

Council,
August 11, 1960

Alderman Lloyd: "This could be deferred for consideration, or should it go back to the Town Planning Board in the light of what the Planning Director has said?"

His Worship the Mayor: "To the Redevelopment Committee."

Alderman Trainor: "There is one question I would like to ask. We dealt with this as a replotting in the Committee on Works the other day. As I understand it, there are about five sections or plots of land which must be combined into one. I would like to ask the Solicitor, forgetting about the fact there is going to be a service station there or a hot dog stand or an office building, just what our legal status would be if we denied the owners of this property the right to replot it all into one particular lot? Could we deny the replotting?"

City Solicitor: "That is a matter which I have under very serious consideration right now. I have not reached a conclusion on it yet because I have to go back quite a few years for certain reasons which I don't want to divulge tonight."

Alderman Lloyd: "That would seem to be another reason why, because of the legal implications, and because of the planning, and also in fairness to the owners of the land, that we shouldn't come to a hasty decision on this matter tonight. Although I am very much in favour of seeing this area organized for replanning on a specific basis, I don't like it to be on the basis of 'We're-going-to-hold-it-sort-of-thing because sometime we might do something'. I think we should be as specific about it as we can. Therefore, I am happy that the Planning Director tells us he will have this specific proposal for the Redevelopment Committee within what length of time?"

His Worship the Mayor: "I know he has been working on it."

Alderman Lloyd: "What length of time; a week, two weeks?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No more than two weeks."

Alderman Lloyd: "Then, there is the report on the matter raised by Alderman Trainor."

Alderman Trainor: "I would like to have that, not only for this item but we often get these replottings in the Committee on Works; we know that in

Council,
August 11, 1960

the future development of the land after it has been replotted, there is going to be a service station; there is going to be some other particular building go up which we may not take a kind view towards, or something like that. It may not particularly blend in with the planning we have for the area. Can we, legally, not grant the right to replot all the land? That is what I would like to know."

His Worship the Mayor: "The Solicitor will look into the matter."

Mr. Ian MacKeigan: "May I ask what Council has decided on this application?"

His Worship the Mayor: "We have a verbal report from the Director of Planning to the effect that he wants to study the implications of this property as related to an immediate scheme he wishes to prepare, and is now preparing, for the Redevelopment Committee especially with respect to the widening of Water Street, from Prince Street north to a point north of George Street. This, he says, is necessary to consider immediately because of the construction of the new Federal Building's addition which would bring to the area greater amounts of heavy vehicular traffic. He also pointed out to us there are two setbacks now in the R. C. M. P. Garage, the Fisheries Experimental Station Building. There are only two buildings existing now between Prince Street and George Street for removal or demolition for widening of the street. He also wants to prepare a more detailed, specific redevelopment scheme for us that would not hamper, in any way, the long-term development of the area. He has asked us for a stay of proceedings in the matter for a couple of weeks."

Mr. MacKeigan: "His recommendation is relevant to the matter now before you."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Mr. MacKeigan: "And, do I understand that no ruling has been given as to whether this matter is properly before Council?"

City Solicitor: "No. That opinion will be given at the same time that this scheme comes up."

It was agreed to refer the matter to the Redevelopment Committee for further consideration.

Council,
August 11, 1960

REPLOTTING - BARRINGTON AND RICHMOND STREETS

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
From: Town Planning Board
Date: August 2, 1960
Subject: Replotting - Lots 10 and 11, Barrington & Richmond Streets

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending in favor of a replotting of lots 10 and 11 at the corner of Barrington and Richmond Streets, as shown on Drawing No. P200/180, and that no public hearing be held in accordance with Section 727C of the City Charter.

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

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

REPLOTTING - LOTS 6 AND 7 - WEST SIDE OF CONNAUGHT AVENUE

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
From: Town Planning Board
Date: August 2, 1960
Subject: Replotting - Lots 6 and 7 - Connaught Avenue

The Town Planning Board at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Director of Planning recommending in favor of a replotting of lots #6 and #7, Connaught Avenue, as shown on Drawing No. P200/181, and that no public hearing be held in accordance with Section 727C of the City Charter.

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

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

Alderman Wyman: "May I ask if there is any question as to whether or not we have any right to consider the first two replottings. How does that affect our right to consider these other two?"

City Solicitor: "Because of the circumstances, they are altogether different."

Council,
August 11, 1960

Alderman Wyman: "That is all the answer I need. So long as I know they are not in the same category as the first one."

Alderman Lloyd: "I wouldn't say that."

His Worship the Mayor: "Definitely not."

Alderman Lloyd: "The Solicitor expresses his opinion we do have the power to replot in this case, whatever the comparisons may be."

His Worship the Mayor: "These two, items #14 and 15, replottings of portions of City Property, land in the City of Halifax which was subdivided, approved subdivisions, passed after the passing of the Zoning By-Law of 1950. That is the difference between these two and the first one."

The motion was put and passed.

EXPROPRIATIONS - JACOB STREET REDEVELOPMENT AREA

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

From: Committee on Works

Date: August 2, 1960

Subject: Expropriations - Jacob Street Redevelopment Area

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Commissioner of Works recommending expropriation of two blocks of land in the Jacob Street Redevelopment Area, as shown in red on Expropriation Plan No. SS-5-14892, and that the assessed value plus 5% be paid into Court.

