

Council,  
June 16, 1960.

will be down at the other end of the Town."

His Worship the Mayor: "Of course, there will be no increase of traffic at all in the City."

Mr. Gaffen: "There will be no more increase at that corner than any other corner in the City."

His Worship the Mayor: "At this corner we have the opportunity now of vacant land to lay down certain lines to protect ourselves."

Mr. Gaffen: "This is not vacant land. There is a little piece on the side, but if this vacant land is used, you are taking away the use of our 'built-on' land."

Alderman Lloyd: "Does this plan indicate the removal of the Willow Tree?"

Planning Director: "Yes!"

Alderman Lloyd: "I don't care who's tree it is. At the moment I am more concerned about the island that is placed alongside of it. On this map, that I have here, there is an island as you enter Quinpool Road from Robie Street to proceed west on Quinpool Road. The drawing I have, Your Worship, in front of me shows, in yellow, an island separating the traffic, and to act as a pedestrian island, is that the idea?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Because of the large number of High School students, some 2,000 meet there."

Alderman Lloyd: "I was going to say that is pretty terrific, and I wonder if we are not faced with some sort of underground subway approach to cross at this intersection if the traffic continues the way it is with children now."

His Worship the Mayor: "If we are faced with that possibility, we are going to need more land than we are talking about now."

Alderman Lloyd: "Well, I say, I don't know where it would be located, but it certainly seems that should be part of your plan. If you have to look to heavy traffic, as you say, you have got to think in terms of some underground traffic for the students of the schools."

Council,  
June 16, 1960.

Alderman Ferguson: "I would like to ask Mr. Munnich. I have noticed the biggest block of traffic has been entering Quinpool Road coming from Bell Road and Cogswell Street. I notice it is always a hard job for the traffic to get through between the Old Willow Tree area and the existing boundaries, and I also noticed that that has been reduced very definitely to two lanes. I just wonder if that will be adequate enough or be a greater bottleneck than we have there. Have you given that any thought? I, personally, don't see how the flow from Bell Road, with the switch, would ever get through two lanes of traffic."

His Worship the Mayor: "I will disclose this one. Mr. Munnich would like to get Council's sanction, which he plans to shortly, to close Bell Road. Yes, I know it sounds very radical but I think when you see his plans you will recognize the wisdom of it."

Alderman Lloyd: "I was going to ask you if there was any possibility of changing the approaches to this intersection, and what effect that would have on this proposal?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Mr. Munnich's plan was a straight four-way approach rather than a five-way one. The five-way one produces your major problem there."

Alderman Ferguson: "If you did do away with Bell Road, you would increase the flow of traffic on the other points that would be just as great only you would not have a direct line."

Planning Director: "Not all the traffic would flow through this junction"

Alderman Wyman: "It would reduce considerably the traffic at this intersection if Bell Road was eliminated because alternative routes would take a proportion of the traffic."

His Worship the Mayor: "Don't forget that as far as this intersection is concerned, we are also proposing to extend Cogswell Street to Water Street by a very direct and attractive street. In the next four to five years it should be completed. So, your traffic flow, your pattern now which builds up through Sackville and Duke Streets to Prince Street, a great deal of it will travel up Water Street, Hollis Street, Granville Street, and so on and turn and go up the hill on this major street. Mr. Munnich also suggests making



Council,  
June 16, 1960.

Rainnie Drive a one-way street east and make Cogswell Street a one-way west."

Alderman Lloyd: "Your Worship, supposing that is all so, what does the City propose to do; merely to take the piece of land that is required and leave the abutter with what is left? Is that what the City proposes to do?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, that is right."

Alderman Lloyd: "Has there been any thought given to acquiring the land and being done with it, such as negotiating the purchase of it, expropriating the entire area? I wonder if acquisition of the site in contention might be a parcel to this; because, if what you say is true, you are going to need some opening up of the choke here -- these roads. Then, it may be that you would want, rather than penning yourselves in, to take the whole thing. Take what you require and buy the property, and be done with it. I don't know if there is some value in that, or not, but I would think there would be. It doesn't seem right to lay down a plan; this plan, as projected by Mr. Munnich, is not yet laid down, it is a tentative proposal, it's not the usage of the land -- this plan -- and it seems to me whenever we cut up a parcel of land, or subdivide, if there is any suggestion, that we should give the benefit of the doubt to the private party and be done with it."

His Worship the Mayor: "We were arguing the other side of the coin this morning."

Alderman O'Brien: "I would like to say a point or two about this right-hand turn. It seems to me that Mr. Gaffen is right to this extent, that the number of right-hand turns there are not likely to be a large part of the traffic at that intersection, but as I see the plan -- ."

His Worship the Mayor: "Why is this assumed?"

Alderman O'Brien: "I assume this because a lot of the traffic that comes south in Halifax, as it comes from the Dartmouth Bridge or the Fairview Overpass, may come down some other street like Windsor Street, Connaught Avenue or Oxford Street. I am not taking Mr. Gaffen's side beyond this point; I am suggesting that even though this be so, as I read this plan, Mr. Munnich has drawn two lanes going straight south in front of the proposed building and one making a left-hand turn. He is saying, in effect, we need room to make the

Council,  
June 16, 1960.

right-turn and still have two lanes facing south, there, and one with a left-hand turn. Also, if we are going to have the increased traffic up Cogswell Street related to our Redevelopment Scheme, there will need to be room going through the Willow Tree at the intersection on the far side of it, for two or three lanes of traffic at once. If we can allow these right-turns to be made without having to wait for lights and get out of the way all the time so that the through traffic, straight ahead traffic, either way, has a better chance, it seems to me that it is related, even though the number of turns may be small to the right, to get them out of the way and not be blocking these other ones where the heavier traffic will be. Robie Street is the backbone of the north-south traffic through the City, and it seems to me that there will be heavier traffic there whether there is a Bridge or not, and I expect there will be a Bridge. That artery is going to carry a lot of traffic and, some how or other, there has to be planning for it, whether the triangular traffic island there is required. I don't know, because I am not an authority on this sort of thing, whether it needs to be there or whether the turn could be a little further out, but it seems to me important to keep the setback of the building on Robie Street so that we can have a right-turn lane on that part of Robie Street, when we get to the traffic improvements that have to be made there."

Alderman Butler: "If we were considering the widening of Quinpool Road and Windsor Street, it seems to me that the widening of this corner would make the right-hand turn a separate lane and the traffic, then, would not interfere with the through-traffic west on Quinpool Road. If you are not going to remove that large building, that is there now where the stores are, you are going to be merging with the through-traffic on Quinpool Road. Are you going to be achieving anything?"

His Worship the Mayor: "It won't be merging because that right-turn is made while the other lights are red. You make the right-turn on the green light while the other traffic is stopped."

Alderman Butler: "Well, with respect to this island, as shown on the plan, the purpose of it, why it is there in effect, is for a safety zone, not to be used for traffic."



Council,  
June 16, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "Of course it is."

