

Questions from Council

Councillor DeRoche stated it is not necessarily comforting to hear that both the federal and provincial government have responsibilities. He stated there is often a question as to whether or not they discharge their responsibility, and when most problems occur, it is not the federal or provincial authority that is expected to handle the problem, but those at the municipal level. He stated this gets awful tiring after awhile. He stated it is dangerous to assume that the municipal government has any controls in this regard.

George Cousins, East Lawrencetown, reviewed his presentation in support of this application. Copies of his presentation were circulated to Members of Council. Mr. Cousins concluded expressing full support for this application.

Questions from Council

None.

Mr. John Gant, Lawrencetown, advised he has been a resident of Lawrencetown for 17 years, and he is in full favour of this proposal. He stated by not speaking in favour of this application, there may cause some problems for other landowners in the future. He stated for the past 11 years there has been an elected citizens committee in Lawrencetown, working on the Municipal Planning Strategy for the area. He stated if there is an argument that the proposed garden centre may not conform with the proposed plan for the area, the plan may take another 11 years to become affective. If a land owner is turned down on this basis, and there are many other landowners in Lawrencetown that could experience the same trouble.

Questions from Council

None.

Bob Isenor, advised he was born and raised on a farm in Cole Harbour until the County expropriated it. He stated that the dangerous insecticides were banned a number of years ago, and any gardener at home would use as much pesticides and other chemicals as Mrs. Godfrey would use in her garden centre. He stated there are many pros and cons related to this development, but he is supportive of this application. He stated he took a poll of residents in his area, and the results were presented to Councillor Randall. He stated of the homes visited, everybody was supportive of this development; he stated not one person in the West Lawrencetown area was opposed to this garden centre.

Mr. Isenor stated there is an animal hospital in Lawrencetown which is close to the water and maybe closer than the garden centre will be. He felt the garden centre would not put near the amount of chemicals in their sewer systems that the animal hospital uses.

Mr. Isenor concluded that he and most everybody from the West Lawrencetown area are supportive of this application.

Questions from Council

Councillor Eisenhauer commented that pesticides for 144 head of cabbage would require more chemicals than this garden centre would use, and the chemicals would not kill the bugs anyway because it is no longer strong enough. Mr. Isenor agreed.

Councillor Eisenhauer stated most commercial industries gives off pollution, but the garden centre gives off oxygen, as opposed to smoke and pollutants.

Councillor MacKay inquired about the geographic region of the poll Mr. Isenor conducted in relation to the site for the proposed garden centre. Mr. Isenor responded that he polled the West Lawrencetown area which is approximately one mile from the site. Councillor Randall clarified that poll conducted by Mr. Isenor was submitted to the Planning Department, and copies of the poll were circulated to Members of Council. There was some discussion about the polls which were circulated; they were all from the Upper Lawrencetown area. Mr. Isenor clarified that there was no opposition to this development in the area he polled.

Warden MacKenzie noted that comments are becoming repetitious, and he asked that representatives simply give their name and indicate that they are in favour of this application.

There were eight other people who indicated they are supportive of this proposal, including Ralph Crowell, Roger McDonald, Doug Mercer, and Lucille Melanson.

Speakers Opposed to this Application

Keith Stone, West Lawrencetown Road commented on the importance of Cole Harbour from an ecological perspective. He stated the area is relatively productive due to organic material and nutrients from the surrounding drainage basin, salt marshes, and eel grass beds, as well as physical mixing from tidal currents. He advised this means there is much food available there for a wide variety of species. There are large concentrations of soft shelled clams which are harvested commercially and recreationally, as well as blue mussels. He stated there are also a variety of migratory birds that use this area for feeding, nesting, and over-wintering, as well as migratory fish species that pass through to spawning areas in some of rivers and streams that flow into Cole Harbour.

Mr. Stone stated one of the unique features of this habitat is that it is close to the city and relatively accessible to the public. There have been attempts made by the Province to retain and preserve this sensitive environment.

Mr. Stone stated the proposed garden centre, which is proposed at the head of Cole Harbour, will introduce the potential for contaminants to enter the system.

Mr. Stone stated there is no guarantee that problems will not occur, and he felt it would not be sensible to allow a garden centre so close to Cole Harbour - most particularly when the Province is involved in purchasing property around the harbour for the purpose of establishing a wildlife reserve. He felt if there is to be such a facility it should be away from the water in an area where the risk of potential impact from runoff would be much lower.

Mr. Stone noted that the Department of the Environment has indicated that there will no impact from herbicides or pesticides, but he stated there has not been much research done on long-term chronic affects of these substances at low levels. Also, if there is an accident, closing the garden centre will not have any affect on the results.

Questions from Council

None.

Valerie Myra, Upper Lawrencetown informed that she was not polled for an opinion about this development. She stated the area in question is fragile, and the water drainage is not very good. She questions the affect of the dirt drainage from this development. Ms. Myra stated the owner of the garden centre may have a 20 year record of no faults, but she expressed concern if an accident does occur in the future. She stated if the place is closed down after an accident, the harm is done, and this will not do any good.

Ms. Myra stated there is much wildlife in this area, which once died off and is now slowing coming back. She stated this tempormal condition should not be upset. She concluded that people already have enough difficulty getting an adequate water supply, and this development will only enhance these problems because it will require such a large quantity of water.

Questions from Council

None

Ms. Carol O'Neil, West Lawrencetown advised that she was not approached with a poll concerning this development. She informed that she has conducted her own informal poll on her own road, which is close to the mouth of Cole Harbour and will receive the effluent produced at the head of the Harbour. She advised that most people she contacted regarding this were violently opposed to this development. She stated the residents of this area use the beaches and clam flats, and they do not want to see these contaminated.

Ms. O'Neil advised that she has been in Lawrencetown since 1972, and in 1974 residents were informed by the Department of the Environment and the Department of Municipal Affairs that this area is very environmentally delicate; that Cole Harbour is one of the last unpolluted salt marshes on the entire eastern seaboard of the continent; and that it is a very important feeding ground for migratory birds. She stated many Councillors must be aware of the problems there have been in trying to balance the environmental needs and sensitivity of the area. The rights of land and homeowners if also recognized. All direction at all public meetings have had an emphasis on the environment, and she expressed concern that the Department of the Environment had not considered this development in greater detail.

Ms. O'Neil expressed concern that any chemicals would wash through the floor drains in the cement floor of the greenhouse and eventually make its way into the harbour. She also expressed concern that if there was an accident with a chemical that it would be swept up with sawdust for garbage disposal. She stated pesticide use and disposal requires very careful handling. She stated it is very important to consider the potential for damage now, and the potential with this proposal is very real and serious. She stated it has been suggested to Mrs. Godfrey that she relocate to another part of Lawrencetown rather than on the water at Cole Harbour, which has already been subjected to terrible abuse. She stated this chance should not be taken again, and this opposition is only one in a series of steps to protect Cole Harbour. She asked that Council will consider the future when deciding on this development.

