

Council,
June 16, 1960.

premium increase from \$140.00 to \$188.00 per year. These are average prices, and they have been compared with those obtained by Mr. Mitchell, the Assistant City Solicitor."

Alderman Lloyd: "From what limits, to what limits?"

Mr. Smith: "That, Alderman, covers an increase from \$5,000/10,000/1,000 to \$10,000/20,000/5,000. We are all in agreement on that \$5,000.00 Property Damage, we are not questioning that at all. In fact, we heartily concur in it. That \$5,000.00 Property Damage coverage is satisfactory to all concerned. Our problems only arise on the Public Liability angle. That creates a premium increase of an extra \$48.00 per year for the taxis. However, when you get into the field of \$20,000/40,000/5,000 your premium cost rises to \$226.00 and when you add to that, as people always do, fire and theft coverage, give or take a dollar or two, it amounts to a round figure of \$250.00.

"There is one very important factor, which I do not believe has been mentioned before, certainly not to Council, because this is the first time it was dealt with. Many taxi owners are obliged to purchase their automobiles with the assistance of Finance Companies which, in turn, necessitates the use of Collision Insurance. I think we all understand the requirement of that. It may come as rather a surprise to many that the coverage for \$250.00 deductible insurance premium on collision for a taxi, in one year, is \$200.00, and for \$100.00 deductible, it is a prohibitive price, it runs to over \$400.00 per year, and when you add a \$250.00 deductible carrying a premium of \$200.00 to an insurance increase of \$10,000/20,000/5,000 of \$188.00, you are getting into formidable money.

"As I say, I want to again point out that the cost to the owner is not the sole answer, by any means, because the public must be protected. When you consider a taxi operator, a quick look at it, if he has \$200.00 premium for collision insurance; if he has \$188.00 for \$10,000/20,000/5,000; he has office rent of \$600.00 per year, that is \$50.00 per month; his oil, gas and tires are \$1,000.00; his depreciation on his car; the licenses both here and at Provincial levels he has to buy; the repairs and the rising cost of replacing; you can see, yourselves, that the taxi business is being subjected to a pretty, heavy expense.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

"However, some drivers of taxis, I might say, are on the assignment plan. I think you will understand that, and the Companies, to whom they are registered and assigned, are only compelled to write \$5,000/10,000/1,000, and it is up to the Company to say whether they want to go higher or not and, therefore, the taxi operator is at the mercy of the Company and may not be able to comply with the By-Law if it goes higher. I think we will have no real difficulty in getting \$10,000/20,000/5,000. In fact, the Association says they are quite prepared to take that chance, but when you get into the higher bracket, you may find that the Insurance Company wouldn't do it.

"Comparative figures, that were asked for at the Finance and Executive meeting, the smaller size trucks, I speak of G. M.C., Fargo and small Half-Ton Mercurys, you can get a \$20,000/40,000/5,000 policy insurance on them for \$40.00 to \$65.00 per year, according to make. Now, compare that with taxis. Those figures, I might say, came from A. J. Haliburton and Company and I leave it to the members of Council to decide whether the average truck on City streets is a greater hazard than taxis, or not -- yet \$5,000/10,000/1,000 is all they are allowed to carry.

"Now, the Public Utilities Board set the limits of \$10,000/20,000 at the Public Liability level for a twelve passenger Bus. Now, why should a taxi, which only carries, at most, five passengers and usually one or two, two is the average call, have to be double the limits that a Bus carrying twelve passengers has to be. The Bus goes all over the place, out of town as well as in town. It seems almost like discrimination, if that word fits the situation, and the Public Utilities Board having set \$10,000/20,000 limits for a Bus, it does not seem fair or reasonable that a taxi should have to, under this proposed amendment of \$20,000/40,000 now before you, carry double what a twelve passenger Bus does. This simply doesn't seem to make sense.

"If we examine the letter that was put forward by the City Manager, under date of May 12th, he made a comprehensive survey of some of the Canadian Cities. I don't want to burden you with them, but I must point out these -- that the City of St. John requires \$10,000/20,000/2,000. Now, we are quite happy with the 'five', so we don't mind that at all. The City of St. John

Council,
June 16, 1960.

seems to be a comparable place to drive in to the City of Halifax. It is much the same size, streets are old, some are narrow, just about the same as ours, yet that is all they require.

"The City of Montreal, a tremendous City, where there is heavy traffic, all they require is \$10,000/20,000/1,000; Ottawa, a sizeable City, \$10,000/20,000/5,000; London, Ontario, \$10,000/20,000/2,000; Saskatoon, they only have \$5,000/10,000 out there; the entire Province of Alberta, like Calgary, Edmonton, and all over, \$10,000/20,000/5,000, which the Taxi Association here advocates; Vancouver \$10,000/20,000/3,000 and Victoria \$10,000/20,000/2,000.

"Out of that list of Cities, there are eight Cities that have no higher than \$10,000/20,000/5,000, and they are all prominent and foremost Cities in this Country. There are only two higher, one is Toronto and the other is Windsor. Well, Windsor gets the overflow from Detroit, and the accident hazard, I think, could be said to be great. Toronto has \$25,000/50,000/5,000, which seems to be pretty high under the circumstances and they are the odd one of the lot.

"Now, the Taxi Association wants to approach this problem in a spirit of cooperation and a mutual desire to protect the public, but are the Taxi Authorities that govern eight of our foremost Cities; can you say they are wrong, that they are too low and we, therefore, should be twice the size. I suggest, on behalf of the Taxi Association, that the proposed cost is an element that should be considered. Otherwise, you may have a business extermination, you may put people out of business. It might result, perhaps, in an application for higher rates if it went through, because these men are not making any kind of money at all. They want to protect the public and they also feel that they want to protect themselves, and should be protected by Council, as well.

"So, \$10,000/20,000/5,000 doubles the present limits of \$5,000/10,000/1,000, and there is no recorded case where any of these policy limits were ever exceeded on any plan. None of the Companies we have asked have been able to find one for us. If the amendment went through, I feel it only fair to say that the strongest representation would have to be made to the Department of Municipal Affairs requesting that the By-Law in the \$20,000/40,000/5,000

Council,
June 16, 1960.

be not approved, but one on the \$10,000/20,000 should be.