Alderman Butler: "It is a form of traffic control, but I suggest --"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. For one thing, it is for pedestrians, to keep them from having to cross the very wide streets in the same area. You mean, 'why was the island put in there?'"

Alderman Butler: "Yes. I was going to say that the island that is there in the midst, somewhat in the centre of the streets, might just as well form a part of the corner. If you take the corner out further, wouldn't you be achieving just as much that way?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Planning Director: "The island is there to protect the pedestrians; also, to separate the traffic going through from Cogswell Street from traffic turning right from Robie Street."

Alderman Butler: "In order to vote on this, I want to be satisfied that is the only solution there as we see it now. Isn't it possible that corner could be maneuvered and still come out a little further not to interfere with this man's building?"

His Worship the Mayor: "You can remove any corner -- take any right-angle corner in the City, it is a question of whether the sharper your corner is the more difficult it is to maneuver in time and a lower number of vehicles get to the intersection on the light change. Isn't that correct, Chief? Isn't this the experience on Brunswick Street and Rainnie Drive, it makes it easier for traffic?"

Chief of Police: "Yes, that is correct."

His Worship the Mayor: "There are certainly more vehicles through there on any lights."

Alderman Wyman: "In following that point through, I don't quite understand how that can be argued when, at the present time, we have a device to make that corner sharper than it naturally is. Does the large cross-patched area, there, make you make a separate turn than would be required if that were not cross-patched? That is possible because of the fact that there is not enough traffic making that right-hand turn to necessitate the amount of space we have

Council,  
June 16, 1960.

now. Apart from its advantage for the pedestrians, I cannot see where you will have any advantage putting that triangular island in there to allow your right-hand-turn traffic to go behind it into a space, which is very narrow, just beyond that. Your traffic going through that intersection will be controlled by the width between the centre island and the point that comes at the corner of the Willow Tree Apartment, now. To make it easier for more traffic to get in there isn't going to let any more get through, because we would still have the narrow spot. As for making a right-hand-turn, that can be done with an arrow just as well as with an island."

His Worship the Mayor: "Why do they need a cross-patch?"

Chief of Police: "To slow down the wide throat of the intersection so the pedestrians will have some measure of protection in lieu of an island."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think if you are planning for the future, you are talking about bridge traffic increasing traffic. Apart from the bridge, there is bound to be east and west traffic increase, as I see it. It seems to me that such a busy intersection, as that, will continue to have one, two, three, four, five entries to the traffic section pouring into there. It seems to me you have got to go underground. We might, even, some day think of a grade separation. I don't know, but, certainly, underground for pedestrians seems almost essential in that area, in the long run."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think the devices they used were both - the undergrounds were for pedestrians. Underground or overhead, they are not used. The public will not use them. In Boston they are not used; in Montreal they are not used, the people are scared and will not go down underneath. They do not use them."

Alderman Lloyd: "There may be reasons for that."

His Worship the Mayor: "I don't know what the reasons are for it."

Planning Director: "I might say, Your Worship, that undergrounds for pedestrians, where there are lights controlling the junction, are not too important because there is a period when pedestrians can cross. They apply more in areas where there is a continuous circulation of traffic and there is no break in the traffic."



Council,  
June 16, 1960.

Alderman Lloyd: "Well, if it is controlled by lights, you might be able to eliminate some of that island material that you have there. That is what is bothering me, that very narrow, narrow entrance for the traffic flow."

Alderman DeWolf: "This matter has been up for some time. I would like to know if any discussion has been made with the owner in respect to selling. I noticed a 'For Sale' sign on the property, and I see now some question of building. There has been a 'For Sale' sign on the property for many, many months, possibly, a year. I have no doubt they want to sell it. Now, that we are beginning to fix up the damages, if the imagination of the owner isn't too great, I think it would be better business to buy the whole thing than to expropriate part. I would like to know if the Manager has inquired what the price of that is."

His Worship the Mayor: "To my knowledge, he hasn't."

Alderman DeWolf: "I see the 'For Sale' sign on it. It has been on the house for months."

Mr. Gaffen: "The sign should have been taken down. It has been up there and we haven't got around to removing it."

Alderman DeWolf: "It has been advertised for months."

Mr. Gaffen: "Yes, we advertised it for a long time, and the sign is still there."

Alderman DeWolf: "I would like to know now what they want for the whole property."

His Worship the Mayor: "Is the Council agreeable for the Manager to discuss it with the owner to see what they want?"

Alderman Lloyd: "Yes, it would finalize it. We might get a report on that."

Alderman Dunlop: "This matter has been before us I think a dozen times. I think we should decide if we want to lay down the street lines or not. Up to the present time Mr. Gaffen's clients have been insisting upon the whole area. I think we should tell them that they can either develop the whole area or they can't develop it. If they find they are unable to develop the whole area, they may modify their requirements. I am prepared to move the matter tonight."

Council,  
June 16, 1960.

Alderman Lloyd: "The only point I have to make is that the City in its relationship with taxpayers, whose properties are affected by its Redevelopment plans, some times will bring about greater opposition to Redevelopment if we don't show some flexibility in our willingness to recognize some losses that may occur. Now, I don't know what the circumstances are in this case as far as the owner is concerned. Let me put it to you, theoretically; supposing that four or five years ago an unnamed party had bought that corner with the intention of carrying out certain plans. Now, it is conceivable that if he had planned this kind of building that he may have been willing to pay a certain price for it because it was zoned Commercial and it was on a certain corner, and so on. I don't know whether that would, actually, apply or not; but if there is any possibility of that having happened, then, I think we should recognize a responsibility as a public action, in causing damage to that man's operation. That may be a case especially for the Court to decide. I think it is pretty clear that, generally speaking, the proposal, if accepted by this Council for improvement of that intersection, is highly desirable, and everybody agrees. You may split hairs on islands and locations but, generally, it has to be improved. If that is the case, then, I think we should make some effort to make sure we are not causing a damage to the owner, which would be unfair as against the general interest of the taxpayers."

Alderman O'Brien: "I think we must be fair to owners, and whatever compensation is due for any loss caused by our action must be forthcoming. We make the best judgment we can on that and, if it is not acceptable, then it goes to the Courts and the Courts determine. It seems to me that if Council wishes to vote on this tonight, we could vote on the proposal of our staff and, then, the question of compensation might be given further consideration by the Manager, who might discuss the matter with the owners and come back to us, at a later date, and recommend either complete purchase or partial purchase, according to his discussions with the owners."

His Worship the Mayor: "Is it Council's wish to vote on the motion?"

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Lane, that the official street line of a portion of Quinpool Road be laid down at the northwest corner



Council,  
June 16, 1960.

of Quinpool Road and Robie Street; and that a portion of the official street line of Robie Street be removed at the northwest corner of Quinpool Road and Robie Street, as shown on Plan No. P.300/32.

