

Mr. Meech responded Councillor Bayers was correct. He replied he did not notice this either until he received his agenda.

Councillor Bayers requested that this letter be removed from the Council agenda.

Mr. Meech stated this letter was not mentioned as a separate item and there was no action taken with respect to this particular aspect.

Councillor Bayers reiterated this letter should not have been included in the agenda.

It was moved by Councillor Bayers, seconded by Councillor MacDonald

"THAT the letter submitted by Mr. David Grace regarding the facility for federally sentenced women be deleted from the agenda."

Warden Lichter stated he wished to make Councillor Bayers aware that other individuals besides Council received the Council agenda in which this letter was included.

Mr. Crooks stated the motion on the floor could be passed but he was uncertain if it would do anything with respect to this conflict as other individuals, besides Council, received the Council agenda.

Mr. Meech asked if for the record, there was some kind of resolution that Council could take to formally remove this from the record.

Mr. Crooks advised Council could pass the resolution on the floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

MEMORANDUM RE MAINTENANCE OF GREEN AREAS/PARKLAND IN URBAN AREAS - SACKVILLE COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Mr. Kelly outlined the letter. He advised the Committee requested that Halifax County Council ask the Parks and Recreation Department to prepare a report addressing the development of a policy whereby abutting property owners could be given permission to maintain the green area adjacent to their properties.

He advised the basis of such a policy would be a volunteer effort, encouraging residents to participate in the beautification of their neighborhood. Guidelines and restrictions would be required with the necessary assurances that the property owners would adhere to.

It was moved by Councillor Morgan, seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer

"THAT Halifax County Council ask the Parks and Recreation Department to prepare a report addressing the development of a policy whereby abutting property owners could be given permission to maintain the green area adjacent to their properties."

MOTION CARRIED.

COLE HARBOUR PLACE BUDGET - 1991/92

It was moved by Councillor Richards, seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer

"THAT the Cole Harbour Place Budget 1991/92 be deferred to the Westphal/Cole Harbour Community Committee for consideration."

Councillor Cooper questioned the reason for deferral.

Councillor Richards responded this item directly effected the Westphal/Cole Harbour communities. He stated it seemed to him this item fell in the same category as other areas dealt by the community as it related to area rates, etc. He felt this was the appropriate action to take.

Mr. Meech stated it was his understanding the Community Committee had the benefit of this back in January in which it was discussed. Because there was no necessity for a specific area rate to cover the operation costs, there was no area rate set. He stated the reason why this was brought before Council was technically this facility was owned and operated by the Municipality. He stated Council had to endorse the budget.

Warden Lichter asked if Councillor Richards wished to withdraw the motion as individuals wished to speak on the issue.

MOTION WITHDRAWN.

Councillor Cooper felt the placement of the budget before Council was appropriate in its present form. He stated the budget's content had been discussed within the community by Councillors of the area. He stated if Councillor Richards wished to discuss this item, he could bring it before the Community Committee.

It was moved by Bates, seconded by Councillor Cooper

"THAT the Cole Harbour Place Budget for 1991/92 be accepted as

presented."
MOTION CARRIED.

POLICY RE BUDGETING TIME FRAME

Warden Lichter advised the document provided in the agenda with respect to this matter was self explanatory. He advised the policy re budgeting time frame would go into effect for the fiscal year commencing April 1st, 1992.

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

"THAT the following budgeting time frame be approved:

- November 1st - The Budget Coordinator submits budget documents to internal departments and area rate organizations for the ensuing fiscal year.
- December 1st - Internal departments and area service organizations provide preliminary budget estimates to the Budget Coordinator.
- January 15th - Preliminary internal department and area service budget estimates for all operations assembled and reviewed by Budget Coordinator and submitted to Chief Administrative Officer for consideration.
- February 15th - Chief Administrative Officer's review process complete and proposed internal departments and area services budgets submitted to Council for consideration.
- April 1st - All budgets and tax rates approved for the ensuing fiscal year.

Warden Lichter questioned if Staff could stick to this policy.

Mr. Meech responded this was the intent. He stated the reason they wanted this formally adopted as a policy of Council was because they would now be communicating to those required to develop their budgets. He stated this would bring it to their attention that certain dates are required in which information has to be obtained if Halifax County Council is to fulfill it. Warden Lichter advised he would assist in any way with respect to this matter.

MOTION CARRIED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING - TWO FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

Mr. Kelly advised the Department of Housing were requesting Council to approve the construction of two family housing units.

Councillor Boutilier asked what these units would be used for.

Mr. Meech responded this would be used for family housing as opposed to senior citizen housing. He stated there would be a list where individuals had to qualify to be placed in this housing.

Councillor Boutilier asked if this housing was for lower income households.

Mr. Meech responded that was correct.

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Councillor MacDonald

"THAT Council approve construction of two family housing units with the Provincial Government paying the full capital cost and operating losses being shared 75% by the Federal Government, 12.5% by the Provincial Government and the remaining 12.5% by the Municipality of the County of Halifax."
MOTION CARRIED.

HALIFAX COUNTY/BEDFORD DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD RE PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTRE

Warden Lichter advised the letter included in the agenda with respect to this issue required that two or three representatives serve on the Planning Committee for the development of a Community Learning Centre.

He advised this item was deferred from the previous Council session.

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

"THAT Councillor Boutilier be appointed to the Planning Committee for the Development of a Community Learning Centre."
MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by Councillor Fralick, seconded by Councillor McInroy

"THAT Councillor Meade be appointed to the Planning Committee for the Development of a Community Learning Centre."

MOTION CARRIED.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Richards

"THAT Councillor MacDonald be appointed to the Planning Committee for the development of a Community Learning Centre."
MOTION CARRIED.

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

"THAT Councillor Cooper be appointed to the Planning Committee for the development of a Community Learning Centre."
COUNCILLOR COOPER DECLINED.

It was moved by Councillor Bates, seconded by Councillor McInroy

"THAT nominations cease."
MOTION CARRIED.

Warden Lichter asked Mr. Kelly, Municipal Clerk, to advise the School Board accordingly.

ADVANCE POLLS - MUNICIPAL ELECTION

Mr. Kelly outlined the memorandum with respect to this matter.

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

"THAT one advance poll be held on Tuesday, October 15th, 12:00 noon - 8:00 p.m., and a second advance poll be held on Saturday, October 12th, 12:00 noon - 8:00 p.m."
MOTION CARRIED.