Questions from Council

None.

Jim Reid, Cole Harbour Dyke stated he does not agreed with Mr. Cooper that he should trust those with greater knowledge. He stated the Cole Harbour Dyke is a rural slum, and nothing could be enforced here, let along complicated issues, such as pesticides. He stated his concern is of self-interest, as a resident at the mouth of the harbour he gets his water supply from the fresh water that literally floats on top of the salt water on the dyke. He asked about guarantees for a continued, pollution-free water supply. He stated he does not have the benefit of having water piped in, and there are 15 houses on this road, all in the same situation. He stated those residents may not even be aware of this meeting, and he has a definite health concern in this respect. He noted the upper harbour is badly polluted, and more and more pollutants over the years will only lead to more problems.

Mr. Reid also expressed concern that the garden centre does not work out, and the land use is changed to a dry cleaning establishment, and in a local sense there would be many houses affected by this.

Mr. Reid stated this area is supposed to be deemed as a recreational park of which part is Rainbow Haven Beach, which is great. He stated this area is deteriorating and the more it is built up, the more it deteriorates. However, it is a unique area within six miles of Dartmouth.

The west side of Cole Harbour has been expropriated, and from the head to the mouth of the harbour has been designated for park use. Within the next few years, there will be intense use of these areas. He concluded that he never wants to see Cole Harbour in the shape that Halifax Harbour is now in.

Questions from Council

Councillor DeRoche clarified that Mr. Reid lives near the Mitchell's by the tidal flats.

Donna Lassaline, Ross Road advised that she has lived in the Cole Harbour area for approximately 25 years and she loves it there. She remembered Cole Harbour when there was no odour and no garbage in the harbour. Then gravel was washed into the harbour among other problems. She stated these things should be taken into consideration before approval of this project is given. She stated she is not opposed to garden centres, although she is opposed to one at this site.

Questions from Council

None

Mike McMaster advised that he recently moved to Lawrencetown to enjoy the area where it is calm and peaceful. He stated he would hate to see anything ruin the animal and fish life near this harbour. He stated if pesticides got into the Harbour it would kill anything. He questioned what will happen if there is a leak or an accident. He stated it will be too late then. He also expressed concern that the municipal water on the Ross Road will be contaminated, and if this could ever be cleaned up.

Questions from Council

None

Don Grady, West Lawrencetown advised that he is a member of the Lawrencetown Citizens' Committee.

Mr. Grady stated he is concerned about the planning process in Lawrencetown; he is also concerned about the environmental impact and affect of this proposed rezoning. He stated he is also concerned about the long term costs and the short term benefits of approval of this rezoning application.

Mr. Grady stated efforts have been made in Lawrencetown since 1979 to produce a plan for the area which will respect and protect the environment. One of three primary injunctions is to protect the environmental ground water, the harbour, the marshes, and other water resources in the community. This proposal for rezoning is a direct threat to the waters of Lawrencetown. It is not threatened by Mrs. Godfrey's operation, but by the nature of her operation. He stated citizens would be opposed to this type of development no matter who was proposing it.

Mr. Grady continued that he and Doug McLeod have been directed unanimously by the residents to vigorously oppose this application. They have also been instructed to oppose it on the Lawrencetown Citizen's Committee.

Mr. Grady stated this application puts Halifax County Council in a difficult position, as it is not a municipal responsibility to enforce the environmental laws of Nova Scotia. This Council is also not responsible for the Planning Act or for other Acts of the federal and provincial governments. However, Halifax County Council is put in the position of making a decision regarding this application and defending that decision.

Mr. Grady stated this application has been dealt with the same as another application which residents had concern about several years ago. Representatives of the Committee made a good argument against the rezoning, and Council denied the application.

The planning process is an attempt to develop a series of planning regulations which would become what the Lawrencetowners want for protection for the community. He felt confident that the plan is a responsible one, and County Council will respect it. When the job is complete, it will be found to be proper by Halifax County Council. However, while the plan is in the process, Atlantic Nurseries Ltd. have made application for rezoning, knowing that once this rezoning is made, it will be included in the proposed plan, and they will be permitted to make any use of that commercial zone incorporated into the plan. He stated residents are very distressed about this. He stated those who are supportive of this development are sadly misinformed.

Mr. Grady continued that current provincial regulations are inadequate to ensure that the waters of Cole Harbour and the Little Salmon River and the ground water of Lawrencetown will be protected. He stated the Pesticide Control Act and the Pesticide Control Officer will not take control of any situation should it arise here, as indicated in the staff report. He advised he has spoken to the Pesticide Control Officers concerning this, and they have indicated that the Act will not be sufficient control for this use, and the regulations under which the Nova Scotia Act will be applied are about two years from application to the retail sales sector.

Mr. Grady noted that Mr. Cooper stated Council should feel as he does about pesticides control and environmental pollution. He stated the same assurance given by Mr. Cooper were given 40 years ago about DDT and 30 years ago about asbestos. He stated it is insufficient for an enlightened County Council to say the government is there it protect us because the government has been tragically wrong in the past, and there is no reason to believe those regulations not yet in affect will be sufficient to protect Cole Harbour.

Mr. Grady stated the residents of the area have been making an investment by cleaning up messes. The Nova Scotia Wildlife Association has a letter on file with County Council opposing this rezoning application, and he noted this is the same group of volunteers who spent the past 12 years trying to clean up the Little Salmon River. The government of Nova Scotia has also been attempting to acquiring lands in Lawrencetown and Cole Harbour since 1979, in order to protect the water resources here. He stated the residents are a long way from getting these controls in place, and measures of protection must be taken in the meantime.

Mr. Grady concluded that the best manner to handle this situation is to exercise extreme caution. He stated the same attitude of responsibility and accountability which was adopted with the previous application, when the matter was deferred for further clarification. Mr. Grady stated there are very powerful risks involved with the approval of this application for rezoning. He stated this operation will undertake maintenance, which means treatment of various pesticides and herbicides; the retail garden centre business cannot run by bringing plants in and letting them sit there; they must be "maintained". He stated expressed concern that many of the chemicals which will be used are very dangerous, and the consequences of leaks and exposure to these chemicals must be considered, as these are serious hazardous products not to be used privately or publically without due regard to their danger. He stated County should know a great deal more about this proposed development and the impact on the environment. He stated Mr. and Mrs. Godfrey ought to be encouraged to locate their garden centre in Lawrencetown, but no closer to the water than 1,000 feet. The plan, when affective, will be very hospitable to Mr. and Mrs. Godfrey, as long as they stay well away from the water.