The motion was put and lost, four voting for the same and eight against it, as follows:

For the Motion: Aldermen Dunlop, Lane, Macdonald and O'Brien - 4

Against the Motion: Aldermen Butler, DeWolf, Abbott, Fox, Ferguson, Lloyd, Wyman and Connolly - 8

TO LAY DOWN A 10 FOOT BUILDING LINE ON THE WEST SIDE OF ROBIE STREET FROM QUINPOOL ROAD TO 46 FEET NORTHWARDLY OR TO THE EXISTING R-3 ZONE

A formal Resolution was submitted as follows:

WHEREAS the Committee on Works at a meeting held on the 16th day of February, A. D., 1960, did recommend that a building line be established on the west side of Robie Street from Quinpool Road to forty-six feet (46') northwardly or to the existing R-3 Zone;

AND WHEREAS the City Council at a meeting held on the 16th day of June, A. D., 1960, considered the matter and approved of the recommendation of the said Committee on Works.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a building line be established as follows:

1. A 10-foot building line on the west side of Robie Street from Quinpool Road to forty-six feet (46') northwardly or to the existing R-3 Zone.

The above building line being as shown on Plan No. SS-5-14759 on file in the Office of the Commissioner of Works of the City of Halifax, at City Hall, N. S.

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman DeWolf, that the Resolution as submitted be approved. Motion passed.

Alderman O'Brien: "On this first one, you say we can really go ahead, but is there a street line there at all, now? Can a permit be given to build in the light of that?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman O'Brien: "So, we haven't solved that problem."

His Worship the Mayor: "We had a vote on both matters; one in the affirmative and one in the negative."

TAX COLLECTIONS - MONTH OF MAY, 1960

CIVIC YEAR	RESERVES	O/S BALANCE APRIL 30, 1960	NEW ACCOUNTS & ADJUSTMENTS	MAY 1960 COLLECTIONS	O/S BALANCE MAY, 1960
1958	\$ 90,393.80	\$ 218,534.98		\$ 16,720.31	\$ 201,814.67
1959	106,928.80	578,339.26		58,883.59	519,455.67
1960	66,984.19		D.R. \$9,132,359.29	5,069,403.23	4,062,956.06
		\$ 796,874.24	D.R. \$9,132,359.29	5,145,007.13	4,784,226.40
TAX YEARS PRIOR TO 1958 (COVERED BY RESERVES)				1,899.06	
				<u>5,146,906.19</u>	

POLL TAXES

1954		9,830.32		59.62	9,770.70
1958		5,382.09	D.R. 40.00	412.58	5,009.51
1959		34,906.87	D.R. 155.00	1,115.16	33,946.71
1960		275,000.00	D.R. 802.00	111,717.22	164,084.78

POLL TAXES OTHER THAN LISTED ABOVE

113,304.58  
370.05  
113,674.63

TOTAL COLLECTIONS IN MAY, 1960

5,260,580.82

TOTAL COLLECTIONS IN MAY, 1959

4,878,358.49

CURRENT TAXES COLLECTED JAN. 1st to MAY 31st, 1960

5,069,403.23

CORRESPONDING PERIOD 1959

4,778,904.53

TAX ARREARS COLLECTED JAN. 1st to MAY 31st, 1960

466,647.94

CORRESPONDING PERIOD 1959

446,250.49

POLL TAX COLLECTIONS JAN. 1st to MAY 31st, 1960

131,728.37

CORRESPONDING PERIOD 1959

65,743.62

5,667,779.54     5,290,898.64

		AMOUNT COLLECTED JANUARY 1st to MAY 31st	%
TAX LEVY 1960	9,057,011.22	5,069,403.23	55.97
TAX LEVY 1959	8,692,401.33	4,778,904.53	54.98
TAX ARREARS JANUARY 1st 1960	1,311,545.43	466,647.94	35.58
TAX ARREARS JANUARY 1st 1959	1,232,763.37	446,250.49	36.20
TOTAL COLLECTIONS TO MAY 31st, 1960		5,536,051.17	61.12
TOTAL COLLECTIONS TO MAY 31st, 1959		5,225,155.02	60.11

Respectfully submitted,

H. R. MCDONALD,  
 CHIEF ACCOUNTANT.



Council,  
June 16, 1960.

As it stands now there is no Street Line on that portion fronting on Quinpool Road, and the Building line laid down extends from the existing Building Line down to the corner on Quinpool Road."

Alderman Dunlop gives Notice of Reconsideration on the matter of the Street Lines at the Northwest corner of Quinpool Road and Robie Street.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PARKING AUTHORITY

Deferred.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT FOR MAY - 1960

The monthly Administrative Report for May, 1960, was submitted from the City Manager, and same is attached to the original copy of these Minutes.

FILED.

APPROPRIATIONS REPORT

A report of the Sinking Funds and Trust Accounts of the City of Halifax, for the year ending December 31st, 1959, was submitted from the Commissioner of Finance; copies of which had been distributed to the members of Council prior to the meeting.

FILED.

LIST OF HEADLINES

Additional Staff at City Prison	652
Amendment - Section 6- Ordinance #13- Taxi Insurance Coverage - First Reading	653
Boundaries of Land to be Conveyed to C. B. C. on Bell Road and Price Therefor.	658
Tag Day - Halifax Symphony Society - August 12	658
Accounts Over \$500.00	659
City Clerk's Department - Personnel - \$1,400.00 - 316 "C"	660
Write Off -Hospital Account - Estate of Elsie J. Pyke	661
Latin American Cultural and Trade Fair -\$1,500.00 -316 "C"	661
Truck Licenses - Amendment-Ordinance No.14 - First Reading	662
Downtown Parking Garage	667
Modification of Sideyard and Rearyard - No.310 Jubilee Road	677
Court of Tax Appeals Organization	679
Tax Exemption - Halifax Labour Temple - Legislation	679
Bicentennial Highway Entrance - Consultants	680
Mulgrave Park Housing Project - Contract Changes	680
Redevelopment Area - Demolitions	681
Housing Authority -Supplementary Budget -Bayers Road Project	681
Progress - Mulgrave Park Housing Project	681
Housing Authority - Supplementary Budget - Mulgrave Park Housing Project	682
Advertising Account and Application Fee for Rezoning - Drummond Court - Leaman Street Area	682
Conveyance of City Land at Mulgrave Park to Partnership	683

Council,  
June 16, 1960.

