

Councillor Cooper stated this still did not address the problems being experienced with respect to Capital Funding. He stated Halifax County should not continue to operate the way they presently were until they had some method of making sure all areas received consideration as due to them. He stated there were many individuals who had arsenic, etc. They remain at the bottom of the list.

Warden Lichter stated the vote was unanimous.

Warden Lichter suggested that this report be forwarded back to the Executive Committee, bringing this matter forward the 3rd Tuesday in August.

It was moved by Councillor Merrigan, seconded by Councillor Bates

"THAT this report be forwarded back to the Executive Committee Meeting for discussion."

Councillor Deveaux asked if final funding had already been done.

Warden Lichter stated with respect to these projects, Halifax County would go ahead. He stated they did not know exactly how they would be financed. He stated this is what would be reviewed.

Councillor Deveaux asked if financing was worked out, would this come back to Council.

Warden Lichter responded that it would be brought back to Council.

Councillor Deveaux stated when the Caldwell Road issue came up, he was under the impression that this would be paid for by the Province and Federal Government. It would not cost the Municipality any money.

Warden Lichter stated Councillor Deveaux was correct. He stated he brought this up to David Nantes at the last meeting held in which Mr. Meech attended.

Councillor Deveaux asked if this was not phased.

Warden Lichter stated the Province did not want just the Indian Reserve served. They wished Halifax County to extend the services to Caldwell Road.

Councillor Deveaux felt in doing this, Halifax County was taking priorities away from other areas.

Mr. Meech advised when the agreement was made with the Indian Band Council, there was not going to be any capital funding commitment

at that time. He stated it is anticipated in 1991/92, the sidewalk program would be completed on Caldwell Road.

It was moved by Councillor Cooper, seconded by Councillor Deveaux

"THAT an amendment be made to the motion:

"THAT at such time as the Executive Committee considers this report, they also draft a policy which addresses the health concerns based on individuals suffering as the result of arsenic in wells, or bacteria counts higher than appropriate for consumption of water within the entire Municipality."

Councillor Reid asked if these were identified concerns.

Councillor Cooper responded there were a number of these concerns.

Councillor Richards stated he fully agreed with Councillor Cooper in terms of capital funding. He stated when it came from cooperation and support from the Provincial Government, they would do whatever they wished to.

Councillor MacDonald advised of a report received at the Executive Committee meeting with respect to the impact on the taxpayer.

Warden Lichter stated Mr. Meech had gone through the figures.

Mr. Meech responded on assumption of the present tax base assuming projects would be given the go ahead today, the environmental services rate would have to be increased by 5.8 cents, the general tax rate 1.6 cents. He stated this would include the Millwood Expansion.

Councillor MacDonald questioned funding from the Province with respect to Caldwell Road.

Mr. Meech stated the Province would provide 20% towards the Humber Park Project, 35% towards Cherrybrook and 35% towards the Caldwell Road Project. He stated he could not take issue with respect to the funding proposal. He stated this seemed to be a reasonable proposal.

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED.

#### GRANT REQUESTS

Mr. Kelly outlined the report.

It was moved by Councillor Merrigan, seconded by Councillor MacDonald

"THAT Council approve the following grant requests:

- A A District Capital Grant in the amount of \$300.00, District 1, for the purchase of equipment for the St. Margaret's Saints Soccer Club.
- B A District Capital Grant in the amount of \$287.00, District 3, for topsoil and grass seed, Tantallon Junior High School playground.
- C A District Parkland Grant in the amount of \$1,300.00, District 17, for playground fencing, Windsor Junction School.
- D Two District Capital Grants in the amount of \$500.00 each, District 17, provided to the Silverdale and Frame Subdivision Homeowners Association for beach repairs.
- E A General Parkland Grant in the amount of \$833.34 and District Parkland Grant in the amount of \$833.34, District 20, for a total of \$1,666.68 for construction of tot lots, Judy Anne Court and Nordic Crescent.
- F A District Capital Grant in the amount of \$5,000.00, Districts 16, 19, 20, 21 & 22, to provide \$1,000 from each district for capital improvements to the Fultz House.
- G A General Parkland Grant in the amount of \$570.00, District 24, for lighting, Colby Village Pool.

MOTION CARRIED.

#### NATAL DAY HOLIDAY

Mr. Kelly outlined the report.

It was moved by Councillor Fralick, seconded by Councillor Sutherland

"THAT August 5th be declared a Municipal Holiday in Halifax County Municipality."

MOTION CARRIED.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

##### FORMER ST. ANDREW'S SCHOOL, TIMBERLEA

Mr. Kelly outlined the report.

It was moved by Councillor Poirier, seconded by Councillor Merrigan



"THAT the proposal submitted from Halifax Christian Academy to lease the former St. Andrews School, Timberlea be approved by Council."

MOTION CARRIED.

CAPITAL GRANT CULTURAL & RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, PORTUGUESE COVE

Mr. Kelly outlined the report.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Ball, seconded by Councillor Merrigan

"THAT Council approve a Capital Grant (1/6th Funding) in the amount of \$10,033.00 for Cultural and Recreational Facilities, Portuguese Cove."

MOTION CARRIED.

GENERAL PARKLAND GRANT, DISTRICT 24

Mr. Kelly outlined the report.

It was moved by Councillor Richards, seconded by Councillor Bates

"THAT Council approve a General Parkland Grant in the amount of \$1600.00 for construction of a parking lot at Mel Braine Ball Field in Cole Harbour."

MOTION CARRIED.

MINOR VARIANCE APPEAL

Paul Morgan, Planner, advised a municipal development permit application was initially received from Robert Parker to permit a boathouse on his property, situated at Paddy's Head Road, Indian Harbour.

He stated a development and building permit application was made earlier in the year for a boathouse. During the course of construction, it was found that this was more than a boathouse, there was also living accommodations being constructed.

Mr. Morgan advised Mr. Parker was instructed to make a revised permit application.

Slides were shown.

Mr. Morgan advised under the general requirements of the Land Use By-law for Planning Districts 1 and 3, any building or structure must be setback at least 25 feet from the rim of any watercourse or waterbody. Boathouses and buildings related to fishing activities or boat building are exempt. Therefore, because the structure has



been built with no setback from the shoreline, a municipal development permit cannot be issued for use as a residence unless a variance to this setback requirement is granted.

He stated the Planning Act Stipulated that a minor variance shall not be granted in the event that the variance is not minor, in that it violates the intent of the land use by-law; the difficulty experienced is general to the area; or the difficulty experienced resulted from the intentional disregard for the requirements of the land use by-law.