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

Mr. Kelly outlined the report.

It was moved by Councillor Fralick, seconded by Councillor Harvey

"THAT the report of the Development Officer be received."
MOTION CARRIED.

CHURCHILL ESTATES WATER UTILITY

Warden Lichter advised Council had advised that a satisfactory

Asset Purchase Agreement could be achieved, that the P.U.B would approve the transfer of the Utility to Halifax County, and that all conditions directed at the July 22, 1991 meeting can be met, to ratification of the approval of acceptance of the ownership and operation of the Churchill Water Utility by Halifax County.

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

"THAT a satisfactory Asset Purchase Agreement be achieved, that the P.U.B approve the transfer of the Utility to Halifax County, and that all conditions directed at the July 22, 1991 meeting be met, to ratification of the approval of acceptance of the ownership and operation of the Churchill Water Utility by Halifax County."

Deputy Warden Ball advised the principle with respect to this matter was passed July 22, 1991. He advised most Councillors received a letter from the Churchill Estates Homeowners Association with respect to this issue. He advised residents of the Association seemed very pleased. He advised from July 23, 1991 to this point and time, the water had not been turned off at all. Up until that day, the water was turned off once every day for approximately 6 months. He suggested that some of the recovery of the outstanding accounts receivable be obtained on a user fee system which had been established. He stated he hoped in the future Halifax County would consider in putting water meters to individual homes in order to monitor the water.

Mr. Crooks advised there was a form of agreement in which had been agreed upon in draft between the current owner of the Utility and the Municipality. He stated this had been reviewed and given a verbal approval. He stated he was uncertain if copies of that agreement had been made available. He felt it would be appropriate for Council to indicate approval and authorization for the Municipality to enter into the above mentioned purchase agreement as negotiated with the owner and approved by the Public Utilities Board.

Deputy Warden Ball assumed that the agreement to purchase assets was for \$1.00.

Mr. Crook replied that was correct.

Deputy Warden Ball questioned if easements had been put in place. He advised there was one particular well of concern to him located on private property which was owned by Mr. Wolfe Perry. He questioned if Halifax County had the proper easements to maintain that particular well which was located on private property.

Mr. Meech responded yes. He advised Mr. Kelly had presented him with an additional report that had been prepared. He advised there were a number of specifications that needed to be resolved. He advised until that resolution was put forth, Halifax County would not recommend and execute those agreements. He advised there were three areas where some final resolution and agreements were required.

Mr. Crooks advised he wished to point out that the agreement, once signed, remained subject to those matters being sorted out. He advised if they were not sorted out to the satisfaction of the Municipality, the agreement could be terminated.

MOTION CARRIED.

RESOLUTION RE LAKEVIEW WATER EXTENSION

Mr. Kelly outlined the resolution with respect to Lakeview Water Extension.

Mr. Meech advised this was the necessary resolution under the By-law or legislation that allowed Halifax County Municipality to levy the capital charge fee to respectful property owners.

It was moved by Councillor Snow, seconded by Councillor Horne

"THAT for the purposes of By-law #58 of the Municipality of the County of Halifax, A By-law respecting the Charge for Water Service, and in particular for the purposes of Sections 5, 6, and 7 of By-law No. 58, it shall be the policy of Council that owners of real property shall be assessed a charge for a portion of the capital cost to the Municipality of the construction of the water main to which any building on the property is connected, and, if no building on the property is connected to a central water main, then the owner shall be assessed a portion of the capital cost to the Municipality of constructing the water main through the street on which the property fronts or abuts."

MOTION CARRIED.

CONTROL OF CATS - COUNCILLOR DEVEAUX

Councillor Deveaux advised this had been a controversial issue over the years.

It was moved by Councillor Deveaux, seconded by Councillor Fralick

"THAT the Control of Cats - Councillor Deveaux issue be deferred to the first meeting in October pending as much information as Mr. Crooks, Municipal Solicitor, could obtain with respect to the control of cats."
MOTION CARRIED.

DISCUSSION PAPER - BUSINESS OCCUPANCY TAX

Warden Lichter advised the recommendation from Mr. Meech with respect to this matter was that this issue be referred to the Executive Committee for a report and recommendation.

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Councillor Fralick

"THAT the Discussion Paper Respecting Business Occupancy Tax be deferred to the Executive Committee."

Councillor Cooper stated this matter would effect the entire Municipality. He, therefore, felt a Committee of the Whole meeting would be more appropriate.

Warden Lichter suggested that Staff and the Finance Department conduct a study with respect to this matter preparing a report. Details of that study and report would be discussed at a Committee of the Whole meeting.

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Councillor Fralick

"THAT the motion be amended as follows:

"THAT Staff and the Finance Department prepare a report with respect to Business Occupancy Tax to be discussed at a Committee of the Whole Meeting."

MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED.

URGENT AGENDA ITEMS

1. Deputy Warden Ball - Paving

Deputy Warden Ball stated it was his understanding the Department of Transportation & Communications had presently had monies in place to pave Oceanview Drive as suggested.

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

"THAT a letter be forwarded to the Department of Transportation & Communications requesting paving of Oceanview Drive, Herring Cove, under the 15 year plan."
MOTION CARRIED.

2. Deputy Warden Ball - Crosswalks

Deputy Warden Ball stated it was his understanding of the policy with respect to Crosswalks that the Municipality made requests for painting crosswalks and were responsible for those costs. He asked if that was correct.

Warden Lichter responded that was the way it should work.

Deputy Warden Ball questioned what happened in the case where the crosswalk had been denied for painting by the Municipality, but the Department of Transportation & Communications went ahead for political reasons and painted it. He questioned if Halifax County paid the cost of painting this crosswalk in this circumstance. He stated if the Municipality did, he suggested that Halifax County not pay bills for crosswalks that the Municipality did not request to be painted. He felt if the DOT were willing to paint crosswalks in the middle of the Provincial Election, he hoped the crosswalks would be painted in every Municipal unit free of charge throughout all of Nova Scotia. He stated this should be communicated to the DOT.

Mr. Meech stated the only ones the Municipality were prepared to pay for were the ones that Halifax County and DOT had an agreement with respect to the Municipality's responsibility to maintain. He stated the balance of those crosswalks the DOT billed the Municipality for, payment would be held off until an explanation received.