Mr. Grady noted that Mr. and Mrs. Godfrey also want to develop their garden centre as a recreational area, and they have right of first refusal on the additional two acres between the current 1.87 acres and the mouth of the Little Salmon River. He felt the only fair way to approach this matter, it to examine carefully the planned use of these land to ensure the environmental safety of the community, as well as the values of the Plan, which have taken so long to develop.

Questions from Council

Councillor DeRoche noted that this property has not been included in the lands acquired by the Province for preservation. He asked if any attempts have been made by the Province to acquire this property, or if it has been left of for a particular reason. Mr. Grady advised he spoke to the Honourable David Nantes' office regarding this, as well as to the Honourable Tom McInnis, and both of those MLA's were unaware that this property had not be designated, purchased, or controlled. Mr. Nantes' office indicated that they are preturbed that this land had escaped consideration. He noted that both MLA's had expressed concern and interest in trying to resolve this problem by examining very carefully in an effort to discover whether this problem could be solved by a land acquisition undertaken by the Province.

Councillor MacKay inquired about Mr. Grady's direction in being here to oppose this rezoning. Mr. Grady advised that he had been instructed by the residents of the West Lawrencetown Road to oppose this application. In the other four areas of Lawrencetown, either this matter was not considered or representatives were not instructed to oppose this rezoning. He noted he is representing about 400 residents of his road, who are opposed to this rezoning. He and Doug McLeod were also instructed to oppose this application by the Lawrencetown Citizens' Committee.

Councillor Wiseman commented on a contradiction that the condition of Cole Harbour is deteriorating, as indicated by Mr. Reid, yet in a letter from the Cole Harbour Rural Heritage Society, it refers to the improvement of the water quality at Cole Harbour since 1970. She asked if the condition of the water in the harbour is deteriorating or improving. Mr. Grady stated this issue is contradictory. He felt the condition of the water in some respect has improved over the past 15 years, but in other respects they may have deteriorated over the same period. He stated the waters of Cole Harbour will not be any better protected if this rezoning application is approved.

Deputy Warden MacDonald inquired about the recommendation for this property if this application is not approved. Mr. Grady advised it is not designated R-1 in the proposed plan, although this has not been seriously reviewed yet. He noted in the proposed draft plan there is an RR-1 designation which is sensitive to the history of Lawrencetown and to the need to have planning in the community to have home businesses and to use properties as traditional in this area. It will also involve a zone that will preclude Mr. and Mrs. Godfrey from locating their business on this land unless they go through an additional evaluation and analysis program. He noted this RR-1 zone is more flexible than the R-1 designation in other jurisdictions, but not flexible enough to permit this type of use. This type of use is proposed to be allowed in the part of the Lawrencetown which is away from the water.

Deputy Warden MacDonald there is a 500 foot setback requirement in the District 15/18/19 plan until the new sewer system is installed here. He inquired about the proposal for a septic tank on this property. Mr. Morgan advised it is not known at this point where the septic system is proposed. He noted that the Department of Health has indicated that regulations require that the disposal field be a minimum setback of 100 feet from the watercourse, but it could be more once it is evaluated. There is nothing to prevent the garden centre from being closer than 100 feet from the watercourse as long as the septic field is beyond 100 feet.

Councillor Randall inquired about the proposed RR-1 zone, and if it would allow a garden centre under a development agreement. Mr. Grady advised this is not known yet because the people are not sure what they want to do with garden centres. There is no definition for a garden centre, and a proposal for the terms of development agreements have not yet been prepared, so it cannot yet be determined if development agreements will apply to garden centres. He noted Policy

50 in the draft plan is a requirement that an intensive evaluation of the land capability and proximity of water be made, as well as the topography of land which might be involved in this process. He clarified that the community has never voted on garden centres or development agreements for garden centres.

Councillor Lichter asked if the PPC for the area has taken a stand with regard to this application. Mr. Grady clarified that the Lawrencetown Citizens' Committee has not taken a position on this application for rezoning as there has been very deep and heated discussion about this matter. He stated of the nine members on the Committee four are very much opposed to this rezoning application, four have expressed the view that they would not like to take a position or it may be an allowable use, and one member of the Committee has not yet made up his mind. He stated the Committee is neither in favour or opposed to this rezoning application. Only Mr. McLeod and Mr. Grady, representing the West Lawrencetown Road, have been instructed to oppose this application. He clarified there were three speakers from that Committee at this public hearing; two were in favour of the application, and Mr. Grady was against. Councillor Lichter clarified that these people are representing themselves rather than the Committee. Mr. Grady objected that some distinction must be made. He stated the two members instructed to oppose this application represent 20 percent Lawrencetown; he noted that others from the Committee who spoke in favour of this application have given these feelings at the Committee, as well. He noted he also has a letter from Ross Haines of East Lawrencetown in opposition to this application. He was also asked by Mr. Jim Henley, Chairperson of the Committee, to express his objection to this application.

Joan Axford and Helen Fletcher expressed their objection to this application from the gallery.

Mr. Kelly reviewed letters respecting this rezoning. The first was from Frank Oram, President of the Halifax Wildlife Association, expressing opposition to this application, and the second was from Rosemary Eaton, Secretary, Cole Harbour Rural Heritage Society expressing support for the application provided regulatory controls are implemented.

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

"THAT this matter be deferred and in the meantime that Halifax County request a meeting with representatives of the Department of the Environment and that the matter be dealt with following discussion with the Department of the Environment."

MOTION CARRIED 10 YES
 8 NO

There was some discussion concerning a time limit on the deferral.

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

"THAT the meeting with the Department of the Environment be co-ordinated as soon as possible and brought back to Council at the first Council Session in May."

It was agreed that the meeting with the Department of the Environment will be held with all of Council.

MOTION CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT this public hearing adjourn."

MOTION CARRIED

The public hearing adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

APRIL 25, 1988

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. G.J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. R.G. Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. William Butler, Manager, Policy Division

SECRETARY: Glenda Hill

Warden MacKenzie called the Public Hearings to order at 7:05 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. Kelly called the Roll.

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

"THAT Glenda Hill be appointed Recording Secretary."
MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION NO. PA-SA-04-87 - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SACKVILLE
MUNICIPAL PLANNING STRATEGY AND LAND USE BY-LAW, RE COMMERCIAL
POLICIES

Mr. Butler reviewed the staff report as presented to Council. He advised that this application contains a number of proposed amendments to the Sackville Plan and By-law which were considered by the Planning Advisory Committee and at a public participation session on February 23, 1988. He stated the amendments are related to the Industrial Park, as well as to the Commercial Core Designation and the General Commercial Designation within Sackville.

Subsequent to the Public Participation meeting, a decision was made that the amendments related to the Commercial Core and the General Commercial Designation should be left for the plan review process, currently underway. However, the Planning Advisory Committee felt the amendments related to the Industrial Park should proceed.