He stated given these criteria, he did not feel he was in a position to issue the development permit. He stated the requested setback was 0 feet, the required 25 feet. He stated this was quite a large property and there was no reason why the dwelling could not be located 25 feet back from the watercourse.

Mr. Morgan advised the provisions of the Planning Act, an appeal of this decision had been made to Council. The act stated that Council could make any decision that the municipal officer could have made.

#### QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Meade referred to the living accommodations mentioned. He asked what rooms were located in this building.

Mr. Morgan stated it was his understanding this was a dwelling unit. However, he had not been inside the building.

Councillor Meade asked if he was correct in assuming no floor plans had been submitted for material development except for a boathouse.

Mr. Morgan responded that was correct. He stated it was Mr. Parker's intention that this would be used for temporary living accommodations until such time as a dwelling unit would be built back from the shoreline.

Councillor Meade asked where the septic tank disposal field was located in this case.

Mr. Morgan advised a permit had been issued for a sewage disposal system. He stated it was the Department of Health's regulations that this be setback 100 feet minimum from a watercourse.

Councillor Fralick stated he believed under the health regulations, if the system was an old existing system, it could be located within 50 feet of the watercourse. He asked if there was an existing system there.

Mr. Morgan responded there was not an existing system located there.

Councillor Fralick asked if this was totally a new structure.

Mr. Morgan responded that it was a new structure.

Councillor Fralick referred to the living conditions with respect to a 0 setback. He stated he believed the actual shed would be a 0 based setback but he believed the dwelling would not be a 0 based setback.

Councillor Fralick asked if the residence Mr. Parker was requesting approval was a 0 based setback.

Mr. Morgan stated he was not quite sure how far this was back. He stated the intent of the Land Use By-law was that a boathouse structure by itself could be built from a 0 foot setback. He stated the dwelling had to be 25 feet in a combined structure. He stated in his interpretation, this was unusual.

Councillor Fralick asked what the approximate setback would be with respect to the living accommodations.

Mr. Morgan stated he was uncertain.

Councillor Fralick requested this information be obtained from the Development Officer.

Councillor Cooper asked if Halifax County had a definition for a boathouse.

Mr. Morgan responded he did not believe there was a definition for the term "boathouse" in the Land Use By-law.

Councillor Cooper stated obviously from the slides shown, this was not related to a fishing structure. He asked how constitutions with respect to boathouses were determined.

Councillor Morgan stated to him, a boathouse would be where an individual kept or stored his boat.

Councillor Cooper questioned the portion of the dwelling that would be considered a boathouse.

Warden Lichter stated he considered it to be ridiculous to require that an individual build a separate building for their boat in which they could not live in, being that close to the water. He stated it was the septic tank disposal field that ought to count in this case. He stated it was not the fact whether individuals lived

in a particular building. He stated the intent of the PPC that created the District 1 and 3 Plan clarified quite clearly that a boathouse was a unit in which you store a boat, prepare a boat, but you don't live in that particular structure, although the definition did not appear in the plan.

Councillor Cooper stated he felt the application had gone beyond a boathouse.

#### SPEAKERS IN FAVOR

Mr. Bob Parker advised he was the owner of the subject property located in Indian Harbour, Paddy Head Road. He advised they applied initially for a building permit for a boathouse and a workshop. He stated this was granted. He stated they also, prior to that time, applied for permits to build a wharf and a slipway in conjunction with that. He advised these permits were granted also. He stated approximately half way through the construction process, they decided to convert the workshop area of the boathouse to occasional living accommodations. He stated the reasons were because they intended, in the near future, to build another residence on the site. However, due to financial constraints were not able to. He stated at the time they decided to convert the workshop to these living accommodations, they went to the Development Department and asked for procedures. He stated they, plus the Building Inspection Department, advised that they needed to apply for an upgrading permit to allow for these changes. He stated this was done. He stated the Building Inspection did not see a problem with this. He advised they had to apply for a Health Permit to install a septic tank, pumping chamber and a contour drain field trench located approximately 170 feet away from the boathouse. He stated this was very carefully sited because of the concern they had with respect to the landscape. He stated this was worked out very carefully with the Health Department and those facilities were installed. He advised after the upgrading permit was applied for to allow for a dwelling unit, three weeks later they received a notice that they required a minor variance which could not be granted by the Development Officer. He stated by this time, the structure was substantially complete as contractors were engaged and waiting to go onto other jobs. He stated after application was made for the upgrading permit, the inspector came on site and issued them to stop work order which was complied with. He stated he asked, in subsequent construction with the Building Inspector if the building could be secured by putting on the rest of the doors, and so forth. As seen from the slides, this represented quite a substantial investment. He stated this was done and work stopped at that point. He mentioned the living portion was back twenty feet from the waterline. He stated they felt they had been caught in the process. He stated the wharf, etc. as mentioned was done by permit. He stated they did restore



the shoreline presently there. He stated a lot of debris and old machinery was removed.

He stated they had spoken with all abutting neighbors which supported the appeal. He stated with regards to the areas, when they applied for the upgrading permit, they did indicate there would be a sleeping area over the boathouse and that there would be a living room and eating area down below. He stated these bedrooms were not full sized by any means. He stated the kitchen area could hardly be called a kitchen. He stated they intended to use this as an occasional dwelling. He stated they were trying to follow the correct procedures and were asking Council to support the appeal.

Councillor Harvey asked if the on-site sewage disposal system was in place at present.

Mr. Parker indicated this system was in place.

Councillor Harvey asked if it was in operation.

Mr. Parker responded rain was needed. He stated it had been inspected and approved.

Councillor Harvey questioned the distance from the shoreline.

Mr. Parker responded the actual drain field was located perpendicular from the waterline at approximately 120 to 125 feet.

Councillor Harvey asked if a permit was obtained from the Department of Health for this.

Mr. Parker responded absolutely, a permit was obtained and final approval given.

Councillor Cooper asked if he was correct in saying construction continued after it was indicated an upgrading permit was required.

Mr. Parker stated in terms of securing the building such as windows and doors, work was continued. He stated they were advised they could do this. Work, however, was stopped on everything else.

Councillor Cooper questioned if the building was in the form it was shown in the slides.

Mr. Parker responded that was correct.

Councillor Cooper asked when Mr. Parker came in to ask about the Health Permits, was it indicated to him that he should not proceed any further until the permit was issued.

Mr. Parker responded it was not indicated to him that they should not proceed any further until the permit was obtained. He stated there was no indication at all that there was anything to do with setback requirements from either the Development Department or Building Inspection Department.

Councillor Cooper asked if Mr. Parker indicated to the Inspection Department at that time that he was intending to put a dwelling unit on the property.

Mr. Parker responded they had indicated they intended to put a dwelling unit on the property.

