

ISSUING RESOLUTION - HAMMONDS PLAINS FIRE STATION

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

"THAT THE ISSUING RESOLUTION - 91-02 - HAMMONDS PLAINS  
FIRE STATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$308,000.00 BE APPROVED"

MOTION CARRIED

EASTERN PASSAGE/COW BAY SUMMER CARNIVAL

Councillor Deveaux stated that this is a request to have Council approval for carnival and beer garden in Eastern Passage subject to approval from the Department of Health and Liquor Control Board.

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

"THAT COUNCIL SUPPORT THE ISSUANCE OF LICENCE FOR THE  
SALE OF LIQUOR"

MOTION CARRIED

MEMORANDUM RE: 1991 CENSUS

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

"THAT THE REPORT RESPECTING THE 1991 CENSUS BE RECEIVED"

MOTION CARRIED

MEMORANDUM RE: AUDIT AND POLICE COMMITTEE

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

"THAT THE SOLICITOR PREPARE THE NECESSARY AMENDMENTS TO  
THE BY-LAW TO INCLUDE THE AUDIT COMMITTEE AND THE POLICE  
COMMITTEE"

MOTION CARRIED

MEMORANDUM RE: MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT, SANITARY SEWER  
INSTALLATION, CFB SHEARWATER

Mr. Kelly outlined the memorandum of agreement which requires annual payment of \$295.00.

It was moved by Councillor Giffin, seconded by Councillor Taylor:

"THAT THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT, SANITARY SEWER  
INSTALLATION, CFB SHEARWATER BE APPROVED"

MOTION CARRIED

MEMORANDUM, CHAIRMAN COLE HARBOUR/WESTPHAL COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

Mr. Kelly outlined the memorandum which expressed concern for the safety of both pedestrian and motorists on John Stewart Drive and requested Council's support and assistance in addressing the problem.

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

"THAT COUNCIL SUPPORT AND ASSIST IN ADDRESSING THE PROBLEM BY WRITING THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS INDICATING THE CONCERNS WITH A COPY TO DAVID NANTES, MLA"

Councillor Cooper stated that John Stewart Drive had to accept sidewalks on the side of the street away from the residences necessitating the children in the area to cross frequently. He stated that there are three schools in the area and this street provides a convenient bypass to some of the traffic lights in the area. He stated that this is just the beginning of what is going to be serious concerns on John Stewart Drive. The residents have identified the streets listed in the memorandum as requiring action that would alleviate these concerns. He stated that they are asking the Department of Transportation by way of motion that they take action to alleviate these concerns on John Stewart Drive the same way as they are looking at the concerns of the Caldwell Road area. He stated that these concerns have been brought to the attention of the Department of Transportation and communications earlier and on a continuing basis. It is time now to address these concerns and have them taken care of for the safety of the residents.

MOTION CARRIED

MEMORANDUM RE: CONSENT FORM, FCM NATIONAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Warden Lichter stated that up until June, 1992 he is still acting as a member of the Board of Directors of FCM. What FCM wants to know is whether he is prepared to stand for office, whether council wants him to stand for office and whether council is prepared to finance his stand for office if he is successful. He stated that before he is prepared to send in that consent form he wanted to bring it to Council's attention.

Councillor Bayers asked the warden if he was prepared to stand for office.

Warden Lichter stated that he was prepared to stand for office.

It was moved by Councillor Peters, seconded by Councillor Bayers:

"THAT THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL CONSENT TO WARDEN LICHTER OFFERING AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FCM AND FURTHER ALL ASSOCIATED EXPENSES BE APPROVED BY COUNCIL"

MOTION CARRIED

Deputy Warden Sutherland asked how many representatives there were from the region.

Warden Lichter stated that there are two from the Metro area. The two were Mayor Ducharme and himself and Mayor Savage was on by virtue of having being president of UNSM.

REPORT RE: REACTION TO THE TASK FORCE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Warden Lichter stated that he wanted to thank the four members of the Committee for their hard work. They had met three times and it wasn't an easy topic to deal with or decision to make.

Councillor Peters asked when the Charter will be adopted. She stated that she would like a request to go to the provincial government requesting that the Charter be introduced in the House.

Warden Lichter stated that in a recent conversation with the Minister of Municipal Affairs he mentioned to the Minister that the County had come to him before they began work on the Charter, he had given his blessing if they were willing to do the work and willing to pay for it. He informed the Minister that the task was completed and the Municipality was disappointed that the letter that had come back from him indicated that he was not prepared to take any action on the Charter based on the fact that the Task Force Report is just about to be released. The Minister at that point indicated that simply because the task force report exists does not mean that life can stop. Consequently the Minister gave an indication to his staff, right there, to begin immediately to prepare it for introduction in the House if indeed if that was the decision of Halifax County Council on May 19, 1992. He stated it will have to be the entire document.

Councillor Deveaux asked if there was any concern expressed about size.

Warden Lichter stated that page 2 is indicating that the Committee has made great stride in Halifax County Municipality to accentuate the positive and what the County would like to do by having the Charter introduced and passed in the House allow the County to make those strides and not force us into the amalgamation that would drastically reduce these positive changes that have been made. He stated the Committee didn't close the door completely on amalgamation if it can be proven that financially it would be a great advantage to the taxpayers. Until that is proven this is the course of action the County wants them to take.

He stated that the items: (1) Education to be totally funded by the Provincial government and (2) Local roads costs to include the Capital costs. He stated that it will take them a long time to get to that point and this recommendation is saying don't make those changes until you are ready to make those changes.

He stated that the reason there is no reference made to Social Services is because the Committee said that it accepts that changes are required in this area. The Task Force Report did say that Social Service costs be fully taken over by the province.

Councillor Deveaux asked if the Municipality accepts the fact that the Municipalities will be taken over responsibility of the highways has it been determined whether local government will get the best bargain.

Warden Lichter stated that what was provided in the report was that Municipal Affairs provided Mr. Wilson with figures for Halifax County Municipality at 1990 costs and Mr. Wilson has examined those figures and have found that these figures did not include the capital costs for roads that have never been paved and if the demand is there to pave those roads then if the County has to pave them then it would be capital costs. This is why the report has indicated we want those included and want some kind of revenue sharing from gasoline tax. The scenario is different for almost every rural Municipality. They are not going to come out too well. Halifax County estimated between 8 to 9 percent tax increase if those 1990 costs were allocated the way the task force report indicated they would allocate it. Some of the other rural Municipalities whose wardens sat in on the meeting indicated 20 up to 68 percent tax increases mainly because of road costs.