"We wish to cooperate, we wish to assist, we consent readily to doubling the present limits, but we want \$10,000/20,000/5,000 and would willingly do it. We thank you for your kindness and patience in hearing our representations, and that is the position we wish to take."

MOVED by Alderman DeWolf, seconded by Alderman Connolly, that the insurance coverage for Public Liability, Property Damage and Passenger Hazard on taxis operating in the City of Halifax be set at \$10,000/20,000/5,000; and that Ordinance No.13, Section 6, be amended accordingly and same be read and passed a first time.

The motion was put and passed, nine voting for the same and four against it, as follows:-

For the Motion - Aldermen DeWolf, Abbott, Dunlop, Lane, Butler, Fox, Lloyd, Wyman and Connolly - 9

Against It - Aldermen Macdonald, Ferguson, Trainer and O'Brien - 4

BOUNDARIES OF LAND TO BE CONVEYED TO C. B. C. ON BELL ROAD AND PRICE THEREFOR.

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 letter was submitted and read from the Board of School Commissioners advising that it is prepared to declare surplus the land at Queen Elizabeth High School.

As legislative authority has been obtained, your Committee recommends that 37,334 (more or less) square feet of land on Bell Road, as shown on Plan No.00-9-14848 be sold to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at the assessed value of \$1.25 per square foot, subject to a pipeline easement.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

TAG DAY - HALIFAX SYMPHONY SOCIETY - AUGUST 12

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 letter was received from the Women's Auxiliary of the Halifax Symphony Society requesting permission to hold a Tag Day on August 12th, 1960, because

Council,
June 16, 1960.

their scheduled date of May 14th had been rained out.

Your Committee recommends that the request be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

ACCOUNTS OVER \$500.00

To: His Worship, C. A. Vaughan and
Members of the City Council.
From: A. A. DeBard, Jr., City Manager.
Date: June 14, 1960.
Subject: Accounts over \$500.00

In accordance with Section 119-F of the City Charter, the following accounts are submitted for Council's approval. These accounts have been certified and audited.

<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>VENDOR</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Finance	H. R. Doane & Company	Auditing Books	\$ 4,840.00
	Hillis & Sons	Car track frames and gratings	2,127.48
	W. R. MacInnes & Co.	General Insurance	11,002.96
Fire	Office Specialty	Steel Cabinets	1,901.25
	King Seagrave Ltd.	Fire Appartus	4,319.26
	Northern Life Assurance	Insurance Premium	4,384.57
Works	Hughes-Owens Company	Survey equipment	660.00
	Industrial Machinery	Snow removal	2,218.70
	MacAskill's Trucking	Trucking services	504.45
	McConnell Nursery Co.	Flants	692.00
	N.S.Tractors & Equip.	Equipment parts	860.67
	L. E. Shaw Ltd.	Manhole sections	703.40
	Standard Paving Co.Ltd.	Winter work	9,024.71
Health	Dictating Equipment	Dictating Machines	1,603.28
Mental Hospital	Canadian Laundry Machinery Co.	Laundry equipment	21,364.00
Recreation	Phinneys Limited	Baseballs	732.75
	Purves Industrial Sales	Ladder, slides, swing	1,780.50

Council,
June 16, 1960.

<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>VENDOR</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Tourist Bureau	Royal Print & Litho	Celluloid Buttons	\$ 1,125.00
			<u>\$ 69,844.98</u>

A. A. DE BARD, JR.,
CITY MANAGER.

MOVED by Alderman DeWolf, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the report be approved.

Alderman Wyman: "In connection with the item Laundry Equipment, for the Mental Hospital; I was wondering if that equipment has been installed, and, also, when it is, if it will enable us to handle the laundry of all our Institutions, ourselves."

Commissioner of Health: "The Laundry Equipment is in the process of being installed now. I have been assured by the Company that with this equipment we will be able to look after all the laundry for all City Institutions."

Alderman Dunlop referred to the repairs and replacements being made to the wooden fence around the Wanderers' Grounds, and said that it was his understanding that the fence was to be replaced by an ornamental fence similar to that around the Public Gardens.

His Worship the Mayor: "They claim they can't carry on competitive or paying professional-type sports without having an enclosed field. That is the argument advanced by some. We will hold up the replacement of the fence for further study."

The motion was then passed.

CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT - PERSONNEL - \$1,400.00 - 316 "C"

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 City Manager recommending that a Senior Clerk-Typist be added to the staff of the City Clerk's Department at a salary of \$2,368.00 -- \$2,876.00. The sum of \$1,400.00 is required for the last six months of the current year.

Your Committee concurs in the recommendation; funds to be provided under the authority of Section 316 "C" of the City Charter.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

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

WRITE OFF - HOSPITAL ACCOUNT - ESTATE OF ELSIE J. PYKE.

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 Commissioner of Finance advising that a cheque from the Eastern Trust Company in the amount of \$1,109.94 has been received which represents payment of a Victoria General Hospital Account against the Estate of Elsie Jane Pyke.

Also attached was a copy of the Final Decree advising that the Estate was insolvent and that the City's claim was allowed in the amount as stated above.

As the total amount of the account was \$1,948.00, the Commissioner recommended that the balance of \$838.06 be written off.

Your Committee concurs in this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Trainer, seconded by Alderman Connolly, that the report be approved. Motion passed.

LATIN AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE FAIR - \$1,500.00 - 316 "C"

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 City Manager advising that the Free Port Committee had considered the possibility of a free port in Halifax and a Latin American Cultural and Trade Fair.

After conference with the Consul of Venezuela in this City, it was decided that some preliminary investigation would be necessary to discuss the feasibility of having such a fair.

