

liaison with the seniors. He said other members on that committee are also members of other community organizations. He said he feels it is totally irrelevant and unnecessary to rescind the motion of February 21st.

Mr. Markesino said he did attend a meeting in the community at which he explained the procedures of the county with regards to funding. He said he also explained, pertaining to the operating costs, that there would be an area rate. He said he also suggested that the \$186,000.00 could be held in an escrow account to offset some of their deficits. He said when this began all the information they had was what was received from Mr. Adams Executive Assistant. He said they felt they had to get something going with the Recreation Committee since they were the group behind the centre. He said Recreation worked with them to try to come up with some kind of report to show what kind of facility they wanted.

Mayor Ball asked Mr. Blakney if he had met with representatives. He asked if he could give the rationale for the composition of the recommended committee structure versus what council ended up with.

Mr. Blakney said at a Ratepayers meeting the objective was, it seemed, to plan a recreation centre. He said he identified a real battle between two organizations that wanted to take control of the project. He said someone had to be the lead agency and, as staff, they have always dealt with and recognized the Recreation Association as the lead agency. He said when the county deals with recreation or capital projects they deal with the Recreation Association. He said it seemed sensible to continue with that group and involve the Ratepayers in the project similar to the representation they would have in other enterprises in the community. He said he had no problem with Councillor Hendsbee's suggestion that there should be two people from the Ratepayers Association and it is his understanding that the Recreation Association accepted that. He said the Municipality had recognized the East Preston Recreation Association as the lead agency.

Mayor Ball asked if the two representative from this group were reflected in the original report.

Mr. Blakney said it was not. He said that was based on the County Recreation Department as the group that had leased the facility and the group that they had always dealt with with regards to recreation issues. He said they do recognize that the Ratepayers Association has had key input into seeing that the tax implications would be dealt with by the community.

Mayor Ball asked for confirmation that the resolution that staff proposed basically was East Preston Recreation Association Chair

as the lead agency plus one additional representative, two from the Ratepayers Association, one from the East Preston Seniors Club, one member of the Lion's Club, one member of the church and one non partisan resident at large, appointed by the consensus of committee.

Mr. Blakney confirmed this.

MOTION DEFEATED

10 IN FAVOUR

13 AGAINST

SECOND AND THIRD READING - A BY-LAW TO AMEND BY-LAW NO. 51, THE TAX EXEMPTION BY-LAW

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

"THAT SECOND READING BE GIVEN TO A BY-LAW TO AMEND BY-LAW NO. 51, THE TAX EXEMPTION BY-LAW"

Mayor Ball asked if there was anyone present who would like to speak on that particular By-law.

No speakers came forward.

MOTION CARRIED

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

'THAT THIRD READING BE GIVEN TO A BY-LAW TO AMEND BY-LAW NO. 51, THE TAX EXEMPTION BY-LAW"

MOTION CARRIED

SECOND AND THIRD READING - A BY-LAW TO REPEAL BY-LAWS ESTABLISHING COMMUNITY COMMITTEES IN THE MUNICIPALITY

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

"THAT SECOND READING BE GIVEN TO A BY-LAW TO REPEAL BY-LAWS ESTABLISHING COMMUNITY COMMITTEES IN THE MUNICIPALITY"

Mayor Ball asked if there was anyone present who would like to speak on this particular by-law.

No speakers came forward.

MOTION CARRIED

It was moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Mitchell:

"THAT THIRD READING BE GIVEN TO A BY-LAW TO REPEAL BY-LAWS ESTABLISHING COMMUNITY COMMITTEES IN THE MUNICIPALITY"

MOTION CARRIED

SECOND AND THIRD READING - A BY-LAW TO AMEND VARIOUS BY-LAWS RELATIVE TO POLLING DISTRICT CHANGES

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

"THAT SECOND READING BE GIVEN TO A BY-LAW TO AMEND VARIOUS BY-LAWS RELATIVE TO POLLING DISTRICT CHANGES"

Mayor Ball asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak on this by-law.

No speakers came forward.

MOTION CARRIED

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

"THAT THIRD READING BE GIVEN TO A BY-LAW TO AMEND VARIOUS BY-LAWS RELATIVE TO POLLING DISTRICT CHANGES"

MOTION CARRIED

REQUEST FOR LOAN - NORTH PRESTON COMMUNITY CENTRE

Councillor Hendsbee requested that this item be deferred to the next council session.

STAFF REPORT RE: HUBBARDS FIRE FIGHTING AGREEMENT

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

"THAT THE AGREEMENT BE ADOPTED"

MOTION CARRIED

PROCLAMATION - NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK

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

"THAT COUNCIL PROCLAIM THE WEEK OF APRIL 9-15, 1995 AS

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK IN HALIFAX COUNTY MUNICIPALITY"

MOTION CARRIED

Canada Post - Councillor Hendsbee

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

"THAT A LETTER BE WRITTEN TO MR. WENDELL SKIER, CANADA POST, REGARDING IMPROVEMENTS OF DELIVERY SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY MAILBOXES FOR THE POSTAL CODE OF B0J 2S0 WHICH SERVICES THE PORTERS LAKE AND LAKE ECHO REGION. FURTHER A COPY OF THE LETTER BE SENT TO HIMSELF, COUNCILLOR LEVY AND ROSANNE SKOKE, MP"

MOTION CARRIED

Court House Committee - Councillor Giffin

Councillor Giffin said the municipality has been involved with the administration of courthouses in this province since 1818. He said at the end of March that responsibility will be given up and taken over by the Department of Justice. He said on March 27, 1995 there will be a plaque placed on the wall of the Law Courts building denoting all the chief justices of Nova Scotia. He said there will also be a plaque with the names of the last Court House Commission also being erected which will have his and Councillor Sutherland's name inscribed.

Metro Transit - Councillor Rankin

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

"THAT A LETTER BE WRITTEN TO METRO TRANSIT URGING THEM TO CONSTRUCT A STREET BETWEEN THE SUBDIVISIONS OF GLENGARRY AND GREENWOOD HEIGHTS, SUGARMAPLE AND JAMES STREET FOR THE EXCLUSIVE AND MORE EFFICIENT USE OF METRO TRANSIT"

MOTION CARRIED

SERVICE STANDARDS COMMITTEE REPORT

Halifax County Transit (Beaverbank Transit)

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

"THAT COUNCIL APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$17,000.00 FROM THE UNEXPENDED AMOUNT FOR PARA TRANSIT PROJECTS WHICH

WAS APPROVED IN THE 1994/95 GENERAL OPERATING BUDGET"

MOTION CARRIED

MEMORANDUM - TO DATE SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES - REGIONAL SOLID WASTE

Council agreed to receive the report for information.