He stated that the province is talking about a province wide revenue neutral swap between the province and the 66 Municipalities or whatever number of Municipalities there are going to be. If it is revenue neutral for the entire province and it is an advantage for the cities someone else will have to pick up the windfall in the form of a loss and that is going to be the rural Municipalities. The province has indicated that they are going to reallocate some resources in order to cushion the blow for those Municipalities that are going to be on the losing end. Although should Halifax City, Dartmouth, Bedford and Halifax County amalgamate the 1990 figures look like tax rate without area rates.

Councillor Merrigan stated that he would like to have had an opportunity to study the report further. He stated he felt the Charter should be dealt with but the other part of the report could be tabled and dealt with later.

Warden Lichter stated that Council had asked the Committee to do the work and bring it in at this Council session because on the 27th UNSM have their regional meeting at which time this is going

to be the topic when the five voting delegates have to have some direction as to what it is they ought to support. If you don't give the five delegates direction then they will make their own decision.

Councillor Taylor asked about local roads.

Warden Lichter stated that up to 400 series the province would look after but they would bill back 50% of the maintenance costs on arterial roads and collector roads.

Mr. Wilson stated that his understanding is that the Province will maintain the 100 to 400 series highways. If those smaller roads go through a community they would be maintained by the community it falls through and there is an agreement that they would then reimburse 50% of the costs of the maintenance. He stated that the Committee's difficulty was what happens on the capital costs of those particular roads if they are putting in a new road or have to pave local roads which was not in the figures provided. This is why the report stated that more information is needed and the province to provide more money to take care of those roads.

Councillor Richards stated that the report addresses some of the task force recommendations. His concern was with other items within the task force that are not addressed in the report. He recognizes that time is critical and yet if something is not done then on May 27th there won't be a recommendation at the regional meeting. The whole question of regionalization bothers him to some degree because at different times this has been talked about in a general sense. With the exception of the police force comment in the last paragraph in the report it is the only area where regionalization is discussed to any degree. He is wondering if this doesn't leave the Municipality short when it comes to those services that should be looked at more seriously in terms of regionalization.

He stated what is written in the report is fine but perhaps what is not written concerns him.

Warden Lichter stated that all the different kinds of regionalization was not talked about and the reason was time limitation and the task force report really does not speak about regionalization. The report speaks strictly about a one tier government created for this particular area. He stated that the police issue came up because he had written a draft paper for discussion purposes and he knew that the police committee needed direction. He felt that if Halifax County receives a clear signal from the government by having them pass the Charter then Halifax County has a number of years in which it will exist then going into and looking for areas in which we can have regional cooperation or regional servicing created makes sense. On the other hand if they just decide to force amalgamation, whether it is wanted or not, then Halifax County needs to know this before starting to make work

for staff who would be looking at regionalization. He felt the best way to test the waters was to see if what was promised will be done with the Charter. He stated that this would be known quite fast.

Councillor Richards asked, in regards to the Warden's conversation with the Minister with regard to the Charter being brought to the House, would it be this session of the House.

Warden Lichter stated that he could not verify if it would be this session or not. It sounded quite immediate because he instructed his staff to start immediately on whatever work is left in order for the Charter to be introduced. It would be introduced by the Honourable Ken Streach as a Private Members Bill.

Councillor Richards stated that he would be prepared to endorse items 1 & 2 particularly with regard to the costing of education i.e. the province carrying the full cost of education.

Councillor Bates stated that it may be very difficult because the way the amalgamation is planned will do away with grass root representation. It would be best if there was some form of government where there could be regional cooperation between the Municipal units that are already in place. He is concerned that anything done at this meeting would be final. He stated that he feels that some recommendations can be made but his main concern is that cooperation on a regional basis is not done very well now and he is not sure that the idea of a large amalgamation is going to be better than what is already in place.

Councillor Bayers asked how far the amalgamation was going to go.

Warden Lichter stated that if his enquiries were answered honestly then what would happen if the government said yes we are giving it our blessing then somebody in the provincial government would appoint an implementation commissioner for this area. In six months time that is all the mandate that person would have which would be to set up a working government with the new powers for the entire area. The task force report speaks about balancing efficiency and accountability with that of representation.

Councillor Bayers asked if there may be some boundary changes in the event of the amalgamation.

Warden Lichter stated that the report does indicate that it does not necessarily have to be the entire Halifax County however, you have to take a look at the reality of the other side. His neighbouring municipality is East Hants and Colchester. Those two Municipalities are not rich so what they would like to get, if anything, is good assessment base if they take anything. You can't have a poor rural municipality acquire the poor parts of Halifax County and have the new unit created survive.

Councillor Cooper stated that the report talks of many things. It only addresses to any degree to the changing of the fiscal responsibility and services. The other areas such as restructuring are items that are going to be looked at under commissioners. He is getting the impression that the provincial government is saying "fine, we are going to become another property owner in the large metropolitan areas that we create". They don't address all the problems such as education. They don't say how cost sharing problems are going to be resolved. A lot of the infrastructure is going to require a lot of money in the next little while to be brought up to date. He stated that he feels that Halifax County's task is to say fine, if you don't want to be involved with us, at least give us a structure that in an operational and up to date condition. The Charter ensures the community input. Hopefully what will be the end result is that communities can have input into their areas of concern. He stated the only stand is to say to the province that they address the major issues and then we will talk all down the line until everything is settled up.

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

"THAT COUNCIL ENDORSE THE COMMITTEES REPORT OUTLINED IN THE MEMORANDUM DATED MAY, 1992"

Warden Lichter asked if the mover and the seconder intend that the document "Reaction to the Task Force on Local Government" would go to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to the Premier and all Halifax County MLA's and be supported by the five members of UNSM at the regional meeting.

Councillor Richards stated that this was his intent.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

REPORT RE: HALIFAX INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

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

"THAT THE REPORT BE TABLED FOR DISCUSSION"

MOTION CARRIED

BY-LAW #2, SECTION 2 (1A) - CANCELLATION OF COUNCIL SESSIONS - COUNCILLOR RICHARDS

Councillor Richards stated that it has been quite some time that a session of Council has lasted as long as the present one. He stated that reason this session is as long as it is is due to the fact that it is the only session held this month. The reason for this was that the May 5th session was cancelled.

