

Requests for Grants and Loans

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Capital Grant, District 11 in the amount of \$5,000 and a loan in the amount of \$3,000 to be repaid over a period of ten years, principal and interest, with Council reserving the right to levy an area rate in default of repayment of interest and/or principal, the purpose of this funding being to purchase a fire vehicle for the Mooseland Volunteer Fire Department."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a loan in the amount of \$20,000 for the Upper Musquodoboit Volunteer Fire Department to be repaid over a period of ten years, principal and interest with Council reserving the right to levy an area rate in default of repayment of principal and/or interest."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a loan in the amount of \$100,000 to the environment services operation over a five year term for the purpose of carrying out capital improvements for storm drainage related projects, the loan being repayable with interest with Council reserving the right to levy an area rate in default of repayment of principal and/or interest."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Capital Grant, District 1 in the amount of \$2,500 for the purpose of building improvements to the South Shore Regional Recreation Association."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Parkland Grant, District 3 in the amount of \$5,500 for the purpose of improvements to the Three Villages Recreation Association;

ALSO THAT approval be granted for a District Parkland Grant, District 3 in the amount of \$2,500 for improvements to the Tantallon Centennial Athletic Club."

MOTION CARRIED

It was moved by Councillor P. Baker, seconded by Councillor C. Baker:

"THAT approval be granted for a General County Parkland Grant in the amount of \$13,000; a District Parkland Grant, District 4 in the amount of \$10,000; and a District Capital Grant, District 4 in the amount of \$7,000 for the purpose of constructing a boat ramp and skidway at Terence Bay."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Parkland Grant, District 8 in the amount of \$150 for the Lions Club to build a skateboard ramp."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Parkland Grant, District 14 in the amount of \$1,000 for beach improvements at Silversides Subdivision."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Capital Grant, District 13 in the amount of \$2,000 for two air cleaning filtration systems at the Gays River, Cooks Brook, Lake Egmont Recreation Hall."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Capital Grant, District 14 in the amount of \$2,000 to replace the roof at the Waverley Volunteer Fire Department;

ALSO THAT approval be granted for a District Capital Grant, District 14 in the amount of \$1,500 for a drilled well at the Grand Lake Volunteer Fire Department."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Capital Grant, District 19 in the amount of \$540 for the installation of an overhead crosswalk sign at the intersection of Fenerty Road and Highway No. 1."

Councillor MacKay informed that the installation of an overhead crosswalk sign can be paid for from the street lighting account. He felt this should not be paid for by District Capital Grant.

Deputy Warden MacDonald agreed to withdraw this motion and pursue this matter under the street lighting account.

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Parkland Grant, District 19 in the amount of \$1,041.60 for the Sackville Lions Club to install a wheelchair ramp."

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT approval be granted for a District Capital Grant, District 2 in the amount of \$20,000, as well as a loan in the amount of \$10,000 over a ten year period to be repaid with interest and that Council reserve the right to levy an area rate in default of repayment principal and/or interest, the purpose of this grant and loan being for capital improvements to the Timberlea and area Lions Club (County-owned property)."

MOTION CARRIED

URBAN SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORT

Pedestrian Crossing Points, Sackville

Mr. Kelly reviewed this report.

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

"THAT Council request the Department of Transportation to approve of the installation of illuminated overhead pedestrian crossing signs at all three locations as denoted in the staff report."

MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Mont, Chairman of the Urban Services Committee advised that there will be a special meeting of the Urban Services Committee on Monday, April 25, 1988 at 5 p.m.

There was some discussion concerning this announcement. Councillor Mont informed the meeting is to discuss sewage treatment plant lands with the Town of Bedford. Several Councillors objected, stating they have to attend a Board of Health site visit at 5:30 p.m.

Councillor MacKay asked that representatives of the Sackville-Beaver Bank Advisory Board be invited to attend this meeting because any decision will have an effect on the residents of Sackville. He noted the Sackville-Beaver Bank Advisory Board has been informed of deliberations up to this point, and they have attended meetings of the Urban Services Committee in this respect in the past. He felt they should be included in any deliberations now.

Following much discussion, Councillor Mont announced that this meeting will be held on April 25, 1988 at 5 p.m.

METROPOLITAN AUTHORITY REPORT

Councillor McInroy noted that copies of his report had been circulated.

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

"THAT this report be received."

Councillor MacKay stated 1988 costs for transit were recently circulated and the figures differed. He asked if this is based on transit costs by assessment rather than mileage. Mr. Meech advised that the most recent revision reflects the final determination that the 1987 deficit is \$100,000 less than originally advised.

Councillor MacKay stated there has recently been some publicity about problems at the landfill site in Sackville, and he asked if these problems have been overcome. Deputy Warden MacDonald advised that the wet weather and breakdown of equipment has been causing problems for about a month. However, the last report indicated these problems are being overcome. He stated it is hoped this will not happen again as it is priority to cover this on a daily basis. He stated that he has not noticed any improvements yet, although they are proceeding with the work.

Councillor Rawding stated he is surprised to see that a private firm is in the process of evaluating the current transit system when the Urban Services Committee is still conducting public meetings with respect to route reviews. He asked if Delcan Corporation will be attending these meetings and what their role in this process is. Councillor McInroy stated it has been his understanding that Delcan has been involved to this point with the compilation of information through the distribution of questionnaires, etc. The meetings throughout the County now were not initially anticipated, as it was the Urban Services Committee that undertook these public meetings. He suggested Delcan do not intend to attend these public meetings, and they are not there to facilitate Metro Transit meetings and information from constituents. They will be involved with transit staff over the next 12 to 18 months to do work involved in terms of compiling the information forwarded to them for transit purposes. Councillor Rawding asked that members of the Metropolitan Authority make queries regarding this. He stated Halifax County contributes to these bills, and if these consultants are going to evaluate and make decisions, they should be involved in the public process.

Councillor Rawding also expressed appreciation to the Department of Municipal Affairs for providing a one-time only grant of \$210,000 for the upgrading of regular public transit and transit for the disabled in Timberlea/Lakeside. He stated this news is very encouraging as there is a need for this service in his area. He asked if this money will come off of any deficit for that area. Mr. Meech advised he is not sure of this. He stated it will not affect our budget.

Councillor DeRoche noted that a bus refurbishing problem will be a part of this program, and he asked what extended life will be provided by this refurbishing program. Deputy Warden MacDonald suggested the purpose of the refurbishing program was to extend the life of the buses from 15 years to 20 years.

