

Council,  
February 11, 1960.

Alderman Trainor: "I am somewhat familiar with that subject as the owner of that particular company called me to find out, first of all, if Council would have to agree to an appeal. I am rather surprised at the City Solicitor telling us that he has appealed. Maybe he can without Council's permission. If he can, that is fine; but from my own personal thinking -- not having been persuaded and guided by any briefs that have been presented to me verbally -- I think we are very foolish pursuing this particular course which we are taking in appealing it. I think we should drop the appeal right now and put some kind of tax license like we had in previous years on pop-vending machines, pin-ball machines. As a result, we will be able to get some additional revenue for the City. I can see, personally, nothing wrong with that type of machine and I don't think it affects too many people, if any."

His Worship the Mayor: "The only thing is, as the law stands on our books, we have been banning them. The Council says we aren't going to take that stand and the Solicitor must follow his duties to enforce the law. He is so doing. If Council wants to say, at this time, that we should repeal that section of the Charter and substitute a right to license them, as we have in other cases, we should do so."

Alderman Lloyd: "I feel that the matter should go to the Finance and Executive Committee where there is perhaps more opportunity to discuss it. I am like Alderman Trainor. I have some doubts in my mind, but I'm not a 'Member of The Bar', but it has been suggested to me years past that this type of authority we have had may have been ultra vires to the powers of the Province to enact. I don't know whether that is the correct terminology to apply to it or not, but I think it is the basis on which the case has been turned down. Doesn't it run counter to legislative powers of the Federal Government in some way?"

City Solicitor: "That's right. There is a case in Winnipeg. On the other point, I would like to get straightened out. Do I have to come to Council every time there is a dismissal of an Ordinance or a Section of the Charter? Do I have to come to Council and ask for a right to appeal?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. If nothing else, there is a provision in the Charter whereby the Mayor shall see to it that the City Officials are

Council,  
February 11, 1960.

diligent in their duties in upholding the laws of the City."

Alderman Lloyd felt the City Solicitor should take the matter to the Finance and Executive Committee.

His Worship the Mayor: "There is also the Tobacco Act which prohibits the sale of cigarettes to minors. If they are going to be operated by a vending machine, how can you control the sale of tobacco to minors?"

Alderman Lloyd: "I think if you read the case, you will find why it was decided. I read the case. I can only suggest that in this particular case, apart from general reference that he made to other matters, there is reasonable evidence for us to question the wisdom of the people."

Alderman Trainor also suggested that the matter be referred to the Finance and Executive Committee for study and a recommendation to Council to carry it on in Court or to forget about going any further as far as an appeal goes or to consider licensing these machines.

City Solicitor: "That was only my suggestion. If the decision of the Magistrate is confirmed, all I am asking for is authority to amend the Charter to license them or not."

Alderman Lloyd: "I thought he was talking about appealing the case. Now he is talking about authority to impose a license."

City Solicitor: "An appeal has been entered, but it may not be heard in time for me to get legislation."

Alderman Wyman: "It does seem quite clear that with the possibility of the Magistrate's decision being upheld and an appeal to the County Court, that we may be faced with doing something with what we now have on our books that the Court might decide had no right to be there."

Alderman Lane: "May I ask Mr. Doyle if the machines that have been distributed since this decision made by the Magistrate are operating legally?"

City Solicitor: "No. They are all waiting for the decision."

Alderman Lane: "There are plenty of new ones."

City Solicitor: "That is right, but what are we going to do? Are we going to prosecute all of them? This is a test case."

Council,  
February 11, 1960

Alderman Trainor: "Some of these machines, as I understand it, are put in for control. They control the sale of cigarettes with respect to health and no person on the street can walk in and deposit the money in the machine. It has to be some member of the staff in the store."

City Solicitor: "We had that case."

The matter was referred to the Finance and Executive Committee for consideration.

ANNUAL PAYMENT TO CITY - PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
162 Lady Hammond Road

January 28, 1960

Mr. R. H. Stoddard  
City Clerk  
City of Halifax  
City Hall  
Halifax, N. S.

Dear Mr. Stoddard:

Acting on the instructions of the Committee, I informed you on 30th January, 1959, that the Commission could pay the City of Halifax for the year 1959, as taxes and as a payment from surplus, a total amount of \$100,000. At that time the Commission decided that when the financial results for 1959 had been determined the amount so paid to the City of Halifax would be reviewed and possibly a further payment could be made if the surplus, if any, was such as to warrant it, with any additional payment not to exceed \$25,000., in accordance with the terms of the Deed of Trust and Mortgage from the Commission to the Nova Scotia Trust Company dated as of the 2nd day of January, 1952.

At a meeting of the Public Service Commission of Halifax held 27th January, 1960, tentative financial results for the year 1959 were reviewed and I am instructed to inform you that the Commission is pleased to advise that it can make an additional payment of \$25,000. to the City of Halifax from the Commission's surplus for the year just closed.

The Commission's Act of Incorporation makes it clear that any payment from the Commission's surplus to the City of Halifax should be made at the end of a year, after the amount of surplus, if any, has been determined. However, so that you will have information for the preparation of your 1960 revenue budgets, I am further instructed to inform you that upon reviewing the estimated gross revenues and total expenses for 1960, the Commission has resolved that it can pay the City of Halifax for 1960, as taxes and as a payment from surplus, a total of \$100,000 and provision for the payment of this amount will be made.

Payments by the Commission to the City of Halifax to be made in 1960, as stated above, therefore, will total \$125,000. As in the past, City taxes will be paid in full and the balance of the payment of \$125,000 after deducting taxes will be applied as a contra account against the amount that the Commission will be billing the City of Halifax for fire protection service for 1960.