Councillor Cooper asked if they indicated that there was setback requirements at that time.

Mr. Parker responded there was no indication with respect to setback requirements. He stated three weeks later, they received a telephone call followed by a letter from the Department Officer advising of the setback requirements. He stated he was very flabbergasted at that point.

Councillor Meade asked if Mr. Parker was not aware of the 25 foot setback.

Mr. Parker responded he was not aware of this setback. He stated when he was first made aware of it, it was called a rear yard setback. 8 feet was the required setback standard.

Councillor Meade asked how long Mr. Parker lived in St. Margaret's Bay.

Mr. Parker responded twenty-one years.

Councillor Meade asked how many houses would be closer than 25 feet to St. Margaret's Bay. He stated everyone would apply for a boathouse, and all of a sudden have a house there.

Mr. Parker stated they would not have proceeded with this project if they knew the setback required.

Councillor Meade felt if Halifax County approved one, they would have to approve several in the next number of years. He referred to the sleeping quarters. He asked if the bedroom located over the boathouse was still 20 feet away.

Mr. Parker responded that portion would be closer to ten feet. The main living area was 20 feet.

Councillor Meade asked if Mr. Parker did not classify a bedroom a

living area.

Mr. Parker stated it was a sleeping area. He stated he was unsure what would be classified as a living area.

Councillor Harvey asked if there was any provision for heating in the house.

Mr. Parker responded this dwelling contained electrical heating.

Councillor Harvey questioned whether this could be characterized as a seasonal boathouse living arrangement.

Mr. Parker stated he would consider it a seasonal boathouse living arrangement because it was not insulated to very high standards. He stated it would be better insulated if they planned to use it as a year round dwelling.

Councillor Sutherland asked Mr. Parker what his future plans were in terms of time intervals. He asked if Mr. Parker intended to proceed with construction of another building.

Mr. Parker stated that was their intention probably within two years. He stated they ran into a great investment because of the very extensive septic field and drain field.

Councillor Sutherland asked if the septic field and drain field would accommodate the new structure.

Mr. Parker responded that it would not. He stated they were working it out with the Health Inspector. It could not be used to serve both facilities because of the location and size.

Councillor Sutherland asked if Mr. Parker had any indication of the required twenty-five foot setback.

Mr. Parker responded not until the telephone call was received.

Councillor Poirier referred to the number of years Mr. Parker lived in the area. She questioned if he owned another home in St. Margaret's Bay.

Mr. Parker responded he had another home but it was presently being sold. He advised his wife passed away last year and he decided to sell the house. He stated he was living in Halifax at present.

#### SPEAKERS IN FAVOR

Mr. Peter Thomas advised he owned the property abutting Mr. Parker's property located on Paddy's Head Road. He stated he did



not have any objections to the Minor Variance. He stated as shown from the slides, the structure was a nice amenity to the area. He stated it was not used as a year round home.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR

Ms. Debbie Gilbert advised she was part of the joint project located on Paddy Head Road. She stated she could substantiate what Mr. Parker had said. She requested support with respect to the appeal.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION

None.

DECISION OF COUNCIL

It was moved by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Poirier

"THAT Minor Variance #MV-10-3-91 to allow for a minor variance to the required setback from a watercourse as stipulated by the Land Use By-law for Planning Districts 1 and 3 be rejected."

Councillor Fralick stated he felt the rules were ridiculous with respect to these matters. He felt Council had to be a little flexible. He personally believed it would be unjust for the expenditure and work that has gone into this project to deny this particular application.

Councillor MacDonald asked if this was rejected, would the building be torn down.

Warden Lichter responded it would not be able to be used as sleeping quarters.

Councillor Sutherland expressed difficulty with the sleeping accommodations or living quarters. He questioned what would be considered living quarters.

Warden Lichter responded he could not advise on this.

Councillor Richards stated it seemed the dwelling itself was within five feet of what would be permissible. He stated this seemed to be quite a common arrangement in boathouses. He stated many minor variance appeals had been approved by Council, some more severe than five feet. He stated the disposal field was a proper distance away from the watercourse. All permits necessary were received. Therefore, he could not support the motion on the floor for rejection.

Councillor Bates stated he certainly would not be supporting the motion. He stated a great amount of money was spent for a disposal system which was installed in conjunction with the Department of Health. He stated he would be very disappointed if Council did not support the gentleman's request.

Councillor Morgan stated he would not support the motion.

Councillor Boutilier stated the permits were obtained and a proper sewage disposal field installed. He felt this was an honest mistake on Mr. Parker's part. He, therefore, could not support the motion.

Councillor Reid wished to ask Mr. Morgan a question with respect to the 25 foot setback. He advised the applicant indicated three weeks after he applied for the upgrading, he was notified that there was a setback requirement. He requested clarification with respect to this.

Mr. Morgan responded the original permit application was for a boathouse. He stated he was not advised of the living conditions. He stated if he knew this was Mr. Parker's intention, he would have been advised at that time.

Councillor Reid stated it was to his understanding the applicant came in and applied for an upgrade to his permit.

Mr. Morgan stated they were unaware living conditions would be installed. He stated when he became aware of the situation, Mr. Parker was notified.

Councillor Meade felt the bedroom conditions were considered living conditions. He stated they were talking about 15 feet not 5 feet. He stated if this was approved, the plan should be reviewed as others who applied would have to be approved.

Councillor Harvey stated he understood Councillor Meade's concern. He asked if Mr. Parker could sleep in his boat inside the boathouse. He stated he would not support the motion.

Councillor Cooper asked if any infilling had taken place with respect to this situation.

Warden Lichter responded nobody made any reference to it.

Councillor Cooper asked if the slide which showed the side view of the dwelling and water mark of the property in question could be illustrated. Agreed.

MOTION DEFEATED.

It was moved by Councillor Fralick, seconded by Councillor Smiley

"THAT Minor Variance #MV-10-3-91 to allow for a minor variance to the required setback from a watercourse as stipulated by the Land Use By-law for Planning Districts 1 and 3 be approved."

MOTION CARRIED.

#### TRANSIT COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Kelly outlined the Transit Committee Report.

It was moved by Councillor Bates, seconded by Councillor Randall

"THAT Council request Metropolitan Authority to extend Route 62, Humber Park along the Montague Road to Cherrybrook to Highway #7 and back into the existing route at Montague and Highway #7."

Councillor Richards stated in principle, he was willing to support the motion. However, was concerned with respect to funding. He stated the funding for transit effected the four districts in the Cole Harbour/Westphal area. He questioned the impact this would have on those residents in terms of the transit rate in those areas.

