

He advised that different circumstances warrant different reactions and perhaps there could be some mechanism agreed to that would come part way towards Councillor Lichters request. We are still not absolutely sure what the serviced area will include. He felt that you can approach it from two sides and both sides make good sense. One side is to say were almost there so why put restriction on and the other side says well were almost there so why would the people who are affected be necessarily worried. No member of the PPC to my knowledge have had any approaches requesting that the decision be changed and as Chairman of the PPC would have to say that as far as the PPC is concerned we stand by the recommendation.

Councillor Lichter understood what Mr. Pentland was saying but pointed out that two years is a long time for those people who will have to wait for their development rights.

Councillor MacDonald advised he had extensive phone calls (10-15) especially from people who own land around the lake asking about this particular zoning and when it is explained to them that if they go ahead and develop on the property and have to put a septic tank or holding tank and a year and a half down the road they have to go and pay for a sewage hook-up, people thank him for the information and would rather wait for the sewage system to come through and not pay a double cost. One person in particular decided to wait.

Councillor MacDonald stated that we should let it stand and let it go to the Public Hearing and if there is any objections or someone is being injured by it then we will consider it. He advised the plan is there to protect certain things and if we give everybody everything they want, then there is no sense in doing the plan. He felt there has to be some kind of direction to travel. The intention of the plan was to restrict certain things, to allow certain things and bring everything to perspective so we have a well planned area for the future and I think as far as I am concerned if there is not a major outcry it will stay the way it is and everybody on this Council is free to vote the way they want on this but I think the PPC has given Council direction and we should proceed along that way unless otherwise directed by the people of the community.

Councillor Merrigan asked if it takes two years to put the line down Lakeview Avenue then are you going to take two years before you take off that Zone. Will it be done as each house is hooked up?

Ms. MacKinnon responded that the policy states that at such time as central sewage services are installed, Council shall immediately amend the land use by-law by rezoning the lands within this area through the zone.

Councillor Merrigan wanted more clarification. He asked that if as soon as a person is hooked up, do we have to have a plan amendment hearing or is it going to be automatic?

Joan advised that it says that when its installed, Council shall immediately amend the Land Use By-law which means you do have to have a hearing.

Mr. Meech advised the properties will not be able to connect to the system until its all fully installed because the treatment plant is part and parcel of it so that in fact when its installed it means that people then can connect to the system. As soon as the Engineers give the County a certificate indicating that there is a central sewage system installed.

Mr. Meech advised Councillor Lichters point is that the way the plan is now presently worded even if the Board of Health was prepared to grant the permit for a temporary holding tank, the plan would not permit it.

Councillor DeRoche made a personal commendation to Councillor Lichter and his PPC colleagues for the time and effort that they put into the plan.

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

"THAT Council publicly commend the three chairmen of the PPC Committees for District 15, 18, and 19 for their efforts and contributions on behalf of the residents of the area."
MOTION CARRIED.

TENTATIVE PUBLIC HEARING DATE - SEPTEMBER 14, 1987

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

"THAT the report that was presented be received and that the Public Hearing date be re-confirmed for September 14, 1987 for adoption of the plan."

Councillor MacDonald went on record to thank the chairmen for the three years of hard work and dedication to the plan and wished them the best of luck in the future.

MOTION CARRIED.

Warden MacKenzie suggested that Councillor Merrigan sit down with staff personnel so they could explain to him to his satisfaction.

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT the meeting adjourn. "
MOTION CARRIED.

MUNICIPAL PLANNING STRATEGY
PLANNING DISTRICTS 15, 18, AND 19

SUMMARY OF LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

1.	RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICTS 15, 18, 19).	P.1
2.	MIXED USE A DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICT 15).	P.1
3.	MIXED USE B DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICT 18).	P.2
4.	MIXED USE C DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICT 19).	P.2
5.	SPRINGFIELD LAKE DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICT 19).	P.3
6.	UPPER HAMMONDS PLAINS COMMUNITY DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICT 18).	P.3
7.	RURAL RESOURCE DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICTS 15, 18, 19).	P.4
8.	WATERSHED DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICT 18).	P.4
9.	PROVINCIAL PARK DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICT 18).	P.5
10.	SANITARY LANDFILL SITE DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICT 19).	P.5
11.	FLOODPLAIN DESIGNATION (PLANNING DISTRICTS 18 AND 19).	P.5

RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICTS 15,18,19

MPS
P.50

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Residential Designation has been applied, for the most part, to the larger residential subdivisions which have developed on local subdivision streets. While a number of these areas are in the very early stages of development, others are more firmly established residential neighbourhoods, in which development is almost complete. This designation is predominantly characterized by single unit dwellings with a very limited amount of community facility development. This designation contains provisions to maintain and protect these residential environments.

Zones established in the Residential Designation:

- * R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone P.31
- P-2 (Community Facility) Zone P.57
- * Base Zone

Uses considered by development agreement:

- senior citizens housing
- model homes and associated office uses

MIXED USE A DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICT 15

MPS
P.18

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Mixed Use A Designation recognizes the semi-rural characteristic of the area designated, particularly the traditional mix of low density residential development, home business and resource uses. In the designation, provision is also made for community uses and facilities. As well, the Mixed Use A Designation provides for a limited amount of commercial and industrial development.

Zones established in the Mixed Use A Designation:

- * MU-1 (Mixed Use 1) Zone P.43
- R-3 (Mobile Dwelling) Zone P.38
- R-3a (Mobile Home Park) Zone P.39
- R-6 (Rural Residential) Zone P.40
- R-8 (Special Area (Villa)) Zone P.42
- C-2 (General Business) Zone P.55
- C-4 (Highway Commercial) Zone P.57
- I-1 (Mixed Industry) Zone P.60
- * Base Zone

Uses considered by development agreement:

- expansion to Woodbine Mobile Home Park
- commercial recreation uses (e.g. campgrounds, golf courses, amusement parks)
- extractive facilities

MIXED USE B DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICT 18

MPS
P.19

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Mixed Use B Designation recognizes the semi-rural characteristic of the area designated, particularly the traditional mix of low density residential development, home business and resource uses. In the designation, provision is also made for community uses and facilities. As well, the Mixed Use B Designation provides for a limited amount of commercial and industrial development. It differs from the Mixed Use A Designation with regard to the regulation of mobile homes, mobile home parks, and salvage yards.