Yours very truly,  
J. W. CHURCHILL, SECRETARY-TREASURER

FILED

February 11, 1960

TAX COLLECTIONS MONTH OF DECEMBER, 1959

CIVIC YEAR	RESERVES	O/S BALANCE NOV. 30/59	NEW ACCOUNTS & ADJUSTMENTS	DECEMBER 1959 COLLECTIONS	O/S BALANCE DECEMBER/59
1957	73,294.03	122,789.09 Cr.	56.08	49,438.98	73,294.03
1958	90,395.80	310,202.69 Cr.	4,615.17	18,580.28	287,007.24
1959	104,270.58	1,029,131.89 Cr.	11,650.16	155,828.39	861,653.34
		1,462,123.67 Cr.	16,321.41	223,847.65	1,221,954.61

Tax Years Prior to 1957 (Covered by reserves) 562.15  
224,409.80

POLL TAXES

1954		10,580.19		141.44	10,438.75
1958	Deferred	8,929.17 Dr.	21.66	909.18	8,041.65
1959		49,698.84 Cr.	22.76	3,657.05	46,019.03
				4,707.67	

Poll Taxes other than those listed above 915.09  
5,622.76

Total Collections in December, 1959 230,032.56  
 Total Collections in December, 1958 181,539.89

Current Taxes collected Jan. 1st to Dec. 31, 1959	7,852,102.33	
Corresponding Period 1958		7,580,059.88
Tax Arrears Collected Jan. 1st to Dec. 31, 1959	772,513.78	
Corresponding Period 1958		856,770.86
Poll Tax Collections Jan. 1st to Dec. 31st, 1959	179,064.03	
Corresponding Period 1958		183,366.66
	<u>8,803,680.14</u>	<u>8,620,197.40</u>

	AMOUNT COLLECTED	JAN. 1st to DECEMBER 31	%
Tax Levy 1959	8,692,401.33	7,852,102.33	90.33
Tax Levy 1958	8,437,086.76	7,580,059.88	89.84
Tax Arrears January 1st 1959	1,232,763.37	772,513.78	62.67
Tax Arrears January 1st 1958	1,279,244.14	856,770.86	66.97
Total Collections to December 31, 1959		8,624,616.11	99.22
Total Collections to December 31, 1958		8,436,830.74	100.00

Respectfully submitted,

H. R. McDonald,  
CHIEF ACCOUNTANT.

FILED

COUNCIL,  
February 11, 1960

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT FOR JANUARY

The Administrative Report for the month of January was submitted and copies of the same were furnished the members of the Council for their information.

FILED

LEGISLATION - SECTION 512 - CITY CHARTER

Deferred for one month.

Meeting adjourned

9:40 P. M.

LIST OF HEADLINES

Minutes	99
Sale of Land to Halifax Infirmary	99
Hospitals - Capital Grants	99
Public Hearing Re: Second Reading - Rental Control By-Law	99
Purchase of Land - Halifax International Airport	107
Accounts over \$500.00	108
5% Salary Increase	109
Salaries - Registered Nurses	110
Salaries - Nursing Classifications	110
Street Lines - Clyde Street Extension - Date for a Public Hearing	112
Rezoning Lots 2, 3, 4 and 17 Gottingen Street (Seaboard Investments) R-2 to R-3	112
Modification of Sideyard - 87 Lynch Street	113
Storm Sewer under Howe Avenue	113
Resubdivision - 80 Prescott Street	114
Resubdivision - 174 Lady Hammond Road	115
Request for Basement Apartment - 55 Duffus Street	115
Classification - Director of Planning	116
Acquisition of two small Parcels of Land - West Side of Oxford Street, between Young Street and Bayers Road	116
Progress Estimate No. 9 - Engineering Consultants - New Incinerator	117
Certificate No. 7 - Final - Sidewalks - 1959	117
Limitation of Taxis - Increase Taxi License	118
Job Evaluation	119
Proposed Sewer Ordinance - Amendments - Sections 590 to 608 - City Charter	120
Renewal - Lease - Grafton Street Parking Lot	121
Bargaining Rights - Halifax Police Association	121
Requested Legislation Re Retiring Allowance - Secretary-Treasurer - School Board	123
1960 Legislation	123
Report - Redevelopment Committee - Acquisition of Property - No. 4 Cunard Court	124
Report - Redevelopment Committee - Liaison - Halifax Housing Authority	124
Motion - Alderman Lloyd Re: Sub-Police Station - George & Water Streets Area	124
Alteration - Street Lines - Robie Street between Young Street and Livingstone Street	126

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING

Council,  
February 11, 1960.

Control of Rodents - City Dump	127
Snowstorm - February 3, 1960	127
Sewer - Ralston Avenue	132
Plans - Bicentennial Drive	132
1960 Budget	133
Increasing the Boundaries of the City of Halifax	133
Request for Land - County of Halifax - West of Purcell's Cove Road - Fleming Heights	134
Change of Name - Halifax Tourist Committee	135
Cigarette Vending Machines	135
Annual Payment to City - Public Service Commission	138
Tax Collections for the Month of December, 1959	139
Administrative Report for January	140
Legislation - Section 512 - City Charter	140

There were present His Worship the Mayor, Chairman, Aldermen Smith, Abbott, Dunlop, Lane, Butler, Macdonald, Ferguson, Fox, Lloyd, Trainor, Ryan, Connolly, Greenwood and O'Brien.

Also present were Messrs. A. A. DeBard, Jr., R. H. Stoddard, W. J. Craney, T. C. Doyle, G. F. West, V. W. Minto, C. A. Vaughan, L. M. Kenney, A. P. Flynn, W. A. Gray, A. R. Barry, K. Hennich, H. K. Randall and Dr. A. R.

C. A. Vaughan,  
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN.

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

The meeting was called specially to consider the following items:

1. Public Hearing Re: Rezoning Block Land Bounded by Chebucto Road, Willow Street and Dublin Street from R-2 zone to R-1 zone.
2. Public Hearing Re: Amendment Zoning By-Law to Permit Multiple Housing Units - Westwood Area.
3. Reports - Redevelopment Committee.
4. 1960 Legislation.
5. Contract Provisions - Works.
6. Payrol #108 - Membership Sub-Foreman.
7. Incinerator Material and Equipment Contract - Change Orders 3 and 4.
8. Compensation Procedure.
9. Rezoning - Drummond Court Area (R-2 to R-1). Date for Hearing March 31, 1960.
10. Rezoning - Remaining Portion of Dudley Street to R-2. Date for Hearing - March 31, 1960.
11. Set Date - Laying Street Lines - Willow Tree. Date for Hearing - March 17, 1960.
12. Erection of Tower - Robie Street (C.J.C.N.) Date for Hearing - March 17, 1960.
13. Progress Estimate #15 - Incinerator Construction.
14. Progress Estimate #13 - Material and Equipment - New Incinerator.
15. Progress Estimates #24, 25 and 26 - Fairview Overpass.
16. Motion - Alderman Lloyd Re: Sub-Police Station.
17. 1960 Budget.
18. Reception Petitions and Delegations.

