

Council,
May 26, 1960.

today they are the choice properties of the City of Vancouver. Just to digress a little bit, I believe that a number of you read Time Magazine, and there has been an article in last week's Time Magazine about a rock in Caracas, a bare rock, and there is a \$30,000,000.00 development taking place on this rock. It is entirely built up. So, why should we go into the conjunction of what is bad and what is good land. The needs of the City and of the population will determine what is good and what is bad; and we had to confine ourselves to simple facts. Again, the previous speakers have mentioned that we referred to some mysterious housing development in the Lake Williams area. I don't know where in this report is there any reference to a housing development. To the best of my knowledge we haven't referred to any housing development. We were talking about increase in population but maybe this is what induced some of the speakers to talk about housing development. Obviously, if we have an increase in population, houses will have to be built to house these people. But, whether this housing development will take place in the Lake Williams area, or beyond Lake Williams area, or far in the background there, I don't know, maybe four or five miles west of the North West Arm Bridge. This, I don't know. I haven't referred, and we were not concerned with it in this report. I also believe that pulling a little bit further from the North West Arm shoreline, the so-called 'bad lands', it becomes better, and some of this land is very comparable to land in the Bedford Basin or in the Dartmouth area.

"Mention has been made, here, about traffic being normally channelled outside of the City instead of inside. Well, gentlemen, this Bridge is supposed to channel the traffic out of the City. It is, primarily, a connection between people working in the City and people living outside of the City, with a limited amount of by-passing commercial traffic which may come over the Bicentennial Drive. I would like to, again, insist on the fact that in our earnings prognostics, and in our traffic analyses, we have given very little consideration to possible commercial traffic, and the Bridge shows complete feasibility, within the 27-year period, based on traffic commuting between Halifax and the so-called Spryfield-Herring Cove area, or whatever area may be developed there.

"Another item brought up, here, which is contrary to the facts, is the

Council,
May 26, 1960.

statement made that certain property, what I mean by property is actually houses, will have to be demolished in the vicinity of Oakland Road, or in the vicinity of Robie Street. I believe mention has been given particularly to Oakland Road. Our plan #3 locates every single house, on the Halifax side, in the neighbourhood of the Bridge and, as can be seen by very superficial examination, there is not a single house affected. On drawing #3, there isn't a single house that has to be demolished because of the construction of the Bridge. The only possible change there, is the re-location of a Transmission Tower."

His Worship the Mayor: "What about the Robie Street approach? Are there any houses being demolished, there?"

Mr. Benn: May I just continue? We are clearing, also, at least in our report layout (which after all it has to be remembered is only a preliminary one based on area maps) but even here we are clearing every house until the Rotary, on the left arm of the Bridge, and there will be certain portions in the Spryfield-Herring Cove area which will be affected but I believe this can be done, so demolition of some of these houses will only be of benefit for the area.

"As far as the Robie Street area is concerned, we are crossing, admittedly, a very valuable property there but we are not touching any of the houses, neither in the Halifax area nor on the north of it; and I believe there is only one or two properties which are involved. So, statements made, actually even statements made in the Press that valuable houses will have to be demolished, and so on, are not accurate.

"We have tried to be, in our study, very objective. In our opinion, a Bridge is not only feasible, and I think whether or not it is feasible is proven here -- not only is it feasible, but it can be financed by revenue bond financing if the City, and the Province, and the County will guarantee the revenue. It has been said by, I believe, Mr. Kanigsberg again, that 6% is a very unrealistic figure, but I am not a bond revenue specialist. Generally speaking if, and when, this project will go ahead and if, and when, we should be retained to do the study, a bond revenue specialist will be called upon to make recommendations

Council,
May 26, 1960.

how these bonds will be raised. I don't know if Mr. Kanigsberg is an authority on bond revenue financing, but I can tell you that we have inquired with very substantial Houses in New York and in Canada -- we had conversation on this with the Minister of Highways and, I believe, the Government of Nova Scotia use bond revenue financing for many projects, and we have been told that 6% is a very realistic figures as of today."

His Worship the Mayor: "Our last issue was 5.75 City of Halifax, in March."

Mr. Benn: "So, we have been a little bit more conservative although it may not please Mr. Kanigsberg. So, 6% I maintain as of today is a realistic figure. Obviously, if you are going to rate four, five or maybe ten years, this figures may not be realistic any more at that time. It is also the contrary claim that, on the basis of our findings, there will be no problem in revenue bond financing. We based this contention on experience for working for Banking Houses. Our Associates have made studies on much bigger projects than this -- one of their latest studies is the Chesapeake Low level bridge and tunnel. It is a project of \$140,000,000.00, which is being financed entirely by Banking Houses, on the basis of reports made by our Associates. So, until proper experts, well-recognized experts, will claim that this is not so, I submit that our contentions should be accepted. We further say that not only is it feasible, necessary and possible to say any unnecessary delay in the construction of such a Bridge may constitute an impediment to the future growth of the Spryfield-Herring Cove area, because of impossible access to this area, but only because of that, or may force the Spryfield-Herring Cove area to develop an independent commercial district completely independent from the City of Halifax which, certainly, will not be of benefit to the Halifax business people. I repeat, again, that this is entirely an unbiased report, we have no axe to grind. We will be glad to answer any possible technical question but we cannot get involved in sentiment, as far as citizens living in one or other particular area. We understand, very well, that nobody would like to have a Bridge over his personal property, but these same citizens will also understand that we couldn't get involved in personal consideration, and that we have to base

Council,
May 26, 1960.

our report on general interest and general fact.