There was some discussion concerning this, and Councillor DeRoche asked that this be clarified.

Deputy Warden MacDonald stated there has been much discussion about the landfill site at Sackville nearing capacity. He suggested that this be seriously discussed at the appropriate meeting in the near future. He stated it appears the Metropolitan Authority will be presuring for the expansion of this site within the next year, and if the recycling problem is not addressed, this site will be to capacity and another site will have to be found.

MOTION CARRIED

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

Correspondence

Mr. Kelly reviewed correspondence from the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board respecting school area rates. He noted that the Nova Scotia School Boards Association have recommended to the Minister of Education that Section 57, Area School Rates, be deleted from the Education Act. Mr. Kelly also referred to correspondence from Mr. Gillis regarding school area rates. He outlined this correspondence referring to requests from the various school sections and the use of these funds.

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

"THAT Halifax County Council support the resolution of the Halifax County-Bedford District School Board in requesting that Section 57, Area School Rates, be deleted from the Education Act."

There was much discussion concerning this motion. Several Councillors stated these rates provide many services for their schools, which will be lost if these area rates are deleted. Deputy Warden MacDonald indicated he will loose a resource teacher if the area rate in his area is dropped.

Councillor Deveaux stated these rates are very much like the general rates - some are warranted and some are not. He stated he will not support the motion because many of these area rates are used for necessary purposes.

Councillor Eisenhauer stated it has always been his position that area rates be maintained, although the use of these funds should be controlled. He stated these rates act as a safety valve in the case that the Province decided something is more popular or politically feasible than education.

Warden MacKenzie commented that it is interesting that Halifax County and Bedford are the only two areas in the Province of Nova Scotia that levy school area rates.

Councillor Walker stated this motion will only cause more problems. He agreed that a two tier system is caused by the school area rates, although the problem is with the use of these rates. He stated alternate ways of complementing the existing system should be considered. He stated he is not necessarily opposed to the motion, although he has difficulty with it.

Councillor Wiseman stated school area rates only create an inequity within the system. She agreed that it is interesting that Halifax County and Bedford are the only two municipalities that levy these rates. She stated there is no school in Halifax County that goes without the necessary equipment to deal with their curriculum. She stated sports must also be supported, but there are funds within the school system to cover these costs.

Councillor Mont stated he is not supportive of area rates, but he will not support this motion until there is an alternate means of supplying these funds. He noted that school trustees in Cole Harbour have already asked Council not to support this resolution.

Several other Councillors spoke both in favour of and opposed to this motion. There was much discussion. Several felt there should be an alternative before this right is denied.

MOTION CARRIED 10 YES
 9 NO

Councillor Rawding and Councillor Mont asked for a recorded vote. Mr. Cragg informed this is permissible.

Councillor Walker - YES	Councillor Rawding - NO
Councillor Fralick - YES	Councillor P. Baker - YES
Councillor C. Baker - NO	Councillor Deveaux - NO
Councillor DeRoche - NO	Councillor Adams - YES
Councillor Randall - YES	Warden MacKenzie - YES
Councillor Reid - YES	Councillor Lichter - YES
Councillor Snow - NO	Councillor MacKay - YES
Councillor McInroy - NO	Councillor Eisenhower - NO
Deputy Warden MacDonald - NO	Councillor Wiseman - YES
Councillor Mont - NO	

DEPUTY WARDEN MacDONALD - CIVIC HOLIDAY

Deputy Warden MacDonald advised he has requested information in this respect at an earlier Council Session. He asked that Mr. Cragg comment on the idea of a County holiday.

Mr. Cragg advised that the Retail Business Uniform Closing Act sets out uniform closing days, and the Governor in Council may declare any other day a holiday as appropriate. This Act states that no one

can remain open on the uniform closing day, but it does not apply to a number of operations. Mr. Cragg stated Halifax County's By-law reflects this, and the Municipal Act gives Halifax County authority to provide that during a certain day, certain places where goods are exposed or offered for sale may be closed down. He noted this excludes office buildings and other that do not offer goods for sale. Therefore, he stated he is not sure that the County does have the authority to attempt to declare any day a County holiday.

Mr. Cragg continued that a Private Members Bill was introduced to the House on March 25, 1988 seeking that the first Monday in August be declared Heritage Day to be observed throughout the Province. He stated this reflects the fact that the Provincial Legislature can deal with these matters. He suggested that a government member be requested to propose such legislation or that the Executive Council be requested to declare this holiday.

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

"THAT Halifax County Council request the Executive Council, Province of Nova Scotia to proclaim a civic holiday in Halifax County on the first Monday in August."

Councillor Deveaux stated he is not opposed to having a separate holiday, although he felt it would be more appropriate to have the Provincial government proclaim it as a Provincial holiday. He stated he will support the motion.

Mr. Cragg advised he was able to determine that Nova Scotia is one of the few provinces that does not recognize the first Monday in August as a civic holiday.

Councillor MacKay stated having different holidays for different areas can lead to confusion. He stated the working man is entitled to some holidays, but the Province should be limited to having a uniform holiday throughout the Province rather than having different days for different areas.

Councillor Reid asked if all business will be required to close if the Municipality declares a holiday. Mr. Cragg stated it is not likely a part of the jurisdiction of the Municipality to declare such a holiday. He felt the Provincial government must be requested to deal with such a request. Councillor Reid stated there are implications that business people in the Municipality should be made aware of, such as the cost of closing down an operation for a day. He suggested this consideration should be looked at more seriously.

Councillor DeRoche advised that the collective bargaining process for the Federal government stipulates that if no other civic holiday is observed, the first Monday in August will be observed as a civic holiday. He felt the Provincial government also observes this under their collective bargaining process.

There was much discussion concerning this proposal. It was noted that the County building closes on Halifax and Dartmouth Natal Days, although people who work in the County do not have this day off.

MOTION DEFEATED 8 YES
 10 NO

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

Report, re Communications/Public Relations

Mr. Kelly reviewed the report from the Sub-Committee - Communications, noting this was circulated with the agenda.

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

"THAT the recommendations in the report, re Communications/Public Relations be adopted."

Councillor DeRoche asked if the cost for these recommendations are included in the 1988 budget. There was a brief discussion about this. Mr. Meech felt the cost of these recommendation is not included in the budget. However, Councillor Eisenhauer felt this funding would come from the \$75,000 for professional fees.