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING

Council Chamber,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N. S.  
February 25, 1960  
8:00 P. M.

A meeting of the City Council was held on the above date.

After the meeting was called to order by the Chairman, the members of Council attending, led by the City Clerk, joined in repeating the Lord's Prayer.

There were present His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen DeWolf, Abbott, Dunlop, Lane, Butler, Macdonald, Ferguson, Fox, Lloyd, Trainor, Wyman, Connolly, Greenwood and O'Brien.

Also present were Messrs. A. A. DeBard, Jr., R. H. Stoddard, W. J. Clancey, T. C. Doyle, G. F. West, V. W. Mitchell, J. L. Leitch, L. M. Romkey, A. P. Flynn, W. A. Gray, A. R. Barry, K. Munnich, H. K. Randall and Dr. A. R. Morton.

The meeting was called specially to consider the following items:

1. Public Hearing Re: Rezoning Block Land Bounded by Chebucto Road, Willow Street and Dublin Street from C-2 zone to R-2 zone.
2. Public Hearing Re: Amendment Zoning By-Law to Permit Multiple Housing Units - Westwood Area.
3. Reports - Redevelopment Committee.
4. 1960 Legislation.
5. Contract Provisions - Works.
6. Local #108 - Membership Sub-Foremen.
7. Incinerator Material and Equipment Contract - Change Orders 3 and 4.
8. Compensation Procedure.
9. Rezoning - Drummond Court Area (R-2 to R-1). Date for Hearing March 31, 1960.
10. Rezoning - Remaining Portion of Dudley Street to R-2. Date for Hearing - March 31, 1960.
11. Set Date - Laying Street Lines - Willow Tree. Date for Hearing - March 17, 1960.
12. Erection of Tower - Robie Street (C.J.C.H.) Date for Hearing - March 17, 1960.
13. Progress Estimate #15 - Incinerator Construction.
14. Progress Estimate #13 - Material and Equipment - New Incinerator.
15. Progress Estimates #24, 25 and 26 - Fairview Overpass.
16. Motion - Alderman Lloyd Re: Sub-Police Station.
17. 1960 Budget.
18. Reception Petitions and Delegations.

Council,  
February 25, 1960

PUBLIC HEARING RE: REZONING BLOCK LAND BOUNDED BY CHEBUCTO ROAD, WILLOW  
STREET AND DUBLIN STREET FROM C-2 ZONE TO R-2 ZONE

A Public Hearing into the matter of rezoning the block of land bounded by Chebucto Road, Willow Street and Dublin Street from C-2 zone to R-2 zone was held at this time.

His Worship the Mayor asked if any person wished to be heard in opposition to the proposal.

Mrs. J. E. MacLean, owner of flats, 101-103 Chebucto Road, addressed Council as follows: "The property next to mine has been sold and a business has been set up. My property should not be rezoned at this time; it should be left as a commercial property. I tried very hard to get somebody to help me when the property was being re-built but I did not get very much satisfaction in that respect. I feel that my property has deteriorated in value and cannot be sold as a residential property. The same driveway does for both my property and the business property next door. I think the line for rezoning should be on the east of my property. Further, I think there must have been an error in the wording of the property. I noticed by that that the rezoning is to go from the south-west corner of the property which has been bought recently by Mr. Power. In that case, that would be rezoning his property. It has been commercial and it is also to be rezoned as residential. I think there must be an error there."

His Worship the Mayor then asked to see the description of the area to be rezoned. Upon reading the same, he advised Council that there was an error and same would have to be re-advertised.

Alderman Trainor: "Mrs. MacLean called me today on this matter. Some time back when this building started in this area, she was very disturbed about it. She thought it was a residential area at that time. She went to the City officials seeking advice and counsel. One of the officials told her, the Building Inspector, that he did not issue the permit. If the Building Inspector does not issue the permit, I would like to know who does? Secondly, she also stated that she was interested in knowing who the occupants of the new building were or what type of business they were carrying on and was told that nobody in City Hall knew what type of occupancy it would be.



Council,  
February 25, 1960

"As I understand it, and I am subject to correction, I think that anybody who takes out a building permit also has to get an occupancy permit at the same time. Why these facts and this information was given to Mrs. MacLean, I would like to know."

Mrs. MacLean: "I think there might be an error there. I think it was the Building Inspector who told me that he simply issued the permit. He had nothing to say about who received the permit. He told me to call his office and the lady in his office did tell me what the building would be used for."

Alderman O'Brien: "Before this is passed, it seems to me that this proposal is brought forward because of the interest of people in that neighbourhood. Perhaps if more of them, like Mrs MacLean, were here to speak against it tonight it might influence whether we proceed to re-advertise or drop the whole matter."

Mr. John Britten: "I took up the petition of some of the residents in the area and I presented it to Alderman Trainor. He said he would present it here tonight. I live just about opposite the new building on the south side of Chebucto Road. This petition covered some of the people who live in that area concerned and some across the street. We are in favor of re-zoning. We wanted to have the place between the drugstore and the new building rezoned as well. It is a single dwelling but they told us at the meeting that they are going to leave that commercial. Why that is, I don't know. If that is re-advertised, would the whole thing be included?"

His Worship the Mayor: "It would have to go back to the Town Planning Board for further consideration."

Moved by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Greenwood, that the matter be referred back to the Town Planning Board for further consideration and report. Motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING RE: AMENDMENT ZONING BY-LAW TO PERMIT MULTIPLE HOUSING UNITS -  
WESTWOOD AREA

---

A Public Hearing into the matter of an amendment to the Zoning By-Law to permit multiple housing units in the Westwood Area was held at this time.

Council,  
February 25, 1960

No person appeared for or against the proposal.

A formal By-Law, as prepared by the City Solicitor, was submitted.

Moved by Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the By-Law as submitted be approved. Motion passed.

PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

February 25, 1960

To His Worship the Mayor and  
Members of the City Council.

