

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

"THAT the Curfew By-Law be approved by Municipal Council and further that it be forwarded to the Department of Municipal Affairs for approval."  
(See Motion to Amend.)

Councillor Lichter referred to the portion of the By-Law which indicates that there shall be no trespassing between 10:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M. He felt this could be construed as an invitation for persons to trespass in between those hours and this would create a difficulty prosecuting under other By-Laws and under other circumstances, people who have no entitlement to be on school grounds and who would be trespassing during school hours. He felt this by-law should be referred to the School Board and the Principals of Schools for their opinions or advice on this item.

Mr. Cragg advised that this issue was discussed and it had been found very difficult to get around it; he indicated that no other Municipality in the Province has been able to resolve that particular problem. He also indicated that the By-Law or any portion of it could be revoked or amended in the future but it is very important to at least get a By-Law on the books to assist the Police authorities in apprehending individuals for some portion of the day.

Councillor Deveaux indicated his interest in the establishment of a Curfew By-Law which would pertain to school property only and would have greater restrictions than the one before Council. However, Solicitor Cragg indicated that a separate By-Law for schools would probably not be necessary as school property is included in the draft by-law before Council.

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

"THAT the curfew hours on school property be from 6:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M."  
(See Motion to Defer.)

Subsequent to further discussion,

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

"THAT approval of the Curfew By-Law be deferred until the second Council Session in November, in order that input from the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board can be obtained."  
Motion Carried.

#### Committee Structure

Mr. Kelly advised that the Policy Committee had discussed the possibility of establishing a Committee of the Whole to consider issues presently dealt with by the standing committees. It was the recommendation of the Policy Committee that this issue be referred to Council and further that Council consider calling a Committee of the Whole Meeting to deal with this item.

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

"THAT Council call a Committee of the Whole meeting to deal with the issue of Committee Structure and further that the Warden set the date and time for the meeting."  
Motion Carried.

Request for District Capital Grant - District 14

Mr. Kelly outlined this item from the Policy Committee Report which advised: "The Policy Committee received a request for a District Capital Grant in the amount of \$3,000.00, District No. 14, LWF Volunteer Fire Department, to cover capital improvements to the fire hall. (Copy attached to agenda) The Policy Committee recommend to Council for approval a District Capital Grant in the amount of \$3,000.00 to District No. 14, LWF Volunteer Fire Department."

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

"THAT Council approve the allocation of a District No. 14 Capital Grant in the amount of \$3,000.00 to the Lakeview-Windsor Junction-Fall River Volunteer Fire Department to cover capital improvements to the fire hall."  
Motion Carried.

URBAN SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

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

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

Sanitary Sewage System - Lively Subdivision, Sackville

Mr. Kelly read this item from the Urban Services Committee Report, as follows:

"The Urban Services Committee received a report from the Director of Engineering and Works respecting the water and sewer systems serving the Lively Subdivision. (Copy attached to agenda) As indicated in the report, the water system was taken over by the Municipality in November 1982 and is operated by the Municipality as a private system. The report identifies problems experienced with the existing sewage system. The Committee reviewed this issue and the suggested options identified for the Committee's consideration. The Urban Services Committee recommend to Council that the Municipality take over the sewerage system in the Lively Subdivision."

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

"THAT the Municipality take over the sewerage system in the Lively Subdivision, Sackville."  
Motion Carried.

HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

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

"THAT the Heritage Advisory Committee Report be received."  
Motion Carried.

Evaluation System for Heritage Properties

Mr. Kelly advised that the Heritage Advisory Committee report to Council at the September 20, 1983 Session included criteria established for an evaluation system for heritage properties. He indicated that copies of the report respecting the evaluation system have been provided to members of Council.

It was the recommendation of the Heritage Advisory Committee that the evaluation system be adopted by Council, as identified in the report.

Mr. Kelly also advised that Mr. Gary Meade, Chairman of the Heritage Advisory Committee, was in attendance this evening to answer any questions Council Members may have relative to the evaluation system.

There were no questions for Mr. Meade.

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

"THAT Municipal Council adopt the evaluation system for heritage properties, as identified in the report of the Heritage Advisory Committee."  
Motion Carried.

METROPOLITAN AUTHORITY REPORT - COUNCILLOR MACDONALD

Councillor MacDonald advised that there was little to report since the last report given by Councillor Mont. He advised, however, that the landfill site had been discussed and there was a suggestion that it be extended for use until 1990. He indicated that there were already problems arising on the site, such as small explosions of gas and that there should be no extension of the site. It was felt by Councillor MacDonald that a new site should be established in the near future and that the present site could be used as a back up site. He also indicated that it was up to the Councils of the four participating Municipalities to initiate some action in this regard.

Councillor Deveaux indicated his concern that the cost sharing formula with the three other Municipalities regarding the transit system is being delayed by the Cities of Halifax and Dartmouth. He had previously indicated that this should be expedited and that the Warden should meet with the three Mayors of the other Municipal Units in order to ensure that it be expedited. He questioned whether this meeting had taken place and was advised by Warden MacKenzie that, to date, there has been no meeting with the other Municipalities due to a shortage of available time.

Councillor Deveaux indicated that this was an urgent matter and requested that it be addressed as soon as possible. Councillor MacKay indicated his concurrence with Councillor Deveaux relative to this item.

With regard to transit, Deputy Warden Margeson indicated that Transit service would be an asset for Ocean View Manor. He requested that a six month trial demonstration project be established for transit to Ocean View Manor.

Councillor Deveaux advised the Deputy Warden that there was a study going on now with regard to Transit and he suggested that the matter be deferred pending receipt of a report on the Study.

It was agreed that the matter be deferred pending receipt of the report.

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

"THAT the Metropolitan Authority Report be received by Municipal Council."

Motion Carried.

#### ARSENIC FILTER UNITS - COUNCILLOR MACKAY

Councillor MacKay advised that some time ago, the Policy Committee had investigated the feasibility of the Arsenic Filter Unit, yet no final report and recommendation had come to Council. He also indicated that he had received information relative to a distillation unit, which also produces potable water, previously contaminated by arsenic and other contaminants.

Councillor MacKay requested that the issue of the Arsenic Filter Unit be referred to the next Policy Committee Meeting for a final review of the filtration unit, as well as the new distillation unit and that a recommendation be made to Council. It was his hope that should the unit be proven safe (and he had perused information from the Atlantic Health Unit which indicated that the Unit was successful in its removal of arsenic) that capital funds could be used to subsidize the purchase of these units in areas where it is not feasible to install central water services.