One item to close, it has been said that a Bridge may spoil the natural beauty of the North West Arm. I agree that it may spoil, but it may also enhance, the natural beauty of it. It depends how the Bridge is designed, how it is located; how it is treated. You can make an awfully ugly looking structure; you can make a very beautiful structure. This applies to bridges as well as to other structures. Every engineer, I believe, is fully conscious of this and of our own we have, repeatedly, mentioned the fact that the Bridge built over the North West Arm would be of such nature as to enhance its beauty. We believe that, for instance, the Robie Street Bridge will be an asset for the North West Arm. We may refer to this for just examples, of the Sagamore Bridge, or Twin Bridge, going down to Cape Code over the Sagamore Arm. I doubt it whether anyone will think that the Bridge there spoils the appearance of the surroundings. I think it will enhance it, and if it is majestic and properly treated, it will contribute to the beauty."

His Worship the Mayor: "Thank you, Mr. Benn.

"Anybody else in favour of the proposal?

As there are none, it is best to adjourn this hearing tonight."

Alderman Lloyd: "Are you moving that we adjourn this consideration?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, just deferring consideration of the report."

Alderman Lloyd: "Are you saying that representation should be made before the Council and Provincial authorities, who are in this programme?"

His Worship the Mayor: "I don't know that."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think they should be."

His Worship the Mayor: "They can be made to them. My only feeling on this Bridge location is that we don't want to put ourselves in a position where we found ourselves on the Bicentennial Highway Entrances. Our consideration, at the moment, if the Bridge goes across the Arm, is the best site insofar as the City of Halifax is concerned."

Alderman Lloyd: "This raises many questions, Your Worship, and I am sure the Council will take into account the very excellent presentations made

Council,
May 26, 1960.

here this evening. I am happy that most of them have been written documents, and that we can refer to them, but there are many factors which even the lawyers and engineers haven't dealt with, problems of the economics of this area and growth trends which we are familiar with, because we live here and we know the economic factors. Those, they can tell us too, perhaps, from the different view points than have been expressed."

His Worship the Mayor: "In further consideration of this, you have the benefit of the Minutes which will be reported in full to you, and the briefs submitted will be incorporated in the Minutes."

The matter was then deferred for further consideration.

PUBLIC HEARING RE: REPEALING SECTION 5 OF PART XI OF THE HALIFAX
ZONING BY-LAW

A Public Hearing into the matter of Repealing Section 5 of Part XI of the Zoning By-Law was held at this time.

No written objections were received.

His Worship the Mayor: "It does away with appeals we get sometimes in the establishment of Beauty Parlours, Barber Shops, etc. in residential sections of the City. It was suggested we consider this sometime in the future when we had no appeals before us, so we could consider the whole thing in the manner of good zoning rather than individual appeals before us."

Alderman Ferguson: "As it is now, you can have a Barber Shop or Beauty Parlour in your own property, if you reside there, and no exterior changes. Is that right?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, that is right. They are not permitted in R-1."

Alderman Ferguson: "This would put it plainly in Commercial."

His Worship the Mayor: "It puts a Beauty Parlour or Barber Shop plainly in a Commercial Zone."

Alderman Ferguson: "What about the ones that are there now? Are they non-conforming?"

His Worship the Mayor: "They're non-conforming uses, but those in operation will continue on."

Alderman Connolly: "These other businesses which are operating in

Council,
May 26, 1960.

a residential zone; such as accountants, electricians, plumbers, etc.; will they be affected?"

His Worship the Mayor: "They are not permitted, by the way. Electricians and plumbers are not permitted in a residential zone. Accountants are. Some, I know, are in existence in defiance of the law."

No persons appeared for or against the proposed amendment.

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the amendment, as prepared by the City Solicitor, be approved. Motion passed.

AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCE NO. 49 - PLUMBING AND BUILDING PERMIT FEES -
SECOND READING

AMENDMENTS

BE IT ENACTED by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Halifax as follows:

1. Clause (c) of Section 1 of Ordinance Number 49, respecting Fees to be paid for Building and Plumbing Permits is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(c) For roughing in or installing each fixture, as defined in the said regulations up to and including ten such fixtures 0.40¢

2. Clause (d) of Section 1 of said Ordinance Number 49 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(d) For roughing in or installing each fixture, as defined in the said regulations in excess of ten such fixtures 0.25¢

MOVED by Alderman Fox, seconded by Alderman Ferguson, that the amendments be approved. Motion passed.

AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCE NO. 52 - DEED TRANSFER TAX - SECOND READING

AMENDMENTS

BE IT ENACTED by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Halifax as follows:

1. Clause (d) of Ordinance Number 52, the Halifax Deed Transfer Act, is amended by striking out the words "the legal title to land, tenements, hereditaments or other form" in the third and fourth lines thereof (being the second and third lines of the printed ordinance) and substituting therefor the words "any right or power in respect of any kind."

Council,
May 26, 1960.

2. Clause (e) of Section 1 of said Ordinance Number 52 is amended by striking out the words "the legal title of" in the first and second lines thereof (being the first line of the printed ordinance).
3. Clause (f) of Section 1 of said Ordinance Number 52 is amended by striking out the words "the legal title to" in the second line thereof.
4. Clause (1) of Section 1 of said Ordinance Number 52 is amended by striking out the words "the legal title to land, tenements, hereditaments, or any other form of" in the first, second and third lines thereof (being the first and second lines of the printed ordinance)
5. Subsection (3) of Section 3 of said Ordinance Number 52 is amended by striking out the words "title to" in the first and second lines thereof (being the first line of the printed ordinance).

MOVED by Alderman Fox, seconded by Alderman Ferguson, that the amendments be approved. Motion passed.

DOWNTOWN PARKING GARAGE

His Worship the Mayor: "Mr. George Mitchell is here on behalf of the Downtown Business and Professional Men's Association, and wishes to be heard.

On our Display Board is the sketch plan of the proposed parking garage."