At a meeting of the Redevelopment Committee, held on February 12, 1960, reports were submitted from the Compensation Officer recommending acquisition of the following properties in the Maitland Street Redevelopment Area, subject to the approval of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation:-

<u>OWNER</u>	<u>PROPERTY</u>	<u>SETTLEMENT</u>
Andrew LeVine	26 Maitland Street	\$ 7,946.81 to the owner 1,262.50 to the tenant
J. R. & Mary Driscoll	8 Maitland Street	6,215.00 being the lowest independent appraised value plus 10% for forcible taking.
Provincial Realities Ltd.	22 Maitland Street	8,891.50 broken down as follows:  Land value: \$ 7,880.00 Forcible taking 10% 788.00 $\frac{1}{2}$ cost of improvements 223.50 \$ 8,891.50

Your Committee concurs in the recommendation of the Compensation Officer.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

Alderman Lloyd: "In the Maitland Street Area, for negotiated settlements, the Committee is favoring a 10% margin, is it?"

His Worship the Mayor: "We are favoring it because we have a recommendation from our Compensation Officer which is also concurred in by the appraiser of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation."

City Manager: "We are instituting a procedure that we will not bring them before Committee until we get approval from Central Mortgage and

Council,  
February 25, 1960

Housing Corporation. I have an idea that they have these figures. I don't think we have actually received the approval."

His Worship the Mayor: "It would be contingent upon their approval."

City Manager: "That is right."

Moved by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Greenwood, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

PAYMENT OF INTEREST TO OWNERS OF EXPROPRIATED PROPERTIES

February 25, 1960

To His Worship the Mayor and  
Members of the City Council.

At a meeting of the Redevelopment Committee, held on February 12, 1960, the matter of paying interest to owners of property expropriated for the redevelopment program was considered.

Your Committee recommends that interest at the rate of 5% per annum be paid only to owners of property which has been expropriated for redevelopment purposes from the date of the taking possession of the properties to the date of settlement, when the same have been negotiated and agreed on between the owners and the City.

This policy is to be effective as of October 1, 1959.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.

Alderman Butler: "With respect to the first report from the Redevelopment Committee, is the figure \$7,880.00 the appraised value or the assessed value?"

City Clerk: "It is the lowest independent appraised value."

Alderman Butler: "So it is the appraised value plus 10%."

Alderman Lloyd: "What is the assessed value?"

His Worship the Mayor: "It is not shown here."

Alderman Butler: "Some time ago I received a set of rules or suggestions from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation that should be applied to commercial properties more so than residential; I wonder if those rules were applied to one of the properties we dealt with a moment ago where there was an amount of \$1,262.00 to the tenant. Was that a commercial property?"

Council,  
February 25, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Butler: "Are these rules being applied to all the properties in the Redevelopment Area? Were those rules applied to the case we have on appeal now, the Mattar case? Are those the rules we will submit when we go to Court?"

City Solicitor: "No. Those rules are applied only in order to reach a settlement. If we think it is a good value, then we apply it."

Alderman Butler: "If we were to apply those rules in that case in question, would we come up with any kind of a solution that would be near what they want and what we think they should get?"

City Solicitor: "If those rules were applied; what they wanted and what we thought they should get, yes, we could do it."

Alderman Butler: "I was curious to know if those rules had been applied in that particular case. I believe they were applied in another case, the Photo Engravers Limited. I was wondering why we did not apply them and if we did not apply them, why couldn't we have applied them?"

His Worship the Mayor: "You could not apply them in the Mattar case because they were not willing to accept our proposal. It went to Court instead. The Photo Engraving firm were prepared to accept."

Alderman Butler: "I see, but we did apply the same rules in both cases?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "If rules which are generally acceptable for settling cases without going to Court could be applied to the Mattar case, if you could come up with an answer satisfactory to the owners, you might avoid a lot of proceedings."

Alderman Butler: "That is the point I was making."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think it should be examined if that could be done. Should a proposal come forward from the owners and it comes within the rules as we generally apply them in these other cases, then it would seem wise to settle the matter."

Council,  
February 25, 1960

His Worship the Mayor then read the report again for the information of Alderman Dunlop who said: "Who else gets interest?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Wherever it may be applied by the Court."

Alderman Dunlop: "The Court has that in its discretion. It may or may not give 5%."

City Manager: "In the case of a Court case which is decided by the Court, they tack on 5% interest. For these voluntary ones where they come in and say 'We will sell our property voluntarily', we don't have the authorization to pay interest unless the City Council or Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation agree that the interest should be paid. A person coming in voluntarily would be losing the interest unless we have authorization to pay it. That is why we are asking to do it exactly as in a Court case. There is no provision for it except by a vote of this Council and approval by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation."

Alderman Dunlop: "These settlements which are made out of Court are about the same as done by private buyers. I have never yet seen a sale going through between private buyers where interest was paid, where the sale was concluded within a reasonable time, generally within 30 days."

His Worship the Mayor: "This is longer than that."

Alderman Dunlop: "Why should it take longer?"

City Manager: "We have to get Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation approval."

Alderman Ferguson: "Do I understand that interest is paid after the agreement has been reached until it is paid for?"

City Manager: "That is right."

Alderman Ferguson: "In other words, if there is a long delay, they will be compensated by 5% interest."

His Worship the Mayor: "No. It is from the date of expropriation."

Alderman Ferguson: "From the date of expropriation until the date of settlement."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes. We are asking for this so our

Council,  
February 25, 1960

Compensation Officer will be armed with this power to include in his negotiations."

Alderman Butler: "Are we being altogether fair to the owners of property which have come under the expropriation order? Take the case where there is a considerable delay and the City says 'We will pay 5%'. First of all the man who has his money invested pays more than 5% at the bank. Secondly, if the rents are collected by the City, I cannot accept that argument. I don't see why the City should collect the rents until it has paid the money. Five per cent is not compensating a man for his investment."

His Worship the Mayor: "We are the owners at the moment of expropriation."

Alderman Butler: "I agree with you technically that is right but what justification is there for it just because the law says it? I say it is not fair."

His Worship the Mayor: "As a lawyer, I think you should support the law."

Alderman Butler: "I also have to support the individual taxpayer. An expropriation order is passed and legally the property belongs to the City. If the property is ours, then we are entitled to the rent. I say that we hold the money. There may be quite a long period of time and it might run into months. We are generous if we say we will give the man 5% and yet we are collecting money on his investment. I don't think it is fair."