On motion of Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Connolly, the Committee approved the report and a resolution to expropriate this land and recommended the same to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of the Committee on Works

From: G. F. West, Commissioner of Works

Date: August 2, 1960

Subject: Expropriations - Jacob Street Redevelopment Area

At the July 21, 1960, meeting of this Committee the Commissioner of Works was directed to prepare a plan and description of the blocks bounded by (1) Market, Duke, Grafton and Buckingham Streets (2) Market, Buckingham, Grafton and Jacob Streets, in accordance with Section 626 of the City Charter.

Expropriation Plan No. SS-5-14892, showing the area involved outlined in red and description of same is attached.

It is recommended that the City expropriate the properties for redevelopment purposes as provided under Section 624 of the City Charter and that the assessed value plus 5% be paid into Court.

G. F. WEST,
COMMISSIONER OF WORKS.

Council,
August 11, 1960

BE IT RESOLVED that this Council does hereby adopt the recommendation contained in the resolution passed at a meeting of the Committee on Works held on the 2nd day of August, A. D., 1960, for the expropriation of certain lands situate in the blocks bounded by Market Street, Buckingham Street, Grafton Street and Duke Street; and Market Street, Buckingham Street, Grafton Street and Jacob Street, in the City of Halifax, to be acquired for the purpose of redevelopment, and which lands are more fully described in the resolution of the Committee on Works and set out on a plan prepared by the Commissioner of Works dated July 21, 1960, and bearing Number SS-5-14892, referred to in the said resolution;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said land be and the same is hereby expropriated and that the City Clerk do pay to the Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia the sum of One Hundred and Twenty-two Thousand Six Hundred and Forty-one Dollars (122,641.00) of lawful money of Canada as the price or compensation for the said lands.

R E S O L U T I O N

W H E R E A S the Commissioner of Works of the City of Halifax has submitted a report dated August 2nd, 1960, and also a plan and description, covering the expropriation of property in the two blocks bounded by Market Street, Buckingham Street, Grafton Street and Duke Street; and Market Street, Buckingham Street, Grafton Street and Jacob Street, for Redevelopment Purposes;

AND WHEREAS the Committee on Works is of the opinion that the said lands should be acquired for the purpose aforesaid;

AND WHEREAS the Committee on Works deems it necessary that the said lands as hereinafter described be expropriated;

AND WHEREAS the owners of all the said lands are not definitely ascertained;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Clerk pay to the Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia the sum of One Hundred and Twenty-Two Thousand Six Hundred and Forty-one Dollars (122,641.00) as the price for the following said lands:

Vacant lot East Side of Market Street
adjoining northwardly Civic Number 229 Market Street - \$ 3,045.00

Council,
August 11, 1960

Civic Numbers 241-243 Market Street	- \$ 8,085.00
Vacant Lot East Side of Market Street adjoining Southerly 241-243 Market St.	1,470.00
Civic Number 253 Market Street	2,310.00
Civic Numbers 24-26 Jacob Street	7,350.00
Civic Numbers 180-182 Grafton Street	6,562.50
Civic Number 184 Grafton Street	13,807.50
Civic Numbers 184 $\frac{1}{2}$ -190 Grafton Street	8,925.00
Civic Numbers 192-196 Grafton Street	10,185.00
Vacant lot East side of Market Street adjoining westwardly 144 Grafton Street	1,680.00
Vacant lot East side of Market Street adjoining westwardly 146 Grafton Street	1,680.00
Civic Number 69 Duke Street (vacant lot)	1,050.00
Civic Number 71 Duke Street	16,695.00
Civic Number 44 Buckingham Street	13,807.50
Civic Numbers 140-142 Grafton Street	21,735.00
Civic Number 156 Grafton Street	4,252.50
Remainder of land in above-mentioned blocks	1.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 122,641.00
	<hr/>

said lands being more fully described as follows, viz.:

ALL that certain lot, piece or parcel of land, situate, lying and being in the block bounded by Market Street, Jacob Street, Grafton Street and Buckingham Street in the City of Halifax, as shown bordered in red on a plan entitled, "Expropriation Plan of Certain Lands Required by the City of Halifax for Redevelopment Purposes", dated July 21, 1960, and being on file in the office of the Commissioner of Works of the City of Halifax at City Hall as Plan #SS-5-14892; the said land being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the point where the northern official street line of Buckingham Street is intersected by the western official street line of Grafton Street;

Thence westwardly along said northern official street line of Buckingham Street for a distance of one hundred and twenty-six (126') feet more or less or to the eastern official street line of Market Street;

Thence northwardly along said eastern official street line of Market Street for a distance of four hundred (400') feet more or less or to the former southern official street line of Jacob Street;

Thence eastwardly along said former southern official street line of Jacob Street for a distance of one hundred and thirty-three (133') feet more or less or to the aforesaid western official street line of Grafton Street;

Council,
August 11, 1960

Thence southwardly along said western official street line of Grafton Street for a distance of three hundred and ninety-two (392') feet more or less to the place of beginning.

AND ALSO

All that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being the block bounded by Market Street, Buckingham Street, Grafton Street and Duke Street in the City of Halifax, as shown bordered in red on a plan entitled "Expropriation Plan of Certain Lands Required by the City of Halifax for Redevelopment Purposes", dated July 21, 1960, and being on file in the Office of the Commissioner of Works of the City of Halifax at City Hall as Plan No. SS-5-14892; the said land being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the point where the northern official street line of Duke Street is intersected by the western official street line of Grafton Street;

Thence westwardly along said northern official street line of Duke Street for a distance of one hundred and twenty feet and four tenths of a foot (120.4') more or less or to the eastern official street line of Market Street;

Thence northwardly along said eastern official street line of Market Street for a distance of three hundred and twenty-two feet and five tenths of a foot (322.5') more or less or to the southern official street line of Buckingham Street;

Thence eastwardly along said southern official street line of Buckingham Street for a distance of one hundred and twenty-four (124') feet more or less or to the aforesaid western official street line of Grafton Street;

Thence southwardly along said western official street line of Grafton Street for a distance of three hundred and twenty-three (323') feet more or less to the place of beginning.