Councillor Bates responded this information was included in the report. The total cost anticipated for the full year would partially be covered by the City of Dartmouth and approved by the Metropolitan Authority. He stated the total impact was \$10,000 for one year. He stated it might cost approximately \$1500 for this year. In relation to the total budget for the Westphal/Cole Harbour area, he was unsure.

Mr. Meech stated there was one transit rate for all of the areas serviced with transit. He stated this did not just impact the Cole Harbour/Westphal areas. This would impact all of the areas presently within that serviceable boundary paying the transit rate. He stated 1 cent would amount to approximately \$100,000.

Councillor Cooper questioned the expansions by residents of Districts 8&9 under consideration. He asked if an area rate would come effective. He asked if this would be shared throughout the Municipality.

Mr. Meech stated if Councillor Cooper was referring to an area that was not presently part of the serviceable areas for transit, that



would have to be part of the consideration as to whether they were to incorporate it with the overall serviceable area or whether they would be treated separately.

Mr. Meech stated this area would be part of the serviceable area.

Councillor Cooper questioned the definition of a serviceable area.

Mr. Meech responded it was an existing route with an extension.

Councillor Cooper asked if any existing route could be extended.

Mr. Meech stated this could be done. He stated one common rate was in effect at present. He stated if that area was part and parcel of the transit serviceable area, it would be a matter of policy and would be covered on that basis.

Councillor Bates stated with the addition, this route took in Lake Loon, Cherrybrook, as well as the Westphal Trailer Park. He stated this was an addition of 6.2 kms but they were doubling back 2.2 kms. He stated therefore, they were looking at an additional 4 kms.

Councillor Richards asked if the area this extension would serve was presently paying the transit rate.

Councillor Bates responded they were paying the transit rate.

MOTION CARRIED.

#### BOUNDARIES REPORT, UNION OF NOVA SCOTIA MUNICIPALITIES

It was moved by Councillor Sutherland, seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer

"THAT the Boundaries Report, Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities be received."

MOTION CARRIED.

#### PETITION RE WATER, CHURCHILL ESTATES

Mr. Kelly advised of a petition submitted by residents of the Churchill Estates area with respect to the water problems being experienced.

Deputy Warden Ball advised the residents of Churchill Estates were experiencing a serious health problem. He stated he had discussed this matter with Mr. Wdowiak and Mr. Meech. He stated the Board of

Health were aware of the problem. He felt Halifax County had an obligation to the 142 homeowners to rectify the problem. He stated something had to be done on an interim basis at present and work towards bringing the water line out to the particular subdivision in the future. He stated the sewer line was brought out in 1967 and 1968. He stated for some bizarre reason, that Municipality did not extend the water line at the same time.

Mr. Meech stated Halifax County were operating on the basis of the discussions. He stated a specific report and recommendation should be brought back with respect to this matter.

Deputy Warden Ball stated he agreed with this. However, residents were generally without water on a daily basis. He stated most of these homes consisted of extremely young families. He stated something should be done as soon as possible to alleviate this problem.

Mr. Meech stated to expend dollars would have to receive approval of Council. He stated Council had no legal authority to spend monies on this private water utility. He stated something should be worked out with the owners in this regard.

Deputy Warden Ball stated the owner of the Utility can say "see you later". Then, Halifax County has 142 homes that is in a catch basis because the County is saying it is not their problem and the other individual can walk out anytime.

Mr. Meech suggested that this matter be forwarded to the PUB to give a directive as to the position of the Water Utility.

Deputy Warden Ball stated the PUB gave a directive to the Utility over one year ago. He stated they granted them an 88% price increase. He stated when this was granted, certain recommendations and orders were given. He stated the Board of Health had been dealing with this for a long period of time. He reiterated something had to be done.

Mr. Meech stated he was uncertain how to resolve the problem at this point. He stated Halifax County should not send out messages that Halifax County will provide water to those whose wells have gone dry. He suggested that an emergency meeting of Council be held to discuss the meeting.

Councillor MacDonald asked if the waterbreak in this area had been resolved.

Mr. Wdowiak indicated this was not resolved.

Deputy Warden Ball stated he would like to have a report as to the

status as far as the Municipality was concerned in the next week or so with respect to this matter. If necessary, a Special Meeting of Council should be convened to deal with this. He stated 142 homes were involved here not just one single home.

It was moved by Councillor Reid, seconded by Councillor Merrigan

"THAT the Petition Re Water, Churchill Estates be received."  
MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Ball, seconded by Councillor Merrigan

"THAT Staff prepare a report as to the remedies of what the Municipality can do to rectify the problems being experienced in the Churchill Estates area, and further that, a Special Executive Meeting be convened to deal with this matter as soon as the report is prepared."  
MOTION CARRIED.

#### UNSM CONFERENCE DELEGATES

Warden Lichter advised this was for information purposes. He advised when the Regional Meeting was held, five members of Council were appointed to attend this meeting. He stated this, however, did not mean that the individuals who attended this meeting would have to attend the conference being held in September. He stated a decision would be made later on with respect to this. He urged that no more members than five be urged to attend.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Fralick

"THAT Warden Lichter appoint five delegates to attend the annual UNSM Conference, and further that, the Warden be one of the five attending."  
MOTION CARRIED.

#### APPOINTMENT, DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

Mr. Kelly advised a letter was submitted to Council requesting the Warden and Members to appoint Ms. Dorothy Cartledge and Ms. Janice MacEwen as Municipal Development Officers according to the provisions of the Planning Act. Council as well would be requested to rescind Ms. Spencer's personal appointment as Development Officer.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor MacDonald



"THAT Ms. Dorothy Cartledge be appointed as Municipal Development Officer according to the provisions of the Planning Act."

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by Councillor Harvey, seconded by Councillor Deveaux

"THAT Ms. Janice MacEwen be appointed as Municipal Development Officer according to the provisions of the Planning Act."

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Councillor Bayers

"THAT Council rescind the appointment of Valerie Spencer as Development Officer."

MOTION CARRIED.

#### RESOLUTION, CANCELLATION OF AUGUST 6, 1991 COUNCIL SESSION

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Councillor Sutherland

"THAT the August 6, 1991 Council Session be cancelled."

MOTION CARRIED.

#### SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION, DISTRICT 24

Warden Lichter asked Mr. Crooks to indicate what type of resolution would be required with respect to this matter.

Mr. Crooks stated to his understanding, difficulties had been encountered with the connection of the proposal to install sidewalks from the Department of Transportation. He advised of the right-of-way difficulties in this area with respect to two lots. He advised the owners had been unwilling to date to commit access for construction purposes over their respective properties. He stated in the circumstances, the only alternative the Municipality would have to gain authorized access for itself and/or the Department of Transportation for purposes of sidewalk construction was to expropriate an interest in those two lots which would be in the nature of a temporary easement provided they are suggesting for a period of one year which would permit necessary access for purposes of sidewalk construction within the DOT right-of-way. He advised Mr. Kelly had resolutions with him with respect to the two lots in question.