Zones established in the Mixed Use B Designation:

- * MU-1 (Mixed Use 1) Zone P.43
- R-3 (Mobile Home Subdivision) Zone P.38
- R-6 (Rural Residential) Zone P.40
- C-2 (General Business) Zone P.55
- C-4 (Highway Commercial) Zone P.57
- I-1 (Mixed Industry) Zone P.60
- I-2 (Salvage Yard) Zone P.62
- * Base Zone

Uses considered by development agreement:

- mobile home parks
- commercial recreation uses (e.g. campgrounds, golf courses, amusement parks)
- extractive facilities (involving blasting and crushing)

MIXED USE C DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICT 19

MPS
P.20

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Mixed Use C Designation recognizes the semi-rural characteristics of the area designated, particularly the traditional mix of low density residential development, home businesses and resource uses. In the designation provision is also made for community uses and facilities. As well, the Mixed Use C designation, with its focus on job creation, encourages a significant non-residential component, including commercial and industrial development, especially in areas which have direct access to Highway No. 1.

Zones established in the Mixed Use C Designation:

- * MU-2 (Mixed Use 2) Zone P.47
- R-2 (Two Unit Dwelling) Zone P.34
- R-6 (Rural Residential) Zone P.40
- C-2 (General Business) Zone P.55
- C-4 (Highway Commercial) Zone P.57
- C-6 (Commercial Entertainment) Zone P.59
- I-1 (Mixed Industry) Zone P.60
- I-2 (Salvage Yard) Zone P.62
- * Base Zone

Uses considered by development agreement:

- mobile home parks
- commercial recreation uses (e.g. campgrounds, golf courses, amusement parks)
- extractive facilities
- woodworking shop (LRIS No. 40166985)

SPRINGFIELD LAKE DESIGNATION PLANNING DISTRICT 19
--

MPS
P.33

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Springfield Lake Designation covers the developed lands surrounding Springfield Lake. It is similar in many ways to the Residential Designation but recognizes that special measures must be established to address the potentially serious pollution problem in the area, with the goal of preventing any future deterioration in the lake. This includes a development restriction within 500 feet of Springfield Lake until central sewerage services are installed.

Zone established in Springfield Lake Designation:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| * RR-1 (Restricted Residential) Zone | P.36 |
| R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone | P.31 |
| P-2 (Community Facility) Zone | P.57 |
| * Base Zone | |

UPPER HAMMONDS PLAINS COMMUNITY DESIGNATION PLANNING DISTRICT 18

MPS
P.57

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Upper Hammonds Plains Designation covers the community of Upper Hammonds Plains and recognizes that the primary focus of the community is not the development of detailed land use regulation. It supports a wide variety of land use activities while establishing a number of requirements for these activities, aimed at reducing the major sources of land use incompatibility.

Zones established in the Upper Hammonds Plains Designation:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| * GU-1 (General Use) Zone | P.52 |
| C-6 (Commercial Entertainment) Zone | P.59 |
| I-1 (Mixed Industry) Zone | P.60 |
| R-6 (Rural Residential) Zone | P.40 |
| * Base Zone | |

Uses considered by development agreement:

- mobile home parks

RURAL RESOURCE DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICTS 15,18,19

MPS
P.63

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Rural Resources Designation has been applied to the "backlands" of the Plan Area, which are generally undeveloped and without public road access. At present, the major use of these lands is for resource activities, and the designation establishes resource uses and resource industries as the priority use of land. It also recognizes the designation as a recreation resource and therefore permits recreation uses. Major residential development may expand into this area but will be monitored in terms of its effect on resource development and its impact on the existing communities and their infrastructure.

Zones established in the Rural Resource Designation:

- * MR-1 (Mixed Resource) Zone P.54
- I-1 (Mixed Industry) Zone P.50
- R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone P.31
- * Base Zone

Uses considered by development agreement:

- commercial recreation uses (e.g. campgrounds, golf courses, amusement parks)
- extractive facilities

WATERSHED DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICT 18

MPS
P.72

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Watershed Designation is located on lands within the Pockwock and Tomahawk lake watersheds, most of which are owned by the Department of Lands and Forests or the Public Service Commission. While the designation permits limited residential development on private lands, the primary focus is the protection of the watershed area as a regional water supply.

Zone established in Watershed Designation:

- P-4 (Conservation) Zone P.70

PROVINCIAL PARK DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICT 18

MPS
P.81

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Provincial Park Designation is intended to recognize crown land at Cox Lake in Hammonds Plains which the Department of Lands and Forests has designated as "Park Reserve", and indicates Council's support for the development of the park.

Zone established in the Provincial Park Designation:

P-3 (Provincial Park) Zone

REGIONAL SANITARY LANDFILL SITE DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICT 19

MPS
P.76

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Regional Sanitary Landfill Site Designation covers the site of the sanitary landfill operation. The policies established in this designation attempt to address two separate issues: 1) the safe operation of the facility as a landfill site, minimizing negative effects on adjacent areas; and 2) direction and support for the conversion of the landfill site into a regional recreation facility for the Sackville area.

Zone established in Landfill Site Designation:

I-4 (Sanitary Landfill Site) Zone

FLOODPLAIN DESIGNATION
PLANNING DISTRICTS 15,18

MPS
P.90

SUMMARY OF INTENT

The Floodplain Designation has been applied to lands along the Sackville River and McCabe and Webber Lakes which have been identified in floodplain mapping prepared under the joint Canada - Nova Scotia Flood Damage Reduction Program. The intention of the designation is to minimize the consequences of flooding while providing environmental protection for the identified watercourses.

Zone established in Floodplain Designation:

FP (Floodplain) Zone - 1:20 year
Floodplain P.71

Uses considered by development agreement:

- MU-2 Zone Uses in the 1:100 year floodplain except FP Zone uses which are permitted "by right"

PLANNING DISTRICTS 15, 18 AND 19

PUBIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

1. Kick off Meetings

District 15 October 19, 1983
District 19 October 26, 1983
District 18 October 27, 1983

2. Meetings to Select Members to Serve on the PPC

A. Plan Area Meetings

Nov. 9 Springfield Lake
Nov. 22 Beaver Bank/Kinsac School
Dec. 7 Hammonds Plains Fire Hall

B. District Meetings to Select PPC Members

District 15 - Nov. 2 (meeting organized by Councillor Margeson). 14 members selected - 2 added at Nov. 9 meeting. (a number of additions and deletions since then)

District 18 - Nov. 17,
Dec. 7, (members from all 3 districts in attendance)
Jan. 5 - selected/elected representatives - 1 regular and 1 alternate from 8 identified communities/subdivisions:
1. Haliburton Hills/Stillwater Lake; 2. Highland Park;
3. Upper Hammonds Plains; 4. Hammonds Plains; 5. Maplewood; 6. Uplands Park; 7. Lucasville/Timber Trails;
8. Upper Hammonds Plains selected its representatives at a separate community meeting).