Your Committee recommends that the sum of \$1,500.00 be provided under the authority of Section 316 "C" of the City Charter for the following purposes:

1. A trip to Ottawa to:
 - (a) Enlist support of Ambassadors of Latin American Countries.
 - (b) Secure Federal Government cooperation.
2. Trips to Montreal, Toronto, etc. to secure opinion of leading manufacturers' and exporters' willingness to exhibit.
3. Compensation to Mr. Strand for time spent outside of Halifax.
4. Travelling expenses.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

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

TRUCK LICENSES - AMENDMENT - ORDINANCE NO.14 - FIRST READING

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

At a meeting of the Safety Committee, held on June 10, 1960, a full report was submitted from the City Manager concerning truck licensing and advising that because of Section 248 of the Motor Vehicle Act, it would be necessary to amend Ordinance #14 which would set the license fee for all trucks at \$25.00.

Mr. G. R. Matheson, representing several trucking firms with three or more trucks, addressed the Committee and among other things stated that under the Motor Vehicle Act, the City has no right to control trucking for revenue purposes and suggested that the Ordinance be revoked with respect to firms with more than three trucks.

After a long discussion, your Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That all persons who obtained a trucking license for the year 1959 be refunded the excess amount over \$25.00;
2. That an amendment to Section 4 of Ordinance #14, 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 4 of Ordinance Number 14, The Regulations of Vehicles Used for Transporting Goods for Hire, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

4. The fees payable for licenses in respect of vehicles engaged in transporting goods for hire, shall be as follows:

Horse Drawn Vehicles:-

1 horse	\$ 10.00
2 horses or more	15.00
Motor Vehicles	25.00

It was agreed to hear Mr. J. R. Matheson, Solicitor for several trucking firms, respecting the proposed Amendment.

Mr. Matheson: "Your Worship, may I say just a few words concerning the proposed amendment to the Ordinance? This matter has been before the Committee

Council,
June 16, 1960.

on Finance, briefly, but no action was taken, to my recollection, except to hand the matter over to the Committee on Safety. We haven't really made representations to all the members who were here. I think the only submissions I made, at any length, were before the Safety Committee, and I don't propose to repeat them; but some of my remarks dealt with the question as to whether or not the Ordinance was valid. I realize that the Committee and Council now have an opinion from the Solicitor that the Ordinance is valid, although I don't agree with that opinion."

His Worship the Mayor: "I want to inform you, now, that all your remarks were recorded in the Minutes of the Committee which have been distributed to the members of Council. So, they know your basic argument."

Mr. Matheson: "Thank you, Your Worship. There is just one matter in the report, read by the City Clerk, that says something to the effect that I said the City had no right to tax, had no right to license vehicles for revenue purposes under the Motor Carrier Act. I think that should read the Motor Vehicle Act, as the City's authority is under the Motor Vehicle Act."

"I just want to reiterate the remarks I made the other day to the Aldermen who were not there, that I don't think the City should be regulating trucking for the purpose of revenue. Now, I have not seen the report presented to the Safety Committee by the City Manager, and I don't know in what detail he dealt with the regulations that govern trucking under the Motor Carrier Act and which are, as you know, administered by the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities. I don't know whether he compared these regulations with the Ordinance No. 14 and, if that has not been done, my request tonight would be that the matter be adjourned again until a separate report is made to the Aldermen, because I think a report of that nature must reveal very clearly that there is nothing left."

Alderman Trainor: "Have we had a written report from the Solicitor's Department on that?"

His Worship the Mayor: "We had one from the City Manager, and I think the most pertinent remark in the Manager's report was the fact that we can ill-afford to give up our tax sources and, if we are going to give them up, we

Council,
June 16, 1960.

should be compensated for them by the senior Government. If they move into the field and impose taxes, then I think we should be compensated before we give them up."

Mr. Matheson: "Well, I can sympathize with that position, Your Worship. I don't wish to come here and, with the difficult times the Municipalities are having these days, try to persuade the City to give up its source of revenue. But the City, I suggest, should not obtain revenue from sources where it was only authorized to provide a license fee to pay the cost of protecting the public from the results that might occur if there is an industry, such as the Trucking Industry, that is not regulated; and, I think that was quite proper up until last year."

His Worship the Mayor: "Plus the point that they use the public facility - the streets to operate their businesses on. Quite often these trucking firms (a lot of them) operate out of their hats."

Mr. Matheson: "I don't think there is one of my clients, Your Worship, who is not paying business tax in the City; some of them paying rather extensive taxes, and everybody uses the City streets. I use them, large retail and wholesale firms in the City have dozens, and dozens of trucks using the streets and they are not licensed, and their revenue is considered larger too. This is quite an onerous tax, as Mr. Smith was saying about taxes, I don't think that any of the small trucking firms are paying very much in the way of Income Tax these days. I think they have a very difficult time making ends meet. An operator, with ten trucks, and I think one or two of these have considerably more than that, but some with ten trucks, it is going to cost him \$250.00, and he has to put in a good many days of work with his truck to clear \$250.00, with the competition that he has to face today from the sources I mentioned the other day, at the meeting. There are so many anomalies here, if this Ordinance is permitted to stand. The Public Utilities Board might license somebody and the City's Safety Committee refuse the license. As I stated the other day, the City might revoke a license and the operator would be fined if he went out on the street with his truck. Now, that same operator, who is licensed by the Board of Public Utilities, can be fined if he doesn't

Council,
June 16, 1960.

go out on the street because once he is licensed by the Board of Public Utilities he cannot cease to perform the service for which he is licensed. How can he obey two laws which are so repugnant to each other? I think that illustrates my main argument that there is nothing for the City to regulate. That is why I think the Aldermen should have information of that nature, a comparison of the regulations administered by the Board of Public Utilities with the regulations contained in this Ordinance. I think that a study of those two respective regulations will convince everyone that the regulations that are administered by the Board of Commissioners of the Public Utilities completely and wholly regulates this industry in the City of Halifax, so how can the City justify having a Department, let alone licensing; how can it justify having employees regulating an industry which is completely regulated by another body, and the authority that this body has to regulate must come from the Province of Nova Scotia; and I don't think in the face of this new Act that the City should, any longer, try to control operators who have more than three trucks."

His Worship the Mayor: "You are trying to create the impression that the City of Halifax has a Department exclusively for checking on trucking licenses, which is not so."