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

"THAT the Department of Transportation & Communications clarify their responsibility financially-wise with respect to the painting of crosswalks."

It was moved by Councillor Harvey that this item be deferred to September 3, 1991 session. No seconder.

MOTION CARRIED.

3. Councillor Fralick - Landfill Sites

Councillor Fralick advised he had received a letter today from a

group called the Bay Area residents opposing landfill sites. He advised at a public meeting on June 20, 1991, the Members of the Metropolitan Authority and their consultants suggested at that meeting that relative information might help them to eliminate suitable sites for a landfill in the St. Margaret's Bay area. He stated tons of work had been done with respect to this which was very costly. He stated monies for the excessive amount of travelling to Musquodoboit Harbour, cost of faxing, large number of long distance telephone calls to purchase many different types of maps, aerial photographs, rental of premises, automobile mileage, printing and postage, secretarial supplies, were spent. Members of this group asked that their representative of County Council explore the possibility of financial assistance from Halifax County, the Metropolitan Authority and the Provincial Government to help defray these costs.

It was moved by Councillor Fralick, seconded by Councillor Meade

"THAT a copy of the letter submitted to Mr. Fralick by the Bay Area Residents Opposing Landfill Sites" be forwarded to the Metropolitan Authority for their comments."
MOTION DEFEATED.

Councillor Boutilier stated he voted against this matter because he felt a dangerous precedent was being set. He stated the Councillor should use the District Activity Funds to help defray the cost. He stated regarding aerial photos, etc. he asked if Council had some price tag with respect to this.

Councillor Fralick stated the Metropolitan Authority made these suggestions to the "BAROLS". He stated it was not the Councillors.

Councillor Boutilier questioned the motion.

Mr. Fralick replied the motion was that this matter be forwarded to the Metropolitan Authority.

Councillor Eisenhower stated if there was reasonable cause why a landfill site should not be located in the area, it should not be located there. He felt Halifax County should not be spending monies for other areas at this time.

Councillor Bates felt this issue was already resolved.

Warden Lichter stated Council defeated sending the letter to Metropolitan Authority.

It was moved by Councillor Fralick, seconded by Councillor Meade

"THAT a motion of reconsideration take place at the end of the meeting."

Councillor Eisenhauer questioned why a motion of reconsideration was required as the matter had been dealt with.

MOTION CARRIED.

4. Councillor Meade - Landfill Sites

Councillor Meade advised quite some time ago, Municipal Council passed a motion opposed to the Metropolitan Authority finding a suitable landfill site in Halifax County. He advised when the first 19 sites were identified, three Councillors and the MLA from the Eastern Shore publicly opposed landfill sites in that area. He advised on August 13, 1991, 11 sites were identified, one on the Eastern Shore and seven on the South Shore. He stated the Council, once again, had expressed publicly opposition to any landfill site in the area. He advised he had received numerous telephone calls indicating he was not speaking out publicly against the landfill sites in St. Margaret's Bay. He stated they were saying every individual on the Eastern Shore was, why wasn't he.

Councillor Bayers stated he was not wanting to put undue pressure on Councillor Meade.

Warden Lichter advised Councillor Meade, Fralick, and Eisenhauer met with the Bay Area Residents against Landfill a little over a week ago. He stated a very good meeting took place. He stated a good point brought up by Councillor Meade was if three or four Councillors in an area declared that there was not going to be a landfill site in his area, then nothing else is expected from Councillors but to take a similar stand so they would be on an equal footing. He stated there was nothing easier than that. He stated he could get the entire Council to declare a landfill site was not to be located anywhere in Halifax County.

Councillor Poirier stated from past experience, she wanted to put a motion through with respect to this matter and was told she could not do so.

Warden Lichter advised Councillor Meade was not making a motion.

Councillor Poirier stated she wished to make Council aware she had a petition sent to the Warden's Office to Metropolitan Authority from residents in her area also in opposition.

ADDITION OF ITEMS TO SEPTEMBER 3, 1991 COUNCIL SESSION

None.

MOTION OF CONSIDERATION

Councillor Fralick stated he wished to clarify the motion that the information would be forwarded to the Metropolitan Authority.

It was moved by Councillor Fralick, seconded by Councillor Meade

"THAT a copy of the letter submitted to Mr. Fralick by the Bay Area Residents Opposing Landfill Sites" be forwarded to the Metropolitan Authority for their comments."

MOTION OF RECONSIDERATION CARRIED.

11 IN FAVOR.

8 AGAINST.

Councillor Boutilier felt Council were saying they were prepared to cost share with respect to this matter.

Councillor Morgan stated he heard Council was being asked to support this. He stated by forwarding this to Metropolitan Authority, Halifax County Council were endorsing payment. He stated the Metropolitan Authority would then request Halifax County to cost share.

Warden Lichter stated if Councillor Fralick or Councillor Meade would put a motion on the floor that the letter be passed to Mr. Kelly, Mr. Kelly from the letter would consider what services had been rendered to Metropolitan Authority and indicate that this Council supported the idea that Metropolitan Authority examine whether or not they would be able to assist this group with the cost of those services.

Councillor Richards suggested that the Municipal Solicitor advise of this decision as it was not the same context as the original motion.

Mr. Crooks responded that was correct. He stated there would be some latitude because reconsideration is reconsideration not the just of the motion but of the matter. He stated the motion of reconsideration was to strictly reconsider a matter which had already been decided on. He stated Council could choose to look at the issue more widely if decided.

Councillor Boutilier questioned why Councillor Fralick and Councillor Meade would not forward this to Metropolitan Authority on their own.

Councillor Fralick reiterated it was the Metropolitan Authority consultants who made the comment not this Council.

Warden Lichter stated when somebody says to somebody have a good time, that did not mean have a good time and bring the bill to me. He stated this was the only context the Metropolitan Authority consultants said to these people.

Councillor Fralick questioned if Council wished to send this on to Metropolitan Authority or not.

Councillor Reid suggested that Councillor Meade and Councillor Fralick write a covering letter to Metropolitan Authority advising the residents had approached them on this, and indicate they should deal with it. He did not feel Halifax County Council should deal with this request. He did not agree with paying these bills.

Councillor Fralick stated he attended the FCM Conference in St. John's, Newfoundland. He did not feel the residents created this situation. He stated he was not prepared to pay anything with respect to this. He stated Metropolitan Authority should pay the costs.