Mr. Mitchell: "Your Worship, Members of the Council, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am here this evening representing the Downtown Business and Professional Men's Association of Halifax. We have, what we believe is, a very serious problem which is facing the downtown area. We have a solution we are prepared to put forward to you, this evening. A brief, concerning our proposal, has been circulated to all the Aldermen, and we trust some attention has been paid to it. We have heard some discussion concerning various 'bad lands' in the County of Halifax but we are concerned with some 'bad lands' within the City of Halifax, which we think is more important. Our proposal is to have, in the centre of Halifax, erected a parking garage. Now, that is what we propose. We feel there is a very grave problem concerning parking in the downtown area. We feel this is the only reasonable solution; a solution which has been reached in all of the other Cities, of any size, in Canada and the United States. We feel that the time has come to do something about it, here, in Halifax.

Council,
May 26, 1960.

"I don't propose to read the brief, but what I think I will do, is go through it and just point out a few of the highlights which are contained in it. First of all, I think we should consider who this Association represents. I am sure all of you know, and have heard of, these Downtown Businessmen's Association. It is made up of, at present, one hundred and eighteen members, and the Association is the only voice of all the other businessmen in the City of Halifax. The assessment of the active members of the Association totals something over \$10,000,000.00. These Downtown Businessmen are the businessmen who, we feel, carry on the life of the City. In the course of a year, these people pay the City, by way of taxes, both real estate and occupancy, something over half a million dollars. I don't know, exactly, what proportion that is to the total revenue of the City, but I think it is quite considerable."

City Manager: "You said they represented all the merchants in Halifax. You didn't mean that - you meant the downtown merchants?"

Mr. Mitchell: "Well, the Downtown Merchants. They have one hundred and eighteen active members, and that is the only voice for the balance of the downtown businessmen."

City Manager: "You said all of Halifax."

Mr. Mitchell: "I am sorry. It is confined to the downtown businessmen. Just so there won't be any confusion, we feel the boundaries of downtown are on the south, Spring Garden Road; on the west, Brunswick Street; on the north, Buckingham Street, and it continues on down to Halifax Harbour."

"The brief points out that the businessmen are suffering as a result of failure of parking space in the downtown area, at a considerable loss of revenue. You will note in the brief there are several examples which indicate that, in the downtown area, considerable space is for rent or for lease, and has been for some time. There have been, until recently, quite a number of buildings which have been offered for sale for some time but which have not been sold. All of this means a considerable loss in revenue to these businessmen, in the downtown area, who are supporting the City. These businessmen are losing revenue because they do not have people in their buildings, the customers are not coming downtown. When somebody moves out of a downtown office building, nobody

Council,
May 26, 1960.

moves in to replace them. At present there is not an influx of new business into the downtown area. All of this results in a serious loss, and a present loss, to the downtown businessman."

His Worship the Mayor: "Some of this results from the building of the Ralston Building and the Bank of Canada Building."

Mr. Mitchell: "No, I don't think it is. I don't agree. I think what the Ralston Building has done is to bring together a lot of Government Offices which were situated in different parts of the City. True, some of them were situated in the downtown area but, basically, it brings in Departments from outside the downtown area and locates them there. In any event, it creates a parking problem itself, because it does not provide sufficient parking space for all the people who use the building. It increases the problem more than anything else. The problem will increase with the opening of the new Bank of Canada Building, also on Hollis Street. They do have some parking there but it is not sufficient. The loss to the businessmen is not only present but it is a continuing and a future loss because they are suffering, and will continue to suffer, from the loss in the resale value of their properties. Although, we realize that this affects the downtown businessmen, it also, we feel, affects the City to a considerable extent. We think that the City has the same interest in the parking problem and it has an interest which it should preserve. We have indicated in the brief one reference to an assessment appeal which was carried out this year, in which the building situated on Barrington Street had its assessment reduced by over \$20,000.00. The reason for that was because the building had not been rented for a certain period of time, and one of the principal reasons was that the owner of the building had not been able to secure tenants because there was, absolutely, no parking in the area. That was one of the principal reasons."

City Manager: "I'm sorry, Your Worship, I will have to disagree with that. Mr. Thomson can give evidence as to why the assessment was reduced."

Mr. Mitchell: "I'm not saying that was the reason but it was a portion of the reason why it was reduced."

City Manager: "No, that wasn't even mentioned in the Court of Tax Appeals."

Council,
May 26, 1960.

Mr. Mitchell: "In any event it was reduced."

City Manager: "Yes, but not for that reason."

Alderman Lloyd: "Was there any reason given?"

City Manager: "Yes. It was an obsolete building. Mr. Thomson can go into detail as to what is wrong with the building itself. As a matter of fact, the occupant of the building is in another building where there is no parking. He didn't move because of that reason."

Mr. Mitchell: "Well, be that as it may. The building has now a reduced assessment which this year will mean a loss to the City, I think, of over \$1,000.00. This sort of thing is beginning, and I'm suggesting and submit to you that it will, in all likelihood, continue. Once this sort of thing gets underway everybody, as it were, will probably 'jump on the bandwagon', and I feel in years to come the assessment of a great many people in the downtown area will decrease and, therefore, the revenue to the City will, consequently, decrease as well. We are submitting a proposal for a parking garage. The Association has, for some time, felt the need of a reasonable solution to the parking problem and they have, themselves, done a considerable amount of investigation and work. For one thing, they have engaged a Solicitor to look into it and they have, also, gone to the trouble and expense of engaging an Architect to prepare plans, which you have before you this evening. Albeit, these are rather rough sketches but they are here to indicate to you the type of building which we hope, in the not too distant future, will appear. The Association has also dealt with various interested parties who wish to establish a parking garage here. They have selected a piece of property in the downtown area which they feel is ideally suited to the establishment of a downtown parking garage.