Mr. Matheson: "I didn't mean to suggest that, but there are men engaged in the regulation of trucking in the City. I say that the City is not justified paying salaries to these men for regulating trucking when the Province of Nova Scotia and the Legislature of this Province has decided, in its wisdom, that somebody else should do it."

His Worship the Mayor: "Have you made this same argument to the Province? You came to the easiest mark, the City Council."

Mr. Matheson: "No, I wasn't retained at the time the Province was preparing its legislation, but this legislation is not only for the City of Halifax, it is for the whole Province."

Alderman Dunlop: "Their fees are much higher, their fees are double."

Mr. Matheson: "I think their fees this year are, probably, not much higher than they were last year. I think last year they were reduced about a

Council,
June 16, 1960.

third or a quarter to what they were. The license fee, set by the Board of Public Utilities, incidentally, is only sufficient to cover the cost of administration, and that is why the fees were drastically reduced, so that the fee paid for trucking last year, from the first of September to the end of December, is the same as the fee charged in 1960 for the whole year. It was reduced by that much, because the policy is to charge, as I understand it, only enough as a license fee to pay the cost of administering these regulations. They have Inspectors out on the road to inspect the vehicles; they require the operator to have his drivers put through a medical examination; they require the certificate of an automotive mechanic before they license a truck that it is mechanically sound; they require fire extinguishers; first aid kits and they have very strict regulations as to the other equipment the truck must have. There just isn't anything left for anybody else to control.

"My argument is that the City has nothing to control. Therefore, it must only be imposing this license fee to raise revenue; and the Motor Vehicle Act expressly says the City cannot tax motor vehicles. That is the reason that I would suggest if the Aldermen are not prepared tonight to decide that the Ordinance should be repealed, that a report be prepared so that a comparison will show that the regulations by the Board of Public Utilities more than adequately protect the public of this City; and the duplication is unnecessary and the regulations are repugnant in the sense that you have to have a license from two bodies before you can operate a truck. If the City revokes the license, then, the person goes on the street at his peril or he stays home at his peril. Surely, that in itself is enough reason why this Ordinance should be repealed. Thank you very much."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think the Public Utility Board also controls the distribution of milk. Does it not, Dr. Morton? There are many places where you do find, perhaps, a duplication, but that is not all the fault of the City of Halifax. I think some of these arguments should go to the Public Utility Board."

Mr. Matheson: "I understood the Board of Public Utilities were concerned in the milk industry only with rates, and that sort of thing, and not with the things that Dr. Morton is concerned with, which is the health of the

Council,
June 16, 1960.

citizens."

His Worship the Mayor: "There are two bodies regulating different aspects of the same thing."

Mr. Matheson: "Yes, that is my very point, Your Worship. I am saying, here, that you have two bodies that are trying to regulate the same aspects of an industry, whereas in the milk business you have two bodies controlling separate aspects of the business. That is my very point. You put it much more clearly, perhaps, than I was doing. That is the point that I have been trying to make."

Alderman Lloyd: "There have been statements made about the matter of revenue and I expressed myself before on this matter. Where business taxes are being paid, I usually like to see there is no additional tax imposed. Unfortunately, we have also people who do an extensive volume of business in the City who pay a very small business tax. There are many, many inconsistencies, unfortunately. To defend the system on pure logical grounds is an impossible task. One has to compromise a great many principles in a tax structure of a City.

"However, there was one statement made by the City Manager which should be answered before the second reading: First, what responsibility does the City have and I would like to have the Chief of Police give us a report at the time of the second reading?"

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Wyman, that the amendment to Ordinance No. 14 be read and passed a first time. Motion passed.

DOWNTOWN PARKING GARAGE

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

From: Committee on Works.

Date: June 10, 1960.

Subject: Downtown Parking Garage.

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date considered a request on behalf of the Downtown Merchants Association, that the City expropriate the land as shown in red on Plan No. SS-5-14769, and that the Parking Garage be erected on that site.

On motion of Alderman Abbott, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, the Committee recommended to City Council that the land as shown outlined in red on Plan No. SS-5-14769 be expropriated for the purpose of parking facilities and also that City Council engage appraisers to advise the City.

Respectfully submitted,
K. C. Mantin,
CLERK OF WORKS.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

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

From: K. M. Munnich, Director of Planning.

Date: June 16, 1960.

Subject: Earl Granville Parking Garage.

I have the following general comments on the Proposal for a Parking Garage submitted to the Council by the Downtown Business and Professional Men's Association on May 26, 1960.

1. The Need

Although we lack a detailed traffic survey for the City which would also cover the parking needs, there can be little doubt that the City's central area suffers from a severe shortage of car parking facilities.

The situation is relieved to some extent by:

- (a) Meter parking provision on streets, which in many instances, such as on Hollis Street, Sackville Street and others, creates or contributes to traffic congestion.
- (b) Free parking on streets where space is usually occupied by all-day parkers leaving no room for people who wish to shop or do business in the downtown area. Again, this type of parking often interferes with traffic circulation as for instance on Brunswick Street between Rainnie Drive and Sackville Street.
- (c) Temporary parking lots on areas cleared for redevelopment by the City. These lots will ultimately be developed and car parking displaced.
- (d) Makeshift parking lots on wharves and odd parcels of private undeveloped land. This provision is symptomatic of lack of business expansion and commercial pressure in the downtown area and cannot be considered a healthy solution of the parking problem. It should be considered beneficial to the prosperity of the City to see land misused for makeshift parking arrangements returned to more intensive use in keeping with the commercial and business function of the downtown area.

Even with all those facilities and including the Grafton Street parking lot the demand for parking space in the commercial centre of the downtown area is not satisfied. Considering the temporary nature of some of the present provision and the need for clearing of the major streets of the parked cars to allow free traffic circulation I have no doubt that a permanent solution of the parking problem in the downtown area can be considerably advanced by the parking garage advocated by the Association.

2. The Location

The parking garage site suggested is in the centre of the retail business and office area and should be most attractive to customers. It is also downhill from the majority of shopping. The location is very convenient to people wishing to call at the Provincial and Federal Offices or banks which are all east of Barrington Street, a major pedestrian barrier. Traffic approaches to the site are quite adequate especially with ultimate abolition of parking on major streets. Sackville Street provides a direct link with many major traffic routes and Granville Street which is in the nature of a service road affords suitable access to the garage without interference with through traffic.