Councillor Randall advised two to three committees were dealing with landfill sites in his community. He stated they paid their own costs. He stated if this was the way this would be handled at present, he would be looking, as well, for reimbursement.

It was moved by Councillor Randall, seconded by Councillor Fralick

"THAT a copy of the letter submitted to Mr. Fralick by the Bay Area Residents Opposing Landfill Sites" be forwarded to the Metropolitan Authority for their comments."

Councillor Richards questioned the motion made.

Warden Lichter advised the motion for reconsideration succeeded. However, the same motion was brought back on the floor which Council was still debating. Therefore, Council was voting on the same motion that was on the floor before.

Mr. Crooks stated if Council wished to put the same motion on the floor at present, and revote, that was fine.

MOTION WITHDRAWN.

Councillor Fralick advised he would speak with Mr. Meade and they would forward the letter to Metropolitan Authority as Councillors from the area. He stated this issue was certainly not over.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Harvey, that the meeting adjourn.

TIME OF ADJOURNMENT: 9:10 p.m.

SPECIAL COUNCIL SESSION

August 26, 1991

PRESENT WERE: Warden Lichter
Councillor Meade
Councillor Poirier
Councillor Fralick
Councillor Bates
Councillor Adams
Councillor Randall
Councillor Boutilier
Councillor Smiley
Councillor Reid
Councillor Horne
Councillor Merrigan
Councillor Morgan
Councillor Snow
Councillor Eisenhauer
Councillor MacDonald
Councillor Harvey
Councillor Richards
Councillor Cooper
Councillor McInroy

ALSO PRESENT: G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk
Alan Dickson, Municipal Solicitor
K. S. Wilson, Director of Finance

=====

DISCUSSION PAPER - BUSINESS OCCUPANCY TAX

Warden Lichter advised that a report was now available from staff regarding the Business Occupancy Tax and he had received a letter from the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities urging the County to take a position and forward it to them by September 15, 1991 at the latest.

The discussion was led by Mr. Wilson, Director of Finance. A copy of the document prepared by the Department of Municipal Affairs had been circulated previously and Mr. Wilson had prepared a report in summary. With regard to background information, he advised that one of the main concerns of many Municipal units was to assure all taxes are a lien on real property. Presently Business Occupancy Tax is not a lien on property as it is assessed to the occupant of the commercial space. The discussion paper proposes ways to eliminate the business occupancy assessment and tax, in its present form.

Mr. Wilson noted there were two suggested options in the discussion paper. One was to eliminate the business occupancy assessment completely; therefore, all other assessment would have to cover the

revenue. This could be done by increasing the commercial tax rate or increasing both commercial and residential tax rates.

At this time, Councillor McInroy declared a Conflict of Interest and removed himself from the Chambers.

Mr. Wilson continued that the second option was to change the name of the assessment from Business Occupancy Tax to Business Tax and have it be a lien on the real property and be collected by the property owner from those who occupied the property. The assessment of the Business Tax would be calculated on the same basis as previously, mainly 50% but there could also be a variation of that where the average of around 40% would be assessed to all properties. Mr. Wilson advised that right now the Business Occupancy Tax is not charged if the property is vacant so there would then have to be some mechanism put in so the property owner could apply for a credit for vacancies.

Also put forth in the discussion paper were some of the difficulties. If the Business Occupancy Tax were eliminated completely, then the amount would have to be recovered from property tax so that total dollars would still be collected from the property except that the property owner would do it. However, when the rent was increased for some in the 25% category, they would then be paying a little more and those in the 75% category would be paying a little less but the total dollars would be collected. The elimination of the Business Occupancy Tax would change the uniform assessment calculations used by the province for grants and funding. The net cost of this to the County would be \$683,000.

Councillor Bates asked what exactly seemed to be the problem with the system now. He said this would put quite a burden on the people who own buildings and have to be responsible for collecting all of this tax and it may impose some hardships on them.

Mr. Wilson replied that because the Business Occupancy Tax is not a lien on the property, it is necessary to go through the courts. Councillor Bates then asked how much of the Business Occupancy Tax was not being collected. Mr. Wilson replied that it was somewhere between \$70-100,000 per year. Business Occupancy Tax constitutes 3.6 million dollars a year so the amount was really insignificant. Mr. Wilson said there was a lot of effort involved for the Assessment Department because they had to find out what businesses have started, stopped, report back and so on and there was a tremendous amount of paperwork involved. The Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities itself had passed a Resolution asking the province to look into this because it was not a lien on the property.

Councillor Bates said his point was that it was such an insignificant portion uncollected that he did not see it being a really big issue. He said he felt that the way it was being

collected now was much easier on the landlord and he did not see the benefits of what was being proposed.

Councillor Morgan wondered if anybody had brought up the small business and property owner's side. The concern in this area occurs when they are both the property owner and the occupant. He asked if anybody had written or petitioned Mr. Wilson, UNSM or the province directly as there was nothing in the report to indicate that small business, which bears the largest tax burden of the province, was concerned about double taxation when they are the property owner and the occupant. Mr. Wilson replied that he had no correspondence on this matter but he knew that this had been a concern of small business but, if the Occupancy Tax is eliminated completely, then the revenue generated would have to come from someplace else.

Councillor Morgan stated that, all through his association with the number of business people in the Sackville districts, the concern is that the Business Occupancy Tax - when they are the property owner - is causing a severe hardship and this proposal from UNSM just further aggravates the situation.

Councillor Meade referred to financial institutions paying 75% and 25% for small business. He asked, if change was implemented, how much the 25% for small business would increase. Mr. Wilson replied that it would depend on the methodology which was used. It could mean they would be paying 40% instead of 25%. Those that were 75% would be paying 40%. He said this was because if there was no assessment, when the tax rate is set, then the commercial rates would be higher. He added that the federal and provincial grants in lieu were calculated on the commercial or residential base and they do not now pay on business occupancy assessment so that if the tax was eliminated completely, the commercial rate would go up and, therefore, the grants in lieu. Presently, the provincial grants in lieu have been capped and, if uncapped, more funds would be available.

Warden Lichter asked about capping federal and provincial grants in lieu. He said that if the federal and provincial governments did not want to pay any more, they would simply argue the assessment was not realistic and lower it. He said that this has been done a number of times.