MOVED by Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Abbott, that the reports and resolutions be approved. Motion passed.

PETITION - ST. MARGARET'S PARISH - CURB AND GUTTER - EAST SIDE ROBIE STREET

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of the City Council
From: Committee on Works
Date: August 2, 1960
Subject: Petition - Saint Margaret's Parish - Curb and Gutter - East Side of Robie Street

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a request from Saint Margaret's Parish for the installation of curb and gutter along the east side of Robie Street. The Commissioner of Works said that the estimated cost would be \$3,000.00, and the estimated assessment \$2,262.75, and that he would recommend that this work be done.

On motion of Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Connolly, the Committee approved the recommendation of the Commissioner of Works for the installation of curb and gutter along the east side of Robie Street and recommended the same to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

Council,
August 11, 1960

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

PROPERTY ACQUISITION - ST. JOSEPH'S SCHOOL

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
From: Committee on Works,
Date: August 2, 1960
Subject: Property Acquisition - Saint Joseph's School

The Committee dealt with this matter 'in camera'.

On motion of Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Connolly, the Committee granted permission to the Compensation Officer to obtain independent appraisers regarding this matter, and recommend the same to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

His Worship the Mayor: "Mr. Smith, you are engaging appraisers on behalf of the City for these properties?"

Mr. C. D. Smith: "Yes, I already have."

His Worship the Mayor: "The matter is still in process. You have nothing to report to Council tonight?"

Mr. C. D. Smith: "No."

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

ENCROACHMENT - MARITIME TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE COMPANY LIMITED - SOUTHWEST CORNER OF POINT PLEASANT DRIVE AND TOWER ROAD

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
From: Committee on Works
Date: August 2, 1960
Subject: Encroachment - Maritime Telegraph and Telephone Co. Ltd., (S.W. Corner of Point Pleasant Drive and Tower Road).

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a request from the Maritime Telegraph and Telephone Company, Limited for permission to install a Pay Phone Station at the southwest corner of Point Pleasant Drive and Tower Road. The Commissioner of Works informed the Committee that they would be encroaching on City property, and an encroachment fee should be charged as provided under Section 538 of the City Charter.

On motion of Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, the Committee approved the request by the Maritime Telegraph and Telephone Company, Limited for the installation of a Pay Phone Station at the southwest corner of Point

Council,
August 11, 1960

Pleasant Drive and Tower Road, at the fee of \$5.00 per year, and recommended the same to City Council.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

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

SETTLEMENT FOR LOAN ON CONCRETE TESTING MACHINE TO CITY

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council

From: Committee on Works

Date: August 2, 1960

Subject: Concrete Testing Machine (Mr. Noonan).

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a request from W. H. Noonan for settlement for a concrete testing machine which was loaned to the City and never returned.

Mr. DeBard said that the matter had been checked and found that the machine was used by the City, but could not be located. The Manager said he would recommend that the City pay him \$500.00 for the replacement of this equipment.

On motion of Alderman Trainor, seconded by Alderman Lane, the Committee recommended to City Council payment of \$500.00 to W. H. Noonan for replacement of his concrete testing machine.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
CLERK OF WORKS.

Alderman Lloyd: "Who is asking for it?"

His Worship the Mayor: "The man who owned it wants it back. The only thing is that we cannot locate it at the City Field at this time. It has been in use in the years between 1932 and 1960. In any event, I am sure we could find it. It wouldn't be worth very much money but we had the use of it all these years because the man who did the testing recalls having used a testing machine, which was loaned to the City during the time when Mr. Doane was on the Engineering staff; and he recalls borrowing this machine. We arranged a settlement agreeable to the owner of the machine for the extra payment of it."

Alderman Lane: "How much?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Five hundred dollars."

Alderman Greenwood: "Does the City Manager recommend this?"

Council,
August 11, 1960

City Manager: "Reluctantly, yes, in view of the circumstances. The machine was supposed to be worth \$1,200.00 when it was new. What it would cost to replace now, we don't know."

Alderman Lloyd: "There weren't any rentals for that machine?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

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

BORROWING AUTHORIZATIONS - CANCELLATIONS

August 11, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee, held on August 4, 1960, a report was submitted from the City Manager suggesting cancellation of the following Borrowing Authorizations:

Fire Department Pumper	\$ 1,443.88
Point Pleasant Park Rest Room	1,534.83
Halifax Council Housing Company	45,000.00
Acquisition of Land, Kempt Road and Windsor Street	3,000.00
Extension of Tower Terrace	500.00
Sewers, Construction, Pinewood Subdivision	2,000.00
Sprinkler System, City Field	1,000.00
Stone Shed, City Field	15,000.00
City Share - Improvements - Fairview Entrance to City	21,000.00
Rest Rooms - Public Gardens	1,000.00
Landscaping - St. Andrews School	22,000.00
	<u>\$ 113,478.71</u>

Your Committee concurs in the suggestion of the City Manager with the exception of the \$21,000.00 covering the item: "City's Share - Improvements - Fairview Entrance to City".

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

WESTWOOD PARK AGREEMENT - TAXATION

August 11, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Redevelopment Committee held on the above date, a report was submitted from the City Manager respecting the matter of taxes

Council,
August 11, 1960

to be received by the City from the Westwood Park Housing Project.