District 19 - Nov. 5, 1983 - Six individuals volunteered and were accepted as PPC members; consensus that additional PPC members from other parts of the district were needed; attempts made to recruit.

3. PPC Meetings

The first PPC meeting for the Plan Area as a whole, after a selection of PPC members from each district, was held on January 12, 1984. A total of 51 PPC meetings were held between January 12, 1984 and May 1, 1986. All PPC meetings were open to the general public (meeting dates as follows:).

	1984	1985	1986
January	12, 26	10, 24	9, 23
February	8, 23	7	6, 20, 27
March	8, 22	14, 28	20
April	5, 19	11, 18	3, 17
May	3, 17, 31	2, 17, 30	1
June	14	13, 20, 27	
September	6, 20, 17	5, 19	
October	11	3, 17, 30	
November	1, 8, 22	14, 28	
December	9, 20	5	

4. District Sub-Committee Meetings and Community Meetings

Throughout the process, a number of district sub-committee meetings and community meetings were held to review the recommendations of the PPC for the Plan Area as a whole and to provide input and suggestions to the central PPC. These meetings were useful in reviewing specific policies in terms of how they would affect the individual district or community and in making decisions for each district. Ratepayers groups also reviewed plan and zoning proposals and provided guidance to the central PPC.

A number of community meetings were held after the final PPC meeting of May 1, 1986, in order to deal with specific issues. PPC members for the district affected attended these meetings.

5. General Public Meetings and Open Houses

At key points during the process, the PPC held public meetings and open houses to present its recommended policies and zoning to the community. All of these meetings/open houses were organized by the district PPCs, on a district basis, with separate meetings and open houses held in each district.

In addition to smaller community meetings, the following general meetings were held:

District 15

February 20, 1985 - Public Meeting
July 17, 18, 1985 - Open House (zoning)
February 13, 1986 - Open House (zoning)
April 22, 1986 - Public Meeting/Open House

District 18

February 12, 1985 - Public Meeting
August 21, 22, 1985 - Open House (zoning)
February 18, 1986 - Open House (zoning)
April 29, 1986 - Open House/Public Meeting

District 19

February 19, 1985 - Public Meeting
July 24, 25, 1985 - Open House (zoning)
February 11, 1986 - Open House (zoning)
April 23, 1986 - Open House/Public Meeting

6. Bus Tour - The PPC organized a bus tour in June of 1984 in order for each PPC member to become familiar with all the communities and each district within the Plan Area. This tour included a guided tour of the Pockwock water treatment facility.

7. Survey - The distribution and tabulation of a Plan Area survey formed an important part of the PPC's efforts to gather public input. This survey was tabulated on a community basis and was useful in helping the PPC form its recommendations. 3,380 surveys were distributed and 742 were returned. This represents a 22 per cent response rate.
8. Advertising - A number of flyers and newsletters were distributed door to door throughout the planning process:
 - a. Flyer advertising kick off meetings to begin the planning process;
 - b. Flyer to District 19 residents requesting additional PPC representatives;
 - c. Flyer to District 18 residents advertising meeting (January 5, 1984) to elect PPC representatives for District 18;
 - d. Flyer advertising schedule of PPC meetings, meeting location, and listing the names and phone numbers for PPC representatives from each district;
 - e. Flyer advertising public meetings for February 12, 10 and 21, 1985;
 - f. Newsletter/flyer advertising Open Houses (Zoning Maps) for July 17/18, 24/25 and August 21/22, 1985. The newsletter outlined a summary of designations and information on survey comments.
 - g. Newsletter/flyer advertising Open Houses (Zoning Maps) for February 11, 13 and 18, 1986. The newsletter outlined a summary of zones within each designation.
 - h. Flyer advertising Public Meeting/Open House and final PPC meeting (May 1, 1986) prior to recommendation to MPC.
9. Ongoing Requests to Change Proposed Zoning

Subsequent to the final PPC meeting, a number of requests for changes in proposed zoning were received. Such requests have been sent to the district Chairmen and PPC representatives from the area affected. Recommendations on each request have been submitted to the Planner and individuals have been notified. In all cases, the individuals have been informed that if not satisfied with the PPC recommendation, they have the opportunity to pursue their requests at the Public Hearing.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Warden MacKenzie, Councillors and PPC Chairmen
FROM: Joan MacKinnon, Senior Planner, Policy Division
RE: PLANNING DISTRICTS 15, 18 & 19 MUNICIPAL PLANNING STRATEGY AND LAND USE
BY-LAW
DATE: August 19, 1987

1. Zoning Maps

Attached is a revised copy of the draft ZONING SCHEDULES, PLANNING DISTRICTS 15, 18 and 19, dated August 19, 1987. This draft corrects several zoning map errors and also contains corrections to the zoning legend, title, and certification.

PLEASE DISCARD YOUR JULY 22, 1987, DRAFT ZONING SCHEDULES (ZONING MAPS).

2. Land Use By-law

Please insert the attached pages (Table of Contents and page 14) as corrections to the typographic errors contained in the draft Land Use By-law.

3. Municipal Planning Strategy

Please make the following corrections to the Municipal Planning Strategy:

- page 129, P-135(a)(i) - delete "identified in Map 3".
- page 31, P-13 - fifth line - delete reference to P-7 and insert P-12.

Attach.