Councillor MacKay also requested that if a negative recommendation is made that the reasons why be stated. He agreed to provide the relevant information in his possession regarding the new distillation unit.

It was agreed by Council that the arsenic filter unit be referred to the Policy Committee for a final review and report to Council.

#### SEWER LEGISLATION - COUNCILLOR MACKAY

Councillor MacKay was also requesting up-dated information on sewer legislation. He advised that some time ago, Council had requested changes to the sewer legislation and no information has come forward as yet.

Subsequent to brief discussion,

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

"THAT the sewer legislation item be placed on the agenda of the next Urban Services Committee Meeting."  
Motion Carried.

FIRE PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION - DEPUTY WARDEN MARGESON

The Deputy Warden spoke on this issue briefly, advising that the Special Task Force Report on Volunteer Fire Departments had been received. He questioned whether this report has been forwarded to all Councillors and to the Fire Advisory Committee and whether the Committee had a chance to review it and make recommendations.

All Councillors had received copies of the Task Force Report on Volunteer Fire Departments; however, to Mr. Meech's knowledge, it had not been forwarded to the Fire Advisory Committee.

The Deputy Warden requested that this report be discussed at the Fire Advisory Committee. There were also three other items he wished to have discussed at the Fire Advisory Committee, which were included in the following motion:

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

"THAT the following be referred to the Fire Advisory Committee:  
(1) Fire Prevention and the use of Smoke Alarms; (2) Suppression and any methods or advantages some Departments may have that should be shared with other Departments; and (3) increasing the height of buildings over 35 feet and further, that a Report be brought back to Council with recommendations from the Fire Advisory Committee."  
Motion Carried.

Mr. Kelly advised that the next meeting of the Fire Advisory Committee would be held November 10, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

DEVELOPMENT CONTRACT, DISTRICT NO. 7 - COUNCILLOR DEROCHE

Councillor DeRoche referred to two Public Hearings held in Council, April 11, 1983 and July 11, 1983, both with respect to the Municipal Development Plan for Cole Harbour - Westphal.

Councillor DeRoche advised that resulting from the first Public Hearing was a resolution rejecting the Staff recommendation to amend the Zoning By-Law to permit automotive repair facilities on the Highway Commercial Zone, along Highway No. 7 in Westphal and it also directed Staff to prepare an amendment to the Municipal Development Plan for that area by which rezoning by Contract could be permitted.

He advised that at the July Public Hearing, a By-Law was adopted to amend the MDP for Cole Harbour - Westphal, to permit the Automotive Repair Facilities by contract.

To-date, he advised, Council or PAC has not had an application to consider, from the party who initiated the whole process, T. C. Welding and Automotive. He advised that this application was now more than seven months old. He questioned the reason for this delay.

Mr. Birch advised that Ministerial Approval to the amendment which was necessary for bringing the application forward was not received until late September and in the period between that approval and now, there has been some difficulty in corresponding with the Applicant, until very recently. He advised that the application will be brought to PAC in the next week or so for consideration.

Councillor DeRoche indicated his concern that Staff had not been developing the agreement from July, so that it would be ready for the PAC.

Mr. Birch advised that Staff had a backlog of other applications before them and it would have been presumptuous of them to assume that the Minister was going to approve the amendment and to go ahead and work on the application before receiving this approval.

Subsequent to further questioning from Councillor DeRoche, he reiterated that Staff could not concentrate on an application in the absence of Ministerial approval.

#### BUS ROUTES TO PARKING LOTS, OUTSIDE CITY - COUNCILLOR EISENHAUER

Council agreed to defer this item until the next Council Session as Councillor Eisenhauer had been unable to attend this evening's Council Session.

#### ROAD FRONTAGES, DISTRICTS 10, 11, 12 AND 13 - COUNCILLOR LICHTER

Councillor Lichter advised that on May 17, 1983 Council had considered a recommendation from PAC relative to road frontages in Districts 10, 11, 12 and 13. He advised that these amendments from the PAC were relative to the Subdivision Regulations as well as a By-Law to amend the Zoning By-Law No. 24. He advised that as a result of Council's decision, a Public Hearing was held on June 13, 1983 and both amendments were approved.

Councillor Lichter was concerned that no action has yet been taken relative to Council's request. He, therefore, proposed the following motion:

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

"THAT Halifax County Council direct a letter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, requesting him to bring about a speedy resolution on Council's request, dated June 13th, 1983."  
Motion Carried.

ADDITION OF ITEMS FOR THE NEXT COUNCIL AGENDA

The following items were added to the agenda of the following Council Session:

1. House to House Mail Delivery, Eastern Passage - Councillor Deveaux.
2. Report, Re: Breakdown of Water System, North Preston Councillor Adams.

Councillor Adams advised that the Water System in North Preston had been broken down for a number of days at the end of September causing a great deal of inconvenience to residents. He requested the following to be addressed in the "written" report: (1) extent of the breakdown; (2) why the power failure that was reported caused the breakdown and the burnout of the Plant; (3) why the fuse system would not protect the equipment in the event of that power failure, and (4) the standard of the equipment the Plant does have and further that this Report be available by the next Council Session.

3. Report, Re: Leisure Buddy Program - Councillor DeRoche.
4. School Overhead Crosswalk Signs - Councillor Snow.

Councillor Adams also requested that Staff have someone in to examine the Public Address System which was malfunctioning somewhat and causing a disturbing humming sound.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Therefore, there being no further business, the Regular Council Session adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

MINUTES & REPORTS

OF THE

FIRST YEAR MEETINGS

OF THE

FORTY - FIRST COUNCIL

OF THE

MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX

NOVEMBER COUNCIL SESSION

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1 and 15, 1983

&

PUBLIC HEARING

NOVEMBER 3, 1983 *& Nov. 28/83*

*Committee of the Whole*

*Nov. 21/83*



PUBLIC HEARING

NOVEMBER 3, 1983

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk  
Mr. Robert Cragg, Municipal Solicitor

SECRETARY: Christine E. Simmons

---

OPENING OF PUBLIC HEARING - THE LORD'S PRAYER

Warden MacKenzie brought the Public Hearing to order at 7:05 P.M. with The Lord's Prayer.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the Roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

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

PUBLIC HEARING

Warden MacKenzie advised that the Public Hearing was being held to consider Rezoning Application No. RA-TLB-37-83-02, a request to rezone Parcel 1-AR of the lands of Helena Doris Poirier, located on Elm Grove

Avenue at Timberlea, Halifax County from R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone to R-4 (Multi Unit Dwelling) Zone. The Warden then outlined to those present in the Council Chambers, the procedure to be followed for the Public Hearing.