Mr. Butler advised that these amendments are primarily designed to increase the competitive position of the Industrial Park relative to other industrial parks within the metro region. A previous plan amendment in 1986 relative to the Industrial Park expanded the range of uses somewhat by permitting support of commercial activity. However, many residents of Sackville still feel that business opportunities in the Sackville Industrial Parks were being lost to other industrial parks in the area because of the current restrictions.

Mr. Butler reviewed the amendments as proposed, stating they will permit all C-2 uses contained with the Sackville Land Use By-law to locate with the Industrial Park if they are contained within industrial related malls. Restricting commercial and office activities to industrial malls will keep the commercial components at a smaller scale than permitted elsewhere in the community, and there will be less competitiveness within the community. It will also support the physical appearance of the park, which is designed for a suburban type industrial area.

Questions from Council

Councillor MacKay asked for the definition of a mall type structure, multiple tenancy industrial mall, multiple tenancy mall, and multiple tenancy mall. He stated this wording is used in the amendments, and somebody will be responsible for interpreting this in the future. Mr. Butler responded that the intent is the industrial malls currently in place, which are designed for rent or lease to more than one occupant. The intention is to restrict the ability of strictly commercial or office activities to locate in free-standing buildings that serve only the one occupant. The height restriction of 35 feet will also remain in affect in the Industrial Park.

Councillor MacKay inquired about the difference between a smaller building occupied by one business and a larger building divided and leased to more than one occupant. Mr. Butler stated these restrictions will prevent against highrise buildings. Mr. Butler stated a building can be constructed to 35 feet, as long as the building is designed for multiple tenancy and not just for one occupant; there is no specific definition placed in the by-law, but Mr. Butler felt this would not pose a problem.

Councillor MacKay asked if this restriction is the thought of the Planning Department or if it is a compromise to satisfy persuasions from the C-2/C-3 area that did not want the Industrial Park opened to other permitted uses. Mr. Butler replied that the concerns of the Planning Department have been that expansion to the Industrial Park

will have an effect on the existing commercial areas, and this is seen as a reasonable compromise, recognizing that any time there are commercial uses permitted in two areas, a competitive situation is created. However, by only permitting commercial development in industrial malls, the potential competitive disadvantage is minimized to the Sackville Drive area.

Councillor MacKay asked if this was weighted against what the Sackville Industrial Park is losing to other industrial parks. Mr. Butler replied that the position of the Planning Department is that they are not 100 percent certain that this is the best course of action for Sackville, but recognizing the commercial interests and that Sackville is losing much business, it is important to concentrate on this objective, rather than developing a strong commercial area, which may take ten years. Therefore, the Planning Department is prepared to accept opening up of the Sackville Industrial Park, so as not to continue to lose business over the short term.

Councillor Eisenhauer asked if there is a commercial core around the Sackville Downs location, where there is no height restrictions, providing an industrial or business potential within this certain parcel of land. Mr. Butler advised this is still in affect. Mr. Butler advised there were proposed amendments considered to apply the Commercial Core regulations more uniformly along Sackville Drive so there would not be two distinct areas. However, these amendments are not being considered at this public hearing.

Speakers in Favour of this Application

Harold Irving, Director, Sackville Chamber of Commerce; Member of the Halifax County Industrial Commission; and resident of Sackville stated over many years there have been attempts to develop an industrial or commercial base in Sackville. Sackville is a community with between 25,000 and 35,000 people - mostly a bedroom community with spuratic development. Over the past few years, the mainstreet has been mostly taken up.

Mr. Irving advised that he has been involved in the Inudstrial Park in Sackville since 1978, and he has found the park needed the push from the County in order to get going, and that was not enough. The zoning regulations in Sackville were not up to the same standards as other municipalities within the metro area; therefore, the Sackville Industrial Park was at a disadvantage.

Mr. Irving stated he is supportive of this application because it is step in the right direction in developing the Sackville Industrial Park. There are areas that should be opened up more, and he could expand on this at another time. He felt freestanding buidings in the Park is a necessity because it is an area surrounded by other industrial parks that allow for increased buiding size because the land is being used up. He stated Sackville wants to get the best use out of the land at the Sackville Industrial Park as possible.

Mr. Irving asked Council to support these amendments and that other ideas concerning increased business use and increased tax revenue for the Municipality will be supported by these amendments. He stated he

wants to see more tax revenue for the County and that the people of Sackville have more opportunities to work in their own community. He stated this was the intention of the Sackville Industrial Park in 1978.

Questions from Council

None.

Sharyn Adams, immediate past President, Sackville Chamber of Commerce, advised she is here as a member who helped to formulate policy through the joint efforts of several groups known as the Ad Hoc Committee of the Sackville Commercial and Industrial Planning Committee. She stated the attempt at that time was to address the issues of permitted uses in the I-1 zone of the Industrial Park. The permitted uses in the C-2 and C-3 zones were also addressed.

Ms. Adams stated at the Public Participation meeting on February 23, 1988, it was felt that staff's report with regard to the C-2 and C-3 designation were somewhat confusing and ambiguous; therefore, it was recommended that this be reconsidered in more depth. Therefore, the only topic of this public hearing is permitted uses under the I-1 zone. Ms. Adams stated she and the Sackville Chamber of Commerce are fully supportive of expanding the permitted uses. She stated Appendices "C" and "D" of the staff report addresses some of the issues, although she would have preferred to see a broader interpretation of some of the permitted uses recommended, specifically in terms of freestanding buildings. She stated the Sackville Industrial Park is and will continue to loose prospective tenants. The Sackville Commercial and Industrial Planning Committee attempted to make some long range plans so mechanisms would be in place so the concept of freestanding buildings could be dealt with. However, she stated the staff report and recommendation for these amendments remain somewhat restrictive, but it is a step in the right direction. First, these amendments will attract more tenant by being more viable. The same types of permitted uses available adjacent industrial parks are being requested for the Sackville Industrial Park. She concluded, asking for support for these amendments and that additional uses, such as freestanding structures, the withdrawal of a height restrictions, etc., would be welcome. She stated a concept of condominium type office and related industrial, professional consulting services are being sought for this park, as many of these activities are suited to an Industrial Park setting. She stated the downtown core in Sackville is being rapidly used up, and accessibility to these areas is more and more difficult every day. She asked that these amendments be supported, bearing in mind that long term policies are sought at the same time.

Questions from Council

Councillor MacKay clarified that Ms. Adams requested support for expanded uses including freestanding buildings and the removal of the height restrictions. He asked if there was anything else that should be considered from the recommendations of her committee in terms of

the I-1 zone. Ms. Adams replied that staff's recommendation refers to accessory office and retail, and some of the commercial uses may not be considered accessory, for example, day care facilities, the inclusion of hospital and care facilities, institutional community uses, etc. She stated these are not spelled out in the amendment.