JMK/rmn

LAND USE BY-LAW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1:	TITLE	3
PART 2:	DEFINITIONS	3
PART 3:	ZONES AND ZONING MAPS	14
PART 4:	GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR ALL ZONES	17
PART 5:	SIGNS	27
PART 6:	R-1 (SINGLE UNIT DWELLING) ZONE	31
PART 7:	R-2 (TWO UNIT DWELLING) ZONE	34
PART 8:	RR-1 (RESTRICTED RESIDENTIAL) ZONE	36
PART 9:	R-3 (MOBILE DWELLING) ZONE	38
PART 10:	R-3a (MOBILE HOME PARK) ZONE	39
PART 11:	R-6 (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) ZONE	40
PART 12:	R-8 (SPECIAL AREA) ZONE	42
PART 13:	MU-1 (MIXED USE 1) ZONE	43
PART 14:	MU-2 (MIXED USE 2) ZONE	47
PART 15:	GU-1 (GENERAL USE) ZONE	52
PART 16:	C-2 (GENERAL BUSINESS) ZONE	55
PART 17:	C-4 (HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL) ZONE	57
PART 18:	C-6 (COMMERCIAL ENTERTAINMENT) ZONE	59
PART 19:	I-1 (MIXED INDUSTRIAL) ZONE	60
PART 20:	I-2 (SALVAGE YARD) ZONE	62
PART 21:	I-4 (SANITARY LANDFILL SITE) ZONE	63
PART 22:	MR-1 (MIXED RESOURCE) ZONE	64
PART 23:	P-2 (COMMUNITY FACILITY) ZONE	67
PART 24:	P-3 (PROVINCIAL PARK) ZONE	69
PART 25:	P-4 (CONSERVATION) ZONE	70
PART 26:	FP (FLOODPLAIN) ZONE	71
PART 27:	ADMINISTRATION	73
APPENDIX "A":	NON-CONFORMING USES - SECTIONS 83 TO 87 OF THE <u>PLANNING ACT</u>	
APPENDIX "B":	EXISTING USES	
APPENDIX "C":	NON-CONFORMING USES - PLANNING DISTRICTS 15, 18, 19	
APPENDIX "D":	LEGAL DESCRIPTION - MUNICIPAL DISTRICT 15	

PART 3: ZONES AND ZONING MAPS

3.1 ZONES

For the purpose of this By-law, the Planning Districts 15, 18, and 19 Plan Area is divided into the following zones by the zoning maps, the boundaries of which are shown on the attached zoning schedules. Such zones may be referred to by the appropriate symbols:

	<u>Symbol</u>	<u>Zone</u>
<u>Residential Zones</u>	R-1	Single Unit Dwelling Zone
	R-2	Two Unit Dwelling Zone
	RR-1	Restricted Residential Zone
	R-3	Mobile Dwelling Zone
	R-3a	Mobile Home Park Zone
<u>Mixed Use Zones</u>	R-6	Rural Residential Zone
	R-8	Special Area Zone
	MU-1	Mixed Use I Zone
	MU-2	Mixed Use 2 Zone
	GU-1	General Use Zone
<u>Resource Zones</u>	MR-1	Mixed Resource Zone
<u>Commercial Zones</u>	C-2	General Business Zone
	C-4	Highway Commercial Zone
	C-6	Commercial Entertainment Zone
<u>Industrial Zones</u>	I-1	Mixed Industrial Zone
	I-2	Salvage Yard Zone
	I-4	Sanitary Landfill Site Zone
<u>Community Uses Zones</u>	P-2	Community Facility Zone
	P-3	Provincial Park Zone
	P-4	Conservation Zone
	FP	Floodplain Zone

3.2 ZONING MAPS

- (a) Schedules A-1 to A-3, B-1 to B-6, C-1 to C-7, and D-4 to D-7, attached hereto, may be cited as the "Planning Districts 15, 18, 19 Zoning Maps" and are hereby declared to form part of this By-law.
- (b) The extent and boundaries of all zones are shown on Schedules A-1 to A-3, B-1 to B-6, C-1 to C-7, and D-4 to D-7, and for all such zones the provisions of this By-law shall respectively apply.
- (c) The symbols used on Schedules A-1 to A-3, B-1 to B-6, C-1 to C-7, and D-4 to D-7, refer to the appropriate zones established by Section 3.1 above.

LAND USE BY-LAW
PLANNING DISTRICTS 15, 18 AND 19
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ZONES

	PAGE
R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling) Zone	1
R-2 (Two Unit Dwelling) Zone	1
RR-1 (Mobile Dwelling) Zone	1
R-3 (Mobile Dwelling) Zone	1
R-3A (Mobile Home Park) Zone	1
R-6 (Rural Residential) Zone	1
MU-1 (Mixed Use 1) Zone	2
MU-2 (Mixed Use 2) Zone	2
GU-1 (General Use) Zone	2
C-2 (General Business) Zone	3
C-4 (Highway Commercial) Zone	3
C-6 (Commercial Entertainment) Zone	4
I-1 (Mixed Industrial) Zone	4
I-2 (Salvage Yard) Zone	4
I-4 (Sanitary Landfill Site) Zone	5
MR-1 (Mixed Resource) Zone	5
P-2 (Community Facility) Zone	5
P-3 (Provincial Park) Zone	5
P-4 (Conservation) Zone	6
FP (Floodplain) Zone	6

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ZONES

RIUD - Page 1

AUGUST, 1987

ZONE	COMMENTS	PERMITTED USES	LOT STANDARDS
R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling)	Residential Designation By Rezoning: Mixed Use Designations Rural Resource Designations	Single unit dwellings Office in dwelling Daycare facility in dwelling Open space uses Existing two unit dwellings Existing mobiles Existing Uses - Appendix "B"	300 sq. ft. of office use 7 children in day care No signs, open storage, display No expansion
R-2 (Two Unit Dwelling)	Planning District 19	Single & two unit dwellings Office in a dwelling Day care in dwelling Open space uses	300 sq. ft. of office use 7 children in day care No signs No open storage or display
RR-1 (Restricted Residential)	Springfield Lake Designation	Existing Uses; Uses Accessory to existing uses Office in dwelling Open Space Uses	300 sq. ft. of office use
R-3 (Mobile Dwelling)	Mixed Use A and B Designation - by rezoning	Mobile homes Single and two unit dwelling Day care facility in dwell. Home business Open space	1,000 sq. ft. of home business in dwelling or accessory building No open storage/display
R-3A (Mobile Home Park) Zone	Applied to lands of Woodbine Mobile Home Park	Existing mobile home park	Expansion of park may be considered by development agreement within R-3A zone
R-6 (Rural Residential)	Mixed Use A, B, C Designations	Single & two unit dwellings Home business Day care in dwelling Open space uses Agriculture uses Forestry uses Existing use - Appendix "B"	1,000 sq.ft. home business use in dwelling or accessory building; No open storage/display 14 children in day care Maximum 50 fowl/10 other animals Maximum 1,000 sq. ft. structure related to forestry. Separation distance requirements.

