Lichter

Councillor Lichter advised that the Policy Committee had discussed, at its last meeting, a request for a capital grant for the purchase of a fire vehicle and fire department equipment for the Elderbank-Meagher's Grant Volunteer Fire Department.

The estimated total cost of the vehicle and equipment was \$20,000 and Councillor Lichter requested that \$10,000 be allocated from the County General Capital Grant Fund, \$5,000 from the District 13 Capital Grant Fund and \$5,000 from Fire Department Volunteer Fund raising.

Although, there had been some opposition expressed at the Policy Committee Meeting, the overall consensus of the Committee was to approve the request. However, this item had not come to the Council Session this evening but was intended to be on the agenda of the next meeting.

However, Councillor Lichter advised that there was some urgency in approving this request this evening, as there was another buyer for the vehicle, which is worth a great deal more than the asking price of \$13,000. He requested that Council approve the expenditure so that he may purchase this vehicle. He explained that any further delay could result in the vehicle being sold to the other bidder.

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

"THAT Council approve the allocation of a \$10,000 General County Capital Grant and a \$5,000 District Capital Grant towards the purchase of a fire vehicle and fire department equipment for the Elderbank - Meagher's Grant Fire Department, with the remaining amount required, of approximately \$5,000, coming from Volunteer Fire Department Fund raising."
Motion Carried.

Councillor Lichter indicated that there may be a future request coming into Council for additional Fire Department Equipment. At this point, Councillor MacKay advised that the Sackville Fire Department did have a Fire Pumper which would be coming up for sale in the near future.

This information was taken under advisement by Councillor Lichter for future reference.

Congratulations - Councillor Gaetz

Councillor Gaetz congratulated Warden MacKenzie on a very successful interview which had recently appeared in the publication, "Dartmouth This Week."

This was for Council's information only.

1983 Calendars - Deputy Warden Margeson

The Deputy Warden issued Thanks to whoever was responsible for placing new 1983 Calendars on the desks of all Councillors and requested that this sentiment be expressed to the appropriate staff member.

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT the Regular Council Session adjourn."
Motion Carried.

Therefore, there being no further business, the Council Session adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

REGULAR COUNCIL SESSION

FEBRUARY 15, 1983

PRESENT WERE: Warden MacKenzie, Chairman
Councillor Walker
Councillor Poirier
Councillor Larsen
Councillor Gaudet
Councillor Baker
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor DeRoche
Councillor Adams
Councillor Gaetz
Councillor Bayers
Councillor Reid
Councillor Lichter
Councillor Snow
Deputy Warden Margeson
Councillor MacKay
Councillor Eisenhauer
Councillor MacDonald
Councillor Wiseman
Councillor Mont

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. Keith Birch, Chief of Planning & Development
Ms. Valerie Spencer, Supervisor of Planning - Policy
Division
Mr. John Markesino, Co-ordinator of Recreation
Scouts From the Sixth Sackville Scouts Troup
Mr. Jim Butson, Scout Master

SECRETARY: Christine E. Simmons

OPENING OF COUNCIL - THE LORD'S PRAYER

Warden MacKenzie brought the Regular Council Session to order at 6:05 with The Lord's Prayer.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the Roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

It was moved by Councillor Larsen, seconded by Councillor Gaudet:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

"THAT the Minutes of the February 1, 1983 Regular Council Session be approved."
Motion Carried.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Warden MacKenzie welcomed to the Council Session the Sixth Sackville Scout Troup, explaining to Council Members that they were working toward their Citizenship awards. He also welcomed their Scout Troup Master Mr. Jim Butson.

The Warden then advised that Councillor McInroy was absent from this evening's Council Session as he was on vacation.

LETTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

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

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

Letter From the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board

Mr. Kelly read this letter into the Record as follows:

"It is anticipated that the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board will have completed the preparation of its 1983 Budget estimates by the end of February.

Provincial Funding rates were not known by the Board until mid December and even at this late date, the Board still anticipates minor adjustments in the revenue from the Province.

In accordance with our District Board agreement, it is the wish of the Board to host a budget presentation meeting for the two Municipal Units on March 2, at 2:00 P.M., in the Council Chambers on Dutch Village Road." ...

This letter was for Council's information only but a motion was required to signify agreement with the proposed date for the budget presentation.

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

"THAT the Municipality of the County of Halifax Council, and the Town of Bedford Council meet on March 2, at 2:00 P.M. for the presentation of the 1983 Halifax County-Bedford District School Board Budget."
Motion Carried.

Letter From the Waverley Ratepayers' Association

A letter had been received by Mr. Kelly from G. R. Sirota, Chairman of the Planning and Development Committee of the Waverley Ratepayers' Association. This letter requested that a spokesman of the Waverley Ratepayers' Association be permitted to speak briefly at the February 15th Council Session to outline the concerns of the Association pertaining to possible changes to the process by which proposed developments are approved.

The spokesman on this occasion would be Mr. Paul B. Miller, Solicitor for the Association.

Subsequent to brief discussion:

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

"THAT Mr. Paul B. Miller be permitted to speak to Council in regard to possible changes to the process by which proposed development is approved."

Motion Carried.