Bellevue Case	684
Installation - Civil Defence Sirens	689
Administrator - Estate of Mrs. Ella Boudreau	689
Tenders for Fire Hose	690
Tenders for Traffic Lights	690
Traffic Lights - Installation - Bayers Road and Romans Avenue	691
School for the Deaf Site - Extension of Boundaries	692
Appointment to Industrial Development Commission	692
Appointments to Forum Commission	692
Costs - Mattar Case	692
Taxing Solicitors' Accounts	693
Modification of Sideyard - No.290 Robie Street	693
Service Costs - Mulgrave Park Housing Project	694
Erection of Transmission Tower - Chebucto Road - Nova Scotia Light and Power Company, Limited	695
Permission to Operate Sport Fishing Boat	695
Expropriation - City Block Bounded by Brunswick, Jacob, Market and Buckingham Streets	696
Encroachment - Federal Building	698
Encroachment - No.273 South Street	699
Progress Payment No.15 (Final) - Material and Equipment- New Incinerator	699
Reception of Petitions and Delegations	703
Zoning and Rezoning Falkland Street Area	703
Conditions of Lease Renewal - Marden Wild Limited	703
Appointment of Committee Re: Provincial - Municipal Fiscal Policy	703
Uncut Grass	704
Applications for Building Permits	705
Capital Budget	707
Sprinkler System - Administration Building, School Board	708
Improvement - 100 Feet of Scott Street	710
Borrowing Resolutions	711
To Lay Down and Remove a Portion of the Official Street Line at the Northwestern Corner of Quinpool Road and Robie Street as Shown on Section 14 B. of the Official City Plan.	712
To Lay Down a 10 Foot Building Line on the West Side of Robie Street from Quinpool Road to 46 Feet Northwardly or to the Existing R-3 Zone	724
Tax Collections - Month of May, 1960	725
Establishment of Parking Authority	726
Administrative Report for May - 1960	726
Appropriations Report	726

C. A. VAUGHAN,  
MAYOR AND CHAIRMAN.

R. H. STODDARD,  
CITY CLERK.



*D. Morton*

CITY COUNCIL  
MINUTES

Council Chamber,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N. S.,  
June 30, 1960.  
8:05 P. M.

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC HEARING RE: PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT SCHEME - AREA SOUTH OF SPRING GARDEN ROAD, BETWEEN CLYDE STREET AND SPRING GARDEN ROAD.

A public hearing in connection with the proposed redevelopment scheme for the area south of Spring Garden Road to Clyde Street was held at this time.

The City Clerk advised that the matter had been duly advertised and that written objections had been received as follows. He then read the following letters:

June 29, 1960.

Dear Mayor Vaughan:

We have been requested by Imperial Oil Limited and by Mr. Harvey Hubley, the tenant of the Company's Service Station at the intersection of Spring Garden Road and Dresden Row, to write to the City authorities in connection with the proposed parking area on Clyde Street, and as well the establishment of a shopping mall which would involve the closing off from vehicular traffic of Brenton Street, Dresden Row and Birmingham Street. We appreciate that a Public Hearing is arranged for the 30th June but as this matter involves many problems it is thought that the Company's views, and those of Mr. Hubley, might be better set forth by way of memorandum.

The following observations are made:-

Imperial Oil Limited, as well as Mr. Hubley, appreciate the endeavours of the City authorities to make Halifax a better City and wish to clear out blighted areas is fully recognized. The intention to make broad plans for the future of Halifax is supported and appreciated.

Imperial Oil Limited has owned the Service Station property on Spring Garden Road at Dresden Row for about thirty years, and Mr. Hubley has been a tenant in this property for a long period of time. The present plans would undoubtedly give rise to a serious disruption of the business of the Company and Harvey Hubley, and there is an added possibility that there would be a serious

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

capital loss of the value of the Service Station. This Service Station has a very large gallonage and indeed its sales are one of the largest in the Maritime Provinces. These facts indicate that the location is necessary for the purpose of the motoring public.

To bring about the suggested changes in the Service Station and surrounding properties would involve a large capital expenditure and it is not presently understood how this would be borne. Changes of this character would constitute expropriation in one form or another. Our understanding at present is that the Service Station would be available, in part at least, to the parking area. Company officials and Mr. Hubley think that such access would in no way offset a loss in the business by reason of the blocking off of Dresden Row.

Many customers presently turn into the Service Station from Spring Garden Road and then proceed down Dresden Row. It is thought that the blocking off of Dresden Row would substantially reduce the number of vehicles entering the Service Station.

If the general public think that the proposals should go ahead, it is respectfully suggested that no changes be made with respect to Dresden Row. It is thought that Hubley's Service Station is the only business that might be presently affected in a substantial way as it relies on moving vehicular traffic. To eliminate Dresden Row as a Street, and as well the other two Streets, means that there is a very large distance without an intersecting street that is to say from South Park Street to Queen Street. The submission is made that if Dresden Row is left open there would be access to the parking area from Spring Garden Road. In addition Dresden Row would serve to have a service means to permit fire engines and other necessary vehicles to gain entrance to properties in the rear of Spring Garden Road.

Both Imperial Oil Limited and Harvey Hubley wish to indicate that they have to resist the proposed changes insofar as Dresden Row is concerned. Such resistance is not intended to be by way of objection to the whole of the Plan but the situation of the Company and the tenant must be carefully considered.

Officials of the Company and Mr. Hubley would be very glad to sit down with the City Engineers to consider all phases of the matter at some convenient time.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) McInnes, Cooper & Robertson.

He next read the following letter:

June 27, 1960.

The City Clerk's Office,  
City Hall,  
Halifax, N. S.

Dear Sir:

Referring to my commercial properties situated at 59, 61 and 57 Dresden Row, I wish to enter my protest for the rezoning of this Area south of Spring Garden Road under the Town Planning Act.

The reason for my protest being the Building Permits issued to me by the City Hall over the past two years.

Yours very truly,

JOHN G. HENRICKS LIMITED,  
(Sgd.) John G. Henricks.



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

He also read the following letter:

82 Dutch Village Road,  
Halifax, N. S.  
June 27, 1960.

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

Dear Sir:

Mrs. Zinn of 49 Birmingham Street, Halifax, N. S., has retained me with reference to the matter of the Town Planning Act and the Spring Garden South Redevelopment.

My instructions are to object to this redevelopment scheme on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Zinn on the grounds that the precarious condition of the health of both of them is likely to cause irreparable damage in the event of their having to re-locate, particularly in the very near future.

The premises, 49 Birmingham Street, was purchased by them a few years ago and they have expended a considerable amount in making improvements to these premises. Due to reasons of health, they have been obliged to let a portion of the said premises in order to produce income, and this source of revenue is practically their sole means of livelihood at the present time. Mr. Zinn can work intermittently but the scope of his employment is limited and consequently affects his total income. These premises are free of all encumbrances and it would be most difficult for these people to re-locate at present-day costs anywhere in the vicinity of their present location.

Yours very truly,

Percy C. Henley.

His Worship the Mayor asked if any other persons wished to be heard against the proposed Redevelopment Scheme.

Mr. Andrew MacFadden, 5 Annandale Street, addressed Council and asked what plans have been made to accommodate the people who would be disturbed, people who have lived in the area during their lifetime, some of whom have spent considerable money improving their properties, and many of them derive a livelihood by operating rooming houses; and many of the occupants would not qualify for accommodation in housing projects such as Mulgrave Park.

Mrs. Birch, 47 Brenton Street, addressed Council as follows: "We bought the property at 47 Brenton Street four years ago because we liked it, and because it was so central. I have two small children who will be going to school next year. Morris Street School is just around the corner. All the houses from Spring Garden Road right down Brenton Street are well kept, with the exception of one we live in them and we like them."

Mrs. Birch stated that she rents one room and from her experience felt

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

that there was a great demand for rooms in the area because of its central location; and she asked if all the people in the area are to be moved for the sake of business, because it is not for the reason that the properties have become slums.