Councillor Poirier, requested that she be excused from the Council Chambers, as this application would represent a conflict of interest.

Councillor Poirier was excused from the Council Chambers.

#### STAFF REPORT

Mr. Mike Hanusiak addressed Council to present the Staff report relative to this issue. He advised that the Public Hearing had been advertised as prescribed under the provisions of the Planning Act, and advised that todate, no written correspondence has been received either in favour or in opposition to the Application.

He advised that the purpose of the rezoning application, as stated by the applicants, the Nova Scotia Housing Commission, is to permit the construction of a Senior Citizen complex consisting of 15 apartment units. Included in the Staff report was a conceptual plan of the proposed project as submitted by the applicant; this plan he also presented to Council on an overhead projected map.

Mr. Hanusiak then referred to the Staff report which gave the following lot description:

Area: Approximately 31,195 square feet;

Features:

- relatively flat;
- evidence of a rock outcropping in the southwest corner of the subject property;
- evidence of poor or impaired drainage toward the centre portion of the subject property;
- sparse vegetation on the front section of the subject property, gradually increasing to a heavy tree cover toward the rear.

The surrounding land use, he also reviewed from the Staff Report which advised: "At present, there are eight, very similarly styled single family dwellings located on Elm Grove Avenue. Although the exact date on which these houses were constructed could not be established, an examination of the County's assessment records indicated that the majority were built prior to 1973. The lands to the immediate east and south of the subject property are undeveloped."

Th Staff report described the future land use designation as Residential.

Mr. Hanusiak then referred to the portion of the Staff Report which indicated the avenue by which this application may be considered under the Municipal Development Plan, which read:

"The avenue by which Council may consider and if deemed advisable, approve the proposed rezoning is set forth under Policy P-33 of the Municipal Development Plan for Timberlea-Lakeside-Beechville.

P-33 Notwithstanding Policy P-23, within the Residential Designation, and where municipal central sewer and water services are available, Council may consider permitting multiple unit dwellings by an amendment to the zoning by-law. In considering such amendments, Council shall have regard to the following:

- (i) the availability and capacity of water and sewer services;
- (ii) the adequacy of access by way of collector or arterial streets;
- (iii) separation distances from low density residential development;
- (iv) the location and appearance of access and parking areas;
- (v) the provision of amenity areas; and
- (vi) the provisions of Policy P-89."

The provisions of P-89 were included in the Staff Report as Appendix "A". Please refer to Report for detail if required.

Mr. Hanusiak advised Council that the Department of Engineering and Works were requested to comment on the application with respect to its impact on municipal water and sewer services. The Department has replied that the services presently being installed along Elm Grove Avenue are capable of accomodating the number of units being proposed.

However, the Department of Planning and Development made the following comments:

1. The size and shape of the proposed structure (approx. 120 feet X 66 feet X 26 feet) is inconsistent with the existing single family dwellings along Elm Grove Avenue. Thus, its presence would significantly alter the scale and streetscape of this long established, low density residential environment.
2. The lack of adequate tree cover on the front portion of the subject property, coupled with this relatively small separation distance between the proposed development, Lot 64 and Lot 67-A, will serve to lessen the privacy and enjoyment of present as well as future abutting property owners.
3. Given that the proposed development is to be located at the end of a series of local streets, an unnecessary amount of traffic will be generated throughout the entire residential neighbourhood. The problem of high traffic intrusion need not occur if the proposed development were located on the periphery of the subdivision and adjacent to collector and arterial roads.
4. The choice of the subject property as a location for an apartment building is poor due to its lack of proximity to shopping and business facilities, bus routes and other amenities. The locational problems of the site are compounded by the fact that no sidewalks exist in the Timberlea area.

Based on the above, it was the recommendation of the Department of Planning and Development, that the application to rezone parcel 1-AR of the Lands of Helena Doris Poirier, located on Elm Grove Avenue at Timberlea, from R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone to R-4 (Multi-Unit Dwelling) Zone be rejected by Council.

#### Questions From Council

Councillor Gaetz indicated his opinion that it was irregular to require a tree cover. However, Mr. Hanusiak advised that the Department of Planning and Development were concerned about the height of the building and its physical size which is a dramatic increase over the height and size of the existing dwellings on the street. He advised that the Planning Department were attempting to protect the property enjoyment of the existing residents as well as those residents who may build on the vacant properties on one side of the proposed development.

Mr. Hanusiak also advised, in response to further questioning from Councillor Gaetz, that fifteen units would dramatically increase the population of Elm Grove Avenue and the residents of senior citizen complex would have to use the street in order to get to the shopping areas and so on, which would have a further large impact on the traffic of that street, which is relatively quiet at the present time.

Councillor Lichter advised that at the present time, under the by-laws, a single family dwelling could be built on the street with a height of 35 feet, with no tree cover and he felt that aesthetically, this would be no different than the present situation.

Mr. Hanusiak advised that it would be the same with respect to height and the buffer.

Councillor Lichter then advised that P-33 addresses multiple unit dwellings; the MDP gave no consideration to the huge difference between multiple unit dwellings housing young families where possibly two people are travelling to and from work every day, versus a senior citizens' home where that kind of traffic does not exist.

Mr. Hanusiak agreed with this comparison; however, he advised that what staff is looking at is the drastic increase in population and traffic with 15 units developing in one fell swoop. He advised that it would not be the same with fifteen single family dwellings developing one at a time. He felt that a senior citizens complex would have a dramatic impact on the area.

With regard to the height of the building, he agreed that the height of a single family dwelling could be 35 feet; however, the problem with the senior citizens' complex was not only the height but the actual scale and size of the building in comparison to the existing size and scale of the residences. He advised that it worked out to thirteen times the average size of the residential dwellings on Elm Grove Avenue.

Councillor McInroy indicated his opinion that Planning Staff were considering the potential of the lot and not considering the actual proposal. It was his opinion that the senior citizens' complex would certainly not cause a traffic problem and would have little impact on the neighbourhood, less than three single family dwellings with five family members in each one.

Mr. Hanusiak also advised that he is basing his comments on the expected two persons per unit. However, Councillor Mont indicated that most of senior citizens' complexes he was familiar with only have one person per unit. In response to this comment, Mr. Hanusiak advised that the complex has the potential to house two persons per unit. He advised that it was the responsibility of Staff to look at the potential of any development beyond what is being proposed.