He stated that he had reviewed the By-law that was passed which

permitted cancellation of a council session. There were situations discussed that might require a session to be cancelled and an amendment to the By-law was passed giving the council the authority to cancel a council session. There were many members who debated what the circumstances or reasons would be for a session to be cancelled. The amendment read "THE WARDEN UPON WRITTEN REQUEST FROM THREE COUNCILLORS MAY CANCEL A REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL FOR LACK OF BUSINESS OR OTHER VALID REASONS".

Councillor Richards quoted from the minutes of the meeting when this amendment was passed. The minutes of that meeting indicated that the instances of these cancellations would be on very rare occasions and for a valid reason. The cancellation came about as the result of an invitation to an occasion and in his opinion it was totally inappropriate to cancel for that reason. He stated that there is no amendment necessary to the present By-law other than a clear understanding of what the By-law reads "a valid reason or lack of business". He stated that if council was to be cancelled in future he would hope that the reasons be acceptable by the majority of council members.

Councillor Cooper stated that the decision to cancel a session of council should be a decision of last resort.

Councillor Peters stated that she was one of the councillors who signed the request for the council session to be cancelled and in her opinion the reason was valid.

Warden Lichter stated that ever since the By-law was enacted there has not been a council session cancelled other than this one. To him that means rare. A valid reason means different things to different people. He stated that he had received an invitation to go to the reception and to go to Neptune without knowing that any other member of council had received an invitation. He stated that he has declined invitations to social functions on occasion because he felt his place was at council and in those instances either he had asked the Deputy Warden to go instead or neither had gone. After having made the decision to ask the Deputy Warden to chair the May 5th meeting, councillors had come to him and pointed out that they had received an invitation as well and his principles had dictated to him that the only way to deal with this was to say to the councillor who approached him the first time that if he received a written request he would honour it.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION - DEPUTY WARDEN SUTHERLAND

Deputy Warden Sutherland stated that this item had to deal with Gloria Avenue in Sackville where council had authorized a motion to proceed to take legal action against the person who had encroached on county property.

He stated that he would like to have this issue deferred until the



next council session.

WATER EXTENSION, ROODE COURT and PAVING BISSETT LAKE ROAD -  
COUNCILLOR COOPER

Councillor Cooper stated that motions had gone through council regarding the paving of Bissett Road and the water extension in the Cole Harbour area.

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

"THAT THE PETITIONS THAT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED BE FORWARDED TO THE MLA AND APPROPRIATE DEPARTMENTS AS BACKUP TO THE PREVIOUS MOTIONS OF COUNCIL"

MOTION CARRIED

CN RAIL, WELLINGTON AREA - COUNCILLOR PETERS

Councillor Peters stated that CN has cut down brush along the rail line going through district 14 and into district 17 and they have left all the brush and scrub there for about two years now and in her opinion it is unsightly and a fire hazard. She would like it removed and tidied up.

It was moved by Councillor Peters, seconded by Councillor Ball:

"THAT A LETTER BE WRITTEN TO PRESIDENT OF CN ASKING THAT THIS BE CLEANED UP"

MOTION CARRIED

RATIFICATION OF APPROVED DISTRICT CAPITAL GRANTS

It was moved by Councillor Ball, seconded by Councillor Smiley:

"THAT THE APPROVED DISTRICT CAPITAL GRANTS, MARCH, 1992 BE RATIFIED"

MOTION CARRIED

TABLING OF REPORTS

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

"THAT THE REPORTS BE TABLED FOR DISCUSSION AT JUNE 2, 1992 COUNCIL SESSION"

MOTION CARRIED

MONTHLY REPORTS - DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

It was moved by Deputy Warden Sutherland, seconded by Councillor Richards:

"THAT THE REPORTS BE RECEIVED"

MOTION CARRIED

URGENT AGENDA ITEMS

Westray - Councillor Deveaux

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

"THAT HALIFAX COUNTY CONTRIBUTE \$5,000.00 TO THE WESTRAY MINE DISASTER FUND"

Warden Lichter asked where the money was coming from. He stated that no one would want to deny the help to those families but there is a set budget and if a source is named he would carry out council's request.

Councillor Deveaux stated that he appreciated the fact that the availability of money is at a minimum.

Warden Lichter stated that the money could be found if council agreed that the money comes from the total allocated grant fund.

Councillor Deveaux withdrew his motion with the intent that the issue be brought forward that the special council session dealing with grants to organizations.

The seconder agreed.

Ocean View Manor - Councillor Randall

Councillor Randall stated that this year Ocean View Manor is celebrating its 25th anniversary. He is asking in honour of the occasion and in acknowledgement of the dedication of the staff he would like to ask council to consider a donation of \$350.00 to purchase a silver tea service.

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

"THAT HALIFAX COUNTY DONATE \$350.00 TO OCEAN VIEW MANOR FOR THE PURCHASE OF A SILVER TEA SERVICE"

Councillor Deveaux reminded council that Ocean View Manor serves all of Halifax County and also at budget time the County used \$200,000.00 of Ocean View Manor surplus funds..

MOTION CARRIED

ADDITION OF ITEMS TO JUNE 2, 1992 COUNCIL SESSION

Councillor Ball - Department of Transportation, Portuguese Cove  
Councillor Ball - Department of Transportation, Herring Cove Road  
Councillor Ball - Dumping in district 5

Councillor Holland - Atlantic Winter Fair

IN-CAMERA ITEM

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

"THAT COUNCIL MOVE IN CAMERA"

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT THE CAO BE INSTRUCTED TO ENSURE THAT INFORMATION BE OBTAINED AND A STAFF REPORT, DEALING WITH POSSIBLE SALE OF OCEAN VIEW MANOR, BE FINALIZED AND PRESENTED TO COUNCIL WITHIN THE NEXT 30 DAYS"

MOTION CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

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

"THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED"

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARING

MAY 25, 1992

PRESENT WERE:

Warden Lichter  
Councillor Meade  
Councillor Rankin  
Councillor Fralick  
Councillor Bates  
Councillor Adams  
Councillor Randall  
Councillor Bayers  
Councillor Smiley  
Councillor Taylor  
Councillor Merrigan  
Councillor Brill  
Councillor Snow  
Councillor Giffin  
Councillor Boutilier  
Councillor Harvey  
Deputy Warden Sutherland  
Councillor Richards  
Councillor McInroy  
Councillor Cooper

ALSO PRESENT:

G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk  
Alan Dickson, Municipal Solicitor

=====  
CALL TO ORDER

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

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

"THAT SANDRA SHUTE BE APPOINTED AS RECORDING SECRETARY".