MEMORANDUM - SACKVILLE COMMUNITY COUNCIL RE: SACKVILLE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB

Ms. Dempsey Crossman outlined the memorandum which informs council that at the March 14, 1995 Sackville Community Council meeting a motion was passed which states that when budget time arrives a request will be made to increase the Social Services budget for 1995/96 from \$18,000.00 to \$44,000.00, 50% of which is cost shared by the Province, for funding for the Sackville Boys' and Girls' Club.

Council agreed to receive the information.

AMENDMENT TO THE HALIFAX COUNTY CHARTER AND RECORDED RESOLUTION RE: ADDITION OF EASTERN PASSAGE (DISTRICT 6 & 13) TO THE COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF COLE HARBOUR/WESTPHAL

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

"THAT COUNCIL APPROVE THE RECORDED RESOLUTION AND AMENDMENT TO THE HALIFAX COUNTY CHARTER"

MOTION CARRIED

RATIFICATION OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE DATES

Council agreed to the dates as recommended.

MARCH 21, 1995 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE RECOMMENDATION

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

"THAT MUNICIPAL COUNCIL ENDORSE A COUNCIL FOR THE AMALGAMATED UNIT MADE UP OF TWENTY FOUR MEMBERS, TEN OF WHOM WOULD REPRESENT THE RESIDENTS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF HALIFAX COUNTY MUNICIPALITY"

MOTION CARRIED

Mayor Ball said he would suggest that this information be forwarded to the MLA's for Halifax County and Mr. Hayward.

Summer Work Program - Councillor Deveaux

Councillor Deveaux said the Department of Economic Renewal is providing some opportunities to have some summer works projects take place. He said the program being brought forward is strictly a provincial program and it applies to the private sector, the municipalities and the non profit organizations. He said the non profit business will be required to provide some funding according to the number of students they hire. He said in speaking with the non profit organizations in his area he has ascertained that the Province will guarantee up to \$5.00 maximum. He said if an organization, such as the Lions Club, wants to hire on person they have to pay the extra fifteen cents to bring the amount up to minimum wage plus pay all the other benefits involved which could amount to approximately \$1,400 for the non profit organization.

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

"THAT WHEREAS THE NON PROFIT ORGANIZATION WHO HIRES STUDENTS FOR THE SUMMER WORKS PROJECTS THAT THE PROVINCE PROVIDE SUFFICIENT FUNDING TO COVER THE MINIMUM WAGES PLUS THE BENEFITS TO THESE ORGANIZATIONS THEREBY REMOVING THE REQUIREMENT OF THESE ORGANIZATIONS TO PROVIDE THESE EXTRA FUNDS UNDER THE PRESENT SUMMER WORKS PROGRAM. FURTHER THAT THE LETTER BE SENT TO THE PREMIER, THE MINISTER OF ECONOMIC RENEWAL, THE HEADS OF THE TWO OPPOSING PARTIES AND THE MLA'S FOR HALIFAX COUNTY"

MOTION CARRIED

Symphony Nova Scotia - Councillor Deveaux

Councillor Deveaux said he feels it would be a disaster for the Province and the Metro Area to have to lose this body of musicians. He said they play an important role in the arts and culture aspects of Nova Scotia.

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

"THAT A LETTER BE WRITTEN TO THE PREMIER INDICATING COUNCIL'S CONCERN WITH REGARDS TO THE POSSIBLE DEMISE OF THE NOVA SCOTIA SYMPHONY AND REQUEST THAT THE GOVERNMENT CONSIDER PROVIDING SOME FUNDING TO ASSIST THEM IN ORDER TO CONTINUE IN THEIR OPERATION AS A SYMPHONY FOR THE PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA. FURTHER THAT A COPY BE SENT TO THE MINISTER OF YOUTH AND CULTURE, THE CANADIAN ARTS COUNCIL, THE HEADS OF THE OPPOSITION PARTIES AND THE MLA'S FOR HALIFAX COUNTY"

MOTION CARRIED

ADDITION OF ITEMS TO APRIL 4, 1995 COUNCIL SESSION

Natural Resources - Councillor Giffin
DOT - Councillor Fralick

IN-CAMERA ITEM

It was moved by Councillor Hache, seconded by Councillor Mitchell:

"THAT COUNCIL MOVE IN CAMERA"

MOTION CARRIED

Council agreed to move out of camera.

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

"THAT COUNCIL RECONSIDER THE MOTION WITH RESPECT TO THE
AWARD OF THE REFUSE CONTRACT FOR AREAS 6 AND 18 OF
HALIFAX COUNTY"

Councillor Reid said he feels the term "best interest of the Municipality" means that council makes a decision that is in the best interest of all taxpayers of the municipality and not just the ones in those two particular areas. He said although he sympathizes with what has happened in those two areas he cannot support the fact that those contracts have been awarded to someone other than the low bidder who are quite capable of doing the job.

Councillor Bates said he believes that it is clear cut. He said the contract states clearly the service that the county wants the contractor to provide. He said if staff are satisfied that the lowest tender can carry out the project then he feels that that contractor should be awarded the contract.

Councillor Deveaux said some of these people have collected garbage in the Municipality for many years. He said he feels the human aspect has to be taken into consideration. He said he feels that if Mr. Beazley receives the contract for his area he has no doubts that it would be in the best interest of the community.

Councillor Meade said Mr. Beazley is located in the county and the company pays taxes to Halifax County. He said he does not recall any occasion when the lowest tender was not awarded that Halifax County had been taken to court.

Councillor Naugle said Mr. Beazley has started the practice of

opening the hoppers on the garbage trucks for people to discard any garbage that may sit on the side of the road until pick up on the scheduled garbage day.

Councillor Hendsbee asked if these two areas could be re tendered.

Mayor Ball said the contract is up on April 1st and if the people presently doing the collection do not agree continue on there may be problems with regards to pick up.

Mr. Meech said unless there has been some reason identified as to why the tender call itself was not done properly council can't just recall tenders.

Mayor Ball said he would be concerned if it was retendered that the same privilege would not be afforded to other contractors.

Councillor Smiley there have been many phone calls, letters and a petition in support of Mr. MacDonald. She said the other contractor is aware of the community concern.

Councillor Bates said he feels it is a violation of trust that the contractors have in the county to treat them in a fair way. He said he feels it is a matter of principle. He said the criteria was given to the contractors. Time and effort went into the bids and he sees not reason why not to give the contract to the lowest bidder.