Mr. Wilson advised that the provincial assessment department has either agreed or disagreed and they have arrived at a figure but the assessment which has now been approved by the federal government, both at the airport and Shearwater, have been determined and are pretty well set. With regard to uncapping, the province normally would pay the tax rates times the assessed value of the property - in 1989 they froze it so in essence they put a cap on the grants in lieu and this was nowhere near the assessed value of the property times the current tax rate.

Councillor Eisenhauer asked Mr. Wilson if machinery and equipment was business occupancy or commercial assessment. Mr. Wilson replied commercial.

Councillor Eisenhauer noted that Ontario was considering eliminating the Business Occupancy Tax and wanted to know if this tax in Nova Scotia could cause businesses to locate elsewhere. Mr. Wilson noted that Nova Scotia was the only Atlantic province to have Business Occupancy Tax. He said that if the tax was eliminated, then the dollars lost would have to be made up and the the business occupancy portion would be included in the commercial rate.

Warden Lichter noted that if the Business Occupancy Tax were to disappear and the portion of that revenue picked up by residential tax base, residential taxes are not a tax write off but successful businesses can use that tax portion as a tax write off; consequently, it is the federal and provincial governments who subsidize the tax rate. This kind of move, especially if put on the residential rate to recover the revenue, would let the federal and provincial governments off the hook and allow them to achieve another unloading and, at the same time, another tax burden would be put on residential taxpayers.

Councillor Fralick said that the Department of Municipal Affairs brought this item forward for discussion and that was exactly what should be done - it should be discussed and no changes should be made at present. He said businesses are very sensitive right now, some are barely hanging on and no increases or disturbances should be created which would be unnecessary and he strongly recommended that the paper be tabled and studied.

Warden Lichter noted that Council could not really do that as it had to react to the request of UNSM. Councillor Fralick replied that if the paper were tabled, he felt it would be quite in order.

Councillor Reid declared a conflict of interest and removed himself from the Chambers.

Councillor Richards stated this issue became more and more complex. He said, in a preliminary way, he could agree with the removal of the Business Occupancy Tax entirely from the County; however, this would have implications. The tax structure as it now stands is an unfair system in that it affects different kinds of businesses in different ways. Under one of the proposed system, the province is looking for a balance sheet in which it will pay no more or no less than previously but trying to adjust it somehow so that it will improve the system. He stated, then, that Halifax County would be saddled with \$683,000 loss by the stroke of the pen. He stated that the more business occupancy is studied, the more he tended to believe that it could be done away with entirely. He said maybe there was merit in what Councillor Eisenhauer was referring to that

it might help increase business in Halifax County if it had a so-called tax advantage. The loss of revenue could quite easily be overcome.

Councillor Boutilier asked who set the rate for the tax. Mr. Wilson advised that the business occupancy assessment is calculated at an average of 50% of the real property tax and paid by the occupant. The County itself includes that assessment with its total assessment when it calculates the tax rate and comes up with one tax rate for commercial property which is used for commercial, industrial and business occupancy. Councillor Boutilier asked if the County would be able to recoup the losses if the tax structure were changed. Mr. Wilson said yes because the business tax assessment would replace the business occupancy tax - the name would be changed - so that it would be a lien on the property and, therefore, the assessment is retained. The only difference would be that the property owner would be the one who collects the tax by increasing the rent to get it from the occupant.

Councillor Boutilier said with reference to tabling this matter, that Council has been asked to provide its input and if it wished to see it left the way it is, then the message should be very clear.

Councillor Bates said what was really being discussed was the mechanism for collecting taxes. The same amount of taxes have to be collected but the question is whether or not to juggle it around a different way and he did not see anything proposed which would be better. He saw the new method as being a burden to the landowner. He said that at a future point in the meeting he would be willing to make a motion to continue with the present method.

Councillor Morgan advised that many concerns had been raised, particularly the small businesses, and also property owners who own and operate small businesses out of their own properties. He said that particular sector seemed to be lobbying for the elimination of the occupancy tax. He said he did not think he would be serving the small business owner in his district by advocating calling the tax something else and having it collected by the property owner. If, in fact, the best that UNSM could come up with was to make sure that the overburdened property tax payer would get a lien on his property for unpaid occupancy tax, he would certainly not advocate this. He felt the tax should be left as is, at least until Councillors can go out to the residents and business community of their respective districts to find out what they want.

Councillor MacDonald asked how the occupancy tax was collected. Mr. Wilson replied that the County tries to collect it themselves; however, if the company has gone out of business and they are able to trace, then they would go through the Courts to collect the money. If they are unable to be located, they would give the account to a collection agency. Councillor MacDonald stressed that

this was a very delicate time for small businesses and he would be against making changes to upset small businesses at this point.

Councillor Merrigan asked what justification was there to have the business occupancy tax in the first place. He said he did not have enough understanding as to how the value of a business was assessed and felt that more information should be available. He said that an empty building should not be worth as much as a building with a good tenant. He asked if there was any possible way to eliminate business occupancy tax over a period of time and phase in the proper assessment of commercial property based on their value. Mr. Wilson advised that the province has a group who does assessments on commercial properties. Because they have had difficulties in the past, they are now working on various methods but the valuation of the assessment of the property was fairly good now.

Councillor Fralick stated he would be prepared to second Councillor Bates' motion when it was presented. He said he felt that this matter should not be discussed any further at this time because more time would be required to come up with an option to replace the business occupancy tax and there was not enough time to September.

Warden Lichter conveyed what he had heard from the business community - that if the business occupancy tax were eliminated and called some other name, all that would be said would be to turn the other cheek. He said another option would be to have the regular residential taxpayer pick up a portion of the burden and he pointed out that, at budget time, Council is extremely careful on how much the tax rate would be raised. He did not want to find the tax rate had to be raised when budget deliberations were held because Council had agreed to the elimination of the Business Occupancy Tax.

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

"THAT THE MUNICIPALITY REPLY TO THE UNION OF NOVA SCOTIA MUNICIPALITIES INDICATING THAT AT THE PRESENT TIME IT DOES NOT WISH TO MAKE ANY CHANGES TO THE BUSINESS OCCUPANCY TAX STRUCTURE CURRENTLY IN PLACE AND THAT, FURTHER, THE UNION OF NOVA SCOTIA MUNICIPALITIES BE URGED TO TAKE THE POSITION THAT THE MUNICIPALITY HAS TAKEN, WITH THE PROVINCE".