City Solicitor: "The man who doesn't settle with us and we go to Court, he only gets 5%."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think this is law from the grave when you talk like that. Everybody knows that a person who is in an existing operation, business or rented unit in the Redevelopment Area which we are going to expropriate, are faced with finding a new location. If we expropriate the property, take all the income, it is reasonable to assume that a person

Council,  
February 25, 1960

is going to try to re-locate. They haven't got the money with which to re-locate until settlement is made and the City pays them. In the interim they have to go to their bank, if they can get money, and under present banking regulations you can't get money for real estate alone, unless you have a pretty good security to show that you are going to liquidate the loan within a very short space of time. If you get the money it is going to cost 6% at least and the chances are that it may cost you more than that. Under the present interest rate level, which is at least  $7\frac{3}{4}\%$  on first mortgages and some as high as 8%, I think the City can be reasonable in cases that come forward where there is a person who says 'Look, I am willing to settle but what about the interest factor?' I think there is just one shade of difference between myself and Alderman Butler. If it can be demonstrated that the City was earning money out of the property from the rentals it was taking, then I think you should have some flexibility in recommending an interest factor that is reasonable in the circumstances."

His Worship the Mayor: "All we are asking you to do is to arm the negotiator with power to offer 5% as one of the terms of settlement."

Alderman Lloyd: "At an interest rate which he deems practical under the circumstances."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, no!"

Alderman Lane: "How many cases of this sort would there be where there would be a lengthy delay and where there would be a hardship involved?"

City Manager: "Not very many. We don't have this situation in the Jacob Street Area because we have not expropriated it yet. You are in a position where having expropriated the whole area and become owners as of September 1st, and where the thing is settled in Court, the Judge says 'You became owners on September 1st' and the man has to be paid on such and such a date, he gets interest. When he comes in voluntarily, there is no Court in it. I felt that we did not have the right to pay interest unless this Council approved of it. As to your question, Alderman Lloyd, we could take the rents, say at \$100.00 per month, but whether we collect them or not, determines whether we have a profit so we would not have the profit figure

Council,  
February 25, 1960

in time unless we make some kind of a retroactive payment on interest. Probably better than do that, it would be better to give him 5%. If we turn up with a loss on that property, he still gets 5% and we are the ones who have lost and not him."

Alderman O'Brien: "We have lost on all of them when we tear them down."

City Manager: "That is not his fault. I think what Alderman Lloyd was trying to say was to gauge the interest to income. It is a good idea except that you can't determine it in time."

City Solicitor: "When you expropriated the Maitland Street Area, I immediately made preparations to have all the titles searched so anyone who wants to settle, there need be no delay whatsoever."

Alderman Lloyd: "You mentioned the Jacob Street Area. What stage are we in?"

City Manager: "Anybody who wants to deal with the Compensation Officer, and they are every day; even the owners of large commercial buildings. There are some who have been dealing with the Compensation Officer on a voluntary basis. It may be that there will be a small hard core at some time in the future which has to be expropriated; but, as of now, we have no place to put the people. They can stay there either under our ownership or the former owner."

Alderman Lloyd: "Have we nailed down all our agreements with Ottawa with respect to Jacob Street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman Lloyd: "I am speaking now when we come down to the commercial section."

City Manager: "I am talking about the old original area."

Alderman Lloyd: "When might we get some decision on that?"

His Worship the Mayor: "The matter has gone back to Ottawa and we have to write again to the Real Estate Office because the local naval authorities have given their answer to headquarters. The Navy has expressed



Council,  
February 25, 1960

an unwillingness to local authority to part with this property."

Alderman Lloyd: "Without this property, you would have to change the plan."

His Worship the Mayor: "The plan will be meaningless insofar as extending below Barrington Street is concerned."

Alderman Lloyd: "I see. You have to wait until this matter with the naval authorities has been cleared away and so far as you know, it has not been as yet."

His Worship the Mayor: "No. It will be a week before we get an answer back."

Alderman Ferguson: "Have the people in the area been made aware of that?"

City Manager: "No, because people in that area by and large have never been approached to sell their property because we have no right to buy them. There have been one or two, one in particular, I think all the Aldermen know about that, who say they were advised by the City. I think, having examined the correspondence, that that is a rather liberal interpretation of what the City really did say to that particular owner. There is no effort being made by the Compensation Officer to deal with those people until we have a right to approach them which we don't have now, because if the Navy or Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation or somebody said that they don't want to go through with it, then we would have approached them unnecessarily. We can't help if the newspapers carry public stories of what our public discussions are."

Alderman Ferguson: "Has that been made known to that particular person?"

City Manager: "No, because I just found that out today. I'll see, perhaps, later on about it."

Alderman Ferguson: "I think that you should, probably, in view of correspondence notifying to that effect."

City Manager: "I shall. There is quite a bit of correspondence involved."

Council,  
February 25, 1960.

Alderman Lane: "Is this the big building involved in the registered mail that I received today?"

City Manager: "Yes."

Alderman Butler: "Is an amendment about the percent in order or are we fixed at 5%?"

His Worship the Mayor: "We hope you aren't going to raise the interest rate that the Courts have normally set."

Moved by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

#### LEGISLATION

Draft legislation, a copy of which is attached to the original copy of these minutes, was submitted by the City Solicitor and same was considered item by item.

##### Item 1:

Alderman O'Brien: "Before this is passed, might I ask whether we have made any progress with the staff level in the legislation for the overall changes that we discussed the other day in the Works Committee?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, with the staff level. The Director of Planning has contributed his summary of it."

Alderman O'Brien: "Do these two changes that are proposed fit into that overall picture?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, they stand apart from that, actually."

Alderman O'Brien: "But we still expect to get the overall legislation before us in time for this Session."

His Worship the Mayor: "It goes before the Town Planning Board first within the next few days, I hope."

It was agreed the item be approved.

##### Item 2:

Approved.

##### Item 3:

Alderman Dunlop: "I think there is no need for the City Electrician. I think the City Manager is the man who should be responsible for that."

Council,  
February 25, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "The City Electrician signs the permits, though."

Alderman Dunlop: "Well, the City Manager surely will consult with him, but it puts the responsibility on two persons and no one has the final say." He contended that if both the City Manager and the City Electrician are authorized to permit installations, the responsibility is divided; and he asked if they disagree, what happens.

Alderman Greenwood: "I think as far as setting fees is concerned, it is a policy matter rather than an administrative matter; and, I believe, either the Committee of Council or Council should set the fee. Certainly, the City Manager can recommend a fee but, I believe, it should still go to the Committee of the Council."