He recommended, after conferring with City Officials and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, that the City receive 25% of the gross receipts or normal taxes, whichever is the lower, but not less than \$150.00 per unit per annum.

Your Committee concurs in this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

Alderman Ferguson: "It is a different policy than what was laid down at the start of the Mulgrave Park Project."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, it is not. If we were to adopt what was before Council at the last meeting, we would be merely following the Mulgrave Park proposal. We have had discussions with Mr. Borland and we are recommending this because of the fact that the land is being conveyed to us at the sum of \$320.00 per unit, which is far below the actual market value. In using this as the basis of assessment, and taking also the calculated value of the units to be built, which would be far less in value or cost than Mulgrave Park, we came up with a figure of \$8,750.00 which would produce a tax revenue of \$188.15. This is on regular, normal taxation. We have recommended then that we do take the formula but we also write in a third clause that in no case will the payments per unit be less than \$150.00 per year. We say this: In consideration of the fact that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation had this land and have not put on it any increased capital valuation by reason of their holding it and selling it to the Partnership, we have to go some of the way when they come part of the way, too. For this reason, we are recommending that the Agreement be amended by merely inserting that the amount of taxation be not less than \$150.00 per unit per year."

Alderman Lloyd: "Would you explain how that works?"

His Worship the Mayor: "The taxation is to be this: It is to be 25% of the gross receipts, or normal taxes, whichever is the lower."

Council,
August 11, 1960

Alderman Ferguson: "Or normal taxes? Would normal taxes be under the assessment as by the City Assessor?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Normal taxes would be roughly in the nature of \$188.00."

Alderman Ferguson: "Is it the same as the taxes on a building, say on Barrington Street?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Oh, yes. The normal assessment."

Alderman Ferguson: "In other words, our floor is \$150.00."

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right. If we put up this on the basis of initial rental scales, which we anticipate for the first tenants, we will find that we will, in order to pay full taxation on it, require a larger subsidy than the Federal Government is prepared to pay at this time."

Alderman Ferguson: "I think that should be known. I would sooner pay the full value of the land and have that proportion, and then know what the subsidy is, than to do it this way."

His Worship the Mayor: "The only thing is: We can go through all the details and get this information for you. But, in the final analysis, will you make a different decision to proceed with Westwood Park or not, in the light of this information?"

Alderman Ferguson: "No, I don't think so."

His Worship the Mayor: "What we are doing is, the Committee is suggesting and we were going to follow through and get the information for you, so we will know the degree of subsidization which we are making beyond the subsidy as contained in the Agreement."

Alderman Ferguson: "I think that is quite important that we do have it. It's so easy to be forgotten at a later time."

His Worship the Mayor: "We will do it for you as soon as we get the information. However, the report from the Redevelopment Committee tonight will indicate to you that we have an Agreement and we can now proceed with it."

Alderman Ferguson: "Did I misinterpret your remark? You were saying that on the previous basis as it was recommended, or before the last Council meeting, was on the same basis as Mulgrave Park?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Council,
August 11, 1960

Alderman Ferguson: "Are we not on full taxes on Mulgrave Park?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. This is the term which was used. It was discussed in Council and in Committee when we were discussing the Mulgrave Park Agreement. The Agreement there contains the taxation clause that we receive 25% of the gross receipts or normal taxes, whichever is the lesser."

Alderman Lloyd: "That was for Bayers Road?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. On the Bayers Road Project, we get 25% of the gross receipts which now can exceed the actual normal taxation on the property."

Alderman Ferguson: "I was under the impression we were getting full normal taxes on Mulgrave Park."

His Worship the Mayor: "No."

Alderman O'Brien: "I think there is one more thing that should be on the record when this is passed, although the Committee recommended it, I think, unanimously. Some of us on the Committee reserved the right to re-open the question on future projects because one of the arguments Central Mortgage and Housing made with us, was that too much is being paid in the way of taxes on the Bayers Road scheme. I think there was some averaging involved in the three projects now under way.

"The second argument they used was that they have subsidized some land, the Province is likely to subsidize some land in the School for the Deaf site and they might expect us to do so in the future. If we are going to be subsidizing land, we should be subsidizing taxes, too. So, the question is open for future projects in spite of the fact the Committee agreed to go along with this one at this time."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think it is important that we proceed with our study, and I am quite sure that you would not agree to abandon the Westwood Park Project even if in spite of the fact the degree of subsidization is by way of a hidden subsidy in the form of tax concessions, which actually we are making in this case."

Alderman Macdonald: "Did the City give a subsidy to the Bayers Road Project at all?"

Council,
August 11, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "We are now paying a subsidy but a very slight one."

Alderman Macdonald: "It doesn't compare with this 38.13."

His Worship the Mayor: "It is less than \$4,000.00 a year at this point."

Alderman Ferguson: "But we get full taxes, 100%?"

His Worship the Mayor: "We get more than full taxes from Bayers Road now. Actually, from this Project, we get more than normal taxation by reason of the Agreement we worked out."

Alderman Lloyd: "We should say we get more than our particular residential tax taxation."

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right. It is also true that in the early days of the Bayers Road Project, we got less than full taxation by the application of the formula and by reason of the rental scales then in effect."

Alderman Lloyd: "Is this the practice that is followed in other cities?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Lloyd: "They use 25% of the receipts straight?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, the present formula."

City Manager: "Most of them are 25% of the gross receipts or taxes, whichever is the lower; but it happens that in just a few projects the 25% is lower."

Alderman Lloyd: "You have repeatedly pointed out that a single tax rate in other places would equal or be greater than our residential rate."