His Worship the Mayor: "Mrs. Birch, you would say that, in your opinion, where you live and around that area is a desirable area for housing?"

Mrs. Birch: "I would certainly say so."

Mrs. Carl Lawler also addressed Council stating that she was acting as spokesman for a number of people in the area. She expressed herself as favoring the closing off of Dresden Row as there would be less danger from traffic to the small children who play in the area; but she felt that the people living in the area should not be forced out because they liked living in the area and a great many had children attending schools and churches in the area; and she asked, if houses had to be demolished to make way for a parking lot, that better type housing be provided in the same general area for the people who would be disturbed.

His Worship the Mayor: "Mrs. Lawler, in your opinion, do you think the general area where you live is a good area for housing?"

Mrs. Lawler: "Well, yes."

His Worship the Mayor: "Thank you, Mrs. Lawler."

Mrs. Huelin, 29 Brenton Street, addressed Council stating that her house is one of those which will be affected by the extending of Clyde Street. She informed the Council that she had spent a considerable sum of money improving her property which she operates as a rooming house, and which serves as a livelihood for herself; and she concluded: "What am I supposed to do? I like it there -- it is a livelihood for me, and I just don't want to move -- and that is why I am opposing the proposal."

No further persons wished to be heard against the proposal.

His Worship the Mayor thanked those who had spoken and then asked if anyone wished to be heard in favour of the proposal.

Mr. Offman, Manager of the Offman Furniture Company, Spring Garden Road, addressed Council as follows:



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

"Your Worship, the City of Halifax has been making great strides in progress. A few years ago City Council engaged Dr. Stephenson to make a survey of the City development, and decide how we could go about redeveloping our City. Our City Council passed that the Dresden Row area and the Clyde Street area should have a parking lot for the South End, because the business area on Spring Garden Road is developing at a rate where the City is getting a large sum of money, in tax money, to pay for all the necessary things around the City, and you can't run the City on just good wishes, but you have to have money to run the City and, in order to run the City, you have got to collect taxes. I would say that in the last decade about \$2,000,000.00 worth of new property has been built on Spring Garden Road and in the Spring Garden area, from which the City receives about \$95,000.00 in taxes. In return we can go ahead and build schools, pay teachers, and so on. Now, the area south of Spring Garden Road, about 25% of the property there, proposed for the parking lot, is vacant land; another 50% is property, which is below habitation. It should be condemned. A lot of it has been condemned, some torn down and there is about 50% more that should come down as they haven't any proper facilities for people to live.

"The question is the rezoning south of Clyde Street residential, which I am fully in favour of. I would like to see this area rezoned to residential where decent housing could be built for people in a low-income bracket. They could move in there and have proper facilities to live and, then, the City could develop the rest of the area from Spring Garden Road where they could derive, perhaps, double the income in commercial rates. It would enhance the whole area because this is the only slum area, there, in those two blocks which we are talking about preparing for this parking lot. The City would gain tax money by permitting other people to put up business properties, and this block south of Clyde Street could be redeveloped into a low-cost housing, new hi-rise apartments for people who live in that area. I am in full accord for the Council to go ahead with this project because we have spent money for this purpose. We have paid professional people for that purpose, to design this project, to go ahead with it. I can't see why we shouldn't because as the City develops all

Council,  
June 30th, 1960.

the outskirts of the City develop, like different shopping centres, and the downtown area is suffering on account of that because where there is no access to an area, naturally, the commercial properties soon depreciate and the revenue to the City definitely will depreciate. So, I am in full accord with the plans originally laid by Dr. Stephenson, and approved by City Council, by you, Your Worship, and also your Town Planner. There has been a lot of planning put into this project. It is impossible to please everybody because if you are going to try to please everyone, we won't get anywhere with our plans. We can't stand still. Look at this room, here. Some years ago it was renovated, and now you have made a beautiful room out of it and you can be proud of it. This is exactly what we are trying to do for the South End of the City, south of Spring Garden Road. I think that the plan is correct and right, and I say to the people who have their properties, they should be paid for them, and for people who live there should be found better accommodation than they have been living in, at a reasonable rental. I think the plan is worthy of high praise. I have looked at it several times, so have others, and I think we should go ahead with the plan because it is going to enhance the City. The City is going to gain by receiving more tax money because there are going to be more commercial properties built in that area and what the City is going to lose is just a few dollars and old properties that are beyond repair. I wouldn't say we should tear down a good street, but any property that is beyond repair should come down, and we should go ahead with this project. I am, truly, in accord with this project.

Thank you."

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

Mr. Andrew MacFadden, 5 Annandale Street, was permitted to address Council again, and he referred to Mr. Offman's statement that the people in the area would be provided with alternate low-rental accommodation in high-rise apartment buildings and he asked where the apartments would be located; and he contended that no action is being taken to provide accommodation for the people in the area, who could not afford to pay the rents applicable in the Malgrave Park and similar projects.

His Worship the Mayor: "What are they paying in monthly rental, now?"



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

Mr. MacFadden: "Most of those I know personally own their own houses. They got them when they were cheap, put good plumbing in and added considerably to them, and they are now quite valuable; but they won't be able to get anything to accommodate them and to give them a revenue." He referred to the properties owned by Mr. Offman and by Mr. Henricks as being fine buildings and he asked if the City would be willing to subsidize the property owners in the area so that they too could improve their properties.

His Worship the Mayor advised Mr. MacFadden that the City was prohibited by law to make any subsidy of the suggested nature.

Alderman O'Brien: "Your Worship, I think some attempt should be made to answer these questions rather than have some other questions arise in the meantime. I think you would be an appropriate person to answer them."

His Worship the Mayor: "The only answer I could give Mr. MacFadden is that the City is now building houses in the Mulgrave Park area and these units will rent for 20% of their monthly total family income. We will be having people living there getting modern flats for \$35.00 or \$40.00 per month, others will pay \$60.00, depending upon their income, some will pay \$80.00 depending upon their income. These houses are now being provided for persons who are being displaced. Of course, we make no allowance if a person rents a property other than to provide fair compensation for those people. But, that's it."

Alderman Lloyd: "The problem divides itself into three parts, as I see it. The area south of Clyde Street, those residents have a different interest in this matter than those who are in other parts of this area. You should really discuss the area south of Clyde Street, and that is one of the answers to Mr. MacFadden's questions. It should be pointed out that the people in the area south of Clyde Street are not affected by this proposal."

8:25 P. M. Alderman Dunlop arrived.

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

Alderman Lloyd: "You should really discuss the area south of Clyde Street. That is one of the answers for Mr. MacFadden because he asks a general question about the entire area, and you cannot answer him without pointing out that the people south of Clyde Street are not affected by this proposal. Is that correct, or not?"

His Worship the Mayor: "That is correct."