I am, therefore, satisfied that the location is suitable on planning grounds.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

3. The Scheme

The tentative scheme submitted by the Association takes advantage of the natural slope of the area to accommodate shops on the Hollis Street frontage. This should prove a successful arrangement. I am also informed that these shops would have rear service access which would keep Hollis Street free from parked delivery vehicles. The proposal indicates access to the garage from Granville Street with no access off Sackville Street which I consider very sound. Although at this stage it would not be appropriate to discuss the proposed building in any detail, the submitted sketch proposal indicates that the site is capable of being developed in a satisfactory way for a parking garage and that all the major planning requirements can be met.

4. Conclusion

For the reasons stated I consider that the proposal submitted by the Downtown Business and Professional Men's Association can be recommended on planning grounds as a sound contribution to the rehabilitation of the downtown area which, together with the major redevelopment already undertaken by the City, should go a long way towards ensuring a healthy, attractive and prosperous future for the heart of the City.

Respectfully submitted,

K. Munnich,
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING.

To: His Worship, C. A. Vaughan and Members of the City Council.

From: A. A. DeBard, Jr., City Manager.

Date: June 15, 1960.

Subject: Proposal for a Downtown Parking Garage.

A report dated May 28, 1960, received by me at 3:45 P. M. on May 25th, 1960 was on the agenda for the Council meeting of May 26, 1960.

Page 3

Point 2. Private parking lots are primarily for employee parking? Is this the pattern throughout Canada or is private parking to some degree, a fairly large one, in some cases, for shoppers?

If there are about 25,000 passenger vehicles registered, what proportion would want to park within the bounds set forth on Page 2.

Page 4

If most of the 1,000 private parking spaces (page 3) are for employees, why do working parkers use street meters? I cannot comment on the claims as to loss of revenue. One indication would be vacant business premises in the area described on page 2. There are few vacant stores, just how much vacant office space is there and for the older ones are the physical facilities reasonably good and for the newer ones are the rents reasonable?

Page 6

The assessment reduction granted to Barrington Operating Company was not because of inadequacy of parking space, but because the building is obsolete. Mr. Thomson can elaborate on the details of obsolescence.

I would like a listing of the businesses which moved from downtown area with their occupancy taxes in their new locations. Larger space, newer buildings

Council,
June 16, 1960.

would probably cause the occupancy taxes to be equal or surpass the former ones. If the old premises are not vacant there is a net gain.

Page 8

The merits and problems of financing a down-town parking garage can be discussed immediately and should not be coupled with the merits and problems of a Parking Authority.

- (a) If downtown is not a good location, assessments being reduced, etc. why is it "impossible to purchase the land suitable for the scheme on reasonable terms." If parking space is needed, the highest use for land should be for such purpose yielding an even better return than for other uses.
- (b) The Building Inspector, without any special check, has found one bad building and one not in a very good condition, the rest are old, but far from a slum. This statement is an exaggeration and a reflection on our building and health inspectors.

The tax revenue from the lands and buildings is approximately \$16,600.00 including business tax. The estimated future tax revenue is \$35,000.00.

Page 9

- (b) Care must be exercised in acquiring lands for lease or sale by the City. Where the purpose is primarily redevelopment and there is an extensive area, land is probably available in sufficient quantity to satisfy a large number of uses. To expropriate a certain small section for a specific purpose and offer to lease or sell it to what would likely be a small number of interested parties may be taking land from one owner or several owners and turning it over to some one else. Only where there is absolutely no other place for an activity could this be justified.
- (c) I am not aware that the City has any plans to establish a Parking Authority. There has been a request to the City to establish such an authority. The request is for an authority which has "the powers to regulate the parking garage and parking lots in the City and to generally exercise all the powers of a Parking Authority". This will be discussed in a separate memorandum, but I suggest for coordination that "powers" be left in the hands of the City Council and Traffic Authority rather than in the hands of a Parking Authority. The two merchants groups have done a very good job of operating the two present lots with the regulations established by the City Council, probably with quite some suggestion from the merchants and some from City officials.
- (d) Removal of meters may be desirable, but main arteries are not presently "congested" nor do they present any problem in approaching a parking garage.

Page 10

- (a) Note there was a special assessment to pay the bond interest.
- (b) How many votes were taken, how many of those eligible to vote actually voted and what were the votes.

Page 11

- (d) Do you mean lowest tender? If so, it was not the lowest for the land, but lowest to erect the parking garage.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

(e) This indicates it is self supporting.

Multi-level, Self-park Garage

Page 12

A further refinement of figures submitted show:

<u>Lot No.</u>	<u>Berths</u>	<u>Land Cost</u>	<u>Per Berth</u>	<u>Improvement Cost</u>	<u>Per Berth</u>	<u>Total Per Berth</u>
1	220	168,221.00	764.64	225,000.00	1,022.72	1787.36
5	260	106,000.00	407.69	236,157.66	908.30	1315.99
6	118	130,721.28	1107.80	68,951.82	584.34	1692.14
	598	404,942.28	667.17	530,109.48	886.47	1563.64

Page 13

See the quotation from the history of the Vancouver Downtown Parking Corporation.

Points I would make are:

- (1) Whether funds from parking lots should be used for more parking facilities or for other civic benefits is a decision which should lie in the hands of the Council. To get the funds for parking lots in the first place and to underwrite early losses requires funds from other sources. These determinations should be made by Council.

There might be some question about issuing 'direct obligations of the Corporation!.

Are these notes paid now?

Page 14

Grafton Street lot used for the working parker. I doubt there are any or many cities providing parking for workers. Businessmen are not paying for their customers' parking - they pay less than half - see top of page 1.

Page 16

Professor Stephenson's recommendations for more parking are accepted, but his locations (an expert's) are rejected.

Recommendations.