Councillor MacKay noted the Land Use By-law will be amended to read "... any C-2 zone use permitted." He asked if all the specifics mentioned by Ms. Adams would be encompassed in the C-2 permitted use. Ms. Adams stated the Committee wants them listed because they are not specific in the C-2 zone permitted use.

Councillor MacKay clarified with Mr. Butler that these uses would be permitted as long as they are in a multiple tenancy building.

Councillor MacKay noted there was much resistance from land owners and entrepreneurs in the C-2 zone to expand this use to allow apartment buildings. There was such resistance from the abutting residential neighbourhood. He advised he is in receipt of a petition against this permitted use.

Frank LeTourneau, Nova Scotia Business Capital Corporation advised he represents the successor agencies to Industrial Estates Ltd., the institution which owns the unsold lands at the Sackville Industrial Park. He stated he supports the comments of Ms. Adams and Mr. Irving to broaden the permitted uses in the Sackville Industrial Park. He stated anything that might intercept business that may otherwise go to Burnside would be to the benefit of Sackville and the Municipality at large. He commented that there is talk of construction of a highway between the Sackville Industrial Park and the Burnside Industrial Park, so broadened uses are even more important.

Mr. LeTourneau stated the Halifax County Industrial Commission can be relied upon to use its good judgement and not allow situations that would be detrimental to the Community, including freestanding structures dedicated to one user. He recommended that the restriction on freestanding buildings be lifted.

Questions from Council

Councillor MacKay noted the Halifax County Industrial Commission recently directed a letter to Mr. LeTourneau with respect to changing the name of the Sackville Industrial Park to the Sackville Business Park. Mr. LeTourneau advised that he received and responded favourably to this letter.

Councillor MacKay asked if Mr. LeTourneau had received many inquiries from prospective businesses or tenants that could not be accommodated here due to restrictive zoning. Mr. LeTourneau advised most inquiries that came to his attention were generated through Bill Davies of Davies Properties, and he had difficulties in accommodating some of his inquiries during the early stages of the park.

Councillor DeRoche commented that the future link between the Sackville Industrial Park and Burnside Industrial Park will probably not be in the near future. He stated the 107 Highway was proposed to go through to Sheet Harbour 12 years ago, and it is not there yet.

Bill Davies, Davies Properties Ltd. advised he is in favour of the proposed amendments. He stated they are felt to be essential for the future of the Park. He stated he would appreciate Council's support for these amendments. Mr. Davies also expressed appreciation for the support in the past.

Questions from Council

Councillor MacKay inquired about prospective tenants that were lost because uses in the Park would not permit them. Mr. Davies advised he has had at least six very good prospects that had to be turned away because of the limited permitted uses. He stated six may not seem like many, but it certainly is in this business. He suggested there may have been others that did not approach him because the zoning regulations in the park are now well known.

Councillor MacKay advised that approximately two months ago he had requested Mr. Meech to investigate the possibility of illegal uses in the Park. Mr. Meech reported that all tenants and business in the park had a development permit. He asked if Mr. Davies was aware of any illegal uses in the Park. Mr. Davies advised all the tenants have development permits. He added that he is in favour of amendment the uses further to permit freestanding structure for specific single user purposes. He felt this would not have a detrimental effect on the downtown core, but over the long term it would probably benefit the downtown core by bringing in development not otherwise located in Sackville.

Councillor MacKay suggested that Mr. Davies may be putting himself at some risk by supporting these amendments because he holds a major parcel of land along Sackville Drive, and clients here could be lost to move to the Sackville Industrial Park. Mr. Davies stated he has no fear of this because there are presently businesses in the Sackville Industrial Park that would not otherwise be there if they could not locate there. He stated he is very supportive of the Industrial Park in Sackville.

Deputy Warden MacDonald expressed support for free standing buildings in the Industrial Park. He stated companies looking to locate in the Park do not require a high profile location, but they want to find a place to do their business at a reasonable price. He stated there are free standing buildings in the park now under a different name, including Anchor Industries, the cement company, etc.

Councillor DeRoche noted that Mr. Davies had stated support for these amendments is crucial to the life of the park. He asked if this is with respect to the possibility of losing present tenants or increased occupancy. Mr. Davies replied that his comment was with regard to increased occupancy. He stated existing tenants will not be

lost because of the existing zoning regulations. However, potential for the park is limited with these regulations, and these amendments and the potential road through Burnside will unlimit the potential.

Evan Morgan, Chairman of the Business Improvement District Commission, Sackville Drive stated he is supportive of the improvement of expanded permitted uses within the Industrial Park. He added that an Ad Hoc Committee was formed last summer to ask the PAC if they would also consider broadening the permitted uses in the C-2 zone along Sackville Drive. It was imperative that while there were some members who did not feel there would be any detriment to Sackville Drive businesses, other were not as sure. He stated members of the BIDC were concerned that the position of the PAC was that they would proceed with the amendments to the Industrial Park and at some later point considered those amendments for Sackville Drive. He asked that permitted uses for the C-2 zone along Sackville Drive also be expanded simultaneously with those in the Industrial Park. He asked if this is not possible at this point, that the PAC proceed as soon as possible with this consideration.

Mr. Morgan concluded that he is a resident of Sackville and very interested in promoting business in Sackville, whether it be along Sackville Drive or in the Industrial Park.

Questions from Council

Councillor Lichter clarified that the first request to the PAC was that the C-2 zone along Sackville Drive as well as in the Industrial Park be considered for amendments. The PAC held a Public Participation meeting in Sackville, and the outcome was that people were in favour of expanding the permitted uses in the Industrial Park, but they were not unanimous. He stated the PAC based their recommendation on the fact that the people who spoke on this issue were divided on the issue of expanded C-2 uses along Sackville Drive.

Mr. Morgan responded that it was his opinion that nobody was against the expansion of C-2 uses; therefore, he did not speak at that meeting. He felt those in attendance wanted assurances about the expansion of the I-1 zone.

Councillor Lichter stated there was a feeling that the commercial core had to be examined very carefully. He added that the PAC has received a letter from Mr. Morgan since that time, indicating that every member of the committee would be welcome to this Public Hearing.

Mr. Morgan stated the members who go to the committee meetings are in favour of the expanded C-2 uses, and they are aware of what is taking place via monthly newsletters. Those at the meetings asked that Mr. Morgan speak in favour of immediate expansion of the C-2 area.

Councillor MacKay stated after the Public Participation Committee meeting, several people had indicated concerns about this proposal. The business people along Sackville Drive had also circulated a petition, which will be presented, opposed to changes to the C-2 permitted

uses. Many of the abutting and adjacent residents were also opposed to expanded C-2 uses, including apartment buildings. He concluded that it was the determination to defer the C-2 and C-3 uses to the Plan Review Committee to allow for full investigation.