ZONE	COMMENTS	PERMITTED USES	LOT STANDARDS
MU-1 (Mixed Use 1)	Mixed Use A and B Designations - base zone	Uses permitted in R-6 Zone (above) Boarding/Rooming Houses Bed and Breakfast Institutional use except fire/police stations Senior Citizen Housing Existing Mobiles Commercial uses permitted in C-2 Zone (below) Trucking/Landscaping/ Excavating/Paving Services Agriculture Uses Forestry/Wooden Furniture	Maximum 6 persons Maximum 2,000 sq. ft./no open storage/outdoor display Maximum 2,000 sq. ft./located on residential lot/controls on open storage Separation distance requirements Maximum 2,000 sq. ft./separation distance requirements/controls on open storage
MU-2 (Mixed Use 2)	Mixed Use C Designation Planning District 19 - base zone	Uses permitted in MU-1 (above) Mobile homes Uses permitted in I-1 Zone Existing mobile home park, salvage operations and campground	Increased lot size and lot frontage requirement for commercial/industrial uses over 2,000 sq.ft.; separation distance requirements Controls on open storage/display/parking and loading areas
GU-1 (General Use) Zone	Planning District 18 Upper Hammonds Plains - base zone	All uses <u>permitted</u> except: - hazardous waste disposal sites - sanitary landfill sites/dumps - mobile home parks - commercial entertainment - industrial uses over 10,000 square feet	- requires development agreement - requires rezoning - requires rezoning

ZONE	COMMENTS	PERMITTED USES	LOT STANDARDS
C-2 (General Business)	Mixed Use A, B & C Designations - new uses by rezoning	Retail/food stores Service/personal service Offices Commercial Schools Banks/financial institutions Restaurants except drive-in take-out Funeral establishments Theatres, cinemas Parking lots Welding, plumbing, heating electrical, other special trade contracting services Bakeries Single/two unit dwellings	Maximum 5,000 sq. ft. commercial structure No open storage or outdoor display Parking controls
C-4 (Highway Commercial)	Mixed Use A, B, C Designations - new uses by rezoning	All uses permitted in C-2 zone Display courts Motels Service stations Taxi/bus depots Greenhouses/nurseries Veterinary clinics/indoor kennels Recycling depots Building supply outlets Drive-in/take-out restaurant Fraternal centre/private club	30,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size Controls on open storage/display/parking and loading areas Maximum 10,000 sq. ft. of commercial structure

ZONE	COMMENTS	PERMITTED USES	LOT STANDARDS
C-6 (Commercial Entertainment)	Mixed Use C Designation Upper Hammonds Plains Designation -by rezoning	Taverns/beverage rooms Nightclubs/lounges Billiard/pool halls Private clubs Bingo/dance halls	40,000 sq.ft. minimum lot size 200 feet maximum lot frontage
I-1 (Mixed Industrial)	Mixed Use A, B, C Designations Rural Resource Designation - new uses by rezoning	Manufacturing, processing, assembly, warehousing - not obnoxious - conducted, wholly contained within building Service industries General contracting storage yards/services Transport facilities/main- tenance yards Machinery sales/service Building materials outlet Greenhouses Agriculture/forestry uses Existing asphalt plant Trucking, landscaping, ex- cavating, paving Accessory-single unit dwell- ing, mobile, office, retail	Separation distance requirements from residential zones Controls on open storage, outdoor display, parking
I-2 (Salvage Yard)	Mixed Use B & C Desig- nations - by rezoning	Salvage yards Retail-gas & oil-accessory to salvage yard Auto body repair - accessory to salvage yard Single unit dwelling - ac- cessory to salvage yard Mobile dwellings - accessory to salvage yard	80,000 sq.ft. minimum lot size - increased yard requirements - separation and buffering requirements

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ZONES

R10D - Page 5

AUGUST, 1987

ZONE	COMMENTS	PERMITTED USES	LOT STANDARDS
I-4 (Sanitary Landfill Site) Zone	Planning District 19	Existing Sanitary Landfill Site Operation Recreation Uses	
MR-1 (Mixed Resource) Zone	Planning Districts 15, 18 and 19	Agriculture and intensive agriculture uses Forestry/fishing uses Kennels Communication transmission stations Recreation uses Single unit/mobile dwellings	80,000 sq.ft. minimum lot size Separation distance requirements
P-2 (Community)	Residential Designation - new uses by rezoning	Elementary schools Existing junior high school Denominational institutions/uses Day care facilities Fire & police stations Government offices/public works Hospital/medical clinics Public libraries/museums/galleries Community centres/halls Recreation uses Residential care facilities Nursing homes Open space uses	Landscaping requirements Controls on parking
P-3 (Park) Zone	Planning District 18	Public parks, trails, playgrounds Recreation uses Conservation related uses	No minimum lot size

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ZONES

R10D - Page 6

AUGUST, 1987

ZONE	COMMENTS	PERMITTED USES	LOT STANDARDS
P-4 (Conservation Zone)	Watershed Designation Planning District 18	Water distribution uses Open Space Uses Single unit dwellings Mobile dwellings Agriculture and forestry - - no buildings	Residential Uses - 80,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size Increased setback from watercourses
FP (Floodplain) Zone	Along Sackville River, McCabe/Webber Lake	Agriculture Uses Forestry Uses Fishing Uses Open Space Uses	Fill requirements No structures for human habitation

MINUTES & REPORTS
OF THE
SECOND YEAR MEETINGS
OF THE
FORTY - SECOND COUNCIL
OF THE
MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX
SEPTEMBER COUNCIL SESSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1 AND 15, 1987
&
PUBLIC HEARINGS
SEPTEMBER 14 AND SEPTEMBER 28, 1987
AND
JOINT URBAN/RURAL SERVICES MEETING
SEPTEMBER 8, 1987

Chief Building Inspectors Report -----	5-6, & 24
Computerized Data Base -----	17
Collins Park Water System -----	23
Crosswalk - Flying Cloud Drive -----	27
Crosswalk - Old Sackville Road and Riverside Estates -----	28
Director of Development - Report -----	7
Grants -----	15-16 & 25
Halifax Herald Ltd. -----	5
Henson College Study -----	7-14
Joint Transportation Committee Report -----	27
Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary -----	1 & 20
Motion - Approval of Minutes -----	1-2 & 20
Motion - Letters & Correspondence -----	2-5 & 21-23
Motion - RRAP Program -----	2
Motion - Sidewalk, Sackville Cross Road & Beaver Bank Connector -----	3
Motion - Speed limit, Sackville Drive -----	4
Motion - Family Housing Units -----	4-5
Motion - Halifax Herald Ltd. -----	5
Motion - Chief Building Inspectors Report -----	5-6 & 24
Motion - Undersized Lot Legislation -----	6
Motion - Public Hearing Dates -----	6-7 & 23-24
Motion - Director of Development report -----	7
Motion - Executive Committee report -----	7
Motion - Henson College Study -----	7-14
Motion - Grants -----	15-16 & 25
Motion - Computerized Data Base -----	17
Motion - J.B.'s Caberet, Sackville -----	17 & 27-28
Motion - Transportation -----	17
Motion - School -Bus Service, Vocation Schools -----	18
Motion - Transit, Beechville/Lakeside/Timberlea and Bedford/ Dartmouth/Sackville runs -----	18-19
Motion - Adjournment -----	19 & 28
Motion - Collins Park Water System -----	23
Motion - North Preston Water System -----	23
Motion - Development Agreement, Cole Harbour -----	23-24
Motion - Loan, Musquodoboit Harbour Volunteer Fire Dept. --	25
Motion - Permit fees, St. Margarets Bay Arena and Cole Harbour Place -----	25
Motion - Olympic Celebration -----	26
Motion - By-law #40 -----	26
Motion - Sewer Connections, Timberlea -----	26
Motion - Communications -----	27
Motion - Joint Transportation Committee report -----	27
Motion - Crosswalk, Flying Cloud Drive -----	27
Motion - Crosswalk, Old Sackville Road & Riverside Estates --	28
Motion - Easement, Village Road to Churchill Estates -----	28
Motion - Retirement Policy -----	28