Mr. Kelly presented the two resolutions to Council.

Councillor Richards stated he wanted to be certain that the procedure being followed was one that the Municipality should be following or if it was one that the DOT should be. He stated he had difficulty understanding why, if they were the individuals constructing the sidewalks and own the right of way next to the street level, why the Municipality expropriate on the temporary basis these particular properties. He stated he understood the need to have that sidewalk completed. He stated he supported the concept but was not quite sure why they had to go this route.

Mr. Meech responded Halifax County was dealing with a Cost Share Program between the Municipality and the Department of Transportation. He stated part of the requirements of that agreement was, if any addition lands required right-of-way, it was the responsibility of the Municipality to provide those lands to the DOT.

Councillor Richards asked if he was correct in saying the Municipality expropriated and gave it to the DOT.

Mr. Meech responded that was correct. He stated it was not going to be necessary that it be conveyed on a long term basis but in fact only during basic construction. He stated the land would be reconveyed back to the property owner.

It was moved by Councillor Richards, seconded by Councillor Sutherland

"BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Municipality of the County of Halifax deem it necessary to acquire, and that the Council does hereby expropriate an easement as described below in that portion of the lands of Wayne A. White and Arlene E. White and Moran J. Wagner and Faye M. Wagner, situated at Cole Harbour, Halifax County, more particularly set out in the description annexed hereto as Schedule "A", and outlined in red on the plan in Schedule "B" annexed hereto, (the "Lands") for the purpose of laying out and constructing a sidewalk.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the nature of the interest intended to be expropriated hereby is an easement to and in favour of the Municipality, its servants, workers and agents, including any employee of the Province of Nova Scotia, to enter on the Lands for the purpose of constructing a sidewalk on adjoining lands; said easement to be for a period of one year from the date hereof. Such interest is intended not to be subject to any existing interest in the Lands.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the aforesaid Council that this Resolution be a certificate of approval within the meaning of paragraph 11(1)(e) of the Expropriations Act, S.N.S. 1973, c.7,

as amended, and that the Municipal Clerk in and for the Municipality of the County of Halifax be and is hereby authorized to execute true copies of this Resolution and any and all such further documents as may be required pursuant to the aforesaid expropriation.

Councillor Sutherland asked if there were any alternatives going towards expropriation. He requested Staff to look at any possible alternatives.

Warden Lichter stated Eddie Brine and the Solicitor looked at this. He stated the answer came back that this was the only route Halifax County could follow.

Mr. Meech advised he had a call from a resident in the area very keen on this project. He advised, legally, even with expropriation, Halifax County was technically required to wait 90 days before it could proceed on the property. However, there was a mechanism that Mr. Crooks had brought to their attention. With approval of the Attorney General, Halifax County could get more immediate access. He stated they intended to ask the DOT to assist in expropriation. He stated the contract for the project had been awarded.

MOTION CARRIED.

#### BEAVER BANK ROAD - COUNCILLOR MERRIGAN

Councillor Merrigan outlined his request. He advised this was supposed to be completed last fall.

It was moved by Councillor Merrigan, seconded by Councillor Fralick

"THAT a letter be forwarded to the Department of Transportation & Communications questioning why the resurfacing of the Beaver Bank Road had not been done to date."

MOTION CARRIED.

#### METRO TRANSIT - DEPUTY WARDEN BALL

Deputy Warden Ball outlined his request.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Ball, seconded by Councillor Deveaux

"THAT a letter be forwarded to the Metropolitan Authority requesting the linking of the #20 bus in Herring Cove to the #15 bus servicing the Purcell's Cove Road for the purpose of



facilitating better ridership on the #15 and to connect Spryfield, Purcell's Cove and Herring Cove into this service."

Deputy Warden Ball requested that Mr. Reinhardt take care of this matter as he would be away.

MOTION CARRIED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - COUNCILLOR FRALICK

Councillor Fralick wished to delete this from the agenda.

EMERGENCY AGENDA ITEMS

1. Unsightly Premises - Councillor Deveaux

Councillor Deveaux stated he was made aware by Staff that Halifax County did not have monies in the budget to pursue the cleanup of unsightly premises. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Meech responded the budget had been reduced substantially. He stated there were very little monies available for the Unsightly Premises Program.

Councillor Deveaux stated he agreed with the cuts. He stated he wondered if some of the cuts were feasible or logic. He stated this placed Halifax County in a bad position.

Mr. Meech stated in the cases where there were violations, Halifax County still had the option of prosecuting, hopefully, getting the message across and getting the residents to clean the property up.

Councillor Deveaux stated it could be six months to a year before someone should come up in court. In the meantime, the unsightly premises problem still carries on. He asked if Mr. Meech had any suggestions.

Mr. Meech stated the other possible solution would be, if Halifax County were charging back the full costs as it being a recovery from the property or a lien against the property, Halifax County would expend the money and establish it as a receivable.

Councillor Deveaux stated he wished to express concern. It was ridiculous to try and handle a by-law where Halifax County was trying to clean up unsightly premises. He stated when it came down to the final straw, Halifax County could do nothing about it.

2. EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER - COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX

Councillor Deveaux advised he had spoken to Mr. Meech a couple of weeks ago. He stated the emergency number dealt specifically with the Engineering & Works Department in relation to sewer and water problems. He suggested that whoever answered the telephone there, be given some indication of where to transfer calls for other departments.

Warden Lichter stated the person who answered the telephone should at least have the name and number of department heads.

Mr. Meech advised that he requested Mr. Brothers to investigate this to see what could be done to expand this.

3. Proposed Outfall Re Treatment Plant - Councillor Deveaux

Councillor Deveaux made reference to the location of the treatment plant with respect to the Harbour Clean Up. He stated he was not happy with this decision nor the individuals in his area. He stated the Environmental Panel would be coming out to the area with their findings sometime at the end of this year. He stated they would have to abide their time on this issue to see what would happen.

He stated he had some concern with respect to the location of the proposed outfall - near George's Island. He requested Mr. Meech to elaborate on this as he was a Member of the Halifax Harbour Clean Up Commission. He stated he had spoken to Mr. Calda with respect to this matter. He stated they had to receive permission from the individuals who dealt with water matters whether this would be an appropriate site. He stated to have the outfall at this location could cause some problems as indicated at the public meetings held. He stated it had not been determined where effluent would go, etc. He stated it was to his understanding the requirement of HHEI was that approval would have to be received from a CoastGuard confirming the present outfall site. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Meech responded that was correct. He stated there had been some questions and concerns raised as to whether that was the most appropriate location. He stated this issue would have to be addressed as well as the issue of the location of the plant itself as part of the environmental examination of the overall project. He stated there was still some possibility that the suggested location may change after the information was generated.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor MacDonald

"THAT a letter be forwarded to the appropriate Coast Guard indicating concern with respect to the present proposed outfall site, and further that, serious consideration be given

to not approve the proposed site for this purpose."