Letter From the Metropolitan Authority

A letter had been received by Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk, from Mr. Mort Jackson of the Metropolitan Authority.

It was agreed that this letter would be circulated to Council, later in the agenda and dealt with at that time.

AEROTECH BUSINESS PARK - LAND EXPROPRIATION

Mr. Lorne Denny approached Council at this time to outline a problem he was running into relative to the acquisition of land at the Aerotech Business Park Site.

Mr. Denny advised Council that all owners of all other parcels of land required by the Halifax County Industrial Commission for the development of the Aerotech Industrial Park, have agreed in principal to the purchase of their lands by the Commission; one land owner, Atlantic Land Dealers Ltd. have not agreed as it is a policy of their Company not to sell land.

Therefore, it was necessary for Council to pass a resolution to expropriate this parcel of land. Mr. Denny, with the use of a map pointed to the parcel of land in question. In response to questioning from Council as to the importance of this particular parcel to the Business Park, Mr. Denny replied that it was very important as it was possible and likely that a road would be put right through this piece of land.

Councillor MacKay indicated his understanding that when this project had been initiated options had been obtained for all necessary parcels of land. He and several other Councillors expressed their surprise that this action was necessary.

However, Mr. Denny advised that although options had been obtained on most parcels of land, they had not been obtained for every parcel.

Subsequent to further discussion:

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

"WHEREAS The Municipality of the County of Halifax by resolution agreed to purchase land to the east and south of the Halifax International Airport and that the said lands described as attached (Refer to schedules) does fall within those said boundaries; Whereas The Halifax County Industrial Commission has worked diligently to acquire the said lands without response; Whereas The Halifax County Industrial Commission authorized their project legal Council to submit an offer to purchase based on a qualified land surveyors legal description and a certified appraisal by Turner, Drake; Whereas by letter dated January 31, 1983, addressed to Kitz, Matheson, Green & MacIsaac, Attention: Mr. Joel E. Fichaud, re: lands at Goffs, Halifax County, Nova Scotia. "Thank you for your letter and offer to purchase the above mentioned property. I am sorry to have to say that it is company policy not to sell any of our real estate holdings," signed Atlantic Land Dealers Ltd., Stephen D. Carsen. Date received, February 4, 1983; Be It Resolved that the Municipality of the County of Halifax approves the expropriation of a certain lot of land and of the fee simple and all the title thereto, of Atlantic Land Dealers Ltd., more particularly described in Schedule "A" annexed hereto, for the purpose of an Industrial Park to be established by the Halifax County Industrial Commission."

Motion Carried.

Prior to the passing of the above motion, the Deputy Warden advised that in the documentation presented to Council this evening by Mr. Denny the area surrounding the airport had been spelled in two different ways. In Schedule "A", it was referred to as "Goffs", whereas in the resolution it had been referred to as "Goff". Mr. Denny advised the Deputy Warden that the area is referred to in both manners by those residing there. However, he clarified that the correct spelling was as in Schedule "A", "Goffs". Therefore, this spelling was incorporated into the resolution.

As well, prior to the passing of the motion, several Councillors, in particular, Councillor Lichter felt he could not vote on the resolution without having the price of the land in question disclosed.

Mr. Denny advised that he had been given a legal opinion that this amount should not be disclosed at this time; however, subsequent to further debate, he advised that most of the land had been acquired for approximately \$2,100 per acre while the offer for the land of Atlantic Land Dealers Limited was \$1,500 per acre for the approx. 20-acre parcel.

Subsequent to the above information, the resolution was passed by Council.

At this time, Mr. Denny retired from the Council Session.

REPORTS OF THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

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

Proposed Alterations to the Processing of PUD Applications

Mr. Keith Birch came forward at this time to outline to Council, the Planning Advisory Committee Report on the proposed alterations to the processing of PUD Applications. This Report of the Committee, read:

"At the January 31, 1983 meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee, Planning and Development Staff presented the attached report relative to the processing of PUD Applications. (Please refer to Report) The purpose of altering the procedure of processing PUD applications was in an attempt to overcome some of the current problems encountered by the Municipality and the developers.

The following resolution was adopted by the Committee:

That the staff recommendations to alter the procedure of processing PUD Applications be recommended to Council for approval. Also, that it is the Committee's intention to adopt the procedure on a trial basis, which would be monitored by the Committee and be re-examined at a later date."

Mr. Birch advised that the proposed alterations to the procedure of processing the PUD's would result in considerable savings in Staff time which would be useful in terms of the current operation of the Development Division and secondly, it would free up an approval process without losing the right of appeal by the Public.

He advised that if the procedure is not amended, there is little point in involving oneself with a PUD Application but might just as well request a rezoning application, and get it to the Municipal Board as quickly as possible; in effect, in this manner the decisions of the County are being made by a body other than the Municipal Council of the County.

Councillor Snow questioned Mr. Birch as to what were some of the current problems being encountered at the present time, under the present procedure.

Mr. Birch advised that what occurs now is that the Municipality is authorized to open negotiations with Developers which involves a hold-up with the Department of the Environment; (Mr. Birch clarified that this was not meant as criticism of the Department of the Environment) however, to get full and absolute approval from that Department you must have the Development application into that Department which