MOTION CARRIED.

PA-8&9-52-91 & ZAP-8&9-52-91 - Application by Patricia Keeping to amend the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for Planning Districts 8 and 9 in order to permit the development of an 18,110 square foot shopping centre on lands located within the Lake Echo Community Designation.

The Staff Report was presented by Kurt Pyle who advised that an application had been received by Patricia Keeping to amend the Municipal Planning Strategy for Planning Districts 8 & 9 in order to permit the construction of a commercial shopping plaza on her property located in Lake Echo across from the Lake Echo Community Centre. The reason for the amendment was to permit Ms. Keeping to

complete the construction of a shopping plaza which she began prior to the adoption of the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for Planning Districts 8 & 9 in 1988. In support of this application, the applicant indicated that a municipal building permit to construct the proposed development was received in 1987 and was renewed until 1991. It was not renewed further due to the lack of construction progress on the property, which Ms. Keeping contends was due to poor economic conditions, not her lack of desire to complete the development.

Mr. Pyle showed slides to illustrate.

Mr. Pyle stated that the property was located within the Lake Echo designation which was primarily a residential designation allowing for commercial development but the Plan restricts the location of the commercial development. The property was zoned C-1 (Community Commercial) which permits small scale commercial uses on collector roads up to a maximum of 2,000 sq. ft. The proposed development was not permitted in the C-1 zone due to the size requirement and, as well, shopping plazas were not permitted; however, the C-2 zone permits commercial uses over 2,000 sq. ft. but the C-2 zone, in terms of its location, was restricted to 1,500' from the intersection of Highway 107 and the Mineville Road. Ms. Keeping's property was nearly two miles away from that intersection.

He said that the Lake Echo Community Designation, while generally not supportive of new commercial development, quite clearly recognizes that commercial development is an essential part of community development; however, the Plan recognizes there is a need to restrict the location of commercial development in order to minimize land use conflicts and traffic concerns in a predominantly residential area. Based on size and location, the shopping plaza proposed by Ms. Keeping was clearly inconsistent with the intent of the Municipal Planning Strategy. At the time of her application for the building permit for the shopping plaza, Ms. Keeping was aware of the planning process which was underway for Planning Districts 8 & 9 and was aware that the renewal of her municipal building permit would depend on the progress of construction activity on the site. Mr. Pyle stated that staff was not prepared to recommend that circumstances surrounding Ms. Keeping's application were extenuating or unique enough to warrant an amendment to the Municipal Planning Strategy as Ms. Keeping was aware that her development proposal would not conform to the Municipal Planning Strategy prepared through extensive discussion within the community. There was no justification, from staff's point of view, to amend the Plan in a manner so contrary as proposed in the application.

He said that staff provided four possible options if Council wished to consider such a development, which were as follows.

Option 1 was to rezone the property to C-2. Option 2 was to exempt Ms. Keeping's property from the maximum commercial floor area of the C-1 zone. Option 3 was to consider the development by Development Agreement. Option 4 was to establish a Commercial Centre Designation. Of the four options outlined in the Staff Report, staff gave support to Option 3 if Council was to consider such a development as it would enable Council to exercise a greater degree of control over the scale, design and location of large scale commercial developments.

Mr. Pyle stated that at the February 17, 1992 meeting of Planning Advisory Committee, staff was directed to prepare amendments to the Municipal Planning Strategy and Land Use By-law for Planning Districts 8 & 9 which would permit Ms. Keeping to construct a shopping plaza which would exceed the maximum floor area requirements of the C-1 zone, which was Option 2 of the original Staff Report. In the Addendum Staff Report dated March 2, 1992, the amendments required to implement Option 2 were outlined as directed by Planning Advisory Committee. Staff still recommended that the proposed amendments not be approved by Council as they strongly contradict the intent of the Planning Strategy for Planning Districts 8 & 9. A Public Participation meeting was held on the application in Lake Echo on April 9, 1992.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Bates asked if there were any changes now with regard to what Ms. Keeping had planned in 1987 versus what was now planned after the Plan was in place. Mr. Pyle advised that she added a second story to the development for which she had received a permit. Councillor Bates asked if she had proceeded with the development before the Plan came into effect, would everything have been all right. Mr. Pyle agreed yes.

Councillor Giffin asked if a lack of construction progress was the reason Ms. Keeping was not allowed to renew her building permit and was the decision made by the County Planning Department. Mr. Pyle replied yes.

Councillor Giffin asked if the tough economic times and lack of money were considered as extenuating circumstances. Mr. Pyle stated he was not privy to the conditions under which they made their decision.

Councillor Giffin said that the Plan stated that all C-2 development was required to be on Highway 107 and asked was not Highway 107 a limited access highway and would there not be difficulty putting a development such as this on that highway. Mr. Pyle advised that the development would be off Highway 107; there would not actually be access onto Highway 107.

Warden Lichter stated that Mr. Pyle had indicated that staff was not in favour of the amendment because it was contrary to the Municipal Planning Strategy. He said it was somewhat redundant to say that the only reason Council was looking at the possibility of an amendment was because the Municipal Planning Strategy did not promote that type of development. Mr. Pyle said the reason staff was saying it was not consistent with the intent of the plan was that the intent of the plan for Lake Echo designation was very clear in terms of where small scale and large scale development would be located. Warden Lichter said he realized this and that was why a Plan amendment was required which would require the majority of the entire Council vote.

Councillor Cooper asked how much residential development was within 1000' of the proposed development. Mr. Pyle referred to page 8 of the original Staff Report, Map 3, and explained that Faber Court and Martin Lake Drive were both residential. Up to this point as well, most of the structures along Highway 7 were residential.

Councillor Cooper asked what would be permitted on the R-6 property to the northwest. Mr. Pyle advised single family dwellings.