MOTION OF RECONSIDERATION DEFEATED

10 IN FAVOUR

12 AGAINST

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Meade:

"THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED"

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARING

March 13, 1995

PRESENT WERE: Deputy Mayor Cooper
Councillor Meade
Councillor Rankin
Councillor Fralick
Councillor Mitchell
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor Hendsbee
Councillor Levy
Councillor Smiley
Councillor Reid
Councillor Naugle
Councillor Brill
Councillor Giffin
Councillor Hache
Councillor Scratch
Councillor Harvey
Councillor Sutherland
Councillor Turner

ALSO PRESENT: Nancy Dempsey Crossman, Municipal Clerk
Alan Dickson, Municipal Solicitor

=====

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Lord's Prayer. Ms. Dempsey Crossman called roll.

APPOINTMENT OF RECORDING SECRETARY

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

"THAT JULIA HORNCastle BE APPOINTED AS RECORDING SECRETARY"

MOTION CARRIED

Deputy Mayor Cooper outlined the procedure followed for a public hearing.

1. PA-LAW-12-93-APPLICATION BY REID PATTERSON TO AMEND THE PROVISIONS OF THE MUNICIPAL PLANNING STRATEGY AND LAND USE BY-LAW FOR LAWRENCETOWN IN ORDER TO PERMIT A WIDER VARIETY OF TOURIST AND COMMERCIAL RECREATIONAL USES ALONG THE CROWELL ROAD

Ms. Susan Corser made the staff presentation. She said in October, 1994 council held a public hearing to hear amendments to the MPS for Lawrencetown. The amendments as originally presented

in the staff report dated July 18, 1994 would have allowed for the consideration of commercial recreation uses by development agreement within the Lawrencetown designation. The amendments to the Lawrencetown plan were prepared in response to a request by Mr. Reid Patterson who wishes to locate a facility for the rental and sale of water sports equipment on the property he owns on the Crowell Road in Porter's Lake. Council deferred a decision on that evening on the amendments in order that representatives from the Lawrencetown Citizens Committee could meet with Mr. Patterson to determine if a consensus could be reached regarding provisions to the amendments.

She said Planning staff was directed by council to attend this meeting and to advise council of the outcome at a special council session to be held October 31, 1994. The applicant and the LCC met but no consensus was reached with regards to specific revisions. At the meeting the LCC raised several concerns and proposals were put forward to resolve them. It was agreed at the meetings' conclusion that staff work with the applicants lawyer to draft revisions for consideration. She said the LCC felt that any revisions must be referred back to the community for future consideration.

Council was unable to deliberate further on this application on October 31, 1994 as the municipal elections had since taken place and the attendance necessary, to approve the amendments, could not be achieved.

She said the revised amendments were brought back to the community in January, 1995 at a public participation session. This was to receive additional input on the revisions. The revised amendments being presented tonight have been prepared by planning staff in consultation with Mr. Patterson and his solicitor. The amendments are intended to address concerns raised towards the previous proposed amendments. At the meeting with Mr. Patterson and the LCC two concerns were raised by the LCC. The first related to the lack of definition of recreation uses. It was felt that many types of recreation uses could be disruptive to surrounding properties and be out of character with the semi-rural environment of the Lawrencetown designation. It was suggested that the type of proposals which could be considered be defined. She said a second concern related to the fact that the proposed amendment would allow for recreation uses to be considered anywhere within the Lawrencetown designation. Some of the LCC members felt that this would not be appropriate as recreation uses could be quite unacceptable in some areas.

She said the revised amendments address the concerns raised. First, provision would be made to only permit consideration of facilities which would allow for water related recreation activities such as canoeing, kyacking, windsurfing and other non-motorized water recreation uses. Secondly, the development agreement for a water related facility within the Lawrencetown designation would only be considered on the site which directly

abuts a body of salt water. Finally, for any application made under this provision council would have to satisfy the proposal in terms of an agreement addressing all the evaluation criteria set out in Policy PA.

She said staff recommends that the amendments be approved.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

No questions from council.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR

No speakers in favour.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION

No speakers in opposition.

DECISION OF COUNCIL

Ms. Corser outlined submissions had been received in support and opposition to the application.

It was moved by Councillor Levy, seconded by Councillor Hendsbee:

"THAT APPENDIX "A" OF THE JANUARY 23, 1995 STAFF REPORT
BE APPROVED"

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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

"THAT APPENDIX "B" OF THE OCTOBER 31, 1994 STAFF REPORT
BE APPROVED"

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. RA-8&9-21-94-08 - APPLICATION BY LINDA WAY AND BILL ATKINSON
TO REZONE LANDS ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF HIGHWAY NO. 7 AT PORTERS
LAKE FROM RE (RURAL RESOURCE) ZONE TO I-2 (SALVAGE YARD) ZONE

Mr. Paul Morgan gave the staff presentation. He said the application is to rezone a portion of two properties on the South side of Highway No. 7 near Porter's Lake. He said the Atkinsons currently operate a salvage yard on lot 49 on the plan of subdivision. He said it is a 1.8 acre property. He said it is not an auto salvage yard. He said they take scrap materials from construction sites to this property where they are cut, sorted and shipped to scrap dealers. He said there is 325 feet frontage onto highway No. 7. He said there are two driveways leaving the property. He said the applicants live in a mobile home on the

property. He said the actual salvage yard is to the rear of the mobile home and encompasses half the lot. He said they also operated from another property three lots down. He said lot 49 is zoned as rural enterprise zone. The zone does not permit salvage yards but there is a general provision under the Land Use By-law that states that any use in existence from the effective date of the By-law is a permitted use.

He said the truck storage yard is a permitted use under the RE zone. He said the applicants established the property in 1987. and the Land Use By-law came into effect in late 1989. He said the truck storage is quite visible from the highway and there have been complaints about the unsightliness of that. He said the owners would prefer to keep their trucks stored to the rear of their current operation for security reasons. He said they would like to move the salvage yard operation somewhat further back on the property. He said there is screening on the front portion of the lot. He made a slide presentation to council.