MOTION CARRIED.

CAMPUS CONCEPT FOR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES

Warden Lichter advised he would try to brief Council on this matter and said that he would be looking for Council's advice although it might be a moot point at this time.

He said that several months ago, conversation took place with Metropolitan Authority as to whether it would make sense to have the facilities spread over the four municipalities or perhaps a campus, known as a solid waste management park, could be developed. No actual discussions about details took place. At the last meeting of Metropolitan Authority, Mayor Savage asked Warden Lichter, now that it was known that incineration was going to be a component, if Halifax County favoured the campus concept. Warden Lichter had replied that only in his personal point of view could he speak and he had not discussed it with Council.

Warden Lichter said he was cautioned by staff at that time that the campus concept has not been studied by them or by the engineers and there may be complications. He told them to start studying the idea so that when discussing with Council, he would have the information. Recently, it was indicated that by August 20, Rene MacEachern would have a paper developed on the campus concept pros and cons and he obtained the document, which was circulated to Council. He said he did not consider the document to be a very scientific paper, just a statement indicating that it would really not work and be very expensive. Staff recommended that the campus concept not be pursued due to possibly long transportation costs, siting of the incinerator by October 19 and inability to site the landfill by that time.

Warden Lichter said he wanted to explain why he personally felt the campus concept might make some sense. The incinerator, which is worth \$125,000,000 approximately, would be owned, maintained and operated by one of two proponents, Foster Wheeler or Ogden Martin. This would, therefore, be a commercial enterprise just as much as any other commercial enterprise and this would mean hefty tax revenue for the municipality that happens to have it within its boundaries. It might be that trucks would be travelling in two or three different directions and, as well, the landfill will not accept organic material at any time once it is in operation in order to do away with odor, bird and rodent problems. He said the only way he could see it working would be for the facilities to be adjacent to each other so that trucks going to the wrong place, would not have to be redirected. He noted that the above were some of the basic arguments he had in favouring the campus concept but, on the other hand, he supposed each municipality could take its fair share of the solution which would be an argument against the campus concept. He noted that Halifax has already taken the neatest, cleanest, most prestigious portion of the waste management system - the materials recycling facility.

Warden Lichter said he was wanting to know what Council felt about this - would Council be interested in Metropolitan Authority pursuing this possibility.

Councillor Bates said he had a little difficulty understanding what Warden Lichter meant, the reason being that as a member of the

Board of Metropolitan Authority, when he went into a meeting he did not go in with a preconceived notion of what he would be supporting or not supporting because he did not know what the arguments would be. He asked did he in fact represent Council or did he go there with Council's views. He understood that when a person was a member of any Board, you go with an open mind, with the ability to represent the County and use your best judgement. He said, if that was the case, he did not understand what was the point of finding out was.

Warden Lichter stated that the same position that Councillor Bates had just explained had been explained by him a few times to Council. By By-Law, Council had handed over the waste management to Metropolitan Authority; therefore, Councillor Bates was correct in that when Councillor Bates, Councillor MacDonald and himself sat on Metropolitan Authority, they would have to represent the best interests of the four municipalities. He said when he was asked the question by Mayor Savage, he felt that his favouring it was not sufficient, that he should have some kind of expression of feeling of Council. From that, it could be decided how to conduct themselves at Metropolitan Authority. He said he had the choice as to whether or not to discuss with Council.

Councillor MacDonald wanted to know if Council favoured the landfill and incinerator on the same site. Actually there were four components - hazardous wastes and composting facility as well. He said there would be a major saving in trucking if they were located in a closer site, such as an industrial park.

Councillor Eisenhauer was concerned that the campus concept would have a serious effect on traffic for the area that was decided upon. He said he would like to know where the landfill was to be located first as the location was very important.

Councillor Boutilier asked, when the Metropolitan Authority went through its last site selection, did it include the campus concept. Warden Lichter replied no. Councillor Boutilier said he did not mean to be critical but now the campus concept is being looked at which would have to have some impact on the current sites being considered. He felt there would be some difference between selecting a site for a landfill and for a campus concept. The bottom line should be cost. He said he would have to trust the three representatives from Council to make the decision based on the economic factor.

Warden Lichter noted that subject to physically being able to do it and financially being able to afford it, he wanted to know how Council would feel about the campus concept. He noted that when talking about a hazardous waste facility, this would only be a collection building and materials would then be shipped to a proper facility, maybe out of the province.

Councillor Bates said the reason he had problems with this discussion was the fact that there was no detailed analysis of the cost. Warden Lichter said he had hoped to have it today and had expressed his disappointment about the report he received. Councillor Bates said he could understand the comments made by Councillor Boutilier. He said he could not support a campus concept because the financial aspect was not available nor did he have the benefit of the debate of the other members of the Metropolitan Authority. He asked what could be learned from today's discussion - it would be hard to try to gather anything more from Council due to lack of information.

Councillor MacInroy said he generally agreed with what was being said but did not think it was a useless exercise. He pointed out that wherever the facility is located, taxes would be generated. He said he had difficulty with taking pieces of the operation. He did not see the sense in splitting up the components unless some cost saving was realized. On-going transportation costs and security needed to be considered and a central location could help to reduce these costs.

Councillor Richards stated most of his comments would be identical to Councillor MacInroy. He said in order to make a decision, the dollar impact would be required. He said that sharing around for the sake of sharing was not something he endorsed. Parts of the system were not going to be well received by any district but, nevertheless, the problem needed to be resolved academically, financially and with good common sense.

Councillor Meade asked if there was going to be a change with regard to garbage going to transfer stations first and then to the landfill site. Warden Lichter advised that his understanding was that if the incinerator was located in Halifax or Dartmouth, then only that portion of the garbage going to the landfill site would require transfer stations. He understood the transfer stations existed for convenience at this time but did not know how many transfer stations would be required in future. Details such as this have not been worked out as yet.

Warden Lichter said that there was a contract which needed to be signed with Nova Scotia Power Corporation by October 19 and there was not much time left until then. He said that in order to have an incinerator built, a contract was required with one or the other proponents before then and, in order for the proponent to enter into an agreement with Metropolitan Authority, the proponent would have to know where it would be located. He felt that things were moving too fast for him.

Warden Lichter was asked if garbage going to the landfill would be baled. He replied that it would not but that it would be treated. No organics would be allowed at the landfill; therefore, a private citizen would not be able to go out to the new landfill.