His Worship the Mayor: "We argued that, too. They say 'Here, you cannot expect the tenants in these houses to pay a higher residential tax rate than would apply normally throughout the City'. They said that to me when they were talking to me."

Alderman Lloyd: "Their Agreements are related to their costs and the rents are related to their land costs. That is one of the items we have in another case which will probably be coming up in a year and a half's time."

Alderman Ferguson: "I am a little concerned. I was under the impression that Mulgrave Park was full taxes. Maybe there's nothing we can do about it now. I am just wondering, on these details, how well informed members of

Council,
August 11, 1960

Council are."

His Worship the Mayor: "Mr. DeBard points out to me now that he was against the Mulgrave Park proposal on the basis of the taxation clause in the Agreement. He did make the objection at that time."

City Manager: "Before Council decided to go along with it."

Alderman Dunlop: "If we are going to build houses, we can't have everything our way."

His Worship the Mayor: "No, there has to be some give."

Alderman Lloyd: "There are all the other considerations."

His Worship the Mayor: "I think we should have this whole question tied up in the report to Council."

Alderman Lloyd: "In other words, you are going to show us what our contribution is going to be."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

The motion was then put and passed.

EXPROPRIATION - NOS. 8-10 POPLAR GROVE

To: His Worship the Mayor and Members of City Council
From: Committee on Works
Date: July 21, 1960
Subject: Expropriation - #8-10 Poplar Grove

The Committee on Works at a meeting held on the above date, considered a report from the Commissioner of Works on the expropriation of property owned by Messrs. Peter Carroll and Ernest G. Copus (Nova Scotia Armature Works Limited) on the west side of Poplar Grove between Jacob and Hurd Streets, known as Civic No. 8-10 Poplar Grove.

On motion of Alderman Lane, seconded by Alderman Butler, the Committee approved the report and recommended to City Council a resolution to expropriate the property and that \$38,377.50, which is assessment plus 5%, be paid into Court.

Respectfully submitted,

K. C. MANTIN,
Clerk of Works.

To: His Worship Mayor Vaughan, Chairman and Members of the Committee on Works
From: G. F. West, Commissioner of Works
Date: July 21, 1960
Subject: Expropriation - 8-10 Poplar Grove.

Council,
August 11, 1960

At the May 3rd, 1960 meeting of this Committee, the Commissioner of Works was directed to prepare a plan and description of the above property for expropriation purposes.

Expropriation Plan No. SS-5-14807 showing the property involved bordered in red and description of same is attached hereto.

It is recommended that the City expropriate this property for re-development purposes as provided under Section 624 of the City Charter and that \$38,377.50, which is assessment plus 5%, be paid into Court.

G. F. WEST,
COMMISSIONER OF WORKS.

BE IT RESOLVED that this Council does hereby adopt the recommendation contained in the resolution passed at a meeting of the Committee on Works held on the 21st day of July, A. D., 1960, for the expropriation of property known as Civic Number 8-10 Poplar Grove in the City of Halifax, to be acquired for the purpose of redevelopment, and which is more fully described in the resolution of the Committee on Works and set out on a plan prepared by the Commissioner of Works dated May 5th, 1960, and bearing Number SS-5-14807, referred to in the said resolution;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said land be and the same is hereby expropriated and that the City Clerk do pay to the Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia the sum of Thirty-eight Thousand Three Hundred and Seventy-Seven Dollars and Fifty Cents (\$38,377.50) of lawful money of Canada as the price or compensation for the said land.

R E S O L U T I O N

W H E R E A S the Commissioner of Works has submitted a report, dated July 21st, 1960, and also a plan and description, covering the expropriation of property known as Civic Number 8-10 Poplar Grove in the City of Halifax, for Redevelopment Purposes;

AND WHEREAS the Committee on Works is of the opinion that the said lands should be acquired for the purpose aforesaid;

AND WHEREAS the Committee on Works deems it necessary that the said lands as hereinafter described be expropriated;

AND WHEREAS the owner of the said land is not definitely ascertained;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Clerk pay to the Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia the sum of Thirty-eight Thousand Three Hundred and Seventy-seven Dollars and Fifty Cents (\$38,377.50) as the price for the

Council,
August 11, 1960

said lands, the said lands being more fully described as follows, viz:

All that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being on the western side of Poplar Grove between Jacob Street and Hurd Street in the City of Halifax as shown bordered in red on a plan entitled "Expropriation Plan of Certain Lands Required by the City of Halifax For Redevelopment Purposes", dated May 5th, 1960, and being on file in the Office of the Commissioner of Works of the City of Halifax at City Hall as Plan No. SS-5-14807; the said land being more particularly described as follows:—

Beginning at a point where the western official street line of Poplar Grove is intersected by the northern boundary line of land now or formerly owned by Max Pascal;

Thence northwardly along the said western official street line of Poplar Grove for a distance of eighty feet (80') more or less or to the southern boundary line of land now or formerly owned by Sara Silverman;

Thence westwardly along the said southern boundary line of land now or formerly owned by Sara Silverman for a distance of seventy-three feet (73.0') more or less or to the eastern official street line of Starr Street;

Thence southwardly along the said eastern official street line of Starr Street for a distance of eighty feet (80.0') more or less or to the northern boundary line of other land now or formerly owned by Max Pascal;

Thence eastwardly along the northern boundary line of the said other land of Max Pascal and continuing eastwardly along the aforesaid northern boundary line of land now or formerly owned by Max Pascal for a distance of seventy-three feet (73.0') more or less or to the place of beginning.