Alderman Lloyd: "South of Clyde Street. There will be no property taken south of Clyde Street and there is no intention to take any property south of Clyde Street. This is for the record now, Mrs. Lawler. It is the intention of this Council to do everything in its power to encourage, through its Minimum Standards Regulations, and the like, that the housing in that area improves rather than goes down; that is south of Clyde Street. The second problem has to do with those folks who have homes which will be required for a street area. Are there any houses in this area, here (indicates) Spring Garden Road and Brenton Street? There are some houses north and I understand, this evening, that they are to be acquired."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "On one plan I saw, those were not to be taken. It was just, simply, the one or two houses which happened to be in the way of the proposed street. Now, that has been altered. Are there any houses on Brenton Street, on the east side, north of the new entrance to Brenton Street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes. The proposal does envisage taking these houses."

Alderman Lloyd: "How many properties are involved?"

Planning Director: "There are four houses involved."

His Worship the Mayor: "There are four buildings north."

Alderman Lloyd: "Well, there are, approximately, six buildings to be acquired. Now, that is the second part of the answer to Mr. MacFadden. That is a separate problem. The third problem has to do with the area in which many properties have been condemned. Are there any people from that particular area who are objecting, apart from the ones I have mentioned? I would like to hear them."



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, there was one; a letter from Mr. Henley, representing one of his clients, at No. 49 Birmingham Street."

Alderman Lloyd: "That is the remainder of the property north of Glyde Street, the area which is to be acquired in addition to those six units on Brenton Street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Right."

Alderman Lloyd: "So, in essence, the only way you can answer Mr. Mac Fadden fairly is to say we must answer you with respect to the six properties on Brenton Street and those properties that are on the north side of Glyde Street. Isn't that correct?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, that is correct."

Mr. J. Bennett: "May I ask a question now, Your Worship? Are we discussing the entire 'A', 'B' and 'C'?"

His Worship the Mayor: "We are discussing only #1, but some people have introduced the other areas. We are talking about the first portion of it, which is the parking lot proposal, north of Glyde Street."

Alderman O'Brien: "The question has been asked about the compensation in the case of property owners in the area where the properties are being taken over. There is some uneasiness resulting from the feeling that, perhaps, the method used in the Jacob Street area would be duplicated exactly. I think we ought to say that it is the City's aim to set a fair market value in determining what will be paid for these properties, and that we will seek the advice of appraisers to help determine that value, and offers will be made for the properties on the basis of the appraisers' advice, our views, and the views of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. If these values are not satisfactory to the property owners, they, then, have recourse to the Court which is the last resort for justice and where the people would receive whatever compensation is owing to them in view of the Judge concerned. There is no desire on the part of the Redevelopment Committee, or the Council, to take any action which would hurt the economic interests of property owners in the area. We feel, in the Redevelopment Committee at least, that the whole project is a sound one, and that we must compensate properly and fairly the property owners and taxpayers, at large."

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

This is our basic problem. I don't know of any fairer way. Perhaps, some of the people can suggest their ideas, if they know of anything better."

Mr. W. Mills: "May I speak in favour of this project? I believe the City has taken a wonderful step in going ahead and getting a Planner who has done a wonderful job as we are looking at tonight. I have attended quite a few meetings on this, that is with the businessmen of Spring Garden Road, and in that area. We have been unanimous in our praise for the job that was done. As a group we believe that this will be the first step toward better conditions everywhere in Halifax. We will get this job done; then, we will get on with some other good job. I would like to go on record as being for it."

Mrs. Lawler: "If this is one step, we would like to know what the next step is?"

His Worship the Mayor: "There are no hidden plans. Let me tell you that there is nothing here of an ulterior nature, whatsoever. No one here is trying to mislead the public in any of our plans."

Alderman Lane: "We are considering the first matter only but I do feel from the tenor of the remarks this evening, from those who have been opposing this, that there is a misunderstanding still over what we plan in the way of rezoning. You have continually emphasized the fact, when people have pleaded on behalf of their homes, you have said, 'you regard this as a good place to live, for a residential zone?'"

His Worship the Mayor: "I asked the question, yes."

Alderman Lane: "That is precisely what items 'A', 'B' and 'C' are going to bring about. It is to assure you that it is going to remain a residential district; it is now commercial. You want to go on living there. If it is going to be residential, it has to be rezoned to R-3. Now, I feel that is a misunderstanding which should have been cleared up earlier."

His Worship the Mayor: "I was trying to get the people's views first."

Alderman Lane: "The issue was very clouded, I am afraid."

Alderman Abbott: "I was wondering when that was going to be brought out because the concern of most of the people, who spoke this evening, was the fact that they were going to lose their homes. This was going to become busi-



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

ness, but everything south of Clyde Street is now going to become residential. It is now commercial. This Council proposes to change the zoning from Commercial to Residential, so those who live south of Clyde Street can rest at ease. They can go home in peace because, if Council approves this tonight, their homes will change from Commercial to Residential. There is no intention of moving them at all.

"Your Worship, Alderman Lloyd brought out the fact that we were going to acquire six homes, I believe, on Brenton Street. Do we need these six homes for street purposes there?"

His Worship the Mayor: "I think what we should do now, having had our Hearing, we should do nothing tonight by way of positive action because there are still some details we have to work out on the financial basis. It may be the desire of Council to do this on a partial basis first; to test it. I know this is not in keeping with the Town Planner's viewpoint. The Manager does take this stand. I think we might well approach this matter on the basis of a little bit at first to test it. Nothing would be lost in doing this. If we lay down our lines we are protected quite fully. I think it would be wise tonight if we merely closed off the Hearing and deferred action until the next meeting."

Alderman Lloyd: "I think that is wise."

His Worship the Mayor: "I want to discuss items 'A', 'B' and 'C' and, then, come back to it."

Alderman Lloyd: "When you come to 'A', 'B' and 'C', as Aldermen Lane and Abbott pointed out, if you do not rezone, then there is a far greater threat to those interested in residential, and a continuation of residential buildings south of Clyde Street. If you don't rezone, and you went ahead later with this parking lot, you have people opposing the rezoning to residential, because they see a potential development along Clyde Street, opposite the new parking lot which goes contrary to what the City is trying to do, which is to contain the expansion of commercial areas into residential areas for the very reason mentioned by Mrs. Lawler; the location of schools, the location of churches, parks, gardens, etc. So, you try to confine your commercial areas as much as you

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

possibly can without intrusion, unnecessarily, by default. If you didn't rezone the area south of Clyde Street, I predict that within a very short space of time the entire south side of Clyde Street would be on the market as commercial properties; at commercial property prices. If you start there and say, 'all right, let Clyde Street go commercial', then, the first thing you know the back doors of commercial buildings, the service entrances of service buildings on the south side of Clyde Street will be intruding into the residential area. Contrary to what has been said, the proposal which comes to us is to protect, as much as you possibly can, and preserve the entire residential area south of Clyde Street. If I am wrong in that, please correct me."

His Worship the Mayor: "That is correct."

Mrs. Birch: "Would you please give us the exact numbers of the houses on Brenton Street which are going to be taken by the City? We want that made clear."

His Worship the Mayor: "I wouldn't say they would be taken as this has not been established, as yet, by Council; whether we go this far or not. This is part of the proposal."