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

"THAT this matter be deferred to budget considerations."

Councillor Wiseman stated it would first be helpful to know if these recommendations and this report are supported in principle. She stated only the funding will be discussed at the budget meeting - not the report and the recommendations. She noted some of these recommendations do not require any funding.

MOTION DEFEATED

Councillor MacKay stated there is a need for a public relations policy. He stated some of the recommendations contained in the report should go without saying, such as the manner in which telephones are answered, restricted lunch hours and breaks, etc. He stated it is his understanding that the first eight recommendations will not cost any money, and they are for immediate action. However, the future recommendations will cost some money. Councillor MacKay stated he has seen many pilot projects, such as that suggested in this report, and he stated once a person is hired, they become an integral part of the operation, and it is hard to do without that position. He expressed concern about this recommendation, noting that it may be the intention to have this position remain on-going if it proves to be successful.

Councillor Rawding stated he is supportive of the report and recommendations, although a budgetary solution should be queried and reviewed. He felt the recommendations will solve communication problems.

Councillor Rawding stated he is supportive of the report and recommendations, although a budgetary solution should be queried and reviewed. He felt the recommendations will solve communication problems.

Councillor Wiseman reviewed the proposed budget for this purpose. She stated it has been determined that it will cost approximately \$8,000 to send out a newsletter, and two per year would amount to about \$16,000 per year. The additional \$4,000 is proposed for a more comprehensive information vehicle to be developed. She stated it was assumed it would be difficult to do any more than this between now and next budget time so these funds were set aside for this purpose.

Councillor DeRoche stated the majority of these recommendations are within the pervue of the administration. He stated policies should be set and implemented, rather than implementing procedures without a policy, as proposed by this recommendation. He stated there are also other options that will take care of the calendar and booklet aspect, which are now in use by almost all other large organizations which are computerized. He stated Halifax County Council has already made commitments against the 1988 budget and that is why there are problems arriving at a base tax rate now, and this recommendation for an additional \$20,000 will compound the problem.

Deputy Warden MacDonald inquired about the Personnel, Policy, and Procedures manual that was compiled a few years ago. He stated the policies under that manual should be followed. He expressed difficulty with the Director and Assistant Director of a department being out of the office at the same time leaving nobody who can answer any questions.

Mr. Meech felt there is no need to take any specific action on the first eight recommendations. He felt these are done as a matter of course; these items are considered to be part and parcel of the normal administrative practices. He stated if somebody is not satisfied from time to time, they should not generalize that this is what happens all the time. He stated there are circumstances at times when the necessary people will not be available. He added that there have been training sessions with respect to answering the telephone, customer service skills, etc. Mr. Meech stated he has had discussion with department heads on this, and they were also surprised by the recommendations of this report. He stated these procedures are already part and parcel of administration practices, although there may be a need for some improvement.

MOTION CARRIED

PAC - COUNCILLOR WALKER

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

"THAT a Halifax County Western Advisory Committee be formed to include Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 18 with responsibility for planning and financial interest for those areas within the Municipality of the County Halifax, reporting and recommending directly to Halifax County Council."

Councillor Walker stated all areas have regional concerns, and they should be addressed initially rather than waiting until the problems grow. He stated this is the procedure in Sackville now, and the western subsystem are experiencing problems such as Sackville recently experienced, so this should be dealt with now.

Councillor P. Baker agreed that rural Councillors are often in opposition with urban Councillors, although it should not be that way. He stated it seems that the urban areas get more than the rural areas, and he would like to know more about this proposal before deciding upon it. He suggested the areas involved meet to discuss this proposal to determine if it will be beneficial to the whole County; he stated he does not want to get involved in splitting up the County.

Councillor Walker stated this proposal will benefit the entire County. He stated addressing concerns on a local basis will serve the entire County better.

Councillor C. Baker indicated that he has difficulty hearing Councillor Walker, and he was not sure what he is talking about.

Councillor Lichter stated there was a resolution passed by Council about two months ago to write to the Minister of Municipal Affairs inquiring about the ability of Council to establish such a committee. He asked if there has ever been a response from the Minister. Mr. Kelly agreed that this resolution was passed and a letter was sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but there has been no response to date.

Following much discussion,

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

"THAT this matter be referred to the Executive Committee for further consideration."

Councillor Wiseman suggested that Councillor Walker submit a more formal proposal in this regard so Councillors can know the intended duties and responsibilities of this committee, as well as how this committee can be structured.

Mr. Cragg advised that the Planning Act states "... Council may establish an appointed Planning Advisory Committee." He noted this is singular, and the Committees and Boards By-law also states that Council shall appoint certain committees, one being the Planning Advisory Committee. He felt both the Act and the By-law indicate that the Planning Advisory Committee should be generally responsible for all planning matters and to generally advise Council concerning all planning matters. Therefore, there can only be one PAC. However, the Planning Act also states that the PAC may, with the approval of Council, establish an area advisory committee to advise the PAC.

MOTION CARRIED - 2 NO

Councillor Rawding asked that district representatives affected by this proposal be invited to attend the Executive Committee meeting when this will be discussed.

ATLANTIC WINTER FAIR, HORSE RACING - COUNCILLOR P. BAKER

Councillor P. Baker asked that this matter be deferred to the second Session of Council in May. He also asked that Members of the Halifax County Harness Racing Association be asked to meet with Council to give an update on what has been happening.

BLASTING BY-LAW, DISTRICT 13 - COUNCILLOR LICHTER

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

"THAT District 13 be included in the Blasting By-law."
MOTION CARRIED

ADDITION OF ITEMS TO THE MAY 3, 1988 COUNCIL SESSION

Councillor MacKay asked that Mr. Meech report on the cost of furnishing for the new Sackville office, as discussed at a previous Council Session.

Councillor Snow asked if there has been any reply to Council's letter to Premier Buchanan regarding the truck stop at Enfield. Warden MacKenzie advised there has not, although the Premier has indicated a reply is forthcoming.

Councillor Snow - Schools

Councillor Snow - Sidewalks

Councillor Snow - Environment

Councillor P. Baker - Department of Transportation (May 17, 1988 Session).

Members of Council agreed to hear a resolution from Councillor C. Baker regarding the recent search for Mr. Martell.

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

"THAT thanks be extended to the people of Harrietsfield for their support in providing food at the fire hall during the search for Mr. Martell;

ALSO THAT appreciation be expressed to the RCMP, the Search & Rescue Team, Emergency Measures Organization and others who took part in the search."

MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Deveaux requested a staff report on a sidewalk by-law to protect horses and other such animals from travelling on sidewalks.

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT this Council Session adjourn."
MOTION CARRIED

The Council Session adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
PLANNING DISTRICTS 1 AND 3

APRIL 7, 1988

PRESENT WERE: Warden MacKenzie
Councillor Walker
Councillor Fralick
Councillor P. Baker
Councillor C. Baker
Councillor DeRoche
Councillor Adams
Councillor Randall
Councillor Reid
Councillor Lichter
Councillor Snow
Councillor McInroy
Deputy Warden MacDonald
Councillor Wiseman
Councillor Mont

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. G.J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Mr. R.G. Cragg, Municipal Solicitor
Ms. Valerie Spencer, Director, Planning & Development
Mr. Bill Butler, Manager, Policy Division
Mr. Brant Wishart, Senior Planner
Ms. Berit Pittman, Chairman, PPC, District
Mr. Gordon Morrison, Chairman, PPC, District 1
Mr. Robert Hoegg, Chairman, PPC, District 3
Mr. Rupert Giffen, Municipal Planning Committee

SECRETARY: Glenda Hill

Warden MacKenzie called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

Mr. Wishart advised the purpose of this meeting is to introduce to Council the draft of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for Districts 1 and 3. He advised a Public Participation Committee (PPC) was formed and the planning process began in November, 1984. He advised that the PPC was under the direction of excellent chairpeople, and he introduced them as Berit Pittman, Gordon Morrison, and Robert Hoegg. He stated they have worked hard throughout this process, and he expressed appreciation to them for their dedication.

Mrs. Pittman advised that in November, 1984 kick-off meetings were held in each of the districts and to select members to serve on the PPC. The first few meetings of the PPC were spent learning from Mr. Wishart. She advised that a total of 31 PPC meetings were held, and all were open to the public. There was much public input and good representation at all meetings. Mrs. Pittman then reviewed each of the meetings.

Mr. Morrison spoke on the survey which was conducted as a part of the PPC's efforts to gather public input. He advised there was a response rate of over 22 percent. He also reviewed the advertising which was done as part of this planning process. He stated all people should have been aware of this process by all the advertising that was done.

Mr. Hoegg stated there was a total of 31 meetings of the PPC starting in November, 1984 and there have been 21 meetings with the Municipal Planning Strategy Committee (MPSC). He advised sometimes there was a large crowd and other times there was not; many people expressed their views, and he felt the needs and wants of the people are reflected in this plan and Land Use By-law, and he stated it is the hope of the three chairpeople that this plan be approved.

Mr. Wishart advised that the draft presented contains all suggested recommendations of the MPC, including changes whereby commercial entertainment uses are now to proceed by development agreement and existing commercial entertainment uses can continue operation and expand, and that an exemption had been provided for one site. Parking requirements for home businesses was amended; lands of Barry W. Doucette, Seabright, were placed in a separate appendix, and two small zoning errors were noted at the Head of St. Margaret's Bay and corrected. Mr. Wishart also referred to three small corrections in this evening's package which should have been included in the plan or by-law and were inadvertently left out. He noted the first allows a development agreement to take place; the second is to correct typographical errors; and the third is to delete reference to a property to Barry W. Doucette because it has since been transferred to another Appendix.

Mr. Wishart advised the plan divides the planning Districts of St. Margaret's Bay into nine designations, each accompanied by a number of zones in the Land Use By-law.

The first is the residential designation. Mr. Wishart outlined this area on the map. He stated this designation covers the newer subdivisions in the area or those that have received residential zoning in the past. The zoning applied to these areas accommodate single unit dwellings, two unit dwellings, and some accessory apartments whereby 35 percent of the core area of a home can be used for an accessory apartment.

The second designation is that of the Hubley Mill Lake area, which was represented by a homeowners group through the public participation process. The zoning here will allow single unit dwellings, accessory apartments, and 1,000 square feet for home business, and institutional uses recognizing the significant public investment in the schools here.

The third designation and accompanying zones is the mixed rural residential designation. It is in transition from a semi-rural area to a more residential area. This designation allows a wide range of residential uses; 1,500 square feet for home business with some restrictions; small craft and antique shops; local convenience stores; and resource uses, in particular the fishery.

The fourth and fifth designations are very similar being Mixed Use A and Mixed B. These two designations are almost the same except that the Mixed Use B requires fish processing plants to go by development agreement, while Mixed Use A allows fish processing plants to proceed by right. He stated this recognizes different traditions in the community. He noted these designations allows everything except for industrial uses, mobile home parks, camp grounds, etc. The people had not necessarily objected to these uses, but they would like the opportunity to consider them through the public hearing process. The only uses not allowed at all are such uses as those utilizing hazardous waste materials, penal institutions, and garbage dumps.

The resource designation is primarily owned by Bowater Mersey, and much is crown land. This designation recognizes the economic resource base in the area, and allows resource activities to take place by right.

Mr. Wishart advised that the conservation designation is part of the Pockwock Water Shed in order to protect the watershed area. He noted this is all public land.

Another designation is that of Provincial Park which recognizes existing Provincial parks, allowing them to continue, supporting them, and allows limited commercial uses related to the Provincial parks.

Mr. Wishart stated the final designation is the Peggy's Cove conservation area over which the Municipality has no direct control. The Peggy's Cove Commission takes care of zoning and planning in this area. He noted the PPC does not want to see this area expanded beyond its present boundaries because of the impact on other lands.

Mr. Wishart continued that there are great concerns about the environment in this area, and the plan calls for some environmental protection policies, such as an education program for the proper care and maintenance of septic systems, various types of systems, etc.; strict adherence to existing environmental controls and regulations; and it does not allow any industry that will pollute the area. He noted that the plan allows recognizes and permits development on private roads. It has attempted to recognize existing development rights and to allow all existing uses to continue and to expand either by right or by development agreement.

Mr. Wishart concluded that the PPC worked very hard to document this Plan and Land Use By-law, and it seems to meet the needs of the area.

Questions from Council

Councillor C. Baker inquired about recommendations for the fishing industry. Mr. Wishart outlined on the map the various areas that allow for some fishing industry, and he pinpointed the areas that will not allow any fishing industry.