(Containing an area of five thousand eight hundred and forty square feet (5,840 sq. ft.)

His Worship the Mayor (To Compensation Officer): "The figure set out in the report—is this assessment plus 5%?"

Compensation Officer: "That is right."

His Worship the Mayor: "No other allowance for compulsory taking of business nor anything else?"

Compensation Officer: "No."

His Worship the Mayor: "Let the Court determine the amount to be paid in compensation."

MOVED by Alderman O'Brien, seconded by Alderman Greenwood, that the reports and resolutions be approved. Motion passed.

Council,
August 11, 1960

TENDERS FOR LINEN, ETC. - BASINVIEW HOME

August 11, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Public Health and Welfare Committee held on the above date, tenders were submitted from the City Manager and Commissioner of Health for the supply of linens, etc. for Basinview Home.

Your Committee concurs in the recommendations as follows:

1. 50 dozen sheets - Royal Supply Company Limited - \$1,362.00,
Federal Tax included.
2. 20 dozen draw sheets - Robert Simpson Company Limited - \$304.00,
Federal Tax included.
3. 10 dozen flannelette sheets - J. & M. Murphy Limited - \$312.00,
Plus Federal Tax.
4. 7 dozen blue spreads - Wood Brothers Company Limited - \$294.00,
Plus Federal Tax.
5. 7 dozen pink spreads - Wood Brothers Company Limited - \$294.00,
Plus Federal Tax.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE MINISTER OF HEALTH OF THE PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA RESPECTING REGULATIONS FOR THE OPERATION OF NURSING HOMES

His Worship the Mayor nominated the following members of Council to be appointed to the Special Committee to make recommendations to the Minister of Health of the Province of Nova Scotia respecting Regulations for the Operation of Nursing Homes:

Alderman Lane, Chairman

" Macdonald

" Fox

" Connolly.

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman O'Brien, that the nominations be accepted. Motion passed.

RENTAL CONTROL BY-LAW - SECOND READING

August 11, 1960

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

Council,
August 11, 1960

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on August 4, 1960, a Rental Control By-Law, as prepared by the City Solicitor, and read and passed a first time at the last meeting of the City Council, was again considered.

Your Committee recommends that the By-Law be read and passed a second time and forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

Alderman Greenwood: "Before this passes, has the staff any plans for implementing this By-Law?"

The City Manager replied in the negative.

His Worship the Mayor: "Is there an effective date for announcement of the coming into force of the By-Law? Does that mean if it is passed tonight it is in effect tomorrow morning?"

The City Solicitor advised that it must go to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval.

His Worship the Mayor: "What machinery has been set up to take care of the provisions of the By-Law?"

City Manager: "You have to appoint your Rental Authority and I suppose they just handle the personnel."

His Worship the Mayor: "A Rental Authority is one person, isn't it?"

City Manager: "A person or persons."

Alderman Trainor: "How long will this Rental Authority be in effect? Are there any definite terms of reference?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No. It is in effect as long as the Ordinance stands on the books."

Alderman Greenwood: "Have you, Your Worship, any comments on the fact that this Municipality will be alone in its attempts to control rentals?"

His Worship the Mayor: "No, I haven't. I talked with the Warden of the County and the Mayor of Dartmouth. You have been aware that the Warden did communicate with me and told me that his Council rejected it."

Alderman Lloyd: "Under this type of a control, it is not fixed to any base year. Rentals can be fixed in light of all the circumstances, can they not?"

Council,
August 11, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "There is no fixed base year."

Alderman Lloyd: "No. There is a separate determination in every application."

Alderman Abbott: "This is a Rental Authority but it's a much greater rental control than we had a few years ago."

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes."

Alderman Abbott: "Much greater because in the rental control we dropped in 1957, anything built after 1947, or remodelled after 1947, did not come under that control. This control takes in everything built after 1957 and anything remodelled at any time. If you bought a property today and remodelled it into apartments, it comes under this control."

His Worship the Mayor: "What it does not control, is what is built after a certain date."

Alderman Abbott: "After 1957?"

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right."

Alderman Abbott: "When we had the control before, everything built after 1947 was not controlled."

His Worship the Mayor: "That is right."

Alderman Abbott: "We are going back ten years. In other words, in 1965, we could move back and take in everything that was built up to 1962 or 1963. There's no guarantee that we won't do that."

His Worship the Mayor: "There is no guarantee."

Alderman Ferguson: "A recommendation will come to the Finance and Executive Committee, I take it, at a subsequent meeting regarding staff and the employment of staff. As it is now, the City of Halifax will be employing that staff?"

His Worship the Mayor: "Yes, we will be employing it alone."

Alderman Ferguson: "That will come to a future meeting of the Finance Committee and then on to Council."

Alderman Lloyd: "I understand then that this is not sent to the Minister for approval until the Finance Committee has given a report on the staffing."

Council,
August 11, 1960

His Worship the Mayor: "There still are some decisions to make in the Finance and Executive Committee. One, for instance, is the Authority— one person, or more than one person, and the matter of compensation."

Alderman Lloyd: "In other words, the whole thing is contingent upon our finding staff for the operation."

MOVED by Alderman Greenwood, seconded by Alderman Lloyd, that the By-Law be read and passed a second time. Motion passed.

AMENDMENTS - ORDINANCE #34 - "RESPECTING CHILDREN UNDER SIXTEEN YEARS OF AGE BEING ON THE STREETS OF THE CITY AT NIGHT" - SECOND READING

August 11, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on August 4, 1960, amendments to Ordinance #34 respecting "Children Under Sixteen Years of Age Being on the Streets of the City at Night", as prepared by the City Solicitor and read and passed a first time at the last meeting of the City Council, were again considered.