Mr. Morgan responded that one business person who signed the petition had informed he that one of the position to be taken was to eliminate the cluttering of apartment buildings, such as in the C-3 zone. He stated this is the reason why a number of the business people signed the petition. At meetings of his committee, discussion about the inclusion fo apartment buildings in the permitted uses should include provisions to make them of a better quality. He added that there are already R-4 zones in the area that allow apartment buildings and are intended for apartment buildings. It is hoped to encourage the developers of this land to build a higher class apartment building. However, those who signed the petition were not aware of this, and there are people who regret having signed the petition. They were concerned about a proliferation of apartment buildings on Sackville Drive.

Speakers in Opposition to this Application

None.

Councillor MacKay asked if it would be possible to approve the recommendations of staff, as well as to include free standing buildings. He asked if the best way to do this would be to add the words free standing buildings or to delete the words mail-type structures, multiple tenancy malls, and multiple tenancy industrial malls, and free standing industrial malls.

Mr. Cragg felt it would not be appropriate to deal with free standing buildings at this public Hearing because the advertisement did not reflect that this would be considered. He stated allowing free standing structures is outside of multiple tenancy industrial malls, which was not referred to in the advertisement. He stated another Public Hearing would be required to determine the use of free standing buildings in the Industrial Park. He stated if it had been anticipated that this concern may arise the advertisement could have read that this option would be considered, as well. However, it was not mentioned, and he felt it should not be considered.

Councillor MacKay submitted a petition to Mr. Kelly with regard to the business people in the C-2/C-3 area. Mr. Kelly reviewed the petition, indicating the signatures are those of property and/or business owners along Sackville Drive was in opposition to the expansion of the C-2 zone area to a C-3 zone along Sackville Drive. He advised that the petition was signed by 16 people.

Councillor McInroy asked if consideration could be given to a position subject to the solicitor's further review. He felt Council should be able to deal with free standing buildings at this point, rather than holding another public hearing.

Mr. Cragg advised that the public hearing notice is worded very clear that Halifax County Council will deal with this amendment with respect to multiple tenancy buildings, and it would only be fair to the public to hold another public hearing.

There was further discussion concerning holding another public hearing. Deputy Warden MacDonald expressed concern about the time frame involved, and he asked if Council could recommend a public hearing date tonight. It was felt the PAC could deal with this, and make a recommendation to Council.

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

"THAT Halifax County Municipality alter the "industrial" designation of the Sackville Municipal Planning Strategy according to Appendices "C" and "D" of the staff report and that the timing of these amendments, relative to the Sackville Plan Review be a matter of Council Decision."

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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

"THAT the Land Use By-law for Sackville be amended to allow new commercial requirements according to Appendices "C" and "D" of the staff report."

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT this public hearing adjourn."

MOTION CARRIED

The public hearing adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

MINUTES & REPORTS
OF THE
THIRD YEAR MEETINGS
OF THE
FORTY - SECOND COUNCIL
OF THE
MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX
MAY COUNCIL SESSION
TUESDAY, MAY 3 and 17, 1988
&
PUBLIC HEARING
MAY 9 & 30, 1988
&
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
MAY 2, 11, 29 & 31, 1988
&
JOINT COUNCIL SESSION
MAY 13, 1988

May

INDEX

Area Rates -----	26
Bedford Waterfront Development Corporation -----	16 & 33
Chief Building Inspector's Report -----	10-11 & 28-29
Cat By-Law -----	41
Director of Development Report -----	10
Grants -----	11 & 29
Gulf Steel Limited, Property Lease -----	11
Head Harbour School - Tantallon -----	30
Halifax County Industrial Commission - Appointment of Member-----	17 & 35-36
Harness Racing -----	38
Irving Oil Truck Stop -----	24-26
Letter and Correspondence -----	3-4 & 26-27
Loan - Beaver Bank Volunteer Fire Department -----	11-12
Loan - District 9A, Fire Department -----	29-30
Motion - Approval of Minutes -----	1-2 & 22
Motion - Letter & Correspondence -----	3-4 & 26-27
Motion - Meeting Re Department of Housing -----	3-4
Motion - Public Hearings -----	4-5 & 36
Motion - Lands of Arthur Zinck, West Dover -----	5
Motion - Lands of Mr. Erfani, Sackville -----	5-6
Motion - Storm Drainage Legislation -----	6-7
Motion - Minor Variance Appeal -----	7-9
Motion - Director of Development Report -----	10
Motion - Chief Building Inspector's Report -----	10-11 & 28-29
Motion - Grants -----	11 & 29
Motion - Property Lease, Gulf Steel Limited -----	11
Motion - Loan, Beaverbank Volunteer Fire Department -----	11-12
Motion - Temporary Borrowing Resolution, Sackville Reservoir	12
Motion - Tax Rate -----	12-15
Motion - Bedford Waterfront Development Corporation -----	16 & 33
Motion - Sludge Disposal -----	17
Motion - Appointment, Halifax County Industrial Commission -----	17 & 35-36
Motion - Financial Statements -----	17-18 & 23-24
Motion - George P. Vanier School -----	18
Motion - Sidewalks, Waverley -----	18
Motion - Benere Brook -----	18
Motion - Water Utility Office, Sackville -----	18-19
Motion - Policing, Sackville -----	20-21
Motion - Adjournment -----	21 & 42
Motion - Irving Oil Truck Stop -----	24-26
Motion - Area Rates -----	26
Motion - Sheet Harbour School -----	29
Motion - Sackville Drive, Streetscape Improvements -----	29
Motion - Loan, District 9A Fire Department -----	29-30
Motion - Head Harbour School, Tantallon -----	30

INDEX

Motion - Fire Fighting Rates, District #13 -----	30-31
Motion - Sewage Treatment Plant -----	31
Motion - Meeting, Department of Transportation -----	32
Motion - Transit Cost Sharing -----	32-33
Motion - Parkland Acquisition, Cow Bay -----	34
Motion - Sackville/Beaver Bank Advisory Board, Budget ---	34
Motion - Metropolitan Authority Report -----	34
Motion - Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities -----	34-35
Motion - Sidewalk Construction, Fall River Road -----	36-37
Motion - Appointment of Animal Control Officer -----	37
Motion - Pennant to Terence Bay Road -----	38
Motion - Harness Racing -----	38
Motion - Highway, District #1 -----	38-39
Motion - Policing, Hubbards -----	39
Motion - Abandoned Railway Line -----	39
Motion - Sidewalk Priorities -----	40
Motion - "C" Class Roads -----	40
Motion - Cat By-Law -----	41
Motion - Traffic Lights, Hugh Allen Drive -----	41
Motion - Health Analysis, Petpeswick and Chezzetcook Inlets -	42
Public Hearings -----	4-5 & 36
Policing, Sackville -----	20-21
Parkland Acquisition, Cow Bay -----	34
Policing, Hubbards -----	38-39
Storm Drainage Legislation -----	6-7
Sludge Disposal -----	17
Sheet Harbour School -----	29
Sackville Drive Streetscape Improvements -----	29
Sewage Treatment Plant -----	31
Sackville/Beaver Bank Advisory Board, Budget -----	34
Temporary Borrowing Resolution, Sackville reservoir -----	12
Tax Rate -----	12-15
Transit Cost Sharing -----	32-33

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

SLUDGE DISPOSAL

MAY 2, 1988

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. K.R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Mr. R.G. Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Mr. E.T. Wdowiak, Director, Engineering & Works
Mr. D.D. Reinhardt, Deputy Municipal Clerk

SECRETARY: Glenda Hill

Warden MacKenzie called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. He advised that Mr. Harry Bensted, former Halifax County employee, is in hospital. He stated he would advise Council further when he has more details.