Councillor Cooper asked if there was any proposed access onto Faber Court from the development area. Mr. Pyle replied there was nothing to indicate that in any of the drawings submitted. All of the residential development was on the same side of the road as the proposed development.

Warden Lichter pointed out that in an R-6 designation in Planning Districts 8 & 9 a lot more than just residential dwellings was permitted and he asked that Mr. Pyle list the permitted uses for Councillor Cooper. Mr. Pyle listed same.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR

Mr. Bob Beer stated he represented Ms. Keeping who was the owner and developer. He stated that the original development permit was issued in 1987 for construction of a commercial building which was to consist of a full ground floor and half the building would have a second floor. This was later amended and approved as Phase 2. In the interim, a permit was issued and reissued three different times and then the new Municipal Planning Strategy was approved which allowed for no more than 2,000 sq. ft. Several extensions were granted to the present owner; however, the Department of Planning and Development was not prepared to renew the permit for Phase 1, which was due to expire in August, 1991 and similarly they advised that the Phase 2 permit would not be renewed on November 6, 1991. It was, therefore, decided to seek an amendment at that time. Several letters were written pointing out good faith and close to \$100,000 was spent.

He said one of the remarks brought up was that the development would not be in the setting of Lake Echo. At the time, in order to meet the permit's requirements, Ms. Keeping had to put in footings and when this was done, the contractor wanted to cut down trees to make the job quicker and cheaper but Ms. Keeping would not permit same because she was very aware of the setting the building was going to be in and she was preserving the trees, which was one of the complaints at the Public Participation meeting on April 9.

Mr. Beer advised that the building would be a two-storey frame building with a main floor footprint of roughly 8510 sq. ft. and a second floor with overhangs of 9,600 sq. ft. for a total floor area of 18,110 sq. ft. The parking ratio was three times the footprint of the building, roughly 25,500 sq. ft. and would provide 57 parking spaces. There would be a drilled well and an on-site contour disposal system which was developed by Department of Health engineers in conjunction with the project Engineer and the capacity was much greater than anything that would ever be used in the building. Many designs were considered and many changes were made in the process to meet the aesthetics. Three properties were acquired in order to obtain the proper space - approximately two acres. Professional and service people were contacted, such as druggists, doctors, lawyers who all showed an interest in locating in the community. He said the reason the construction did not go ahead was because of the recession, the high interest rates, the Gulf War, the GST - all of which combined to keep the project from being developed. Last year, he said a person came along who was willing to develop it, provided the necessary permits were in place. Permits were applied for and he said Ms. Keeping was now here tonight as part of the on-going process that started in 1987. Through no fault of the owner, the project just could not get off the ground.

Mr. Beer stated the design of the project was set so that it would meet the requirements of Lake Echo as most small villages today do have malls in them. He quoted from the Planning Department: "Within the designation, priority is given to low density residential development and supportive uses in recognition of the transition of the area from a rural to a suburban community". He said this was one of the reasons for changing the plan, no doubt done with good intentions but, unfortunately, caught Ms. Keeping in the middle.

Mr. Beer stated that a questionnaire had been sent out, as did the people who opposed it, and over 300 signatures were received in support. As well, Mr. Beer stated approximately 40 letters were received in support and he quoted from same. Mr. Beer left the letters with the Municipal Clerk.

Mr. Beer pointed out that the mall construction would provide employment for construction and tradespeople, would provide employment for store owners and offices and their staff, would



provide employment for staff to maintain the mall, would provide the County with much-needed commercial taxes and relieve the burden on residential taxes in Lake Echo, would help restore the necessary confidence in the area and act as a catalyst for more residential development and could also expedite the installation of municipal services - water and sewer. He stated he hoped that Council would approve the amendment.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Bates asked if Ms. Keeping was developing the site herself - had major tenants agreed to move in and signed agreements already.

Mr. Beer responded that no agreements had been signed; the project could not proceed until approval was granted. He stated the project has been discussed with many people and when approaching financial institutions, they insist on anywhere from 65-75% approvals and signatures before they will authorize a mortgage to build the building. That was the second step - the first step was the amendment. Because of the recession, there were national companies such as Shoppers Drug Mart who had expressed interest but pulled back their development plans and slowed down. He said they knew they could get business to come into the building and they could be signed up in six months sufficient to get assurance from the bank to go ahead with the development.

Councillor Bates asked if anyone was signed up yet pending the approval of the amendment. Mr. Beer replied no it was hard to get someone to commit themselves after four years of struggle but they definitely want to come to the community.

Councillor Bates asked if Mr. Beer thought the economic conditions had changed. Mr. Beer replied he felt there was a trend on the road back.

Councillor Taylor asked if Ms. Keeping was aware that a lack of construction would result in the permit not being renewed. Mr. Beer replied that Ms. Keeping had obtained three extensions.

Councillor Taylor asked if she had received any correspondence from the County to the effect that her permit would not be renewed. Mr. Beer responded yes, in August, 1991 after having involved herself to the tune of \$80-100,000. That was when she applied and was turned down and, at the same time, she was advised that Phase 2 would not be renewed in November.

Warden Lichter explained that development permits and building permits indicated that they had to be renewed within 12 months or they may cease. Councillor Taylor pointed out the permits were renewed from 1987 to 1990. Warden Lichter stated there were some renewals.

Mr. Beer pointed out it was considered feasible to issue and renew three times and then the ballgame changed and, through no fault of Ms. Keeping, she was caught in the middle.

Councillor Adams stated it appeared the developer was about to negotiate the sale of the property to somebody and asked if Mr. Beer was at liberty to disclose who. Mr. Beer replied he was not at liberty to disclose; the matter was confidential.

Councillor Adams asked if the sewage disposal system was tentatively approved by Department of Health. Mr. Beer replied it was approved and it was a system designed by the Department of Health with far greater capacity system than would ever be needed.

Councillor Adams asked if there was any part of the proposal which would prevent a duplication of services in the immediate community. Mr. Beer replied there was no intention of putting somebody out of business who was already there. The development was geared along the lines of a library, pharmacy, dentists, beauty salon, doctors, etc. and all those different companies had been contacted.

Councillor Giffin asked if Ms. Keeping lived in the area and Mr. Beer replied the family had lived there for over 40 years. Ms. Keeping was very careful about the environment and had sold some of her properties with very strict covenants about cutting trees and concern about the lake.