Councillor Margeson indicated his opinion that the proposed site is an excellent site for a senior citizens' complex as it is in a quiet residential area, far removed from Highway No. 3. However, Mr. Hanusiak advised that he could not evaluate the project on the basis that it is a senior citizens' accomodation; he advised that the MDP does not allow staff to do that as it refers to R-4 Multiple unit buildings and not specifically to any type of building such as a senior citizens' complex.

Councillor Mont questioned whether Staff concerns could be addressed if the development were to go forward on a contract basis with the Nova Scotia Housing Commission; however, Mr. Hanusiak advised that this avenue did not exist at the present time.

There were no further questions for Mr. Hanusiak at this time.

#### SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR OF THE APPLICATION

Mr. Ernest Clark, representative of the Nova Scotia Housing Commission: Mr. Clark advised that he was present on behalf of the Housing Commission to speak in support of the rezoning application, which will allow the Housing Commission to construct a senior citizens' complex. He referred Council to the Brief from the Housing Commission which explained the position of the Commission.

However, copies had only been made available to the Planning Advisory Committee Members; therefore, additional copies were made and distributed to the remaining members of Council.

In support of the Application, the Brief indicated:

The Site - The site in question is located on Elm Grove Avenue in the community of Timberlea. The site is rectangular in shape and contains an area of 31,200 square feet. This parcel has a street frontage of 130 feet and a depth of 240 feet. The site is generally flat with the majority of it being heavily treed except for a small flat area in the front of the lot which is open. Municipal sewer, water, and streets are currently being upgraded.

Building Form of the Senior Citizens Project - The proposed building will house fifteen self-contained, one-bedroom units, in a one-storey (at the front) and two-storey double-loaded corridor format. Communal facilities in the form of a lounge, laundry room and storage will be provided. An example of a similar type of building in the County of Halifax is the fifteen unit senior citizens project in Forest Hills on Circassion Drive.

M.D.P. Considerations -

1. The current land use in the area is single family residential and vacant land. The Generalized Future Land Use Map (1A) places a "residential" designation on the area in question. This description is intended to "encourage a housing mix and other compatible uses".
2. P-33 permits multiple unit dwellings to be included in the residential designation by amendment to the zoning by-law.
3. P-33 establishes six criteria for considering applications for rezoning. With respect to the proposed rezoning:
  - (i) The site is fully serviced with municipal sewer and water.
  - (ii) The site has easy access to Route No. 3 via Elm Grove and Parkdale Avenues. The travel distance is less than one-quarter mile. The senior citizens complex by its nature will generate a minimum of additional traffic and no additional traffic during peak periods. The Transportation Map (No. 3) does not designate any collector or arterial streets in the area.
  - (iii) The 130-foot frontage of the site will enable the building development on the site to be maintained a minimum of 25 feet from the sidelines. Senior citizens housing will generally require less separation than conventional family multiple units.
  - (iv) Access to the site will be via a single, 10-foot, paved driveway in a location approved by the Department of Transportation. One hundred percent parking will be provided close to the building.
  - (v) The entire site will be landscaped including the provision of walkways, patios, and a variety of amenity areas for tenant use.
  - (vi) Development will meet the provisions of Policy 89 in that:
    - i) It is in conformity with the Municipal Development Plan,
    - ii) It is not premature or inappropriate,
    - iii) It does not conflict with adjacent or nearby land uses,
    - iv) The physical characteristics of the site are suitable.
4. Reference is made to Policies P-39 and P-40 which state:

P-39 It shall be the intention of Council to create a liason between the Municipality, the Nova Scotia Housing Commission and senior levels of government in order to:

- (i) develop long range residential priorities, strategies and programmes,
  - (ii) optimize public investment in basic infrastructure and services, and
  - (iii) coordinate planning, promotional and development efforts.
- P-40 It shall be the intention of Council to participate in any federal or provincial programme leading to the up-grading and rehabilitation of the housing stock, such as Residential Rehabilitation Programme and the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme, and to encourage the use of any programmes providing assistance in the provision of adequate housing.

The senior citizens' project would be developed under the Section 40, residential programme. Under this programme, the municipality would be a partner in the project and would enter into a Designation Agreement fixing details of land use, location, building design, as well as operation.

Conclusion - It is hoped that this information will explain how the proposed R-4 zoning conforms with the policies of the Municipal Development Plan and will enable the proposed senior citizens residential project to be developed in the community of Timberlea.

#### Questions From Council

In response to questioning from Council, relative to parking spaces allotted per unit and the number of seniors living in each unit, Mr. Clark advised that the average is .3 cars per unit and 1.2 seniors per unit.

Councillor Margeson questioned Mr. Clark as to whether he was a Planner. Mr. Clark answered in the affirmative advising that he had obtained his degree at the University of Toronto. He advised that, in his opinion, the proposed location was suitable for the senior citizens' complex and indicated that the above-mentioned Brief sets out his reason why and indicates the proposal's conformity to the Municipal Development Plan for the communities of Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea.

Councillor Margeson then pointed out that there was a difference of opinion between Mr. Clark and the Municipal Planning Department.

Councillor Margeson then questioned Mr. Clark relative to the traffic generated by the senior citizens complex both pedestrian and vehicular. He was advised by Mr. Clark that little pedestrian traffic would be expected and also that car ownership among seniors is small. As well, he advised that any traffic to and from the complex would be at non-peak hours. He also advised that the proposal is not a Nursing Home so there would be no Staff travelling to or from the complex.

Councillor MacDonald advised that several of the problems experienced with the senior citizens' complexes in Sackville is the lack of proximity to shopping centres and buses. He indicated his opinion that this location was quite far back. He advised that there were no shopping centres or buses at all in the community where the complex is proposed to locate. He felt this was a disadvantage.

Mr. Clark advised that there were a number of local shops close by but that there was no shopping centre as such.

Councillor MacDonald then questioned why this particular site was chosen and Mr. Clark advised that there had been some difficulty in finding a site in Timberlea which was serviced, available for sale and had the proper area and grade required for the development. However, the proposed location did possess all of these requirements, subsequent to the servicing being extended to that area.

Councillor DeRoche asked Mr. Clark where the occupants for the complex would be coming from and he was advised that they generally come from the surrounding communities; therefore, it was reasonable to assume, that the occupants for this complex would come from the Beechville-Lakeside-Timberlea area.