1. That the location specifically suggested be studied to see if it is the only one or the best. #
2. The lease, if possible, should be to the merchants. It ought to be determined if it might not be better to lease in this way even if the City has to build the parking garage itself.
3. That no Parking Authority be established 'for regulation and development of the City-wide parking problem!'. If there must be a Parking Authority let it operate the lots under regulations set by the Council. Development, financing and determination should be a responsibility of the Council. Opinions of merchants and all citizens would no doubt be weighed by Council.

- A check of present facilities should be made, designating each facility and its capacity, with relation to principal destinations of people, and spotting available sites. If this is not done, and well done, the lot will not be located in the best place and will interfere with possible locations of future lots. Parking lots, particularly those combined with shopping facilities generate traffic and may cause a serious problem.

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

Council,
June 16, 1960.

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

His Worship the Mayor: "Before you vote on this, we have Mr. Munnich's report on the planning aspects of the location of this garage; and you, also, have Mr. DeBard's comments on the proposal."

Alderman Lloyd: "Does the City Manager take any point of objection to the proposal?"

City Manager: "Yes. I say that in the brief which was presented by the merchants that they have very little of fact. I am not sure that that is the correct location for a parking lot. I don't think we should be spending this kind of money on an impression. I think, probably, a parking lot is needed downtown, but I don't think they have proved it in their brief as I have pointed out in mine; and I think we should be careful that, if we put a parking lot there that we are not spoiling the parking plans for the future in having a lot or facility at Grafton Street and one down there where, perhaps, a lot such as on Sackville Street perhaps should be further down, closer to George Street."

Alderman Lloyd referred to Comment No. 4 of Mr. Munnich's report and asked: "Is that a direct difference of opinion between Mr. Munnich and the City Manager?"

City Manager: "I would say so."

Alderman DeWolf: "It seems we are only asked to deal with one recommendation. I would like to know if any official in the City has made a survey of this City, itself, to see whether there is any area downtown that would be just as suitable or, perhaps, more so; and, perhaps, at less money. I did suggest the other day the Parade. I would like to have a report on it."

His Worship the Mayor: "That would cost us more money."

Alderman DeWolf: "All right. I don't fully agree and that is what I want to know. I think it is a mistake to jump at one conclusion before examining other factors. I don't say that this is necessarily the one. I am in favor of a parking space. It might be that the parking space up here should have an extra deck on it, but what I am against is taking privately-owned land and developing it for this purpose where we are getting a revenue, as

Council,
June 16, 1960.

against any other land that may be available at a lower price.

"I was told by somebody that it would cost us more money here. I don't believe that. I have to be shown. Somebody, I assume, has told you that it would cost more money."

His Worship the Mayor: "It would cost us a lot more money."

Alderman DeWolf: "I don't fully subscribe to that without somebody who isn't a downtown merchant, but an engineer to tell me that. For instance, this land here is more than twice as big as the land that they are going to take. This land has 52,000 sq. ft. against 24,000 sq. ft. which is proposed to be taken. So, if they have four stories down there, they would need only have two here; and I would think the cost of putting up a two-storey garage would be lower, proportionately, than a four storey."

His Worship the Mayor: "Your plan is to put it underneath the Parade."

Alderman DeWolf: "Yes."

His Worship the Mayor: "Move the trees?"

Alderman DeWolf: "Move everything and put the parking lot down and put everything back again. I talked with a specialist in moving earth, rock and so on; and I asked him what the cost might be. He couldn't tell without knowing what the formation of the soil was, whether it was all rock, hard rock or what; but, he did suggest that it would be less than \$100,000.00. It may be considerably less. This man has been in the business, so I take his word for it the same as I would take an engineer's word for it; but I haven't been told by an engineer what the difference in cost is going to be. The only reason is and I particularly like this -- if it can be done, then I suggest that the City is going to save money in taxable land. This land will never be taxed. Other land will be taxed; and I suggest, too, that this report which we got from the merchants hasn't been sufficiently clarified from the economic standpoint to tell us where we are going, or what we are going to get out of it; where we are going to get back our money in taxes and enjoy the same position we presently enjoy. I suggest it doesn't show that because if it is suggested it will cost \$450,000.00, that would be \$45,000.00 per year to pay that off in twenty years. The taxes on that building or what they claim they will pay are at $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ as a cor-

Council,
June 16, 1960.

bined rate of business and occupancy. That would be much more than we are getting now. I understand from Mr. DeBard's report we are getting \$16,000.00 a year now; but we are going to lose \$16,000.00. We are going to lose the difference between \$100,000.00 and \$450,000.00. In my opinion, and I would like to have this confirmed by someone who knows, engineers, as to what the difference will be. I think it should be produced by somebody probably in City Hall who would have access to that type of information."

City Manager: "Nobody on staff, not even Mr. Munnich, as he has pointed out in his report, has really studied this."

Alderman DeWolf: "From the standpoint of planning, no one can find fault with Mr. Munnich's report. That particular area in his opinion would be all right, but he doesn't say that another area on Granville Street, perhaps another area on Barrington Street or Argyle Street, but he doesn't say that that wouldn't be all right. He is only reporting on the area that he was asked to report on. I want to know if the officials have been consulted, have they made any survey of their own to determine that something else could be located; and that's why I think it is a mistake to jump at the first one that has been pointed out to us rather than taking a look for ourselves."

Alderman Lloyd: "It is fair to say that should such a parking garage be constructed, I am sure that any realtor will agree that our ability to hold our assessment values in the very heart of the City where we derive so much revenue, would be a lot easier than if we don't proceed with some such proposal coming from the merchants."

His Worship the Mayor: "And this will be a validation scheme. The merchants are going to pay over and above their taxes."

Alderman Lloyd: "I don't want to shut off the possibility of a garage under the Grand Parade by any means. That may be an additional thing we may need for other purposes, but I would hope that, if there is going to be a delay, it is not going to be a protracted one. I would like to see a time fixed for that information to be obtained. Surely it can be obtained fairly rapidly."

Alderman DeWolf: "Not only the Grand Parade, but anywhere else in that

Council,
June 16, 1960.

area. I am not trying to limit it to this."