North Preston Water System -----	23
Olympic Celebration -----	26
Public Hearing - Dates -----	6-7 & 23-24
Sidewalks - Sackville Cross Road & Beaver Bank Connector -----	3
Undersized Lot Legislation -----	6

COUNCIL SESSION

SEPTEMBER 1, 1987

PRESENT WERE: Warden MacKenzie
Councillor Rawding
Councillor Fralick
Councillor Adams
Councillor P. Baker
Councillor C. Baker
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor Randall
Councillor Bayers
Councillor Reid
Councillor Lichter
Councillor Snow
Councillor Merrigan
Councillor MacKay
Councillor McInroy
Councillor Eisenhauer
Councillor MacDonald
Councillor Wiseman
Deputy Warden Mont

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

SECRETARY: Virginia Veinot

Warden MacKenzie called the Council Session to order at 6:12 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. Reinhardt called the Roll.

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

"THAT Virginia Veinot be appointed Recording Secretary."
MOTION CARRIED

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Councillor P. Baker, Seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT the minutes of the Special Session, July 13, 1987, be approved as circulated."
MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT the minutes of the Special Session, July 22, 1987, be approved as circulated."
MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT the minutes of the Council Session, August 4, 1987 be approved as circulated."
MOTION CARRIED.

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

"THAT the minutes of the Public Hearing, August 10, 1987 be approved as circulated."
MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Mont, seconded by Councillor Wiseman:

"THAT the minutes of the Public Hearing, August 17, 1987 be approved as circulated."
MOTION CARRIED.

EMERGENCY ITEMS

Councillor P. Baker requested two items be added to the agenda: Atlantic Winter Fair and school bussing.

It was agreed these items be added to the Council Agenda.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Letter From the Minister Responsible for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation

Mr. Reinhardt advised the first letter is from the Office of the Minister Responsible for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and addresses delivery responsibility for the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP) through the Mikmakik Development Corporation. The letter states that CMHC believes the service delivery is good and has no reasons to withdraw the Mikmakik's delivery agent status.

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

"THAT the correspondence from CMHC be received."
MOTION CARRIED.

After discussion, it was moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Fralick:

"THAT the Minister and the appropriate staff be requested to meet with the Councillors in a Committee of the Whole Session to discuss the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP) and associated problems experienced in Halifax County."
MOTION CARRIED.

Letter from the Minister of Transportation - Condition of Beaverbank Road and Signage

Mr. Reinhardt stated that the correspondence from the Minister of Transportation responded to concerns with respect to the condition of the Beaverbank Road and speed signs knocked down. The Minister stated that one section of the Beaverbank Road from the railway crossing to Mayflower Avenue has been upgraded, repaved with new curbs and sidewalks in 1984. He acknowledged the deterioration of a portion of the road north of the upgraded section to the Hants County line. It was pointed out by the Minister that due to a great number of requests sufficient funds are not available to meet all demands and he assured that in the assessment of priorities for 1988/89 fiscal year, the Beaverbank Road will again be considered along with similar requests.

It was moved by Councillor Merrigan, seconded by Councillor Randall:

"THAT the letter from the Minister of Transportation regarding the Beaverbank Road be received."

MOTION CARRIED.

Correspondence from the Department of Transportation re Sidewalks, Halifax County

Mr. Reinhardt read the letter from the Minister of Transportation dealing with sidewalks constructed in the Sackville area. It was suggested by the Minister that input from the County is welcomed with respect to installation/location of sidewalks and perhaps a standard procedure should be established to follow on future projects.

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

"THAT correspondence from the Minister of Transportation be received."

MOTION CARRIED.

It was felt that consultation should occur between the Department and Mr. Wdowiak, Director of Engineering and Works, with respect to sidewalk installation.

Discussion took place with respect to a very dangerous section of highway between the Sackville Cross Road and the Beaverbank Connector.

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

"THAT a letter be forwarded to the Minister of Transportation inquiring when the section of sidewalk located between the Sackville Cross Road and Beaverbank Connector is expected to be completed."

MOTION CARRIED.

Correspondence from CN Re Sounding of Engine Whistle When Passing over Public Crossings

Mr. Reinhardt read a letter from CN advising that under the provisions of the Canadian Railway Act of Canada Section 248 (1) all railways are required to sound their whistle prior to passing over a public crossing. This provision has been incorporated into Operating Instructions for Canadian Railroads by General Order No. 873 by the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada. The letter further suggested that if Council feels strongly they should bring this to the attention of the Canadian Transport Commission.

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

"THAT this letter be received."
MOTION CARRIED.

Correspondence from Department of Transportaton Re Reduction in Speed Limit, Sackville Drive

A letter was received from the Department of Transportation advising that the speed limit on Sackville Drive has been reduced from 60 km/h to 50 km/h.

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

"THAT the letter be received."
MOTION CARRIED.

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

"THAT a letter be forwarded to the Minister of Transportation thanking him for his attention to this matter."
MOTION CARRIED.

Correspondence from Department of Housing Re Family Housing Units, County of Halifax

This correspondence advised that the 1987/88 budget of the Department of Housing includes 6 family units for the County of Halifax and preliminary plans are now being finalized for the units to be built this year. The Department suggested that the units be constructed as follows: 2 in Sheet Harbour, 2 in District #3 and 2 in Middle Musquodoboit area.