Councillor Fralick asked if there would be any possibility that Metropolitan Authority would consider a further distance from the metros. He asked if the campus concept were to be considered, would there not be another round of siting done. Warden Lichter advised that he indicated previously to Councillors Eisenhauer, Meade and Fralick that he might try to increase the distance from a 100 series highway by another five kilometers. He said that he had looked at this possibility and did not know if he could now do that with the opposition that was being received from every corner of the County.

Councillor Harvey asked why the campus concept was not raised earlier. He felt this should have been part of strategy considerations - it seems they were thinking of things as they go along. He said the economics did not seem to be there to locate on one site. He noted that since the prevailing winds are from the west, the stacks should be located east of the population centre. This would eliminate St. Margarets Bay altogether. He asked what happens when the incinerator component fails to pass the economic and environmental review.

Councillor Harvey said that no organics would go to the new landfill; however, there would be a time gap between June, 1994 and the new incinerator and what would happen to the organics during that time. Warden Lichter said he had made it absolutely clear at Metropolitan Authority that there may be a one year period in which the landfill site might have to be used. If the contract with NS Power was signed by October 19, both of the proponents for the incinerator thought they might be able to complete the project by December, 1994. He added that the campus concept had been discussed at Metropolitan Authority, not as a formal agenda item.

Councillor Snow said he had difficulty with the fact that if they do not go with the campus concept, would there be four different sites similar to what we have now. He said he would like Council to ask for a public health review, before incineration begins. He felt incineration was backwards technology because incinerators are being closed down, not built, at this time.

Councillor Cooper said that the economics of the campus concept should be checked very closely because it would probably be the best way to go. He did not want to see different locations and felt that the residents of the County would not be educated in time for sorting at source and have the fewest number of trucks on the road.

Warden Lichter said that after September 10, which is the next meeting of Metropolitan Authority, there should be a better idea of what direction they will be proceeding.

Councillor MacDonald made reference to health review studies and said that environmental studies would certainly be done and, if the incinerator was deemed not safe, it would not be approved.

Councillor Smiley asked how strong the relationship was with regard to the number of jobs and the different components of waste management. She felt the host community which would have the landfill should certainly have the jobs associated with it.

Warden Lichter advised that with regard to the job situation, he did not know how many jobs would be involved. He referred to Item #5 in the motion that was accepted by Council and by Metropolitan Authority, negotiations were to be undertaken to compensate the host community and the host municipality, which was the last part of that motion. Negotiations for compensation have not been discussed as yet.

Councillor Cooper asked if the time frame put forth by NS Power Corporation was fixed. Warden Lichter replied that there might be a six-month extension. Councillor Cooper said, therefore, that if there was an extension, then the campus concept could be considered with the recycling facility. Warden Lichter advised that where the recycling facility is located there is no identified landfill site possible. Councillor Cooper replied that the rest of the campus concept could be put there, without the landfill.

Warden Lichter noted that Councillors Bates, MacDonald and himself had heard a great deal and assured Councillors that they would not forget what was discussed tonight. He felt that there was really no consensus reached; nevertheless, that it was a useful exercise to share information.

Councillor Boutilier brought up solid waste disposal at the landfill at present. He asked that tipping fees be put on the next Council agenda for September 3, 1991 to discuss this problem.

SIDEWALKS - GREENWICH DRIVE

Councillor McInroy advised that the subject of sidewalk construction on Greenwich Drive was discussed at the last Council session. At that time, points were raised with respect to existing access to schools and how many properties on which Department of Transportation would have to undertake work outside of its right of way. He advised that the Municipality was now in a position to go forward with Resolutions with respect to the short term expropriation for the purposes of constructing the sidewalk on Greenwich Drive.

Mr. Dixon advised that Resolutions had been prepared and the two earlier Resolutions had been changed in that the Department of Transportation now requires an extra meter. The earlier Resolutions had provided for expropriation of 2.5 meters but 3.5

meters would be required in order to correct a sloping problem. The Resolutions to be considered would expropriate an easement of 3.5 meters for a period of one year to allow the Department of Transportation to do the necessary work.

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

"THAT BE IT RESOLVED that the Municipality of the County of Halifax (the Municipality) deems it necessary to acquire, and that Council does hereby expropriate an easement as described below in that portion of the lands of David Marvin and Linda Marvin situate 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 or contractor of the Province of Nova Scotia, to enter on the Lands and to pass and repass over and on the Lands with or without equipment and vehicles for the purpose of constructing a sidewalk on adjoining lands together with the right to excavate, reslope and resurface the Lands to facilitate the said construction; 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".

MOTION CARRIED.

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

"THAT BE IT RESOLVED that the Municipality of the County of Halifax (the Municipality) deems it necessary to acquire, and that Council does hereby expropriate an easement as described below in that portion of the lands

of Gary Whelan and Caroline Whelan situate 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 or contractor of the Province of Nova Scotia, to enter on the Lands and to pass and repass over and on the Lands with or without equipment and vehicles for the purpose of constructing a sidewalk on adjoining lands together with the right to excavate, reslope and resurface the Lands to facilitate the said construction; 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".

MOTION CARRIED.

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

"THAT BE IT RESOLVED that the Municipality of the County of Halifax (the Municipality) deems it necessary to acquire, and that Council does hereby expropriate an easement as described below in that portion of the lands of Faye M. Wagner situate 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 or contractor of the Province of Nova Scotia, to enter on the Lands and to pass and repass over and on the Lands with or without equipment and vehicles for the purpose of constructing a

sidewalk on adjoining lands together with the right to excavate, reslope and resurface the Lands to facilitate the said construction; 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".

MOTION CARRIED.

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

"THAT BE IT RESOLVED that the Municipality of the County of Halifax (the Municipality) deems it necessary to acquire, and that Council does hereby expropriate an easement as described below in that portion of the lands of Wayne A. White and Arlene E. White situate 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 or contractor of the Province of Nova Scotia, to enter on the Lands and to pass and repass over and on the Lands with or without equipment and vehicles for the purpose of constructing a sidewalk on adjoining lands together with the right to excavate, reslope and resurface the Lands to facilitate the said construction; 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".

MOTION CARRIED.

