

years they have been living there and granted there was a Fire Station, there was still the possibility that a commercial designation would be approved for the property. The best Council can say to the people in the area was that there would be another Public Hearing when a proposal was received. He stated he found it difficult to believe that there was no consideration given to removing the building and selling the lots. There should not be any difficulty with selling the lots. He said that granted Council would be out about \$100,000 but, over a period of 20 years, he did not know why that was a preposterous proposal. He stated he felt the Municipality had some obligation to residents in an R-1/R-2 zone to protect them. He said he did not feel at all inclined to go along with the recommendation notwithstanding the fact that there would be another Public Hearing.

Councillor Boutilier stated that no one was suggesting that the property should be turned into a commercial designation. They were looking for the right to have additional options that could be considered through Sackville Community Council. They were not looking to put an industrial or commercial use on it - they were looking for an ability to have an option that could come before the community at a Public Hearing where there could be input. It had already been cleared previously at a Public Participation Session before that the residents in the immediate area of the Fire Station were not opposed to having some use of the Fire Station that would be compatible as it existed as a community today. He said the five Sackville Councillors, including Councillor Brill, had no intention of imposing anything on anyone, they were looking for options.

Councillor Bates stated that he understood the intention tonight was to permit the possibility of a commercial development.

Deputy Mayor Richards stated his understanding was to permit Community Council to consider, within the community, future Development Agreements for the site. It would not change the site from its current P-2 zone but would allow Community Council to address the issues should they arise.

Mr. Morgan added that it would allow the possibility to use the existing structure for commercial uses but there were criterias for Community Council to consider. The provision would not preclude a developer, if he so chose, to develop with R-2 development. There was still provision in the Sackville Municipal Planning Strategy to apply for the R-2 zoning.

Councillor Bates stated this clarified the issue as far as he was concerned.

Councillor Boutilier stated that the status quo was obviously not good enough. It was not previously good enough because Sackville Community Council agreed, and he thought at one point unanimously, to bring the matter forth to look at the possibility of having

other options to deal with the Fire Station. That was one of the reasons the entire Municipal Council was involved tonight. He noted that besides commercial, also allowed would be office or service industrial. There were some uses under these two that would be less intrusive than the Fire Station. He stated when the motion was made, he was certainly prepared to support it.

Councillor Harvey pointed out that should the amendment succeed, and he would support it, it did not preclude the building being sold for a P-2 use. It simply gave the Municipality more options to dispose of the property. He said he did not see this as the beginning of something, but the end.

Councillor Fralick asked how many times the issue had been dealt with at the community level.

Deputy Mayor Richards advised that it had been discussed at least twice.

Councillor Merrigan asked if Community Council had looked into the possibility of renovating the Fire Station for use by different departments of the Municipality.

Councillor Harvey responded that this had been investigated at least twice over the last year and the answer on each occasion was that it was not a feasible undertaking, particularly in view of the on-going consideration by the County to move its main offices from Dutch Village Road. It did not seem to be an appropriate way to spend taxpayers' dollars.

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

"THAT THE SACKVILLE MUNICIPAL PLANNING STRATEGY BE AMENDED SO AS TO PERMIT THE COMMERCIAL AND SERVICE INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SACKVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT SITE LOCATED AT THE JUDY AVENUE/BEAVERBANK ROAD INTERSECTION, TO BE CONSIDERED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AS OUTLINED IN APPENDIX "A" OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 24, 1991".

MOTION CARRIED.

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

"THAT THE LAND USE BY-LAW FOR SACKVILLE BE AMENDED SO AS TO PERMIT THE COMMERCIAL AND SERVICE INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SACKVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT SITE LOCATED AT THE JUDY AVENUE/BEAVERBANK ROAD INTERSECTION, TO BE CONSIDERED BY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AS OUTLINED IN APPENDIX "B" OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED JUNE 24, 1991".

PUBLIC HEARING

10

December 8, 1992

MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.