Councillor P. Baker inquired about the Peggy's Cove preservation area, asking it is extends in to District 4. Mr. Wishart advised that the plan recognizes property boundaries, and it may dip into District 4 in small areas, but he thought that the preservation is all in District 3. Councillor P. Baker stated the Peggy's Cove preservation area extends into District 4, and he expressed concern about how this would affect his plan. Councillor Walker clarified that the preservation area was not touched; status quo was maintained here. It is a buffer zone between the District 1 and 3 Plan and District 4.

Councillor Fralick advised he was in receipt of a letter from Mr. Corkum, a large land owner in Hackett's Cove. He advised that Mr. Corkum lives in Halifax and was not aware of the planning process. He is now requesting that this land be zoned to allow yacht storage and a small marina. He identified the property on the map, noting it is approximately one-half a mile on the coastline and the roadside. Councillor Fralick advised that this land has been well maintained, and it is in excellent condition. It is Mr. Corkum's dream to construct an elite marine here, although he is not prepared to do it right away. He requested that this property be listed in the Appendix. Councillor Fralick concluded that he has received no other comments on this plan.

On behalf of the MPSC, Councillor Lichter expressed appreciation to the chairpeople and members of the PPC for Districts 1 and 3 for their hard work.

Councillor Walker expressed concern about one area of potential development in his district. He identified the land and requested that they be zoned C-6 or that they be exempt from the existing regulations until it is determined what type of development will take place here. Mr. Wishart advised the MPSC has requested that a property be exempted from the provisions for a development agreement for a commercial entertainment use, and this amendment has been included in the draft plan. He stated the same type of provision could be done for the property in question, although there has been no staff evaluation. He felt the other property may lose its exemption as a result of this.

Warden MacKenzie also expressed appreciation to the PPC Chairpeople and members for their hard work and dedication to the development of this plan.

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

"THAT a public hearing date for the adoption of the Municipal Development Plan and Land Use By-law for Districts 1 and 3 be recommended to Council for May 30, 1988."

Mr. Wishart advised that the PPC had suggested May 16, 1988 as they will all be available on that date.

There was some discussion concerning the date for the public hearing.

Councillor Walker stated that he would like to see an advertisement that the PPC has presented the plan to Council and should anyone want to discuss the plan before the final public hearing, the PPC would be willing to discuss it with them. He stated planning is new to the residents of his area, and they should be comfortable with this plan. Recommendations from these discussions can then be made at the public hearing.

There was some discussion about this alternative. It was noted the public hearing will be to discuss the plan as presented and advertised, and there should not be any variations to this. Councillor Lichter stated any concerns at the public hearing will be addressed and closely examined, and recommendations for changes at that point will come back to Council. Councillor Walker stated this may mean a longer process, and it will not be any more just.

Ms. Spencer stated she is intrigued by Councillor Walker's idea. She suggested if the PPC is to meet with the public to discuss this final draft, it should be advertised that this is the final draft which Council will adopt; it should not be advertised that this is the final chance to make amendments before it goes to Council. She stated experience has shown that no matter how many meetings, people will come before staff and PPC members for revisions before the final draft goes to a public hearing. She suggested Councillor Walker's suggestion will allow the public to find out how to make a submission, what their zoning is, etc. so they can be prepared to come before the public hearing. She suggested this may assist Council in terms of the submissions made at the public hearing. She agreed that the plan should stand as it has been presented, but it is a positive suggestion to have the PPC Chairmen work with the public in approaching this Council. She noted the intention is not hold public meetings in the district before Council's public hearing. She stated advertising in this respect will have to be considered very carefully, and she suggested the public hearing should not be any later than May 30, and she expressed hope that this will not come out of any meetings with the public about this plan.

Following some discussion, Mr. Hoegg stated there were times, including the final, all day meeting, where it was felt the people had a last chance to bring some concerns forward. At this point, it was considered very important that proposed resolutions not be discussed in any other place than the full eye of the public. He stated this gave the best opportunities to resolve any issues. Mr. Hoegg felt it would be unwise to discuss this plan any further than at the public hearing in the full eye of the public. The PPC has not convened as a group for some time, and the work of the PPC has been presented to Council. Therefore, he felt the responsibility to discuss this further with the public should not lie with the PPC, although the members are willing to assist, answer questions from the public, offer alternatives, etc. He stated he would be reluctant to discuss this with the public at any meeting other than the one which will be advertised - the public hearing. He agreed with Councillor Walker's concerns about the comfort of the residents, but he does not want the public to feel their may be a flaw in the process, and any other

public meeting would be given them an opportunity to find such a flaw. He felt Councillor Walker's concern can be dealt with through the normal process. He concluded that this process has been on-going for 3 1/2 years, and he would like to see it wrapped up as soon as possible.

Councillor McInroy expressed agreement with Mr. Hoegg, stating either it is time to advertise or not. If the Committee and the PPC are not prepared to advertise, there should be another special meeting, advising the people of the plan area that there will be another meeting. He stated it is not fair to start changing the process at this point.

Mr. Morrison also agreed that the normal process will work for this plan. He stated there is still an opportunity for the public to discuss this, and they can make representation at the public hearing.

MOTION CARRIED

It was agreed that the two areas of concern by Councillor Walker and Councillor Fralick be dealt with at a regular meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee, and that any recommendations be presented to Council on April 19, 1988.

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT this meeting adjourn."

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 8 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

APRIL 11, 1988

PRESENT WERE: Warden MacKenzie
Councillor Walker
Councillor Rawding
Councillor Fralick
Councillor P. Baker
Councillor C. Baker
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor DeRoche
Councillor Adams
Councillor Randall
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. Bill Butler, Manager, Policy Division
Mr. Paul Morgan, Planner

SECRETARY: Glenda Hill

Warden MacKenzie called the public hearing to order at 7:10 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. Kelly called the Roll.

Warden MacKenzie welcomed Councillor Deveaux back to Council following his illness. Councillor Deveaux extended appreciation to staff and Council for all they did while he was in the hospital and home recovering.

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

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

Warden MacKenzie reviewed the procedures for the public hearing.

APPLICATION NO. PA-15/18/19-02-88-18

Mr. Butler advised this application is for an amendment to the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for Planning Districts 15/18/19 to add an area to the plan that should have been included in the original adoption of this plan. Mr. Butler advised when the notice for advertising for the particular plan area was put in newspaper an old map was inadvertently used, which did not properly portray the plan area boundaries. He reviewed the area included on a map, noting the area consists of approximately 2,000 acres - nine separate parcels of land, owned by five property owners. Mr. Butler further advised that the property owners affected by this amendment were notified of the Public Participation Session on February 29, as well as this public hearing.