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

"THAT this letter be received."
MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Schofield was in attendance and provided Council with a brief presentation on the subject. He advised he was seekin the concurrence of Council with respect to the location of the family housing units.

It was pointed out that the areas selected are based on demand.

After discussion, it was moved by Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Wiseman:

"THAT approval be given to the construction of 6 Family Housing Units to be located in the areas recommended by the Department of Housing."

MOTION CARRIED.

Councillor Walker stated that there is a housing requirement in the Hubbards area and approximately four years ago a petition was circulated to all interested senior citizens.

It was pointed out that there is also a big demand in the Forest Hills and Eastern Passage areas.

Mr. Schofield advised that he will review these areas and respond shortly.

Councillor C. Baker congratulated Mr. Schofield on the beautiful Senior Citizens Home located in Herring Cove.

Council thanked Mr. Schofield for providing Council Members with information on this subject.

Correspondence - Halifax Herald Limited

Correspondence was received from the Halifax Herald Limited advising they had published a statement on the front page of the Chronicle Herald and on page two of the Mail Star with respect to an apology regarding the article published on the subject of illiteracy on the Eastern Shore.

After discussion, it was moved by Councillor Lichter, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"THAT a letter be forwarded to the Halifax Herald Limited politely pointing out the following: (1) the Warden's request for an apology was actually Council's request of August 5, 1987; 2) insulting one person and apologizing to another is not acceptable; an admission and an apology to Ms. Briggs is not an apology to the people of the Eastern Shore; and 3) that an apology to the people of the Eastern Shore appear on the front page of the Mail Star as it is predominantly delivered in this area."

MOTION CARRIED.

BUILDING INSPECTORS REPORT RE: LESSER SIDE YARD CLEARANCE

Council received a report from the Assistant Chief Building Inspector recommending approval for lesser side yard clearance of 1 foot. The property is located at Hubbards and the applicant is Mr. Gordon Morrison. The reason for the request is because of replacing the existing building.

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

"THAT approval be given for a lesser side yard clearnce of 1 foot for a property owned by Mr. Gordon Morrison which is located in Hubbards."

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING RE UNDERSIGNED LOT LEGISLATION

Ms. Sharon Bond, Development Technician, was present and advised that this is a straightforward application. The reason for the request is to allow the applicants, Wallace and Marie Boutilier, to give a lot to their daughter, being Lot T-1-A, and retain the remaining lands for themselves. There is insufficient frontage to allow approval of this application except under the undersized lot legislation as there is only 161 feet for both properties and each property would require 100 feet.

Ms. Bond provided information with respect to the history of the lot and the present status.

Warden MacKenzie called three times for speakers in favour of the application. There were no speakers in favour of the application.

Warden MacKenzie then called three times for speakers in opposition to the application. There were none.

It was moved by Councillor Fralick, seconded by Councillor Rawding:

"THAT approval be given to the proposed subdivision of lands of Wallace and Marie Boutilier, Boutilier's Point, to form Lot T-1-A and a remainder lot, be given final approval."

MOTION CARRIED.

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

1. Application No. RA-SA-14-87-16 - Rezoning of 190 Cobequid Road, Lower Sackville

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

"THAT a public hearing be held with respect to the above-noted application on September 28, 1987 at 7:00 p.m."

MOTION CARRIED.

Councillor MacKay pointed out that he would like to see the wording changed to read "that the Municipality give consideration".

Mr. Cragg, Municipal Solicitor, advised that the wording for such advertisements is set out in the Planning Act.

2. Application No. RA-SA-13-87-19 - Rezoning of Lot A, Located at 10 Beaver Bank Cross Road, Lower Sackville

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

"THAT a public hearing for the above-noted property be scheduled for September 28, 1987 at 7:00 p.m."

MOTION CARRIED.

3. File No. F-487-87-05 - Undersized Lot Legislation, Lots 12-13-A and 12-13-B of the lands of Henrica Kerkhoff, Portuguese Cove

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

"THAT a public hearing be scheduled for the above-noted properties on October 6, 1987 at 7:00 p.m."

Motion Carried.

DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT REPORT

It was moved by Deputy Warden Mont, seconded by Councillor Rawding:

"THAT the Director of Development Report be received."

MOTION CARRIED.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

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

"THAT the Executive Committee Report be received."

MOTION CARRIED.

Henson College Study - Public Information Meeting

Mr. Reinhardt advised that the Executive Committee discussed a proposed public information meeting be held in the Community of Sackville respecting the Henson College Report. At this public meeting, Henson College will present their findings and recommendations of the report to the general public and also provide an opportunity for individuals and groups to present their views at the public session. It is also proposed that prior to the public information meeting, a follow-up meeting between representatives of Halifax County and the Sackville/Beaver Bank Advisory Board be held. Comments were made that additional information was required by the residents of Sackville and Beaver Bank before the future direction of their communities could be determined.

The Warden advised he thought that this was actually to give some consideration to what effects it would have on the whole Municipality and to deal with what effect any incorporation would have on the rest of Halifax County.

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

"THAT Council establish a committee to formulate policy or direction to deal with the issues respecting Sackville and Beaver Bank with the membership of the committee being determined by Council or the Warden.

MOTION CARRIED.

Councillor Merrigan indicated that it is difficult for 21 Councillors to sit down and plan a strategy and thought a committee could best deal with it.

He advised that in Beaver Bank a phone survey indicated 20 percent in favor to go with Sackville as a separate community, 40 percent were against, and 40 percent were undecided. He indicated that a number of dollars had been spent on the Henson Report, and we also have the Sackville Civic Status Report and nothing has been decided.

Councillor Deveaux asked the Warden if the Province is coming forward with a report or recommendation with regards to the status of Sackville. He anticipated that the report would indicate what would happen to the rest of the County or how it would effect the remainder of our Municipality if Sackville does decide to incorporate.

Mr. Meech responded that the present report being prepared by the Department of Municipal Affairs is looking strictly at the impact on Sackville becoming an incorporated community. He has also initiated something in-house to try to develop that information base. The report that is being put together by the Department is basically a financial model which is expected to be released sometime in the month of September.

Mr. Meech indicated that the mandate of this adhoc committee would be to take the existing information available, as well as to identify what additional information is necessary, and then start disseminating that information to the public and hopefully get Council to arrive at a decision or course of action.

Councillor Deveaux indicated that he had no objection. He is as interested as anyone else is to find out what the impact would be on the remainder of the Municipality if indeed Sackville did decide to incorporate or take some other course which could have some effect on the remainder of the County. However, he hoped that it would include what the financial aspects would be or what effect it would have on the remainder of the Municipality financially, as well as the other relevant aspects.