City Solicitor: "That is exactly why this was changed; because they felt it is purely an administrative matter and they should not be bothered with it. These were the instructions I received from the Committee."

Alderman Greenwood: "How many cases a year have we?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Not too many."

City Manager: "Actually, the fee is fixed and I think it is a determination who is subject to it, and it depends on the conditions. In other words, if a box is placed where it is readily accessible to the public, there is no charge; but where someone wants a box and it is for their own exclusive use, or pretty much their exclusive use, if it is a determination that this one should be free or paid for, if the Committee or Council want to do it, it is all right, but it seems to be a relatively small matter. Most of them fall pretty clearly into one or the other category."

Alderman Greenwood: "It is really a service fee rather than a license."

City Solicitor: "There is a license fee involved too, but that is drafted in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Safety."

Alderman Trainor: "How is this going to effect the establishment of taxi call boxes, which the Chief of Police is now looking into for the Safety Committee?"

City Solicitor: "That doesn't effect the taxi call boxes at all; really it is call bells, fire alarm or burglar alarm signal boxes, or other signal

Council,  
February 25, 1960.

devices. It is for fire alarm purposes only and not for call boxes."

Alderman Trainor: "It says, 'for other signal devices'."

Alderman Lloyd: "Is it intended that this should be a license fee for installations on poles owned by a utility?"

City Manager: "No, it is to control where it comes into the Police or Fire Headquarters. That is what we are trying to control. There is an obligation on the part of both the Police and Fire Departments where a call box turns in at their Headquarters, to not service them exactly, but to see that they are working; and when they ring, to see that some attention is paid to them. That is what they are paying for."

Alderman Wyman: "What happens in the case of a person who erects one of these signal devices on his own property. Do we license that under a different Section?"

City Manager: "If he brings it to these Headquarters, he is to pay a fee."

Alderman Wyman: "Yes, but not under this."

The City Solicitor pointed out that the Section reads 'upon any pole set in the streets', and he said we have no control over private property.

Alderman Wyman: "That doesn't seem to me to make sense. If this is a license to cover the cost of our handling the calls that come in from such a box, it applies just as much where the box is on private property or public property. Yet, this specifies strictly 'upon any pole set in the streets'. If, on the other hand, it is to license these things because they are things that are put on our streets and create certain problems on the street, that is a different matter; but I would like to know what we are dealing with."

City Electrician: "\$50.00 is a service charge, charged to people who have fire alarm boxes installed on their own private property and connected to their sprinkler system in the buildings. This box acts like a 'watchman'; if they have a fire and the sprinkler system goes off, this box automatically trips off and notifies the Fire Department.

"We charge them \$50.00 a year for a service charge. We inspect the box and test it once every month. If they are placed on the street, there is no charge because any citizen can use it; but if it is on private property, a

Council,  
February 25, 1960.

citizen cannot use it and we make a charge."

His Worship the Mayor: "What about a burglar alarm?"

The City Electrician said that there is only one burglar alarm, which is located at the Robert Simpson building, which is a private property.

Alderman O'Brien: "We could meet two of the objections here quite easily. It seems to me that the fee should be set on some principle basis by Council and that the permit should be issued not by Council, but by either the City Electrician or the City Manager; and I would suggest that if we cut 'Manager' out of the first line and change the 'Manager' to 'Council' in the last line, we would meet both of these points."

Alderman Wyman: "I am still not clear on what the purpose of this is. Are we going to charge ourselves the fee for the fire alarm boxes that are on the street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "If Council decides to charge a fee, then we can."

Alderman Wyman: "If this is the idea of charging a license fee for allowing a person the privilege of having something which they use placed on the public street, then it is perfectly reasonable and perfectly sensible; but if this is an idea of charging in this way in order to compensate for servicing calls when they come through, then there is something wrong with it. After all, what are the telephones we are talking about? I would think that the telephone you would see attached to a post on a public street would be a call box for a Taxi Company -- this would be the most likely thing, that or a Police Department telephone."

His Worship the Mayor said one of the reasons for this amendment to the Charter was the desire to obviate having these matters of relatively minor importance come to Council and to reduce them to an administrative function.

Alderman Wyman: "Who erects a fire alarm signal box on the public streets? Is not that a matter of our own fire alarm people?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No!"

Alderman Wyman: "When it is a public street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No!"

The City Electrician said the boxes, for which a \$50.00 fee is charged,

Council,  
February 25, 1960.

are owned by private companies who purchase them and install them.

Alderman Wyman: "Not on the public street?"

His Worship the Mayor said that some are on private property and some are on the street.

Alderman Lloyd said if they are on the public street, then there is no charge. "How is that?"

His Worship the Mayor said the reason for that is that the public have access to them and they are added protection to the citizens.

Alderman Wyman: "This proposed legislation says that if it is installed on a public street that they don't pay a license fee."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, not necessarily."

Moved by Alderman Greenwood, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the matter be referred to the Safety Committee for rewording of this Section.

Motion passed.

Item 4:

Alderman Dunlop: "Is this a new principle?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Dunlop: "What happens in case the property is destroyed by fire?"

City Solicitor: "We can't provide for everything. In case of a fire, if he is in the same position as the Mutual Life of Canada, they were held libel. I see no reason, unless you decide otherwise, to deviate from that principle."

Alderman Dunlop: "This is a new principle and I think it will lead us quite a long way down. This doesn't cover a fire, but I don't see why it shouldn't if it is a good principle. If a man goes out of business by reason of a fire, the principle is just the same. I think it is a principle in the Assessment Act of Nova Scotia and I think it is going to lead us into a lot of difficulty."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think it is all right if you apply it to business occupancy taxes. It is not applying to real estate. Occupancy taxes are taken care of. In case of fire, he can notify the Assessor that he is vacating the premises and not going back in."

Council,  
February 25, 1960.

City Solicitor: "It is only business tax."

His Worship the Mayor: "They have to notify because, for instance, if a man operates a garage in Halifax, he ceases to operate the business, moves somewhere else and operates his business there, he moves back for the un-expired portion of the year and he starts his business again along this street, he pays his taxes in both places in one year."

Alderman Lane: "Isn't that contrary to the statute which says you can't be assessed twice for the same year?"

City Solicitor: "There is no such statute."

Alderman Lane: "Did I understand in case of a fire that the insurance company is responsible for the loss where the tax is concerned?"