Questions from Council

Councillor Lichter asked how the affected property owners were notified. Mr. Butler advised they were notified by letter, and to his knowledge all have received their letters.

Speakers in Favour of this Application

None

Speakers in Opposition to this Application

Mr. George Piercey, Piercey Investors Limited, advised his company owns more than 1,000 acres of the lands in question. He stated there was immediate concern when this proposed amendment was announced, although he was not sure why he did not have representation at the Public Participation Committee meeting in January. Mr. Piercey advised development of this area based on residential zoning, and if it is to be rezoned to MU-1 (Mixed Use 1) Zone, it will affect all proposals for this land. He informed that customers have already expressed interest in this development because they have been ensured that the development will be R-1 (Single Unit Dwelling).

Mr. Piercey outlined the boundaries of his company's property on a map, showing where the amendment is proposed and how it will affect the land. He advised there have been two sales of these lands with another expected immediately, and there have been many, many inquiries. He stated all people have been ensured that it is their intention to keep this an R-1 development. The MU-1 zone will allow some commercial development. He reviewed the road patterns, noted the only access to Highway No. 103 is through other lands his company hold, and it is their intention to connect that residential road in order to continue with R-1 development, and the MU-1 zone will funnel any commercial traffic through this development. He asked that Council consider this when making a decision regarding this application.

Mr. Piercey stated he cannot argue with a Multiple Resource zone, although they are objected to the Mixed Use 1 Zone. He continued that there are two very natural locations for future commercial

development, and other land in the area will serve these demands in the future. He stated this falls under Policy Statement 9 that Halifax County Council does not want too much fringe residential development along public highways, as his proposed development cannot be on public highways due to the limited access to Highway No. 103. He read the policy statement, stating his request is not something that Council cannot consider because it is fully in line with this policy statement.

Questions from Council

Councillor DeRoche asked when Piercey Investments Limited submitted subdivision plans for the approval of these lands. Mr. Piercey stated they were submitted in the fall, 1987, and it was approved in October.

Councillor DeRoche noted that Piercey Investments Limited recently purchased the lands along Highway No. 103, and he asked why they would be concerned about commercial development, when they control the development. Mr. Piercey stated if any existing parts can be changed to a commercial use, it will add to the traffic flow in the area, and there is only one entrance to the property. He stated his company only controls the development until it is sold, and if the zoning is MU-1, new owners can override the existing use. He stated he is concerned that if this amendment is approved before he can apply for and obtain rezoning to R-1, the loss would be to Piercey Investments Limited.

Councillor DeRoche asked if staff was aware of the subdivision application and approval for these land when the staff report and submission was prepared. Mr. Butler replied that he was not; he stated part of these lands are within the Timberlea/Lakeside/Beechville plan area, and those lots which have been approved would fall under that plan area. The larger parcel of land next to Highway No. 103 falls within the Timberlea/Lakeside/Beechville plan.

Councillor Rawding expressed objection to Mr. Butler's opinion. He stated District 2 ends at Cranberry Lake and these lands are further down the road from the boundary. There was some discussion and concern about the district and planning boundaries.

Councillor DeRoche clarified that staff was not aware of the subdivision application and approval when the staff report was prepared. Mr. Butler agreed.

Councillor Fralick suggested the land in question is in District 3. He stated there are some business on both sides of the road. He stated these businesses are existing uses, and they must be kept in mind. Councillor Fralick suggested that this matter should be referred back to staff, and that some provision should be made for R-1 for Mr. Piercey, allowing existing business to remain. He agreed that Mr. Piercey's land should be zoned R-1.

Mr. Piercey indicated he is not aware of any other business uses at this location, except for one.

Councillor Lichter stated an R-1 designation cannot be dealt with at this public hearing because the area is not within the District 15/18/19 Plan, and the policy does not apply to these lands. He felt the Council should approve the amendment as indicated, and because Piercey Investments Limited owns the land, it can be assured that there will not be any development until there is a rezoning of the lands after the Plan is in affect. He felt nobody would object to this rezoning as it is the most restrictive zone under the District 15/18/19 Plan. He suggested there is no jurisdiction to deal with this request at this point because the advertisement of this public hearing did not reflect this change.

Mr. Cragg stated the amendment for which this public hearing has been scheduled is to include within the plan area those certain lands, and he agreed they must be included first, before a request for a rezoning could be entertained.

There was further discussion concerning the district and plan boundaries.

Anne Fournier, Timberlea, advised that she is only opposed to this amendment with respect to Mr. Piercey's concerns. She stated there was confusion in the original public advertisement in August, 1987 which may be causing some of the confusion tonight. She outlined the boundaries of Timberlea and the District 15/18/19 Plan area, as well as District 3. She noted that Districts 2 and 3 share part of the Timberlea/Lakeside/Beechville planning strategy.

Mrs. Fournier stated the MU-1 zone is a sound zone, allowing for some protection; however, homeowners want a safety clause. Plans are not enough without enforcement of all the regulations.

Mrs. Fournier advised she had inquired of the Department of Municipal Affairs how it is determined lines on the map are drawn. She was informed that the scaling-down of the map for the newspaper advertisement probably caused the confusion with the boundaries. She stated Mr. Piercey cannot be criticized for not attending public planning meetings because he was probably not aware that his lands were included, as she originally felt her planning district and property boundary were not affected. She stated she would be very concerned if certain uses were allowed next door, when she felt there was some protection.

Mrs. Fournier stated the MU-1 zone does provide some safeguards, and it is very sound. She stated there if there is a definite need to alert residential uses, it should be done now.

Mrs. Fournier concluded that she delivered a letter concerning this to the Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Kelly, and the Councillors for Districts 2, 3, and 18. She read the letter, commending the Department of Lands and Forests and Halifax County for foresight in protecting the District 15/18/19 plan for the use of all Nova

Scotians. The letter requested consideration for a natural resource designation on another parcel of crown land, which is approximately 40 acres adjacent to Maple Lake and Upper Sheldrake Lake. The letter read that planned residential development in the future will enclose this area, and this lot is very beautiful, and it is used by Cubs, Scouts, Guides, etc. It is also very accessible for sport fishermen, as well. She concluded that this land could be used in many ways by future Nova Scotians. As it stands now, this land would make an ideal park left in its natural state, allowing for future recreational uses as the area develops.