UPDATE RE STATUS OF COUNTY CHARTER

Warden Lichter briefed Council members on the status of the County Charter. He noted that the Charter had been approved in principle by Council and it was requested that it be introduced in the Legislature as a Private Members Bill and the Hon. Ken Streach has agreed to do that. A meeting was held with Hon. Ken Streach on April 30, 1991 at which time he indicated that it was too late for the spring session but he will try to introduce it for the fall session.

Warden Lichter said that in order to pave the way so that the Charter could be approved in the fall session, on August 15, 1991 the Chairmen of Cole Harbour/Westphal Community Committee and Sackville Community Committee, himself and Mr. Meech met with Vince MacLean to discuss the Charter and ask for his support and assistance in having it passed through the House in a speedy manner. The same thing in the same way was done with Alexa McDonough of the NDP on August 19, 1991. He said that quite a number of questions have been asked and a Charter Committee meeting will be held to discuss some of the concerns, although the concerns were quite minor.

Warden Lichter wrote to Hon. Brian Young in order to inquire as to what the status of the Charter was. He knew that staff members were examining it at the provincial level and, if there are concerns, they should be sharing those concerns as soon as possible so that they can be reacted to rather than having it stalled in the House. He said, therefore, it looked like there was a fairly good chance of having it passed in November/December.

LETTER TO HON. GEORGE MOODY, MINISTER OF HEALTH

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

"THAT COUNCIL GO IN CAMERA".

MOTION CARRIED.

It was agreed to come out of camera.

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

"THAT COUNCIL AUTHORIZE THE WARDEN TO FORWARD A LETTER

SPECIAL COUNCIL SESSION

16

August 26, 1991

TO THE HONOURABLE GEORGE MOODY, MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FITNESS ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL OF HALIFAX COUNTY MUNICIPALITY AND BEDFORD TOWN COUNCIL RESPECTING EXPANSION OF THE MILL COVE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT".

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

MINUTES & REPORTS
OF THE
THIRD YEAR MEETINGS
OF THE
FORTY-THIRD COUNCIL
OF THE
MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX
SEPTEMBER COUNCIL SESSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3 & 17, 1991

&

PUBLIC HEARING
SEPTEMBER 9, 1991

&

SPECIAL COUNCIL SESSION
SEPTEMBER 12, 1991

SEPTEMBER COUNCIL SESSION - 1991

INDEX

Atlantic Winter Fair - - - - -	23
Children's Training Centres - - - - -	33
Closed Business Occupancy Accounts - - - - -	35
Crosswalks - - - - -	38
Dog Control Program - - - - -	9-11 & 26-30
District 8 Volunteer Fire Dept. - Loan - - - - -	36
Development Officer Report - - - - -	38
Education Select Committee - - - - -	18 - 19
East Preston Business Centre - - - - -	24 - 26
External Auditors - - - - -	37
Five Island Lake - Ground Water Contamination - - - - -	3 - 5
Grants - - - - -	8-9 & 35-36
Halifax/Dartmouth port Development Commission - - - - -	16 - 17
Home Care Advisory Committee - - - - -	32
Letters & Correspondence - - - - -	1 - 3
Lake Major Watershed Area - - - - -	33
Motion - Recording Secretary - - - - -	1 & 24
Motion - Letters & Correspondence - - - - -	1 - 3
Motion - Cultural Awareness Week - - - - -	3
Motion - Ground Water Contamination, Five Island Lake - - - - -	3 - 5
Motion - Lands of Guy Boutilier, Spry Bay - - - - -	5 - 6 & 34
Motion - Tax arrears write off - - - - -	6 - 7
Motion - Temporary Borrowing Resolutions - - - - -	7 - 8 & 36
Motion - Grants - - - - -	8-9 & 35-36
Motion - Dog Control Program - - - - -	9-11 & 26-30
Motion - Private Road Signs - - - - -	11-12
Motion - Minor Variance Appeals - - - - -	12-16 & 30-31 & 37-38

INDEX

Motion - Transit Route Performance Report - - - - -	16
Motion - Halifax/Dartmouth Port Development Commission - - - -	16 - 17
Motion - Meagher's Grant Elementary School - - - - -	17
Motion - Tipping Fees - - - - -	17 - 18
Motion - Education Select Committee - - - - -	18 - 19
Motion - Sackville Expressway - - - - -	19 - 20
Motion - Turner's Island Wharf - - - - -	20
Motion - Sheet Harbour Hydroelectric Project - - - - -	20 - 22
Motion - Sackville Landfill Site - - - - -	22
Motion - Atlantic Winter Fair - - - - -	23
Motion - Adjournment - - - - -	23 & 29
Motion - East Preston Business Centre - - - - -	24 - 26
Motion - Mill Cove Treatment Plant Meeting - - - - -	31
Motion - Speed Zone, Porter's Lake - - - - -	31 - 32
Motion - Speed Zone, Seaforth - - - - -	32
Motion - Intersection #3 & 333 - - - - -	32
Motion - Home Care Advisory Committee - - - - -	32
Motion - Children's Training Centres - - - - -	33
Motion - Lake Major Watershed Area - - - - -	33
Motion - Date for Public Hearings - - - - -	33 - 34
Motion - Planning District #5 - - - - -	34
Motion - Closed Business Occupancy Accounts - - - - -	35
Motion - Tax Exemption By-Law - - - - -	35
Motion - Loan, District #8 Fire Department - - - - -	36
Motion - U.N.S.M. Dues - - - - -	37
Motion - Resignation, John B. Morrison - - - - -	37
Motion - External Auditors - - - - -	37
Motion - Development Officer Report - - - - -	38
Motion - Road Name Changes, District #8 - - - - -	38
Motion - Crosswalks - - - - -	38
Motion - Tax Billings - - - - -	38 - 39
Private Road Signs - - - - -	11 - 12
Public Hearings - Dates - - - - -	33 - 34
Sackville Expressway - - - - -	19 - 20
Sheet Harbour Hydroelectric Project - - - - -	20 - 22
Sackville Landfill Site - - - - -	22

INDEX

Tax arrears - write off - - - - -	6 - 7
Temporary Borrowing Resolutions - - - - -	7 - 8 & 36
Transit Route Performance Report - - - - -	16
Tipping Fees - - - - -	17 - 18
Turner's Island Wharf - - - - -	20
Tax Exemption By-Law - - - - -	35
Tax Billing - - - - -	38 - 39
U.N.S.M. - Dues - - - - -	37