Councillor DeRoche then indicated that these residents would be knowledgeable with regard to the shopping facilities or the lack of shopping facilities.

Deputy Warden Adams questioned the criteria for building senior citizen complexes in areas which have the shopping centres, bus routes and sidewalks.

Mr. Clark advised that the N.S.H.C. would favour a location which had sidewalks; however, that is not always possible. He indicated that their primary criteria is filling a need and he advised that in that area of Timberlea there is a definite need for this type of housing. He advised that it would be desirable as well to locate in proximity to a shopping area; he reiterated that there was shopping within one-quarter of a mile from the proposed location, but not a shopping centre. He advised that another criteria is to locate within proximity to a church and there is a church very near by.

The Deputy Warden then questioned, since it is obvious that shopping centres and some other criteria are not going to be met in the rural areas of the Municipality, what would be the bottom line in determining that a facility should be located in a rural community such as is suggested in this application.

Mr. Clark advised that the bottom line would be the need and the availability of land and some basic facilities near-by; services and some shopping. He felt that in the area of this proposal there is a good range of facilities, although not as complete a list as one would like. He advised that in a low-density area such as the proposed location, sidewalks do not become a big issue.

Deputy Warden Adams then questioned whether an invasion of privacy of existing property owners would be experienced with a senior citizens' complex and was advised by Mr. Clark that this has not been the experience of the Housing Commission to date. Rather, senior citizens were extremely quiet neighbours and the need for screening and buffering would be thereby reduced.



Council requested that Mr. Schofield of the N.S.H.C., who was seated in the Council Chambers, address Council relative to what preceded the selection of this particular location.

Mr. Schofield advised that during the last two years, the N.S.H.C. had been looking at different sites in the Timberlea area, bearing in mind that servicing was coming on-stream. He advised that they had looked at four or five sites and three of them were on the Number Three Highway. There was some concern, at that time, relative to Seniors walking across the highway to get to shopping. As well, there was concern with regard to the development costs of some of the sites as there was a lot of rock in the area. This site was selected due to its proximity to what was felt would be a future developed commercial area which they would be able to walk to without going on the Number Three Highway.

He also advised that the Engineers and Architects, from the Commission looked over the site and approved it and further that the need and demand survey completed a few years ago, indicated that there were more than enough seniors from the Lakeside-Beechville-Timberlea area to fill the units and they wanted to keep the complex as close to the centre of the area as possible. The result was that the proposed site was the one eventually selected for the proposal.

Councillor Snow questioned whether anyone from the Nova Scotia Housing Commission met with the citizens of the area to determine their opinion on the proposal, prior to coming to Council.

Mr. Clarke advised that the Housing Commission understood the Public Hearing to be the opportunity for public input. He also felt that the past record of the Nova Scotia Housing Commission was evidence that the Commission dealt quite well with any problems encountered in subdivisions.

Councillor Snow indicated that in his District, a senior citizens complex is just being started now, subsequent to a year of planning and discussion with the residents of the area.

There were no further questions for Mr. Clark and Mr. Schofield.

Mrs. Annette Webster, resident of Parkdale Avenue: Mrs. Webster advised that if there were any heavy traffic she would be affected, as it would pass by her home. However, she felt that the site chosen by the Housing Commission is a good site for senior citizens. She indicated her opinion that the senior citizens should not be put off in an area by themselves but should live in communities such as the location of the proposed complex. She advised that the complex has all the required facilities including a Fire Department which is very near the proposed location. She also indicated her understanding that if the building is properly maintained, which it will be, that it would improve the community.

Mrs. Webster advised that the senior citizens have lived in the area, worked in the area, and contributed to the neighbourhood. She felt that they should be allowed to remain part of the neighbourhood.

There were no questions for Mrs. Webster and there were no further speakers in favour of the application.

#### SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION TO THE APPLICATION

Mr. Clifford Towner, Resident of 19 Elm Grove Avenue: Mr. Towner forwarded to the Warden a Petition signed by approximately 40 residents, homeowners and taxpayers of the area who were strongly opposed to the proposal. He advised that they could foresee many negative ramifications from such a proposal.

He advised that he had moved from the City and put money into his home because he wanted to live in a residential area. He advised that he is now faced with a fifteen unit complex going up in his neighbourhood which is one of the reasons he left the City.

Mr. Towner also advised that if the proposal is approved tonight it will set a precedent and pave the way for other developers to come seeking R-4 Zoning in the same neighbourhood and neighbourhoods nearby and putting up apartment buildings.

He also referred to the impact on the neighbourhood, by putting in a building of this size and with the potential for traffic, etc. He repeated Mr. Hanusiak's comment that the proposal would be thirteen times the size of houses on the same street.

With regard to the facilities referred to by the representatives of the N.S.H.C., he advised that there were none. There was only a Tavern one-quarter mile away, and a utility store in the neighbourhood which consisted of a drug store and a hardware store. To Mr. Towner's knowledge, there were no future facilities planned for the area.

Lastly, Mr. Towner advised that a great number of the criteria in the MDP, which enabled Council to consider the proposal, could not be met and, therefore, the development should not proceed.

#### Questions From Council

Councillor Deveaux agreed with Mr. Towner relative to the ramifications of an R-4 Zone; however, he advised that this complex would be for senior citizens and on that basis he could not oppose the development.

Councillor Deveaux indicated that there should be a separate zone for senior citizens. He questioned the Solicitor, whether, if the R-4 was approved in Council tonight and subsequent to that a Senior Citizen Zone was established, could the property then be rezoned to the Senior Citizen Zone.

Solicitor Cragg advised that it could; however, he could see no reason why the Housing Commission would want to have it rezoned unless for expansion purposes.

Mr. Towner reiterated his concerns relative to additional traffic and other impacts stated above.

Councillor McInroy questioned Mr. Towner as to whether he was familiar with the Church which is located on the plan to which Mr. Towner replied that he was.

The Councillor then asked Mr. Towner whether he was aware of the size of the Church as compared to the size of the homes. Mr. Towner could not supply this information but agreed that it was much larger than the homes.

Councillor McInroy then questioned Mr. Towner as to whether this Church destroyed the aesthetic character of the area. Mr. Towner advised that it did not because it was set off from the rest of buildings and there was a tree cover around it.

With regard to the lack of facilities, Councillor McInroy advised that the seniors who would be living in the complex will come from the general area and are, therefore, already aware of the lack of shopping facilities, the lack of bus service, sidewalks and so on. He felt that if there was a demand for senior citizen housing in that community then that should be the first and foremost consideration, not whether there are shopping facilities.