He said there are two applications, one is a rezoning application and the other is an amendment to the zoning standards. He said the zone that they require is I-2 which requires a minimum of 100 feet of frontage on a public roadway. It also has a minimum area requirement of two acres. The applicants would like to continue living on the front portion of the property and they are interested in removing the mobile home and replacing it with a permanent single unit dwelling. He said they do have some concerns about applying the salvage yard zone over that portion of the property because it would become a non conforming use. He said the I-2 zone does not permit single unit dwellings or residential structures. He said the applicants also advised that it would be more difficult to obtain a mortgage loan if that was the case. He said staff would consider amending the standards and not put frontage requirement on the salvage yard zone. He said it is the opinion of staff that, given the nature of the salvage yard, this would be beneficial in dealing with any application. He said council would be putting the zone over that portion of the property which is considered appropriate for that actual use.

He said one of the criteria staff looked at is lack of visibility from surrounding development. He said presently the zone requires that the salvage yard zone be extended all the way to the highway. He said staff is suggesting that it would be better to remove that requirement. He said there are still standards with regards to setbacks and the applicant would have to satisfy these. He said any portion of a salvage yard cannot be within fifty feet of the side lot line. It cannot be within 300 feet of a watercourse. He said these standards would be maintained. He said the zone would be maintained or placed over that portion of lot 49 and the rear portion of the lot which they seek to acquire. He said the proposed amendments also require that any portion of the salvage yard has to be screened from abutting residents and property owners as well as the highway.

He said the overlying land use designation is a mixed use designation under the Planning Strategy for districts 8 and 9. He said this is an area where priority is given to residential development. He said there is a requirement for rezoning for salvage yards because they can be a nuisance by virtue of their appearance and visibility to surrounding development. He said it is the contention of the planning department that by approving this application some of the concerns can be resolved. He said the flat bed trucks would be moved to the rear portion of this lot where there is tree screening. He said this property does not have the characteristics of an auto salvage yard.

He said the Department of Environment has advised that there is a valid salvage yard license. He said they have advised that they are not aware of any violations with regard to disposal of waste into the environment. He said they are prepared to amend the terms of the license if this rezoning application is approved. The Department of Transportation has advised that the entrance closest to Halifax does not meet the stopping site distance requirements. He said because they had allowed the driveway to be established they have said they won't try to close it down but it would be their preference that it was closed. He said the applicants need that entrance to allow for easy access and movement out from the property. He said if the applicants had additional area to the rear this would no longer be necessary. He said they would be prepared to close this driveway down. He said the issue tonight is not whether the applicants are allowed to be there because under the Land Use provisions they were established prior to the By-law. He said regardless of the decision tonight they would continue to operate from that property. He said it is staff's position that this application is consistent with the policies for this area. It is an operation which creates employment opportunities and satisfies an environmental need in that they recycle these materials. He said staff is recommending approval.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

Councillor Hendsbee asked if this changing of the plan would open the doors for other salvage yard operations in district 8 and 9. He asked if this would make it more restrictive and controllable.

Mr. Morgan said within the resource designation there is already provision for council to consider rezonings. He said unless the plan is changed so that they couldn't even be considered, he does not feel this will make a difference one way or the other. He said in his opinion the changes in the standards that are being suggested might make it such that in future applications there might be an opportunity to make proposals more acceptable.

Councillor Hendsbee referenced the recommendation with regards to access to an I-2 zone shall be from a collector highway. He

asked what the definition of a collector highway was.

Mr. Morgan said the Highway 7 is identified by the plan as a collector highway.

Councillor Hendsbee asked if roads such as the Crowell Road, Middle Porters Lake Road or Myra Road could be considered as collector highways. He asked if those roads could be applicable to an I-2 zone.

Mr. Morgan said he would have to review the document to verify which are and which are not considered collector roads.

Deputy Mayor Cooper asked if this recommendation is approved is there any way that Appendix C is tied into Appendix A.

Mr. Morgan said the Department of the Environment is responsible for the operation of the salvage yard and these are the terms that have been imposed. He said if the terms were violated the Department of the Environment could revoke the license for the operation. He said if the application is approved the terms of the license will have to be amended. He said the applicants will not only have to comply with municipal land use requirements but also have to conform with provincial licensing requirements.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR

Ms. Linda Way addressed council. She said when they applied for the rezoning they intended to move the trailer from it's present location and moving their business into a wooded area. She said in doing so they hoped to accommodate the neighbours. She said they are doing this at a great expense to themselves because the land in question would have to be filled in and levelled off before it could be used. She said this would be at a cost of approximately \$70,000. She said they are being compared to other salvage operations. She said they are not dealing in toxic materials or PCB's. She said concerns were expressed with regards to oil, engine coolants and battery acids. She said there has been no decrease in property values as a result of their operation. He said new homes are being built in the area. She said it has been suggested that the operation be moved to an industrial park but they are not willing to wait until studies are done and more meetings are held. She said they have kept the front portion, to the best of their ability, appealing to the motoring public and their neighbours. She said a picture of the property was taken from the top of a tree. She said if the rezoning is not approved they are within their legal rights to continue their business on the present location. She said they would prefer to purchase land elsewhere in order to build their home. She said it is time for a decision to be made because in her opinion enough talk and enough meetings have been held.

Ms. Karen MacKay addressed council. She said she is a resident of district 8. She said she is speaking in support of the

application. She said the applicants have provided employment to members of her family which has resulted in them having the opportunity to become homeowners and having a quality of life that they would otherwise not have. She said Ms. Way and Mr. Atkinson helped her in starting up her own business. She said they are community oriented and she has had great support from them. She said there are presently eight people employed by the salvage yard and there have been, on occasion, up to 27 people employed. She said there have been comments made that the operation has resulted in medical problems for residents. She said her husband has not experienced any medical problems as a result of his employment.

Mr. Gerald Nauss addressed council. He said he was in favour of the application. He said the operation was not visible from the road. He said if you stop at the driveway all that is visible is the trailer. He said it is his opinion that the operation is not detrimental to the community in any way.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION

Mr. Ron Jeffrey made a presentation to council. He said that from the onset it is readily apparent that the applicant knew full well that limitations of their existing property since they were detailed under the existing use clause for the planning use for district 8 and 9. It is common knowledge that the residents have in the past voiced their concerns and that the county council has on three previous occasions been presented with petitions from the residents expressing their adamant objections to any development of this nature in their community. He said this has been since October 1988. This is not just a case of a few surrounding residents being concerned as this report would have one believe. He said residents are totally awed that this application is even being considered let alone the fact that the county has put it on paper. This is a slap in the face to the residents of this area and seems to be indicative of the County's dealings in this matter from the onset of this situation.

He said the statement that this lot is used to park 18 flat bed trailers, two trucks and five cranes is quite incredible. Normally there is only 12 to 14 trailers parked of various varieties. The fact is that the neighbours on the opposite side of the highway facing the parking lot have never seen the quantity of trailers, cranes and trucks quoted in the report. He said this is just a further confirmation of council's lack of awareness of what has, and is, transpiring with regards to this matter.