Planning Director: "The street numbers of the properties necessary for the extension of Clyde Street, which has already passed Council, are Nos. 29, 31 and 33 Brenton Street. In the development area, itself, the commercial development and the service road, we need houses Nos. 47, 49, 53 and 59."

His Worship the Mayor: "Eight buildings all together."

Mrs. Birch: "Five houses from No.47 up to No.59; what kind of a roadway is the City planning to build? That is going to take in a lot of property just for a roadway."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, no, Mrs. Birch. I think you misunderstood us. Nos. 29, 31 and 33 are involved in the extension of Clyde Street through from Dresden Row to Brenton Street. The other numbers, listed by Mr. Munnich, are proposed to be included in the Redevelopment Scheme. These are not, necessarily, for street widening. It is for a service area only, as a new street leading into the parking lot or a new service lane."

Mrs. Birch: "In other words, you are going to have commercial and



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

residential back onto each other. I thought that was something you were trying to do away with."

His Worship the Mayor: "Where do you live, Mrs. Birch?"

Mrs. Birch: "I live at No.47 Brenton Street."

His Worship the Mayor: "Mrs. Birch, you now live in a commercial zone; and your next door neighbour could apply for a permit to build a store there and could have the permit granted. You now live in a commercial zone."

Mrs. Birch: "Yes, but I thought you were trying to get away from that."

His Worship the Mayor: "We couldn't deny the permit under the present zoning; where you live now, for instance."

Mrs. Birch: "There is a Beauty Parlour at the corner now. What I can't understand is why the houses from there down to No.47; what good is it going to do to take those?"

Alderman Lloyd: "Let us see clearly Nos. 29, 31 and 33 Brenton Street."

Planning Director: "These are (indicates) Nos.29, 31 and 33 for Clyde Street extension."

Alderman Lloyd: "Is that where Mrs. Huelin's property is located?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "That is for the extension of Clyde Street."

Planning Director: "That is correct. The service entrance will serve all the commercial properties on Spring Garden Road."

Mrs. Birch: "Just one, not all of the properties."

Planning Director: "No, not all of them; two properties for the road itself and, then, other properties will be affected by the service area in the block, which fronts Spring Garden Road."

Alderman Lloyd: "I see your problem. That is the reason that you don't want to make a decision tonight. There may be some modification, depending upon the treatment of this Imperial Oil Limited property."

His Worship the Mayor: "We have finished the Hearing. Can we have a motion of Council?"

Alderman Wyman: "It seems to me that in line with what you were sug-

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

gesting a few moments ago, that Council should ask the Redevelopment Committee to bring forward to us now a step-by-step plan for the implementing of this for our consideration when we are considering the whole matter of the redevelopment of the area."

MOVED by Alderman Wyman, seconded by Alderman Lloyd, that the matter be referred to the Redevelopment Committee for a step-by-step plan. Motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING RE: (A) REZONING PORTION OF THE BLOCK BOUNDED BY  
DRESDEN ROW, SPRING GARDEN ROAD, BRENTON STREET AND MORRIS STREET,  
FROM C-2 ZONE TO R-3 ZONE.

A public hearing in connection with the proposed rezoning of the block bounded by Dresden Row, Spring Garden Road, Brenton and Morris Streets, from C-2 (General Business) Zone to R-3 (Multiple Dwelling) Zone, was held at this time.

The City Clerk advised that the matter had been duly advertised and that no written objections had been received.

Alderman Lloyd: "Anybody presently conducting business in a commercial zone, you might explain Your Worship."

His Worship the Mayor: "Anybody presently operating a business, enterprise, or occupying business premises in this area would be permitted to carry on business as a Non-conforming Use."

Alderman Wyman: "I would like to raise a question in connection with this. As far as the Agenda is concerned, the description of 'A' and 'B' are identical. I think that there should be some distinction between them if we are going to discuss them separately."

Alderman Lloyd: "How was it advertised?"

His Worship the Mayor: "A portion of the block bounded by Dresden Row, Spring Garden Road, Brenton Street and Morris Street."

Alderman Lloyd: "Are there 'A' and 'B' portions in that block?"

Planning Director: "There are two portions in the same block."

His Worship the Mayor: "Then, these are described correctly. The only thing is we are concerned with two portions of land in the same block, and they are legally described for the Zoning By-Law, to be passed by Council."



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

They are described by metes and bounds rather than the general description here."

Alderman Wyman: "That is the point. There are two and we should know just which one is referred to."

Alderman Lloyd: "Which portion is 'A'?"  
For the purpose of clarification, the plan submitted by the Planning Director showed the portion as 'A' and the portion as 'B'.

Alderman Lloyd: "The top portion is 'A' and it is presently zoned commercial?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, it is presently zoned commercial; that is where Mrs. Birch lives."

The Planning Director was requested to name the properties included in this portion.

Planning Director: "The properties Nos. 33 to 45 Brenton Street, inclusive."

Alderman Wyman: "There will be the five houses north of Clyde Street, on the east side of Brenton Street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "Yes, because the service area comes above that."

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right. The proposal is to rezone that portion of Brenton Street, extending from the north line of Clyde Street, north to No.45 from Commercial to Residential R-3."

Mrs. Huelin: "Would you explain to us what difference it makes?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Do you mean the zoning?"

Mrs. Huelin: "Yes."

His Worship the Mayor: "I'll explain it quite briefly. In an R-3 Zone you can have an apartment house and other associated kinds of building. You cannot carry on in this zone any commercial enterprise unless it was there before the Zoning By-Law was amended."

Mrs. Huelin: "Well, could the City still take it if it is residential?"

His Worship the Mayor: "The City doesn't propose to take this portion."

Mrs. Huelin: "I mean if they do agree, as they agreed to cut through No.29. If it is residential, can they still do it?"

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, the City has that right."

The Mayor asked if anyone wished to be heard in this Rezoning proposal on Brenton Street.

Mrs. Huelin: "Earlier this evening, you said that it was passed by the Council that you were going to put the street through. Is that definite?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, that is definite. It was passed several months ago."

Mrs. Huelin: "When are you going to put it through? When do we get our notice?"

His Worship the Mayor: "I can't tell you that."

Alderman Lloyd: "There would be many months' notice, though?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Oh, yes."

Mr. J. Bennett: "Your Worship, apparently 'A' has been dealt with."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, it has not been. We are dealing with 'A' right now, No.2 (A) on the Agenda. Only those houses that face on the east side of Brenton Street, north of Clyde Street, the first five houses north."

Mrs. Birch: "Is that from my house up?"

His Worship the Mayor: "What is your number, Mrs. Birch?"

Mrs. Birch: "No. 47 Brenton Street."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, Nos. 35 to 45 only are affected by this Reasoning proposal."

Mrs. Hopkins: "I would like to know about the seven houses that are going to be left there, from Nos. 35 to 45. They are going to be left and no plans to remove those?"

His Worship the Mayor: "There are no plans to remove those houses. None, at the present time. There are no secret or hidden plans, either."