With regard to future residential development in the area, Councillor McInroy advised that he would prefer to live next door to a Senior Citizens' Complex rather than take the risk of three or four homes developing which will bring a lot of traffic or noise, compared to the senior citizens' complex which will not generate noise or traffic.

Mr. Ninos, Lot 14, Elm Grove Avenue: Mr. Ninos advised that his property was right next door to the proposed senior citizens' complex. Mr. Ninos advised that, like Mr. Towner, he was not against senior citizens but was against the fifteen unit complex because it represents a loss of privacy. He was also concerned about the precedent which would be set relative to the R-4 Zone and the possibility of other apartment complexes developing in the area.

#### Questions From Council

Mr. Ninos was questioned briefly by Council relative to how long he had lived in the area, which was twenty-two years.

There were no further speakers in opposition to the application.

#### MOTION AND DISCUSSION OF COUNCIL

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

"THAT the request to rezone Parcel 1-AR of the lands of Helena Doris Poirier, located on Elm Grove Avenue at Timberlea, from R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone to R-4 (Multi Unit Dwelling) Zone be approved by County Council."  
Motion Carried.

The above motion was passed subsequent to lengthy discussion in Council, during which many Councillors expressed their view that a Senior Citizens' Complex should be separated from any other multi unit dwelling, as it would not cause the nuisances of a normal apartment building, such as traffic, noise, etc.

The Sackville Councillors spoke in support of the motion, as their experience with Senior Citizens' Complexes indicated that senior citizens make excellent neighbours.

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT the Public Hearing adjourn."  
Motion Carried.

Therefore, there being no further business, the Public Hearing adjourned at 9:15 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING

NOVEMBER 28, 1983

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk  
Mr. R. G. Cragg, Municipal Solicitor

SECRETARY: Christine E. Simmons

---

OPENING OF PUBLIC HEARING - THE LORD'S PRAYER

Warden MacKenzie brought the Public Hearing to order at 7:05 P.M. with The Lord's Prayer.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly then called the Roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

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

PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

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

APPLICATION NO. RA-SA-47-83-20

Application No. RA-SA-47-83-20 was an application by the Municipality of the County of Halifax to rezone Lot No. 361493 of the Nova Scotia Housing Commission from C-2 (General Business) Zone to P-1 (Open Space) Zone; and Lot No. 357012 of Scotia Agencies Limited from R-2 (Two Unit Dwelling) Zone to C-2 (General Business) Zone.

Staff Report

Mr. Bob Gough, Director of Development came forward at this time to outline to Council the Staff Report relative to the above application. He advised that the Public Hearing for the zone changes was advertised as prescribed under the Planning Act and that no correspondence had been received, either in favour or in opposition to the application.

Mr. Gough advised that the purpose of the rezoning requests was to correct an error in Schedule "C" of the Sackville Zoning Map.

Mr. Gough then read to Council the remaining portion of the Staff Report as follows:

"Because this property was being used for business purposes, the Sackville Public Participation Committee intended to zone it to C-2 Zone under the Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-Law for Sackville, when they were adopted in May of 1982. However, an error was made in the preparation of Schedule "C" which resulted in the C-2 Zoning being applied to a piece of open space parkland owned by the Nova Scotia Housing Commission.

The Department of Planning and Development recommends that the proposed amendment to Schedule "C" of the Sackville Zoning Map be approved for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rezoning is only intended for the purpose of correcting an error in the Schedule "C" of the Sackville Zoning Map;
2. The property owners are aware of the application and support the changes."

In summary, it was the recommendation of the Department of Planning and Development that the rezoning of Lot. No. 361493, owned by the Nova Scotia Housing Commission, From C-2 (General Business) Zone to P-1 (Open Space) Zone; and Lot No. 357012, owned by Scotia Agencies Limited, From R-2 (Two Unit Dwelling) Zone to C-2 (General Business) Zone be approved by County Council.

Questions From Council

None.

Speakers in Favour of Rezoning Application

None.

Speakers in Opposition to Rezoning Application

None.

Motions and Discussion of Council

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

"THAT the rezoning of Lot No. 361493, owned by the Nova Scotia Housing Commission, from C-2 (General Business) Zone to P-1 (Open Space) Zone, be approved by Halifax County Council."  
Motion Carried.

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

"THAT the rezoning of Lot No. 357012, owned by Scotia Agencies Limited, From R-2 (Two Unit Dwelling) Zone to C-2 (General Business) Zone, be approved by Halifax County Council."  
Motion Carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT the Public Hearing adjourn."  
Motion Carried.

Therefore, there being no further business, the Public Hearing adjourned at 7:25 P.M.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

NOVEMBER 21, 1983

PRESENT WERE: Warden MacKenzie, Chairman  
Councillor Larsen  
Councillor Gaudet  
Councillor Baker  
Councillor Deveaux  
Councillor Gaetz  
Councillor Bayers  
Councillor Lichter  
Councillor Snow  
Councillor Margeson  
Councillor MacKay  
Councillor McInroy  
Councillor Eisenhauer  
Councillor MacDonald  
Councillor Wiseman  
Councillor Mont

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mr. R. G. Cragg, Municipal Solicitor

SECRETARY: Christine E. Simmons

-----  
OPENING OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE - THE LORD'S PRAYER

Warden MacKenzie brought the Committee of the Whole Meeting to order at 7:05 P.M. with The Lord's Prayer.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Meech 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.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Mr. Meech advised that the Policy Committee had discussed the Committee Structure and recommended that a Committee of the Whole Meeting be held to discuss this issue with all Councillors. He advised that the concerns of the Policy Committee, relative to the present Committee Structure were:



1. Staff do not have a lot of time to research items;
2. The Municipality was building up an increasing number of Committees and it was becoming difficult to decide which issues should go to which Committee;
3. There is a good deal of repetition of discussion on many issues.

Prior to discussion of the above concerns, Councillor Deveaux questioned Solicitor Cragg as to whether motions were permitted during this meeting and he was advised by the Solicitor that it is permissible to make a motion to recommend to Council.

For discussion purposes, Mr. Meech had prepared a report which was now circulated to Council and which defined the present Committee Structure, additional Boards and Commissions or Special Committees, including Joint-Provincial-Municipal or Inter-Municipal Boards and Commissions such as School Board, Metropolitan Authority and MTC.