He said the vacant lands on the West side of lot 49 are zoned exclusively for residential purposes. He said all these lots were zoned as such, including Mr. Atkinson's. He said the residents point out that this activity does detract from the

character of their community and the residents have consistently stated this. He said this operation is detrimental to the visual appearance of existing residential areas.

He said this application is an inappropriate development. He said not only does it currently abut on a subdivision, this expansion will further this infringement. Additional to this is the encroachment on two other major subdivisions as well. He said they object to the argument that lot sizes should be reduced when considering I-2 zoning. He said I-2 lots should have a minimum lot size of 80,000 square feet to limit the impact of their operations on the existing residences. He said that perhaps council should consider these factors and realize that is why the by-laws are in place in their present form for these very reasons. He said the standards that the report talks about to protect the ground water and surface waters from pollution are already covered in Appendix C, which are the conditions of the license by the Department of Environment.

He said that in his opinion the applicant is in violation of two of the conditions of his present license these being burning and not limiting access to only the easterly driveway. He said it is unimaginable that as suggested that the expansion will not have an immense impact on the surrounding area not the minimal one as suggested. He said the reality is, if this operation is allowed to expand activity levels will intensify creating and generating ever increasing levels of noise. This will certainly not alleviate any concerns over noise. He said it is readily apparent that parcel A would soon be stripped of any trees to facilitate expansion and the proposal to relocate existing stock piles. He said this would nullify any dense tree cover and the situation would only deteriorate.

He said there appears to be little or no control in the enforcement of the existing rules and regulations. Since at least 1992 there appears to be and still are no buffers enforced on the sides or back property lines of this operation. He said he has to ask if council really believes that situation will be any different in the future under a new set of rules. He said they question whether the applicants will have to comply to anything under the guise of the existing use clause. He said it seems that the applicant can violate any terms or agreements he wishes while operating on lot 49. He said it was stated that the Department of Transportation has advised that both the eastern and western driveways can be approved as commercial access points because they were developed prior to current regulations. He said the Department of Transportation failed the westerly driveway and stated that a permit would be denied. He said he feel that the question of safety is being sidestepped. He said he would like to question whether the Department of Transportation is legally liable and morally responsible for any accident or loss of life entailing from the use of this driveway. He said if the applicants had placed their maintenance shed as advised by DOT they would currently not be in this situation and

they would have been able to comply with the regulations.

He said it is apparent that these amendments to the standard of the I-2 zone are tailored to cater to an individual. He said it is also readily apparent that no consideration has been given to the impact on district 8 and 9 as a whole. He said these proposals effectually give the ability to the County Planning Department to further violations and trespasses against this community. He said it is the contention of the citizens and residents that by-laws are put in place and effect to protect property, people and their inherent rights and not to provide the County Planning greater flexibility or to make their job easier to determine salvage yard locations.

He said the statement that Ms. Way and Mr. Atkinson have operated a salvage yard for the past six years in quite contentious. He said the county has maintained that the was a recycler for about three years and his business card reflected this fact.

Mr. John Crout said of foremost concern to the residents of district 8 and 9 is the possible and very real threat of toxic waste contamination. He said it was only recently and still vivid in the minds of all and is fact to the residents of Halifax whose lakes and waterways were polluted by PCB contamination by the "Junkie Jim" salvage yard operation. He said the magnitude of the environmental damage to the areas lakes and waterways will take years to access. He said the other reality of the situation is the consideration to the health of the residents and how this contamination will affect them in the years to come. He said it is only then that the full impact of the consequences will become a bitter reality. He said that the residents contend that this is an environmentally sensitive area. He said the local area is sitting on bedrock and as such quickly disperses any run off into the surrounding area. He said the small quantity of topsoil that is present will not provide any safety. He said it would soon become saturated with any possible contamination which in turn would soon start leaking into the areas waterways, streams and lakes.

He said there is a small brook nearby. He said this brook runs continuously on a year round basis and would, on becoming contaminated, quickly disperse any contaminants and spread them to nearby water systems such as Porters Lake. He said this area is serviced by private wells which people depend upon for their daily water needs and consumption. He said these wells are highly susceptible to any pollutants or ground water contamination. He said the local residents are very concerned about this potential threat and if is felt they have due cause to be. He said the residents primary concern is the residents who have dug wells and who will be the first of realize the consequences of any contamination. He said the residents are also concerned that contaminants can be stored on site, for up to

one year, under the proposed licensing conditions. He said what this amounts to is that contaminants can be stored on site forever. He said it becomes obvious that there will be no one from the Department of the Environment who will regularly monitor, dutifully mark and date the various associated containers and ensure of their timely disposal. He said some of the possible contaminants are waste oils, engine coolants, transmission fluids, battery acid and lead from old car batteries. He said this list is not inclusive but only reflects a cross section of possible contaminants. He said this type of operation brings a high level of noise pollution. He said this not only affects the residents of the area but also has a detrimental impact on the natural environment ie. the wildlife of the area.

He said that the proposed area for expansion of the salvage yard is bound by three subdivisions which were all conceived prior to the inception of the salvage operation. He said there are numerous other subdivisions in other stages of development along the No. 7 highway within a few kilometres of the proposed salvage yard operation. He said these subdivisions along with local residents will be the first to feel the consequences of any environmental mishap. He said that districts 8 and 9 are host to a provincial park and a campground. He said as result of the tourism during the summer months and they are concerned with the image the salvage yard will portray. He said it can only reflect negatively on the community and the tourism industry.

He said currently it appears that the existing by-law and controls that are in place, provincial and county are considered anaemic and effective. When enforced, minimum fines may be imposed which amount to a slap on the wrist and has the effect of water running off a ducks back. He said a monitoring of current sites appears to be virtually non-existent unless a complaint is received. He said it also appears to be apparent that the required resources to control these sites are limited and tests are expensive. This negates soil testing until after the fact or until a problem is suspected to exist. With cutbacks expected in every level and aspect of government this situation can only be expected to deteriorate or remain at its present status at best. He referenced another operation in the area which had applied for a rezoning in 1988. He said he is very involved in the community and he has received the impression that the people are very opposed to the salvage yard.