City Solicitor: "In the case I referred to they were assessed, they didn't appeal it; and after the first of the year, the whole building burned down and they were held responsible for the full year's taxes on the building and the land."

Moved by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Lloyd, that the item be approved. Motion passed.

Item 5:

Approved.

Item 6:

Alderman Dunlop: "I think that that should stop at the words, 'official plan'. Every year we are going to the Legislature getting closed streets. I don't think it should be limited to the three special reasons. I would stop at, 'shown on any official plan', which would give us the right to close off any street. There certainly isn't any harm in asking for it."

His Worship the Mayor suggested a safeguard such as a public hearing and the approval of the Minister of the Municipal Affairs.

The City Solicitor then read the section as follows:

"The City may by resolution of Council close to public use any street or portion of street shown on any official plan after public hearing and the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs."

The item was then approved.

Council,  
February 25, 1960.

in the Items 7, 8, 9 and 10: in the afternoon."

Approved. *Chair:* "Business hours in a house start from 7:30 in the morn-

ing on Items 11 and 12: ight. I quite agree that I think 'reasonable' time is

The Commissioner of Works explained Item 12 as follows: "We are attempt-  
ing to consolidate everything pertaining to sewers in one place and make it  
easily available to both the staff and citizens who are interested in the  
Plumbing By-Laws and Regulations. We are suggesting that we put it into an  
Ordinance, and this particular Section pertains to which Committee of the  
Council has the authority to make plumbing regulations. We feel since the  
plumbing is so closely allied with the Works operations and since the permits  
are issued under the Works Department, although the applications are processed  
through the Health Department, it would be much better to have it under one  
Department."

Alderman Lloyd: "It is Council that approves of regulations, not a  
Committee. Surely, we aren't going to start providing the powers going in the  
opposite direction. Every opportunity we get, I think we should place it in  
the hands of the Council. The Committee on Works can recommend, but Council  
should approve of regulations the Committee recommends."

It was agreed that the item be redrafted to provide a recommendation  
from the Committee on Works and the approval of City Council.

Items 13 and 14: Works at a meeting held on the above date considered  
a report from the City Manager recommending that the following clauses be in-  
cluded in the Contract Provisions:

Approved.

Item 15: reads:

(A) Approved.

(B) Alderman Wyman: "Shouldn't there be the word 'reasonable' in  
there? It says, 'at any time of the day' and while, presumably, the Assessor  
will use reasonable discretion at the time in which he will demand entrance in-  
to a house, don't you think that the regulations should have the word  
'reasonable' time?"

Alderman Dunlop: "Then the Assessor gets into an argument on what is a  
'reasonable' time."

City Solicitor: "The only way out is to state your hours."

Alderman Abbott: "It should be between business hours, between 9 o'clock



Council,  
February 25, 1960.

in the morning and 6 o'clock in the afternoon."

Alderman Lane: "Business hours in a house start from 7:30 in the morning on until 10:30 at night. I quite agree that I think 'reasonable' time is a most nebulous term. I don't know how you would decide if it is the right time of day to enter a house. I think 'by appointment' would be better."

City Solicitor: "We just had that problem last year. They wouldn't let him in at any time."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think Alderman Lane is right. I think in legislation, you can rely upon the City Assessor to equip his men with identification cards and to use their common sense in judging the time. I think the power should be there. It won't be abused."

Moved by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Greenwood, that the item be approved. Motion passed.

Item 16:

Approved.

CONTRACT PROVISIONS - WORKS

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council.

From: Committee on Works.

Date: February 16, 1960.

Subject: Contract Provisions - Works.

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the City Manager recommending that the following clause be deleted from the Works Contract Provisions:

The Clause reads:

"The hourly rate of wages to be paid by the Contractor or his sub-contractor shall be a fair and reasonable one, and not less than the current rates for the respective classes of labour being paid by the City of Halifax to its employees."

On motion of Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Connolly, the Committee recommended the report to City Council, but agreed that the words "fair and reasonable" be left in the specifications.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. Martin,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

Moved by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Connolly, that the report be approved.

Alderman Dunlop: "What is going to be put in?"

Council,  
February 25, 1960.

City Manager: "Nothing."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think there should be something. I think the rate of wages should be the rate of wages prevailing in the locality. I don't think we should leave it free for outside contractors to come in and pay any rate they want to. I didn't see anything very much wrong with leaving our own scale of rates in there. I think there should be some scale of rates provided in this contract. Otherwise, we will have price cutting."

City Manager: "The reason it was brought up was that in discussions at various times the members of Council talked about contracting certain stages of City work. Presumably, it would be cheaper to do it by contract. It couldn't be cheaper to do it by contract except for cost of supervision and possibly greater efficiency. That would be a relatively small amount of the total if it were true. The only way to find any comparison is to let contractors come in and bid."

Alderman Dunlop: "I think it should be the rate of wages prevailing in the locality which will require them to pay the going rate set by the construction."

Alderman Ferguson: "What is the going rate -- the construction rate, the City rate or the rate outside the construction industry? You have three going rates. In the locality, you have the City of Halifax and the area governed by the Industrial Standards Act. You have areas outside that aren't."

Alderman Dunlop: "In the Federal contract they have a clause. I think it is the prevailing rate."

Alderman Ferguson: "They have a rate that they list."

Alderman Macdonald: "At the moment, I understand there are two different rates being paid to plasterers in the City. It is going to cause some confusion."

His Worship the Mayor: "Isn't it a matter for the Union to police that? They are governed by Unions."

Alderman Ferguson: "Why should we get into setting private contractor's rates?"

Alderman Lloyd: "I think the Manager is right."

Alderman Dunlop: "For instance, you take tearing down buildings. The City is giving contracts for tearing down buildings. Some of the contractors come from outside this City."

City Manager: "I think they are inside the City, actually."

Council,  
February 25, 1960

Alderman Dunlop: "I understand that one of the main contractors does not pay one cent of taxes to the City. He brings in a good deal of his labourers from outside. Do they pay the prevailing rates for labour? If we take this out of the contract, it is going to allow that man to bring people in from outside and pay them the rate prevailing in Armdale."

Alderman Dunlop moved that the Clause remain as at present and stated: "I think there should be some Clause in there which requires a man entering into a contract with the City to pay some amount of wages. I don't think we should leave it to him to go around and bargain to get the lowest price."

There was no seconder to the motion.