Councillor Deveaux advised that in 1979, when there had been very many Committees, it had been difficult to cut back and a number of Committees were incorporated into the Policy Committee and the Management Committee. He did not feel it was possible to cut back additional Committees now. It was his opinion, in fact, that the Social Services Committee and the Recreation Committee should have been retained at that time. He indicated that if Council abolished all Committees at this time and went to a Committee of the Whole Structure, then Councillors would lose the personal contact with the issues and with Staff, which is enjoyed at the present time when Councillors come into the Municipal Administration Building to attend Committee Meetings and to interact with Staff.

Councillor Deveaux indicated his understanding that it is a difficult position for a Councillor who also has a full time job. He advised that he, who does not have a full-time job, devotes a great deal of time to being the District Councillor and that it has almost become a full-time responsibility. He felt that candidates running for election are misled into believing it is a part-time responsibility when, in fact, it is a good deal more than that.

Councillor Deveaux also advised that if the Committee Structure is altered, that consideration must also be given to a change in pay scales. He advised that it would not be possible to change the pay structure to correspond with the pay level that would be required to compensate for the loss of remuneration Councillors presently receive in Committee pay. In summation, Councillor Deveaux advised that he was in strong support of retaining the present system.

Councillor MacDonald advised that he could not agree with cutting out the Policy Committee and Management Committee once a week and holding a Committee of the Whole in their place; he did not see where this was going to save time or gain anything. He also agreed with Councillor Deveaux's statement that the Municipality was not in a position to change the salary system of its Councillors, which would have to be considered, should the system be changed in any major way.

Councillor MacKay indicated his opinion that Councillors are too concerned with the day to day operations of the Municipality instead of Policy items. He felt that if a Councillor had a problem in his district, he should go to the appropriate staff person or Department and get it straightened out by Staff rather than to carry it through themselves. He also expressed his opinion that the present Committees were not operating correctly as many items are coming to Council without recommendations. He then advised that quite often, not all Committee Members are in favour of the majority opinion of the Committee and subsequently did not support an issue when it comes to Council; therefore, the issue is totally re-debated at Council. It was Councillor MacKay's opinion that an issue discussed at the Committee level should not be re-discussed at Council unless it is extremely controversial.

Another concern expressed by Councillor MacKay was that if Council did go to the Committee of the Whole Structure, there should be a straight Salary for Council and if this was the case, he felt that there would be an attendance problem. He advised that Councillors have to realize they are in the position in order to represent their Constituents in the best manner possible and not for the primary reason of earning a salary. He felt that if Councillors were paid a straight salary, regardless of their attendance, there will be a good deal more absenteeism; in that respect he felt that the present Committee Structure was the best method because if a Councillor does not put in an appearance at meetings he-she does not get paid. He advised that if it were not for this problem he would support the Committee of the Whole. However, because of just this problem, he could not support it and would support retaining the present structure.

Warden MacKenzie expressed his concern relative to the amount of time spent in Council Sessions; he advised that there was a time when Council commenced at 10:00 A.M. and adjourned at 12:00 P.M. However, he was reminded by several Councillors that not too long ago Council began at 2:00 P.M. and went as late as 10:30 P.M. with only a one-half hour break for sandwiches.

Councillor Bayers advised, as one of the newer members of Council, that he had been forewarned of the time-consuming nature of the responsibility of Councillor. As well, he had received documents from the Municipal Clerk, outlining exactly the duties and responsibilities of the District Councillor. This he stated in response to Councillor Deveaux's suggestion that new Council Members should be properly informed about the nature of the position when they are running for election.

Councillor Bayers also indicated his support for the present Committee Structure. He advised that it is a good learning vehicle for a new Councillor as it familiarized the Councillor with all aspects of interacting with Staff from all Municipal Departments. Also, as a working Councillor, he did not find that the position of Councillor, although time consuming, interfered a great deal with his outside employment. He indicated that most meetings are held in the evening with the exception of Policy and Management and as a member of the Management Committee he did not have a great deal of difficulty in obtaining one morning off per week to attend the Management Committee Meeting.

Councillor Bayers indicated his concern though, over the fact that Council did not accept Committee recommendations but chose to deliberate the issues over again when they came to the floor of Council. He felt the Chairman of the respective Committee should summarize the issue and what occurred at the Committee level and that the other members of that Committee do not have to repeat their views on the issue. He also advised that it would be helpful if other Council members who were not on the subject Committee could get the background information on the issue from Staff. This, he felt would streamline Council discussion to dispose of issues more expediently.

Councillor Eisenhower indicated that one problem he had with the Committee Structure is that a Committee Member will go into a meeting without having any forehand knowledge about what will be discussed. He advised that agendas are not distributed until one arrives at the meeting and, therefore, Committee Members, have no time to research an issue or to think about it before discussing it. He indicated that, consequently, one could have a different view of the issue by the time it reaches Council after having some time to think about it further. It may be that the issue was not properly debated at the Committee Level.

However, he had problems with the Committee of the Whole Structure as well. He advised that the fewer persons debating an issue the better. For example at the Committee level an issue could be dealt with quicker than it would at Council where more people would be speaking on it.

Councillor Eisenhower indicated his opinion that the Planning Advisory Committee was a necessary vehicle for discussion of Planning issues which should, under no circumstances, be abolished. This Committee, he advised, always had a very heavy workload and accomplished a great deal.

Councillor Eisenhower gave his opinion that Council should go back to only three Committees; PAC, Policy and Management. He advised that because of the establishment of the Urban Services Committee and the Rural Services Committee there are less items to be discussed at the Policy Committee

He concluded his discussion, advising that he would prefer that Council does not go to a Committee of the Whole Structure as these meetings will be very lengthy. He agreed with the previous suggestion of Councillor Bayers, that the Chairman of the three major Committees and even Rural and Urban Committees should review the discussion at the Committee level, for the benefit of other Council Members; this should assist in streamlining discussion at the Council level.

Councillor Lichter indicated his opinion that if the Policy Committee had such difficulty in obtaining items for discussion, then that is the Committee which should be abolished but definitely not the Urban Services Committee and the Rural Services Committee as these Committees are accomplishing a great deal for the Municipality.

With regard to the repetition of discussion, he advised that many Councillors stand up to discuss an issue and repeat almost exactly the sentiments of the previous speaker. He indicated his opinion that it would be satisfactory to briefly voice agreement and to indicate this point by vote unless, of course, the issue is extremely controversial.