Your Committee recommends that the amendments as submitted be read and passed a second time and forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

1. Ordinance Number 34, Respecting Children under Sixteen Years of Age Being on the Streets of the City at Night, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:

1. Except as hereinafter provided, no person under the age of sixteen years shall be in or upon the public streets, highways, roads, alleys, parks, playgrounds, wharves, docks or other public grounds, public places and public buildings, places of amusement and entertainment, vacant lots or other unsupervised places in the City of Halifax between the hours of half-past nine o'clock in the afternoon and six o'clock in the following morning.

2. The provisions of Section 1 of this Ordinance shall not apply to any person under the age of sixteen years, or to the parents, guardian or persons with whom such person resides, who is in or upon any public streets, highways, roads, alleys, parks, playgrounds, wharves, docks or other public grounds, public places and public buildings, places of amusement and enter-

Council,
August 11, 1960

tainment, vacant lots or other unsupervised places in the said City of Halifax between the hours aforesaid and who is accompanied by a person over eighteen years of age in charge of such person, or to any such person under the age of sixteen years who between the hours aforesaid is returning directly to his place of residence, having left such place of residence prior to the hour of half-past nine o'clock in the afternoon.

3. The Chief of Police shall issue to any person under the age of sixteen years who is engaged in the employment of messenger boy, errand boy, clerk or similar occupation with the consent of his parents or guardians, a certificate setting forth such employment and consent, and such person shall be exempt from the operation of this Ordinance. Such certificate must be produced and shown to any Police Officer when the same is requested.

4. It shall be lawful for any Police Officer of the City of Halifax to take into custody any person under the age of sixteen years who is found in or upon the public streets, highways, roads, alleys, parks, playgrounds, wharves, docks, or other public grounds, public places and public buildings, places of amusement and entertainment, vacant lots or other unsupervised places in the said City of Halifax on any day between the hours mentioned in the first section of this Ordinance.

5. The parents, guardians or persons having the legal custody or control of any person under the age of sixteen years shall prevent such person from contravening the provisions of this Ordinance.

6. Every parent, guardian or person having the legal custody or control of any person under the age of sixteen years who contravenes or fails to comply with the provisions of this Ordinance shall, for every offence upon summary conviction, be liable to a penalty not exceeding Twenty-five dollars and in default of payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve days.

7. The times mentioned in this Ordinance shall be either Atlantic Standard Time or Daylight Saving Time, whichever is in force at the time by virtue of any enactment or of any resolution of the Council of the City of Halifax then in force.

8. This Ordinance shall be known as Ordinance Number 34.

9. Ordinance Number 34 as heretofore enacted and the amendments thereto, are hereby repealed.

Council,
August 11, 1960

MOVED by Alderman Greenwood, seconded by Alderman Dunlop, that the report be approved and the amendments be read and passed a second time and forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval. Motion passed.

AMENDMENTS - ORDINANCE #28 - "WEIGHING OF COAL AND COKE" - SECOND READING

August 11, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee, held on August 4, 1960, amendments to Ordinance #28 respecting "The Weighing of Coal and Coke", as prepared by the City Solicitor and read and passed a first time at the last meeting of the City Council, were again considered.

Your Committee recommends that the amendments as submitted be read and passed a second time and forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

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

1. Clause (c) of Section 2 of Ordinance Number 28, The Weighing of Coal and Coke, is amended by striking out the word "Mayor" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the words "City Clerk".
2. Clause (d) of Section 2 of said Ordinance Number 28 is amended by inserting after the word "Mayor" in the third line thereof the words "or City Clerk."
3. Section 3 of said Ordinance Number 28 is amended by striking out the word "Mayor" in the seventh line thereof and substituting therefor the words "City Clerk."
4. Section 10 of said Ordinance Number 28 is amended by striking out the word "Mayor" in the fourth line thereof and substituting therefor the words "City Clerk."

MOVED by Alderman Lloyd, seconded by Alderman DeWolf, that the amendments be read and passed a second time and referred to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for approval. Motion passed.

Council,
August 11, 1960

TAG DAY - HALIFAX COLORED CITIZENS' IMPROVEMENT LEAGUE - AUGUST 20, 1960

August 11, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Finance and Executive Committee held on August 4, 1960, a letter was submitted from the Halifax Colored Citizens' Improvement League requesting permission to hold a Tag Day on August 20th, as their scheduled day was again rained out.

Your Committee recommends that the request be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

MOVED by Alderman Fox, seconded by Alderman DeWolf, that the request be granted. Motion passed.

CANCELLATION - INSURANCE POLICY - MOTORCYCLE OPERATORS

August 11, 1960

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

At a meeting of the Safety Committee held on August 2, 1960, a report was submitted from the Commissioner of Finance advising that the Motorcycle Operators' Accident Insurance Policy, covering 16 men, is due for renewal.

The maximum benefits which could be provided are as follows:

Principal Sum	\$ 3,000.00
Capital Sum	\$ 3,000.00
Weekly Indemnity	\$ 35.00
Annual Premium	\$ 63.65 per man

Considering the cost of this insurance to the City, and the small protection contained in this coverage, the Commissioner and Chief of Police suggest that the policy be cancelled in view of the benefits provided members of the Police and Fire Departments, if involved in an accident, as contained in the City Charter and the Superannuation Plan.

Your Committee concurs in the suggestion of the Commissioner of Finance and Chief of Police.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. STODDARD,
CITY CLERK.