Deputy Warden Ball stated he remembered Councillor Deveaux for the last two years suggesting that an objective approach be taken with respect to this. He stated he would not support sending a letter to relocate the outfall site.

MOTION DEFEATED.

4. Staff Response to Public - Councillor MacDonald

Councillor MacDonald advised he had some telephone calls from residents indicating the hard time they had experienced trying to locate their County Councillor. He felt there had to be a better way of finding this information out. He stated he found this very embarrassing.

Mr. Meech stated district boundary maps were available. He stated he did not know how detailed they were.

Warden Lichter stated this inquiry was also received in his office. He advised his secretary could get into the mainframe and immediately find out what Councillor represented which district. He stated individuals should be learned how to "tap" into this information. He stated it was there for their use.

Mr. Meech stated these matters should be referred to the Municipal Clerk's Office. He advised this issue would be addressed.

5. Waste Management - Councillor Boutilier

Councillor Boutilier stated he was very disappointed with the direction Metropolitan Authority took with respect to incineration. He asked what happened if some materials were left over from composting that could not be put in a landfill. He asked why Metropolitan Authority was so sure composting could handle everything. He stated a great amount of time was involved with respect to educating the public, etc. He asked how Metropolitan Authority Members would come here Tuesday to make a decision on which route they would proceed with respect to a management system when they did not visit a composting facility. He stated he thought the next meeting with respect to this would take place July 23, 1991.

Warden Lichter stated the majority of Council had gone on record as supporting incineration. He stated there was a motion one time of that kind. He stated there was a motion on February 19, 1991 that once Metropolitan Authority received proposals for incinerators and central composting facilities, these proposals would be compared carefully. If one or the other could not demonstrate it could meet



the environmental standards, that option would be rejected. He stated if both proposals met environmental guidelines, the less expensive would be accepted. He stated there was some doubt with respect to incineration and composting. He stated he did think in a democracy there were losers and winners. He stated he and other Councillors would be visiting a Sortation System and composting plant. He stated he may come back totally convinced that he was wrong. He stated if he felt the system would not work after this visit, he would come back to Council indicating that there was no other option but the incineration option. He stated he could not agree with "incineration at this time" because the indication of that carried two messages. One would be that Halifax County was playing politics with the public. Secondly, where there was clear majority, he wanted the financial commitment from Halifax, Dartmouth and Bedford that the treatment of the waste would be done one way or another. He stated he wanted to avoid any possibility of promises being made that would not have to be delivered. He stated it was Halifax County's taxpayers and Halifax County's environment that Council ought to protect. He stated he felt Council struggled with tremendous amounts of information with respect to this matter. He stated it was difficult to make a decision as to what to believe.

Warden Lichter asked Mr. Meech to pass out the cost sheet indicating the Metropolitan Authority options and the costs involved. Warden Lichter referred to Option Y.

Councillor Boutilier questioned Warden Lichter's opinion.

Warden Lichter advised he had the speech he gave to Metropolitan Authority written out. He stated he did not leave anything unrecorded. He stated he indicated to them that he was not persuaded that incineration was an unsafe method or that composting was an unsafe method. He stated he indicated as long as the public perception appeared to be that incineration was not safe, he would go along with them as their representative. He stated public perception was very important.

Councillor Boutilier stated 18 or 19 Councillors at the time the motion was made supported incineration. He stated every Councillor who sat here listened to the same telephone calls and comments. He stated he could not make a decision one way or the other because of the comments received for and against.

Warden Lichter stated when he looked at a \$125 million dollar mistake to the taxpayers vs a \$15 million dollar, he would rather take the gamble of the \$15 million dollar mistake.

Councillor MacDonald referred to Japan with respect to composting and incineration. He referred to the composting sites he had seen.

Warden Lichter asked how a vote came to 5 to 5 if one choice was so clear.

Councillor MacDonald stated his decision was based on public perception. Other Councillors' decisions were based on facts.

Councillor Deveaux asked if consideration had been given to acquiring a smaller portion of land for the landfill. He asked if this was taken into consideration when costs were considered.

Warden Lichter responded this was the reason the information was circulated in order to view the percentage of garbage which would be forwarded to the landfill. He stated with Option Y, Halifax County could probably have 30% go towards the landfill. He stated with other options, there were lesser percentages than that. He stated the cost was not going to be just the landfill itself.

Councillor Deveaux stated common sense indicated to him that if something was burnt, it was not all that much trouble than composting. He stated this would cause a lot less problems. He felt problems would not be eliminated by composting. He stated the problem was the garbage going in the ground.

Councillor Eisenhower made mention of rats as a result of garbage. He felt the garbage should be burned first.

Councillor Bayers stated one of the items he wished to bring forward under Emergency Agenda Items was the item presently being discussed. He stated he was looking at the figures and did not see the \$125 million Warden Lichter was referring to. He stated he was looking at the number of people turned out on the Southern Shore and Eastern Shore. He stated one of the major problems that faced Metropolitan Authority and Halifax County was the siting for a new landfill. He stated this told him one thing. They did not want a 600 acre landfill site anywhere in Halifax County. On the Eastern Shore, it was indicated these sites were acceptable. However, no organic material, construction material, or hazardous waste was allowed. He expressed concern with respect to gambling with taxpayers dollars. He stated if Halifax County wanted 64% of the garbage going to landfill, then Halifax County could get away with a total cost of \$80 million dollars. Halifax County would compost as well. He stated the people were saying they did not want 64% of the garbage going to landfill. He stated all three members located on the Metropolitan Authority supported incineration in some state. He stated County Council should support the hundreds of people on the South Shore and the hundreds of people on the Eastern Shore. He stated if Council looked at the majority of individuals, they did not want a landfill site. He felt Halifax County should be supporting incineration at 53% and 4% going to landfill. He stated this might alleviate some of the fears the

public had from the South Shore to the Eastern Shore. He stated Halifax County should get the smallest possible landfill site they could come up with as people did not want a landfill site.

Warden Lichter pointed out why X,Y options were labelled as such.

Warden Lichter stated Council knew quite well even from an incinerator, 10% volume and 30% weight would have to go to a landfill site. He stated experts made them aware of this. He stated to reduce this to 4% was impossible.