"The property in question has been considered very tentatively by the City itself and it is the area bounded by Hollis Street on the east, Sackville Street on the north, and Granville Street on the west. The area of which we are immediately concerned would measure, roughly, 122 feet on Sackville Street and go south some 200 feet. I'm sure you are all familiar with it. I have with me this evening, photographs which I would like to circulate among the Aldermen. I know they are familiar with the area. It just indicates the type of building

Council,
May 26, 1960.

which is now on the land we are concerned with. I think it is fairly obvious from looking at the pictures and from your own knowledge, that the land itself is not satisfactory and not land which should be used the way it is being used in the heart of downtown Halifax. Certain portions of it are slum housing, certain other portions are used for business. None of them are in particularly good repair and what we are suggesting is something which we feel will enhance the centre of Halifax and change something which we feel is a blight in the centre of our City.

"At present, the land under consideration has a set value of approximately \$272,000.00. The revenue to the City from that property is approximately \$12,500.00. It is difficult to calculate what any future assessment of the land might be, but I would suggest with a parking garage on the property, and the continuation of the businesses on the Hollis Street level, that the assessment of the area would, probably, double in any event. At present, portions of this land are assessed on a residential basis, which bring in a much lower return to the City by way of taxes. Any parking garage erected on the land would be assessed on a business basis; the tax on it, at a business rate, would bring to the City of Halifax a further direct source of revenue. As well as bringing a direct source of revenue, we feel that it would bring an increased indirect source of revenue.

"If a garage such as this were situated in downtown Halifax, as we suggest it must be, it would increase the volume of business of everyone in the downtown area; and it would stop the trend of businesses away from the downtown area and thereby maintain, or possibly increase, the present revenues of the City from the downtown area.

"In their efforts to look into this very closely, the Association has discussed the question of purchasing the land under consideration, privately. As a result of investigations made, they have found that it is impossible to purchase this land by means of a private purchase. It's something that cannot be done and, perhaps, that is the principal reason why we are here this evening. We feel that such a parking garage must be established and it is vital to the life and future of downtown Halifax. We feel that since the City has an interest in it, that they should be prepared to take certain steps. We have gone

Council,
May 26, 1960.

into this and our proposal at the moment is: that the City take action to expropriate the whole of the property in question.

"It may be that the City Council may not approve of such a move but we feel that such a move can be done under the powers of the City Council at present. We feel they have the legal authority to do so; we feel that such a move is in the good interests of all Halifax, particularly the centre of the City which is, as we all know, and has been for a long time, the centre of the Maritime Provinces. We want to keep it that way but we feel that unless something is done, such will not be the case in the years to come. At present there are a number of people interested in erecting this parking garage. What we are suggesting is that the City expropriate and then lease the property in question, by way of a tender to private enterprise.

"There are four groups -- two local groups and two groups from outside the Province, who are extremely interested in erecting a parking garage. Some of them have had considerable experience elsewhere and others have not. But, I think they all feel that it would be a good financial gamble; and I don't think even a gamble. It is something that has proven itself elsewhere and we feel it would certainly prove itself here.

"Our plan, as we suggest, would perhaps in the first instance involve the City in a certain amount of expense in acquiring the land. We feel that the expropriation of the land, the cost of it could be minimized by permitting the businesses which are established on the Hollis Street level to remain there. It may be that their premises will have to be rebuilt for them but they will be able to stay there and, therefore, the cost of relocating them in some other part of the City would not have to be considered.

"In any event, it is our submission that such a project would, in the long term, be self-liquidating. This has been the case in other Cities. The parking garages have been able to show such a substantial return that not only have operating costs been kept up with, and interest charges, but principle amounts have been repaid. Perhaps the City we have investigated most closely, and which will closely approximate Halifax, is that of Vancouver. We have in the brief several statements concerning the operation of parking garages in Vancouver. Very briefly, what they have done in Vancouver is, raised money by way of a Public

Council,
May 26, 1960.

Improvement By-Law and this money has been used to acquire sites in the City. The downtown businessmen were assessed a certain amount necessary to cover the interest charges of this improvement money. The downtown businessmen have formed a company which was able to submit the lowest tender on the erection of garages and the establishment of parking lots, and they, themselves, operate the lots there. They have found the parking garages to be very successful. They have utilized the self-park type of garage whereby the customer goes into the garage himself, parks the car himself, locks the car himself, and, then, when he comes out, he pays his fee, whatever it may be. They have also utilized a system which is, perhaps, opposite to that of a normal parking lot. Their desire is to bring short-term parkers into the downtown area. They want the housewife to come in and do her shopping there -- they want the businessman to be able to come in and park, and go and do his business; and without having to walk a considerable distance, and also to be able to do it at a reasonable rate. In Vancouver they have reversed the normal trend. They charge for the first hour there -- 10¢ -- and as time progresses, they charge a slightly higher rate. We would suggest that if a parking garage were to be established here, the same scheme might have been carried out. In any event, it has been shown the scheme of charging a small amount has been very successful and results in a large turnover of the cars in the garage.

"One Page 11 of the brief, there is a statement, a quotation prepared by Tempest DeWolf, who is the managing Director of the Downtown Association, in Vancouver. I won't read the whole thing but the import of it is that in their downtown parking garages, they have discovered that in the busy districts they have been able to turn over the capacity of the garage many times per day, which results in a greater income. He says, referring to one particular garage, that they have occasionally turned over this lot ten times. He is referring to Lot No.6, and you will note on Page 12 of the Brief that it indicates that Lot No.6 has a capacity for one hundred and eighteen cars. It would mean in this particular case, there were approximately 1,100 odd cars in one garage in one day. We are not suggesting that, perhaps, the same thing would apply here but we think very likely it would.

Council,
May 26, 1960.

"One further statement in connection with the Vancouver parking garage: it's not contained in the brief but we have figures to suggest the minimum earnings per parking booth in their garages have been \$20.00 a month. That is their basic minimum per transient parker. That would amount to approximately \$240.00 per year per berth.