City Manager: "I would like to ask a question about something we didn't consider. What are you going to do, in cancelling that, which is on the recommendation of Mr. Romkey and the Chief of Police. I wasn't so happy about it; I agreed with it. What are you going to do? Are you thereby agreeing that if anybody is hurt that you go the limit, whatever is necessary, to do something

Council,
August 11, 1960

for the widow, that you will pay unlimited hospital bills and anything else that was covered by this policy? Presumably, you are just not going to take away the protection to motorcycle officers. It's being cancelled because it was felt that the cost was too great for what protection the amount of motorcycle constables get."

Alderman Lloyd: "Either the premiums go up; wouldn't that be in relation to what our risk would be?"

City Manager: "Well, it would be in relation to the Company's experience."

Alderman Lloyd: "Wouldn't that also increase the potential of our liability? Our liability is also, we discovered, greater in this particular type of operation than for automobiles, trucks or something else. Is that the reason there is such a difference in the premium?"

City Manager: "No. It is what the company thinks is the value of the risk that they cover. We have had a rather fortunate experience so far. Chief Mitchell is the one who originated this. He said to Mr. Romkey and to me: 'I think we are throwing our money out because we are paying such high rates and we are not collecting on it because we are so fortunate in not having any Constables hurt at all, or to any great extent'; I don't know which."

Alderman Lloyd: "What kind of insurance is it?"

City Manager: "It is a liability insurance."

Alderman Lloyd: "Public liability insurance?"

City Manager: "No. It's to cover the motorcycle operators themselves."

Alderman Lloyd: "Our own staff, in other words."

City Manager: "The principal sum is \$3,000.00; the weekly indemnity is \$35.00 per week, and the annual premium is \$63.65 per annum."

Alderman Ferguson: "Thirty-five dollars a week for how long? There is always a limit."

City Manager: "It is not in the report."

Alderman Greenwood: "This doesn't renew any public liability coverage?"

City Manager: "No. This covers the operator himself."

Alderman Greenwood: "Are these officers covered by Workmen's Compensation?"

City Manager: "No, they are not."

Council,
August 11, 1960

for the widow, that you will pay unlimited hospital bills and anything else that was covered by this policy? Presumably, you are just not going to take away the protection to motorcycle officers. It's being cancelled because it was felt that the cost was too great for what protection the amount of motorcycle constables get."

Alderman Lloyd: "Either the premiums go up; wouldn't that be in relation to what our risk would be?"

City Manager: "Well, it would be in relation to the Company's experience."

Alderman Lloyd: "Wouldn't that also increase the potential of our liability? Our liability is also, we discovered, greater in this particular type of operation than for automobiles, trucks or something else. Is that the reason there is such a difference in the premium?"

City Manager: "No. It is what the company thinks is the value of the risk that they cover. We have had a rather fortunate experience so far. Chief Mitchell is the one who originated this. He said to Mr. Romkey and to me: 'I think we are throwing our money out because we are paying such high rates and we are not collecting on it because we are so fortunate in not having any Constables hurt at all, or to any great extent'; I don't know which."

Alderman Lloyd: "What kind of insurance is it?"

City Manager: "It is a liability insurance."

Alderman Lloyd: "Public liability insurance?"

City Manager: "No. It's to cover the motorcycle operators themselves."

Alderman Lloyd: "Our own staff, in other words."

City Manager: "The principal sum is \$3,000.00; the weekly indemnity is \$35.00 per week, and the annual premium is \$63.65 per annum."

Alderman Ferguson: "Thirty-five dollars a week for how long? There is always a limit."

City Manager: "It is not in the report."

Alderman Greenwood: "This doesn't renew any public liability coverage?"

City Manager: "No. This covers the operator himself."

Alderman Greenwood: "Are these officers covered by Workmen's Compensation?"

City Manager: "No, they are not."

Council,
August 11, 1960

for the widow, that you will pay unlimited hospital bills and anything else that was covered by this policy? Presumably, you are just not going to take away the protection to motorcycle officers. It's being cancelled because it was felt that the cost was too great for what protection the amount of motorcycle constables get."

Alderman Lloyd: "Either the premiums go up; wouldn't that be in relation to what our risk would be?"

City Manager: "Well, it would be in relation to the Company's experience."

Alderman Lloyd: "Wouldn't that also increase the potential of our liability? Our liability is also, we discovered, greater in this particular type of operation than for automobiles, trucks or something else. Is that the reason there is such a difference in the premium?"

City Manager: "No. It is what the company thinks is the value of the risk that they cover. We have had a rather fortunate experience so far. Chief Mitchell is the one who originated this. He said to Mr. Romkey and to me: 'I think we are throwing our money out because we are paying such high rates and we are not collecting on it because we are so fortunate in not having any Constables hurt at all, or to any great extent'; I don't know which."

Alderman Lloyd: "What kind of insurance is it?"

City Manager: "It is a liability insurance."

Alderman Lloyd: "Public liability insurance?"

City Manager: "No. It's to cover the motorcycle operators themselves."

Alderman Lloyd: "Our own staff, in other words."

City Manager: "The principal sum is \$3,000.00; the weekly indemnity is \$35.00 per week, and the annual premium is \$63.65 per annum."

Alderman Ferguson: "Thirty-five dollars a week for how long? There is always a limit."

City Manager: "It is not in the report."

Alderman Greenwood: "This doesn't renew any public liability coverage?"

City Manager: "No. This covers the operator himself."

Alderman Greenwood: "Are these officers covered by Workmen's Compensation?"

City Manager: "No, they are not."