His Worship the Mayor: "The value of your parking lot goes down with each block you move away from Barrington Street. Therefore, the first two blocks you would consider would be the Granville or the Argyle Street area. If you examine all this area, you will find that it is about the lowest priced area you can get to locate the garage and still get the maximum location value out of it because it is close to Sackville and Barrington Street which is the principle business corner in Halifax. It is one block removed from it; and, you have the advantage of having some blight there. It has the advantage of uplifting an area close to the new Federal building and the new Bank of Canada building and there is a vacant lot there now. It is about the only block in the downtown area, if you walk around it and you check on the assessment values of lots, that you can possibly pick out at this time."

Alderman Ferguson: "When you give the matter some thought, there are many drawbacks to this situation. It is going to be expensive. I doubt if it will ever be economically feasible from a strict business point of view; but notwithstanding those facts, I think it is essential and necessary that we get the parking facility and get it as soon as we can. I think that, while we may lose a little money from the straight tax point of view which I would be prepared to do for one, we will get more back from the increase or at least the holding of a settlement in the general area. I think increased parking is absolutely essential for it isn't what we are going to lose in just this particular parking lot, it is what we will lose in the whole downtown area. I think it is a must. I think it is the lesser of a number of ills. I don't think it is going to be economically possible to recover the full cost; but, notwithstanding that, I think it is going to be a form of subsidy which we have to give if we expect to get even the normal tax return in dollars that we are getting from the downtown area. I think it is a must. I am certainly in favor, in principle, of going along with the situation. I would like to get some further thoughts of the method of operation at a later date; but as it stands now, certainly, I think we should get on. You may get other locations. I don't think you are going to get any cheaper ones. I don't agree with the figures that Alderman DeWolf has on the cost of excavation. I think the

Council,
June 16, 1960.

gentleman who gave him the information may have made a mistake. It could be very, very expensive if you struck rock."

Alderman DeWolf: "I got the information from a man who has been in the business for at least thirty or forty years, and he is doing the largest excavations probably in the City. Surely, he should know."

His Worship the Mayor: "Except that we had a similar kind of information from a man in business for the excavation of the Industrial Mile Area. It was 1/10 of what we ever expected to get by at a contract price, after he had started boring, which indicated the underlying character of the ground."

Alderman Trainor: "I agree with the thoughts expressed by Alderman Ferguson. I wonder, carrying this thing a little further, if the Assessor has any idea of how much increase in assessments there has been in the last year in the Gottingen Street area over two years ago because of the fact that there has been and is underway presently a municipal parking lot."

His Worship the Mayor: "Glube's and Heinich's were built only on the assumption that the parking lot was going to be created there."

Alderman Trainor: "There are other additions and improvements going on up there all along." And he asked the City Assessor to submit a report at a subsequent meeting. "That will make our stand more positive that we have to go ahead with this downtown parking garage. Just where the location is going to be is another thing, but we have to approve the thing in principle."

Alderman Wyman: "In this connection, not long ago I attended a meeting where there was some discussion, not of parking garages, but of the parking problem generally, at which time it was stated that Haligonians are particularly opposed to walking. Whether we think they should be or not and whether we like it or not, the fact remains and if we are going to persuade Haligonians to do business in the downtown area, they have to be able to get there and get there without much walking. I think we can all agree on that. When we talk about the downtown business area, essentially we are speaking of the length of Barrington Street and adjacent streets from about Spring Garden Road to Buckingham Street; and if you look at that area and try to provide a location close to it where any substantial amount of parking is possible, it is not going

Council,
June 16, 1960.

to be easy to find. I can't picture any location that is any better located with regard to that business area than the one we are talking about.

"If we go ahead with this, having built a parking garage there, I have no doubt that if it does, as we all hope it will, not only sustain the value of this business district, but perhaps enhance it, it is likely that before too many years there may be need for further parking facilities in the area. I would plan perhaps we might look at the Parade as a possibility. I am inclined to agree with those who have doubted whether or not the Parade can be developed at anything less than a very large price because I feel reasonably sure that most of it would be blasting, if it is ever done; but I think there is an urgency that rather precludes the undertaking of that type of a development. It will take much longer than the location we are discussing. It might be a reserve that we can keep for some future time and at the same time provide this which has been needed for some time. The need has been evident and it has been called to our attention time and again that something needs to be done."

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

Alderman DeWolf: "I am 100% in favor of a parking lot downtown. I know it is needed. All I want to do is, I think it is fair enough not to take the first one that comes along at a price. I think it should be explored. Can you do as well somewhere near and until I find out, I will have to vote against it."

MODIFICATION OF SIDEYARD AND REARYARD - NO. 310 JUBILEE ROAD

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

From: Town Planning Board.

Date: June 19, 1960.

Subject: Modification of Sideyard and Rearyard - No. 310 Jubilee Road.

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending against a modification of sideyard and rearyard at No. 310 Jubilee Road.

It was moved by Alderman Macdonald, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the Board approve the report and recommend it to City Council.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

The vote on the motion was 3 - 2 in favor:

For:

Alderman Macdonald
Alderman O'Brien
Alderman Abbott

Against:

Alderman Connolly
Alderman Trainer

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. Mantin,
CLERK OF WORKS.

MOVED by Alderman Butler, seconded by Alderman Lloyd, that this matter be referred back to the Town Planning Board.

Alderman Butler: "The building on this lot has been there for a number of years and there are some circumstances. I understand which would indicate that this might be a case that possibly could justify a relaxing of the rules with respect to rearyard lines and sideyard lines. The frontyard is something like 80 feet from the south side of Jubilee Road. I understand there is a peculiar problem involved inasmuch as the building is quite far back on the lot and the living room is on the front of the house, the kitchen is on the back of the house. In order for this gentleman to add to his kitchen in order to accommodate his family, the only place he has to add to this building is at the back of it."

His Worship the Mayor: "He is adding a dining room."

Alderman Butler: "Yes, opposite the kitchen. That is correct. There was a suggestion that he put it on the front of the building, but it does seem most impractical for him to walk from the back of his house to the front of the house in order to eat his meals."

His Worship the Mayor suggested re-arranging the use of the rooms.