"The proposal we are suggesting for Halifax would be a parking garage containing something in the vicinity of 300 berths. We feel that that is, perhaps, not too large because with the increase in growth of the downtown Halifax area, you would need at least that many. That would mean that there would be an approximate gross revenue, from a project such as this, of around \$70,000.00. We feel that this is sufficient to indicate to you that any private industry going into a venture such as this, that it would be well able to pay any taxes assessed on it; it would be able to pay a rental to the City sufficient to cover any outlay made to acquire any property by expropriation and it would, also be sufficient to repay capital to the City so that in the long term it wouldn't cost the taxpayers one cent. That is the beauty of this program. It does mean that the City may have to go to some trouble at present to acquire the land and to lease it and, perhaps, enter into negotiations with private individuals. But, in the long run it isn't going to cost the City of Halifax one cent.

"The Downtown Businessmen's Association, as you are all aware, at present operates the Grafton Street Parking Lot. This particular lot has been in operation for a number of years and we feel it has been carried on quite successfully. Every year there has been a sum handed to the City of Halifax, which indicates that over the past few years, there has been in the vicinity of \$10,000.00 a year. The gross revenue from this parking lot is approximately \$17,000.00 a year, and that is on the basis of 92 parking booths. If we were to multiply this by three, to approximately 300, we would have an estimated gross annual increase of around fifty-odd thousand dollars. Where we have moved such a garage down to the centre of Halifax, as we propose, we feel that the income would be even higher. Furthermore, there could be night parking in such a garage which would further increase the income and place it in a better position to return the money to the City and the taxpayers.

Council,
May 26, 1960.

"These sketches, we have had prepared, are very, very rough and they just indicate the type of a garage that could be situated on the property. We feel that it would be quite an improvement. The stores on Hollis Street would remain; they would be improved and we feel that with the addition of two new buildings on the opposite side of Hollis Street, with an improvement of this land, would certainly enhance the whole area. The proposal is that we include a panel here to completely conceal the cars, so that anybody coming along the street, although they might realize it was a parking garage, would not actually see the cars in the building. In all respects it would be an esthetically attractive sort of a building and would increase the beauty of downtown Halifax."

City Manager: "Would that be an enamel or glass panel?"

Mr. Mitchell: "I would think it would not be transparent."

"The members of the Downtown Businessmen's Association have throughout the years carried on in regard to the Grafton Street Parking Lot, a validation system. This is a system whereby they pay the parking charges of customers who park there, and then deal with them. They are quite prepared to carry on this system in connection with any parking garage. We feel that it is a very good indication of the fact that they are interested in the garage. They need the establishment of such a garage. In fact, when you get right down to it, they're saying they are prepared to pay for it. They are paying for their customers' parking. I don't think we need a stronger argument to show that they are interested in this garage and want it very badly."

"In conclusion, I can only reiterate the points that I've already made, that the Downtown Businessmen feel that such a garage is needed very soon, and, in fact, immediately. They are losing revenue and they feel that this is the only way to solve the parking problem. As I just mentioned, they are certainly prepared to participate in the payment of it through the validation system. We also feel that it is a good thing for the City; it would maintain the City's revenue, and it would, probably, even increase it. Furthermore, it would add immeasurably to the attractiveness of the downtown Halifax district by removing a number of slums. Also, we feel that it is important to the tourists coming into downtown Halifax. If he drives through and finds a place

Council,
May 26, 1960.

to park, he may stay and shop or do his business there. If he drives through and cannot find a place to park, he will carry on.

"I think it is interesting to note, at this point, that Professor Stephenson, in his Report, even though he was not requested in his terms of reference to deal with the parking problem at all; he mentioned several times the need for adequate parking facilities in the City of Halifax. He suggests that there should be a garage erected over the Grafton Street Lot. He also suggests that there should be a garage erected in association with the redevelopment of the entrance to Halifax Harbour. The Association feels that these are admirable suggestions but they do not feel that they are close enough to the centre of downtown Halifax to solve the problem at all. They are worthy things and they should, perhaps, be carried out, but they should be considered to be in conjunction with the downtown parking garage and not in place of it."

Alderman DeWolf: "This proposed parking garage; is that to be wide open or would it be an enclosed garage? I was wondering from the standpoint of the appearance."

Mr. Mitchell: "Well, that is why I mentioned that cars would not be visible. We don't really have a proposal for a garage. Our basic point is that we haven't got the land and can't get it."

Alderman DeWolf: "From the esthetic point of view it wouldn't be too attractive, would it?"

Mr. Mitchell: "Well, I think it would be much more attractive than what is presently there and I think it would be attractive. It would have to be open to a certain degree to the air."

Alderman DeWolf: "Have the merchants considered other areas to any great degree, or do they particularly desire that location?"

Mr. Mitchell: "They feel that that location is the most satisfactory location in the downtown area."

Alderman DeWolf: "In their brief they submitted - and this fact, perhaps, doesn't rest too well; the fact that certain buildings can't be sold, was perhaps attributed to lack of parking. One that was mentioned was the Chronicle Building which has been sold. I am not trying to get away from the fact that I'm interested in the downtown parking garage but I think sometimes

Council,
May 26, 1960.

these facts make this thing look a little worse than it really is. Another was the Church of England Institute, which is not a commercial building and nobody has bought it because, probably, it has no value from a commercial standpoint. The suggested area is 122 feet by 200 feet, and costs somewhat over \$272,000.00. "

Mr. Mitchell: "That is the assessed value."

Alderman DeWolf: "The price would be at least \$300,000.00. Isn't that right?"

Mr. Mitchell: "Well, that might well be."

Alderman DeWolf: "It wouldn't be less."

Mr. Mitchell: "No."

Alderman DeWolf: "I think this Grafton Parking Lot is very efficiently run but it doesn't make money. It pays \$10,000.00 a year but that doesn't pay for the interest on the money involved plus the taxes that a normal private operation would pay. It would cost about \$15,000.00 a year minimum for the interest on the money. Has this Committee ever considered underground parking space, rather than going up in the air?"