Councillor Giffin asked if Ms. Keeping was aware that meetings were going on regarding the Municipal Planning Strategy. Mr. Beer replied that Ms. Keeping had attended the meetings and was aware that the land use was being changed; however, she was getting her permits renewed and the recession was a struggle.

Deputy Warden Sutherland asked where the proposed building would sit on the lot and if any part of it would extend behind the rear lot lines of the lots that extended behind. Mr. Beer advised that there was a very steep incline and the building would be located against the hill. There was no intention to cross into Faber Subdivision. The front of the mall would parallel the highway and there would be parking in the front and rear of the building so that parking would be at two levels. The lot itself was approximately two acres.

Councillor Boutilier asked if the grandfathering clause would exist simply because of the increase in square footage. He said there was nothing that addressed that. Warden Lichter explained that his understanding was that if the permits were acted upon to the satisfaction of the Building Inspection/Development Department, the buildings could have been completed to the extent that the permits were there; however, as the economic conditions did not permit Ms. Keeping to proceed with the plans after the third renewal, staff simply said they could not stretch beyond that point. He said he

could understand that part of staff's argument although it might be difficult to accept on the applicant's end.

Councillor Boutilier pointed out that in Lake Echo, under the current Planning Strategy, there were areas that could be permitted to rezone to C-2 but it did not apply to rezonings along the No. 7 Highway. He asked for clarification of the fact that if the property was located in another area besides No. 7 Highway, then there would be no problem for rezoning in excess of 2,000 sq. ft. Warden Lichter responded Councillor Boutilier was correct; if it happened to be at the right designation, then rezoning would apply. He said because it was not under the right designation, there had to be more than rezoning.

Mr. Beer pointed out that one part of the zoning regulations said that when you obtain a building permit, reasonable time was allowed to commence construction. Planning Department was questioned as to what was considered to be a reasonable time with a recession. No reply was received except that a permit was not going to be re-issued. He said he thought that in poor economic times, the normal times should be extended.

Councillor McInroy asked if Mr. Beer could indicate if there was any verbal or written agreement or understanding to sell the property to a potential purchaser. Mr. Beer replied there was a contract drawn up with an individual subject to the approval of the plan amendment. He said he had a pretty clear concept of what was going to be written into the agreement and the property would be protected. The purchaser had to pay all the development costs for the hearings, etc.

Councillor Randkin noted the community perception regarding the demand for the facility and that Mr. Beer had implied that there were no firm proposals from potential business users. He asked if Mr. Beer had a professional market analysis carried out for the demand of such a facility.

Mr. Beer replied that they had spoken to dentists and doctors who indicated they would be quite happy to locate there as long as there was a pharmacy. Pharmacies were contacted and the community of Lake Echo was compared to others, population wise, and there seemed to be no problem; however, it was very difficult in a recession to get a true analysis of what people were going to do because of what they are currently experiencing with the recession. He stated there was no study done.

Councillor Brill asked on whose advice the footings for the building had been put in place. Mr. Beer advised they were put in place in 1988 due to the fact that the permit read that something had to be started on the site. That was considered progress and cost quite a bit of money. This showed the Planning Department that it was intended to go ahead with the project. He noted that

Ms. Keeping had purchased three extra lots, consolidated them and had the properly zoned.

Councillor Bayers asked if this particular property was the old Bob Warner property in the early 50's. He was advised that one lot was formerly owned by Bob Warner. Mr. Beer noted that the way the property was put together, there was approximately 300' along the highway and the lots could be subdivided and a mixture of buildings constructed which would not match one another. To call the proposed development a mall was actually a misnomer as it was actually one building.

Warden Lichter asked if the permit which would have permitted the construction of the lower floor expired before the permit for the upper floor. Mr. Beer advised that Phase 1 expired in August, 1991 and Phase 2 in November, 1991. Warden Lichter noted, therefore, that there was approximately three to four months during which time, on an inquiry, it was stated by somebody in the Municipality that the second permit could be proceeded with. Mr. Beer responded that the first permit was denied and the Municipality did not have any intention of renewing Phase 2, all of which was included in the same letter.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR

Mr. Lorne Ryan stated he lived on the #7 Highway and stated he read about the proposal in the local newspaper, The Crier. He said he liked the idea and, because he did like it, he took a number of petitions around to houses in the area. The majority of houses he called on liked the idea. He said the reason he liked the idea was because it would be an addition to the community, would help with taxes, would provide job openings on a full time basis for people in the area and it would be a potential for employment for young people who wanted to get work experience. He said that if young people want to get a part time job, they have to travel into Cole Harbour or further and by the time their parents have paid for the gas to transport them to and from their job, it would be cheaper to give them the gas money. The disadvantage to this was that when they went to apply for a full time job, they had no references on their application. He said he would like to see the proposed businesses that had been outlined locate in the building and for convenience sake.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Adams asked how many households Mr. Ryan had contacted. Mr. Ryan estimated that he had gone to approximately 50-60 houses and estimated that 80% of the people he spoke to were in favour.

Warden Lichter pointed out that Council appreciated the information but Council could not act on heresay information.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR

Mr. Leonard Carrigan stated he had property in Lake Echo and stated he believed anyone who could bring employment to Lake Echo should be welcome to do so. He said he believed the environment in the community should be protected.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Giffin asked how long Mr. Carrigan had lived in the area. Mr. Carrigan replied he had had property there 15 years and lived there part time.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION

Mr. Ken Packham, 514 Ponderosa Drive, Lake Echo, stated he was currently the President of Lake Echo Ratepayers Association and had been a resident for approximately 11 years.

Mr. Packham stated that several things had been touched upon at a public meeting and also at a subsequent Ratepayers Association meeting regarding concerns with traffic buildup in the area directly affecting institutions which were already in place, i.e. the local canoe club. He noted that some of this was more a problem six months of the year - obviously the canoe club would be a problem in the summer. He also cited outdoor day care centres ongoing at the tennis court location adjacent to the canoe club. For quite some time the Lions Club of Lake Echo had operated the Lake Echo Community Centre and there was a possibility that the Community Centre would be expanded which would have to be taken into consideration with regard to traffic. He advised that the Fire Hall was apparently going to be relocated due to the fact it cannot be enlarged in its present location because of health considerations with regard to the septic system. This made many people ask at the public meeting and subsequent ratepayers meeting if a septic system could work for the proposed development buried in the slate and shale on the side of the hill.