Mr. Meech advised that the intent would be to develop that additional information.

Councillor Merrigan stated that Beaver Bank and Sackville have worked closely for many years and that a lot of services are tied. The people in the community have no idea what impact Sackville's leaving the Municipality will have. He felt that Council has an obligation to communities such as Beaverbank which may be effected to do something.

We have this obligation because we are Halifax County Councillors. He thought it time for Council to look at the situation and have a committee established to provide recommendations. He asked all Councillors to please support this motion.

Councillor MacDonald asked for clarification from Mr. Meech if he was doing a separate study or model or if he was talking about the Municipal Affairs report.

Councillor MacDonald asked since that information is now readily available, why would you have to do another study.

Mr. Meech responded that with the exception that the Department study is just focusing on developing a model on the implications to the community of Sackville as an incorporated community. It doesn't deal with the question on the other side that if Sackville incorporated what would happen to the Municipalities structure in terms of staffing, program services, financial matters as well. They're only looking at one side of it as this point.

Councillor MacDonald advised that it is the responsibility of the County to continue to protect and support the people of Sackville as long as there are no facts and figures that tell us that we're going to go in a different direction.

His opinion was that maybe it was time for Sackville to go in its own direction. He felt we should be looking at the impact on the Municipality if Sackville leaves but thought that we should not be involved in steering Sackville in a particular direction. He wanted to know what would happen to the services that Sackville have now as far as the sewer system and many other services that belong to the Municipality.

Mr. Meech responded that he has started an exercise to gather the information regarding the impact to the remainder of the Municipality if Sackville incorporated with the idea of getting all the information and then coming up with a suggested strategy. Presumably, at some point, Council should make a decision as to which direction it would like to see the Municipality go.

Councillor MacDonald asked if the information was being derived from our Municipality for the model which is being done by Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Meech replied that that is correct, but that it goes beyond that. He felt that part of the intent was to try to assist the people in Sackville by giving them a better information base from which they can ultimately make their judgement.

Councillor MacDonald advised that we should all wait until the Municipal Affairs report does come out and we have a chance to study it and have some dialogue on it because it may identify that Sackville is not prepared to do anything at this time. He didn't think we should be premature in doing something that would be counter productive to the report. The Sackville Advisory Board, the County, and the Civic Review Committee are all waiting on this report.

Mr. Meech reiterated that as he understood, what we are proposing to do is to assist the Community. One of the reasons the committee was suggested at this time is with the knowledge that the Department of Municipal Affairs report is to be presented and that information will have to be communicated to the people of Sackville as well as the rest of the Municipality. The Warden has taken action in accordance with Council direction to initiate a public meeting in the community.

Councillor Wiseman referred to the report in the book. The first paragraph of that suggests that the committee discuss the proposed public information meeting to be held in the community of Sackville respecting the Henson College Report. The recommendation that is included in the last paragraph has absolutely nothing to do with that public information Session. It seems that with the presentation of the report to Council, there was the intention of Council to bring this information to the Community and to discuss it with the community. In a previous paragraph it says that, as proposed, prior to the public information meeting that we have a follow-up session. Councillor Wiseman said a fair amount of information is now available and when the Municipal Affairs report comes out on the financing, there should be enough information for the people of Sackville to make up their minds. She suggested that the leadership of this Municipal Unit can provide the facts and figures and the financial information and try to co-ordinate that information so that the people can make a reasonable judgement. She questioned the Warden if the way it is going to proceed is first with the meeting with the Advisory Board, secondly with the Public Meeting and would this committee meet concurrently with those other activities?

Warden MacKenzie clarified the situation by advising that the letter he had written to the Chairman of the Sackville /Beaver Bank Advisory Board suggested that a meeting would be held later on in September and it was from that letter that the Executive Committee discussed and made a recommendation to Council in the last paragraph of this report.

Councillor Wiseman wanted clarification if it is the intent of the Council to meet first of all with the Advisory Board and secondly to go to a public meeting. Is it the intention of Council to have concurrent sessions for this committee that you are projecting be set up?

The Warden advised that he had voted to have the meeting some time in September but if Council goes with the recommendation here then that meeting could be delayed until the committee does get in place.

Councillor Wiseman advised her understanding was that this report affected the people of Sackville and that the intent from the previous meeting was that this information be taken to the people of Sackville. She advised that she was concerned that we seem to be waltzing around the whole issue and not dealing with it straight forward as far as the people of Sackville are concerned.

Deputy Warden Mont advised that the intention of the Executive Committee is to deal straight forwardly with the people of Sackville. Our understanding at the Executive Committee was that the Warden had written to the Sackville/Beaver Bank Advisory Board inviting their participation in setting up the public meeting and that we would be going ahead separately and apart from this second committee.

He understood that that was going ahead and the only question was whether we were going to do it right away at the first of the month or we were going to wait until we had the provincial report. The Warden has written the letter and that's underway. Then there was discussion about whether we as a Council owed it to the people of Sackville and the people of Beaver Bank to be presenting and making sure that they are informed of all the facts and figures concerning Sackville incorporation or town status or city status or remaining in the County and it was generally the feeling that we have a duty to the people of Sackville to show leadership in presenting in an unbiased way the facts and figures and all the possible avenues that are open to them and we have a duty to then request a fair and impartial referendum.

Councillor MacKay advised that the Communities of Sackville, Forest Hills, Cole Harbour, Beechville/Lakeside/Timberlea, Eastern Passage and even the rural areas are not being served well in the present set-up that we have with Halifax County Council. We have too much diversity and something has to be done. He indicated he supports the study and the formation of a committee.

He felt the Henson College Report did not answer anything. It just outlined some different scenarios and different courses of action to take. He also supported the resolution that was put forth by the Executive Committee.

The Warden advised a letter went out from his office to the Chairman of the Sackville Advisory Board. It was hoped that we would have the figures which the Department of Municipal Affairs were putting together and that those figures would be available by the time we had our meeting with the Board.

Councillor MacKay advised it was his understanding that the intention was was to meet with the residents in a public information session to discuss the Henson College Report and unless you do some costing on it and do some facts and figures on it, were wasting our time and confusing our residents even more.

The Warden advised that at this point we should hold back as far as any other meetings are concerned until such time as Council does support this.

Councillor MacKay advised that when the Henson Report was first tabled there was some support by some sectors of the Council to go out into the community and hold information Sessions then. These sessions were postponed until fall, and as yet, nothing has happened except Mr. Meech's saying that he has gotten various Department Heads to start to gather some information.