Mr. Mitchell: "I think we all are fairly familiar with the terrain of downtown Halifax. It's pretty solid underneath and to be honest, the Association has never gone into the question at any depth, to consider going underground."

Alderman DeWolf: "In a copy of the Illustrated London News, issued in February of this year, it shows various photographs of garages in different parts of the world -- Switzerland is one; and also in London, England. You can see on the top of the parking lot, which is underground, they have a bowling green."

Mr. Mitchell: "I think the cost of an underground garage would be staggering."

Alderman DeWolf: "I don't know; that may be so. They built one in the City of Chicago; I went in about two weeks ago, I wanted to examine it. It cost between six and seven million dollars. It was built, I think, in 1954. In the last four years it has been operating, they've paid off about 25%.

Council,
May 26, 1960.

"I am going to suggest that the Grand Parade could be excavated. At this end it is about 20 feet deep. Two levels could be put in there; the top put on again and no one would even know the Parade had been changed; and I think you'd have twice as much land as you have there and the cost would be nil so far as the land is concerned. That is only a thought to consider. Certainly, as a convenience, it is as good as anywhere in the City, and I believe that two stories could be put there underground, the top put on again with the sod there and you could gain entry from Barrington Street or put some kind of a subway from Argyle Street. The City Officials might give that some thought."

Alderman Lane: "This is the second time I've been through this brief, once in its entirety and once earlier when the Downtown Merchants issued an invitation to the Aldermen, in the Wards concerned in the downtown area, and invited us to attend a special meeting to discuss this, informally. Alderman Macdonald, Alderman Butler and I were present. It was a very interesting discussion and I did feel that the proper procedure, under the circumstances, was to move this to the appropriate Committee from this Council for consideration, and a recommendation to Council. I don't think that at this time of night we can give it serious consideration. I would presume the Town Planning Board is the proper place?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. I'd like to commend Mr. Mitchell on his presentation of the brief which has been most carefully prepared. I think Alderman DeWolf has picked up a point that I was going to mention and that was the buildings you picked out; they weakened your case a bit, Mr. Mitchell. That's just my opinion. If I were starting a business and looking for quarters, it would not be in them. One, to my positive knowledge, has a steep flight of stairs and a most horrible lift, and I don't think I'd take an office in that building if they gave it to me rent free."

"I think we are all well aware of the need for improved parking conditions for the benefit of the citizens at large and stimulation of business in the downtown area."

MOVED by Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman Wyman, that the matter be referred to the Committee on Works for consideration and report.

Council,
May 26, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor advised that the matter would have to be dealt with by the Finance and Executive Committee before coming back to Council.

Alderman Macdonald: "What is the minimum standard for berth space?"

Mr. Mitchell: "I don't think there is a minimum standard. I think he suggested that this was the minimum which they have discovered through the years to be the best size. I think they felt that if it were smaller than that, it might not return as good an income."

Alderman Macdonald: "On the basis of your proposals, this lot which you have comprising 24,400 square feet and which would accommodate 284 cars, that's dividing by the square foot, you propose putting 300 in so the spaces would have to be smaller, I presume."

Mr. Mitchell: "Not necessarily because there can be more levels."

The motion was put and passed.

MODIFICATION OF FRONT YARD - #2 ALBERT STREET

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

From: Town Planning Board.

Date: May 17, 1960.

Subject: Modification of Front Yard - #2 Albert Street.

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending in favor of modification of front yard at #2 Albert Street.

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

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

MODIFICATION OF SIDEYARD - #93 CONNOLLY STREET.

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

From: Town Planning Board.

Date: May 17, 1960.

Subject: Modification of Sideyard - #93 Connolly Street.

The Town Planning Board, at a meeting held on the above date, consider--

Council,
May 26, 1960.

ed a report from the Director of Planning recommending in favor of modification of sideyard at Civic No. 93 Connolly Street.

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

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman Macdonald, seconded by Alderman Fox, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

RESUBDIVISION #36-38 LOWER WATER STREET

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

From: Town Planning Board.

Date: May 17, 1960.

Subject: Resubdivision - #36-38 Lower Water Street.

The Town Planning Board, at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending in favor of an alteration to a subdivision at #36-38 Lower Water Street.

On motion of Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, the Board approved the report and recommended it to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

PROGRESS ESTIMATE #17 - INCINERATOR CONSTRUCTION.

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

From: Committee on Works.

Date: May 17, 1960.

Subject: Progress Estimate #17 - 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 #17, re Incinerator construction.

On motion of Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman Abbott, the Committee recommended to City Council payment of Progress Estimate #17, re Incinerator construction, in the amount of \$3,582.24, to Foundation Maritime Limited.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

Council,
May 26, 1960.

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

REPORTS - REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ACQUISITION - #28 MAITLAND STREET

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

At a meeting of the Redevelopment Committee, held on April 29, 1960, a report was submitted from the Compensation Officer recommending that the property of Mr. Barney Roza, #28 Maitland Street, be acquired for the sum of \$6,500.00 plus 5% interest to date of payment, which offer is acceptable to the owner.

Your Committee concurs in the recommendation of the Compensation Officer, subject to approval by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman Lane, that the report be approved.

Alderman Trainor asked if the recommendation had been concurred in by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

His Worship the Mayor advised that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation had not yet approved the acquisition.

Alderman Trainor: "Don't you think, possibly, we should have their O. K. on it, and then deal with it on the memorandum we got from the Manager?"

City Manager: "We have a memorandum being circulated tonight, in which we outlined the future procedure on acquisitions. The Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation people and we, here, think that it is the best way to do it smoothly."

Alderman Lloyd: "Are you discussing this tonight, or not?"

City Manager: "We are not discussing the procedure tonight. It is not on the Agenda. It was just given to you because it is being circulated to the Redevelopment Committee, and I send everything to all Council members."