Alderman Butler: "It gets complicated. That is why I suggest it go back to the Town Planning Board. The City, I understand, owns the land south and adjacent to this property; and I believe he would be about nine feet from the rear line and even if something were built upon the land of the City, no doubt there would be a certain set-back -- they wouldn't build up to his rear line. As a result, he would have a fair amount of clearance. It doesn't seem to me to pose such an awfully serious problem. The building is far enough back that it doesn't interfere in any way with the adjoining building. I

Council,
June 16, 1960.

don't think there would be any objection from the neighbors because there is a large retaining wall now and this addition would more or less make it a much better situation for himself and his neighbor. I think there are some facts that would substantiate that the matter be reviewed in more detail in the Town Planning Board. I would move now that permission be granted if I could get a seconder for the motion."

His Worship the Mayor suggested that the owner be asked to submit present floor plans and the proposed floor plans for the guidance of the Committee.

Motion passed with Alderman O'Brien wishing to be recorded against.

COURT OF TAX APPEALS ORGANIZATION

June 16, 1960.

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 City Manager giving information with regard to the number of assessment appeals, withdrawals, costs, etc. over the past years.

Your Committee, in considering the emolument to be paid to the members of the Court of Tax Appeals, recommends that the Chairman receive \$1,200.00 and each member \$1,000.00 per annum effective as of 1961.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

TAX EXEMPTION - HALIFAX LABOUR TEMPLE - LEGISLATION

June 16, 1960.

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 City Manager relative to a request from the Halifax Labour Temple Association for fixed taxation in the amount of \$500.00 for the next ten years.

For the information of the Committee, the report revealed the tax paid and exemption granted for the last 4 years with respect to the Longshoremens' Hiring Hall and the Carpenters' Hall.

The City Manager suggested that any exemption in the case of the Halifax Labour Temple Association should cease when the present physical facilities are changed and that it should be for 5 years rather than 10.

Council,
June 16, 1960.

Your Committee recommends that legislation be secured to fix the tax payable by the Halifax Labour Temple Association at \$500.00 for the next 5 years retroactive to January 1, 1960.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

BICENTENNIAL HIGHWAY ENTRANCE - CONSULTANTS

Deferred in Committee.

His Worship the Mayor: "I have written to the Minister of Municipal Affairs posing two questions directed to me by the Committee. One was, 'Will the Province be prepared to accept the recommendation of Whitman, Benn and Associates?'; and two, 'Will the Province share in the cost of this study?'"

MULGRAVE PARK HOUSING PROJECT - CONTRACT CHANGES

June 16, 1960.

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 City Manager listing changes from the Province of Nova Scotia which have been requested by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation respecting the Mulgrave Park Housing Contract as follows:

	<u>Subtract</u>	
1. Cement Pipe - City Services	\$ 4,369.75	\$ 5,167.30
2. Additional pipe and manhole backdrops		1,020.47
3. Drain tile and waterproofing		1,050.25
4. Additional excavation and rock		6,125.00
5. Chase in concrete wall		360.00
6. Gravel stops for roofs and maisonettes		5,104.00
7. Drilling for tests (Piles)		385.00
8. Window cleaner bolts.	2,206.00	
9. Smaller rail on retaining walls	304.00	
10. Hardware reduction	16,150.37	
11. Security window substituted for names brand in specifications	67,500.00	
	<u>\$ 90,530.12</u>	<u>\$ 19,212.02</u>
Net Reduction	\$ 71,318.10	

Your Committee recommends that the changes be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

Council,
June 16, 1960.

REDEVELOPMENT AREA - DEMOLITIONS

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

From: Committee on Works.

Date: June 10, 1960.

Subject: Redevelopment Area - Demolitions.

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date considered a report from the City Manager recommending that the lowest tenders be accepted for the demolition of buildings in the redevelopment area.

On motion of Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Connolly, the Committee recommended to accept the low tender in each case, and in the case where there is a tie the City Manager toss a coin to decide who should be awarded the tender and recommended the same to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. Martin,
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

HOUSING AUTHORITY - SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET - BAYERS ROAD PROJECT

June 16, 1960.

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, the City Manager submitted the following supplementary budget requested by the Housing Authority for the operation of the Bayers Road Project:

Fidelity Bond - 2 new members of Authority	\$ 34.23
Catch basin and line to storm sewer - Romans Ave.	2,500.00
Share of fence - St. Andrews Avenue line	<u>1,000.00</u>
	\$3,534.23

Your Committee recommends that the supplementary budget, as requested, be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

PROGRESS - MULGRAVE PARK HOUSING PROJECT

Alderman Trainor: "When do we expect to start moving people in the first unit of Mulgrave Park?"

His Worship the Mayor: "About September 1st. The first twenty-seven

Council,
June 16, 1960.

units are expected to be ready then."

Alderman Trainor: "How many units do you expect will be completed by the end of the year?"

City Manager: "Ninety-nine."

His Worship the Mayor: "They are making much better progress than expected."

HOUSING AUTHORITY - SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET - MULGRAVE
PARK HOUSING PROJECT

June 16, 1960.

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 City Manager advising that the Housing Authority has requested a supplementary budget because of increase in personnel and office equipment due to proposed occupancies in the Mulgrave Park Project beginning in September.

The report listed estimated revenue amounting to \$18,753.00 and estimated expenses amounting to \$45,125.00, resulting in an estimated deficit of \$26,372.45.

Your Committee recommends that the supplementary budget as requested be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. Stoddard,
CITY CLERK.

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

ADVERTISING ACCOUNT AND APPLICATION FEE FOR REZONING - DRUMMOND
COURT-LEAMAN STREET AREA

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

From: Committee on Works.

Date: June 10, 1960.

Subject: Advertising Account and Application Fee for Rezoning Drummond Court and Leaman Street.

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date considered the matter of the advertising account and application fee for rezoning of the Drummond Court and Leaman Street area.

On motion of Alderman Connolly, seconded by Alderman Trainor, the Committee agreed to recommend to City Council that the advertising account in the amount of \$432.00 be paid by the City of Halifax and the application fee in the amount of \$10.00 paid by Mr. Colin Hubley refunded to him.

Respectfully submitted,
K. C. Mantin,
CLERK OF WORKS.