Councillor Bayers asked if there were secret negotiations between the Warden, and the Mayors. He asked if Warden Lichter was prepared to tell Council what those secret negotiations were about.

Warden Lichter stated he would advise Council of what that meeting was about although it was not secret negotiations. He stated if Council wished to call this meeting secret, this was Council's privilege. He advised at government house on Friday night before the Metropolitan Authority meeting, Mayors Wallace, Christie and Savage asked if there was something Halifax County was going to propose to Metropolitan Authority with respect to this matter. He stated that he told them he would not tell them. He stated these individuals advised if the site was to be located in Halifax County, it was important they would be able to support Halifax County's position. Warden Lichter advised these individuals asked if he could meet with them Saturday or Sunday to discuss whether they could support the County. He advised they came into his office Monday. He stated he told them they were proposing to Metropolitan Authority exactly what Councillor Boutilier witnessed at the Metropolitan Authority Meeting. He stated all three of them indicated they could support this decision. He stated they also suggested that Halifax County talk to their individual members just to let them know what would be supported by the Chief Magistrates.

He stated they have gone back to talk to their Councils. He stated if the majority voted this way, that was the point of view he represented. He stated the Members who sat on Metropolitan Authority were free to vote the way they felt was right. He stated these were not secret negotiations the way some people seem to understand it. He stated this was not taking bribes, etc. or whatever Councillor Bayers meant.

Councillor Bayers stated he did not mean it this way at all. He stated he did not think Warden Lichter was taking bribes. However, he stated he did not fully agree with this either because it left the other two Members of Metropolitan Authority somewhere at a disadvantage. He stated he had been called in for an emergency meeting before. He stated he did not mean there was anything done wrong about it. However, he believed Council could have been informed of it and he believed it would have firmed their support



with all Members of the Metropolitan Authority.

Warden Lichter stated he was not trying to insult any Council Members nor buy any of their votes. He stated the Council Members spoke of incineration very, very strongly until "SMART" contacted them. He stated Halifax County then became quiet with respect to this matter.

Warden Lichter further stated when this particular motion came before Council, Council Members supported it by majority that Halifax County look at composting proposals and incineration proposals and if both were environmentally acceptable, then we proceed with the cheapest method. He stated this was a very subjective thing. He asked if it was or wasn't. He stated he went one way, his other colleagues the other, which was fair.

Councillor Deveaux asked if it had been determined as yet whether one method was better than the other.

Warden Lichter responded he did not think anyone would ever know until they proceeded with one or the other. He advised of telephone calls received. He advised of an incineration plant built in Florida costing \$150,000,000. He stated they were presently in debt for \$500,000,000 of the taxpayers money because they had nothing but problems with it. He stated he did not know whether that was the truth or not. He stated this was the problem. When so much information was received, it was hard to make a decision one way or the other.

Councillor Cooper stated he had heard on the news that the Province was going to become a little more persuasive in their field by probably supporting composting and recycling as opposed to incineration. He asked if Warden Lichter had any information with respect to this and to how it might affect the discussion taking place presently.

Warden Lichter advised he had no information with respect to this matter. He advised the information he had received from Ontario was that the New Democratic Government particularly the lady holding the environment portfolio announced some time ago that garbage was not going to be transferred North, no landfills would be created in Ontario, and no incineration would be permitted. He stated it was his understanding the Civil Servants have come to the understanding that something would have to take place. He stated the Minister was looking at the possibility of saying she did not approve incineration but would support a Waste & Energy Plant.

Councillor Cooper asked Warden Lichter to make an effort to check up on this matter.

Councillor MacDonald stated a closer look should take place as to what would be composted and what would be burnt.

Councillor Richards stated he understood through discussions with Warden Lichter yesterday and this evening that the Warden would rather support the taxpayer, and would rather spend \$14 million as opposed to \$125 million. He stated if Halifax County looked at incineration, the amount of incineration and wastes as compared to that composted, the \$14 million could not be compared to the \$125 million. He stated Halifax County was looking at composting 5% in most of the situations and yet they were looking at incineration as high as 40 to 53%. He stated all of this would have tremendous impact on what was leftover. He stated the leftovers would go to a landfill. He stated he understood the dollar concept and was extremely conscientious of that. However, he did not feel the Warden could look at those two figures in isolation. He thought Halifax County should look at the total picture. He stated he did not have nothing in comparison to those individuals who served on the Metropolitan Authority in terms of technical data that was supporting some of those figures. He stated when he looked at this, incineration was not out of the question. He stated if this was the direction Council took some months ago, that motion should be looked at again and, perhaps, the members of Metropolitan Authority should be given some new direction that he did not feel should be an either/or at all. He stated if that was the message Warden Lichter was receiving based on the motion passed, he stated he would be prepared to make a new motion that it not be an either/or at all.

Warden Lichter stated he agreed with Councillor Richards. He stated he had not supported the 10% organic waste composting at all. He referred to Option Y with respect to composting of 30-31%. He stated 30% only to the landfill. He stated this was the clause he could support if indeed it was determined that sortation and composting would work. He stated the reason he believed in Sortation was because he felt Halifax County would outdo themselves with their garbage. He made reference to the motion made February 19, 1991.

Councillor Bates stated when this was discussed at Council, they talked about composting, etc. He stated the score was 21 to 2. He stated he was not in favor. He stated they have argued about it and it now was up to the Metropolitan Authority. He stated the problem with what was being proposed was that none of the advice given by the experts was being followed. He stated he hoped Council could compost and not have to incinerate so that Council would be in agreement with these people. He stated none of the experts seemed to be concerned with it. He stated all of the people who wanted to solve this problem in somebody's else's backyard did not want incineration. He stated he hoped that

Halifax County could compost everything and did not need an incinerator. He stated he had a hard time believing this would work. He felt Halifax County would end up with the same problem as Sackville without an incinerator.

Warden Lichter stated he would be visiting one of these sites as indicated earlier and if he felt it did not work, he did not have any other option than an incinerator. He stated if incineration was agreed to, why couldn't Halifax County incinerate more than 40% and play around with the other percentages. He felt this would result in a 60% landfill that had been experienced in the past. He stated this was his difficulty.

Councillor Meade asked if on July 23, 1991, Metropolitan Authority voted for incineration. He felt they should go back to the consultants as he felt 600 acres was not required if incineration was decided. He stated 100 to 250 acres of land would only be necessary which would leave sites available in Halifax, Bedford and Dartmouth. He asked if there would be additional sites in other Municipalities.

Warden Lichter responded incineration was not being decided at this time. He stated if incineration was the option they were going with, the more percentage incineration, the smaller the landfill that would be required. He stated the smaller landfill required would put the pressure on Halifax/Dartmouth. He stated he was quite sure they wanted to avoid this.