Warden MacKenzie next advised that a tentative meeting with the Town of Bedford has been arranged for May 13, 1988 at 1 p.m. to discuss the School Board budget. He advised he would confirm this with Council when the meeting has been finalized.

Warden MacKenzie stated this meeting was originally called for the presentation of the Land Use By-law and Municipal Planning Strategy for District 5, but it has been changed to discuss the issue of sludge management. He stated the District 5 Plan and By-law will be presented on May 11, 1988 at 7 p.m.

Warden MacKenzie stated at the end of April he was advised that the County would be cut off from dumping sludge into a manhole in Dartmouth at the end of May. He stated the property owner who let County dumpers travel across his property to a manhole now requires

this land for outdoor storage, and it is understandable that he has requested the County to stop dumping sludge and septage here; he has been quite lenient in this regard over the past year. However, Warden MacKenzie expressed concern that the City of Dartmouth had informed Mr. Meech the County may be cut off from dumping anywhere in the City of Dartmouth in the very near future. He stated the City still have some septic disposal fields, and they must be finding a place to dump their effluent. He expressed concern about the lack of regional cooperation expressed by the City of Dartmouth recently, most particularly in relation to this issue and the issue of water supply to the County of Halifax. However, the City of Dartmouth has no hesitations about using the landfill site in Sackville, and they are now supporting a one plant treatment plant option for the clean-up of Halifax Harbour, and this plant is proposed for Halifax County. He stated he has every confidence that Halifax County can deal with this situation, but he expressed concern for the lack of cooperation from the City of Dartmouth. He felt the Province will probably have to be asked to assist Halifax County with this situation.

Mr. Reinhardt next reviewed his report, advising of the direction of the Board of Health since sludge management became an issue in May, 1986. He noted the last direction of the Board was on March 9, 1988 when Mr. Wdowiak was requested to provide required additional information to Grow-Rich Waste Recycling Systems so they can provide a more formal proposal for sludge management. It was also agreed that once a final proposal is received, a meeting of the Committee of the Whole would be arranged to discuss the proposal.

Councillor MacKay referred to the action of the Board of Health on May 13, 1987 when a letter was received advising there are many health and political reasons for avoiding sewage sludge disposal on land. He asked if there was any elaboration on the health reasons for avoiding this option. Councillor Lichter replied that Dr. MacLean of the Atlantic Health Unit had indicated that this consideration would pose a health risk; he clarified that this was land application, as opposed to landfilling.

Councillor Wiseman referred to where the Board of Health was advised that disposal of dewatered sludge at the regional sanitary landfill would not be permitted under present conditions. She asked what the present conditions referred to. Mr. Wdowiak responded that an investigation was carried out with application at the present landfill disposal site in Sackville. At a meeting with Mr. Jackson of the Metropolitan Authority, he advised that because of the time limit on the existing landfill site, the Metropolitan Authority could not accept any additional material. It was suggested that if approval could be obtained for extending the landfill option at this time, the Metropolitan Authority would be prepared to accept dewatered sludge. He stated present condition refers to the fact that the landfill site was not suitable from their point of view because of lack of space.

Councillor Wiseman inquired about volumes of sludge during any given year. She stated she would like to know about the amount of sludge deposited here in comparison to the amount of garbage delivered here.

It was clarified there is approximately 24,000 gallons per week of septage in liquid form, as opposed to dewatered form, that goes through the plants per week. It also appears that septage from septic tanks would approximate about the same amount.

Mr. Wdowiak next reviewed his report concerning sludge management, as circulated to Members of Council. He noted reasons why the disposal of sludge at Eastern Passage would not be possible, even for the immediate short-term. He added that disposal of septage is impossible to accommodate at any of the existing plants. Mr. Wdowiak recommended that temporary lagooning and burial on-site be investigated as the immediate interim solution. Staff of the Department of the Environment, as well as the Department of Health, have indicated that the required approvals could be granted reasonably quickly. He also suggested the cooperation of the City of Dartmouth be sought for continued disposal into the Dartmouth system. He concluded that although lagooning and land disposal was felt by the Direction of the Atlantic Health Unit as not being the most appropriate, it was not disapproved from the Department of Health. He was of the understanding that approvals could be granted, and if everything is satisfactory, they would be prepared to deal with them expeditiously.

Mr. Wdowiak advised that Mr. Wright, of Porter Dillon, was fully involved in the Eastern Passage plant expansion, as well as expansion of the Mill Cove treatment plant.

Deputy Warden MacDonald asked how long it would take to set up a lagooning system, and he asked if there are any potential sites. Mr. Wright advised that he was involved in the design of a lagooning system at Hants West; he stated Halifax County has more and larger sewage treatment plant by virtue of the larger population base than other communities. In Hants West, the longest stage was that of finding a suitable location for the lagoon. He stated implementation can accelerate very quickly after a site is located. He stated at Hants West it was possible to build lagoons on the landfill site, which simplified the implementation. He stated the whole process took less than six months from the start date to the date the lagoons were in place. With respect to cost, Mr. Wright informed that Hants West deals with much less quantities; the lagoon was designed and built by the staff at the landfill with equipment at the landfill site, and the total package cost less than \$50,000, including the site selection study and the design. He stated much more than this can be spent just looking for a site, depending on what may be available.

Warden MacKenzie asked if lagooning will resolve the problem for septage, as well as sludge. Mr. Wdowiak and Mr. Wright informed it would. Mr. Wright noted there are more septic tanks in Hants West than sludge from treatment plants.

Councillor Deveaux stated he is glad to see the reason why the Eastern Passage treatment plant cannot be used for sludge and septage disposal, and he agreed that it would not be wise to dump here after the odour problems have just recently been resolved here. Also, the Provincial government just recently allocated \$3 million for the

clean-up of Halifax Harbour; therefore, there would be no logic in further polluting the harbour. He expressed hope that a solution will be found, but that it will not involve the use of the Eastern Passage treatment plant. Councillor Deveaux asked Mr. Wright if there are any other reasons why it would not be feasible to make use of the Eastern Passage treatment plant for the purpose of sludge and septage disposal. Mr. Wright informed that he cannot add to Mr. Wdowiak's reasons. Mr. Wdowiak added that septage disposal is as important as sludge disposal, and this must be considered as part of the problem. He stated it may be a problem that all surrounding areas are experiencing, and he felt cooperation in this regard should be solicited from the City of Dartmouth and perhaps some direction from a senior level of government should also be solicited.