Alderman O'Brien: "We considered the point which Alderman Dunlop has raised. We felt that by leaving in the words 'fair and reasonable' there would be some flexibility and also some protection against serious price cutting and really low wage rates by contractors coming in."

The motion was put and passed with Alderman Dunlop wishing to be recorded against.

LOCAL #108 - MEMBERSHIP SUB-FOREMEN

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
From: Committee on Works  
Date: February 16, 1960  
Subject: Local 108 - Membership Sub-Foremen

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the City Manager recommending that the City apply to the Dept. of Labour of the Province of Nova Scotia for exclusion of sub-foremen from the bargaining unit represented by Local 108.

On motion of Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Lane, the Committee approved the report and recommended it to City Council and also recommended to City Council that the fee of \$6.00 for the foremen and sub-foremen to belong to the Foremen Club be paid by the City.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

Council,  
February 25, 1960

City Manager: "The Solicitor for the Union is ill and he requested that this not be considered until he is able to be present. I think that is a reasonable request."

His Worship the Mayor: "The Union asked me too to be heard on this matter and I think it is fair that we should hear them. We will hear them when it is before Council again."

The matter was then deferred until the next regular meeting of Council.

INCINERATOR MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT CONTRACT - CHANGE ORDERS 3 and 4

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
From: Committee on Works  
Date: February 16, 1960  
Subject: Incinerator Material and Equipment Contract - Change Orders 3 and 4

---

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the City Manager recommending Change Orders #3 and 4 in the Incinerator Material and Equipment Contract for a total of \$188.00.

On motion of Alderman Macdonald, seconded by Alderman Connolly, the Committee approved the report and recommended it to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Butler, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

COMPENSATION PROCEDURE

To: His Worship, C. A. Vaughan, and Members of the City Council  
From: A. A. DeBard, Jr., City Manager  
Date: February 17, 1960  
Subject: Compensation Procedure

---

Mr. Borland has suggested the procedure set forth below as being best considering the various parties concerned.

1. The Compensation Officer discuss the matter fully with the Corporation's Mr. A. E. Ridout, or such other person I may nominate. Sufficient time should be allowed for investigation, before recommending any action to the Redevelopment Committee.

Council,  
February 25, 1960

2. After the above consultation the Compensation Officer may consider it advisable to discuss settlement further with the owner, before making his recommendation to the Committee.

3. Before the recommendation of the Committee is presented to Council, the official views of the Corporation should be sought, which may or may not be of assistance to Council in making its decision.

Mr. C. D. Smith, Compensation Officer, and the writer agree the procedure is a logical one.

A. A. DeBard, Jr.,  
CITY MANAGER.

MOVED by Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

REZONING - DRUMMOND COURT AREA (R-2 to R-1). DATE FOR HEARING MARCH 31, 1960

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
From: Town Planning Board  
Date: February 16, 1960  
Subject: Rezoning - Drummond Court Area (R-2 - R-1)

---

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending in favor of rezoning the Drummond Court Area from R-2 to R-1.

On motion of Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Lane, the Board approved the report and recommended to City Council that a date be set for a public hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the report be approved and that Council fix March 31, 1960, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, City Hall, Halifax, Nova Scotia, as a time and place for a Public Hearing into this matter. Motion passed.

ZONING - REMAINING PORTION OF DUDLEY STREET TO R-2. DATE FOR HEARING MARCH 31, 1960

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
From: Town Planning Board  
Date: February 16, 1960  
Subject: Zoning - Remaining Portion of Dudley Street to R-2

---

Council Chamber, City Hall, Halifax, Nova Scotia, as the time and place for  
a Public Hearing into this matter. Motion passed.  
ERECTION OF TOWER - ROBIE STREET (C.J.C.H.). DATE FOR HEARING MARCH 17, 1960

Council,  
February 25, 1960

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending the zoning of the remaining portion of Dudley Street to R-2.

On motion of Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Connolly, the Board approved the report and recommended to City Council that a date be set for a public hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman Greenwood, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the report be approved and that Council fix March 31, 1960, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, City Hall, Halifax, Nova Scotia, as the time and place for a Public Hearing into this matter. Motion passed.

SET DATE - LAYING STREET LINES - WILLOW TREE. DATE FOR HEARING MARCH 17, 1960

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
From: Town Planning Board  
Date: February 16, 1960  
Subject: Set Date - Laying Street Lines - Willow Tree

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending the laying of street lines at the Willow Tree. The Director of Planning explained that the building line would only be laid on the Robie Street frontage of the C-2 zone adjoining the northwest corner of Quinpool Road.

On motion of Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, the Board approved the report and recommended to City Council that March 17, 1960, be set as the date for a public hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman Macdonald, seconded by Alderman Butler, that the report be approved and that Council fix March 17, 1960, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, City Hall, Halifax, Nova Scotia, as the time and place for a Public Hearing into this matter. Motion passed.

ERECTION OF TOWER - ROBIE STREET (C.J.C.H.). DATE FOR HEARING MARCH 17, 1960

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council  
From: Town Planning Board  
Date: February 16, 1960  
Subject: Erection of Tower - Robie Street - (C. J. C. H.)

Council,  
February 25, 1960

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending in favor of the erection of a 50' guyed tower at #741 Robie Street, (C.J.C.H.).

On motion of Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Macdonald, the Board approved the report and recommended to City Council that a date be set for a public hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman Dunlop, seconded by Alderman Greenwood, that the report be approved without a Public Hearing.

Alderman Dunlop: "We have an incinerator chimney in the north end and another tower owned by the Telephone Company. We never had a Public Hearing when the Telephone Company asked to put up a tower on their building."

His Worship the Mayor: "We have microwave towers all over town and we never had Public Hearings for them."

Alderman Wyman: "The location of their plant is in a commercial zone?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Wyman: "If it were not a residential area, I would think we would have a hearing."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

The motion was then put and passed.

PROGRESS ESTIMATE #15 -- INCINERATOR CONSTRUCTION

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

From: Committee on Works

Date: February 16, 1960

Subject: Progress Estimate #15 - Incinerator Construction

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Commissioner of Works recommending payment of Progress Estimate #15, re Incinerator construction.

On motion of Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman Macdonald, the Committee recommended to City Council payment of Progress Estimate #15, re Incinerator construction, in the amount of \$22,996.50, to Foundation Maritime Limited.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,  
CLERK OF WORKS.