Mr. Packham stated that if there was an amendment passed and the property was built as per the description given and something was not right, experience has shown that to try to get something changed after it has been put in place was a monumental undertaking that no one in the community had been up to handling so far.

He said the Department of Planning and Development has recommended that the amendment not be passed and they have obviously spent a fair amount of time and effort to come up with that recommendation. He noted that there was a steep grade behind the building and if a building of that dimension was to be built on the property, it would be necessary to cut heavily into the rock and shale. He referred to the fact that there had been problems with fish kill in Porters Lake as a result of rebuilding a runway at Halifax

International Airport which has much the same rock as on the property in question. He also referred to the fact that there was arsenic in the system because of the shale. It was his understanding that Myra Road was originally supposed to run straight through to the airport but, because of the shale and granite, the project was halted as the bleed off from the arsenic would cause too much problem. The same kind of rock existed in the Lake Echo area.

Mr. Packham stated it was mentioned the reason they had not exercised the opportunity to build as per the permits issued were due to tough economic times. He pointed out that 1987, 1988 and 1989 were actually pretty prosperous times and probably one of the better times to build.

He stated that if the Municipal Planning Strategy was to be amended, it would defeat the purpose of having the plan put in place at the outset. He asked if there really was a need in the community. There already was a strip mall considerably further from the lake than the proposed location and it was restricted to the fact that there was only one men and womens washroom in the whole one end of the strip mall due to the fact that the Department of Health would not approve anything else because of excessive hydraulic loading and it was on a piece of property that was far enough away from the lake where there was an existing residential road, Old Lake Echo Road, between the rear of the strip mall and the edge of Lake Echo.

Mr. Packham said the natural setting concerns of Ms. Keeping had merit but the natural look concerns and concern for the overall good of the community were pretty well negated when there was a For Sale sign on the property because it would be unknown what the subsequent buyer was going to do or what loopholes would be used to do it. He suggested that Council consider talking to Ms. Keeping to purchase the land to increase the greenbelt in the area.

Mr. Packham stated that at the public meeting and ratepayers meeting, virtually no one spoke in favour of the development. He noted that there had been a doctor located in the strip mall in Lake Echo who closed his office down in the last month or so due to lack of patients. There was already a beauty salon in place in the original portion of the strip mall which had proper sinks. There was already a post office, excellent Bookmobile service and there was a drug store in Porters Lake. The concept of a family restaurant had been tried on several locations and found it could not pay. The hardware store was gone about 15 years ago. The Irving station gallonage dropped by about 65% when Highway 107 was put through. Lake Echo lost most of its commercial viability when the four-lane highway was put through in the late 70's.

Mr. Packham noted that, in his opinion, the footings put in to comply with the building permit were not complete and were not close to the dimensions of the building planned.

Mr. Packham stated he was in possession of letters representing 100 households that were sent out on a direct mail basis and quoted from same. He said that if an amendment was to be carried out, it should be a need-driven amendment and the need at present does not exist for more commercial space as there was a brand-new mall just starting to fill in District 8 in East Preston and there were other vacancies in the area. He said a lot of people were not starting businesses at the moment. He noted there was a curve and fairly narrow bridge coming into the area and as well as two streets emptying; therefore, to clutter that particular space of road with yet another commercial development and worry about the ramifications, it would be highly unlikely that it would be in anyone's interest to approve the amendment.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Bates asked for clarification as to whether or not the development would interfere with the Community Centre or Fire Hall. Mr. Packham advised that the Fire Hall had to move to increase square footage due to health restrictions which led one to ask if the Fire Hall could not handle it, how could a system be put in place along the rock on the side of a hill.

Councillor Bates stated he understood, from Mr. Beer, that the Department of Health had approved a system to handle the water. Mr. Packham responded he did not think the system had been approved but there was a system available that had been designed in conjunction with engineers who worked for the Department of Health.

Warden Lichter explained, in order that nothing should be accidentally or intentionally distorted, that no building permit could be issued without a septic tank disposal field being approved by Atlantic Health Unit.

Councillor Bates stated he understood this was a C-1 property and Ms. Keeping has somebody who would buy the property and proceed with development subject to a permit from the County. He asked if Mr. Packham's group was opposed to Ms. Keeping recovering the funds invested in the property already. Some sort of development could not be prevented from going on the property. Mr. Packham responded that no one had any intention of doing any fiscal injustice to Ms. Keeping and was not against anyone recovering money from an investment.

Councillor Bates stated he found this difficult to understand as the development that was given permits in 1987 was being opposed and Ms. Keeping now has someone who will buy the property on the

basis that she would be permitted to proceed with the development. He asked if Mr. Packham's group was blocking the development.

Mr. Packham responded that the reason this was brought up in the first place was the fact that the original permit was issued in 1987 and almost five years have passed since then. There was a build up of traffic on the corner since 1987. The permits had indeed lapsed, which was unfortunate, but if a Municipal Planning Strategy was put in place and then amended, there was probably not much sense in putting it together in the first place. As far as Ms. Keeping recouping her money, there was no problem with that.

Councillor Bates asked if Mr. Packham acknowledged that the property was still C-1. Mr. Packham stated he was not arguing about the zoning at present; what was being considered was an amendment to the zoning.

Councillor Brill asked when the planning meetings started that created the Municipal Planning Strategy. Mr. Packham said he believed it was six years ago. Councillor Brill asked if it was fair to say that the community was well aware of Ms. Keeping's intent to build. Mr. Packham responded he was not sure if the community was aware or not or how much of the community in its early stages was aware of what the planning committee was doing either. Councillor Brill asked if Ms. Keeping had attended some of the planning meetings. Mr. Packham responded it was quite possible but he had not attended any of the meetings - he had only been involved with the Ratepayers over the last 2-3 years.

Councillor Bayers asked about increased traffic flow at the Community Centre due to expansion. Mr. Packham stated there was already traffic flow but the Lions Club has been working for some time to raise the necessary funds to build an extension onto the back and side of the Community Centre so that larger functions can be held and to provide a facility for seniors in Lake Echo.

Councillor Bayers asked if, two years ago, there was a recommendation sent to Executive Committee for the County Recreation Department to take the building over because it was not being fully utilized. Mr. Packham said he thought that was when the Lions Club took over the building and he outlined the activities that presently took place.