Mrs. Fournier concluded that the Timberlea/Lakeside/Beechville area has no crown lands with potential to be accessed and used in such a manner. Therefore, she urged Council to reserve this lakefront land for the continued and future of Nova Scotians.

Questions from Council

None

Councillor Deveaux asked if this portion of land is not within Districts 15, 18, or 19 and was advertised as such, can this amendment be dealt with. Mr. Cragg responded that whether it is dealt with properly or not may be a future subject, if a decision is reached at this point. He felt there are some justifiable concerns about the district and planning boundaries, and if these concerns are legitimate, it would not be proper to proceed with a decision that Council knows could be incorrect. He expressed no difficulty in referring this back to the PAC or to staff, now that the public hearing portion is complete.

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

"THAT Application No. PA-15/18/19-02-88-18 be referred back to the Planning Advisory Committee for clarification."

Councillor MacKay was of the understanding that these lands were left out of the District 15/18/19, and they are now being included in the plan; the amendment has nothing to do with a district boundary. He expressed no difficulty with referring this for clarification, although it is incidental to the amendment. He was also of the understanding that these lands will first have to be included in the area, and the land use and zone applied afterward. He stated if an MU-1 zone is applied to these lands, an R-1 restriction could certainly be applied later because land can be rezoned more stringent, but not more lenient after something is advertised. He stated Mr. Piercey's request is very simply and logical, and he agreed that the rezoning would be more protective than restrictive covenants. He stated these matters should all be clarified at the PAC.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Warden MacKenzie noted that the public hearing portion of this amendment is over, and the clarification is to assist Council when making a decision.

APPLICATION NUMBER RA-24-33-87-09

Mr. Morgan reviewed the staff report respecting this rezoning application. He showed the location of the two parcel of land involved on the overhead projector. Mr. Morgan noted that the Planning Advisory Committee had recommended that this public hearing be held, but they have not given any recommendation with regard to a decision respecting this application.

Mr. Morgan reviewed comments received from various provincial and municipal agencies with regard to this rezoning application.

Mr. Morgan informed that subsequent to the Planning Advisory Committee meeting, Councillor Randall, representing this area, asked several further questions. The Department of the Environment were asked if they would be monitoring this site. Their response was that for this type of operation, they would not normally monitor it; however, if requested by the Municipality, they could set up a monitoring program, and once the regulations are in place, they will be checking for licensed operators.

The Department of Health were asked about the possibility of chemicals running off into the on-site sewage disposal system. Their response was that on-site sewage disposal systems are for domestic sewage only, and no building drains can lead to that system. The system will also have to meet all provincial requirements, and the sewage disposal system will have to be a minimum of 100 feet from the watercourse, and depending on soil conditions, the distance may be increased.

Concerns were expressed about the height of the road embankment being higher than the site, and the Department of Transportation were approached about this. They responded that this site meets all the Department of Transportation requirements, and any access will have to be no further west than 75 feet; there must also be adequate on-site parking provided; a maximum of two driveways, each with a maximum width of 30 feet; and a maximum driveway grade for a distance of 30 feet from the edge of the paved roadway cannot exceed 2 percent.

Questions from Council

Councillor Mont inquired about other allowable uses in a C-1 zone. Mr. Morgan advised a C-1 zone will permit all R-1, R-2, R-3, and R-4 zone uses; a store for the purpose of retail trade and services only; a gasoline filling station; a general office, parking lot, restaurant, drycleaning or packing unit except when in the opinion of the building inspector, the operation would cause a nuisance; and any accessory uses to those lists.

Councillor Mont expressed concern about other uses. He stated although this application is for a garden centre, this property could be sold, and once the lot is zoned C-1 any other of those other uses could be developed here. He stated he would be very concerned if a gasoline station were built on this property.

Councillor Mont noted that the Cole Harbour Rural Heritage Society show conditional approval to this project, provided specific regulations are worked out control adequate setbacks of buildings from watercourses, the use, type, and disposal of pesticides and fertilizers, and careful siting of the parking lot to avoid runoff into the Harbour. He expressed concern that not all of these controls are available. He stated he would be more comfortable with this development, if it were by development agreement. Mr. Morgan stated there is only provision to negotiate by development agreement when there is a municipal planning strategy in place, and at present this area is regulated under By-law No. 24.

Councillor Mont clarified that there are regulations pending from the Department of the Environment. Mr. Morgan agreed, stating there is a pending legislation that all spray operators be licensed.

Speakers in Favour of this Application

Margaret Godfrey, Atlantic Nurseries Ltd., advised that she and her husband own and operates Atlantic Nurseries Ltd., and they have been in the business for over 20 years.

Mrs. Godfrey informed that their operation is a retail and wholesale nursery operation, growing and selling their own product which involves a variety of ornamental plant material and various hard goods. She informed the operation originated in Bedford in 1967 and there has been a long and steady growth over the past 21 years, employing about 45 people for six to eight months, and a core staff of 12 to 15 people for the remainder of the year.

Mrs. Godfrey advised these lands were purchased with a view to serving the Dartmouth and Halifax County area. It was felt the property could be applied for a commercial zone under the present By-law No. 24, even though there is a Municipal Development Plan proposed for this area.

Mrs. Godfrey stated much time and effort has been put into trying to develop a quality product, and this product is now available with reputable service. She stated anybody who has visited their operation either in Bedford or in Sackville would attest to their ability to offer an attractive, clean, and aesthetically appealing-type of business operation. She stated a very strong and loyal clientele has been built.

Mrs. Godfrey presented an architect's perspective of how the facility is viewed as developing.

There were several concerns about this site, which have been addressed. One concern was the highway at the far side of the proposed building. The entrance and exit has been moved to the far eastern portion of No. 207 Highway.

Mrs. Godfrey stated this property is very aesthetically pleasing, and this can be enhanced with some landscaping and the use of boardwalks, park benches, etc. She stated it is their intent to create this type of setting at this location. Mrs. Godfrey stated their business is enhancing the environment, rather than destroying it, and their reputation stands on that. She continued that they have strived for excellence in all aspects of their industry, aspiring to the highest professional standards in terms of the product, their sales staff, and knowing what they are doing.