Mrs. Hopkins: "Is it right for the residential to be in with the commercial like that?"

His Worship the Mayor: "In the opinion of the Town Planner it is."

Mrs. Hopkins: "I mean if Nos. 35 or 37 wanted to sell for commercial, could they?"



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "They could sell it to a commercial firm but the firm could not use it for commercial purposes."

Mrs. Hopkins: "They could at the moment, Your Worship?"

His Worship the Mayor: "They can right now but, if it is rezoned, they will not be able to do that."

Mrs. Hopkins: "No, I mean that block 'A' will be partly commercial and partly residential."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, that block 'A' will be entirely residential."

Alderman Wyman: "I think there is some confusion among the people who are asking these questions. If you look at the corner of Brenton Street and Spring Garden Road there is a commercial development at present, which runs back along Brenton Street. If this Redevelopment Plan is developed, immediately behind that there will be a service lane. Then, the houses we are now talking about are between that service lane and what will be the end of Clyde Street. They are reasonably isolated from the commercial development on Spring Garden Road and they can be reasonably well shielded from the parking lot, which would be behind them."

His Worship the Mayor again asks if there is anyone who wishes to be heard against the proposal to rezone this portion of Brenton Street from C-2 to R-3.

Mr. J. Bennett: "These five houses from the Spring Garden Road property down to the service lane, is that going to be all service lane or are they going to be available for commercial property?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, the proposal is that the frontage will be used for commercial property. This is the proposal that came up from the Redevelopment Committee, but earlier motion of Council just passed but reported back to the Redevelopment Committee for further refinements."

His Worship the Mayor asked if anyone wished to be heard in favour of the proposal to rezone this portion of Brenton Street. No one appeared.

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

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the By-Law be approved. Motion passed.

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

PUBLIC HEARING RE: (B) REZONING PORTION OF THE BLOCK BOUNDED BY DRESDEN  
ROW, SPRING GARDEN ROAD, BRENTON STREET AND MORRIS STREET, FROM C-2 ZONE  
TO R-3 ZONE.

A public hearing in connection with the proposed rezoning of a portion of the block bounded by Dresden Row, Spring Garden Road, Brenton and Morris Streets from C-2 (General Business) Zone to R-3 (Multiple Dwelling) Zone, was held at this time.

The City Clerk advised that the matter had been duly advertised and that no written objections had been received.

Planning Director: "This is a portion of the same block which lies between Dresden Row, Morris Street on the south side, and Brenton Street with the exception of the area already zoned Residential."

His Worship the Mayor asked if any persons wished to be heard against the proposed rezoning of this portion from C-2 to R-3 -- the portion of the block between Clyde Street extension, Morris Street, Brenton Street and Dresden Row.

Mr. J. Bennett: This section is now C-2, which is Commercial. Everybody living in any district today, naturally, are interested in real estate values. First, I don't think there is much doubt that these properties are worth more commercially than they would be R-3. Secondly, if the Spring Garden Road merchants are to be given their parking lot, or their parking mall, I feel that they should be quite satisfied. I don't think that the Spring Garden Road merchants should expect City Council to put the customers down in the block from Clyde Street to Morris Street, which is now commercial. There are still some commercial establishments in the lower end of the block. I can name one, I suppose, which may not come in this zoning. You take Horne & Company, for instance, they do a grocery business over on Dresden Row."

His Worship the Mayor: "On the opposite side of the street, there is only one commercial building in this block proposed for rezoning."

Mr. J. Bennett: "Yes, but if one is rezoned from one to the other it seems natural that the other one will follow suit. If it is made into R-3, anybody doing business couldn't even expand their business. Is that correct?"



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

His Worship the Mayor: "That is correct. He can't expand the building physically."

Mr. J. Bennett: "Then, that being the case, I, certainly, am opposed to the rezoning of any of those blocks from C-2 to R-3."

No further persons wished to be heard on the matter.

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

MOVED by Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman Trainor, that the By-Law as submitted be approved. Motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING RE: (C) REZONING PORTION OF THE BLOCK BOUNDED BY MORRIS STREET, BRENTON STREET, BRENTON PLACE AND SOUTH PARK STREET FROM C-2 TO R-3 ZONE.

A public hearing in connection with the proposed rezoning of a portion of the block bounded by Morris Street, Brenton Street, Brenton Place and South Park Street from C-2 (General Business) Zone to R-3 (Multiple Dwelling) Zone, was held at this time.

The City Clerk advised that the matter had been duly advertised and that no written objections had been received.

Alderman Lloyd: "Is that block presently 'Commercial'?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes!"

Alderman Lane: "Commercial zoning, but it is residential in nature, only."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, no. This is the property occupied by Purdy's."

Alderman Lane: "Yes, but it goes further than that."

His Worship the Mayor: "It's vacant land, but it is designated for commercial use. It is all in commercial use. There is a proposal of Mr. Mannich's before the Council that this all be rezoned Residential."

His Worship the Mayor asked if any persons wished to be heard against the proposal to rezone this portion of Brenton Street, on the west side, north of Morris Street.

Alderman DeWolf: "Is there any point to this?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, there is a point. In long-term development there is a point in having this rezoned as a residential area. You need residential areas to support the commercial areas in the district and also

Council,  
June 30, 1960.

to support Civic and other plans that we have there. Mr. Münnich feels that, as was borne out by Professor Stephenson, himself, who also recommended that this be rezoned from Commercial to Residential."

"Is there anyone opposed to this rezoning?"

Mrs. Abraham: "No, I am not opposed to it, but I would like to ask a question about the property at the corner of Brenton Street and Brenton Place. Are there any plans to take that piece of property to improve the new entrance to Clyde Street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "You mean on the west side of Brenton Street?"

Mrs. Abraham: "Yes, the west side."

His Worship the Mayor: "No!"

Mrs. Abraham: "There is no change in the line there?"

Planning Director: "No, there is no change."

Mrs. Abraham: "I was advised a few days ago that there is a plan to demolish the house on the corner of Brenton Street and Brenton Place, to widen the street."

His Worship the Mayor: "Maybe the owner is proposing that, but the City is not."

His Worship the Mayor asked if any persons wished to be heard in favour of the proposal.

No one appeared.

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

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman Wyman, that the By-Law be approved. Motion passed.

AMENDMENTS - ORDINANCE #52 - "DEED TRANSFER TAX" - SECOND READING

Amendments to Ordinance #52 respecting "Deed Transfer Tax" which were read and passed the first time at a meeting of the City Council held on May 12th, 1960, were again submitted.

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, hereidita-



Council,  
June 30, 1960.

ments 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."

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 No.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 the 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 DeWolf, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the Amendments, as prepared by the City Solicitor, be read and passed a second time and forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval. Motion passed.

AMENDMENTS - ORDINANCE #49 - "FEES FOR BUILDING AND PLUMBING PERMITS" - SECOND READING.

Amendments to Ordinance #49 respecting "Fees for Building and Plumbing Permits" which were read and passed the first time at a meeting of the City Council held on May 12th, 1960, were again submitted.

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¢