Councillor Boutilier asked how many questionnaires had been sent out. Mr. Packham replied he believed there were approximately 800. Councillor Boutilier said that, in his experience, 100 returned from 800 sent out would indicate that people who were not opposed did not bother to take action, did not bother to come out to meetings and did not bother to voice their opinion. He noted, therefore, that there could be some support for the amendment.



Councillor Boutilier asked who sent the questionnaires out. Mr. Packham replied that the Ratepayers Association did. Councillor Boutilier asked if there was a Preamble included to encourage the reader to be not in favour. Mr. Packham replied that it was a "not in favour" letter sent out.

Councillor Cooper asked how large the Ratepayers Association was. Mr. Packham replied there were 40 people at the last meeting. Councillor Cooper asked if the Association was registered and how many were on the membership list. Mr. Packham replied he was not able to give an accurate count but there were a substantial number of people.

Councillor Cooper asked if they had been able to determine where the replies to the questionnaire came from. Mr. Packham said the indication from the people who wrote their address on the questionnaire was that they were pretty well spread out. Councillor Cooper asked if there was a preponderance of replies from the Martin Lake, Faber Court, Patricia Court area. Mr. Packham replied not really.

Councillor Adams advised that with regard to the rock formation that Mr. Packham had referred to, he had talked to Department of Environment who advised that the rock on the hill was Nova Scotia blue rock slate and was not pyritic slate so there would be no problem with environmental concerns such as being experienced at the airport. Councillor Adams asked if Mr. Packham had received any other information. Mr. Packham replied no.

Councillor Giffin noted Mr. Packham's concern about the rock and asked, in consideration of the fact that the Community Centre was intended to be enlarged, if the conditions across the road were any different. Mr. Packham replied decidedly as the Community Centre was quite close to the lake and there would be loam and sand in that particular area.

Councillor Giffin asked if a development came about on a three-lot basis with C-1, would not the same amount of soil be disturbed if a C-2 project were approved. Mr. Packham replied that was possible.

Councillor Merrigan stated he was having a problem with being fair. Ms. Keeping had a permit and had to meet various regulations to get it and must have had a fairly good understanding that she would be able to continue with her development. He asked how he could he say no, the development cannot be supported even though a permit was obtained, money was spent, various things had to be carried out, because there was concern that the development might hurt the people of Lake Echo when it was really unknown that it would hurt them and, if the development was required, it would be developed and would be needed. He asked Mr. Packham how he would feel in that situation.

Mr. Packham responded that Councillor Merrigan mentioned need and would he elaborate on that. Councillor Merrigan responded that developers and banks would not put monies into shopping centres such as was proposed when there were so many vacant throughout the county, without really being satisfied there was a need.

Mr. Packham replied, with regard to the permits that had been issued, that Department of Planning and Development's own recommendation was that the amendment not be approved; however, there were conditions attached to the building permit which were not met, to the best of his knowledge, within the given time frame and that was part of the discussion here. He said Mr. Beer had explained that the economy was tough but it was not tough in 1987 and 1988.

Councillor Merrigan advised that when a plan for an area was drawn up, what was already there was taken into consideration insofar as commercial and residential. He said it seemed that the community did not recognize there was a permit in place. Mr. Packham stated he did not have any information available with him on this.

Councillor Adams pointed out that, as far as he knew, the development was looked upon as being as existing plan in process and, therefore, did not factor into the plan. The reason for the Public Hearing was the fact that there was a lapse and since the lapse, the Municipal Planning Strategy had been adopted.

Warden Lichter stated that what he was hearing in different ways, was that now that there was a possibility of an amendment, it would be the need that should dictate the amendment. He asked if this was what Mr. Packham meant.

Mr. Packham replied that if there was a need in place then it would be appropriate to get together with the Ratepayers Association of Lake Echo and establish the need and ask them how they felt.

Warden Lichter stated that, if that was Mr. Packham's understanding and the understanding of the Ratepayers Association about planning, then he said everybody had misunderstood planning because economic planning was not what was to be considered. Planning was not trying to determine how many businesses should compete with each other or try to curtail competition; it was not the function of the Planning Department or the function of Council. He stated there was a subliminal message coming through that they would prefer that the land be purchased for parkland and noted that if Council kept turning down anything and everything related to business and industry, who was going to pay the taxes to the Municipality to keep on buying property for recreational uses.

Mr. Packham noted there was land designated for commercial use on Highway 107 as indicated in the Municipal Planning Strategy.

Mr. Packham stated that the future of the country was in small business but the Ratepayers Association was trying to ensure that it was small business located in an appropriate location to satisfy the needs of the community.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION

Mr. John Wood stated he lived at the end of Old Camp Road in Lake Echo. He stated he agreed with a great deal of what Mr. Packham had said. He noted there was problem with traffic, especially in the winter. He said he was definitely not in favour of the amendment.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

None

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION

Mr. Jim Gray stated he lived on Faber Court and his property bordered the property in question. He stated his concern was the speculation on the need and the fact that it was unknown what would really be located in the development or if anything would locate there. If the property was zoned C-2 and the businesses that had been mentioned did not locate there, he asked if the residents would be looking at beverage rooms, arcades, etc. He expressed concern with regard to teenagers if such businesses were located in Lake Echo.

Mr. Gray stated that at present, there were a lot of teenagers who cut through his property and onto Ms. Keeping's property to go to the pizza parlour. He noted that the proposed mall might go in with the kind of businesses that had been suggested but what would happen if a developer bought the property from Ms. Keeping and put in what he felt he wanted, i.e. less trees, an open area, etc. and asked what control was there.

Warden Lichter referred to the Municipal Planning Strategy and outlined the C-1 uses and explained that C-2 would allow for a larger size development. Arcades and beverage rooms were not permitted.

Mr. Gray asked what would happen five years from now - could an amendment be approved to add to the list that Warden Lichter had read. Warden Lichter replied that five years from now the Municipal Planning Strategy would be under review at any rate no matter who wanted an amendment as per the Planning Act.

Mr. Gray stated his main concern was the gathering of teenagers and the possibility of disorder and referred to the fact that there was an R-6 piece of property which bordered both his and Ms. Keeping's property and the development of the R-6 lot could be directly