Alderman Lloyd: "This particular case is related to one in which you found the procedure was faulty."

Council,
May 26, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "I think we found in a great many of them we were of the impression that if the Council agreed to something and went on record at an open meeting, we'd save certain amounts; Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation disagreed and we went to Court. We felt the Partnership would be in a bad position going into Court."

Alderman Lloyd: "I spent a couple of hours with Mr. Borland, on this question, only ten days ago. We discussed the question of procedure, Your Worship, when you happened to be away. The questions were raised to me by some persons, who were affected by a Redevelopment plan, and they were wondering how it was that one property was approved by the City. I think you are all familiar with this particular property, it had a right-of-way and, then, it was sold, and now you have some matters before you on the subject of a right-of-way. I can't discuss that because you have it under consideration. The fact remains that that did go through the Council and was approved by the Council, and actual cheques were issued, and that concerned every Alderman. I think this is the procedure which has been agreed upon with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Is it?"

City Manager: "Yes, it is."

Alderman Lloyd: "This will avoid further mistakes. I think if a mistake occurs there it is forgivable when you look at all the properties you have been handling, but I had asked the question, at a previous meeting, what procedure was, and I didn't quite follow it. I tried to find out from Mr. Borland what, from their point of view, happens in a particular case, because a specific question was put to me by a taxpayer in the area, who was somewhat concerned. After talking with Mr. Borland, I didn't give the details, but I did indicate that City Council had a procedure. This particular one, I think, should be noted it was gone through, a cheque was issued and, now, you have a bit of a problem with the right-of-way on that particular property. I presume that, in due course, the matter will be explained to Council, but you propose setting down this procedure, and no further recommendations will come to us without having some indication from Mr. Ridout, of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, as to his feelings on that matter. Then, all of our recommendations will be

Council,
May 26, 1960.

subject, at least, to their approval, because in some cases, in a certain area of settlement, they could be approved locally; there may be other recommendations requiring Head Office Corporation approval and circumstances may warrant forwarding it. I think that is it, isn't it?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

City Manager: "Could I just comment, briefly, in this regard? We would have these things at Redevelopment Committee meetings with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, here, and they would agree this is all right. Then, we would send it on to Council and Council would approve it. Once Council approves, we pay it, and, yet, when it got to Ottawa, perhaps, it wouldn't get through for some reason, or another. You see, the local people thought it would be all right and, then, there would be some question in Ottawa. So, to guard against us going ahead 'full steam' by getting it through Council and paying it, we, at this intermediate step, are getting approval from Ottawa first as is indicated in this memorandum. So, we were kind of blameless, in a way, because we thought we had the approval. It had been given verbally but we didn't have it in writing, which is required."

Alderman Lloyd: "Well, that satisfies me. I am quite happy that this procedure is going to be followed."

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

BICENTENNIAL HIGHWAY ENTRANCE - ENGAGING ENGINEERS.

Deferred to the next meeting.

APPLICATION TO REZONE #95-97 SEAFORTH STREET -
R-2 ZONE TO R-3 ZONE.

An application to Rezone #95-97 Seaforth Street from R-2 Zone to R-3 Zone was referred to the Town Planning Board, on motion of Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Abbott.

RECEPTION OF PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS

No persons appeared.

POLICY RE: TENDER AWARDS

May 24, 1960.

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

Council,
May 26, 1960.

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee, held on the above date, the matter of declaring a policy with respect to tender awards, to allow for a differential of 1% or $\frac{1}{2}$ % on local tender prices, was discussed.

Your Committee recommends that no declaration of policy be made which would confer a benefit on a local tenderer; and that Council continue to exercise its judgment on future tender awards.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Ferguson, seconded by Alderman Greenwood, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PARKING AUTHORITY

Deferred.

TENDERS - TREE STUMP REMOVER - WORKS DEPARTMENT

The tender of Allan Fyfe Company for one Tree Stump Remover, in the amount of \$4,035.00, which had been deferred at the meeting of City Council held on May 12, 1960, pending declaration of a policy with respect to award of tenders, was again considered.

MOVED by Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the tender of Allan Fyfe Company, in the amount of \$4,035.00, be approved. Motion passed.

11:10 P. M. Council adjourned to meet as a Committee of the Whole in the Mayor's Office.

11:35 P. M. Council reconvened, the following members being present:

His Worship the Mayor, Chairman; Aldermen DeWolf, Abbott, Lane, Macdonald, Fox, Ferguson, Trainor, Lloyd, Wyman, Connolly and Greenwood.

RESOLUTION - RE: CITY FIELD SITE FOR THE SIR JAMES DUNN ARTS ASSEMBLY

WHEREAS Lady Dunn has graciously offered to present to the Province of Nova Scotia a building to be known as the Sir James Dunn Arts Assembly;

AND WHEREAS Lady Dunn has expressed a desire that such building be erected in the City of Halifax to better serve the people of Nova Scotia;

AND WHEREAS after a number of sites were suggested to Lady Dunn, we now have the expressed desire from the donor that the present City Field be made available as the site for the Sir James Dunn Arts Assembly;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Halifax make available the said City Field property for such building;

Council,
May 26, 1960.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor be authorized on behalf of the City Council to take such steps as may be necessary to assist Lady Dunn in the completion of her plans;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Halifax go on record as expressing its heartfelt appreciation to Lady Dunn on behalf of the citizens of Halifax for her wonderful contribution to the cultural life of this Province.

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman Lane, that the Resolution be approved. Motion passed.

CAPITAL BUDGET

Deferred.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Connolly, that this meeting do now adjourn. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned: 11:40 P. M.