Councillor MacKay inquired about the life expectancy of the lagooning system at Hants West. Mr. Wright informed the plan for this system calls for two lagoons, one which is in place, and the idea is to build the second as the first fills. It is also anticipated that once the second lagoon is in use, the first will be cleaned up, depositing the naturally dewatered septage and sludge into the landfill site, and this lagoon can be used again as the second is filled. He suggested this system is expected to be a 15 to 20 year solution. He added that the landfill site at Hants West is about 30 acres+, which provides a good buffer area around the landfill. The lagoon part of the facility is very small in relation to the land allotted for the landfilling solution.

Councillor MacKay asked if this lagooning method is recognized by the Environment and Health authorities. Mr. Wright advised it is, although it may not as recognized in a more urban developed area, but is well recognized in this Province.

Councillor MacKay inquired about how much more effluent Halifax County has than Hants West. Mr. Wright estimated that Halifax County probably has 15 to 20 times more accounting for both septage and sludge. However, no additional land would be required over what Hants West has because 30+ acres does provide a good buffer for their system.

Councillor Randall asked if any locations have been identified for possible lagooning. Mr. Wdowiak advised that nothing has been selected at this time. One of the last interim reports by CBCL identified three fairly large parcels of land (200 to 300 acres), but they have not been pursued to determine if the land is available or suitable from a Health and Environment point of view, etc.

Councillor Randall inquired if the possibility of dumping at sea has been further investigated. He noted there is a resident of his area who would be interested in this type of alternative, and he has the tanker boat required for this job. Mr. Wdowiak advised there were investigations and inquiries in this regard during the CBCL study, and the only acceptable solution would be dumping it 20 miles offshore. An assurance would also be required to confirm that there would be no environmental implications in this regard. Mr. Wright added that Transport Canada recently received approval from the Department of

Fisheries to dispose of an accumulated sludge associated with the treatment plant to treat the absent drainage and runoff from their taxiway extension. They have received approval, and they have called tenders; they are proceeding on an ocean disposal format for getting rid of their accumulated sludge. However, they do have one advantage over Halifax County in that their sludge is all located and stored in one place. From an economic point of view, they only have to truck from their storage tank to the ship when they are ready for disposal. A solution in this respect would have to be found for Halifax County as the supply is always on the move here.

Councillor Randall noted that today's Mail Star read the City of Dartmouth Council is expected to approve a recommendation from an environment engineer to no longer allow septic tank and treatment plant sludge to be dumped in the City's sewer system. He stated if the County expects cooperation from the City, it should be solicited quickly.

Councillor Wiseman asked what they will do with their own sludge once they will no longer allow any to be dumped into their system.

Councillor Wiseman stated it was her understanding that it would cost \$750,000 to put the system in place, as well as a \$750,000 dewatering mechanism. She asked how quickly this plant could be put in place, if available, and if it would dewater both the septage and the sludge, and would the dewatering be required if the lagooning system is implemented. Mr. Wright informed it would take the better part of one year to get a dewatering plant operating. He stated delivery periods on this type of equipment ranges from four to six months, so once the equipment needs are established, specified, and tendered, the design and construction of the facility will have to take place around the delivery of the equipment. For the lagooning option, dewatering would not be required and typically is not done. However, the Grow-Rich or composting option would require dewatering. Mr. Wdowiak added that the preliminary proposal from Grow-Rich was for the composting operation, which would require \$750,000. When clarification was submitted to Grow-Rich it was indicated that the Board of Health is looking for a price for a total sludge management package. He stated Halifax County will be responsible for composting, as well as the dewatering equipment. He stated composting is an additional process of dewatering sludge which can be disposed of by landfilling. Composting is enhancing the material by adding nutrients - spending much money for a saleable material. There must be a market for this product. He stated he is not suggesting it is not a good solution, but it is another processing step of a dewatered sludge.

Councillor Wiseman suggested it may be worthwhile to proceed with the dewatering mechanism for disposal at the landfill site, given the long period of time required for lagooning. Mr. Wdowiak reiterated the comments of Mr. Jackson on this suggestion at an earlier date. The operators of the landfill site know that unless there is a reduction in garbage, the landfill site will be at capacity in four or five years.

Councillor DeRoche asked if dewatering is necessary for lagooning for the discharge of sludge. Mr. Wright stated it will be sometime before the first lagoon at Hants West is filled, and there is an allowance for some evaporation and percolation through the soil. What effluent that remains will flow out of the lagoon and into a tile bed or contour trench (an in-ground system), and it would not be of a quality that should be discharged directly to a receiving stream. He stated the same process would be approached for Halifax County, although it would have to be investigated further. He asked of Mr. Casey, Department of Health, if other lagoon systems in the Province discharge to receiving streams. Mr. Casey indicated they do not. Mr. Wright stated there would be containment and a land-type application. Even with larger volumes in the County, there would not be a great flow of effluent from the facility.

Councillor DeRoche asked if there has been any response to the Board of Health's representation to the Provincial authorities. Mr. Reinhardt advised there has been no official response, although Mr. Casey is here informally. He stated Provincial authorities were immediately advised of this special meeting, which has been changed from May 11.

Councillor C. Baker stated all effluent eventually runs into Herring Cove, and he stated it is time to take issue with the City of Dartmouth, as they take advantage of the landfill site in Sackville and they dump effluent into Halifax Harbour which finds its way to the shores of Herring Cove, depriving the fishermen of fishing off this coast. He stated the City should be giving the County at least six months to find a solution to this problem. Warden MacKenzie commented that the County has been aware of this problem for two years.

Councillor Lichter stated there are several options available for a long term solution, but he questioned what will be done in the short term. He stated it took many years to find a location for the landfill site, and the Board of Health is proceeding with this problem in the same manner. However, a short term solution must be determined. According to the letter circulated from Mr. O'Neil's office, Councillor Lichter was of the understanding that the first step should be to apply for a permit from the Nova Scotia Department of the Environment to discharge into the Harbour, although at this point it is not known where in the harbour this will be discharged. He stated this application must be made to assure that they have a chance to say no, and if they do dare to say no, they will have to say no to others as well. If they do issue the permit, a pipe should be created in one of the waterbodies that surround Halifax County without causing pollution that the fishermen express difficulty with. He stated this should only be done as long as it is essential until a long term solution is established.

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

"THAT Halifax County Municipality immediately apply to the Nova Scotia Department of the Environment to discharge sludge and septage into the harbour until a long term solution is established."