Councillor Lichter advised that in 1979 the Municipality paid out the sum of almost \$30,000 for a study and recommendations regarding Committee Structure and at that time it had been recommended that there be three Committees of Council, PAC, Policy and Management. Since that time, four more Committees have come about: Urban Services, Rural Services, Fire Advisory Committee and Heritage Advisory Committee. He advised that there were no problems expressed when the Urban Services, Fire Advisory or Heritage Advisory Committees were established but only recently when the Rural Services Committee had been established. He questioned whether it was the intention to abolish the Rural Services Committee and indicated his opinion that this Committee was accomplishing a great deal and that if any Committee were to be abolished, it should definitely be the Policy Committee which was admittedly searching for items.

Councillor Larsen agreed with previous speakers who had expressed concern relative to re-deliberation of issues from Committees. He felt that more information should be made available with the Committee Reports on the Council Agenda. This would eliminate the requirement for re-discussion and he agreed with the concern expressed by Councillor Eisenhower with respect to receiving the Committee Agenda at the commencement of the meetings. He felt that the agendas should be sent out sooner even if they are incomplete agendas. He also had difficulty accepting the Urban and Rural Committees because he felt they were divisive of Council.

Councillor Wiseman indicated her opinion that the Policy Committee is the Committee which should have the heaviest workload of all Committees in Council as this Committee should be setting Policies to administer the Municipality. She also voiced her opinion that the Urban Services Committee was an excellent Committee and that the reason many items discussed at the Urban Committee did not go to Council for approval was because they were items which could be handled on area rates or which could be solved at the Committee level. She advised that she could also see advantages to the Rural Services Committee if it works as well as the Urban Committee.

Councillor Wiseman then advised that one of the problems she has heard a great deal about in the last few months is the heavy workload of the Planning Advisory Committee and further that PAC Members were required to attend every meeting on the books, many of which were in the evening, in addition to regular weekly meetings which are held in the day time. She felt that there should be some way to handle this overburden administratively and more efficiently. Perhaps if the Policy Committee was setting Policies under which staff could work more effectively.

Another concern expressed by Councillor Wiseman is the requirement for the Board of Health to meet so often. She questioned whether the Board of Health could examine this themselves and come up with a solution.

Councillor Wiseman indicated that it would be her preference to retain the three main Committees as well as the Urban and Rural Committees. She advised that to go to a Committee of the Whole Structure would require additional meeting time which Council did not have to its disposal.

Councillor Mont reviewed a number of the items already discussed. The first, he advised, was the matter of repetition. He indicated that this was the very reason he had endorsed going into a Committee of the Whole Meeting Structure. He had found that any discussion which took place at a Committee Meeting was always repeated at Council. He felt this was natural because any Councillor who was not on the Committee did not have the benefit of the same information. He thought this problem may be alleviated by providing more information on their reports at Committee.

He then referred to the problem relative to late agendas; he agreed this was a problem but advised that in many cases staff do not know what is being discussed before the meetings start.

Relative to the suggestion that the Policy Committee was not operating properly, he agreed that this Committee should be setting Policies for the Municipality and should be one of the busiest Committees of Council. He advised that the previous week's agenda consisted of District Grant Requests and Unsightly Premises items. He was uncertain as to whether these were appropriate issues for that Committee to discuss.

Councillor Mont felt that if the Policy Committee is not to handle Policy items than the Policy Committee and the Management Committee should amalgamate, especially since both Committees deal with monetary items. He suggested that perhaps the Urban and Rural Committees remain in tact, and Council Members be divided one-half into PAC and an amalgamated Policy and Management Committee; otherwise, the Policy Committee should begin to operate in the proper manner.

Councillor Lichter advised that some time ago, when the Policy Committee began to handle Unsightly Premises issues, he had wondered whether they had begun searching for items due to a lack of sufficient workload. He advised that this was not the case with PAC which is working on a number of MDPs which are just getting off the ground. This, he advised, means that PAC members must attend a great deal of planning meetings to see that the ground rules are properly set. He advised that the first meeting of each Planning Group is of particular importance; after that, staff attends many community PPC meetings with the PAC itself is not directly involved in. He advised that Council has also directed PAC to review and upgrade the Zoning By-Law and the Sub-division Regulations; PAC, he advised, has spent a great deal of time addressing these issues. He then advised that a regular agenda for the Planning Advisory Committee can take from 2:00 P.M. to 5:00 or 5:30 P.M. to complete and that PAC has been unable to address the By-Laws

and Subdivision Regulations without calling additional meetings, most of which take place in the evening. He also advised that it is often very difficult to find an available evening to hold these meetings and that the Committee Members have to make a decision as to whether to have an evening at home with their families or to attend the meeting.

With regard to the Board of Health meeting so often, he advised that this Board is very much required; he advised that the Board only holds Public Hearings when someone appeals and further that the Board of Health attempts to hold three Hearings in one evening in order to keep the meetings down. He advised that in addition to the one regular meeting per month, there may be one or two appeal evenings. He advised that new regulations which came in several months ago make it mandatory for the Board to hold a Hearing when there is an appeal.

Councillor Wiseman requested that she be supplied with information relative to these new regulations. As well, she felt that there must be some structure, whereby PAC could develop Policies to assist in reducing its workload. She felt that PAC could examine its agenda to determine whether any of their workload could be reduced or allocated to another Committee with a lighter workload.

Councillor Lichter advised that looking at the agenda, one would find that every item on it should come to PAC even though Staff have done their work and done it well. He advised that on all issues on the agenda, there is no way the Committee can make a recommendation to Council unless the issue goes to the Committee first.

Warden MacKenzie questioned Mr. Meech as to whether there was some means by which the Municipality can cut down on its meetings and streamline its workload.

Mr. Meech advised that without changing the present structure there would be no room for streamlining the workload, unless there is a consensus among the Councillors. To improve within the present structure, some of the concerns discussed tonight should be considered.

With regard to the requirement for an advance agenda, Mr. Meech did not disagree with this suggestion; however, he advised that, from a staff point of view, one meeting is not yet completed before staff is preparing for the next one. Therefore, there just is not enough time to give the agenda the attention it requires.

In response to the suggestion of combining the Policy and Management Committees, he indicated that he had thought for some time that this was a good idea; however, it would be his preference to disband all Committees and go to a Committee of the Whole format. From the discussion this evening, however, he accepted that this was not what the majority of Council wanted.

Warden MacKenzie then questioned whether it would be possible for the issue of streamlining the Committee Structure and Council workload to go back to the Policy Committee for further discussion and recommendation.