Mrs. Godfrey stated this proposed development is not a growing production operation; the methods and procedures used in that kind of an operation are different from a retail station; the product will be brought in from the growing operation for sale at this location. She noted this will be a seven day per week operation other than the normal holiday period. She stated in selling this type of product, there must be some maintenance of the plant material. She assured that her company has always used great care and professional in the use of pesticide products, and in 20 years they have never had an accident with pesticides. The amount of pesticide would be very limited, as well as the variety because this is only a maintenance program, and a good clean operation will not see many problems. Certain pesticide products will also be sold, but these are products that one can buy at any store around, and there is always great care given to the handling of these products.

Mrs. Godfrey added that any pesticide products they use are federally registered and regulated, and all guidelines are followed. She noted that they have employees who were licensed within the Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia to deal with pesticides, and it is these people who apply their pesticides. She noted that the Bedford operation and the proposed location use very limited amount of pesticides, but the employees do know what they are doing.

Mrs. Godfrey stated the land acquisition and the capital assets will be extensive, which will be an added tax base for the County, as well as provide jobs for the local people. She advised that she has made every effort to meet and discuss this proposal with the residents of Lawrencetown. She has attended three different community meetings, and many residents have offered support for this proposal. She stated they are not out to do any disservice or destruction, and their busy has been an asset wherever they have operated. She advised she is in receipt of letters from the County of Halifax and Town of Bedford indicating their business has always been operated well with no problems or complaints. She stated the record states that they stand very professional in the conduct of their business. She added that she is Vice Chairman of the Nova Scotia Greenhouse Growers, past Executive Director of the Landscape Atlantic Organization, and she has much experience in this line of work being very familiar with the laws and guidelines of what is necessary to take off, look after, and monitor such an operation. She concluded that this proposal will be an added asset to the area of Lawrencetown, and they have proceeded with this application because after reviewed the proposed Municipal Planning Strategy for Lawrencetown and garden centres and considered a

desirable type of operation in this area, and she did not expect any objection to this proposal.

Questions from Council

Councillor Wiseman complimented Mrs. Godfrey on her operations in Bedford and Sackville. She stated these operations are both very clean and well organized, offering a quality product. She asked if Mrs. Godfrey intends to have the Lawrencetown operation open year round. Mrs. Godfrey advised it will be.

Councillor Wiseman inquired about the amount of spraying that will be done on plant material at this operation after having transported them from the greenhouse operation in Sackville. Mrs. Godfrey advised the spray operation in Lawrencetown will be very minimal because it will only involve a maintenance program. Pesticides are not used all the time. The spraying will also take place in the greenhouse with a cement floor, and spraying in the nursery is not common, although it has had to be done occasionally. Maintenance would take place once per week, and the primary product will be a safe insecticide soap. This is mostly used in the Bedford operation now.

Councillor DeRoche inquired about the sale of pesticides and fertilizers at the Lawrencetown operation. He also asked if water will be used to a greater extent than a residential use. Mrs. Godfrey agreed. Councillor DeRoche commented on the possibility of problems at a fragile place such as Cole Harbour. He asked what safeguards there will be to protect against the spilling of fertilizer or pesticide which is washed into the septic system. Mrs. Godfrey advised if a bag of fertilizer broke open it would be swept up and put into the garbage for disposal. With regard to liquid pesticide, she advised any spills would involve a mop-up procedure, soaking the solution up with peat moss or sawdust and then sweeping it up. She added that this operation will not use large quantities of these pesticides, and they will be kept in locked cupboards. She felt the limited quantities involved does not lend itself to this kind of analogy. She added that she has three employees who are greenhouse specialists, graduates of a three year technological program in ornamental horticulture and greenhouse production. She advised they were licensed within the Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, and they will be licensed in Nova Scotia once this requirement is enforced.

Councillor Randall advised that the Department of the Environment has replied to the Planning Department that if requested, they could develop a monitoring program for this site. He asked if Mrs. Godfrey would be prepared to cooperate in this regard and accept this monitoring program. Mrs. Godfrey stated this would probably not be a problem, although she felt the Department of the Environment would not deed this to be necessary because such limited quantities of hazardous materials are used. Councillor Randall stated the monitoring program would alleviate any environmental concerns they may be.

Councillor Wiseman inquired about the use of fungicide sprays. Mrs. Godfrey advised fungicide spray is not used often; insects are more of a problem than fungus problems. She stated steps are taken to protect against disease and pest controls, as well, such as the replacement of gravel in the greenhouses with fresh gravel. She stated their operation is very clean, and the greenhouses are thoroughly cleaned twice per year when crops are down. She stated the use of fungicide would be very minimal.

Councillor P. Baker stated he would support the development of this operation, and he suggested if Atlantic Nurseries are ever looking for a new location, they might consider his area.

George Cooper, Solicitor representing Atlantic Nurseries Ltd., stated the problem of pesticides and chemicals are quite trivial, as everybody uses these in their garden and lawns. He stated that the federal government has responsibility for ensuring the pesticides are safe, and they have employees who test these chemicals scientifically, and they put very strict guidelines for use on the labels of these pesticides. It is then law that these chemicals are used in accordance with the law; they are then deemed to be safe. He stated there are many federal departments and agencies involved in this approval process.

Mr. Cooper advised that safe means safe to the staff, to the neighbours, to animals, and to the environment.

The provincial government also has responsibility in this respect, and they can close down any environmentally unsafe operation at any time, any place based on a ministerial order.

Mr. Cooper stated the municipal government has responsibility, as well - to ensure that the building and physical layout is such as to not cause too much runoff, etc.

Mr. Cooper continued that if there is a future argument that pesticides should not be used at all, it is a matter the provincial and federal governments should deal with. All pesticides used are approved, and if somebody disagrees with the fact that they should be approved, the forum for debating this is with the federal government. Improper use should be debated at the provincial government level, and Mrs. Godfrey does use these chemicals improperly, there is a remedy: the Provincial Department of the Environment will monitor the situation and stop the operation. He stated it would be possible for an irresponsible person to deliberately pollute the area, and it would also be possible for somebody to negligently disregard the ecology of the area and carry on business for the environmentally sensitive area. He stated every chemical is a poison if the dose is high enough, but Atlantic Nurseries has an excellent reputation for professionalism; it has been a fine corporate citizen in the County and Bedford for 20 years without any difficulty, and he suggested that the right course of action is to assume that this responsible behaviour will continue, and the permit should be granted. He reiterated that if the company does not behave responsibly, there is a remedy at the Provincial Department of the Environment.