LIST OF HEADLINES

Public Hearing Re: Proposed North West Arm Bridge	585
Public Hearing Re: Repealing Section 5 of Part XI of the Halifax Zoning By-Law	631
Amendments - Ordinance No. 49 - Plumbing and Building Permit Fees - Second Reading	632
Amendments - Ordinance No. 52 - Deed Transfer Tax - Second Reading	632
Downtown Parking Garage	633
Modification of Front Yard - #2 Albert Street	645
Modification of Sideyard - #93 Connolly Street	645
Resubdivision - #36 - 38 Lower Water Street	646
Progress Estimate #17 - Incinerator Construction	646
Reports - Redevelopment Committee - Acquisition - #28 Maitland St.	647
Bicentennial Highway Entrance - Engaging Engineers	649
Application to Rezone #95-97 Seaforth Street - R-2 Zone to R-3 Zone	649
Reception of Petitions and Delegations	649
Policy Re: Tender Awards	649
Establishment of Parking Authority	650
Tenders - Tree Stump Remover - Works Department	650
Resolution Re: City Field Site for the Sir James Dunn Arts Assembly	650
Capital Budget	651

approved. Motion passed.

C. A. VAUGHAN,
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN.

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

Dr. Marten

CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES

Council Chamber,
City Hall,
Halifax, N. S.,
June 16, 1960,
8:00 P. M.

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

After the meeting was called to order, 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, Macdonald, Butler, Fox, Ferguson, Trainor, Lloyd, Wyman, Connolly and O'Brien.

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

MINUTES

Minutes of the meetings of the City Council held on April 14 and April 28, 1960, were approved on motion of Alderman Ferguson, seconded by Alderman Butler.

ADDITIONAL STAFF AT CITY PRISON

June 16, 1960.

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

At a meeting of the Public Health and Welfare Committee, held on June 9, 1960, a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Health advising that one additional night guard and two additional day guards had been taken on the City Prison staff, on a temporary basis, because of the increase in prisoners being committed to the institution.

The report advised that the sum of \$6,165.00 would have to be provided under the authority of Section 316 "C" of the City Charter to carry these additional guards for the balance of the year.

Your Committee recommends that the sum of \$6,165.00 be provided under the authority quoted above for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Fox, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

AMENDMENT - SECTION 6 - ORDINANCE #13 - TAXI INSURANCE COVERAGE -
FIRST READING

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee, held on June 9, 1960, a report was submitted from the Deputy City Solicitor listing yearly premiums for insurance coverage on taxis, as follows:

<u>Limits</u>	<u>Coverage</u>	<u>Yearly Premiums</u>
5,000/10,000/1,000	P. L. & P. D. & Passenger Hazard	\$ 140.00
10,000/20,000/5,000	P. L. & P. D. & Passenger Hazard	188.00
20,000/40,000/5,000	P. L. & P. D. & Passenger Hazard	226.00

Mr. Kenneth S. Smith, Q. C., addressed the Committee and advised by letter, dated May 13th, that the Halifax Taxi Association is in favour of increasing the insurance limits to \$10,000 - \$20,000 Public Liability and \$5,000 Property Damage, which coverage is lower than that recommended by the Safety Committee at its last meeting which was \$20,000 - \$40,000 Public Liability and \$5,000 Property Damage.

He suggested that the Public Liability limits of \$10,000 - \$20,000 should be adequate and referred to eight cities across Canada where these limits are in force. He further advised that the premium for \$10,000 - \$20,000 Public Liability and \$5,000 Property Damage is \$188.00 per annum; but, for the \$20,000 - \$40,000 Public Liability and \$5,000 Property Damage, it is \$226.92 and the difference is quite large which would be an additional burden on the taximen.

After a long discussion, your Committee recommends that an amendment to Section 6 of Ordinance #13, as drafted by the City Solicitor, be read and passed a first time.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

BE IT ENACTED by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Halifax
as follows:

1. Section 6 of Ordinance Number 13, respecting the Regulations of Vehicles Transporting Passengers for Hire, is repealed and the following substituted therefor;
6. The owner of every motor-drawn vehicle to be licensed hereunder, hereinafter called a "licensed vehicle" shall with his application for a license therefore deposit with the Chief of Police an automobile insurance policy providing public liability and passenger hazard insurance in the sum of \$20,000.00 for loss or damage resulting from bodily injury to or the death of any one person and subject to such limit for any one person so injured or killed, the

Council,
June 16, 1960.

sum of \$40,000.00 for loss or damage resulting from bodily injury to or to the death of two or more persons in any one accident, plus the sum of \$5,000.00 for loss or damage to property resulting from any one accident.

It was agreed to hear Mr. Kenneth S. Smith, Q. C., Solicitor for the Halifax Association of Taxi Operators, who had been requested at the Finance and Executive Committee meeting to present information respecting the variation of coverages for the different types of taxi operation in the City.

Mr. Smith: "Your Worship, and members of Council; I believe that the Safety Committee has put forward a proposed amendment to Ordinance No.15, dealing with the required amount of coverage for insurance. That was then referred to the Finance Committee, and has now arrived here. At the Finance Committee certain requests were made for information, and I have been able to obtain it; and I am going to ask that the following items be given consideration, here, in connection with the proposed increase.

"For many years we were tied to the regulations of the Public Utilities Board and what they prescribed. They were \$5,000/10,000/1,000 for quite some time. Then, the Public Utility Board changed the regulations, and it was now decided by Council that the fixing of these limits should be brought here and determined by Council, from time to time.

"At the outset, I would like to say that the Halifax Taxi Association is entirely in favour of increasing the former limits of, as we call them, \$5,000/10,000/1,000. The Taxi Association wishes it to be understood that it is being fully cooperative and mindful of the obligation to protect the public which makes use of the taxis. The only possible point of difference might lie in the amount of that coverage.

"Now, dealing first with prices, and I am going to speak about this briefly, if I may, because I am going to preface my remarks by saying that it is realized that the expense of insurance premiums to the operators of taxis should not be the sole determining factor of what is required to protect the public. The Association fully recognizes that fact, and in recognizing it, it wishes to point out these items. In the first place, it would take an insurance