Mr. Jeffrey addressed council. He stated that further to the report dated March 5, 1995 from the concerned residents of Porters Lake the following points are being brought to council's attention. The application by Ms. Way and Mr. Atkinson is in direct conflict with the conditions and terms of his present land use covered under existing uses as point out in the staff report. He said it is quite clear that the Planning Department has contributed a considerable amount of resources to prepare this report which seem to have been prepared on behalf of the

applicants. He said it is unfortunate that the petitioners don't seem to be or have been afforded the same courtesy. He said they are seeking the same considerations. He said due to the long history associated with the operation and the fact that a overwhelming majority of the residents have always strongly opposed any such development they advocate the rejection of all, or any part of the proposals and applications stipulated in the staff report dated January 16, 1995.

He said it is pointed out that due to the dense precipitation of subdivisions in and around the area that the recommendations in the report are detrimental and non conducive to the present tax base or the future tax base afforded to the county. He said they question whether the county has taken into account the loss to residents for the properties surrounding this area. He said they have heard about the applicants rights since the inception of this operation but what about the rights of the people who were here before them and the families that have been in the area for more than a hundred years. He said he would like to question why Mr. Al Deveau's application had been turned down in 1988 when the same rules and regulations were in place. He said something seems to be wrong here.

He said in consideration of all that has transpired here, the residents of the local area request that compensation for loss of enjoyment of their properties in the amount of \$2,000 per year since 1988 and \$2,000 per year for every year that this operation exists in its present form. They also request that the area rate be adjusted for the local area in the way of a reduction of 30% and not a lowering of the assessment value of their homes. They also request that legal documents be drawn up covering a buy out of all adjacent property owners in the event of any environmental damage or the contamination of wells. He said who will pay the damage. He said why should it be the responsibility of the homeowners to test the wells. He said they feel that the municipal and provincial governments should be responsible and an area set aside for recycling. He said Ms. MacKay said that no one was invited to the church meetings. He said there is an article from the Daily News saying everyone was invited. He said the applicants were invited to meet with the residents. He outlined on a map the areas that could be affected by this operation.

Councillor Giffin said that Mr. Jeffrey had stated that staff encouraged the applicants to locate in the district.

Mr. Jeffrey said that he has on tape Mr. Atkinson stating that he was encouraged to locate in the area.

Councillor Giffin said he would like to access the tape.

Councillor Giffin said reference had been made to ground water

contaminants. He asked if there was any actual evidence of this.

Mr. Jeffrey said he has no facts at the present time. He said he does not feel the residents should have to be responsible for testing their well water. He said they cannot access Mr. Atkinson's property to see what is on the property. He said they have to rely on the Department of the Environment.

Councillor Giffin asked if Mr. Jeffrey realizes that the applicants are legitimate in what they are doing? He said that Mr. Jeffrey had also said that the reports were made up in favour of the applicants. He said he would like to assure Mr. Jeffrey that staff make their reports as objectively as possible.

Councillor Mitchell asked how close to the salvage yard was the nearest home.

Mr. Jeffrey said the nearest one is across the street.

Councillor Mitchell asked how long had the homes been in existence in relation to the salvage yard being in existence.

Mr. Jeffrey said there had been a subdivision in place prior to Mr. Atkinson's operation.

Councillor Naugle asked how long ago had Mr. Jeffrey built his home.

Mr. Jeffrey said he built his home in 1989.

Councillor Naugle asked if the operation had been in existence at that time.

Mr. Jeffrey said the operation was smaller at that time. He said he owned the property prior to the start up of this operation.

Councillor Naugle asked if it had not been a concern of Mr. Jeffrey's that this operation was there.

Mr. Jeffrey said it was after the fact that he learned that a supposed transfer station was now a salvage yard. He said Mr. Atkinson's license says that the materials are to be removed in a timely fashion and they are not to be used for salvage.

Councillor Hendsbee said he wanted to clarify what had been stated in the minutes of the PAC meeting of January 23, 1995 with regards to reference to a mobile home shown on lot 49. He said the mobile home he is making reference to is on lot 52 which now contains a single dwelling. He said with regards to the statement by Dorothy Cartledge, that could be taken out of context. He said it could also be interpreted that any illegal expansion or unauthorized expansion or unpermitted expansion of the operation shall be dealt with seriously.

Mr. Jeffrey said it specifically states that any attempt to expand beyond lot 49 will be seriously dealt with. He said what is here is an attempt to expand beyond lot 49. He said they were given a promise by the county.

Deputy Mayor Cooper said at the time there was no provision for expansion and it would have been dealt with if any attempt had been made to expand.

Councillor Hendsbee said for council's information he met with Ms. Cartledge to review the case file of Mr. Atkinsons operation and the only infraction on record had been the establishment of a maintenance. She said once Mr. Atkinson was notified that it was across the property line he did correct the situation and was cooperative in doing so. He said with regards to the parking lot where the truck trailers are pictured, there were eleven on the property today. He said the trailers are usable until they are vandalized and damage is done.

Mr. Jeffrey said the pictures that have been shown to council show trailers that are clearly salvage.

Councillor Hendsbee referenced where it was stated that the site would be soon stripped of trees to facilitate any expansion and proposal with regards to relocating stock piles. He said in his opinion it is unfair to say that it would soon be stripped of all trees because it is required in the setback that screening requirements would be necessary.

Deputy Mayor Cooper said that what is there now and what will be required under any amendments that were approved by council are two separate things.

Mr. Jeffrey said that what has been done to this point is proof of what is going to happen in the future.

Councillor Hendsbee said with regards to the applicant being encouraged by staff to locate here. He said it is his understanding that the previous operation was located in Harrietsfield and Mr. Heffler provided the information of what other land was available in the county that was unzoned. He said at that time district 8 and 9 was lacking of any by-laws and there were no restrictive zoning requirements.

Mr. Jeffrey said that in the documentation provided they rebut the fact that it was an existing use because it was there not as a salvage operation but as a recycling operation.

Deputy Mayor Cooper asked if this information had been provided to the Planning Advisory Committee.

Mr. Jeffery they did not receive the January staff report until

February. He said he has never been approached by the Planning Department.

Deputy Mayor Cooper said that staff would not ignore information. He asked Mr. Morgan if the correspondence and report presented at this meeting was made available to Planning Advisory Committee when they considered this.

Mr. Morgan said there is history of the residents disputing the right of the applicants to operate on this property. He said Mr. Butler and Ms. Ryan of the planning department were aware of the history of this.

Councillor Hendsbee said reference is made to the risk of contamination. He asked if Mr. Jeffrey was aware of provisions of the Transport Canada Act with regards to the transportation of toxic waste and would any of that material be on site.