Councillor Bayers suggested that if incineration was decided upon and Halifax County required a 100 acres for this, perhaps Halifax or Dartmouth could be persuaded to fit a landfill in their area. He stated Halifax County had the landfill before.

Warden Lichter asked why the entire population did not support Halifax County and why the western area was against incineration.

Councillor Bayers stated this could result in not having facts. He asked if Council was prepared to vote on a new direction to be given to Metropolitan Authority Members.

Warden Lichter stated he was aware of Council's opinion by what they had said. He stated most were in favor of incineration.

Councillor Bayers stated this option would reduce the landfill at the same time.

Warden Lichter stated this could be achieved if Halifax County were prepared to go more than 40% incineration. He stated a large landfill would still be required. He stated \$125 million plant might as well burn everything not needed.



Councillor Bates referred to Sweden. He stated they recycle, compost a certain amount, etc. He stated incineration was needed. He stated untreated garbage would not get into a landfill.

ADDITION OF ITEMS TO AUGUST 20, 1991 SESSION

1. Control of Cats - Councillor Deveaux.

IN-CAMERA ITEM - SACKVILLE COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Council agreed to come out of Camera.

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Councillor MacDonald

"THAT the Municipality of the County of Halifax endorse the Redress Report prepared by the Highway 101 Landfill Closeout Committee and that Metropolitan Authority be advised of said endorsement and requested to act on the recommendations contained within the report."  
MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT

Council adjourned.

MINUTES & REPORTS  
OF THE  
THIRD YEAR MEETINGS  
OF THE  
FORTY-THIRD COUNCIL  
OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX  
AUGUST COUNCIL SESSION  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 1991

&

PUBLIC HEARING  
AUGUST 12, 1991

&

SPECIAL COUNCIL SESSION  
AUGUST 26, 1991

INDEX

Air India Flight 182 Disaster - - - - -	17 - 18
Advance Polls - - - - -	37
Budgeting Time Frame - - - - -	35
Business Occupancy Tax - - - - -	40
Chief Building Inspectors Report - - - - -	23
Cole Harbour Place Budget - - - - -	34 - 35
Community Learning Centre - - - - -	36 - 37
Churchill Estates Water Utility - - - - -	37 - 39
Control of Cats - - - - -	39 - 40
Crosswalks - - - - -	40 - 41
District 10 East Fire Department - Loan - - - - -	25 - 26
Development Officer Report - - - - -	37
Expropriation - Boutilier Property, Mushaboom - - - - -	24
Federally Sentenced Women Facility - - - - -	26 - 33
Greenwich Drive - Sidewalk - - - - -	2 - 15
Grants - - - - -	26
Green Areas/Parkland - Maintenance - - - - -	33 - 34
Hatchet Lake Fire Department - - - - -	24
John Stewart Drive - Traffic Conditions - - - - -	18
Letters & Correspondence - - - - -	15 - 22
Lakeside School - - - - -	23 - 24
Lakeview Water Extension - - - - -	39
Landfill Sites - - - - -	41 - 45
Motion - Appointment of Recording Secretary - - - - -	1
Motion - Approval of Minutes - - - - -	1 - 2
Motion - Sidewalks, Greenwich Drive - - - - -	2 - 15
Motion - Letters and Correspondence - - - - -	15 - 22
Motion - Air India Flight 182 Disaster - - - - -	17 - 18
Motion - Traffic Conditions, John Stewart Drive - - - - -	18



INDEX

Motion - Operation Greensweep	20
Motion - Regionalization of Services	21 - 22
Motion - Dates for Public Hearings	22 - 23
Motion - Shopping Centre, Antigonish	23
Motion - Chief Building Inspection Report	23
Motion - Lakeside School	23 - 24
Motion - Expropriation, Boutilier Property, Mushaboom	24
Motion - Hatchett Lake Fire Department	24
Motion - Senior Planner Position	24 - 25
Motion - Sidewalk Construction Agreements	25
Motion - N.S. Housing Commission Funds	25
Motion - Tax Sale Surplus Account	25
Motion - District 10 East Fire Department	25 - 26
Motion - Grants	26
Motion - Federally Sentenced Women Facility	26 - 33
Motion - Minor Variance Appeals	32 - 33
Motion - Green Areas/Parkland Maintenance	33 - 34
Motion - Cole Harbour Place Budget	34 - 35
Motion - Budgeting Time Frame	35
Motion - Two Family Housing Units	36
Motion - Community Learning Centre	36 - 37
Motion - Advance Polls	37
Motion - Development Officer Report	37
Motion - Churchill Estates, Water Utility	37 - 39
Motion - Lakeview Water Extension	39
Motion - Control of Cats	39 - 40
Motion - Business Occupancy Tax	40
Motion - Paving, Oceanview Drive	40 - 41
Motion - Crosswalk Painting	41
Motion - Landfill Sites	41 - 45
Motion - Adjournment	46
N.S. Housing Commission Funds	25
Operation Greensweep	20
Public Hearings - Dates	22 - 23
Paving - Oceanview Drive	40 - 41
Regionalization of Services	21 - 22
Sidewalk - Greenwich Drive	2 - 15
Senior Planner Position	24 - 25
Sidewalk Construction Agreement	25
Tax Sale Surplus Account	25
Two Family Housing Units	36

PUBLIC HEARING

August 12, 1991

PRESENT WERE: Warden Lichter  
Councillor Meade  
Councillor Poirier  
Councillor Fralick  
Councillor Deveaux  
Councillor Adams  
Councillor Randall  
Councillor Bayers  
Councillor Smiley  
Councillor Reid  
Councillor Horne  
Councillor Merrigan  
Councillor Morgan  
Councillor Snow  
Councillor Eisenhower  
Councillor MacDonald  
Councillor Harvey  
Councillor Richards  
Councillor Cooper



ALSO PRESENT: K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer  
G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk  
Fred Crooks, Municipal Solicitor

=====

The meeting opened at 7:00 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer. Mr. Kelly called the roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

"THAT SANDRA SHUTE BE APPOINTED AS RECORDING SECRETARY"

MOTION CARRIED.

1. PENDING RESOLUTION OF SITE-SPECIFIC MATTERS TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX AND ROBERT H. DAUPHINEE SR. AND DOCKSIDE MARINA INC. TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MARINA AND SUPPORTING FACILITIES LOCATED OFF HIGHWAY 333, MACKEREL COVE, TANTALLON BE APPROVED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL.

Mr. John Bain, Planner, advised that the purpose of the agreement was to establish provisions to permit the development and expansion of boat storage areas and to allow for the development of a fully