Mr. Jeffrey said this was a reference to what has occurred in the past. He said it is not indicative of the present situation. He said that is an example of what can happen and what is still happening. He said he cannot in all instances substantiate but he can substantiate by past occurrences what has happened.

Councillor Hendsbee said some environmental concerns raised are beyond the scope of the municipal council. He said he would encourage these concerns be brought to the attention of the Department of the Environment. He said Mr. Jeffrey stated that the No. 7 highway supports numerous tourist vehicles and there is a concern with visibility.

Mr. Jeffrey said they believe that even if Mr. Atkinson was to extend his salvage yard to the whole of his present lot it would be no different than the current situation.

Councillor Hendsbee said that what Mr. Jeffrey is saying that Mr. Atkinson coming within thirty feet of the right of way of the road would be no less visible than at approximately one hundred feet back. He said the stock piles would be moved further back because the areas in the front would be used for parking lot and storage of the trucks.

Mr. Jeffrey said they don't believe that.

Deputy Mayor Cooper asked if the petition in the packages was the same as the one in the submission by Mr. Jeffrey.

Mr. Jeffrey said they were different. He said the petition was in opposition to rezoning.

Ms. Cathy Brown spoke in opposition to the application. She said they bought their property with the understanding that it was in an area which would provide quiet country living. She said they were approached in 1988 to sign a petition to stop a salvage yard

from opening. She said they signed the petition and also came to the county to change the zoning. She said the trees were cut and the trucks moved in. She said since then trucks have been in and out during all hours of the day and night. She said they have been awakened by loud noises, bright lights and foul language. She said they have had damage to their mailbox and electrical wires pulled out from the side of the house. She said there are things left on the flatbed trailers to sit there for up to a month at a time. She said when they sit outside in the summer the noises are easily heard which shows the buffer zone is not enough. He said in her opinion it seems that the Planning Committee is deciding in favour of the needs of one over the needs of many. She said the operation should be moved to an industrial business area. She said they feel that the planning department is at fault for allowing an industrial business and a residential area to be zoned side by side. She said putting a salvage yard in the middle of a growing community is and was a mistake.

Councillor Hendsbee asked what authority does the municipality have in enforcing covenants in real estate.

Mr. Dickson said ordinarily covenants in a residential development are only enforceable by the other residents in the development or the developer himself. He said the municipality would not enforce those covenants.

Councillor Hendsbee clarified that the municipality could only enforce the by-laws. Mr. Dickson confirmed this.

Councillor Hendsbee asked if it would not be beneficial for Mrs. Brown to see this operation consolidated into one lot.

Mrs. Brown said it would be beneficial in that it would not be in sight every time she looks out her front room window but having it up the road does not make it any different.

Councillor Hendsbee asked if she believed that having a further setback with the tree barrier requirements would perhaps diminish the noise.

Mrs. Brown said she does not believe so.

Mr. Jack Parker addressed council. He said if the applicant is supposed to be fifty feet from his property line this would result in him not having a western driveway because the line would go down the middle of that driveway.

Councillor Hendsbee said would a survey be required to mark the property line if this was approved tonight.

Mr. Parker said there is no doubt of the line. It is a

provincial survey line and is clearly visible. He said the shed that was put up was only five feet from the line.

REBUTTAL BY APPLICANT

Mr. Atkinson addressed council. He said he moved to Porters Lake in October 1987. He said they were transferred from Harrietsfield. He said they bought a piece of commercial property. He said they came to the area and when the area was rezoned, they were already there.

Councillor Naugle asked if Mr. Atkinson, to his knowledge, has ever had any salvage over on the neighbours property.

Mr. Atkinson said there is a tree line and from time to time it has happened.

Councillor Sutherland asked Mr. Morgan to clarify the status of that lot when Mr. Atkinson moved to the area, the zoning and whether or not the operation was legal.

Mr. Morgan said at the time Mr. Atkinson purchased the property, zoning by-law 24 was in effect. He said the present land use by-law was only adopted by council in 1989. He said the property had a general building zone which permitted a wide variety of uses. He said it is his understanding that Mr. Atkinson was out in Harrietsfield and requested to move. He said it is his understanding that the applicant was informed that the general building zone permitted this use on this property. He said under the new land use by-law it is clear that the operation is a salvage yard. He said even the RE zone applied to this property does not permit salvage yards but there is a provision for existing uses under the new by-law. He said under the existing provisions Mr. Atkinson is allowed to be on lot 49. He said the operation is closer to the sideyards than fifty feet that the salvage yard zone requires be maintained. He said if this application was approved and the operation was extended further back Mr. Atkinson would be required to maintain the fifty foot setback and screening.

Councillor Scratch said it is her understanding that this application is before council in order to allow Mr. Atkinson to move his salvage operations further back on the property.

Mr. Morgan said the applicants do want to build a residence.

Councillor Scratch asked if it was to allow the applicants to build a residence or to allow the applicants to build a residence and expand from where they are to the back of the property.

Mr. Morgan said the expansion is primarily to accommodate the flatbed trucks which are located on a lot further down the highway.

Councillor Scratch asked if the applicants were to continue the salvage operation on the existing lot there would be no requirement for setbacks or buffers.

Mr. Morgan said he would like to bring to council's attention that late last week Mr. Atkinson was considering withdrawing his application and using the existing use provision. He said under that provision they are allowed to expand on Lot 49 subject to the By-law requirements. What they were considering doing was moving closer to the highway which they would be entitled to do. He said they are approximately 150 feet back from the highway with reasonably good screening at the present time. He said under the By-law they could cut those trees down and put up a fence within 50 feet of the highway right of way. He said he would ask that council keep this in mind.

Councillor Scratch asked if there was any by-law to deal with the amount of noise on the expanded site.

He said the By-law does not address the noise aspects but the municipality does have a noise by-law.

Councillor Scratch asked if there would be limitations with regards to the buffering.

Mr. Morgan the amendments recommend that the screening be maintained.

Deputy Mayor Cooper asked if this was approved tonight would the setbacks apply to all the areas of the I-2 zone including those portions of the present Lot 49.

Mr. Morgan said if the existing operation encroaches in that fifty foot setback, because of the fact that it is already there, he does not feel that staff could legally require the applicant to move it out.

Deputy Mayor Cooper confirmed that the I-2 zone would be applied to the back portion of Lot 49 and the stock piles of metal would not necessarily have to be moved.

Mr. Morgan said it is his understanding that they could not be forced to move fifty feet.

Councillor Hendsbee said it is his understanding that the proponent is planning to move the stock piles of metal. He said the section of Lot 49 was to be intended for a parking lot for the truck trailers as well as the possible establishment of a weighing scale. He said therefore, the stockpiles would have to be moved off Lot 49.

Deputy Mayor Cooper asked if they would have to, under this

application, be moved.

Mr. Dickson said the question is whether the new zoning would override the existing rights which the applicant has to have an existing use. He said the applicant makes an application to have the rezoning changed and council agrees then he would have to comply with the new rules. He said therefore, in his opinion, he would be forfeiting his right to have the existing use continue.

Councillor Brill confirmed that if council supported the residents position and not that of staff the current business could continue to operate. He asked if it would be as a recycling operation or a salvage yard.

Mr. Morgan said under the Land Use By-law definition there is no doubt that it is a salvage yard. He said even the current zoning applied to this property doesn't permit a salvage yard. The fact that it was legally established prior to the adoption of this by-law makes it, under the general provisions, a permitted use. It is permitted to expand over the lot subject to the setback requirements of the RE zone. He said he could actually expand towards the highway. He said even if it was discontinued for a time, the by-law says it can be reestablished.

Councillor Brill said then what he is saying is that if the residents want aesthetics it is better to support the application.

Deputy Mayor Cooper indicated a letter had been received from Stephen D. Piggott in opposition to the application.

DECISION OF COUNCIL

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

"THAT APPENDIX A OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED FEBRUARY 16, 1995 BE APPROVED"

Councillor Hendsbee quoted from page 52 of the MPS for districts 8 & 9 which states that the general thrust of a mixed use designation is to support and encourage development of the rural economy. In this regard non residential uses considered suitable for the area are relatively wide ranging allowed by right anywhere. Salvage yards are considered a significant exception to this general rule. They are seen as creating potential safety hazards to adjacent residential areas and potential threats to natural environment systems such as lakes and rivers. In addition, most operation are viewed as potentially detrimental to the visual appearance of existing communities and residential areas. It is also realized that salvage yards are a necessary fact of life and they require relatively cheap land in order to be economically feasible. Furthermore, some residents support such operations as they provide a source of income as local

employment opportunities. Most residents do not wish their communities or neighbourhoods to be perceived as a convenient dumping ground for the discarded and partially recycled materials of the Metropolitan area. Some control is considered necessary over the number and locations of salvage yards; therefore, the residents wish to maintain the same level of control that existed before the adoption of the Planning Strategy".

He said it is hoped that the recommendation provided by staff will provide more controls for the these type of operations. He said if council does nothing and leaves the operation as they presently are, nothing is achieved. He said if the status quo is maintained there are unsightly vehicles on the No. 7 highway which has been the majority of complaints he has received. He said there are also problems with traffic and noise etc. He said an opportunity to consolidate this operation would eliminate the unsightliness and traffic flow coming from two properties instead of one. He said it would also help eliminate vandalism. He said it also provides an opportunity for more screening, more noise reduction and less visibility from the road.

He said infill will be required and the infilling material will be by the Department of the Environment standards. He said any concerns about water contamination would have to be regulated by the Department of the Environment. He said he met with the Department of Environment on Wednesday with regards to the operation. He said the establishment of water test pits along the perimeter of the property was discussed in order to ensure monitoring of the water. He said it is his understanding that Mr. Atkinson has been very cooperative with the Department of the Environment and has informed them of his intentions and actions. He said that the Planning Department of Cole Harbour monitors the operations through their by-law officers doing periodic checks on the operation.

MOTION CARRIED

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

'THAT THE REZONING APPLICATION TO REZONE A PORTION OF THE LANDS ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF HIGHWAY NO. 7 IN PORTERS LAKE TO I-2 (SALVAGE YARD) ZONE BE APPROVED"

MOTION CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Giffin:

"THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED"

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

March 21, 1995

PRESENT WERE: Deputy Mayor Cooper
Councillor Meade
Councillor Rankin
Councillor Mitchell
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor Bates
Councillor Hendsbee
Councillor Levy
Councillor Dooks
Councillor Smiley
Councillor Reid
Councillor Naugle
Councillor Merrigan
Councillor Brill
Councillor Giffin
Councillor Hache
Councillor Scratch
Councillor Harvey
Councillor Sutherland
Councillor Turner
Councillor McInroy

ALSO PRESENT: Nancy Dempsey Crossman, Municipal Clerk
Julia Horncastle, Recording Secretary
Tony O'Carroll, Policy
Ron Lowerison, Policy

=====
The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

Prior to the meeting, councillors had an opportunity to examine proposed district map and population statistics.

Councillor Rankin, Chairman of the Redistribution Committee, updated council on the process to date.

Mr. Tony O'Carroll, Policy Division, made a verbal presentation with regards to population statistics throughout the county.

After a discussion period:

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

"THAT THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE RECOMMEND COUNCIL
ENDORSE A COUNCIL FOR THE AMALGAMATED UNIT MADE UP OF
TWENTY FOUR MEMBERS, TEN OF WHOM WOULD REPRESENT THE

RESIDENTS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF HALIFAX COUNTY
MUNICIPALITY"

MOTION CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Meade:

"THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED"

MOTION CARRIED

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

March 30, 1995

PRESENT WERE: Deputy Mayor Cooper
Councillor Meade
Councillor Rankin
Councillor Fralick
Councillor Mitchell
Councillor Deveaux
Councillor Bates
Councillor Hendsbee
Councillor Levy
Councillor Dooks
Councillor Smiley
Councillor Reid
Councillor Naugle
Councillor Merrigan
Councillor Brill
Councillor Snow
Councillor Giffin
Councillor Hache
Councillor Scratch
Councillor Harvey
Councillor Sutherland
Councillor Turner

ALSO PRESENT: K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer
Nancy Dempsey Crossman, Municipal Clerk
George McLellan, Director of Corporate Services

=====
The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. with opening remarks by Mr. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer. He said the budget was being presented at this time with the intent that final approval would be given by Council at the April 18, 1995 Council Session.

Mr. McLellan tabled the preliminary Halifax County Municipality 1995/96 Operating Budget for the fiscal period April 1, 1995 to March 31, 1996.

A slide presentation was made to Council followed by a question and answer discussion period.

It was agreed that the meeting would adjourn to Wednesday, April 5, 1995 at 2:00 p.m.

It was further agreed that if a final recommendation was not reached on April 5th, that meeting would be adjourned to Wednesday, April 12, 1995 at 2:00 p.m.

It was moved by Councillor Merrigan:

"THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED"

MOTION CARRIED